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The Evaluation Team

**Executive Summary**

The UNDP-led project (BNHRC-CDP) supporting the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) began with the signature of the project document in May 2010 and is scheduled to end in April 2015. This is the report of an external evaluation undertaken to: assess to what extent the BNHRC-CDP has addressed the needs and problems identified in the design phase; assess how adequately the BNHRC-CDP has achieved its stated development objective and purpose; measure how effectively and efficiently the BNHRC-CDP outcomes and outputs have progressed in attaining the development objective and purpose of the project; assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation; identify and document substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up the BNHRC-CDP in Bangladesh; and provide forward looking programmatic recommendations for UNDP support to the NHRC. To that end, the Evaluation Team undertook an in-country mission from 21 November to 18 December 2014 and met with over 50 representatives and partners of UNDP, the National Human Rights Commission (JAMAKON) and the BNBHRC-CDP Team.

With regard to the project design (relevance), the Evaluation Team concluded that the project responded to an opportunity (the passing of the NHRC Act in 2009 by Parliament) to establish a new and key human rights institution, one with a unique bridging role between Government and civil society to address the broad spectrum of human rights issues in the country, including state violence, and serious and systematic human rights abuse. The project appropriately focused core support to all three main areas of the Commission’s work[[1]](#footnote-1) and also aimed to strengthen its institutional development, including administrative and management practices.

Over the course of the four and half years examined by the Evaluation Team, the project achieved many notable successes (effectiveness and efficiency). It helped to develop, train and advise on a range of management rules, procedures and tools to professionalize the work of the Commission and strengthen its accountability (outcome 1 of the project document). It supported steady progress in complaints handling, investigation and mediation and helped to develop partnerships to report on human rights violations country-wide (outcome 2). The project developed extensive media contacts for the Commission and helped mobilize partners nation-wide to raise awareness on key human rights issues and the role of the Commission. The project also helped to produce a wide range of research studies and policy papers on key human rights issues and facilitated effective input on human rights-related legal reform and numerous draft laws (outcome 3). These efforts are described in more detail in sections 3 of this report and are documented in annex 1.

The Evaluation Team was able to identify numerous ways in which gender-related issues and concerns were addressed in the project, although the lack of gender-disaggregated data precluded the possibility of adequately measuring its impact[[2]](#footnote-2). Informants in the evaluation who were asked to rate the performance of the project and, by extension, the Commission, gave an average grade of 3.5, corresponding to midway between “satisfactory” and “good”.

The Evaluation Team identified a number of factors that negatively impacted the implementation and progress of the project. These included, most importantly:

* + The design of the project management mechanisms which were not appropriate for an independent National Human Rights Institution. As a result, the Project Steering Committee did not form and a suitable replacement not found. The critical post of National Project Director continues to be filled by persons on deputation[[3]](#footnote-3) without the requisite experience and who are frequently replaced. The technical-level donor meetings (the Commission, UNDP and project donors) have been spaced out with senior management getting involved only in recent years. Sometimes difficult working relationships between the Commission and the Project Team were exacerbated by the physical separation of the two teams in separate office buildings in different parts of the city.
	+ The absence of critical staffing and financial resources at the Commission, which still counts less than 10 professional officers on its staff, most of who are inappropriately on deputation and therefore subject to periodic transfer back to Government ministries. Consequently, the Commission has no staff in departments representing two of its three core areas of work (corresponding to outcomes 3 and 4 of the project) and continues to be unable to establish regional offices of the Commission.

Further negative factors affecting the achievements of the project include flaws in the NHRC Act and its narrow interpretation which have restrained the Commission from undertaking its full mandate; and institutional weaknesses of the Commission resulting in part from its severe understaffing but also from a failure to fully engage all of the Commissioners.

The key lessons learned which were documented in the evaluation, include that project management and oversight mechanisms must be compatible with the independent nature of an NHRI. This means that the Project Steering Committee, as well as the Project Implementation Committee, should not place representatives of Government ministries in a position of deciding or influencing the programmatic focus of the Commission, the role of which includes criticizing the Government. The Project Manager needs a fully functioning and empowered Commission counterpart (NPD and /or a Senior Programme Coordinator) to review progress weekly and resolve issues arising. Given the lack of adequate support by the Commission’s “line ministry” and past efforts to undermine the Commission’s independence[[4]](#footnote-4), there is a continuing critical need for concerted and determined advocacy by the project donors to support the overall project goals of a strong independent and effective Commission.

Another key lesson learned in the evaluation is the need for more accountability in the monthly technical-level donor meetings. There needs to be: more timely and effective follow-up by the Commission to project outputs; better progress on the Commission’s core mandate, including fact-finding and prison visits; more advocacy on threats to NGOs and HRDs within the context of a steadily shrinking democratic space; greater efforts made to sustain the thematic committees, which is key to strengthening the Commission as an institution; and, once an expected new 20 posts are filled by the Commission, the rationalization of its organogram, reflecting actual staffing and responsibilities to facilitate knowledge-transfer by the project.

There were a number of good practices identified by the Evaluation Team. These include the flexible adjustment of the project to overcome the grossly inadequate staffing of the Commission. When it became apparent that the Commission would not have sufficient staff to implement activities in two of the project’s three core areas, the Project Team was expanded to assist the Commission in actual implementation. The new team included expertise in all core areas and effectively doubled the number of professional staff who were serving the Commission. Perhaps the most significant good practice was the support given by the project to the Commission’s use of creative networking and coalition-building to overcome, as much as possible, the lack of regional offices. To that end, there were 24 separate partnerships, networks and MOUs with over 30 NGOs, international organizations and government agencies, including at the local level[[5]](#footnote-5). This has resulted in a wide range of awareness-raising activities undertaken throughout the country and the creation and training of 172 (to date) field monitors who report to the Commission on human rights violations and who channel complaints to the Commission.

Other notable successes of the Commission which were supported by the project and which could be possibly emulated elsewhere include: several effective nationwide awareness campaigns including “Brave Man” and “Bride not before 18”; the extensive networking and mobilizing of civil society and Government for the second Universal Periodic Review (UPR) undertaken in 2013; the array of creative approaches to awareness raising, ranging from TV spots and SMS messages to theatrical performances in villages and factories; and successful stakeholder (including Government) consultations on key legislative and policy reform initiatives that included the Child Act, the draft anti-discrimination law, the Child Marriage Restraint Act, the Prevention of Human Trafficking Act and the Labour Act, among others.

There are numerous critical challenges ahead for the Commission which will determine the sustainability of what has been achieved so far under the project. In 2015, the Commission is expected to finally be able to undertake recruitment of an additional 20 staff, including about 10 professional positions, which would effectively double its present pool of professional staff and allow for sufficient, albeit minimal, staffing in all three core areas supported by the project. These new positions will be critical to ensure an empowered and technically competent Commission secretariat that will be able to bridge the transition to a new Commission in 2016, when almost all of the present Commissioners will have to retire from office. These new staff will also make possible the further strengthening of the Commission’s efforts to address serious and systematic human rights abuses and shrinking democratic space, thereby ensuring an active and strong Commission that will have the requisite broad public support needed to attract prominent, committed and active new Commissioners in 2016. The project will play a key role in supporting the recruitment and training of these new staff and their integration into the Commission.

In order to effectively assist the Commission in meeting the challenges ahead and thereby ensure the sustainability of what has been achieved under the project, the Evaluation Team recommends that donor core support to the Commission should continue through the existing project and when that ends through a new global human rights programme. This recommendation takes into account that 2015 will be a critical year for building new staff capacity at the Commission and that 2016 will be a critical year for transitioning to a new Commission membership. The continued project support will be an important signal to Government of expectations to appoint prominent and competent human rights activists in an open, transparent and pluralistic process. The continued stake in the Commission at this time will lend more weight to international advocacy for a timely and effective transition.

Core funding for the Commission cannot continue indefinitely, of course, and it will be up to the donors to decide at what point they wish to consider transitioning their support. Considering the fragile state of the current Commission, the support for the next few years will be crucial.

The Evaluation Team also recommends that the Project Team and the Commission should be co-located in a new venue. The new premises selected by the Commission would accommodate project staff and thereby restore a close working relationship, improve communication and facilitate greater interaction, especially with new staff arriving in 2015. New Commission premises would also provide working space for Honorary Members and be more accessible to the general public, including the disabled.

Finally, the Evaluation Team recommends that the project should expand its support to the Commission as regards the security sector and Human Rights Defenders[[6]](#footnote-6). Widespread state-implicated violence and shrinking democratic space presently pose a significant threat to democratization and development in the country and the perceived lack of action is eroding civil society support for the Commission. There is an urgent need to support the Commission’s bridging role with the uniformed services through constructive engagement. There should be new or strengthened partnerships for training and advocacy with the police, prisons service, judiciary and armed forces. Police training should include policing demonstrations and the project should support the equipping and training of NGO human rights monitors to monitor public assemblies on behalf of the Commission. Similarly, the project should support the creation and training of a roster of prison visitors to assist the Commission in carrying out this core function nationwide. This could be carried under a protocol reached with the Prisons Department as part of a larger human rights capacity-building effort.

Additional recommendations are made individually to UNDP, the Commission and the Development Partners on a range of issues affecting the project as well as the independence and performance of the Commission.

 **INTRODUCTION**

1. **Purpose, objectives and scope of the final evaluation**
	* + 1. The Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) capacity development project (BNHRC-CDP) for the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission (JAMAKON) was carried out as part of the project management process and in line with UNDP policy. It took place four months before the end of the project in order to comprehensively assess what had been accomplished over the course of the project with a view to inform UNDP, the Commission and its development partners in their planning for possible follow-up to the project.
			2. In line with the terms of reference[[7]](#footnote-7), the specific objectives of the evaluation were to:
* Assess to what extent the BNHRC-CDP has addressed the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
* Assess how adequately the BNHRC-CDP has achieved its stated development objective and purpose.
* Measure how effectively and efficiently the BNHRC-CDP outcomes and outputs have progressed in attaining the development objective and purpose of the project.
* Assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation.
* Identify and document substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up the BNHRC-CDP in Bangladesh.
* Provide forward looking programmatic recommendations for UNDP support to the NHRC Bangladesh.
	+ - 1. Also in line with the terms of reference, the evaluation used the following four key evaluation criteria:
* Relevance - the extent to which the objective, purpose and outcomes of the intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and the needs of the country/the NHRC Bangladesh.
* Efficiency – the extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.
* Effectiveness – the extent to which the outcomes of the development intervention have been achieved;
* Sustainability - Results of the intervention continuing in the long term.
	+ - 1. A number of evaluation questions[[8]](#footnote-8) were posed under each of those four headings and are answered in this report. The evaluation also assessed the potential of the next phase of the project, which is addressed in the sections 8 and 9 below on the challenges ahead and on recommendations.
			2. The Evaluation Team focused on assessing development results generated by the BNHRC-CDP, based on the scope and criteria included in its terms of reference. The final project evaluation covered the time span from May 2010 (the beginning of the BNHRC-CDP) to date, December 2014.
			3. The primary users of the evaluation results will be UNDP and the NHRC, but the evaluation results will equally be useful to relevant Government ministries, development partners and donors. The evaluation results shall also provide critical inputs to the Bangladesh UNDAF mid-term review scheduled for the first half of 2015, where UNDP leads justice and human rights outcome under UNDAF Pillar 1.
			4. In addition, the evaluation aims at critically reviewing and identifying what has worked well in the project, what challenges have been faced, what lessons can be learned to improve future programming. The evaluation will also generate knowledge for wider uses, assess the scope for scaling up the current project, and serve as a quality assurance tool for both upward and downward accountability. Following the evaluation recommendations, UNDP Bangladesh will prepare a management response, and implement follow-up actions as per UNDP Evaluation Resource Center guidance/policies.
1. **Composition of the evaluation team**
	* + 1. The Evaluation Team charged with meeting the above-mentioned objectives consisted of an international team leader and a national consultant, both of whom worked closely together throughout the assignment.
			2. The international team leader, David A. Johnson, has a background in human rights work in the United Nations, including support to national human rights institutions, and focused particularly on the human rights and capacity-building aspects of the evaluation. This included, but was not limited to, the context of the project, the quality and impact of the project activities on the project objectives and issues concerning sustainability.
			3. The national consultant, Nizamuddin Al-Hussainy, is a specialist in project monitoring and evaluation, as well as in gender, and focused particularly on many of the technical aspects of the evaluation exercise. This included, but was not limited to, issues of methodology, design and questions of efficiency. Dr. Al-Hussainy also drew upon his extensive experience in Government, including assignments as National Project Director (NPD), to inform the evaluation of relevant government rules and procedures, some of which were raised in interviews as constraints to the full implementation of the project. Both team members were jointly responsible for all decisions concerning the final findings and recommendations.
2. **Evaluation approach and methodology**
	* + 1. The plan followed by the Evaluation Team to collect and analyze the required data followed three main stages:
* A full desk review of relevant BNHRC-CDP documents -- including project document, project progress reports, database, studies relating to the country context and situation, project review reports, etc. -- was carried out over the weeks prior to the in-country mission. A list of documents consulted by the Team is contained in annex 3.
* An in-country missionwas undertaken from 21 November to 18 December 2014. During that time, key informant interviews, including focus group discussionswere carried out with relevant stakeholders/rights holders/duty bearers from government agencies, donors, UN Agencies, civil society organizations, both at national and local levels. A full listing of persons interviewed by the Evaluation Team is contained in annex 2. The Team also consulted and analyzed BNHRC-CDP’s budgets and expenditure generated from Atlas. It should be noted that the Evaluation Team did not travel outside Dhaka as there are, as yet, no regional presences of the Commission.
* Following the mission, the Evaluation Team shared its preliminary report with a reference group comprised of UNDP, the Commission and the development partners for validation and to ensure accuracy. Comments, corrections and observations made by the reference group were incorporated into the final report.
	+ - 1. The evaluation followed a participatory and inclusive approach and was transparent and inclusive in line with UNEG evaluation standards. It also aimed to be utilization-focused as described by M. Q. Patton in the book of the same name that remains widely used in development evaluation[[9]](#footnote-9). The Evaluation Team submitted an inception report to describe the approach, tools, evaluation framework, methodology, evaluability assessment as the first deliverable under this assignment.  The evaluation used a mix of methods, but primarily relied on qualitative data. An initial documentary review was undertaken, completed by additional documentation provided during the in-country consultative process.
			2. The second phase of data collection was based on semi-structured interviews with key informants (KI) representing the various project stakeholders. Interviewees were selected as representing a range of perspectives on the project and the Commission, and were predominantly from civil society organizations that have partnered with the Commission in carrying out their work. Information was also obtained from non-partnering organizations and individuals, including the media and NGOs critical of the Commission. The result is a balanced assessment that takes into account a variety of views and experiences.
			3. On the first day of the evaluation a joint meeting was held with BNHRC-CDP staff and UNDP to finalize the approach to the evaluation and to discuss some concerns about the terms of reference. It was agreed by all parties that the evaluation should address all relevant criteria specified in the objectives of the evaluation.  While all evaluation questions were included in the exercise, it was not possible to address all questions with the same level of detail, given the limitations of the evaluation timeframe. Questions that would potentially inform future programming were prioritized in line with the evaluation objectives agreed during the inception phase. The evaluation also reviewed the BNHRC-CDP interventions in light of key guiding principles for UNDP, including gender equality, a rights-based approach and human development. It is worth mentioning that all data collected and/or generated by the Evaluation Team were authentic.
			4. The main instruments developed for the evaluation were an open-ended questionnaire for stake-holders interviewed and a 20-page compilation of project activities and “deliverables” organized by project outcome[[10]](#footnote-10). The latter was collected from all BNHRC-CDP quarterly and annual reports spanning the lifetime of the project. The instrument facilitated monitoring and analysis of the project’s accomplishments to date, as well as programming gaps.
			5. Near the conclusion of the in-country mission, the Evaluation Team carried out three debriefings of its initial findings. The first debriefing was given to the members and staff of the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission (JAMAKON) at the headquarters of the Commission in Dhaka. The second debriefing was given to the staff of the BNHRC-CDP at the project office in Baridhara. The third debriefing was given to UNDP senior management at the UNDP-Bangladesh office at Sher-e-Bangla Nagar.
1. **Constraints and limitations on the evaluation**
	* + 1. Constraints and limitations on the evaluation exercise included the following:
* As the evaluation exercise took place before the finalization of the project, many of the activities were still ongoing and some products were not yet finalized;
* There was limited access to UNDP senior management and the development partners, owing to the annual holiday season;
* Due to staff rotation, there were few international participants available who had participated in the design process or the early implementation of the project;
* There was limited access to relevant Government stakeholders, particularly the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, who declined to meet with the team;
* The number of interviews which could be scheduled in a single day were limited, owing to the heavy traffic and long travel times in Dhaka;
* There were few reports or notes available on the tripartite meetings or technical meetings;
* There was a paucity of project-related documentation relating to the original needs assessment, the start-up of the project in 2010 and its early implementation.
1. **Structure of the report**
	* + 1. The final report has been structured to respond clearly to the objectives of the evaluation, as they are identified in the TOR. These objectives are considered a priority in the exercise and the Evaluation Team has made every effort to respond to those objectives comprehensively. The evaluation analysis particularly aims to identify steps that will enhance the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project and any future programming aimed at strengthening the Commission. At the same time, the report aims to incorporate the content described in annex 7[[11]](#footnote-11) of the UNDP “Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results[[12]](#footnote-12). The Evaluation Team notes that the handbook template “does not describe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow” but rather “suggests the content that should be included”[[13]](#footnote-13).
2. **Context**
	* + 1. Bangladesh has made significant progress in past decades and performed well-above initial expectations. It has increased its per capita income many times over, cut the poverty rate over successive years (from close to 60 per cent in 1990 to 31.5 in 2010) and is now well placed to achieve the vast majority of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDG Progress Report 2011 indicates that out of 52 MDG targets, over 70 per cent have already been met or are on track to be achieved by 2015. This record has been driven by strong economic performance during the last decade. According to the Household Income and Expenditure Survey, in 2010 the poverty Headcount was estimated at 31.5 per cent against 40.0 per cent in 2005.
			2. Despite impressive achievement in many fields, Bangladesh suffers from weak governance and limited government capacity to deliver basic services. For instance – access to justice, respect for the rule of law and knowledge/application of human rights are acknowledged as inadequate. Serious and systematic human rights abuses -- including enforced disappearance, summary executions, arbitrary arrest detention and torture – are regularly documented by leading human rights organizations in the country[[14]](#footnote-14). In order to help the Government of Bangladesh and its people to respond to these challenges, the Country Programme Document (CPD) 2012-2016 has set the following outcome: ‘Justice and human rights institutions are strengthened to better serve and protect the rights of all citizens, including women and vulnerable groups”.
3. **Project overview**
	* + 1. The United Nations Development Programme has advocated for the establishment of a human rights commission in many countries, including Bangladesh. Since the establishment of the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission in 2009, UNDP together with its development partners -- the Danish International Development Agency (Danida), the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC), and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) -- has been supporting the Commission through a five year project from 2010 to 2015, the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission-Capacity Development Project (BNHRC-CDP). The project is presently scheduled to finish in April, 2015.
			2. The development objective of the BNHRC-CD project is “improved promotion and protection of human rights in Bangladesh with a conducive environment for Human Development and realization of the Millennium Goals”. The purpose of the project is “to improve the promotion and protection of the human rights of all particularly for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, such as women, disabled, ethnic minorities, and children through institutional capacity development of the National Human Rights Commission”.

* + - 1. The four expected outcomes of the project are:
* Outcome 1 – Institutional Development: the NHRC’s secretariat is fully equipped and operational with modern administrative systems, rules and procedures;
* Outcome 2 – Human Rights Monitoring and Investigation: the NHRC has developed capacity to efficiently and effectively monitor the human rights situation nationally, and handle complaints fairly, independently and in a manner with is responsive to the needs of the NHRC’s client;
* Outcome 3 – Human Rights Awareness: the NHRC efficiently and effectively undertakes human rights education and training and develop a human rights based culture in Bangladesh;
* Outcome 4 – Human Rights Research, Reporting and Policy Development: the NHRC is capable to conduct high quality, human rights based analysis of legislative proposals, draft laws and existing legislation and administrative practices, with regard to Bangladesh’s obligations under international conventions and to provide high quality policy advice to Government on human rights issues.
	+ - 1. The allocated resource for BNHRC-CDP (2010-2015) is USD 6,943,771, which has been mobilized through the Danish International Development Agency (Danida), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and UNDP. According to the project document, the Government of Bangladesh supported a cash and in-kind contribution for CD VAT equivalent to USD 284,713.
			2. A Mid-Term Review (MTR) of BNHRC-CDP was conducted in 2013 by two external experts to provide an independent evaluation of the performance of the project; assess whether the project outcomes and outputs were being delivered in line with the project’s objectives and project document; and to make recommendations on improving performance. The recommendations were taken into account by the evaluation team.
1. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: Project Design (Relevance)**
2. **Project design strengths**

26. In the view of the evaluation team, the project design, as set out in the project document, was well focused to achieve results, namely the improvement of human rights promotion and protection in Bangladesh. Noting that “good governance is critical to the country’s progress in achieving [its] development objectives”[[15]](#footnote-15), the project responded to an important opportunity to assist the Government in establishing a new and key human rights institution. Support to the Commission represented a strategic intervention by UNDP and international donors to help the Government address high levels of violence in the country, including such serious human rights abuses as summary and arbitrary executions by law enforcement agencies, disappearances, torture, custodial deaths, discrimination and violence against women and discrimination against religious and ethnic minorities. These and other human rights challenges were highlighted in the first Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of Bangladesh undertaken by the United Nations Human Rights Council in 2009. Establishing and strengthening the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission (BNHRC) was in line with the Government’s undertaking in its Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (II) to ensure human rights and built on UNDP’s long-time role in supporting national human rights institutions. This role is recognized and further strengthened in its UNDP’s tripartite agreement with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions (ICC-NHRIs)[[16]](#footnote-16).

