

**Triennial review of the
implementation of
recommendations in the OIOS
evaluation report on the
effectiveness of human rights
monitoring, reporting and
follow-up in the United
Nations multi-dimensional
peacekeeping operations**

01 October 2024

IED-24-019



INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

Function *“The Office shall evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the programmes and legislative mandates of the Organization. It shall conduct programme evaluations with the purpose of establishing analytical and critical evaluations of the implementation of programmes and legislative mandates, examining whether changes therein require review of the methods of delivery, the continued relevance of administrative procedures and whether the activities correspond to the mandates as they may be reflected in the approved budgets and the medium-term plan of the Organization;”* ([General Assembly Resolution 48/218 B](#)).

Project team members include:

Johan Tejpar, Project Lead

Contact Information **OIOS-IED Contact Information:**
phone: +1 212-963-8148; fax: +1 212-963-1211; email: ied@un.org

Patty Chang, Chief of Section
Tel: +1 212-963-1736, e-mail: changp@un.org

Demetra Arapakos, Officer-in-Charge
Tel: +1 917-367-6033, e-mail: arapakos@un.org

Contents

Summary	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Recommendations	6
Recommendation 1	6
Recommendation 2	7
Recommendation 3	8
Recommendation 4	9
Recommendation 5	10
Recommendation 6	11
Recommendation 7	12
Recommendation 8	13
Recommendation 9	14
III. Early Results	15
Annex 1: Comments received from MONUSCO, UNMISS, MINUSCA, OHCHR, DPO	16

Summary

The present report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), prepared by the Inspection and Evaluation Division, presents the findings of the triennial review to assess the implementation of recommendations emanating from the 2019 OIOS evaluation of human rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations (PKO).

The triennial review was conducted through: (a) a review of progress reports on the status of recommendations; (b) an analysis of relevant information, documents and reports; (c) virtual interviews with key staff in the Department of Peace Operations (DPO), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) and the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS); and (d) external research. Five more PKOs were covered in the 2019 evaluation but were closed when this review was carried out.

OIOS determined that eight recommendations were implemented, and one (critical) recommendation was partially implemented.

Recommendation 1 asked missions to develop mission-specific action plans with time-bound goals and appropriate strategies supported by DPO and OHCHR. UNMISS, MONUSCO and MINUSCA had not developed specific action plans but focused on developing a series of strategic and operational documents supported by guidance from headquarters in New York and Geneva. These included standard operating procedures (SOP), mission concepts and strategic visions, as well as annual work plans. Although this recommendation was considered implemented, coherence and effectiveness could be strengthened with mission-specific action plans rather than relying on a set of several guidance documents, concepts and plans.

Recommendation 2 encouraged OHCHR to prioritize revising and redrafting its “Manual on Human Rights Monitoring” and developing easy-to-understand material for non-human rights staff and external stakeholders. Three of the remaining 16 chapters have been revised and finalized. OHCHR has also developed a repository of human rights monitoring material. While the latter is easy to understand, it is still an OHCHR-internal product. As such, this critical recommendation was assessed as partially implemented. OIOS encourages OHCHR to increase the speed in finalizing the revised Manual, and to consider ways in which further core aspects or emerging areas of the monitoring methodology could be made public for non-OHCHR stakeholders.

Recommendation 3 concerned ensuring regular publication of human rights reports. MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS all produced public reports on at least a quarterly basis. MINUSCA and UNMISS reports were accessible on their respective missions’ websites, whilst some MONUSCO reports could be retrieved on the mission website. OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 4 asked OHCHR and PKOs to address weaknesses in the human rights case database. These included the accuracy and completeness of case data entry, as well as the establishment of systems for follow-up and quality control. PKOs made a concerted effort to ensure that cases were entered into the database. To a certain extent, quality assurance mechanisms were also in place, but these were less systematic than the process for ensuring data entries. No systems for follow-up were

identified. OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented, but encourages OHCHR and PKOs to continue developing quality assurance and case follow-up tools.

