

**FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT
IRFFI/UNDG IRAQ TRUST FUND (UNDG ITF)**

| Participating UN Organization(s) | Sector(s)/Area(s)/Theme(s) |
|----------------------------------|---|
| UNOPS, UNAMI HRO | Iraq, Human Rights- Protection Sector Outcome Team |

| Programme/Project Title | Programme/Project Number |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Support to Iraq Preparations for the Universal Periodic Review UPR | F8-09 MDTF Office Atlas No: 71108 |

| Programme/Project Budget | | Programme/Project Location |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| UNDG ITF: | US\$1,700,000 | Region (s): |
| Govt. Contribution: | | Governorate(s): Baghdad and communities served by selected CSOs & grantees (Erbil, Muthanna, Baghdad, Missan, Babil, Diyala, Kirkuk, Sulaymaniyah, Mosul, Anbar, Wassit, Basrah, Diyala & Salah-al- Din) |
| Agency Core: | | |
| Other: | | District(s) |
| TOTAL: | US\$1,700,000 | |

| Final Programme/ Project Evaluation | Programme/Project Timeline/Duration |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Evaluation Done Yes No

Evaluation Report Attached Yes No

Overall Duration

28 May 2009 – 31 July 2011

Original Duration

28 May 2009 – 28 Nov 2010

Programme/ Project Extensions

First ext: 28 Nov 2010 – 27 May 2011

Second ext.: 28 May 2011 – 31 July 2011

Report Formatting Instructions:

- Number all sections and paragraphs as indicated below.
- Format the entire document using the following font: 12point _ Times New Roman & do not use colours.

FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT

I. PURPOSE

- a. Provide a brief introduction to the programme/ project (*one paragraph*)

In its Resolution 60/251, the United Nations General Assembly requested the Human Rights Council (HRC) to undertake a Universal Periodic Review (UPR), based on objective and reliable information, of the fulfilment of each State of its human rights obligations and commitments. This project focused on developing the capacity of the Government of Iraq (GoI) to meet its obligations, as well as the capacity of Civil Society to fulfil the role assigned to them within the context of the UPR. These two elements were addressed through a capacity building program including training, workshops and technical advice and assistance designed to enable both the Government of Iraq and the civil society organizations to meet their reporting requirements. During the project the GoI successfully submitted its UPR report and civil society provided numerous inputs to the stakeholder report. Iraq was examined by the UPR Working Group of the HRC in February 2010 and received 176 recommendations on improving its human rights situation. A final conference gathering Iraqi stakeholders was supported by the project in 2011 to facilitate discussions on the implementation of the UPR recommendations.

- b. List programme/project outcomes and associated outputs as per the approved Project Document.

The UPR project focused on developing the capacity of the GoI to meet its human rights treaty obligations under international law and to successfully participate in the UN HRC UPR process.

The project, also aimed to build capacity among Iraqi 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.
- c. List the UN Assistance Strategy Outcomes, MDGs, Iraq NDS Priorities, ICI benchmarks relevant to the programme/ project

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 [...]

- d. List primary implementing partners and stakeholders including key beneficiaries.

Implementing Partners:

UNOPS was responsible for the operational implementation of the project activities, including organizing trainings, study tours, selection of consultants, supporting UNAMI HRO in administrative aspects linked to technical assistance to MoHR and CSOs in report drafting, support to information campaign work, disbursement of grants and logistical organization of the national UPR conference.

UNAMI HRO with the assistance of the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights contributed technically to the implementation of the activities, ensuring that they were in line with the UN Human Rights protection system. In particular, they ensured that activities fell in line with the requirements of the UPR process and the Human Rights Council, reviewed all training agendas, content and delivery plans and provided technical advice to the line ministry the MoHR in relation to the UPR sessions in Geneva and the follow-up and implementation of UPR recommendations.

MoHR: was the line ministry for the project and also the lead ministry assigned to the preparation and follow-up of the UPR process for Iraq. As such, the MoHR played a key role in the drafting of the national report for the UPR in cooperation with relevant ministries. The ministry also chaired the project steering committee and contributed to the design and content of activities aimed to benefit the GoI, including proposing and reviewing training content and designating officials to participate in such activities. The MoHR also led the national conference, which was supported under the project, heading the technical and logistical

committees set up to organize the event.

Project beneficiaries:

Direct Beneficiaries

Direct beneficiaries of this project included the MoHR and its employees, other government officials from ministries such as MoJ, MoFA, MoEd and MoH etc. who participated in trainings and the UPR reporting and national conference and Iraqi civil society organizations working on human rights, who participated in trainings, awareness activities and the national conference.

Indirect Beneficiaries

Men, women and children throughout Iraq benefitted from an increased awareness of the human rights situation in Iraq through the UPR awareness activities, details of the UPR recommendations communicated by civil society the GoI and media, press information on the national conference. In addition, the project has contributed to an improvement in the Iraqi human right monitoring system through capacity building on reporting and the drafting of a National Action Plan (NAP) produced by MOHR following the UPR process. This in turn should impact positively on project beneficiaries.

II. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME/ PROJECT RESULTS

a. Report on the key outputs achieved and explain any variance in achieved versus planned results. Who have been the primary beneficiaries and how they were engaged in the programme/ project implementation?

The project aimed to achieve two main outputs:

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

The first output was achieved during the project when the GoI successfully completed its human rights reporting requirements to the UPR and participated in the UPR sessions in Geneva in 2010. In addition, a group of 25 CSOs were supported through the project to compile and submit a contribution to the UPR stakeholder report, which was submitted in September 2009. (the CSOs were selected through a competitive application process based on their capacity level and activities in the field of human rights.) Both the GoI and the civil society group demonstrated an increased capacity to draft human rights reports and an improved understanding of the UPR process by the end of the project.

The second output was also achieved during the project, demonstrated through regular dialogue between government and civil society during the project activities. For example, the MoHR shared details of its national UPR report on the MoHR website for civil society to comment on prior to the finalisation of the report. Also, during the UPR session in Geneva the project supported two NGOs to attend the review sessions. During the trip, the two NGOs had a formal meeting with the government delegation to discuss the UPR report and follow up to the recommendations.