27. At the time of Bangladesh’s first Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the newly-established National Human Rights Commission had little funding, few staff and had a notable lack of technical capacity to carry out its work. Consequently, a needs assessment was jointly undertaken in 2009 by Danida and UNDP, both of which organizations have a long experience in assisting national human rights institutions worldwide.

28. It is important to recall that the original needs assessment noted that “institution-building is not a short-term undertaking” and that therefore a minimum five-year period of support was set out in the project document[[17]](#footnote-17). The project also implemented a “coordinated approach” to assisting the NHRC, which alleviated the burden on the Commission of separate reporting requirements for each international funder. This also streamlined the delivery of support and ensured a consistent flow of funding over time.

29. In the view of the Evaluation Team, the project appropriately identified the three main areas of the Commission’s work that were to be supported: human rights monitoring and investigation; human rights awareness; and human rights research, reporting and policy development. Very importantly, the project also specified an additional key area of support, namely the institutional development of the Commission itself. This was especially critical since the establishment of a new human rights commission can be a daunting task, even in the best of circumstances.

1. **Project design weaknesses**

30. One of the main concerns of the project design was the failure to establish an appropriate and effective project management mechanism. The project document called for the establishment of an overly-large Project Steering Committee (PSC) that was to be comprised of 21 members, including 10 representatives of various government ministries[[18]](#footnote-18). The inclusion of government representatives on the PSC, particularly so many, arguably would have undermined the independence of the Commission had it ever been convened. In the end, the PSC was never formed. Similarly, the Project Implementation Committee (PIC), intended as a “technical level” review mechanism, was also never formed as it also provided for the participation of government representatives[[19]](#footnote-19). It had been foreseen that the PIC would meet every two months to, among other things, review progress achieved in implementing the project, including the delivery of its targeted outputs and objectives. Most importantly, the PIC would have facilitated a consensus over the project implementation and served as a forum for addressing factors and difficulties arising. Any remaining difficulties or differences presumably would have been addressed at the bi-annual meetings of the PSC.

31. The absence of the PSC and PIC was further exacerbated by the absence of a committed, competent and informed National Project Director. This key position, which was to be the main counterpart for the Project Manager, was filled instead by four different persons over the four-plus years of the project cycle to date, each on secondment or deputation from their ministry, in violation of the Paris Principles for National Human Rights Institutions[[20]](#footnote-20). Normally, senior staffs of a human rights commission are to be recruited by the commission itself in order to ensure its independence from Government. International experience has shown that civil servants dependent on Government for their careers cannot be seen as part of an effort to criticize that Government over sensitive human rights issues, which is a primary function of any human rights commission. This is particularly true for the position of Secretary /National Project Director (NPD), who normally is responsible as the Executive Officer for the commission secretariat. However, in Bangladesh, the commission is presently obligated to accept its senior staff on deputation from Government and the Commission Chairman serves as the Chief Executive Officer. This arrangement has left the Project Manager in the difficult situation of having to deal directly with the Chairman over day-to-day project management and implementation issues. The relationship is skewed by significantly unequal levels in a very hierarchic setting and is also severely constrained by the availability of the Chairman. This, along with other factors[[21]](#footnote-21), contributed to difficult working relationships between the project and the Commission and undermined collegiality and consensus over project ownership and implementation.

32. In the absence of the PSC and the PIC, an alternative project management mechanism needed to be put into place. To an extent, bi-annual high-level meetings of the Chairman, UNDP and the donors could have taken the place of the bi-annual meetings of the PSC but such meetings began only in 2014. Quarterly technical-level meetings of the Commission and the development partners have substituted somewhat for the absent PIC, supplemented by tripartite meetings between the Commission, the UNDP Country Office and the project management that began in 2013, meeting three times yearly. Many informal meetings took place between the commission and UNDP and donors directing policy and more importantly addressing bottlenecks as and when they emerged. However regular structured donor meetings need to take place with full documentation in the future.

33. Lastly, it should be noted that the project document was not signed by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, which is the line ministry responsible for the Commission. In the same vein, the Technical Assistance Programme Proposal (TAPP), which is normally the main legal instrument formalizing the project agreement with Government, remains undrafted and unsigned to the present[[22]](#footnote-22). In September 2012, the UNDP Country Office wrote to the MLJPA urging that the TAPP for the Commission be signed and submitted to the Planning Commission. The matter remains unresolved to present, even as the project is nearing its end.

34. The MLJPA remains the line ministry for the commission yet there is no mention of the line ministry in the project document. Thus the attitude of the Ministry has been to disavow any association with the project and indeed, representatives from the Ministry refused to meet with the Evaluation Team as it claimed it had nothing to do with the project and therefore nothing to discuss. The Ministry remains, of course, a key player responsible for facilitating the provision of adequate human and financial resources for the Commission, and it is due to continuing lack of such resources that the project has had to drastically adapt its implementing strategy.

1. **Project design risks and responses**

35. The risk logs[[23]](#footnote-23) in the project document clearly identify as the number one risk the “lack of political will to support the independence of the NHRC”. The number two risk identified is the “lack of political will to provide adequate financial resources to the NHRC”. The countermeasures listed for both risks highlight the central need for political advocacy by development partners, nationally and internationally. A further risk identified in the project risk log is that the Commission’s legislation is “not aligned with the Paris Principles, undermining the effectiveness of the NHRC”. Again, the countermeasures call for “high level advocacy by development partners and civil society”.

36. As time has shown, these risks not only materialized but still continue to pose the biggest threat to the viability of the Commission and, linked to it, the success of the project even five years after its establishment. Simply put, the project cannot build the capacity of the Commission if there are no staff to train, equip, coach and mentor. With the end of the project looming only months away, the days when it can undertake and implement activities on behalf of the Commission are numbered. It appears that narrow bureaucratic interests and maneuvering may be the main reasons why the Commission has not been able to grow past its initial stage of less than 10 professional staff (most of whom are on deputation) and a single office located in the capital. UNDP and the development partners, in close consultation with the Commission, need to re-assess their approaches to advocacy with Government, particularly the MoLJPA, and mount a concerted effort to facilitate a more constructive and responsible relationship between the Commission and the ministry.

1. **Conclusions**

37. UNDP has a long experience in supporting national human rights commissions around the world and, together with OHCHR and the International Coordinating Committee for National Human Rights Institutions (ICC-NHRIs), it has a tripartite agreement to support the establishment and strengthening of human rights commissions and other national human rights institutions worldwide. To that end, the three parties meet annually to review progress and plan new initiatives. In that connection, UNDP has also developed jointly with OHCHR a Toolkit for Collaboration with National Human Rights Institutions[[24]](#footnote-24). The aims and design of the project accord with these practices and policies.

38. The Theory of Change underlying the project support is that sustainable development cannot be achieved where there are serious and systematic human rights abuses, which undermine peace, stability and the rule of law. Therefore, national mechanisms for promoting and protecting human rights should be supported in order to build national human rights capacity and thereby provide an environment conducive to human development. The protection and empowerment of vulnerable groups are particularly important to ensuring that human rights are universally respected, that discrimination is effectively combated and that participation in public life is inclusive and pluralistic. A key intervention in this effort is to support the establishment and strengthening of a national human rights commission, which has the mandate and the capacity to play a unique role in mobilizing stakeholders in Government and civil society in a constructive effort to address a broad spectrum of human rights concerns. Based on its positive experience worldwide, UNDP undertook support to the newly-established National Human Rights Commission in Bangladesh and, five years later, this support is still critical. The present precarious and concerning human rights situation underline the country’s continuing need for a strong, active and independent human rights commission.

1. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: Project Achievements (Effectiveness)**

39. Although the project document was signed in May 2010, it was not until the first quarter of 2011 that the project manager and her team were recruited. In the interim, a temporary project manager was able to begin assistance to the Commission, most notably with the hosting of a series of consultative workshops aimed at raising awareness of the new Commission and enlisting the active participation of stakeholders in the drafting of the Commission’s five-year strategic plan. An international seminar was also hosted under the project in 2010 which, together with the national consultations, helped the Commission to establish a high profile both nationally and internationally.

40. By the time of the evaluation, the project had been underway for about four and half years with a project team of 11 staff, including support staff. By comparison, the Commission had 28 staff, but only five of which were at the professional level and who carried out actual human rights-related functions rather than chiefly administrative or other support[[25]](#footnote-25). Compounding this inherent weakness, the majority of Commission’s human rights professionals had no previous human rights experience and, since they were on secondment or deputation from Government, they are subject to periodic replacement. None of the Commission’s professional officers were assigned to either the Education, Training. Public Relations, Awareness Raising and Gender Balance Department or to the Research, Policy and Legal Department, which meant that the burden of implementing these core activities of the Commission (corresponding to components 3 and 4 of the project) largely fell to the Project Team. It also meant that the only true capacity-building which could take place were with the Complaints, Monitoring and Mediation Department, the Enquiry and Investigation Department and the Management, Administration and Finance Department as these were the only departments which actually had staff[[26]](#footnote-26).

41. Despite the severe understaffing of the Commission, a remarkable number and range of activities were implemented under all the core functions of the Commission, in accordance with the BNHRC-CDP Project Document[[27]](#footnote-27). The Evaluation Team thoroughly researched all of the quarterly and annual reports of the project and compiled a listing of the main activities or “deliverables”, which runs to 20 pages[[28]](#footnote-28). It is helpful to refer to this record to measure whether the corresponding outcomes were actually achieved and, if not, why it was not possible. The following is an overview of the project’s main achievements under each of its four components.

1. **Project Component 1: Institutional Development**

42. Under this component, the project helped to equip the Commission to become fully operational with modern administrative systems, rules and procedures. There were six key outputs foreseen under this component as follows:

1. NHRC’s organization structure is designed and implemented, with four corresponding activities;
2. Strategic planning systems designed and implemented underpinning the NHRC’s activities with planning, budgeting and performance measurement (M&E), with six corresponding activities;
3. Human resource management policies, structures, systems and procedures developed and implemented, with eight corresponding activities;
4. Regional Offices of the NHRC established and fully operational, with seven corresponding activities;
5. Commission Members and Secretary are fully equipped to provide leadership and good management, with four corresponding activities; and
6. Budget and financial management policies, structure, systems and procedures developed and implemented, with three corresponding activities.

43. Output four, the establishment of regional offices, was never achieved, owing to insufficient human and financial resources allocated by Government for the Commission. Normally, the absence of branch offices would be an extremely serious handicap to any human rights commission, as it is essential to have regional presences to carry out the full range of human rights promotion and protection activities. However, the impact of this shortcoming has been somewhat mitigated by the dozens of partnerships with civil society organizations forged by the Commission and supported by the project. These partnerships have enabled the Commission to project itself into all divisions in the country in order to carry out awareness-raising, training and monitoring activities. This aspect of the project implementation is discussed further under section 7 below on “Lessons learned and good practices”.

44. Another outcome which has still not been achieved is outcome six concerning the implementation of budgeting and financial management policies, structure, system and procedures. One reason why this has lagged behind is that the Commission is following government procedures and practices whereas the project is following United Nations and UNDP practices. This has affected the “transferability” of some administrative tools, including performance monitoring[[29]](#footnote-29) approaches. It was pointed out the evaluation team that the Secretary, who serves as NPD for the project, needs to bridge two different administrative systems – that of the Government and that of UNDP – and that additional training on UNDP procedures would be useful.

45. One remaining incomplete activity[[30]](#footnote-30) – the provision of training on merit-based recruitment and the elimination of discriminatory recruitment practices – must be carried out as a matter of priority, considering that the Commission may be able to finally initiate further recruitment of staff in early 2015.

46. A careful reading of the compilation in annex IV of the project document shows that all of the activities under the remaining four outputs were carried out or are ongoing under the project. This includes dozens of targeted initiatives[[31]](#footnote-31) providing:

* international training and study tours to human rights commissions in Australia, India, Denmark, Malaysia, Philippines UK and New York City;
* a heightened international profile through participation in regular international meetings of Asia Pacific Forum for NHRIs and the International Coordinating Committee for NHRIs as well as in a number of regional conferences;
* the advice and assistance of international experts on management and organizational issues;
* draft rules and SOPs to strengthen the Commission’s management systems;
* numerous monitoring and evaluation tools, including strategic planning, annual work plans, individual learning plans, etc, to assist the Commission in integrating result-based planning and measurement practices;
* substantive support for the establishment of the Commission’s nine thematic committees; and
* Repeated training of Commission staff, taking into account the periodic replacement of officers on deputation.

47. However, it cannot be said that the project has achieved all of those outcomes since many of the SOPs, rules and procedures drafted under the project with expert advice have not been adopted or implemented by the Commission. These include: the draft Complaints Management Rules; the draft SOP on Complaints Handling; the draft SOP for Media Relations; the draft SOP on Child-friendly Complaints Handling; and the draft SOP on Monitoring and Reporting Human Rights Violations. All of these draft SOPs and rules represent a significant investment of time and effort to assist the Commission in systematizing and professionalizing its core work. This failure to follow-up on certain key project outputs is symptomatic of a deeper problem within the Commission, namely its failure to fully function as an institution. Related to this is the absence of a competent and empowered Secretary recruited by the Commission instead of on temporary deputation from Government. These issues are discussed further in section 6 below on “Positive and negative factors impacting progress”.

48. There is still much work remaining to be done in strengthening the Commission’s institutional development. Much depends on whether the Commission will secure the additional 20 posts it has been promised since 2013, which would create sufficient organizational “mass” for the Commission to fully implement its SOP on Decision-making and follow-up[[32]](#footnote-32). In the meantime, the Commission should consider adopting and implementing SOPs and procedures on management and personnel issues that have already been drafted under the project.

1. **Component 2: Complaints, Monitoring and Investigation**

49. Under this component, the project was to develop the Commission’s capacity to efficiently and effectively monitor the human rights situation nationally handle complaints (including information gathering and investigations) fairly, independently and in a manner which is responsive to the needs of clients. There were four key outputs foreseen under this component as follows:

1. Efficient and effective complaints process designed, with three corresponding activities;
2. Internal compliance with the complaints process when investigating, mediating and conciliating all complaints, with five corresponding activities;
3. A monitoring and reporting system designed, with two corresponding activities; and
4. Human rights abuses are effectively monitored and reported in accordance with the monitoring and reporting policy and procedure, with four corresponding activities.

50. Of the 14 activities specified in the project document under this component, it appears that two have not been implemented to date. One concerns the provision of legal support (advice, legal costs and ancillary expenses) for persons whose complaints are being considered by the Commission[[33]](#footnote-33). This lacuna does not appear significant; however, as it could be reasonably expected that the Commission would simply refer needy complainants to an appropriate NGO for legal aid or social services. Furthermore, it is difficult to see how this function could be sustainable for a Commission that is already severely underfunded.

51. The other unfulfilled activity concerns the development of a system for monitoring places of detention[[34]](#footnote-34). The project did provide guidelines and a template for interviewing detainees but no inclusive system was ever drawn up and adopted to implement this core activity of the Commission[[35]](#footnote-35). Although the Commission presently has insufficient staff and no regional offices to effectively and regularly monitor the country’s 68 prisons -- or the hundreds of other places of detention including police holding cells or rehabilitation homes for children in conflict with the law – an initiative must be undertaken to reach a protocol with the Department of Prisons to allow access to civil society monitors who are trained, certified and report to the Commission. The project should consider this a high priority area for the remaining life of the project[[36]](#footnote-36).

52. Otherwise, the project assisted the Commission over a wide range of related accomplishments, including:

* + Facilitating the Commission to professionalize and steadily expand its capacity to process and follow-up on complaints of human rights violations;
	+ Supporting the development and installation of the Online Complaints System;
	+ Developing guidelines and procedures for undertaking fact-finding and investigation;
	+ Helping to develop and implement a strategy for monitoring and investigating human rights violations throughout the country despite the absence of NHRC regional offices;
	+ Supporting to design, produce and distribute numerous relevant manuals, fact-sheets, guidelines, checklists for Commission staff, partners and victims;
	+ Providing frequent training and coaching to staff and partners on the complaints handling, monitoring and investigation functions;
	+ Underpinning the NHRC’s work on mediation and conciliation through training and the development of relevant rules and procedures; and
	+ Facilitating the training and reporting of a roster of over 170 field investigators and a roster of NHRC mediators.

53. It should be noted that the installation and implementation of an online complaints system and human rights violations database is challenging for any organization and requires frequent re-training and fine-tuning. The development of a network of over 170 (to date) field investigators and a roster of Commission-trained and approved mediators was a creative and effective response to the absence of regional offices and insufficient staff to carry out these core functions. This initiative is discussed further in section 7 below on “Lessons learned and good practices”.

54. The number of complaints received by the Commission annually is, in part, a reflection of how well-known the Commission is across the country. Figure 1 shows the number of human rights complaints received by the Commission has climbed significantly over the five years of the project, which is one indicator of the success of this component as well as the human rights awareness-raising carried out under project component three. However, it has been a challenge for the Commission to adequately deal with the increased volume of pending complaints.

*Figure 1 (Source: annual reports of the NHRC and BNHRC-CDP)*

55. It appears that this component has been a notable success for the project, insofar as it is the only project component whose Commission counterpart is at least minimally staffed. Systems and procedures have been put into place and adequate training provided. However, as all of the senior staff in the relevant departments are on deputation and will eventually leave the Commission, the capacity already built will not be sustainable until the Commission is able to recruit its own staff.

1. **Component 3: Human Rights Awareness and Education**

56. Under this component, the project was to develop the Commission’s capacity to efficiently and effectively undertake human rights education and training and develop a human rights-based culture in Bangladesh. It foresaw the following five key outputs:

1. A comprehensive community education and information strategy developed by the Commission, with three corresponding activities;
2. Improved public awareness of the Commission’s existence and mandate as well as targeted human rights issue, with five corresponding activities;
3. Development of a sustainable capacity to plan, conduct and review specialized human rights training programmes with a wide range of governmental and non-governmental partners, with four corresponding activities;
4. Development of capacity to undertake public inquiries in systematic patterns of human rights violations with recommendations for redress, with three corresponding activities; and
5. Development of information management systems and capacities within the Commission, with five corresponding activities.

57. It should be noted that output 4 of this outcome, concerning capacity-building for public inquiries, properly belongs with outcome 2 dealing with complaints, monitoring and investigation. The three corresponding activities[[37]](#footnote-37) under this output have all been implemented.

58. Of the remaining four outputs, there were 17 corresponding activities foreseen in the project document. All of these have been carried out as well as much more, including:

* + Over four years, the project helped organize and support over 150 workshops, seminars, consultations, trainings, rallies and community meetings all over the country;
	+ Awareness and education events ranged from high-level international meetings to gamvhira and theatrical performances in the villages;
	+ Groups targeted for HR education and training included the police, government officials, legal professionals, NGOs, human rights defenders, field monitors and investigators, journalists, teachers, students, medical professionals, indigenous communities and local officials;
	+ Project-supported TV spots, video documentaries, SMS messages and the NHRC website have reached millions of Bangladeshis from all walks of life;
	+ Project-supported NHRC billboards appeared in almost all districts and a full range of supporting materials were produced, including flyers, stickers, brochures, pins, shirts, hats and other souvenir items; and
	+ Innovative and highly-visible HR campaigns were supported, including the “Brave Men” and “Brave Girls” campaign”, the “Because I am a Girl” campaign and the “Bride not before 18” campaign.

59. With the assistance and support of the project, the Commission was able to project itself nationwide and enjoy widespread recognition. Increased awareness of human rights and the role of the Commission also meant that the number of complaints received by the Commission has grown significantly since the beginning of the project.

60. Many of the awareness-raising activities were aimed at vulnerable groups, especially the girl child, women, ethnic and religious minorities, Dalits and even sexual minorities, including ‘*Hijras’*. Human rights training was regularly organized for government and non-governmental stakeholders with heightened awareness of the country’s human rights treaty obligations. Scores of consultations were held with a broad range of partners focusing on specific human rights issues or legislation with a view of identifying a constructive way forward to achieve improvement. Dozens of formal partnerships were concluded with other organizations to build on existing social infrastructure to infuse human rights messages and campaigns. The numbers of persons reached through these efforts cannot be counted but certainly includes a large portion of the country’s population considering the variety of media and messages employed.

61. While the evaluation was taking place, an evaluation survey was underway to follow-up on the 2011 baseline survey on human rights awareness that had been carried out under the project three years before. It is expected that the survey will show an increased awareness of human rights following all of the efforts carried out under this component.

1. **Component 4: Research and Policy Development**

62. Under this component, the project was to build the Commission’s capacity to conduct high quality, human rights-based analyses of legislative proposals, draft laws and existing legislation and administrative practices, with regard to the country’s international obligations under international human rights conventions and to provide high-quality policy advice to Government on human rights matters. There were three key outputs foreseen under this component:

1. Developing the Commission’s methodology for monitoring legal compliance with all international human rights violations, with four corresponding activities;
2. Developing the Commission’s capacity to provide high quality legal analysis and policy advice to the Government, including Parliament, on human rights matters, with four corresponding activities; and
3. Developing the Commission’s capacity to provide high quality reports under UN human rights treaties, with three corresponding activities.