Recommendation 5 concerned developing information sharing protocols inspired by a protocol MINUSCA had already developed. DPO had developed several standard operating procedures (SOPs) with relevant guidance. MONUSCO had developed a specific information-sharing SOP, whilst UNMISS developed several relevant protocols that together fulfilled a similar purpose as a single SOP. These included terms of reference between the UNMISS Human Rights Division and the UNMISS Police Component and Military Component respectively. OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 6 concerned MONUSCO, UNAMID and MINUSMA's cooperation with civil society organizations (CSO) and non-governmental organizations (NGO). The recommendation was four-fold: (a) clarification of mutual roles, (b) acknowledgment of CSO and NGO partners in public reports, (c) circulation of public reports to CSOs and NGOs including in local languages, and (d) enhanced capacity to use technology to improve monitoring and reporting. MONUSCO, being the only operational mission of the three, had organized several relevant capacity building activities that included sessions on economic and social rights, social media training and investigation methods. During these sessions with CSOs and NGOs, roles and responsibilities were discussed and partners also received training on technological tools. However, MONUSCO did not find it feasible to attribute credit to partners, due to safety and security concerns. Nor had the mission translated reports into local languages in writing but used other media such as local radio for this purpose. OIOS assessed the recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 7 requested that DPO, OHCHR, and PKOs ensure uniformity in output and result indicators. Even though a limited number of basic indicators, such as the number of victims, were referenced in human rights reports, there has not been any attempt to develop a uniform set of indicators across PKOs. OHCHR pointed to the introduction of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment System (CPAS), but OIOS could not find any evidence that missions used CPAS as a platform for aligning indicators. OIOS assessed this recommendation implemented, but also encourages PKOs and OHCHR to agree on a harmonized set of human rights indicators for consistent reporting and improved comparability of data.

Recommendation 8 concerned incorporating human rights considerations in the Secretary-General's compacts with his Special Representatives. A review of MONUSCO, UNMISS and MINUSCA compacts between 2019 and 2024 indicated that human rights issues were consistently highlighted. In 2022/23, human rights considerations were further reflected under the newly introduced "resource management section" in the compact with corresponding human rights indicators. OIOS assessed the recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 9 requested OHCHR finalize and distribute its guidance on human rights and early warning. This was done in 2017, and several sensitization sessions have been organized since then. The topic of early warning recurrently appeared in strategic documents and work plans in the three PKOs under review. OIOS assessed the recommendation as implemented.

I. Introduction

1. In 2019, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) completed an evaluation of the effectiveness of human rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations (IED-19-004). This triennial review is part of regular OIOS follow-up conducted at least three years after the completion of an evaluation to assess implementation of recommendations. While the 2019 evaluation covered eight peacekeeping operations (PKOs), at the time of this triennial review, only three of the eight were active in 2024.¹ In addition, the 2019 Secretary-General's reform of the peace and security pillar, as well as management reform pertaining to delegation of authority, had affected the recommendation implementation responsibilities and accountability. The principal responsible and accountable entities have now become: the three active PKOs;² the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR); the Department of Peace Operations (DPO); and the Department of Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance (DMSPC).

2. In the present triennial review, OIOS examined the status of implementation of nine evaluation recommendations. Eight recommendations were assessed to have been implemented (Recommendations 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9), one was partially implemented (Recommendations 2).

3. The methodology for the triennial review included:

- a) A review and analysis of progress reports on the status of recommendations monitored by TeamMate+ recommendation tracking database of OIOS;
- b) An analysis of relevant information, documents and reports obtained from OHCHR, DPO and the three PKOs on various issues related to the recommendations;³
- c) Virtual interviews conducted with key stakeholders across different evaluated entities; and
- d) External research on the development of human rights efforts in peacekeeping.⁴

4. The present report also considered broader peacekeeping developments, such as the publication of the 2023 "New Agenda for Peace" report, which underscored the critical role of human rights in preventing and ending violence, fostering social cohesion, and promoting sustainable peace, and the development of lighter-footprint PKOs where human rights should be kept front and centre.⁵

¹ United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) and United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) were active, whereas the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI), United Nations Stabilisation Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) and African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) were closed.

² Focusing on the PKO's Human Rights Components (HRC) that have different names: the United Nations Joint Office for Human Rights in MONUSCO, Human Rights Division in UNMISS and MINUSCA.

³ The timing of this triennial five years after the completion of the evaluation report posed some limitations in the data collection on follow-up to the recommendations.

⁴ Such as Hunt, T. Charles et al. (2024). "UN Peace Operations and Human Rights: A Thematic Study", p. 9. NUPI: <https://www.nupi.no/en/publications/cristin-pub/un-peace-operations-human-rights-a-thematic-study> providing records of human rights efforts improving the early warning, protection of civilians (POC), conflict management, and peacebuilding outcomes of peace operations.