In addition, planned civil society trainings on treaty body shadow reporting were attended by selected government officials as part of an effort to support dialogue during the project. Their attendance was welcomed by civil society and discussions during the trainings were considered fruitful by both sides and also helped to build mutual trust and better relations.

During the implementation of UPR awareness grants by selected NGOs, the MoHR provided contact details for all its governorate offices, which were passed on to the NGOs for any required assistance. Moreover, many local government officials and representatives of the authorities (police, judiciary etc) in the governorates where the grants were implemented were invited to attend and participate in

the awareness events, therefore creating space for dialogue and feedback.

Finally, over 50 NGOs and civil society organisations were invited by the GoI to attend the UPR national conference in June 2011. Although initially there was some reluctance on the part of the GoI to invite a large number of NGOs, particularly due to concerns over NGO registration and NGO validity, a large number of organisations did eventually attend and dialogue during the conference was open (see below for specific details on the conference).

Although cooperation between the government and civil society cannot as yet be considered to have reached a high level, the UPR project did witness some good improvements in terms of the willingness of both sides to sit down together to discuss human rights issues. This level of dialogue was not present at the beginning of the project. Moreover, recommendations made by CSO participants at the national conference supported by the project were to a large extent incorporated into the final draft version of the National Action Plan (NAP) for human rights that was the focal point of conference discussions and is intended as a plan for implementing the UPR recommendations. The NAP was endorsed by the Council of Representatives on 27 September 2011 and a national committee headed by the Deputy Minister of Human Rights has been established to implement the NAP. It should be noted here that fairly extensive liaison efforts by UNAMI HRO were required to ensure that the conference recommendations were indeed included in NAP. Nevertheless, the overall result demonstrates increased willingness on the part of the GoI to consider civil society inputs and technical expertise that did not readily occur in the past.

In line with the outputs, the project had two primary beneficiaries, the GoI and Iraqi human rights CSOs. The project's aim to develop the capacity of the government to meet its human rights reporting obligations under the UPR process was achieved through technical assistance, study tours and training to support the government in compiling and drafting the national UPR report and completing the UPR process in Geneva. Additional trainings were also provided to government officials on human rights reporting to the UN treaty bodies and on communicating the UPR process to the Iraqi public. Finally, the government led national conference was supported by the project to discuss the implementation of the UPR recommendations for Iraq. The MoHR as line ministry was closely involved in the preparation of the government activities, coordinated through the MoHR focal point for the project. The MoHR was also engaged in the project through its role as chair of the steering committee.

Selected CSOs were supported under the project through trainings and consultant led technical assistance for the drafting of their contribution to the stakeholder report. Civil society was also engaged in the project through the implementation of grants for UPR awareness raising activities, which were carried out following the issuing of UPR recommendations for Iraq. CSOs also played an active role in the UPR conference.

Under output 1 the following activities were planned for implementation:

- 1.1 Trainings on international human rights obligations
- 1.2 Study Tour to Iraq
- 1.3 Support to report writing
- 1.4 Participation to UPR working group session and OHCHR briefings
- 1.5 Selection of CSOs
- 1.6 Trainings for CSOs on UPR and reporting mechanisms
- 1.7 Information campaigns on UPR Mechanism

Under output 2 the following activities were planned for implementation:

- 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

During the project 95% of planned activities under outputs one and two were completed as expected from the project objectives and work plan. Activity 2.3, the creation of a CSO network was only partially completed due to a split within the original network set up under the project, which resulted from inactivity from one section of the network and led to the creation of a separate network by a breakaway group. This variance did not impact negatively on the project outcomes. Indeed, the breakaway group has managed to continue its work and coordination without requiring extensive support from the project, demonstrating capacity, motivation and independence. (See previous annual and quarterly reports for details.)

The following gives an overview of the project activities from the start of the project and details any variance in the work plan.

The first part of the project (2009) related mainly to activities leading to the submission and review of the Iraq contribution to the Universal Periodic Review mechanism, which had a specific timetable set out by the Human Rights Council. Training for the GoI and CSOs to build reporting capacity for UPR reporting was carried out and technical assistance was provided for the drafting of the Iraq national report as well as for a selected group of CSOs drafting a contribution to the stakeholder report. Both the national report and the stakeholder contribution were successfully submitted according to the HRC timetable.

Some variance occurred in the planned study tour to Iraq, designed for government officials from countries that had already completed their UPR to come to Iraq to share their experience. The study tour format had to be altered due to the unwillingness of participants to travel to Iraq for security reasons. The study tour activity was therefore changed so that a delegation from Iraq travelled to Bahrain where the Bahraini government hosted the study tour and shared lessons learned and best practices with the Iraqi delegation. These changes were approved at the time by the UN Resident Coordinator and supported by the Iraqi Ministry of Planning.

The second part of the project (2010) related mainly to 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 also focused on building the capacity of civil society to continue to monitor and report on the human rights situation in Iraq (for example through trainings on shadow reporting to the UN treaty bodies), raise awareness on the UPR process and outcomes and monitor the implementation of the UPR recommendations.

In terms of variance in the project timeframe, the project was originally expected to close at the end of November 2010. However, a 6 month no cost extension was granted in October 2010 so that certain delayed activities could be moved forward to 2011. These activities were therefore not completed during the second part of the project in 2010 as was initially expected.

This 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 required considerable input and consultation on objectives and content prior to implementation. By September 2010 it was felt that progress on the content of the conference, and in particular on a MoHR draft national human rights action plan (intended to be used *inter alia* for the implementation of UPR recommendations) 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.

Plans were also 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 and it was decided for scheduling purposes to complete the activities in 2011.

Two planned training activities for MoHR (training on reporting to treaty bodies) 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 third and last part of the project (2011) therefore related mainly to the project's final major activity which was the implementation of a national conference on the UPR and the finalization of government trainings. Following a number of delays resulting from the security situation, the conference was eventually held at the Council of Representatives conference hall in Baghdad in June 2011. The project had to delay the implementation of the national UPR conference due to the difficult security situation caused by preparations for the Arab Summit and public demonstrations taking place across the country. The event was due to take place in Baghdad and following government requests could not be moved to Erbil to avoid security constraints. The event was therefore postponed and as a result an additional 2 month project extension was requested and approved by the ITF. The project end date moved from 27th May to 31st July 2011, amounting to a total extension period of 8 months relative to the original project timeframe.