63. Of the 14 activities specified in the project document under this component, it appears that only one activity was not carried out, namely developing a research and advocacy strategy paper for legislative and administrative review[[38]](#footnote-38). Regardless of this, the project assisted the Commission in undertaking numerous initiatives in legislative research and advocacy, including:

* + Assisting in drafting several NHRC policy papers for Government on key human rights issues, including women’s rights, migrant workers and persons with disabilities;
	+ Supporting consultations and expert input into critical legislative reform on the Child Act, the Child Marriage Restraint Act, a draft Non-discrimination Act, the Labour Act and an anti-trafficking law;
	+ Assisting in conducting and publishing NHRC studies on Higher Judiciary decisions on arrest and detention and on protecting women’s rights;
	+ Undertaking a series of trainings on treaty reporting and supported the drafting of several shadow reports;
	+ Organizing a series of highly effective consultations with government and NGO partners to prepare for the UPR 2nd round and monitor follow-up to the recommendations; and
	+ Supported a series of studies and publications on the country’s compliance with the major international human rights treaties.

64. Two of the above-mentioned initiatives regarding the Child Act and the preparatory consultations on the second round of the UPR are discussed below in section 7 on lessons learned and good practices.

1. **Perceptions of Project Effectiveness**

65. Considering the fact that the implementation of the project’s main components is still ongoing and is not yet fully finalized, the evaluation used the perception of a sample of key informants to appraise the project effectiveness to date. This is therefore different from the performance analysis, which is based on the analysis of the Evaluation Team. Effectiveness in this section is essentially that perceived through a sample of key informants from different stakeholder groups to inform this evaluation criterion.

66. A coding system on a five-point scale (1 being lowest to 5 the highest, 3 being the mathematical average equivalent to satisfactory) was used to obtain feedback from the key informants on their perceived effectiveness of the project[[39]](#footnote-39).

67. From 34 Key Informants who provided a rating on the project effectiveness, the individual ratings ranged from 1 to 4 out of 5 with the overall average of 3.53,which falls between satisfactory and good. Out of 34 respondents 6 people abstained from rating for various reasons. It should be noted that some of the respondents felt unable to rate the project owing to the lack of awareness of exactly how it had performed and therefore rated instead the performance of the Commission. The detailed results are shown in figures 2 and 3 and table 1 below.

*Figure 2*

*Figure 3*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UNDP | GoB | DONORS  | JAMAKON | BHRC-CDP | JOURNALISTS | INT’L BUSINESS ORG | CSOs and NGOs | ABSTAINED FROM RATING | TOTAL # OF RESPONDENTS |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 34 |

*Table1: Key informant responses to the evaluation team question*

*(Source: notes from the evaluation team interviews)*

68. The qualitative perception of performance results was based on the following achievements cited by respondents:

* Awareness raising about human rights among grass roots and media;
* Good quality of research outcome and results;
* Good quality of trainings/workshops conducted;
* Facilitating international conferences and participation in international events[[40]](#footnote-40);
* Good support by CDP to the Commission for launching new initiatives despite the difficult political context (particularly in 2013);
* Inclusiveness of the consultation process (NGOs, civil society, grass roots level people etc.) although more could be done (Parliament, media, etc.).
1. **Conclusions**

69. A close study of the actual project activities under all four outcome areas reveals that the project went well beyond what had been foreseen in the project document. Of course, at the time when the project document was drawn up, it had been envisioned that the Commission would have the necessary staffing and budget that would normally accompany a new human rights commission. However, when these resources failed to materialize, the project team was expanded from a team of four persons to ultimately a team of 11, which included human rights expertise in all three core areas of the Commission’s work[[41]](#footnote-41). In the absence of Commission staff in two of those areas, the project team assisted the Commission in the actual implementation of its work, particularly under outcomes three and four. On the negative side, this meant that there was little capacity-building that took place except for the few professional officers that served in the Commission during this time. On the positive side, the assistance of the project team in the actual implementation of Commission’s work meant that the work would be carried out as if the Commission were fully functional.

70. A key strategy in multiplying the impact of a severely understaffed Commission and a relatively small project team was to mobilize civil society organizations country-wide as partners of the Commission. To that end, 24 separate partnerships, networks and MOUs were forged with over 30 NGOs, government agencies and international organizations. Among other things, these coalitions supported nation-wide awareness campaigns, raising the Commission’s national profile and publicizing its role at the local level in all divisions. This effort is discussed further in section 7 below on lessons learned and good practices.

71. To what extent is the Commission now better able to promote and protect human rights than in 2009? The obvious answer to that question is that the Commission is now much more known and recognized for its promotion and protection of human rights. Before the onset of BNHRC-CDP support, the Commission was a fledgling institution with few staff, few resources and great expectations on the part of civil society (the general population likely had little idea of what a human rights commission was or how it was expected to function). From such humble beginnings, the Commission could only have been expected to increase its profile over time. However, without the relatively significant human and financial resources that were invested in the Commission through the UNDP Capacity-development Project, it would not have been possible for the Commission to undertake the broad range of activities described in its annual reports[[42]](#footnote-42). Finances alone would have constrained it significantly, considering that its annual funding from Government is only a small fraction of the budget provided for under the project[[43]](#footnote-43). The addition of the Project Team more than doubled the size of the pool of professional human rights officers available to the Commission. However, the Commission is still unable to continue performing at current levels in the absence of the project. This situation will begin to improve only when the Commission receives sufficient new posts to staff all core function departments, at least at a minimum level.

72. The Mid-term Review, conducted in October 2013, was a useful exercise to focus attention and energies on the approaching end of the project. Some of the recommendations were carried out by the project or were underway at the time of the evaluation[[44]](#footnote-44). Other recommendations were outside the control of the project and depended on the Commission or its government partners for implementation and ultimately could not be implemented[[45]](#footnote-45) by the project. Perhaps the most important recommendations[[46]](#footnote-46) called for increased and intensified lobbying by the Commission and the project donors, most notably for increased human and financial resources from Government. Although these issues were reportedly raised with Government by UNDP and the development partners, much still remains to be done, including by the Commission itself. The Capacity Assessment of the Commission, which was carried out with the support of the project in December 2013, is potentially of significant value, insofar as its recommendations were aimed at the Commission in areas needing attention. The project drew up an implementation plan for the recommendations and the Commission prioritized the same in the Government’s Seventh Five Year Plan covering 2016-2020[[47]](#footnote-47). The Commission should systematically implement the Capacity Assessment recommendations and update progress at each tripartite and donor technical level meeting.

73. The sense of ownership of the project by the Commission was negatively impacted by a number of factors. These included salary differentials between Commission and project staff, as UN-funded staff almost uniformly receive higher salaries than their Government counterparts, which may lead to resentment and undermine cooperation and collegiality. This salary differential occurs in almost every country where UNDP has operations and is unavoidable as UN pay scales are set with the agreement of Member States. In many countries, the salary differential has been an incentive for Government staff to work hard to distinguish themselves and eventually apply for a position with the United Nations as international staff, particularly in UN peace-keeping operations. As regards the project, efforts should be made on all sides to reinforce cooperation and foster a sense of common responsibilities. Daily interaction and mentoring between project and Commission staff working in the same premises would help to reinforce ownership and improve project effectiveness.

74. The response of almost all of the interlocutors interviewed by the Evaluation Team was that the Commission played a unique and essential and must not be allowed to disappear at this critical time for lack of support.

1. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: Resources and Funding (Efficiency)**
	* + 1. **Overview**

75. The budget for the project totaled USD $6,421,831 spanning from May 2010 to April 2015. The efficiency of the project, in terms of its delivery rate and its outputs being delivered on time, was adequate. As at 1 January 2015, the annual rate of expenditure (delivery rate) for the project ran 82% in 2011, 79% in 2012, 88% in 2013 and around 91% in 2014. In 2010, the start-up year of the project, the total expenditure was USD $276,265 but it is unclear what the allocated budget for that year was. The total expenditure as at 1 January 2015 was USD $5,195,771, which represents about 81% of the total budget. There were no reports or complaints about budgeting issues having adversely affected implementation.

76. A breakdown of expenditures by component of the project, including expenditures for project management, over the five years of the project, is contained in table 2. The proportion of the expenditures for each component is shown in figure 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Total by Component** |
| **Institutional Development** | $127,723 | $170,624 | $246,595 | $159,807 | $227,793 | $932,542 |
| **Monitoring Investigation** | $12,247 | $121,116 | $94,051 | $127,364 | $173,686 | $528,464 |
| **Human Rights Awareness** | $52,559 | $235,831 | $222,346 | $296,264 | $383,622 | $1,190,622 |
| **Research and Policy** | $39,927 | $37,524 | $159,820 | $243,482 | $128,410 | $609,163 |
| **Project Management** | $43,809 | $461,316 | $410,128 | $486,246 | $533,481 | $1,934,980 |
| **Total by year** | **$276,265** | **$1,026,411** | **$1,132,940** | **$1,313,163** | **$1,446,992** | **$5,195,771** |

 *Table 2: Annual project expenditures by component, including Project Management, in USD[[48]](#footnote-48)*

Figure 4 *(Source: adapted from tables provided by BNHRC-CDP)*

77. It can be seen from the above table and figure that project management costs accounted for 37% of the total expenditures, which is to be expected given the size of the Project Team. These expenditures were maximized by recruiting national officers for the team and establishing only a single international post, that of Project Manager. Expenditures on Project Management would have been considerably higher had more than one international post been established under the budget.

78. It can also be seen that the highest expenditures for a single project component (outcome) was for Human Rights Awareness & Education, which was higher than spending on two of the other components combined (Monitoring & Investigation and Research and Policy Development. This is not surprising as the component on Human Rights Awareness involved country-wide campaigns with workshops and events taking place in all parts of the country at one time or another. It was also necessary to engage contractors to carry out ad campaigns and other essential elements of the work. A full listing of the activities carried out under this component can be found in annex 1.

79. Project expenditures can also be analyzed by object codes, such as facilities, rent, furniture, equipment, etc. Figure 4 shows the breakdown of project expenditures by object, which reveals that the greatest single component, again, was staff costs, including salaries, allowances, service contracts, etc. These costs have thus far accounted for 30% of all expenditures under the project. Consultancies were the next largest item, accounting for 21% of all expenditures, followed by contractors, which accounted for 19%.

*Figure 4 (Source: adapted from tables provided by BNHRC-CDP)*

80. In order to have an idea of how important the resources provided under the project budget was for strengthening the work of the Commission, it is useful to compare the yearly allocated budget under the project to yearly budgetary allocations to the Commission provided by the Government. Covering the period of July 2010 through to June 2015, the total allocation from Government to the Commission was USD $1,599,938[[49]](#footnote-49). This figure represents just over 29% of the allocations under the project USD ($5,438,627) during an analogous timeframe and will likely be several percentage less than that by the end of the project. This comparison is represented graphically in figure 5.

*Figure 5: Comparison of Project Funding to Government Funding for the Commission, by year [[50]](#footnote-50)*

81. The delivery rates (percentage of the yearly budgetary allocation that was actually disbursed) for the Commission’s annual budget (82% for FY 2010-11; 79% for FY 2011-12; 88% for FY 2012-13; and 83% for FY 2013-14) were similar to delivery rates under the project. However, given the limited budget from Government at its disposal, the Commission should make every effort to fully utilize all available funding.

* + - 1. **Conclusions**

82. In the view of the Evaluation Team, the project has delivered value for the money disbursed thus far. Compared to other UNDP projects currently being implemented, it has a relatively small budget, which nonetheless has been adequate for a newly established human rights commission. Unfortunately, owing especially to the very limited human resources available to the Commission, the project has relied heavily on external consultants to carry out much of the work, including training, research, drafting reports, etc. While this has ensured that high-quality work was done, it represents, over the long term, missed opportunities for building staff capacity.

83. It is expected that, by the end of the project in April 2015, there will be sufficient unspent funds remaining for a “no-cost” extension of the project, possibly until the end of 2015. The largest “variable” expenditures (aside from project management and staff costs, which remain relatively “fixed”) are for consultancies and contractors, particularly in regard to component three, Human Rights Awareness and Education. These expenditures may have to be restrained to the extent possible in order to maintain sufficient residual funds to carry the project through to 1 January 2016.

84. Positive synergies were developed with at least two existing UNDP projects, namely the Advancing Village Courts Project and the Police Reform Project. In both cases, initiatives undertaken by the project built on existing networks and duplicative efforts were avoided while reinforcing outcomes of both projects.

85. In terms of administration, ownership of the project by the Commission was problematic. There were some problems in having to provide guidance and support to four different National Project Directors over the four years of the project, none of whom were familiar with UNDP or United Nations administrative systems and requirements. Additionally, there was no formal training available that could be provided to the NPDs, which increased the burden on project administrative staff. This required additional time and effort on the part of both the NPD and the project administrative staff, which negatively impacted the efficiency of the project. The Evaluation Team also learned that the frequent turnover in the Secretary /NPD position also affected the ability of the Commission to access funds that had been allocated under its budget from Government. For example, the absence of “petty cash” to pay for minor expenditures incurred during Committee meetings impeded the regular holding of those meetings. External expertise should be sought as a matter of priority to advise the Commission on proper government administrative and financial procedures that need to be followed.

86. Project monitoring systems helped to track progress over the course of the project but were sometimes tied to factors outside the control of the project, such as severe understaffing at the Commission and its failure to open any regional offices. Consideration of the indicators did, of course, inform the Project Manager and fed into the decision-making process on priorities for the project. The most useful indicators are the process indicators as the measurement of human rights outcomes reliably and accurately is still a significant challenge[[51]](#footnote-51). Project M&E staff should consult the OHCHR publication, “Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation”[[52]](#footnote-52) in order to better adapt the project monitoring indicators to human rights and circumstances in Bangladesh.

87. Considering the key and unique role played by the Commission in the national human rights protection system, the relatively modest funding provided under the project was, in the view of the Evaluation Team, well-spent.

1. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: Project response to gender concerns**
2. **Overview**

88. The overall goal of gender inclusion in project activities was to support the Commission in ensuring gender-responsive human rights efforts, as human rights violations are still widespread daily occurrences all over Bangladesh. Men, women, boys and girls of all ages in rural and urban areas with limited information or financial resources continue to be vulnerable to human rights violations. Those who have been or are victims of human rights violations often try to seek help from family members, community leaders, law enforcement agencies, lawyers, journalists, human rights advocates and organizations, and local government officials. However, many victims, especially women and girls, still lack access to communicate with the above-mentioned entities. To this end, the BHRC-CDP has published several colorful posters and informational materials which are disseminated to local NGOs at the grass-roots level who are working with human rights issues so as to respond to that gap to a certain extent. These materials contain information about human rights organizations, government officials, civil society organizations, human rights advocates, police stations in order to ensure that these entities can be contacted about any incidences of human rights violations. It was hoped that this information would assist victims in reporting human rights violations.

89. In the same vein, the project supported the Commission in undertaking numerous mass awareness-raising campaigns throughout the country in order to educate citizens about human rights, as well as to help create a cultural landscape throughout the country that promotes, protects and respects the human rights of all. The project also supported the ongoing improvement of the NHRC’s communication tools and methodologies for large-scale community education programs, through which the NHRC was able to reach a large segment of the population. Mass awareness campaigns, which have carried a variety of human rights-related messages aimed particularly at empowering women and children, included[[53]](#footnote-53):

* Celebrating the empowerment of women and children through the support of popular events in partnership with JAAGO Foundation and Plan International;
* Supporting the Commission in celebrating International Human Rights Day each year in Dhaka as well as in other venues, including Chittagong and Khulna. The right to participate in public life empowers people to shape their own future and enhances the democratic nature of a country;
* Observing International Women’s Day with support of the project, a program was organized by the Commission to celebrate the International Women’s Day with the JAAGO Foundation in 2013, for example. A half-day long discussion session was organized with parents of students enrolled in JAGGAO schools to create a common space for stimulating the discussion of human rights issues. A session was conducted on ‘Legal Issues for Women’ that aimed to introduce certain national legislation to parents so that they can leverage the law to help ensure their rights. A tri-party consultation between JAAGO, Oxfam and the NHRC was also organized around the theme of ‘Sustainable Rural Livelihoods on the Gender Agenda: Getting Momentum-Rhetoric or Reality’. The objectives of the discussion were to raise awareness on women rights, contribute to women in agriculture, and create awareness about the immediate and long term effects of climate change on women rights;
* In 2013, the project supported the Commission’s launch of the campaign, ‘Bride Not before 18’, jointly with World Vision Bangladesh. The campaign aimed to end child marriage through a one year roadmap that engaged national and local governments, as well as communities (i.e. schools, mosques, activists, etc.). The campaign focused on a yearlong program of activities in Khulna District where early marriage is highly prevalent. The project supported the campaign with technical expertise, while the Commission participated in local and national advocacy efforts, particularly regarding the amendment and reform of the 1929 Child Marriage Restraint Act, and helped to develop materials to support awareness raising activities at the community level.
* ‘Brave men campaign’ outcomes also worth mentioning[[54]](#footnote-54).

90. As regards to measuring the impact of these and other gender-related activities, there is no sex-disaggregated data available on how many women or girls benefitted from these project activities. Similarly, gender-disaggregated data is lacking on the dissemination of information on preventive and remedial measures conducted through partner organizations so as to preclude a comprehensive gender analysis of all project activities.

1. **Conclusions**

91. Based on the above analysis, the Evaluation Team concludes the following:

* + 1. To ensure gender considerations in future programming of project support, a focus on women and children should be strengthened in policy development and implementation, and their outcomes/impacts on women, men and children. The project’s future potential work may be to take a conscious approach in advocating for and ensuring participation of the most affected populations both at national and local levels to promote gender equality. Gender analysis should also be incorporated in the next human rights needs assessment. It is important for gender considerations to be focused on both sexes so males are generally equally aware/educated as women. However, the patriarchal nature of rural Bangladesh society impinges on women’s rights to decision making. Women’s networks and community based organizations that facilitate women’s active engagement in human rights may be strengthened especially at community level. Activities to prevent personal violence and abuse against women and children should be continued and strengthened.
		2. There is a need to coordinate work with established ‘women’s networks’ and members should be trained in gender and human rights in order to further engender interventions incorporating gender needs and specific actions at the national/grass roots level based on learning and best practices of the present project activities.

92. Positive factors that facilitated progress in implementing the project are discussed below under section 7 along with lessons learned.

93. The Evaluation Team was informed that the Commission fully expects be able to recruit 20 new staff during the first quarter of 2015. These 20 new posts include four posts at the supervisory (technical) level and five posts are at the entry level for professional officers. Ten of the remaining posts are 4th class general support staff. If the posts do materialize, it would double the size of the professional staff and would provide a career track at the Commission for a number of senior officers. However, it is not clear why the final approval from the Finance Ministry is taking so long, as the memo from the Planning Commission approving the posts dates from 2013.

94. What is clear is that the Commission is facing a crisis in terms of staffing and capacity in 2015, particularly if the new staff do not arrive in post sufficiently soon to be trained and equipped before the project comes to an end. Even if the new staff do arrive in post in 2015, there still will not be sufficient staff for the Commission to establish regional offices. The corresponding part of the project to support the establishment of those offices will, therefore, remain unimplemented.

1. **Project and Commission staff working in different locations**

95. At the outset, the Project Team was co-located with the Commission at its headquarters in Mogbazaar in downtown Dhaka. However, very shortly after the catastrophic collapse of Rana Plaza in April 2013, which resulted in the death of over a thousand workers, the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) declared the building housing the Commission to be unsafe and ordered the Project Team to move out within 24 hours. There were several attempts shortly thereafter to identify a common premise that met UNDSS safety standards but no lasting agreement was reached with the Commission. The Project Team eventually found another location in Baridhara, about an hour’s drive away from the Commission, taking into account the normally heavy traffic in the city.

96. The abrupt departure of the Project Team, acting under orders from UNDSS, did not enhance working relationships between project and Commission staff. The large travel time between the two locations, requiring at least two hours for the round trip, made daily mentoring impractical and created a psychological gap between the two teams as if they were not all working together. Although the relationship never reached the point of breaking down, the ability of the Project Team to build capacity was impaired.

97. The Commission can and should find another location, one that not only meets UNDSS safety requirements, but more importantly one that is more conveniently located near NGOs also serving human rights complainants and one that is accessible to persons in wheel chairs[[55]](#footnote-55). Particularly if the Commission is finally able to secure the recruitment of new staff in 2015, premises must be found where the Project Team can co-locate and work closely with new staff to build their capacity on a daily basis.

1. **Flaws in the NHRC Act**

98. The 2009 Act to establish the National Human Rights Commission, the founding legislation for the Commission, contains a number of by now well-known weaknesses. Although it would be most desirable to amend those weaknesses, in the view of the Evaluation Team there is nothing in the present Act to preclude the Commission from carrying out its core functions.

99. Unfortunately, the Commission has adopted a narrow interpretation of some of the most apparently restrictive sections of the Act, most notably section 18(1) which states that the Commission “… may call for [a] report from the Government on the allegation of violation of human rights by the disciplined force[s] or any of its members.” The operative word in that sentence is “may”, which is, of course, not “must”. Unfortunately, the Commission has interpreted[[56]](#footnote-56) this section as precluding its legal authority to undertake a fact-finding or investigation of any human rights violation that is allegedly committed by the security forces (even though this normally would have to be carried out anyway prior to communicating the allegation to Government). Given the number and scale of serious and systematic human rights violations reported committed by security forces in Bangladesh – including enforced disappearance, summary executions, arbitrary arrest and detention and torture – excluding these abuses from the purview of the Commission has significantly decreased its effectiveness and credibility and, by extension, has reflected badly on the project.