⁵ UN. (2023). "A New Agenda for Peace: Our Common Agenda, Policy Brief 9". <https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/our-common-agenda-policy-brief-new-agenda-for-peace-en.pdf>

5. The draft report was shared with the entities for management responses, which are provided in Annex I. OIOS expresses its appreciation for the cooperation and assistance provided by the respective entities throughout the review process.

II. Recommendations

Recommendation 1

6. Recommendation 1 reads as follows:

OHCHR, in coordination with DPO and taking into account existing operational constraints, should develop mission-specific and time-bound action plans with appropriate strategies and priorities to improve the coverage of human rights monitoring in peacekeeping operations.

Indicators: Mission-specific action plans developed, adopted and implemented.

7. In 2022, MINUSMA developed and adopted an action plan to strengthen human rights monitoring and reporting specific to the mission context and mandate. As the mission closed in 2023, it was not possible to assess the level of implementation of the action plan. The goals set out in the action plan were based on OIOS recommendations, but they were not time-bound and there were no strategies connected to the goals.

8. In 2020 to 2024, MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS, while not having developed mission-specific action plans, did draft several guidance documents that, when aggregated, fulfilled a similar purpose as an action plan. For example, the MINUSCA Political Strategy, UNMISS Mission Concept, and MONUSCO Mission Concept provided strategic guidance in mission concepts and time-bound mission political strategies where the protection of human rights was a prominent component.⁶ All three missions also developed specific strategies and standard operating procedures (SOP) with relevant guidance, which addressed human rights issues and other closely related issues such as the protection of civilians.⁷

9. Furthermore, for general planning guidance, all three missions used the 2024 “OHCHR Guidelines for Country/Regional Programmes” and, to a certain extent, the 2011 “Manual on Human Rights Monitoring”.⁸

10. From an operational perspective, MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS had developed annual work plans (AWP) and results-based budgets which aimed at increasing the coverage and quality of human rights monitoring, as well as clear goals related to human rights reporting. In MINUSCA, the AWP for 2023 contained elements reflecting the Special Representative of the Secretary-General’s

⁶ MINUSCA Political Strategy (2023-2028); UNMISS Mission Concept, June 2023 (signed 27 July 2023), particularly strategic priority 2 and 4; MONUSCO Mission Concept, 1 May 2024 and MONUSCO Mission Concept 2022-2024, dated 28 June 2022.

⁷ Examples include UNMISS Terms of Reference for cooperation between the UNMISS Human Rights Division (HRD) and the UNMISS UN Police (UNPOL) and Terms of Reference for Cooperation between UNMISS Military Component (Force) and UNMISS Human Rights Division (HRD); MONUSCO Directives Conjointes sur la collaboration entre la Section des affaires civiles et et le Bureau conjoint des Nations Unies aux droits de l’homme de la MONUSCO, 2022; MINUSCA 2022 HRD Strategie de la division des droits de l’homme sur le monitoring, les enquêtes et les rapports sur les violations de droits de l’homme ; and MINUSCA HRD Strategy on priority areas of engagement, 2024.

⁸ <https://www.ohchr.org/en/publications/policy-and-methodological-publications/manual-human-rights-monitoring-revised-edition>

priorities and addressed how to carry out Human Rights Component (HRC) operations, as well as support other mission components and external stakeholders in their human rights-related work. These goals were also reflected in the 2024 “Strategy on priority areas of engagement”. The UNMISS HRC AWP for 2023 was developed in line with the UNMISS three-year strategic vision and its five strategic priorities. Although actions were mission-specific and time-bound, they focused only on the work of HRC and its support to external stakeholders but less on how other components could contribute to these.⁹ The MONUSCO AWP reflected priorities set out in the MONUSCO Mission Concept but, similar to UNMISS, it had fewer elements of support to other sections compared to MINUSCA.¹⁰

11. Based on the above, OIOS considers this recommendation implemented. However, to further increase coherence and effectiveness of human rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up, OIOS encourages MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS to develop mission-specific action plans. Specifically, there should be room to leverage how all components can better contribute to human rights monitoring in operational activities such as patrolling and training, especially by observing and being able to detect potential human rights violations and bringing relevant information to Human Rights Officers for follow-up.

Recommendation 2

12. Recommendation 2 reads as follows:

OHCHR should: (a) prioritize completing its revised manual on human rights monitoring; and (b) develop easy-to-understand materials on human rights monitoring methodology for non-human rights staff and external stakeholders.