The variance in project timeframe supported the achievement of project outcomes by allowing more time for implementation in a difficult political and security context.

Project Activities in Detail:

The following gives an overview of each project activity and its results in relation to the project outcomes

Activities to support the Government of Iraq:

Study tours:

The project initially intended to involve 15 beneficiaries (representatives from the MoHR and other relevant ministries) in the study tour activities. However, for each activity, only 7 candidates were put forward by the government due to workload and other commitments as well as the effects of bombings in Baghdad at that time which took place close to many government buildings. As a result, many government workers were affected and officials involved in the project could not obtain permission to travel as they were needed by their ministries in Baghdad. Furthermore, due to problems with the internal processing of government travel authorisations, only 6 of those officials put forward to participate in the study tours managed to attend (five officials attended each tour, with one person being changed between the Geneva and Bahrein groups). Although the overall contribution to the project outcomes was still achieved through these activities, the results would have been improved by a higher number of officials benefitting from the experience of the study tours.

Study tour to Geneva

In June 2009, at the beginning of the project, 5 government officials took part in a study tour to Geneva where they attended a 4 day training workshop at OHCHR in Geneva (including 2 days to observe a UPR Working Group session and 2 days of additional briefings on human rights with OHCHR staff).

The capacity of the MoHR and other government officials in Iraq to report on the Human Rights situation in Iraq based on the UPR mechanism was developed through this training; participants were briefed on international human rights obligations and had the chance to participate in UPR working group sessions and OHCHR briefings, which helped them to go back to their country and start drafting the Iraqi national report.

Under the project, a second study tour to Geneva for the GoI to attend a session of the UPR working group had been planned for December. For internal reasons at the MoHR, a decision was made by the Minister for Human Rights not to send a delegation to the working group session under the UPR project and the activity was cancelled. Although the second study tour would have been beneficial, the initial study tour contributed in large part to the achievement of the expected result: to train

officials on the UPR process

Study tour to Bahrain

A study tour to Bahrain for representatives of the GoI working on the UPR was organized with the cooperation of The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bahrain. Five government officials representing two ministries (MOHR and MOHESR) went to Bahrain from 27 Sep. – 1 Oct. 2009. During the study tour, members of the Bahraini UPR committee presented their experience through several meetings and open discussions with the Iraqi delegation.

The whole UPR process was covered during the 5 day event, including preparations on the national level, development of the draft national report, preparation of the national report between Bahrain and Geneva, and presenting and discussing the report with the UPR Working Group and the Human Rights Council. The tour also included field visits, one to UNDP, which provided technical assistance to Bahrain during the UPR process and on the follow up to recommendations, and one to the University of Bahrain which undertook awareness raising activities on the UPR process in Bahrain.

As a result of the study tour, the Iraqi delegation became more familiar with UPR requirements and challenges; thus enhancing their capacity to go through their own UPR reporting process. The Iraqi delegation also learned about the importance of diplomatic exchange and follow up during the UPR process.

Moreover, the experience led the Iraqi delegation to further recognise the importance of civil society engagement in the UPR process. This was a positive outcome that resulted in the publishing of the Iraqi draft UPR report on the Ministry of Human Rights website as well as distribution to the media in an effort to encourage comments and input from civil society prior to submission to the HRC. The same draft report was also distributed via UNOPS to the 25 civil society organisations that had taken part in the UPR project by completing training on contributing to the UPR stakeholder report.

Technical assistance for the working group in drafting the UPR national report through the provision of an international consultant

Technical assistance for the drafting was provided by the project. An international consultant based in Baghdad from 4th October – 5th November 2009 guided the drafting committee on the technical requirements for reporting to the UPR. The provision of technical assistance helped to ensure that HRC stipulations on structure, length and basic content were met.

A number of draft versions of the report were produced and reviewed before arriving at a final version. Consultations were held with 12 relevant ministries on the final content of the report and the submitted version was approved during a Cabinet meeting in early November. Comments received from CSOs following the publication of a draft version (mentioned above) were also considered during the drafting process.

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 8th to 9th 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 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. It was delivered by specialist consultants and included a presentation 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.

The UPR Session for Iraq

On 16th February 2010, Iraq was examined under the UPR mechanism at the 7th session of the UPR working group. The UPR delegation, led by the Minister of Human Rights, presented the report to the Human Rights Council (HRC) in Geneva. The review represented the 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 19th 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 11th 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.

First Steering Committee Meeting: focus on CSO dialogue

On 28th 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 in order to share information and discuss Iraq's treaty obligations. In addition, it was agreed that CSOs that would be provided with grants for information activities would be encouraged to coordinate and include government counterparts in their activities where they deemed it appropriate.

Support to government information activities on the UPR

In January 2011, a training course for the media unit of the MoHR was held in Erbil on media strategies for communicating about the UPR. The three day training took place from 16th – 18th January and included topics such as identifying and formulating key messages, addressing different target audiences and communicating the UPR through media outlets. Participants included 13 media unit staff and 2 representatives from the National Institute for Human Rights, who supported the training by delivering sessions on the UPR process and outcomes for Iraq. The sessions on media strategy were delivered by an Arabic speaking media specialist consultant. During the training, participants worked on putting together a short booklet on the UPR designed to inform the general public about the UPR recommendations in an accessible manner.

As part of the media training reported above, the project supported the printing of 50,000 copies of a booklet on the UPR. The booklet, developed as part of the training activity, is intended to brief members of the general public on the UPR process and Iraq's participation and commitment to implement the UPR recommendations received. 50,000 copies of the booklet were printed in Iraq and delivered to MoHR for its dissemination. MoHR worked on the distribution of booklet to universities, public institutions, NGOs and members of the general public.