100. The project document underlined the seriousness of these human rights abuses in its introduction and need to combat impunity, which was a major reason why the Commission attracted international support. Although most of these serious human rights abuses are reportedly committed by security forces in Bangladesh, in many instances, it appears to be less an actual policy than a gross failure of command and control. There is no reason to assume that senior commanders as well as many rank and file would not welcome the intervention of the Commission to help restore discipline and conform to international standards for troops and police serving in United Nations peacekeeping missions. Regardless, it is the duty of the Commission to do everything possible to address the most serious human rights abuses that continue to victimize the people and undermine the rule of law.

101. Additional weaknesses in the Act include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A seemingly restrictive definition of human rights in Section 2(f), although Bangladesh has ratified and is bound by both International Covenants on human rights as well as most of the other United Nations core human rights treaties;
2. The appointment of only two full-time members in Section 5(2), whereas the Commission would be more effective if it were comprised of five or seven full-time members;
3. A term of office of only three years in Section 6(3), which is relatively short in terms of international practice (five-year terms are more common);
4. An inadequately pluralistic and transparent section process of the Commissioners in Section 7, although measures could be undertaken by the Selection Committee to overcome this;
5. The apparent priority inappropriately given to mediation and conciliation in addressing human rights violations in Section 14(1), although this is not a mandatory first step;
6. The deputation of Government officers to the Commission on its request in Section 23(4), although this is normal practice for Commissions when they are first established and before they adopt and implement their own recruitment policies. Unfortunately, in the case of Bangladesh, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs reportedly reinforced this provision by requiring the Commission to adopt recruitment rules approved by the Ministry, which have mandated the continued deputation of senior staff in violation of the Paris Principles.

102. Because of these and other weaknesses in the Act, much unforeseen attention was focused by the project to support the Commission in its efforts to have the Act amended. To that end, the project engaged an international expert to undertake a desk study with a view to possible revisions of the Act; it supported a mission by another international expert to advise the Commission and to propose specific language in an amendment; and it supported the convening of a consultative workshop on amending the NHRC Act. Despite those efforts, and in the absence of support from the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, it is not likely that the Act will be amended by Parliament any time soon.

103. Meanwhile, the Commission has been equipped and trained with the support of the project and has the capacity and mandate to undertake its investigative functions, including violations attributed to the security forces. It should be noted that goal two in the Commission’s Strategic Plan (2010-2015) is “a just society where violence by the state is an episode of the past and officials know, and are held accountable for, their responsibilities”. The continuing lack of progress in this key area has unnecessarily undermined the development objective of the project, namely “improved promotion and protection of human rights in Bangladesh with an environment conducive to Human Development and the realization of the Millennium Development Goals[[57]](#footnote-57). More seriously, the lack of progress represents untold suffering on the part of the many victims of continuing state violence.

1. **Institutional weaknesses of the Commission**

104. Many of the stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation expressed concern that the Commission had not sufficiently engaged all of its Members and that it was not functioning effectively as an institution. The Commission’s SOP on Decision-making and Follow-up, adopted in 2013 with a view to devolving responsibilities from the Chairman to the Commission and its staff, cannot be fully implemented as long as the Commission remains severely understaffed. It had been hoped that the nine thematic committees -- formed by the Commission in 2013 to expand its work, mobilize new networks on key human rights issues and draw upon the leadership and guidance of the Honorary Members -- would strengthen the Commission as an institution. However, many of the Committees have not met regularly and significant progress has not been achieved despite the strategy papers and annual work plans that had been drawn up with the support of the project. In 2016, six of the seven members of the Commission, including the Chairman and the Full-time Member, will have to retire, having completed the second of their maximum of two terms in office. Without avenues to actively engage the Commission’s Honorary Members, experienced and committed candidates will be reluctant to become Honorary Members in 2016. This will affect the sustainability of the Commission, which is a key aim of the project.

1. **LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES**
2. **Lessons learned**

105. The evaluation has identified the following lessons learned during project design and implementation:

1. Project management mechanisms must be compatible with the independent nature of a human rights commission and should not subject the Commission to undue or inappropriate Government control or oversight. This point has already been discussed in section 2B above.
2. The Project Manager needs a fully functioning counterpart with whom to discuss, plan and review project implementation. Normally, this would be the Secretary /NPD but, as discussed in section 2B above, the Commission’s various Secretaries over the duration of the project have had neither the requisite experience nor the necessary time in post to acquire the skills needed to fully function as an effective NPD. Unfortunately, the Commission is still bound by rules submitted to Government to accept mandatory deputations to its post of Secretary as well as other senior Commission posts. The rule must be nullified by a new rule in order to bring the Commission into compliance with the Paris Principles. In the meantime, the Commission should consider creating a post of Senior Programme Coordinator from among the 20 new posts expected in 2015. The incumbent would be responsible for the smooth functioning of programmatic functions of the Commission, as distinct from the administrative and financial management functions covered by the Secretary /NPD. This would provide the Project Manager with a functional counterpart and help to ensure a stable management of the Commission’s programmes and operations despite regular replacement of the Secretary on deputation. This would also ensure a measure of much-needed continuity in 2016 when the Commission transitions to a new membership.
3. There should be greater clarity and accountability in the technical meetings of the Commission, the donors and the project. Although the Commission is a beneficiary of the project, its larger role in the country is as a duty-bearer, the flagship institution that is uniquely placed to engage Government, including security forces, and civil society in a common effort to address serious human rights abuses and promote better awareness of human rights. Issues that need to be tracked in the monthly meetings include:
	1. the timely and effective follow-up to project outputs, including the various SOPs and rules still awaiting Commission approval;
	2. progress achieved on the Commission’s core mandate, including fact-finding, investigations into State violence, prison visits, engagement with security forces and protection of human rights defenders, in line with its Strategic Plan (2010-2015)[[58]](#footnote-58);
	3. progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the Capacity Assessment carried out in 2013 by APF, OHCHR and UNDP;
	4. advocacy on in response to threats to NGOs and HRDs, including legislation that shrinks the democratic space;
	5. efforts made to ensure the regular functioning of the thematic committees and ways that the project can further support them; and
	6. progress achieved in securing additional staffing. In this connection, the Commission should consider rationalizing its organogram to reflect actual staffing and responsibilities to in order to facilitate capacity building and knowledge-transfer by the project.

1. There is a need for concerted and determined advocacy on the part of the international donors, in close coordination with the Commission, to support common project and Commission goals. As noted in Section 2B above, there is presently little to no government ownership of project and scant responsibility for the Commission on the part of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs. The Ministry in particular needs to understand the importance for the country internationally to have strong, independent human rights commission that is fully compliant with the Paris Principles. Although amendment of the recruitment rules as well as the eventual amendment of the NHRC Act are both important objectives requiring the support of the Ministry, the immediate goal should be to secure the 20 new posts that have been promised by the Planning Commission since 2013, which are of critical importance to the Commission and to the sustainability of the project. This may ultimately require approaches directly with the Finance Ministry. Expert advice on the relevant government regulations and practices should be sought as necessary in order to empower the Commission to determine its own requirements without having to depend on the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.
2. **Good practices**

106. There were a number of good practices in the implementation of the project that would be of potential interest to similar projects or even to other human rights commissions. They include the following:

1. Flexible implementation of the project at the outset, when confronted by the sever understaffing of the Commission. As it became apparent that the Commission could not secure any staffing in two of the three core areas of the project (Human Rights Education and Awareness-raising; and Research and Policy Development), the Project Team was expanded to include sufficient expertise and manpower to actually implement programmes in these areas in support of the Commission. Had this approach not been taken, Complaints-handling and Investigation would have remained the only substantive area actively implemented by the Commission. Without the support of the other programmes, most notably Human Rights Education and Awareness-raising, the Complaints, Monitoring and Mediation Department, could not expanded to the nationwide reach that it enjoys today.
2. Partnering and coalition-building was a key modus-operandi in the implementation of the project. Normally, the absence of any regional office outside the capital would be a potentially lethal blow to its effectiveness. However, the Commission, with the support of the project, took this significant disadvantage and converted it to an advantage by forging a series of partnerships that built on and added to the strengths of other organizations, mobilized stakeholders and extended the reach and impact of the Commission to every part of the country. To that end, there were 24 separate partnerships, networks and MOUs with over 30 NGOs, international organizations and government agencies, including at the local level[[59]](#footnote-59). These partnerships made possible numerous country-wide awareness campaigns which helped to raise the Commission’s national profile and publicize its role at the local level. In some case, this involved the innovative use of traditional song and theatrical performances to convey key human rights messages. The partnerships also made possible the creation of an expanding network[[60]](#footnote-60) of Commission-trained field monitors who, in the absence of Commission regional offices, are able to undertake human rights monitoring and reporting covering a growing number of districts. These partnerships built on and strengthened the Commission’s unique catalytic and bridging roles and arguably did more to publicize the Commission and raise human rights awareness than could have been accomplished with regional offices alone.
3. Initiatives undertaken by the Commission, with the support of the project, to mobilize broad participation in the country’s second Universal Periodic Review (UPR) also deserve recognition. This began a year in advance of the review with a policy dialogue with relevant Ministry Secretaries, which led to the creation of a network of human rights focal points in all the relevant ministries, a network which continues to this day[[61]](#footnote-61). Following were a series of consultative workshops with key stakeholders, including civil society, focused on key human rights issues confronting the country. This was followed several months later by a workshop with key government actors to review progress achieved on key issues raised in the first UPR. Finally, a mock UPR was held in partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to better prepare all stakeholders for coming review in Geneva. Since then, there has been a workshop held with officials, NGOs, activists and the media that focused on follow-up to the UPR, most notably to implement the many recommendations accepted by Government.
4. A number of successful awareness-raising campaigns were supported by the project including “Because I am a Girl”[[62]](#footnote-62) and “Bride not before 18”[[63]](#footnote-63) but perhaps the most successful was the “Brave Men” campaign[[64]](#footnote-64). As with other notable awareness-raising efforts, the campaign was carried out in partnership with a national NGO, in this case the Centre for Men and Masculinity Studies. The campaign was a school-based effort targeting male students between the ages of 12 and 15 with messages to say “no” to violence against women and committing them to combat gender-based violence. There were a number of participatory activities carried out with the students, including using social media, posters, diaries and even a video documentary created by students. The enthusiastic response led to the creation of a second phase of the campaign to reach a wider target group as well as the creation of a “Brave Girl” campaign to empower young women to stand up for their own rights.
5. With project support, the Commission hosted numerous stakeholder consultations, including government and NGO partners, consultations on key legislative or policy reform issues. These included the Children Act 2013[[65]](#footnote-65), the draft anti-discrimination legislation[[66]](#footnote-66), the Child Marriage Restraint Act 1929[[67]](#footnote-67), the Human Trafficking Prevention and Control Act[[68]](#footnote-68), the Act on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities[[69]](#footnote-69)and revision of the 2006 Labour Law[[70]](#footnote-70), among others. Through the consultations, a broad range of stakeholders were brought together to exchange views and identify areas of consensus in key legal and policy reform. In some cases, as with the rights of Dalits[[71]](#footnote-71) and LGBT[[72]](#footnote-72) rights, the Commission was in the forefront of organizations successfully campaigning for recognition of these highly marginalized groups. Despite that the Commission had no staff in its own Research, Policy and Legal Department; it was nonetheless able to carry out many successful interventions in this area with project support.
6. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: The Challenges Ahead (Sustainability)**
7. **Overview**

107. The next two years will be critical for the Commission and will determine whether it will continue grow, however slowly, into a sustainable institution that is able to carry out its full mandate effectively and independently.

108. In 2015, it appears that the Commission may finally secure the additional 20 posts that have been promised since at least 2012, which would bring total staffing to 48, including 18 professional posts. Although this would represent only about half of the Commission’s hoped-for staffing of 94, the new posts would allow the Commission to finally have staff working on an additional two of its core functions, namely human rights education, training and awareness-raising and human rights research and policy development, corresponding to outcomes two and three of the project. This would provide the necessary minimum conditions for the project to finally build actual capacity in those areas instead of simply implementing activities for the Commission, which is not sustainable.

109. It is of the utmost importance that the Commission secures final approval and financing for those posts in the first quarter of 2015, so that recruitment can begin as soon as possible. If necessary, the Commission should avail itself of expert advice on steps it may need to take to secure the posts, particularly in view of the continuing lack of active support on the part of the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs. UNDP and the other donors should be prepared to undertake concerted and determined advocacy with Government as necessary to ensure that those posts will all the necessary final approvals, considering that they had already been initially approved in 2013.

110. Given the importance of the new posts as finally bringing the Commission up to the minimum level of staffing it needs to function (albeit not with sufficient resources to envisage the establishment of regional offices), the project should provide training and guidance to the Commission regarding merit-based recruitment[[73]](#footnote-73) and vetting procedures. This should also include support for drawing up the job descriptions and minimum qualifications for the posts to be advertised. The recruitment should be monitored closely in the monthly tripartite meetings. As this may likely be the last new posts that it will receive for quite some time, the Commission should consider rationalizing the organogram with a view to streamlining the original structure and assigning clear responsibilities in order to facilitate targeted capacity-building by the project. The expansion of the staff in 2015 should also allow for the full implementation of the Commission’s SOP on Decision-making and follow-up. The project will need to work even more closely with the Commission to ensure that the Secretariat is empowered, technically competent and able to bridge the transition to a new Commission in 2016.

111. Six of the Commission’s seven Members, including the Chairman and the Full-time Member, will have to retire from the Commission on or around May 2016 when their current terms expire. Ensuring the timely appointment of competent new Commissioners in an open and transparent process will be a significant challenge for all of the Commission’s national stakeholders as well as for the international donors. Advocacy will need to begin in 2015, particularly that the Selection Committee take steps in early 2016 to issue a national call for applications and hold consultations, including with civil society, as part of the decision-making process. The performance of the Commission and its secretariat in 2015 may well set the stage for a smooth transition, particularly if it expands its constructive engagement with the security forces and acts as a catalyst to address the country’s most serious human rights abuses. The project should be prepared to support such an expanded engagement.

* 1. **Conclusions**

112. A strong, active and effective Commission will help attract the necessary support from its stakeholders and the media to attract prominent and active new Commissioners in an open and transparent selection process. 2015 will be a year of testing, not only for the Commission in terms of managing its growth and coming of age as an institution, but also for the Commission’s supporters in government, civil society, the media and the diplomatic missions. Broad and active support will be needed to pressure for a positive and timely transition of the Commission in 2016.

1. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING SUPPORT (SUSTAINABILITY)**
2. **Main recommendations**

113. The following three main recommendations are addressed to UNDP, the Commission and the development partners, as the effective implementation of each recommendation will require the accord and active commitment of each party.

* + 1. **Donor core support for Commission should continue with an exit strategy prepared**

114. Taking into account the significant challenges facing the Commission over the next two years, sufficient core support from the donors should continue. Without this support, the Commission will be a risk of imploding from unmanageable outside pressures and expectations, due to its present severe understaffing and inadequate funding from Government. The gains that have been won over the past four years in terms of awareness raising, the mobilization of networks of partners and the high expectations of the public, will be jeopardized if the major support afforded by the project is not extended. There was a broad consensus of stakeholders interviewed by the Evaluation Team that, if project support were ended now, the Commission would basically “disappear”. That may not be an overstatement, given that there are so few professional officers supporting the Commission now with such limited funds.

115. Core support should continue through 2015 when new staff are expected to arrive, which will give time for the project to build capacity under components two and three, which until now has been impossible. Core support should also continue as part of a new, multi-year human rights programme to maintain support during the Commission’s transition to a new membership. The continued support will be an important signal to Government of expectations to appoint prominent and competent human rights activists in an open, transparent and pluralistic process. The continued stake in the Commission at this time will lend more weight to international advocacy for a timely and effective transition. Extending core support will allow the project to provide essential training, advice and guidance to the new Commissioners.

116. Core funding for the Commission cannot continue indefinitely, of course, and it will be up to the donors to decide at what point they wish to consider transitioning their support from global to targeted support under a larger human rights programme. Maintaining the core funding into the future will provide an opportunity to devise and implement a realistic exit strategy that will not undercut the Commission nor jeopardize gains that have been already made. Benchmarks for an exit strategy should include some of the elements discussed in this and the preceding section, including:

1. support for the recruitment process;
2. training and capacity-building of the new staff;
3. support for expanding the Commission’s engagement with security forces and the justice sector (discussed below);
4. advocacy for a transparent, timely and pluralistic selection process for new Commissioners in 2016;
5. continued support for the secretariat in case new Commissioners are not appointed before the present Commissioners retire;
6. advice, training and guidance for the new Commissioners on their appointment;
7. consultations with the new Commissioners on what targeted support or partnerships the Commission can expect post-2016; and
8. final transfer of all tools and materials developed and acquired to the Commission.

117. The arrival of new staff along with the extension of the project will provide a new opportunity to consolidate the impressive gains already made under the project and will facilitate planning and support for a successful transition of the Commission in 2016.

* + 1. **Project staff and the Commission should be co-located in a new venue**

118. As already noted in section 6C above (paras. 97-99), the physical separation of Commission and the Project Team since 2013 impeded close interaction between to the two and led to unnecessary tensions and missed opportunities for more effective implementation of the project. The situation needs to be addressed before the arrival of new staff at the Commission, who will depend on the Project Team for proper mentoring and coaching as they take on their new jobs and responsibilities. For this to be carried out successfully, the Commission will have to identify new premises, one that will meet the safety requirements of the UNDSS. The new premises should be large enough to accommodate both the Project Team and the expanded staff of the Commission as well as providing sufficient working space for the Honorary Members, which will facilitate their greater involvement in the work of the Commission. The new premises should be more accessible to the public, including the disabled, and would profit from closer proximity to some of the Commission’s NGO partners which are already assisting victims of human rights abuses.

119. The Evaluation Team understands that a move to new premises is possible for the Commission under applicable Government rules and regulations. If necessary, the Commission should avail itself of expert advice on the relevant rules and procedures.

* + 1. **Beginning in 2015, the project should expand its support in the security sector and on Human Rights Defenders**

120. Taking into account the views expressed by a wide range of stakeholders that were interviewed, there is great concern over continuing widespread state-implicated violence along with a recent shrinking of democratic space which are posing the greatest threat to democracy and development in the country. At the same time, the perceived absence of sufficient engagement by the Commission in these issues is eroding civil society and public support for the Commission, as reported to the Evaluation Team by a number of interlocutors. This undermines the fundamental aim of the project to improve the “promotion and protection of human rights … through institutional capacity development of the National Human Rights Commission”.[[74]](#footnote-74)

121. In the face of a number of recently adopted laws that effectively shrink the democratic space for the media and many of the NGO partners of the Commission[[75]](#footnote-75), there needs to be more consistent and active engagement to protect NGOs and Human Rights Defenders (HRDs). Many of the new laws and recent reprisals against HRDs are in violation of the United Nations HRD Declaration and the treaty obligations of Bangladesh and should be denounced by an authoritative institution such as the Commission. The project should provide every support to the Commission to implement its pledge in the Strategic Plan 2010-2015 to “speak out on behalf of human rights defenders in support of their activities, and to defend defenders when necessary”[[76]](#footnote-76).

122. A careful study of all the main activities undertaken by the project[[77]](#footnote-77) reveals that there has been insufficient engagement with the uniformed services. Human rights training with the police began only in 2014 and needs to be both deepened and broadened to include engagement on related issues such as accountability for serious and systematic human rights abuses. There was also only a single human rights training session for the legal profession that was held in the third quarter of 2014 which needs to be followed up with a broader initiative to provide human rights training to judges and lawyers throughout the country. To date, however, there has been very little to no engagement with either the prisons department or the armed forces, both of which are key potential partners in addressing serious human rights abuse and inadequacies in the justice system. All of this is surprising given the emphasis in the Commission’s Strategic Plan 2010-2015 on “developing strong links with the disciplined forces”, promoting “professionalism and accountability of the police” and developing a programme of “unannounced visits /monitoring for police detention/cells and other places of detention”[[78]](#footnote-78).

123. The project should give priority support to the Commission in 2015 to carefully but constructively engage all of the disciplined forces, including the Rapid Action Battalion[[79]](#footnote-79), which is well-known internationally for its association with serious and systematic human rights abuses. Human rights training should begin with senior commanders to ensure their support for a human rights programme and be integrated into the training curricula through training of trainers.

124. As regards the police, training should be carried out in cooperation, wherever possible, with existing support from UNDP through its Police Reform Programme and promote monitoring and accountability for serious human rights violations attributed to the police. Training should also include the use of force and policing of demonstrations, which accounts for a shocking level of routine violence involving the state[[80]](#footnote-80). In that connection, the project should also support the Commission in creating, training and equipping[[81]](#footnote-81) a network of monitors who can monitor public demonstrations and thereby project a “protective presence” as regards the excessive use of force, failure to facilitate /administer emergency medical attention, arbitrary arrest and detention, torture in custody, etc. Training for the monitors could be based on the OHCHR Training Manual for Human Rights Monitoring (Chapter XV, “Monitoring Demonstrations and Public Meetings”)[[82]](#footnote-82). Human rights training for the police could be based on the OHCHR Training Manual for Law Enforcement Officials[[83]](#footnote-83).