Indicators: (a) Completion of the manual; and (b) development and circulation of information resources on human rights monitoring methodology for non-experts.

13. OHCHR has revised and published three additional chapters of the Manual on Human Rights Monitoring since the evaluation was published in 2019, leaving 13 more chapters yet to be finalized.¹¹ The manual constitutes the methodological backbone for Human Rights Officers in monitoring and reporting on human rights; in interviews, Human Rights Officers consistently acknowledged its usefulness and relevance, with one officer voicing a common view by stating it would be challenging without it. There was broad consensus that the manual provides methodological coherence, both for different missions and in dialogue with host governments, with partners, as well as when supporting capacity building. Nevertheless, there is demand from Human Rights Officers in the field to have the remaining 13 chapters updated.¹²

14. In parallel to revising the Manual on Human Rights Monitoring, OHCHR also developed a repository of human rights materials in 2021.¹³ The repository included the most essential elements of guidance for Human Rights Officers, and is a living document that can be regularly updated. Moreover, the repository has quality-controlled examples of how colleagues designed specific tools, such as checklists or mission-specific guidance, which served as useful examples for others. The repository thus constitutes a useful and accessible complement to the Manual.

⁹ Annual Workplan – South Sudan (UNMISS) (2023).

¹⁰ Annual Work Plan DR Congo (MONUSCO) 2021, 2022 and 2023.

¹¹ 16 chapters were revised when the evaluation was published in 2019.

¹² Interviews with Human Rights Officers in PKOs and HQ.

¹³ The repository is a OHCHR internal product available online to staff.

15. Although the repository was a useful and easy-to-understand internal resource for OHCHR staff, it was still inaccessible to external stakeholders, including non-human rights staff in the missions. OIOS underlined the importance of prioritizing resources needed to finalize the revision or redrafting of all chapters of the manual, given its importance for human rights monitoring, reporting, and follow-up methodology.

16. Based on the above, OIOS assessed the recommendation as partially implemented. For it to be fully implemented, OIOS encourages OHCHR to increase the speed in finalizing the remaining chapters in the Manual on human rights monitoring, as well as consider ways in which further core aspects or emerging areas of the monitoring methodology could be made public for non-OHCHR stakeholders.

Recommendation 3

17. Recommendation 3 reads as follows:

OHCHR, in coordination with DPO, should ensure that peacekeeping operations issue public human rights reports as required by the relevant policies of the Organization and Security Council mandates, with any failure to publish as required reported to the Secretary-General with reasons thereof.

Indicators: Public human rights reports issued by all missions in accordance with their respective mandates, budget documents and the 2008 policy directive on public reporting, which provides for six-monthly periodic reports along with thematic and ad hoc reports as included in the annual work plans of the HRCs.

18. With the peace and security and management reforms related to delegation of authority, the responsibility for implementing this recommendation has shifted from DPO and OHCHR to the PKOs. MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS have all fulfilled the public reporting requirements. MINUSCA and UNMISS reports are also accessible on their respective websites; MINUSCA publishes periodic reports monthly,¹⁴ whilst UNMISS publishes its periodic reports quarterly.¹⁵ Some MONUSCO reports are available online¹⁶ but a more comprehensive list of reports can be obtained by contacting the mission. Some of MONUSCO's key human rights data, such as incidents and victims, are also available in publication press releases. MONUSCO also produces and publishes online infographics for its periodic reports.¹⁷ MONUSCO appeared to have produced monthly reports. For example, in 2022, MONUSCO produced 20 public reports.¹⁸

19. In addition to periodic and thematic public human rights reports, HRCs in all three missions contributed to human rights sections in the Secretary-General's reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly. For example, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council on the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo either on a quarterly or bi-annual basis and these reports included a section on the human rights situation. The Secretary-General reported to the Security Council on the situation in South Sudan at least bi-annually, and the reports included a section on monitoring and investigating human rights violations. As regards the situation in the Central African Republic, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council on an annual or bi-annual basis, with all the reports including a section on human rights and the fight against impunity.

¹⁴ <https://minusca.unmissions.org/en/human-rights-division-reports-0>

¹⁵ <https://unmiss.unmissions.org/human-rights-reports>

¹⁶ <https://monusco.unmissions.org/en/human-rights-reports-and-publications>

¹⁷ <https://monusco.unmissions.org/droits-de-lhomme-rapports-et-publications>

¹⁸ MONUSCO UNJHRO RBB end of the year report 2021-2022.