Second Steering Committee Meeting: focus on the National Conference

The project's second steering committee meeting was held on 23rd February 2011 in Baghdad with a videoconference link to colleagues in Amman. The meeting discussed project progress to date and focused on plans for the national conference, due to be implemented by the end of the project in May in Baghdad. The meeting was attended by the Deputy Minister for Human Rights, MoHR officials, civil society representatives and project staff from UNAMI HRO and UNOPS. During the meeting it was agreed that a committee would be set up to prepare for the conference and representatives from civil society and the UN would be nominated to support this committee. The participation of CSOs in the planning of the conference was considered to be particularly important to the project outputs. MoHR would also share the final draft UPR action plan with UNAMI HRO for their comments and inputs prior to the document being presented at the national conference.

Support to government officials to report on human rights

During 2011, two identical training courses entitled *Human Rights Reporting Skills Training for Iraqi Government Officials* were delivered to two selected groups of government officials. The five-day workshops took place in Erbil from 30th May – 3rd June and from 19th – 23rd June and were delivered by specialist trainers, selected and contracted through a competitive procurement procedure. The trainings were designed to provide government officials with the skills necessary to draft high quality national human rights reports to United Nations human rights treaty bodies. Officials from a range of ministries including MoHR, MoE, MoLSA and MoP attended the trainings following their selection by the GOI in line with the training requirements. Participants were selected on the basis of their professional profiles and level of capacity. All officials trained are required as part of their job to draft or provide inputs for national human rights reports. A total of 31 officials were trained over the two courses. Participants were provided with a solid understanding of international human rights standards and of legal obligations imposed on State Parties under the relevant human rights treaties. They were also equipped with a number of useful tools and skills that will enable them to further develop their writing and analytical skills in their daily work.

Technical Assistance to MoHR to develop a National Action Plan on Human Rights (NAP) (UPR plan)

From July to August 2010, technical assistance was provided to the MoHR to develop an implementation plan for the UPR recommendations, to be presented for discussion at the national conference on the implementation of the UPR. UNAMI HRO recommended that the plan should serve as a basis for developing a fuller human rights strategy for Iraq (which became known as the NAP).

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 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. During the first part of 2011, the MoHR carried out work on the action plan in order to reduce the overall length and edit the document. Although there were repeated requests from UNAMI HRO to receive a copy of the revised plan in order to provide technical assistance, the final version was only received in early May 2011 with a very short timeframe available for editing ahead of the UPR conference. It was therefore decided that the plan should be reviewed during the conference and key recommendations provided for its finalization.

Support to Iraq national conference

The project's final major activity was the implementation of a national conference on the UPR. Following a number of delays resulting from the security situation, the conference was eventually held from 5th -7th June at the Council of Representatives conference hall in Baghdad.

The conference was used as a basis for discussing and reviewing a draft national action plan on human rights produced by the MoHR and designed to address the implementation of the UPR recommendations for Iraq.

During the build up to the conference, three preparatory committees were set up: a technical committee, a logistics committee and a media committee. The technical committee included MoHR and civil society representatives and was supported by UNAMI HRO as technical advisor to the project. It met several times in April and May to plan the content and agenda of the conference. The media committee received technical advice from UNAMI PIO and the logistics committee was supported by UNOPS, which made most of the logistical arrangements for the conference in cooperation with MoHR and the Council of Representatives.

The conference opened with keynote speeches from Prime Minister Nouri Al Maliki, The Minister of Human Rights Mohammed Shi'ia Al Soudani, the head of the Council of Representatives Human Rights Committee Dr Salim Al Jabouri, the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General (SRSG) for Iraq Ad Melkert, and a representative from civil society. Below is a summary of the main discussions.

The conference was attended by over 220 people on the first day, including over 50 NGO representatives, government officials from all relevant ministries, members of local government including offices of the MoHR in the governorates, members of parliament and a large number of representatives from the international community (UN, Embassies and INGOs). Below a summary of the main events is given.

During his opening speech, Prime Minister Al Maliki noted that Iraq had taken significant steps forward in the area of human rights since the establishment of a democratic state and noted that he would like government, political powers and the people to make a commitment to maintaining a culture of human rights. He applauded the holding of the conference and the discussion of the UPR recommendations.

SRSG Ad Melkert noted in his speech that a number of improvements to human rights in Iraq could be recognised, however he highlighted the fact that many more challenges in this area still need to be

addressed. He stated the necessity to respond to the legitimate demands of the people and ensure that all human rights are protected without discrimination in order to achieve further progress in this area. It later became known that a satellite television channel had misinterpreted parts of the SRSG's speech and a media advisory was released by UNAMI to highlight the actual content of the speech given.

During the opening ceremony a protest was made by one NGO representative who demanded an apology for comments made by the Prime Minister in his speech that the representative felt criticised NGOs and their work and said that civil society had not been given the opportunity to speak during the opening ceremony. The protestor also called for the release of four human rights defenders that had been detained during demonstrations some days prior to the conference. The protestor then left the room.

The government spokesman Ali Al Dabbagh responded to the protest by noting that a planned speech by a civil society representative had been moved down the agenda because the representative was late and confirmed that civil society would be given opportunity to speak. He also noted that the four detained people had now been released.

Following the opening ceremony, which ended with the delayed civil society speech, the conference then focused on the review of the national action plan, which was presented by MoHR. Once the plan had been presented, conference participants broke off into six working groups to discuss sections of the action plan in detail. The working groups were as follows: rule of law, disability, women's rights, child rights, IDPs and minority rights.

Over the next two days the groups worked on a number of recommendations and suggested revisions to the national action plan. These recommendations were presented by the working groups on the third day during a plenary session. Over 40 recommendations for improving the action plan were made. At the end of the plenary session, the MoHR affirmed its commitment to revising the draft plan in accordance with the conference recommendations and proposed that the technical committee for the conference continue to meet for this purpose following the conference.

The conference was closed on the 7th June with speeches from the Minister for Human Rights, the official spokesman for the GoI Ali Al Dabbagh, the Kurdistan Regional Government Director General for Human Rights Mrs Tavga Omer Rashid, and a number of civil society representatives. Due to a last minute change in the timetable, the Deputy SRSG was unable to deliver a planned closing speech from the UN and instead the Director of UNAMI HRO gave a final speech in his capacity as representative for OHCHR in Iraq.