1. The Prisons Department should provide a particularly key entry point for constructive engagement with the wider justice system, as the current overcrowding in Bangladesh’s prison system -- estimated to be about double of the number of prisoners that the system was planned to accommodate -- are symptoms of wider problems in the justice system, including arbitrary arrest and detention, torture, discrimination, corrupt or inadequate courts and lack of access to bail or legal representation. The Prisons Department will likely welcome the engagement of the Commission, which can integrate human rights training and monitoring as part of a comprehensive programme of prison reform funded by the British and German Governments, which is presently underway in Bangladesh. Similar to the effort that created a system of countrywide field monitors, the project should assist the Commission in creating and training a network of prison visitors who can undertake regular prison visits on behalf of the Commission to the 68 prisons in the country. To that end, a protocol should be reached with the Prisons Department to facilitate access for the visitors, which would enable the Commission to finally carry out this core activity identified both in its founding Act and in its Strategic Plan. Training should begin with senior commanders and be integrated into the curricula through the training of trainers. Materials could be based on OHCHR Human Rights Training Package for Prisons Officials[[84]](#footnote-84).
2. The Judiciary should receive comprehensive training on human rights, in cooperation with the Bangladesh Judicial Training Institute. The effort could be paired with other donor supported reform projects, such as UNDP’s JUST project, to strengthen the knowledge, professionalism and independence in the judiciary. Training could be based on OHCHR’s extensive Manual for Human Rights Judges, Lawyers and Prosecutors and Facilitator’s Guide[[85]](#footnote-85).
3. Human rights training would likely be very welcomed by the Bangladesh Armed Forces, particularly in view of their high participation in UN Peacekeeping Missions[[86]](#footnote-86). This could be carried out starting with senior commanders and subsequently be integrated into the Bangladesh Military Academy, training academies for the other services and particularly at the Bangladesh Institute for Peace Support Operations Training. Training could be based on the Handbook on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Armed Forces Personnel, published by the Council of Europe[[87]](#footnote-87), and carried out in cooperation with international organizations such as the ICRC, which carries out training for the armed forces on international humanitarian law.
	1. **Additional recommendations**

The following additional recommendations are offered for consideration:

* + 1. **To BNHRC-CDP and UNDP**
1. Advocacy for training on merit-based recruitment and the elimination of discriminatory recruitment practices must be carried out as a matter of priority, considering that the Commission may be able to finally initiate further recruitment of staff in early 2015 (see para. 45). This should also include support for drawing up job descriptions and minimum qualifications for the posts to be advertised (see para. 110).
2. The project will need to work even more closely with the Commission to ensure that the Secretariat is empowered, technically competent and able to bridge the transition to a new Commission in 2016 (see para. 110)
3. There should be a strengthened focus on women’s and children’s issues and gender analysis should be incorporated into the next human rights needs assessment. There should be greater engagement with established women’s networks, particularly at the community level (see para. 91).
4. Project M&E staff should consult the OHCHR publication, “Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation”[[88]](#footnote-88) in order to better adapt the project monitoring indicators to human rights and circumstances in Bangladesh (see para. 86).
	* 1. **To JAMAKON**
5. The Commission should consider adopting and implementing SOPs and procedures on management, personnel and other issues that have already been drafted under the project. These include: the draft Complaints Management Rules; the draft SOP on Complaints Handling; the draft SOP for Media Relations; the draft SOP on Child-friendly Complaints Handling; and the draft SOP on Monitoring and Reporting Human Rights Violations (see paras 47 and 48).
6. The Commission should systematically implement the Capacity Assessment recommendations and update progress at each tripartite and donor technical level meeting (see para 72).
7. External expertise should be sought as a matter of priority to advise the Commission on proper government administrative and financial procedures that need to be followed, as regards cash flow and to empower the Commission to determine and secure its own requirements without having to overly-depend on the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs. It is of the utmost importance that the Commission secures final approval and financing the additional 20 posts in the first quarter of 2015, so that recruitment can begin as soon as possible. If necessary, the Commission should avail itself of expert advice on steps it may need to take to secure the posts. (see paras 85, 105(4), 109 and 110).
8. Given the limited budget from Government at its disposal, the Commission should make every effort to fully utilize all available funding (see para. 81).
9. As the additional 20 posts expected in 2015 may likely be the last new staffing that it will receive for quite some time, the Commission should consider rationalizing its organogram with a view to streamlining the original structure and assigning clear responsibilities in order to facilitate targeted capacity-building by the project (para. 110).
10. The Commission should consider creating a post of Senior Programme Coordinator from among the 20 new posts expected in 2015. The incumbent would be responsible for the smooth functioning of programmatic functions of the Commission, as distinct from the administrative and financial management functions covered by the Secretary /NPD. This would provide the Project Manager with a functional counterpart and help to ensure a stable management of the Commission’s programmes and operations despite regular replacement of the Secretary on deputation. This would also ensure a measure of much-needed continuity in 2016 when the Commission transitions to a new membership (see para. 105(2)).
11. The Commission should reconsider its narrow interpretation of certain sections in the National Human Rights Commission Act and fully exercise its monitoring, investigation and reporting functions (see paras 98-103).
12. The Commission should ensure that the thematic committees met regularly and adhere to work plans that have been drawn up and adopted (see para. 104).
	* 1. **To the Development Partners**
13. UNDP and the development partners, in close consultation with the Commission, need to re-assess their approaches to advocacy with Government, particularly the MoLJPA, and mount a concerted and determined effort to facilitate a more constructive and responsible relationship between the Commission and the ministry (see paras. 36 and 105(4)). Particular emphasis should be upon ensuring that the 20 additional posts that have been initially approved in 2013 urgently received the necessary final approval as soon as possible (see para. 109).
14. There should be greater clarity and accountability in the technical meetings of the Commission, the donors and the project; progress on key issues must be tracked in the monthly meetings (see para. 105(3)).

\* \* \* \* \*

**Annex 1: BNHRC-CDP ACTIVITIES BY PROJECT COMPONENT**

**Compiled by the Evaluation Team, December 2014 from Project reports and records**

1. **MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR COMPONENT 1 (INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT) 2010 to September 2014**

| **When** | **Activity** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2010 | Draft SOP on Decision-making and Follow-up  | NHRC Annual Report annex 5 |
| 2010 –2011 | Draft and develop NHRC’s 5-year Strategic Plan; organize 10 consultative workshops on key thematic issues identified in the draft strategic plan; produce and disseminate 400 copies to relevant national and international stakeholders | UNDP Project Reporting 2010; CDP Q1 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Assist in preparing NHRC 2010 Annual Report | CDP Q1 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Develop external communications strategy for the NHRC | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Produce a weekly news digest of HR-related news for Commissioners and staff | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Acquire materials and equipment for a HR resource centre at the NHRC, accessible by the public | CDP Q2, Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Map HR training needs and develop a concept note for HR training for civil society, LEOs, journalists, students, etc | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Assist NHRC on developing and revising annual workplans, provide coaching on human resources management | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Assist NHRC in drafting membership application to Asia Pacific Forum of NHRIs (APF) | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Draft NHRC inputs into the President’s annual address to Parliament | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Develop a concept note on HR training for new NHRC staff | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Design evaluation forms for NHRC workshops | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011  | “Learning Week”: Develop and deliver five HR training sessions for 12 new NHRC staff  | CDP Annual Report 2011 |
| 2011 | Deliver 2nd Learning Week series of HR trainings for NHRC staff, including senior managers | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2011 | Facilitate NHRC participation in annual meeting of the ICC for NHRIs in Geneva | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Assist in preparing NHRC 2011 Annual Report | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Support the work of the new NHRC Child Rights Committee and develop an action plan | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Organize and facilitate a two-day management retreat to foster greater cohesiveness as an institution | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Follow-up management retreat with group consultations with staff and developing an action plan | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Facilitate NHRC participation in an Asia Pacific conference on juvenile justice | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Support the mission of an international consultant to assist the NHRC in drafting a UPR road map, revisiting the system of Committees and reviewing the SOP on decision-making process at a two-day retreat with Commissioners | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Facilitate NHRC meeting with Danish Institute of Human Rights to receive five days training on HR and NIs | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Map potential partners for the NHRC covering all the focus areas of its work | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Produce a Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Report with recommendations for partnership development and fundraising strategies | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Propose and develop partnerships with 16 potential partners in various thematic areas of NHRC’s work | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Assist in translating the NHRC Act into English, as required for membership in the ICC-NHRIs and the APF | CDP annual report, p14 |

| **When** | **Activity** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2012 | Assist the NHRC in proposing to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parl. Affairs some necessary amendments to the NHRC Act  | CDP annual report, p14 |
| 2013 | Draft a discussion paper on strategy for the newly-formed NHRC Committee on Business and Human Rights | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft a discussion paper on strategy for the newly-formed NHRC Committee on Human Rights and Women | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft a discussion paper on strategy for the newly-formed NHRC Committee on Human Rights and Children | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Stock the NHRC library, develop a computerized system for its management and train the documentalist | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft a Partnerships Checklist to establish a procedure to ensure accountability, transparency and sustainability | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Orientation session for NHRC and project staff on the Right to Information Act 2009 | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft and support the implementation of MoUs with five NGOs (Jaago, JTS, Save the Children, Plan and World Vision) | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft and support the implementation of an MoU with Marks & Spencer to pilot HR campaigns in their factories | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Finalize and print the NHRC 2012 Annual Report | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Organize a resource mobilization consultation on 27 Aug. with national and international partners; engage a consultant to identify key areas of shortfall to present to government and donor agencies | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Deepen the experience of the NHRC by supporting its participation in the UPR process in Geneva | CDP Q2, Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013  | Undertake a Mid-term Review of the project to improve support to the NHRC | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Commission an appraisal on the effectiveness of the NHRC’s billboard campaign | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Organize a roundtable discussion and engage an international consultant to review the NHRC Act and identify necessary revisions that would strengthen the independence and effectiveness of the NHRC | CDP annual report, p39 |
| 2013 | Request and support a Capacity Assessment of the NHRC conducted by the APF, OHCHR and UNDP | CDP annual report, p5 |
| 2013 | Strengthen results-based planning and monitoring for the NHRC by developing tools such as formulating client questionnaires, workshop surveys, etc. | CDP annual report, p7 |
| 2013 | Provide staff training and guidance to NHRC on conducting fact-finding missions, reporting to treaty bodies and mainstreaming human rights | CDP annual report, p9 |
| 2013 | Develop an SOP on media and communications; advise and assist in issuing NHRC press releases and statements | CDP annual report, p23 |
| 2013 | Strengthen NHRC’s information management system to improve media monitoring and tracking of HR and NHRC-related news; NHRC now monitoring 40 print and electronic media on key HR issues  | CDP annual report, p22, p34 |
| 2013 | Strengthen NHRC M&E by evaluating the results of the 2012 HR billboard campaign | CDP annual report, p25 |
| 2013 | Support NHRC M&E by conducting follow-up interviews to measure results of the Brave Men Campaign | CDP annual report, p22 |
| 2014 | Formulate an indicator framework for the work of three NHRC thematic committees  | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Develop a plan to implement the recommendations of the Capacity Assessment carried out in 2013 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Prepare a needs assessment for training NHRC staff in financial management and results reporting | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Undertake a dialogue with each NHRC thematic committee and identify strategic areas of work for each | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Facilitate NHRC participation in annual meetings of the Commonwealth NHRI Forum and the ICC-NHRI | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Finalize and print the NHRC Annual Report for 2013 | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Support the mission of Roslyn Noonan to advise on revising the NHRC Act and on drafting the next Strategic Plan | Noonan report |
| **When** | **Activity** | **Source** |
| 2014 | In follow-up to CA recommendations, draft learning plans for each NHRC professional staff  | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Facilitate a capacity-building partnership for the NRHC with the International Development Law Organization (IDLO)  | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Develop strategy papers, action plans and indicator frameworks for all nine NHRC thematic committees | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Develop NHRC’s Annual Operational Plan for 2014 to 2015 | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Facilitate the participation of the NHRC in the annual APF – NHRIs meeting | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Organize a one-day training for NHRC staff on drafting press releases and statements, maximizing media coverage | CDP Q3 report |

1. **INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL SUPPORTED UNDER COMPONENT 1 (Source: BNHRC-CDP administrative records)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dates** | **Destination** | **Event** | **Participants** |
| 2010, 17-25 Sept. | Sidney, Australia | Study tour HR Commission | Chairman, Honorary Members |
| 2010, 6-13 Oct. | Sidney, Australia | Study tour HR Commission | Full-time Member (FTM) |
| 2011, 24-27 May | New Delhi, India | Study tour HR Commission | Secretary and 4 NHRC staff |
| 2011, 19-24 June | Copenhagen, Denmark | Study tour and training HR Commission | All Commissioners, Project Manager (PM) |
| 2011, 25-29 June | London, UK | Study tour HR Commission | All Commissioners, PM |
| 2011, 6-9 Sept. | Bangkok, Thailand | 16th Annual Meeting, Asia Pacific Forum (APF) | Chairman, FTM |
| 2012, 19-22 March | Geneva, Switzerland | Annual Meeting, ICC-NHRI | Chairman, FTM, Secretary  |
| 2012, 12-15 June | Bangkok, Thailand | Asia Pacific Council for Juvenile Justice | FTM and I project staff |
| 2012, 24-29 June | Malaysia and Philippines | Study tours HR Commissions | All Commissioners, 2 staff and PM |
| 2012, 3-10 Sept. | New York, USA | Study tour NYC Commission on HR | Chairman and FTM |
| 2012, 3-9 Nov. | Amman, Jordan | 11th Internat’l Conference NHRIs | FTM, Secretary |
| 2012, 25-29 Nov. | Kathmandu, Nepal | Internat’l Conference on Migrant Rights | Chairman |
| 2013, 24 Apr-11 May | Geneva, Switzerland | Annual Meeting, ICC-NHRI | Chairman, FTM, 4 Hon. Members, PM and 1 project staff |
| 2013, 16-24 Sept. | Geneva, Switzerland | HR Council (Bangladesh UPR) | Chairman, FTM |
| 2013, 30 Sept – 3 Oct | Doha, Qatar | Annual Meeting APF | Chairman, FTM |
| 2014, 9-18 March | Geneva, Switzerland | Annual Meeting, ICC-NHRI | Chairman, FTM |
| 2014, 2-6 Sept. | New Delhi, India | Annual Meeting, APF | Chairman, FTM |
| 2014, 23-27 Sept. | Geneva, Switzerland | HR Council, Committee on Rights of Persons with Disabilities | Chairman, FTM |

1. **MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR COMPONENT 2 (COMPLAINTS, MONITORING AND INVESTIGATION) 2010 to December 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **When** | **Activity** | **Source** |
| 2010-2011 | Design and develop SOP for complaints management | UNDP Project annual Reporting, 2010; CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Draft the Rules on Enquiry, Mediation and Complaints | CDP Q2, Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Support the development and installation of software for the complaints management system | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Organize training for commissioners and staff on negotiation, mediation and conciliation | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Design a template for submitting complaints and draft a factsheet on the role of NHRC in handling complaints | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Prepare a template for reporting deaths in custody | CDP Annual Report 2011 |
| 2011 | Prepare guidelines and a template for interviewing detainees | CDP Annual Report 2011, 2012 p22 |
| 2012 | Support fact-finding missions into HR violations, including 2 missions in Chittagong | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Facilitate a meeting of NGOs with a view to establish a monitoring network for NHRC investigations | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Train and coach NHRC staff on the SOP for complaints handling | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Provide a training session for NHRC staff on conciliation, mediation and arbitration | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Provide four training sessions to NHRC staff on the new online Complaints Management System | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Finalize the draft NHRC Rules on Mediation | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Organize a brainstorming with NGO partners on developing a network of investigators | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | With ASK, draft a manual on complaints management for CBOs on filing complaints with the NHRC | CDP Q1 report 2012, CDP 2012 annual report p17 |
| 2012 | Participate in two workshops for CBOs on filing complaints with the NHRC | CDP Q1 report 2012  |
| 2012 | Provide a training session for Commissioners on conciliation, mediation and arbitration | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Facilitate a new NHRC committee of NGO partners to draft NHRC guidelines for an investigation /monitoring network | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Provide two training sessions for NHRC staff on using the online Complaints Management System  | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Finalize NHRC rules on mediation and submit to Parliament | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Provide an additional training session for NHRC staff on using the online Complaints Management System | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Produce and disseminate Fact-sheets in Bangla on filing complaints with the NHRC for local activists and the public | CDP annual report, p18 |
| 2012 | Assist the NHRC in establishing a roster of 60 HR investigators active in 30 districts | CDP annual report, p18 |
| 2012 | Collaborate with Save the Children Bangladesh to design a child-friendly complaints system | CDP annual report, p19 |
| 2012 | Assist in identifying and training a core group of professionals to serve as NHRC mediators and facilitators  | CDP annual report, p19 |
| 2013 | Develop questionnaires to measure client satisfaction with the complaints handling system | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Train new NHRC staff in the Online Complaints Management System | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Finalize guidelines for field monitors and investigators from ASK, BLAST, Odhikar, Rights Jessore and Nagorik Uddog | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Engage an international consultant to train core staff and 34 rostered investigators on monitoring and investigation | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| **When** | **Activity** | **Source** |
| 2013 | Produce a training manual on investigation and fact-finding techniques | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Engage a national consultant to enter data into the online complaints management system | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Engage a consultant to draft an SOP on complaints concerning child rights and map the referral process with partner NGOs | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Develop a survey questionnaire to ensure that SOPs on complaints handling and management are being followed | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013  | Provide seven 3-day trainings to 172 rostered field investigators in Barisal, Satkhira, Rajshahi, Dinajpur, Sylhet, Cox’s Bazaar and Dhaka Division; advise the NHRC in processing reports submitted by these investigators beginning in the 4th quarter  | CDP Q3 report 2013; CDP annual report, p16 |
| 2013 | Draft a complaints management rule for submission to Government to ensure a lawful complaints handling process | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Assist the NHRC in managing the complaints system and measuring results and effective follow-up | CDP annual report, p13 |
| 2013 | Develop an NHRC SOP on monitoring and reporting human rights violations | CDP annual report, p20  |
| 2013 | Provide training on a child-friendly complaints mechanism | CDP Excel table, 2013 |
| 2014 | Support the organization of a four-day training course on undertaking national inquiries | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Organize a staff dialogue on HR and policing for NHRC staff | CDP Excel table |
| 2014 | Organize a 4-day training on conducting national inquiries for NHRC staff and all Members  | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Organize a 2-day refresher training in Dhaka in June for 30 field investigators | Excel table |
| 2014 | Organize an advocacy meeting with BSWS to discuss ways to improve the management of complaints from LGBT persons | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Development of a system of referral and investigation of cases of VAW/G at the Union Parishad level  | 4th quarter output |
| 2014 | Engage a consultant and support the drafting of a litigation strategy for the NHRC  | 4th quarter output |

**D. MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR COMPONENT 3 (HUMAN RIGHTS AWARENESS AND EDUC ATION) 2010 to September 2014**