The conference provided a good setting for open dialogue between government and civil society and the mix of stakeholders attending the event allowed for a reasonably wide consultation on the contents of the national action plan. This certainly contributed to the project outcome of improving dialogue between government and civil society. The level of discussion at the conference demonstrated the willingness of both civil society and government to debate their opinion even when views differed.

However, following the conference, concerns were raised by UNAMI HRO on the extent to which conference recommendations had been properly incorporated into the draft plan by the GoI when the plan was put before the Council of Ministers without allowing for external review of the amended text by the conference stakeholders. After these concerns were received, MoHR agreed to send HRO the revised text. Following HRO checking, it was noted that some recommendations had not been included in the draft, although a majority had been taken into consideration. The MOHR therefore agreed to consider UNAMI's request to look again at the conference recommendations in relation to the action plan contents and provided a brief note on what should have been included into the final action plan. The MoHR responded to the note justifying its position and the choice of including some of the conference's recommendations into the plan and noted that it believed that the other recommendations were already covered by the plan as it stood and did not need to be explicitly added.

Activities to support Human Rights Civil Society Organizations:

Selection of CSOs to participate in capacity building on the UPR stakeholder report

In Mid July 2009, UNAMI HRO and UNOPS, with the support of a specialized consultant with expertise on human rights and civil society, finalized the selection of 25 Iraqi CSOs from different governorates to participate in the UPR (Universal Periodic Review Mechanism) process. The CSOs were selected out of 97 organizations that applied through a competitive process wherein CSOs were required to write an essay on key human rights issues in Iraq.

Support to CSOs on the UPR process and reporting mechanisms

A comprehensive CSO training on the UPR and reporting mechanisms was conducted in Erbil from 2-5 August 2009. The training was organized in cooperation with the Amman Centre for Human Rights Studies, who were subcontracted by UNOPS to deliver the training. 25 selected CSOs received comprehensive training on the UN human rights system, the UPR mechanism and the role of CSOs in human rights monitoring and reporting. The training focused in particular on how CSOs can report to the UPR and other human rights treaty bodies.

Technical assistance for CSOs to make a contribution to the UPR stakeholder report

Following the training, the project also provided technical assistance to the group of 25 CSOs to assist them in the preparation of a report to be submitted as a contribution to the UPR stakeholder report. To this end, a meeting was also held for the CSOs on the 19 and 20 of August for the purpose of coordinating the drafting with the international consultant providing the technical advice. The project also supported a pre-submission meeting for the group, held in Erbil on 29th September at which all the organizations endorsed the report. The CSOs contribution to the UPR Stakeholder report was then submitted to the Human Rights Council on 1st Sep. 2009.

Training on human rights reporting skills

Following the submission of the CSOs contribution to the stakeholder report, the project went on to hold further training for CSOs in need of additional capacity building in human rights report drafting. As the idea of the training was to give those with weaker capacity an opportunity to improve their reporting skills, not all the CSOs participating in this additional training were the same as had participated in the previous workshops and already had good capacity in this area.

The training was held in Erbil from 21-25 November 2009. Twenty participants, out of twenty three initially registered, fully attended the training course. Four participants were women. The training methodology was based on active learning methods and participatory tools, including case studies, small working groups and practical written assignments. The training was successfully implemented with evidence of increased capacity among participants notable at the end of the 5 days course.

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 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.

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. Representatives from the network also attended and actively participated in the national conference in June 2011.

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 19th February 2010 following the adoption session. During their meeting the two groups discussed the recommendations and shared ideas on the way forward in terms of implementation and follow-up.

Ten 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 was for CSOs to raise public awareness of the UPR for Iraq and its implications.

Following selection and contracting, grant activities began in the final quarter of 2010 and continued into 2011. Grant activities included information seminars and workshops as well as radio programmes, poster campaigns and other similar awareness activities. Target groups ranged from specific groups such as youth and minorities to the general public depending on the grant concerned. All grants were monitored by UNOPS field staff, who regularly attended grant activities and provided support to grant recipients on financial and reporting requirements.

CSOs implementing the grants 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 also reported that as a result of their participation a majority acquired at least a basic understanding of what the UPR is and what the recommendations involve. Where the target groups involved members of the general public, awareness of basic human rights issues was not as high and the grants therefore also contributed to raising general 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 human rights monitoring activities and meetings with local government on human rights issues. The network also intends to work on developing project proposals linked to the implementation of UPR recommendations in Iraq. 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).

Other grants achieved particularly successful results from engaging with local governments. For example, 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 was held in January 2011, to discuss the implementation of UPR recommendations and look at points raised by civil society during the UPR grant activities. The event was attended by 17 members of parliament, the

Director General for Human Rights, the Minister of Youth, the Minister of Social Affairs and 20 civil society organisations as well as representatives from UNAMI HRO and UNOPS. As a result of the meeting, it was agreed to set up a joint committee of civil society and youth activists that would hold regular meetings with the Kurdistan Parliament. It was also suggested that a group of civil society leaders be set up to regularly advise the Kurdistan Parliament committees on issues relating to human rights and the UPR recommendations. These activities are being followed up on by the granted NGO and its partners and are supported by UNAMI HRO. Under the same grant, the UPR recommendations were translated into Kurdish and disseminated to regional government departments and the Kurdistan Parliament (the recommendations were previously only available in Arabic language and translation has allowed for further dissemination and awareness raising in KRG.)

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 2009¹ and additional NGOs representatives 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 3rd 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 Iraq² 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

¹ 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.

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

regular report writing as part of their NGO work in order to improve their skills and reap the full benefit of the training series.

b. Report on how achieved outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes and explain any variance in actual versus planned contributions to the outcomes. Highlight any institutional and/ or behavioural changes amongst beneficiaries at the outcome level.

The project was expected to contribute to the following outcomes as per the project document:

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.