 **Workshops and training sessions for external partners**

| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2010, 30 Sep | Dhaka | National workshop | Human Rights Institutions: Moving Forward | GoB, NGOs, media | 150 |  | 1 day | Consultation on the draft strategic plan; raise awareness and profile of the new commission | NHRC annual report 2010 |
| 2010, 13-14 Nov | Dhaka | Internat’l seminar | National Human Rights Commissions: Experiences and Challenges | International community, NHRIs and NGOs from the Asia Pacific Region | *75* | APF | 2 days | Foster regional cooperation on HR issues, raise national and international profile of the Commission; adopt the “Dhaka Declaration” | NHRC annual report 2010, annex 6, 7 |
| 201010 Dec | Dhaka | Round-table | Speak up, Stop Discrimination | Law students, media, general public | 250 | Univer-sities | 1 day | Raise awareness HR issues | NHRC annual report 2010 |
| 2010,29 Dec | Dhaka | Consulta-tive workshop | Role of NHRC in Protecting Rts of Indigenous Peoples | Policy makers, civil society, media | 110 | NA | ½ day | Analyze situation in CHT and identify actions to be taken by the NHRC; propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | NHRC annual report 2010, annex 8 |
| 2011, 15 Jan | Dhaka | Consulta-tive workshop | Human Trafficking and the NHRC | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | Nat’l Academy Planning | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 2 Feb | Dhaka | Consulta-tive workshop | Women’s Rts and VAW | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | YMCA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 11 Feb | Dhaka | Consulta-tive workshop | Rights of Migrant Workers | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | Nat’l Academy Planning | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 20 Feb | Chitta-gong | Consulta-tive workshop | Access to Justice and Remedies | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |

| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2011, 24 Feb | Khulna | Consulta-tive workshop | Child Rights | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 5 Mar | Rangpur | Consulta-tive workshop | Economic, Social and Cultural Rts | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 6 Mar | Sylhet | Consulta-tive workshop | Right to Education | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011,10 Mar | Barisal | Consulta-tive workshop | Addressing Climate Change | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011,15 Mar | Dhaka | Consulta-tive workshop | State Violence and Role of NHRC | Policy makers, civil society | 110 | NA | 1 day | Analyze present situation, propose recommendations into NHRC draft strategic plan 2010-2015 | CDP Q1 report |
| 2011, 8 June | Dhaka | National Seminar | HR of Indigenous Peoples | Policy makers, civil society, media | 80 | BIPF, ILO | 1 day | Raise national awareness of the plight of Indigenous Peoples and input into the NHRC action plan | CDP Q2 report |
| 2011, Oct | Gopal-ganj | Workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists and public | 50 | NA | 1 day | First workshop in a country-wide campaign to raise HR awareness at the local level | CDP annual report |
| 2011,Nov | Dhaka | Training workshop | HR Defenders and the NHRC | NGOs, activists | 25 | NA | 2 days | Role of NHRC in protecting HR | CDP annual report |
| 2011, 3rd quarter | Dhaka | Dialogue | Dialogue with the Media | Journalists and news outlets | 30 | NA | 1 day | Seeking comments and suggestions for a training manual on HR | CDP annual report |
| 2011, Dec | Cox’s Bazaar | Workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists and public | 50 | NA | 1 day | Second workshop in a country-wide campaign to raise HR awareness at the local level | CDP annual report |
| 2011, 10 Dec | Dhaka | Public events across the country | HR Day | Civil society, media, youth, public | 100s | NA | 1 day | Promote HR awareness, especially among the youth (“Giving Young People a Voice”) through creative competition (drawing, painting, essays) | CDP annual report 2011 |

| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012,25 Feb | Dhaka | Policy Dialogue | UPR | Ministry Secretaries |  | NA | 1 day | Prepare for 2nd UPR | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2012, 4-5 Apr | Dhaka | Internat’lconference | Peoples’ Rts to Land and Food | Policy makers, civil society, media | *75* | Assoc. for Land Reform and Devel | 2 days | Encourage regional governments to take action against land grabbing, particularly from Indigenous communities. The Dhaka Declaration was adopted | CDP annual report, pp30-31 |
| 2012,13 Jun | Dhaka | National Consulta-tion | Inclusion, rt to health and SOGI | Policy makers, civil society, media, public | *50* | Bandhu Soc. Wel-fare Soc. | 1 day | Raise awareness and understanding of the rights and vulnerabilities of the LGBT community  | CDP annual report 2012, p.31 |
| 2012,19 July | Shirajgan | Community workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists, media and public | 10 0 | NA | 1 day | Raise public awareness of the NHRC and follow-up on 2009 UPR recommendations | CDP Q3 report |
| 2012,NA | Sylhelt | Community workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists, media and public | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise public awareness of the NHRC and follow-up on 2009 UPR recommendations | CDP annual report, p25 |
| 2012,26 July | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on institutional development | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,28 July | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on ratification of HR instruments | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,4 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on refugees, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,4 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on women’s rights and compliance with CEDAW | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,7 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on civil and political rights | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,7 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on economic, social and cultural rights | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,13 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | consultation with key stakeholders | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on climate change and disaster management | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2012,23 Aug | Rangpur | Community workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists, media and public | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise public awareness of the NHRC and follow-up on 2009 UPR recommendations | CDP Q3 report |
| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| 2012,NA | Moulvi-bazar | Community workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists, media and public | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise public awareness of the NHRC and follow-up on 2009 UPR recommendations | CDP annual report, p25 |
| 2012,29 Aug | Dhaka | Workshop | Preparation for the 2nd UPR | NA | NA | NA | ½ day | Focus on child labour and trafficking | CDP Q3 report  |
|  2012,30 Aug | Khulna | Community workshop | HR and Role of the NHRC | Local officials, activists, media and public | 130 | NA | 1 day | Raise public awareness of the NHRC and follow-up on 2009 UPR recommendations | CDP Q3 report |
| 2012, 18-19Sept | Dhaka | National seminar | UPR stake-holder report  | Policy makers, civil society media | *60* | NA | 2 days | Raise awareness on the UPR and gather input to the NHRC draft report  | CDP Q3 report |
| 2012,11 Oct | Dhaka | National Consulta-tion | Inclusion, rt to health and SOGI | Policy makers, civil society, media, public | *50* | Bandhu Soc. Wel-fare Soc. | 1 day | Gather input on the rights and vulnerabilities of the LGBT community for drafting an NHRC report | CDP annual report 2012, p.31 |
| 2012Oct | Dhaka | Workshop | Police reform on custodial management | Police, policy makers, civil society, activists | *35* | UNDP Police Reform Prog. | 1 day | Consultation with relevant actors to provide HR input into the drafting of new rules on custodial management | CDP annual report 2012, p.36 |
| 2012Oct | Jessore | Workshop | Police reform on custodial management | Police, policy makers, civil society, activists | *35* | UNDP Police Reform Prog. | 1 day | Consultation with relevant actors to provide HR input into the drafting of new rules on custodial management | CDP annual report 2012, p.36 |
| 2012Oct | Sylhet | Workshop | Police reform on custodial management | Police, policy makers, civil society, activists | *35* | UNDP Police Reform Prog. | 1 day | Consultation with relevant actors to provide HR input into the drafting of new rules on custodial management | CDP annual report 2012, p.36 |
| 2012,29 Oct | Dhaka | consultation | Business and HR | Private sector, civil society and Gvt. | *50* | NA | 1 day | Promote Corporate Social Responsibility and identify partners for cooperative HR initiatives, especially for women and children | CDP annual report 2012, p.34 |
| 2012, 23 Nov | Dhaka | Public rally  | Brave Men March | Civil society, students, media, public | 1000 | Centre for Men and Masc. St. | 1 day | Raise awareness on preventing violence against women and change attitudes of young men and boys  | CDP annual report, p29 |

| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012, Dec | Dhaka | HR and Corp. Social Resp. | roundtable | Private sector, civil society and gvt. | *35* | NA | 1 day | Follow-up to the tragic fire at Tazreen Fashions Factory to raise awareness of responsibilities of the private sector | CDP annual report 2012, p.35 |
| 2010,10 Dec | Dhaka,Khulna, CHT | Public events | Focus on rt to inclusion and rt to participate in public life | Policy makers, civil society, media, public | *300* | NA | 1 day x 3 | Public events simultaneously in 3 divisions,  | CDP annual report, p32 |
| 2012 | DhakaCHT | Two roundtables | Communal Harmony | Policy makers, media, public | NA | NA | 1 day | Discussions aimed at calming communal tensions, including in CHT | CDP annual report, p34 |
| 2013,16 Jan | Bogra | workshop | Together for Human Rights | Local officials and activists | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise awareness on NHRC, sensitize local officials, explore cooperation | CDP Q1 report  |
| 2013, 17 Jan | Gaiban-dha | workshop | Together for Human Rights | Local officials and activists | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise awareness on NHRC, sensitize local officials, explore cooperation | CDP Q1 report  |
| 2013, 2 Feb | Dhaka | national seminar | Protecting Rights of Dalits | Officials, NGOs, educators, Dalits | 400 | Law Comm. | 1 day | Raise awareness and support for new legislation aimed at protecting Dalits | CDP Q1 report |
| 2013,28 Feb | Joypur-hat | workshop | Together for Human Rights | Local officials and activists | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise awareness on NHRC, sensitize local officials, explore cooperation | CDP Q1 report  |
| 2013,9 Feb | Gopal-ganj | workshop | Campaign against Child Marriage | Local officials and activists, journalists | 100 | NA | 1 day | Raise awareness, enlist support and input for action against child marriage | CDP Q1 report |
| 2013,14 Mar | Dhaka | consultation | Observing International Women’s Day | Policy makers, NGOs, media, activists, public | *80* | JAAGO Founda-tion, Oxfam | 1 day | Raise awareness on women’s rights with focus on agricultural workers | CDP Q1 report |
| 2013,29 March | Dhaka | workshop | Observing International Women’s Day | Activists, educators, parents, students | *80* | JAAGO Founda-tion, ASK | 1 day | Increasing HR awareness among teachers, parents and students | CDP Q1 report |
| 2013, 30 Mar | Dhaka | National seminar | Equal opportunity | Officials, activists, media, civil soc. | 300 | Law Comm. | 1 day | Raise awareness and support for proposed anti-discrimination legislation | CDP Q1 report; annual report p36 |
| 2013,1-2 Apr | Mymen-sing | workshop | HR Training for LEOs | Police and border guards | 35 | ILO | 2 days | Train LEOs on respecting the rights of ethnic minorities | CDP Q2 report |
| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| 2013,13 Apr | Dhaka | workshop | Preparing for the UPR2 | Key government actors | 45 | MFA | 1 day | Review progress achieved since UPR1 and prepare for the next UPR | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,May | Dhaka | training | HR in Law Enforcement | Ansar personnel of Civ. Service | 34 | Ansar Academy | NA | Train cadre in HR principles | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013, 16 Apr | Rupashi | workshop | Mock UPR | Ministry officials, NGOs, activists | 150 | MFA | 1 day | Train and prepare stakeholders for the second round of the UPR | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,11 Jun | Dhaka | workshop | Press Freedom and Security | Journalists | 30 | NA | 1 day | Focus on security for journalists and the protection of their rights | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,12 Jun | Dhaka | workshop | LGBT Rights | Activists, media, LGBT community | *30* | Bandhu Soc. Welf.Society | 1 day | View documentaries on the plight of the LBGT community and discuss ways to better protect their rights | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,June | Dhaka | consultation workshop | Working To-gether for HR | Local NGOs and activists  | 22 | NA | 1 day | Raise awareness of NHRC and explore ways of cooperating with local NGOs based in Khulna, Rajshahi and Barisal | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,15 Jun | Dhaka | Roundtable discussion | Improving working conditions | NGOs, private sector, Gvt, media, activists  | 35 | NA | 1 day | In response to recent tragedies, formulate recommendations to government to improve protection for garment workers | CDP Q2 report  |
| 2013,4 July | Dhaka | Roundtable discussion | Improving working conditions | NGOs, private sector, Gvt, media, activists  | 35 | NA | 1 day | In response to recent tragedies, formulate recommendations to government to improve protection for garment workers | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2013,21 Aug | Dhaka | HR Lecture | Rights and responsibilities | University students | 300 | Notre Dame College | ½ day | Lecture and interactive dialogue with university students | CDP Q3 report  |
| 2013,3rd Qtr. | Various divisions | Local HR campaigns | HR awareness | Local officials, activists, NGOs, public | 27,400 | Rupantar | NA | 20 campaigns in several divisions undertaken using traditional performances | CDP Q3 report |
| 2013,14-15 Sept | NA | HR training | HR awareness raising in rural areas | Rural clinic support staff and managers | 16 | JTS, NGO Forum | 2 days | Train key staff at eight rural JTS community clinics on HR principles, the NHRC and the complaints procedure | CDP Q3 report |

| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2013,16-19 Sept | Gazipur | Traditional performances | HR awareness for garment workers | Factory workers, especially women | 2000(1100 wo-men) | Marks & Spencer | ½ day times four | Cultural shows in four factories with HR messages, including birth registration and preventing child marriage | CDP Q3 report |
| 2013, 21 Oct | Dhaka | Roundtable | NHRC Act | NHRC and its partners | 120 | NA | 1 day | Discuss and recommend necessary revisions to the NHRC Act | CDP annual report, p39 |
| 2013,22-23 Oct | Dhaka (Castle Hotel) | Training workshop | Treaty Body reporting | Government officials, NGOs, NHRC staff | 30 | NA | 2 days | Understanding the treaty body system and facilitating the submission of reports | CDP annual report p43; Excel table |
| 2013,29-30 Oct | Dhaka (CIRDAP) | Training workshop | Treaty Body reporting | Government officials, NGOs, NHRC staff | 30 | NA | 2 days | Understanding the treaty body system and facilitating the submission of reports | CDP annual report p43; Excel table |
| 2013 | NA | Training of trainers | HR Awareness and the NHRC | Community facilitators, UP reps | 21 | AVCP | NA | Facilitate community courtyard sessions | CDP annual report, p22CDP annual report, p26 |
| 2014,24-25 Feb | Sardah, Rajshahi | Training of trainers | HR and Policing | Police trainers | 22 | Police Training College | 2 days | Training session for trainers on HR and policing | CDP annual report 2013, p24Excel table |
| 2014,26-27 Feb | Chua-danga | HR Training | HR awareness and the NHRC | Local officials and female community facilitators | 43 | WAVE Founda-tion | 2 days | Targeting Union Parishad representatives and women facilitators | CDP Q1 report, Excel table |
| 2014, 2 Mar | Malibagh Dhaka | Training | HR and Policing | Police investigators | 20 | CID Office | 1 day | Training session for investigators on HR and policing | CDP annual report, p24Excel table3 |
| 2014, 3 Mar | Dhaka | HR training | HR and Policing | Police | 20 | DMP Office | 1 day | HR training for police | CDP Q1 report, Excel table |
| 2014, 4-5 Mar | Dhaka | Training of trainers | HR and Policing | Police trainers | 28 | Police Staff College | 2 day | HR training for police | CDP Q1 report, Excel table |
| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| 2014, 14 Mar | Chua-danga | Court yard meetings | HR Awareness | UP reps. and community facilitators | 1500 | UNDP AVC | 15 days | Many sessions different locations held  | CDP Q1/Q2 reportExcel table |
| 2014, 27 Mar | Dhaka | HR training | HR Education | Teachers | 20 | CIRDAP | 1 day | Workshop for training teachers | CDP Q1 report |
| 20142nd qtr | Dhaka | HR training for journalists | HR Education | Journalists | NA | NA | NA | Training for journalists on HR monitoring and reporting; input for drafting an NHRC manual HR and journalists | CDP Q1/Q2 report  |
| 2014,24-25 Apr | Rajshahi | Workshop | HR Awareness | UP Chairmen, members, community facilitators | 20 | NGO Forum | 2 days | Raising HR awareness among community leaders | Excel table |
| 2014,2-3 May | Barguna | HR workshop | HR Awareness | Students, NGOs, teachers, officials minorities, journalists | 225 | Fareea Lara Fnd-ation | 2 days | Workshop focusing on HR issues affecting women and children | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014, 10 May | Khulna | HR training | HR Awareness | Community facilitators | 18 | WAVEFndation | 1 day | Raise awareness of HR and NHRC at the community level | Excel table |
| 2014,24-25 May | Chitta-gong | HR training  | HR and the Police | Police | 50 | Dampara Police Line | 2 days | Part of the effort to integrate HR principles into police training | CDP Q1 /Q2 report Excel table |
| 2014,27 May | Dhaka | Workshop | Brave Men Campaign | Youth, activists, CBOs | 300 | Ctr. for Men and Masc. Studies | I day | Disseminating workshop for launching phase II of the campaign | Excel table |
| 2014,27 May | Dhaka | HR training for students | HR Education | Students, aged 12 to 15 | 250 | NA | 1 day | Part of a country-wide campaign to raise HR awareness among youth | CDP Q1 /Q2 report |
| 2014,1-2 June | Nilpha-mary | HR training  | HR and the Police | Police | 40 | In Service Training Centre | 2 days | Part of the effort to integrate HR principles into police training | CDP Q1 /Q2 report Excel table |
| 2014,4-5 June | Rajshahi | HR training  | HR and the Police | Police | 25 | Shardah Police Academy | 2 days | Part of the effort to integrate HR principles into police training | CDP Q1 /Q2 report Excel table |
| **When** | **Where** | **Type** | **Title** | **Target group** | **No.** | **Partners (if any)** | **Dura-tion** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| 2014,5 June | Dhaka | HR training for students | HR Education | Students, aged 12 to 15 | 60 | NA | 1 day | Part of a country-wide campaign to raise HR awareness among youth | CDP Q1 /Q2 report |
| 2014,7-8 June | Dhaka | HR training  | HR and the Police | Police | 60 | Police Staff College | 2 days | Part of the effort to integrate HR principles into police training | CDP Q1 /Q2 report Excel table |
| 2014,10-11 June | Khulna | HR training  | HR and the Police | Police | 25 |  | 2 days | Part of the effort to integrate HR principles into police training | CDP Q1 /Q2 report Excel table |
| 2014,24 Jun | Dhaka | consultation | UPR follow-up | Officials, NGOs, activists, media | 60 |  | 1 day | Follow-up to the consideration of the UPR | Excel table |
| 2014,8-13 July | Seraj-gong | Workshop | Brave Men Campaign Phase II | Youth volunteers and teachers | 40 | Ctr. for Men and Mascul. | 4 days | Designing tools and assessments for Phase II of the Brave Men Campaign | Excel table |
| 2014,6-9 Aug | Seraj-gong | Training of trainers | Brave Men Campaign Phase II | Youth volunteers and teachers | 50 | Ctr. for Men and Mascul. | 4 days | Two training sessions of two days each | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014, Aug Sept | Various | Training of trainers | HR Awareness and the NHRC | Community facilitators, UP reps | 168 | AVCP, WAVE FndMadaripur Legal Aid | 9 days | Nine training sessions held to train community courtyard facilitators; at Rangpur, Nilphamary, Gopalgong, Madaripur and Rajshahi | CDP Q3 reportExcel table |
| 20143rd Qrtr | Dhaka, Barisol Chitta-gong | HR training | HR for Legal Profession | Lawyers, legal aid NGOs and prosecutors | 254 | IDLO | 12 days | Nine training sessions organized of 1-2 days training each | CDP Q3 report |

**E. MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR COMPONENT 3 (HUMAN RIGHTS AWARENESS AND EDUCATION) 2010 to September 2014**

 **Campaigns and materials for external partners and the general public**

| **When** | **Activity** | **Target** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2011 | Design, commission, analyze and publicize a baseline HR survey | NHRC, policy makers, activists | CDP Q1, Q2, Q3 reports 2011 |
| 2011 | Develop and upload content of the NHRC website | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1, Q2, Q3 reports 2011 |
| 2011 | Printing of stickers to advertize NHRC’s new address | General public | CDP Q1 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Print 1000 copies of NHRC strategic plan | Policy makers, activists | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Draft leaflets on NHRC complaints procedures in Bangla | Local activists and general public  | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Produce flyers on the commission and its activities | Local activists and general public | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Design a factsheet on complaints to inform public of NHRC role | Activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Develop a concept note on a country-wide awareness-raising campaign | Activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Develop a concept note for NHRC activities observing Human Rights Day 2011 | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Draft and publish 1000 copies of the summary findings of the HR baseline survey | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2012 | Produce and disseminate 1000 calendars with HR messages | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Produce and disseminate a “Factsheet on Human Rights”  | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Produce, translate and disseminate a summary report on the HR baseline survey | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Draft NHRC articles for two local newspapers | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | With UNDP and P4P, design an NHRC’s campaign on preventing VAW  | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1, Q2 reports 2012 |
| 2012 | Design a mass campaign on HR awareness covering 20 districts in 3 divisions; resulted in materials and theatrical performances reaching 25,000 people | Activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2012; CDP annual report 2012, p24, p27 |
| 2012 | Commission contracts to produce TVC, video documentaries and billboards for a HR awareness campaign; resulted in 5 audio-visual products and TV ads aired on 5 channels reaching 113 million viewers; 72 billboards in 24 districts | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q3 report 2012; CDP annual report 2012, p24, p27 |
| 2012 | Develop partnerships for a national campaign to address Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity issues | Policy makers, NGOs, lawyers, activists, media and public | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | In partnership with Grameenphone, 40 million SMS sent on HR Day | General public | CDP annual report 2012, p12 |
| 2012 | Produce and disseminate 4000 copies of the Fact-sheet on filing HR complaints | Local activists and public | CDP annual report 2012, p18 |
| 2012 | Build NHRC capacity to train the police on HR | Law enforcement officers (LEOs) | CDP annual report 2012, p25 |
| 2012 | In partnership with Min. Home Affairs and the Police Training Institute, assist in drafting and producing a handbook for police on human rights | Law enforcement officers (LEOs) | CDP annual report 2012, p36 |
| 2012 | Joint “Because I am a Girl” campaign with Plan International promoting greater access to education, end child marriage and gender-based violence  | Activists, girls, general public  | CDP annual report 2012, p12 |
| 2012 | Joint initiative with Jaago Foundation to mark the International Day of the Child | Activists, youth, general public | CDP annual report 2012, p12 |
| 2013 | Commission additional HR billboards in remaining 4 districts | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report |
| 2013 | Assist NHRC in organizing and launching a campaign against child marriage | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1, Q2 report |
| **When** | **Activity** | **Target** | **Source** |
| 2013 | Assist in the production of five NHRC video documentaries on the NHRC, HR, discrimination, domestic violence, child labour and child education | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP annual report p25 |
| 2013 | Distribute over 14,500 sets of NHRC publications to partners and stakeholders; distribute NHRC video documentaries to 64 district information officers; produce and distribute 1000 calendars and diaries to govt. offices, NGOs and media  | Policy makers, activists, educators, doctors, lawyers, students, journalists, public | CDP Q1 reportCDP annual report, p23 |
| 2013 | Further extend the mass campaign on HR awareness using gamvira, pot song and drama in an additional 20 districts, now covering 40 of 64 districts | Women, students, youth, local officials, community workers | CDP Q1/Q2 report 2014 |
| 2013 | With ASK, train 59 HR educators and 100 people through five community training sessions | Teachers, the poor, local administrators, students | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Commission five 30-sec. TV spots on women’s and children’s rights airing 84 times on 3 channels; viewed by almost 20 million as reported by TRP | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q1 report 2013CDP annual report, p25 |
| 2013 | With World Vision, launch the campaign “Bride not before 18” | CBOs, students, teachers, parents | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | With Jaggo Foundation, activities to observe World Environment Day  | Media, activists, students | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Redesign and update the NHRC website | Policy makers, activists, public | CDP Q2 report 2013CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | With Ctr. for Men, carry out training and activities in 16 schools to combat VAW | Students, teachers, media, public | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Produce 10,000 posters, 500 ribbons, 1500 souvenir items and 700 stickers with HR messages for distribution at NHCR workshops, campaigns and events | Local officials, students, teachers, activists, NGOs, media | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Produce TV spots on NHRC and its campaigns for airing on four TV channels | General public, activists, policy makers,  | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Undertake a training needs assessment for NHRC staff and government officials on treaty body reporting | Ministry officials and HR focal points | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Install an additional 72 billboards with NHRC and HR messages in 24 districts | General public, activists, officials | CDP annual report, p26 |
| 2013 | Publish a newspaper supplement (The Daily Prothom Alo) on HR Day | 3 million officials, activists, public | CDP annual report, p26 |
| 2014 | Support NHRC participation in a Brave Men Rally on International Women’s Day | 250 students and activists | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Further extend the mass campaign on HR awareness using gamvira, pot song and drama in an additional 12 districts, reaching an estimated 12,000 people | Women, students, youth, local officials, community workers | CDP Q1/Q2 report |
| 2014 | Commission a follow-up evaluation to the 2011 baseline human rights survey | NHRC, policy makers, activists | Future annual report |

**F. MAJOR ACTIVITIES FOR COMPONENT 4 (HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT) 2010 to September 2014**

| **When** | **Activity** | **Target** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2011 | Develop concept note for NHRC studies on HR treaty compliance | Policy makers, students, activists | CDP Q2, Q3 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Assist the NHRC in formulating and submitting recommendations on implementing the new National Women’s Policy | Policy makers, activists | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Assist the NHRC in drafting recommendations on a HR constitutional amendment | Policy makers, activists | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Organize a roundtable on new national women’s policy; gather input into NHRC recommendations to GoB on policy implementation | Policy makers, activists, civil society | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011 | Draft NHRC comments on a draft law on human trafficking | Policy makers | CDP Q2 report 2011 |
| 2011-2012 | Commission and supervise studies on compliance of national laws with ICCPR, ICESCR, CAT, CRC, CEDAW | NHRC, Policy makers, students, activists. | CDP annual report 2011 |
| 2012 | Organize and commission two studies on HR treaty compliance concerning migrant workers and persons with disabilities | Policy makers, students, activists | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Prepare NHRC comments on the draft Act on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities | Policy makers | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Organize a policy dialogue with cabinet secretaries on implementing the 2009 UPR recommendations and the role of NHRC in monitoring the results | Policy makers | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Plan and organize a two-day meeting with relevant ministries on UPR follow-up | Policy makers | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Assist in drafting the NHRC’s stakeholder report to the UPR and organize 10 consultations and a national seminar  | Policy makers, activists, civil society | CDP Q3 report 2012, CDP annual report 2012, p38 |
| 2012 | Assist the NHRC in reviewing the proposed Child Act 2012 and submitting recommendations on changing the act in conformity with HR obligations | Policy makers, activists, parents, children | CDP Q3 report 2012CDP Q2 report 2013CDP annual report, pp37-38 |
| 2012 | Undertake research and analysis on High Court decisions concerning HR | Policy makers, lawyers, activists | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Jointly with UNDP Police Reform Programme, draft new Guidelines on Custodial Management to reflect human rights requirements | Police, policy makers, activists | CDP annual report 2012, p.36 |
| 2012 | Assist in conducting and publishing an NHRC study on Higher Judiciary Decisions and the protection of women’s rights  | Judiciary, lawyers, policy makers, activists, civil society | CDP annual report 2012, p41 |
| 2012 | Assist in conducting and publishing an NHRC study on Higher Judiciary Decisions on arrest and detention | Judiciary, lawyers, policy makers, activists, civil society | CDP annual report 2012, p41 |
| 2013 | Undertake research for recommendations for a national policy on Dalits | Policy makers, activists, civil society | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Draft guidelines on review of school curriculum from a human rights perspective; Engage a natl consultant to review school curricula and assist the NHRC in drafting recommendations for the revision of the school curricula to include HR | Policy makers, educators, students | CDP Q2 report 2013CDP Q3 report 2013 |

| **When** | **Activity** | **Target** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2013  | Engage a natl consultant to review the human rights situation of indigenous people and the implementation of the CHT Peace accord | Policy makers, Indigenous Peoples | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Engage and supervise a natl consultant to analyze compliance with ICERD | Policy makers, ethnic minorities | CDP Q2 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Support the NHRC Child Rts Committee in reviewing the Child Marriage Act 1929 | Policy makers, NGOs. children | CDP Q3 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Support the successful NHRC advocacy to Gvt. recognizing the rights of Hijras  | Policy makers, sexual minorities | CDP annual report, p17 |
| 2013 | Assist in drafting five NHRC policy papers for Govt. and Parliament on Migrant Rights, CAT, Civil and Political Rights, ESC Rights and persons with disabilities  | Policy makers | CDP annual report, p36 |
| 2013 | With the Law Commission, hold consultative workshops, draft and submit detailed recommendations to Government and Parliament on proposed new anti-discrimination legislation to be considered in 2014 | Policy makers, civil society, disadvantaged minorities | CDP annual report, pp17, 36-37 |
| 2013 | Formulate policy guidelines for further engagement on child labour issues | Policy makers, activists, children | CDP annual report, p39 |
| 2013 | Provide technical analysis of proposed amendments to the Labour Act 2006 | Policy makers, unions, workers | CDP annual report, p40 |
| 2013 | Engage a national consultant to draft a shadow report on the right to food | Policy makers, civil society, poor | CDP annual report, p40 |
| 2013 | Commission the drafting of a shadow report to the UN Committee against Torture | Policy makers, civil society | CDP Q1/Q2 report 2014 |
| 2014 | Organize a dialogue on the Child Marriage Act 1929; finalize proposals on child marriage to Min. Women’s and Children’s Affairs for drafting new legislation | Policy makers, lawyers, civil society, media | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | With the Law Commission, organize two consultations on the draft anti-discrimination law; finalize proposals to MLJPA for review | Policy makers, lawyers, civil society, media | CDP Q1 report |
| 2014 | Organize two consultations on the draft shadow reports to CAT and CESCR | Policy makers, civil society | CDP Q1/Q2 report 2014 |
| 2014 | Publish research reports on Migrant Workers, ICERD, HR, Indigenous Peoples and the CHT peace Accord | Judiciary, lawyers, policy makers, activists, civil society, Universities | CDP Q1/2 report 2014CDP Q3 report 2014 |
| 2014 | Commission updated studies on legal compliance with CRC and CEDAW | Policy makers, lawyers, NGOs | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Engage consultants to draft and finalize CRC shadow report (submitted in October) | Policy makers, civil society | CDP Q3 report |
| 2014 | Engage consultants to draft and finalize CEDAW shadow report  | Policy makers, civil society | CDP Q3 report |

**G. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS, NETWORKS SUPPORTED BY CDP (all Components) 2010 to September 2014**

| **When** | **Partner(s)** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2011 | Bangladesh Youth Environmental Initiative | Strengthen education on HR and the environment | CDP Q3 report 2011 |
| 2012 | Access to Information Project (A2I) | Access additional platforms for HR information and messages, including on the work of the NHRC | CDP Q1 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Danish Institute for Human Rights | Support for specialized human rights training | CDP Q2 report 2012 |
| 2012 | UNDP and Partners for Prevention (P4P) | Design and implement a collaborative national campaign on preventing violence against women | CDP Q1, Q2 reports 2012 |
| 2012 | Oxfam | Develop joint initiatives on economic, social and cultural rights | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | Rupantar | Collaborate on bringing HR awareness to the local level by using popular media (Pot song, theatre and gamvira); by 2014, resulted in campaigns in 52 districts across the country with tens of thousands of people participating | CDP Q3 report 2012CDP annual report 2012, p28; CDP annual report 2013; p27; CDP Q1/Q2 report 2014 |
| 2012 | Press Institute of Bangladesh | Integrate HR into the curriculum of student journalists | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | International Development Law Organization (IDLO), UNDP, APF, SAARCLAW and CBOs | Collaborate on initiatives to address sexual orientation and gender identity issues (SOGI) in Bangladesh; NHRC and IDLO are implementing partners | CDP Q3 report 2012 |
| 2012 | ASK, BLAST and BNWLA | MOUs to collaborate on monitoring in the human rights situation in the districts and referring complaints to the NHRC | CDP annual report, p19 |
| 2012 | Jaago, ITS and World Vision | MOUs to collaborate on issues of common concern (women’s empowerment, etc) and expand the reach of the NHRC into the districts beyond Dhaka | CDP annual report, p12CDP Q2 report 2013, p.8; CDP annual report, p10 |
| 2012 | Centre for Men and Masculinity Studies | Collaborate in the “Brave Men Campaign” for ending VAW /G by changing attitudes of young men and boys; design of two self-reflective journals to raise awareness; and empower young girls to resist VAW/G | CDP annual report, p29CDP Q1, Q2 reports 2013 |
| 2012 | Bandhu Social Welfare Society | Raise awareness and understanding of the rights and vulnerabilities of the LGBT community | CDP annual report, p.31 |
| 2012 | Ministry for Home Affairs and the Police Training Institute | Produce a handbook on HR and the Police to be integrated into the training curriculum for police | CDP annual report 2012, p36 |
| 2012 | Government of Bangladesh | Following a policy dialogue on the UPR, 15 HR focal points from key ministries were nominated to work under a new unit in MFA on follow-up on UPR recommendations | CDP annual report 2012, p38 |
| 2012 | UNDP Police Reform Programme | Jointly organize 3 consultative workshops to gather human rights input into new guidelines on custodial management | CDP annual report 2012, p.36 |

| **When** | **Partner(s)** | **Purpose** | **Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2013 | Ain o Salish Kendra (ASK) | Collaborate in conducting fact-finding missions and providing training for the rostered field investigators | CDP Q1 report 2013; CDP annual report, p10 |
| 2013 | ASK, BLAST, Odhikar, Rights Jessore and Nagorik Uddog | Establish a network of field monitors and investigators and provide guidelines and training to them | CDP Q1 report 2013 |
| 2013 | Ain o Salish Kendra (ASK) | Train and deploy teams of local HR educators country-wide | CDP Q1, Q2 reports 2013CDP annual report, pp27-28 |
| 2013 | Save the Children Bangladesh | MOU to develop a child-friendly complaint procedure based on piloting in Manikgonj District; present results to Ministry WCA | CDP Q2 report 2013; CDP annual report, p10 |
| 2013 | Jatiya Tarun Sangha | Local partnership for girls empowerment and HR education | CDP Q2 report 2013; CDP annual report, p10 |
| 2013 | Plan International and World Vision | Joint advocacy for increased access to education for girls, ending gender-based violence and child marriage | CDP Q2 report 2013; CDP annual report, pp10, 28-29 |
| 2013 | Marks & Spencer | MOU to undertake focused HR campaign targeting women factory workers using traditional performances | CDP annual report, p10 |
| 2013 | UNDP Activating Village Courts Project (AVCP) | Integrating HR messaging into existing AVCP training; develop a HR training of trainers module for community activists  | CDP annual report, p10;CDP Q1/Q2 report 2014 |
| 2014 | International Development Law Organization | Strengthen NHRC capacity to: monitor and investigate serious HRVs; monitor UPR follow-up; analyze legislation and advocate | CDP Q1/Q2 report |

**Annex 2:** **LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

JAMAKON (NHRC)

Prof. Dr. Mizanur Rahman, Chairman

Mr. Kazi Reazul Hoque, Full Time Member

Prof. Mahfuza Khanom, Honorary Member

Ms. Selina Hossain, Honorary Member

Ms. Fawzia Karim Firoze, Honorary Member

Ms. Aroma Dutta, Honorary Member

Ms. Nirupa Dewan, Honorary Member

Mr. M. A. Salam, Secretary and National Project Director

BNHRC-CDP Staff

Mr. Yves Del Monaco, Project Manager

Ms. Bithika Hasan, Project Officer

Mr. Rabiul Alam, Communications Analyst

Mr. Zahid Hossain, Expert, Monitoring and Investigation,

Ms. Brittany Smith, Consultant

Ms. Lubna Yasin, National Expert-Research and Policy Advice

Mr. Bushan Shrestha, Consultant

Mr. Gouranga Kunar Paul, Accounts and Finance Officer

Mr. Nishan Prosana Krisnapalan, Human Rights Officer

Mr. Shariful Hoque, National Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

Mr. Syed Md. Saikh Imtiaz, Consultant

Government of Bangladesh

Mr. Faiyaz Murshid Kazi, Director (UN), Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Md. Abdul Wadud Akanda, Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

UNDP

Ms. Pauline Tamesis, Country Director

Mr. Nick Beresford, Deputy Country Director

Mr. Rustam Pulatov, Assistant Country Director, Democratic Governance Cluster

Ms. Miyuki Fujii, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Results & Resource Management Cluster

Ms. Mahmuda Afroz, Programme Analyst, Democratic Governance Cluster

Mr. H.M. Nazrul Islam, Programme Analyst, Local Government Cluster

Development Partners /Donors

Ms. M. Mahal Aminuzzaman, Senior Programme Officer, Royal Danish Embassy

Ms. Melina Papageorgiou Trippolini, Programme Manager, Local Governance Portfolio, Swiss Embassy

NGOs

Ms. Sultana Kamal, Executive Director, Ain-O-Salish Kendra (ASK)

Md. Nur Khan, Director, Investigation and Documentation Unit, Ain-O-Salish Kendra (ASK)

Mr. Shamsul Alam, Director, Save the Children

Ms. Ayesha Khanam, President, Bangladesh Mahila Parishad

Mr. Zakir Hossain, Executive Director, Nagorik Uddyog (Citizens’ Initiative)

Nazrul Islam, Project Coordinator, Activating Village Courts in Bangladesh Project, WAVE Foundation

Mr. Chandan Z. Gomes , Advocacy Director, World Vision

Mr. Rafiqul Islam Khokon, Executive Director, Rupantar

Ms. Shaheen Anam, Executive Director, Manusher Jonno Foundation

Barrister Ms. Sara Hossain, Honorary Executive Director, Bangladesh Legal Aid and Service Trust (BLAST)

Ms. Mahbuba Akter, Assistant Director, Bangladesh Legal Aid and Service Trust (BLAST)

Adv. Ms. Salma Ali, Executive Director, Bangladesh National Woman Lawyers Association (BNWLA)

Ms Nafiz Imtiaz Hassan, Project Coordinator, Bangladesh National Woman Lawyers Association (BNWLA)

Mr. Abdullah Hussain, Project Coordinator, Bangladesh National Woman Lawyers Association (BNWLA)

Mr. Adilur Rahman Khan, Secretary, Odikhar

ASM, Mr. Nasir Uddin Elan, Director, Odhikar

Journalists

Mr. Reaz Ahmad, Assignment Editor, The Daily Star

Mr. Partha Sankar Shaha, Staff Reporter, Prothom Alo

Other

Dr. Shahdeen Malik, Advocate, Supreme Court of Bangladesh

Mr. Mizanur Rahman, Senior Social Compliance Manager, Marks & Spencer

Ms. Mona M’Bikay Boin, former Project Manager, BNHRC-CDP \*/

Dr. Lyal Sunga, International Human Rights Consultant \*/

-----------------------

\*/ Interviewed on Skype

**Annex 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED**

JAMAKON (BNHRC) documents

- NHRC Act 2009

- All annual reports

- Strategic Plan of the National Human Rights Commission 2010 – 2015

- Draft Strategic Plan of the National Human Rights Commission 2015 – 2018

- Various workshop and other reports available on the Commission website ([www.nhrc.org.bd](http://www.nhrc.org.bd))

- Various study reports and other publications available on the Commission website

- Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for Complaints Handling

- Standard Operating Procedures for Decision-making and Follow-Up

BNHRC-CDP documents

* Project Document of the Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission Capacity Development Project (2010-2015)
* All Quarterly Progress Reports
* All Annual Progress Reports
* The BNHRC-CDP Indicator Framework (June 2014 update)
* Training and workshop information 02/12/2014 (BNHRC-CDP Excel spreadsheet)
* Activity tracking table 12/11/2014 (BNHRC-CDP Excel spreadsheet)
* Indicators tracking table 12/11/2014 (BNHRC-CDP Excel spreadsheet)
* Capacity Assessment Implementation Table
* Baseline Survey Report
* BNHRC-CDP M&E Tools and Strategy
* BNHRC-CDP Risk logs
* Job Descriptions for all BNHRC-CDP staff
* Qualitative Results Monitoring Framework of the BNHRC-CDP
* Statistical data on complaints handling 2009-2014
* Preliminary Findings on the Baseline Study on the Brave Man Campaign
* Draft NHRC Litigation Strategy
* Awareness-raising materials developed by the BNHRC-CDP
* Legal compliance research conducted by the BNHRC-CDP
* “Mid-Term Review of the BNHRC-CDP”, Allar Joks and Shahnaz Huda, 2013
* Progress reports on “Courtyard meeting on Human Rights Awareness”, submitted by the WAVE Foundation
* Various BNHRC-CDP concept notes
* Various draft rules and SOPs on complaints, media and monitoring and reporting human rights violations

Other documents associated with the Project or with the Commission

* “Review of the Compliance of the NHRC Act with the Paris Principles”, Richard Carver, 2013
* “Mission Report”, Rosslyn Noonan, 2013
* “Recommendation to amend the founding Act to address the ICC-SCA observation”, 2014
* “Report and Recommendations of the Session of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA)”, 2011
* “General Observations of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation”, updated May 2013
* “Capacity Assessment of the National Human Rights Commission of Bangladesh”, APF, OHCHR and UNDP, 2013

Human rights reports on the BNHRC (published by the Asian NGOs Network on NHRIs)

* “Bangladesh: General overview of the Country’s Human Rights Situation in 2009”, Ain o Salish Kendra, 2010
* “Bangladesh: Reconstituted commission is yet to prove its effectiveness”, Ain o Salish Kendra, 2011
* “NHRC is in Critical Juncture of Hype vs Real Action”, Ain o Salish Kendra, 2012
* “Bangladesh [NHRC]: Still yet to Prove Itself”, Ain o Salish Kendra, 2013
* “Bangladesh [NHRC]: Institutional Commitment Needed”, Ain o Salish Kendra, 2014

Human rights reports and related documents

* US Department of State Reports on Human Rights Practices – Bangladesh (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013)
* “Human Rights Monitoring Report”, published monthly online by Odhikar
* “ASK e Bulletin”, Human Rights Monitoring 2014, published and updated online by Ain o Salish Kendra
* “Inexistent Rule of Law in Bangladesh”, special report published by Article 2, 2014
* Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Bangladesh (A/HRC/24/12)
* “No one left to speak for me”, op-ed by Nafeeza Shamsuddin, published in the Dhaka Tribune 04/10/2014
* “Rights commission on wrong track”, op-ed by C.R. Abrar, published in Progress Bangladesh 10/10/2013
* Various reports on Bangladesh published by Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch

**Annex 4:**

**Terms of Reference for the**

**Final Evaluation of Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission –**

**Capacity Development Project (BNHRC-CDP)**

1. **Background and Context**

Bangladesh has made significant progress in past decades and performed well-above initial expectations. It has increased its per capita income many times over, cut the poverty rate over successive years (from close to 60 per cent in 1990 to 31.5 in 2010) and is now well placed to achieve the vast majority of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDG Progress Report 2011 indicates that out of 52 MDG targets, over 70 per cent have already been met or are on track to be achieved by 2015. This record has been driven by strong economic performance during the last decade. According to the Household Income and Expenditure Survey, in 2010 the poverty Headcount was estimated at 31.5 per cent against 40.0 per cent in 2005. Despite impressive achievement in many fields, Bangladesh suffers from weak governance and limited government capacity to deliver basic services. For instance – access to justice, respect for the rule of law and knowledge/application of human rights are acknowledged as inadequate. In order to help the Government of Bangladesh and its people to respond to these challenges, the Country Programme Document (CPD) 2012-2016 has set the following outcome: ‘Justice and human rights institutions are strengthened to better serve and protect the rights of all citizens, including women and vulnerable groups”.

On 1 December 2008, the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), Bangladesh was completed with the appointment of three commissioners. Today, as per the National Human Rights Commission Act 2009, the NHRC has seven members, including one chairman, one fulltime member and five honorary members. Its official mandate makes the NHRC the major national human rights watchdog to monitor the implementation of state obligations to respect, protect and fulfill human rights in the country, addressing specific human rights complaints through investigation, mediation, and conciliation, and where necessary, through constitutional litigation, and more broadly through raising public awareness. The NHRC is also expected to play a strong role in ensuring consistency of laws and policies with international standards. The NHRC has developed a five year strategic plan (2010-2015) to guide its interventions in order to fulfil its mandate in planned ways. The strategic plan envisions “a human rights culture throughout Bangladesh” along with the mission statement “to ensure rule of law, social justice, freedom and human dignity through promoting and protecting human rights”. The strategic plan has prioritized four focal areas: (i) Institutional development of the NHRC; (ii) Human rights promotion, education and awareness raising; (iii) Human rights monitoring and investigation; and (iv) Human rights research, reporting and policy development.