The UPR project has made an overall contribution to the Sector Outcome by enhancing the ability of both the government and civil society organisations to respond to UPR reporting obligations and to the resulting recommendations of the Human Rights Council. This has in turn helped to improve the structural environment in which human rights are monitored and protected: Since the beginning of the project, there have been notable steps forward in creating an improved human rights system in Iraq in which monitoring and reporting is carried out more regularly than before. For many years, Iraq was notably absent from international reporting processes, such as reporting to the human rights treaty bodies. Completing the UPR process marks an improvement for Iraq in meeting its obligations and actively participating in diplomatic processes in support of human rights. Since the UPR reporting process was completed, Iraq has also made significant efforts to meet obligations to treaty body reporting, including reporting to CEDAW and beginning work on other pending human rights reports.

Moreover, through the UPR process, the government of Iraq has made several important pledges that will support better functioning human rights system in Iraq including the following: to strengthen efforts to bring domestic human rights legislation into line with international human rights law; to accede to additional human rights treaties including the conventions on disability and the convention on enforced disappearance; to cooperate with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council and its missions; to provide regular periodic reports to the United Nations treaty bodies; to complete the procedure for establishing the independent Higher Commission for Human Rights and draw up a national five-year plan for the promotion and advancement of human rights (the basis of which may now be drawn from the national action plan drafted with the support of this project). Nevertheless, at the end of this project, Iraq still needs to complete its implementation of the UPR recommendations and it is hoped that positive steps will be made to achieve this by the time Iraq is reviewed again in 2014, using the NAP as a basis and keeping to the pledges made in February 2010.

In addition to the above, an increase in civil society and public awareness of human rights issues and the international and national mechanisms designed to respond to human rights challenges and violations has been observed since the beginning of the project. This is evidenced by the level of participation of civil society in project activities, in particular awareness activities and trainings and the motivation demonstrated by many participating NGOs to continue following up on the UPR. For example, there was a high level of interest in the national conference and in continuing dialogue with the MoHR and GoI on human rights issues through this forum.

It should also be noted here that in addition to the CSO group supported to report to the UPR through this project, many other civil society organisations and groups of NGOs in Iraq also made contributions to the stakeholder report, as well as usual contributions from international NGOs and external human rights groups. This can be seen to demonstrate an increase in civil society activity in the field of human rights and a reasonable level of awareness of international human rights protection mechanisms.

The project has contributed to the Joint Programme Outcome through the training programmes provided during the project, which have contributed towards strengthening the ability of the GOI to meet its reporting obligations and to develop better reporting mechanisms based on an improved understanding of reporting requirements and processes for the UPR and for the human rights treaty bodies.

Work on improving dialogue between government and civil society carried out under the project has also made a contribution to enhancing Iraq's ability to respond to the human rights situation in the country. Increased cooperation between the government, the authorities and civil society on human rights issues will allow for a better response to human rights issues in terms of technical expertise on human rights (gained for example through experience sharing and working together on solutions) and in terms of clearer communication between the parties concerned (for example through open discussion and problems solving debate).

c. Explain the overall contribution of the programme/ project/ to the ICI, NDS, MDGs and Iraq UN Assistance Strategy.

NDS and ICI

The project has contributed in particular to section 3.3 of the ICI and section 8.3 of the NDS regarding the protection of human rights and the establishment of a comprehensive human rights regime country wide. In particular the project has helped to strengthen the government's capacity to report on its international human rights treaty obligations through its successful completion of its first UPR process. In addition, the project has helped to strengthen the role of civil society in human rights protection through capacity building, awareness raising and support to dialogue with the government and Iraqi authorities.

MDGs

A human rights based development approach is essential to the achievement of MDGs, which need to be accomplished within a framework that also supports good governance and human rights protection. This project has indirectly contributed to the achievement of the MDGs in Iraq through contributing to the overall improvement of the human rights system in Iraq.

UN Assistance Strategy

The UN in general and in particular UNAMI HRO have based their technical assistance for Iraq in the field of human rights on building national capacity in the promotion and protection of human rights. For a durable solution to the current human rights situation and to allow for continuous improvement of human rights protection in Iraq, it is of paramount importance that national stakeholders fulfil their respective obligations as duty bearers to comply with the State's obligations under international human rights instruments to promote, protect and fulfil the rights of the citizens to fully enjoy their human rights as rights holders. In this regard, the UPR project directly contributed to national capacity building and in particular to enhancing Iraq's ability to comply with and successfully complete the UPR process.

d. Explain the contribution of key partnerships including national, international, inter-UN agency, CSO or others towards achievement of programme/ project results.

The project was implemented by UNOPS in close cooperation with UNAMI HRO. UNOPS was responsible for implementing the project in operational terms and as such ensured that activities went ahead by carrying out financial and project management work including implementation of necessary procurement processes, expert consultancy hire, logistics support for all project events and workshops and grant management for awareness activities. UNOPS also worked to ensure that the project timeframe and budget were respected and reporting requirements to the ITF were met. UNOPS also

played a key role in ensuring training activities and consultancy tasks were completed in order to directly support the submission of the UPR reports.

UNAMI HRO provided overall technical supervision for the project including review of activity content to ensure relevance and compliance with international human rights standards, technical support for the MoHR and GOI on the UPR mechanism and submission of reports and provision of technical advice and the undertaking of regular liaison work with the MOHR to support the smooth running of the project and where necessary advise on technical issues related the national UPR report, NAP and national conference. Through UNAMI HRO, OHCHR in Geneva was also consulted on project activities and in particular provided training support in Geneva for workshops and briefings for government officials on the UPR mechanism.

MoHR as the project's line ministry played an active role in the design of project activities and their content and took a lead role as chair of the project steering committee. Moreover, the ministry led the delegation that attended the UPR process in Geneva and was the lead ministry working on the drafting of the UPR national report in cooperation with relevant partner ministries. Their work on the national report and its follow up made a direct contribution to Iraq's successful completion of the UPR process. The ministry, with support from the UN agencies involved in the project also played a key role in creating space for dialogue with civil society through the various project activities and meetings that took place (see sections above for details.)

The civil society organisations involved in the project played key roles in ensuring that the stakeholder report was submitted on time and in carrying out awareness activities to inform the public, local authorities and key stakeholders about the UPR and its implications. The more active CSOs made direct contributions by following up regularly on the UPR process and participating in dialogue on the UPR process, most notably as part of the UPR project conference but also in trainings and as part of their own organisations' work in the human rights field.

The relationship between all project partners was strengthened by regular communication, correspondence and meetings to discuss project implementation and progress on specific activities. In general the project partnerships worked well and had a positive impact on the project implementation.

e. Highlight the contribution of the programme/ project on cross-cutting issues:

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 and report on 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 in general and human security in particular

Gender: All objectives and activities for this project were formulated and planned according to principles of gender balance and gender equality. This was to 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. Throughout the project, reaching gender balance amongst participants was challenging and the results not as satisfactory as hoped. The project made efforts to increase female participation by encouraging female applicants for trainings and asking counterparts and CSO partners to nominate qualified female candidates when appointing people to take part in project activities, however, there was a general tendency by government and civil society to nominate more male participants for activities, which limited the project's ability to increase gender balance. In the training activities

carried out in 2010, female participation did increase slightly, up from 14% in 2009 to 24% in 2010 and 30% in 2011.

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.

- **Were the needs of particularly vulnerable or marginalised groups addressed?**

Issues relating to the rights of vulnerable and marginalised groups were addressed in terms of discussion and reporting (within the UPR reports) on the human rights situation of certain groups including women and children, displaced persons, persons with disability and minorities. Many of the UPR recommendations for Iraq also focused on the protection of the rights of these groups. Moreover, representatives from marginalised and vulnerable groups were included from the outset of each activity and during their implementation. At the national conference, specific groups were established to better represent the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups. For instance a group on women's rights and on disabled peoples' rights were specifically established and chaired by representatives of these groups. In terms of other specific activities, some of the awareness grants implemented by CSOs under the project specifically targeted women, children and minorities when carrying out awareness raising work.

- **How did men and women benefit from the programme/project? How were gender inequalities handled?**

The project aimed to maintain gender balance throughout the implementation of the different activities through the project life cycle and tried to give equal opportunity to women and men to participate in project activities as partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders. However, it remained a challenge to include qualified female participants in project activities including trainings. This follows the tendency mentioned above for the predominance of men in key CSO and government posts and the tendency to nominate men for participation in activities. Requests for further female participation in these events were made by the project and over the 2 years of implementation, improvements were seen with female participation in trainings and workshops increasing from 14% to 30% overall.

- **Were environmental concerns addressed including environmental impact/risk assessment where relevant?**

N/A.

- **Were there any specific issues in relation to the security situation?**

During the first phase of the project (2009), a study tour was organised for GOI representatives to share the experience with an Arab state that had already submitted the UPR report. This had to be rescheduled to take place outside Iraq as no Arab state representatives accepted to travel to Baghdad. Instead, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bahrain agreed to host the Iraqi delegation in Bahrain. The revision of the location was done in consultation with the Iraqi Ministry of Planning through the UNAMI SCSO. The study tour went ahead; however, the Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs was unable to nominate someone to participate due to the major explosions that took place in Baghdad (amongst others targeting the Ministry) on the 19th of August, close to the dates of the study tour.

During the first quarter of the second phase (2010), the main constraint faced by the project was the postponement of the SC meeting caused by the security situation in Baghdad in the run up to the

elections which constrained the availability of slots for UN staff to be present in Baghdad to attend such meetings.

Moreover, during the SC meeting, the MoHR officially confirmed information that two members of the UPR delegation were targeted in two separate attacks in Baghdad shortly after their return from the UPR session in Geneva in February 2010. One was killed and the other seriously injured. The link between their targeting and their work on the UPR is not clear; however these tragic events highlight the ongoing security challenges in Iraq, in particular for people working in the field of human rights.

In the last phase of the project (2011), the security situation surrounding the Arab Summit in Baghdad and the public protests across Iraq made it difficult for some project staff to attend meetings in Baghdad (including the project steering committee meeting) and to confirm plans and logistical arrangements for the implementation of the project's final conference.

The main constraint in this phase resulted from the security restrictions, which increased the need for extensive remote management, which made the implementation of the national conference complex, due to limited movement for international staff to check on the set up of the venue and the extensive security requirements for participants to access the venue and attend the event. This situation was managed through the support of national staff and constant telephone communication with all parties concerned to ensure attendance lists were correct and all requirements for the conference were put in place. However, the environment was less than ideal for the implementation of such an event.

In general, throughout the project, restrictions on UN international staff movement had a negative impact on the ability to fully strengthen relations with government counterparts and work smoothly to provide technical assistance because regular meetings and visits to the MoHR premises in the red zone were not always possible. Much of the project communication was therefore done by phone, email, pre planned meetings in the IZ or through national staff able to move around more easily. This was not the ideal working environment and posed a challenge at times, in particular when working on providing technical support for the drafting the NAP (both via consultants and international staff from HRO) and the arrangements for the national conference which required almost daily communication with the MoHR.

Another general point that should be made here is that human rights activists and advocacy organizations do not enjoy freedom of expression and are often subject to suppression (by different groups including state forces) and risks to their personal security because of the work they do. For example, during the last quarter of 2010, one activist participating in the project was exposed to a personal security risk along with his family as a result of his work as a human right activist (although there was no direct link established between the events and his participation in the UPR project).

- **Did the project contribute to employment generation (gender disaggregated)?**

N/A

- f. Provide an assessment of the programme/ project based on performance indicators as per approved project document using the template in Section IV**

See matrix for details

III. EVALUATION & LESSONS LEARNED

- a. Report on any assessments, evaluations or studies undertaken relating to the programme/ project and how they were used during implementation. Has there been a final project evaluation and what are the key findings? Provide reasons if no evaluation of the programme/ project have been done yet?

No formal final internal or external evaluation was included in the project work plan. However, regular monitoring of the project was carried out by project partners throughout the implementation period using a number of methods:

UNOPS closely followed all contractual obligations and worked to ensure that all project outputs were achieved. To do this, regular written and oral communication between the UNOPS project manager and UNAMI HRO were used to follow up on project activities and carefully plan activities under the project. Regular meetings were 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 provided monitoring support for the project by regularly attending project activities and providing feedback to the project manager and the national project officer in Amman who also made frequent visits to Iraq to monitor project activities and meet with MoHR counterparts and civil society.