UNDP Bangladesh has been providing technical and financial assistance to the Government of Bangladesh to find innovative solutions to its development challenges and to build the capacity of national level institutions to implement policy reforms. In the area of human rights, UNDP together with its donors (the Danish International Development Agency – DANIDA, the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation – SDC, and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency – SIDA) has been supporting to the NHRC through a five year project 2010-2015 – Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission-Capacity Development Project (BNHRC-CDP) – with the following development objective, purpose and key outcomes.

The development objective of the BNHRC-CD project is “improved promotion and protection of human rights in Bangladesh with a conducive environment for Human Development and realization of the Millennium Goals”. The purpose of the project is “to improve the promotion and protection of the human rights of all particularly for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, such as women, disabled, ethnic minorities, and children through institutional capacity development of the National Human Rights Commission”.

The four outcomes of the project are:

Outcome 1 – Institutional Development: the NHRC’s secretariat is fully equipped and operational with modern administrative systems, rules and procedures.

Outcome 2 – Human Rights Monitoring and Investigation: the NHRC has developed capacity to efficiently and effectively monitor the human rights situation nationally, and handle complaints fairly, independently and in a manner with is responsive to the needs of the NHRC’s client.

Outcome 3 – Human Rights Awareness: the NHRC efficiently and effectively undertakes human rights education and training and develop a human rights based culture in Bangladesh

Outcome 4 – Human Rights Research, Reporting and Policy Development: the NHRC is capable to conduct high quality, human rights based analysis of legislative proposals, draft laws and existing legislation and administrative practices, with regard to Bangladesh’s obligations under international conventions and to provide high quality policy advice to GoB on human rights issues.

The allocated resource for BNHRC-CDP (2010-2015) is USD 6,943,771, which has been mobilized through DANIDA, SIDA, SDC and UNDP. The Government of Bangladesh has supported cash and in-kind contribution for CD VAT equivalent to USD 284,713.

A Mid-Term Review of BNHRC-CDP was conducted in 2013 by independent external consultants to provide an independent evaluation of the performance of the project; assess whether the project outcomes and outputs were being delivered in line with the project’s objectives and project document; and make recommendations on improving performance. The Mid-Term Review report will be made available to the Consultants conducting the final evaluation.

1. **Evaluation Purpose:**

***Purpose****:* the purpose of the BNHRC-CDP final evaluation is to assess achievements to date, document lessons learned, and propose ways forward to UNDP and its partners to develop a future human rights program in Bangladesh.

***Timing***: the final evaluation is proposed to be carried out in October and November 2014 as the BNHRC-CDP is due to end on 30 April 2015. The timing is in line with the project’s evaluation plan, which foresees that the project undertakes a final project evaluation before the end of the project. The timing is also meant to ensure that the evaluation results will serve as key inputs for UNDP and its partners to develop the next phase of human rights initiatives and make informed decisions.

***Utilization:*** The primary users of the evaluation results will be UNDP and the NHRC, but the evaluation results will equally be useful to other relevant GoB ministries, development partners and donors. The evaluation results shall also provide critical inputs to UNDAF Bangladesh mid-term review scheduled for the first half of 2015, where UNDP leads justice and human rights outcome under UNDAF Pillar 1.

In addition, the evaluation aims at critically reviewing and identifying what has worked well in the project, what challenges have been faced, what lessons can be learned to improve future programming. The evaluation will also generate knowledge for wider uses, assess the scope for scaling up the current project, and serve as a quality assurance tool for both upward and downward accountability. Following the evaluation recommendations, UNDP Bangladesh will prepare a management response, and implement follow-up actions as per UNDP Evaluation Resource Center guidance/policies.

1. **Evaluation Objectives and Scope:**

The final evaluation will focus on measuring development results generated by the BNHRC-CDP, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference.

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

1. Assess to what extent the BNHRC-CDP has addressed the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. Assess how adequately the BNHRC-CDP has achieved its stated development objective and purpose.
3. Measure how effectively and efficiently the BNHRC-CDP outcomes and outputs have progressed in attaining the development objective and purpose of the project.
4. Assess both negative and positive factors that have facilitated or hampered progress in achieving the project outcomes, including external factors/environment, weakness in design, management and resource allocation.
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned, good practices and also opportunities for scaling up the BNHRC-CDP in Bangladesh.
6. Provide forward looking programmatic recommendations for UNDP support to the NHRC Bangladesh.

The evaluation will use four key evaluation criteria: **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness** and potential **sustainability**. The evaluation will also assess the potential of the next phase of the project.

The final project evaluation will cover the time span from 1 May 2010 (the beginning of the BNHRC-CDP) to date.

**Geographic coverage**: BNHRC-CDP is a nationally implemented project, and supports the NHRC Bangladesh to build its national capacity to fulfil the mandates following human rights norms and standards. The project focuses on both policy and filed level interventions (including legislative review, policy research, institutional strengthening, human rights monitoring, human rights education etc.), and supports the NHRC in implementing human rights monitoring/investigation and human rights awareness raising interventions across the country.

**Target groups and primary stakeholders**: the ultimate beneficiaries of BNHRC-CDP are all people of Bangladesh in particular women, children, the poor and other disadvantaged communities. The project directly works with the NHRC Bangladesh.

1. **Evaluation Questions:**

Following the four evaluation criteria applied to this evaluation, the evaluation team should develop tailored-made evaluation questions in close consultation with the NHRC and UNDP/BNHRC-CDP during the inception phase taking into consideration the following proposed questions.

***Relevance: The extent to which the objective, purpose and outcomes of the intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people and the needs of the country/the NHRC Bangladesh.***

1. To what extent was the BNHRC-CDP design relevant in helping the NHRC to better protect the human rights of all people in Bangladesh?
2. To what extent was the design and strategy of the BNHRC-CDP relevant with national priorities, UN priorities, NHRC Strategic Plan 2010-2015 in Bangladesh?
3. To what extent was the theory of change applied in the BNHRC-CDP relevant to serve the needs of the country?

***Effectiveness: Extent to which the outcomes of the development intervention have been achieved***

* Compared to 2009, to what extent does the NHRC now better serve and protect the human rights of all people in Bangladesh? To what extent are any changes linked to BNHRC-CDP interventions?
* What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of the BNHRC-CDP outcomes and outputs?
* To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner/the NHRC Bangladesh impacted on the effectiveness of the BNHRC-CDP?
* To what extent and in what ways did the mid‐term review recommendations contribute to the BNHRC-CDP´s achievement of development results?

***Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, human resources, etc.) have been turned into results.***

* To what extent were the BNHRC-CDP outputs delivered in time to ensure high quality?
* To what extent has BNHRC-CDP ensured value for money?
* To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the efficiency of the BNHRC-CDP?
* To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
* To what extent did project monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?

***Sustainability: Results the intervention continuing in the long term***

* To what extent will the BNHRC-CDP achievements be sustained? What are the indicators of sustainability for these achievements, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)? What are the challenges and opportunities?
* To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of BNHRC-CDP?
* To what extent did the BNHRC-CDP align itself with the National Development Strategies?
* To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support? Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
* Based on the achievements to the date, provide forward looking programmatic recommendations for UNDP support to the NHRC Bangladesh. What could be the potential programmatic modality and focus as a strategic way forward after the current project end date?

The evaluation will also review the BNHRC-CDP interventions in light of the following key guiding principles.

* Gender equality
* A rights-based approach
* Human development
1. **Methodology**

The evaluation team is expected to propose and determine a sound evaluation design and methodology (including detailed data collection methods to answer each evaluation question) and submit it to UNDP in the inception report following a review of all key relevant documents and meetings with UNDP, BNHRC-CDP and NHRC. However, it is suggested that the evaluation should use a mixed-method approach – collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data using multiple sources in order to draw valid and evidence-based findings and conclusions and practical recommendations. The evaluation team is not expected to conduct specific surveys to collect quantitative data, but will review all relevant reports providing quantitative data collected by BHNRC-CDP, UNDP, NHRC, Government or other agencies.

Methods to be used by the evaluation team to collect and analyze the required data shall include but not be limited to:

* **Desk review** of relevant BNHRC-CDP documents, including project document, project progress reports, database, studies relating to the country context and situation, evaluation reports, etc.
* **Focus group discussions and Key informant interviews** with relevant stakeholders/rights holders/duty bearers from government agencies, donors, UN Agencies, civil society organizations, both at national and local levels.
* **Field visits/observation** to selected project sites.
* Analysis of BNHRC-CDP’s budgets and expenditure generated from Atlas.
* Analysis and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data available from credible sources both government and non-government agencies.
1. **Evaluation Products (Deliverables)**

The evaluation team is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to UNDP Bangladesh as per the agreed work plan:

* **Inception Report:** This report will be around 10 pages in length and will elaborate how each evaluation question will be answered along with proposed methods, proposed sources of data, and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix using the template provided in Annex 1, and will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. UNDP and NHRC will review the inception report and provide useful comments for improvement. This report will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the evaluation team and UNDP/NHRC.

* **Draft Evaluation Report:** the evaluation report will be around 30 pages without annexes, contain the same sections as the final report and shall follow the structure outlined in annex 7/Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards of UNDP *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*[[89]](#footnote-89). The draft report will be reviewed by the NHRC, UNDP and the evaluation reference group. The draft report will ensure that each evaluation question is answered with in-depth analysis of information and back up the arguments with credible quantitative and/or qualitative evidences.
* **Presentation/Debriefing**: a meeting will be organized with key stakeholders including UNDP and NHRC to present findings, conclusions and recommendations.

* **Final Evaluation Report:** the final report will incorporate comments and feedbacks from the stakeholders including the feedback provided during the Presentation/Debriefing meeting.
* **Evaluation Brief**: a concise summary of the evaluation report will include findings, conclusions and recommendations using plain language targeting wider audience. This concise summary will be not more than 4 pages.
1. **Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competences**

The evaluation team will be comprised of one team leader (an international consultant) and a national consultant. The presence of an international consultant is deemed desirable given the complexity and sensitivity of some of the issues concerned, and therefore to safeguard the independence and impartiality of the evaluation.

**International Consultant/Team Leader**

* A masters’ degree or equivalent (Ph. D. an asset) in human rights, international relations, social sciences, political economy or other relevant fields.
* At least 15 years of working experience in the field of democratic governance along with 10 years focused experience in conducting evaluations or assessment of large scale policies and programs in human rights and justice funded by government, UN and/or donors.
* Past experience as a team leader for similar assignments.
* Possess strong analytical and writing skills, with the ability to conceptualize, articulate, write and debate about governance issues.
* Experience in implementing a range of qualitative and quantitative data collection tools and methods in project evaluation.
* Knowledge of current issues and innovation in results-oriented monitoring, including trends, principles and methodology.
* Good knowledge of UN and/or UNDP’s mandate and socio-political context and human rights situation in the region.
* Advanced level of proficiency in both written and spoken English.

**National Consultant**

* A masters’ degree or equivalent (Ph. D. an asset) in human rights, international relations, social sciences, political economy or other relevant fields.
* Minimum 10 years of research experiences in evaluating human rights, justice and/or governance related policies, programs or projects.
* Possess strong analytical and writing skills, with the ability to conceptualize, articulate, write and debate about governance issues.
* Experience in implementing a range of qualitative and quantitative data collection tools and methods in project evaluation.
* Good knowledge of UN and/or UNDP’s mandate and socio-political context and human rights situation in Bangladesh.
* Knowledge of current issues and innovation in results-oriented monitoring, including trends, principles and methodology.
* Proficiency in both written and spoken in English and Bangla.
1. **Evaluation Ethics**

UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the ‘United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[90]](#footnote-90).

1. **Implementation Arrangement**

This evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Bangladesh. The Democratic Governance Cluster of UNDP Bangladesh will be responsible for initiating, coordinating and managing the evaluation throughout the entire process. The BNHRC-CDP will provide necessary support to the Democratic Governance Cluster of UNDP Bangladesh in logistic and administrative aspects.

Technical supports are foreseen from the Results and Resources Management Cluster of UNDP Bangladesh to ensure quality of the evaluation process and products as per UNDP Corporate requirements.

The Program Specialist, Democratic Governance Cluster, UNDP Bangladesh (responsible for the BNHRC-CDP) will serve as the evaluation manager for this proposed evaluation.

1. **Time Frame and Evaluation Process**

The evaluation is expected to start on 1 October 2014 and is foreseen to be completed no later than 30 November 2014. The mission shall start as soon as possible after the signature of the contract. The following activities are expected to be commenced as per suggested timeline

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sn** | **Key activities** | **Duty station** | **Working days** | **Indicative Timeline**  |
| **Team Leader** | **National Consultant** |
| 1. | Comprehensive review of relevant documents including project proposals, MTR report, progress reports, project data, and other relevant reports.  | Home Based  | 4 | 4 | 1st week of Oct 2014 |
| 2. | Travel for international consultant (if living outside of Bangladesh)(not counted as working days) | - | - | - |
| 3. | Kick-off meeting with UNDP and NHRC  | Dhaka | 0.5 | 0.5 | 2nd week of Oct 2014 |
| 4. | Preparation and submission of inception report including adjustment of work plan | Dhaka | 3 | 3 |
| 5. | Data collection including consultations, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, on site visits, etc. | Dhaka/may require to travel out of Dhaka | 13 | 13 | 3rd and 4th week of Oct 2014 |
| 6. | Preparation and submission of draft report  | Dhaka | 5 | 5 | 1st week of Nov 2014 |
| 7. | Debriefing meeting with key stakeholders including UNDP and NHRC to present findings, conclusions and recommendations, and receive feedbacks | Dhaka | 0.5 | 0.5 | 2st week of Nov 2014 |
| 8. | Incorporate comments from stakeholders and feedback at debriefing meeting | Dhaka | 2 | 2 |
| 9. | Finalize and submit the final evaluation report and evaluation brief  | Home-based  | 2 | 2 | 3rd/4th Week of Nov 2014 |
| **Total days consultant wise** | **30** | **30** |  |

**Annex 5: Evaluation Question Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** |
| Relevance | 1. To what extent was the BNHRC-CDP design relevant in helping the NHRC to better protect the human rights of all people in Bangladesh?
2. To what extent was the design and strategy of the BNHRC-CDP relevant with national priorities, UN priorities, NHRC Strategic Plan 2010-2015 in Bangladesh?
3. To what extent was the theory of change applied in the BNHRC-CDP relevant to serve the needs of the country? (Need to reconstruct the theory of change underlying the original project)
 | BNHRC-CDP project document, reports, Indicators Tracking Sheet, Activity Matrix, Risk LogsMid-term Review2013 Capacity AssessmentBaseline ReportNHRC ActStrategic Plan of the NHRC 2010-2015UNDAF for BangladeshNHRC Chairman, Secretary and Members, BNHRC-CDP staff, appropriate UNDP management and support staff, partners and counterparts of the NHRC in Government, NGOs and civil society | Analysis of project strategy as articulated in the project document as well as project objectives, outcomes and outputs.Review of risks and challenges as recorded in periodic BNHRC-CDP progress reports and risk logs.Interviews, including group meetings, with UNDP management, project staff, partners at the NHRC and donors representatives |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** |
| Effectiveness  | 1. Compared to 2009, to what extent does the NHRC now better serve and protect the human rights of all people in Bangladesh? To what extent are any changes linked to BNHRC-CDP interventions?
2. What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of the BNHRC-CDP outcomes and outputs?
3. To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner/the NHRC Bangladesh impacted on the effectiveness of the BNHRC-CDP?
4. To what extent and in what ways did the mid‐term review recommendations contribute to the BNHRC-CDP´s achievement of development results?
 | Human rights reports (Odikhar, ASK, Asian Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, US Dept of State)NHRC Annual Reports and special eventsBNHRC-CDP project document, Revised results framework, reports, Indicators Tracking Sheet, Activity Matrix, Risk LogsBNHRC-CDP reports and studies produced for the NHRCMid-term Review2013 Capacity AssessmentBaseline ReportCarver and Noonan reportsNHRC ActNHRC Chairman, Secretary and Members, BNHRC-CDP staff,partners and counterparts of the NHRC in Government, NGOs and civil society | Analysis of trends of serious and systematic human rights violations over the period of the projectNumber and type of interventions by the NHRC to protect human rights, including human rights defendersAnalysis of outputs of BNHRC and their relation to human rights promotion and protectionReview of efforts to strengthen staffing and professionalism of the NHRC Interviews, including group meetings with NHRC Chairman and Members, BNHRC-CDP staff, partners and counterparts of the NHRC in Government, NGOs and civil society |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** |
| Efficiency | 1. To what extent were the BNHRC-CDP outputs delivered in time to ensure high quality?
2. To what extent has BNHRC-CDP ensured value for money?
3. To what extent and in what ways has ownership - or the lack of it - by the implementing partner impacted on the efficiency of the BNHRC-CDP?
4. To what extent was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives/projects that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
5. To what extent did project monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
 | BNHRC-CDP project document, Revised results framework, reports, Indicators Tracking Sheet, Activity Matrix, Risk LogsMid-term ReviewNHRC Chairman, Secretary and Members, BNHRC-CDP staffUNDP management and project staff | Review of project management methods and mechanismsReview of outputs, including timing, costs and perceived impactsInterviews with NHRC Chairman, Secretary and Members, UNDP management and BNHRC-CDP staff |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** |
| Sustainability | 1. To what extent will the BNHRC-CDP achievements be sustained? What are the indicators of sustainability for these achievements, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)? What are the challenges and opportunities?
2. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of BNHRC-CDP?
3. To what extent did the BNHRC-CDP align itself with the National Development Strategies?
4. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support? Have any good practices, success stories, lessons learned or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
5. Based on the achievements to the date, provide forward looking programmatic recommendations for UNDP support to the NHRC Bangladesh. What could be the potential programmatic modality and focus as a strategic way forward after the current project end date?
 | BNHRC-CDP project document, reports, Indicators Tracking Sheet, Activity Matrix, Risk LogsMid-term ReviewCapacity Assessment Report 2013National Development StrategyCarver and Noonan reportsNHRC ActICC Accreditation report for the BNHRC and General Observations by the ICC Sub-Committee on Accreditation Draft Strategic Plan of the NHRC 2015-2018News articles and NGO reports concerning the NHRCUNDP management and project staff, NHRC Chair, NHRC Strategic NGO Partners, journalists, donor representatives, GoB officials | Analysis of project outputs and outcomes. Review of the BNHRC’s Strategic Plan 2010-2015, the proposed new Strategic Plan 2015-2018 and the Bangladesh National Development Strategy Analysis of main risks affecting sustainabilityReview of follow-up to the MTR recommendationsReview of NHRC staffing, actual and projected for 2015, including human rights experience of the professional staffReview of NHRC resources and funding, actual and projected for 2015.Review of steps taken to amend the NHRC Act so that it is in conformity with the Paris Principles.Interviews with UNDP management and project staff, NHRC Chair, NHRC Strategic NGO Partners, donor representatives, GoB officials. |
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34. BNHRC-CDP project document, Activity 2.3.1. on page 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. See the NHRC Act, Chapter III, section 12(c), available at <http://www.nhrc.org.bd/PDF/NHRC%20Act%202009_1_.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
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53. Source : BNHRC-CDP website <http://demo.bnhrc-cdp.org/wordpress/human-rights-education/public-awareness/> [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. The Brave Men Campaign is discussed further under section 7B below, “Good practices”. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
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57. BNHRC-CDP Project document, section 1.5. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
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62. See the BNHRC-CDP 2012 annual report, p.12. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 annual report, p.30. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 annual report, p.31. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 annual report, p.38 [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 annual report, p.37. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 annual report, p.38. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
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71. See the BNHRC-CDP 2013 First Quarterly Report, p.17. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. See the BNHRC-CDP 2012 annual report, p.31. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. As per activity 1.3.6 of the BNHRC-CDP project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. BNHRC-CDP project document, section 1.5, page 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Recent examples include The Foreign Donation (Voluntary Activities) Regulation Act 2014, approved by cabinet in December 2014, and the National Broadcasting Policy, approved by Cabinet in August 2014, which would restrict human rights reporting and freedom of expression. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Strategic Plan of the National Human Rights Commission 2010-2015, section 3, page 5. Available at <http://www.nhrc.org.bd/PDF/Human%20RightsStrategic_Plan.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
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78. See Strategic Plan of the National Human Rights Commission 2010-2015, section 6 “Five-Year Outcomes”, table on page 10 “Outline of Key Strategies for Pressing Human Rights Issues”. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. It should be noted that, under the “Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on UN support to non-UN security forces”, prohibited support to alleged human rights abusers does not include human rights training or engagement to promote compliance with human rights (see section 9). The Human Rights Due Diligence Policy is available at <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/SP/AMeetings/20thsession/IdenticalLetterSG25Feb2013_en.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. In this connection, see “Superiors lacked control” (Daily Star 15 December 2014) on a police investigation into the excessive use of force against mainly female medical students in Barisal. In a notable demonstration of will to improve policing, the official investigation charged a number of senior officers by name of failing to control the rank and file and called for human rights training on policing demonstrations. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. Monitors should wear distinctive vests or jackets which distinguish them from participants or casual onlookers. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
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83. Available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/PublicationsResources/Pages/TrainingEducationthree.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/PublicationsResources/Pages/TrainingEducationtwo.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/PublicationsResources/Pages/TrainingEducationtwo.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. At the time of the report, Bangladesh had more troops, including police, serving in UN peacekeeping missions than any other troop-contributing nation in the world. See <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2014/nov14_1.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. Available at <http://www.osce.org/odihr/31393?download=true>. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. Available for download at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/documents.aspx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
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90. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102> [↑](#footnote-ref-90)