UNOPS and UNAMI HRO had regular contact with the MoHR project focal point and held meetings to discuss issues, lessons learned and government expectations. In addition, the steering committee provided a forum for monitoring project progress and evaluating activities and the next steps to be taken within the project plan.

Satisfaction surveys and training evaluations were also used for monitoring project progress and capacity building activities and feedback was used to improve implementation.

UNAMI HRO, in its advisory role, coordinated regularly with MoHR and ensured monitoring and follow-up of any issues at the political level. Any issues raised are relayed to the UNOPS project manager for relevant action to be taken if needed.

b. Indicate key constraints including delays (if any) during programme/ project implementation

The main constraints faced during the project related to time delays in completing work for the national conference and national action plan and to security constraints that proved challenging to project implementation. These issues have already been detailed in the sections above and were generally overcome through time extensions to the project and alternative implementation methods to deal with security challenges.

Remote management and security constraints also made it challenging to provide an optimum level of technical assistance to the GoI, in particular for the drafting of the NAP. Although expert consultancy services and support from UNAMI HRO were provided, the drafting of the NAP would have benefitted more from a closer collaboration with MoHR counterparts, which proved very difficult given the restrictions on regular meetings posed by the security situation. The majority of technical assistance had to be provided from the IZ and meetings were often postponed or cancelled due to movement constraints for both sides. This made it difficult for project partners to liaise in the most effective manner with government officials. Although the NAP was completed the project felt that the document could have been improved through better collaboration.

c. Report key lessons learned that would facilitate future programme design and implementation.

Listed below are some of the key lessons learned from the project implementation:

In the context of remote management and the specific security context of Iraq, more detailed coordination mechanisms need to be in place from the beginning of the project with clear responsibilities for all parties in order to deal with constraints on normal meeting and communications procedures. This will in turn improve the ability of projects to provide an optimum level of technical assistance and liaison with counterparts.

More targeted efforts need to be made to increase the participation of women in project activities, particularly where there is a tendency for government and civil society nominated candidates for trainings and workshops to be male.

Although a number of significant steps forward have been made by Iraq in terms of increased capacity in human rights and increased ability to meeting international reporting obligations, continued support is required to ensure the sustainability of the skills acquired during the project. The work of the UNAMI Human Rights Office will support the necessary follow up, however additional funding and follow on projects are needed to fully support Iraq as it moves to implement the NAP and UPR recommendations for the next cycle and preparation of the next report, which will highlight the results achieved and progress made during the period 2010 to 2014.

IV. INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

| | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baselines | Planned Indicator Targets | Achieved Indicator Targets | Reasons for Variance (if any) | Source of Verification | Comments (if any) |
|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <i>IP Outcome 1: MOHR and CSOs have the capacity to report on the HR situation in Iraq based on UPR mechanism</i> | | | | | | | |
| 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 government officials | 5 | | Study tour report | It should be noted that the explosions that occurred in Baghdad just prior to the second study tour significantly affected the number of participants that could be put forward to attend. The GoI, on which the responsibility to nominate government officials that should participate lies, decided to put forward 7 people instead of the original 15 planned. Two of these seven were |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | finally not able to participate due to difficulties obtaining travel authorization from their respective ministries. |
| | Indicator 1.1.2 # of MoHR working group trained in reporting on treaty obligations | 0 | 15 | 31 | | Training reports | Two identical five-day training courses on human rights reporting skills were delivered to two different groups of GoI officials (including MoHR officials) on reporting to treaty bodies. More officials were trained than originally envisioned upon government request and budget availability. |
| | Indicator 1.1.3 % of MoHR working group satisfied with the quality of training in terms | N/A | 80% | 100% | | Training assessment report and Satisfaction assessment | A satisfaction survey was sent to all government participants in April 2010 and evaluation forms |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|-----|------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | of relevance and usefulness | | | | | | including satisfaction questions were completed after trainings in 2011. 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 that specifically asked about this activity area. All participating officials 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 | Having all the 25 selected NGOs approving the work plan, plan of action and contents of the report proved to be a serious challenge due to |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | different views and positions. However, after long mediations and negotiations led by the CSOs consultant, a final agreement was reached and the contribution to the UPR Stakeholder report sent on time. |
| | # of human rights CSOs trained on reporting on treaty obligations | 0 | 50 | 25 | | Training reports and progress reports. | 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 network | | Project progress report and monitoring of UNOPS staff | Please refer to narrative details above on the set up of a network under the project. |
| <i>IP Outcome 2: Improved dialogue between government and civil society on human rights issues</i> | | | | | | | |
| IP Output 2.1 | Indicator 2.2.1 # of formalised meetings between MoHR officials and human rights CSOs | 0 | 6 meetings | 6 | | Project progress report and meeting minutes as well as presence of UNOPS management and/or field staff. | 1 meeting after the UPR session in Geneva; 2 SC meetings: (One during the Geneva UPR Session and another consultative meeting took place in 2011 in the run up to the UPR conference) And 3 technical meetings for preparation of the conference. |
| | Indicator 2.2.2 # of CSOs represented in national dialogue | 0 | 25 | 50 | | List of attendance and meeting minutes | 50 CSOs representatives took part in the most important national dialogue activity in the project, the national conference. Included in this |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|-----|-----|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | number, smaller groups and individuals were also present at project meetings and training where dialogue with the GoI was undertaken. |
| | Indicator 2.2.3 # number of CSOs represented in the final conference | 0 | 25 | 50 | | Conference report | |
| | Indicator 2.2.4 CSOs recommendations included in the conference outcome document | No | Yes | Yes | | Conference outcome document: National Action Plan | According to correspondence between the MoHR and the UNAMI HRO the recommendations that were made during the national conference were included into the final Action Plan and the MoHR committed itself to make sure that the process of implementation of the plan includes representatives of |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | the CSOs to ensure transparency and inclusion. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|