20. Based on the above, OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 4

21. Recommendation 4 reads as follows:

OHCHR should urgently address the identified weaknesses regarding its human rights case database and ensure that: (i) it is consistently used, (ii) cases entered in it contain complete information having the quality required by its verification standards; (iii) follow-up actions are undertaken and properly documented; and (iv) it includes a robust supervision, quality assurance and accountability system.

Indicators: Complete, up-to-date and accurate database used consistently and in conformity with OHCHR policy.

22. This recommendation fell under the responsibility of PKOs, and particularly HRC managers as data entry and verification, as well as quality assurance lie with missions, whereas OHCHR headquarters (HQ) manage the overall functionality of the database). Nevertheless, OHCHR HQ was still the owner of the database and provided support to missions, such as delivering training, feedback, coaching and by developing database applications.¹⁹ OHCHR HQ also reviewed all public HRC reports and provided quality assurance on the aggregated level through that process.²⁰

23. About half of the Human Rights Officers in MONUSCO, MINUSCA and UNMISS, as well as OHCHR HQ staff interviewed acknowledged that there was room for improvement in how the database was used. Staff interviewed at HQ and in missions recognized that there was a need for many Human Rights Officers to better accept that entering cases in the database was part of their work, even if it could be a tedious and time-consuming exercise. Some staff members noted that the database was not the most user-friendly.²¹ OHCHR HQ had developed an e-learning program that was compulsory for all Human Rights Officers with monitoring in their job description.

24. All three missions worked systematically to improve the consistency of the data entered into the database. They had a similar work process where HRC HQ controlled whether cases reported in daily and/or weekly reports were entered into the database. For missing cases, HRC HQ would then go back to concerned Field Offices or responsible Human Rights Officers, informing them of the need to enter the cases.²²

25. Missions also worked on the quality of the data in the case files. Typically, there were dedicated sessions where HRC HQ staff supported Human Rights Officers on how to enter their cases into the database. MINUSCA had dedicated weekly sessions where Human Rights Officers entered their cases into the database while supported by HRC HQ in Bangui. This was also an opportunity to verify that case files were correct and complete.²³ UNMISS had a similar system in place, but the exercise was carried out bi-weekly. MONUSCO also had a comparable system with weekly support sessions whilst quality controls were made on a sample of cases at HRC HQ-level.²⁴ In MONUSCO, quality control was the responsibility of field office coordinators.

¹⁹ Interviews with HQ and mission staff.

²⁰ Interviews with mission and HQ staff.

²¹ About 1 out of 4 interviewed Human Rights Officers pointed at this fact.

²² Interviews with mission staff.

²³ Interview with mission staff.

²⁴ Interviews with HRC Officers in all three missions.

26. Whilst all missions had a similar and systematic approach to ensure case files were entered into the database, there were not evident methodologies used in a systematic manner for quality control. However, most interviewees accounted for a similar working methodology which was to go through cases one by one and make sure they were accurately and completely entered in the database.²⁵

27. Based on the above, OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented. However, OIOS encourages missions, with the support of OHCHR, to develop quality assurance tools that allow for systematic follow-up of the quality of data entered into the database, as well as look into tools that would facilitate tracking of cases and their follow-up.

Recommendation 5

28. Recommendation 5 reads as follows:

OHCHR, in coordination with DPO, should develop mission-specific information sharing protocols among relevant mission components using similar standard operating procedures adopted by MINUSCA and MINUSTAH.

Indicators: Standard operating procedures developed and adopted.

29. With the Secretary-General's reform, the responsibility for implementing this recommendation shifted to the missions, supported by OHCHR HQ and DPO. In 2019, DPO developed more generic guidance relevant to information-sharing in PKOs, such as the Peacekeeping Intelligence Policy²⁶ and the Joint Operations Centres (JOC) Policy.²⁷ DPO has also published policies and handbooks on Protection of Civilians, Child Protection and conflict-related sexual violence that all include relevant guidance on information management.²⁸

30. With regard to the three missions, in 2022, MONUSCO published an SOP on information-sharing related to human rights violations, while UNMISS developed several documents that were equivalent to an information-sharing SOP. The MONUSCO SOP included clear guidance on procedures for information collection and sharing, as well as respective roles and responsibilities for doing so.²⁹ In addition to the SOP, a joint directive between HRC and the Civil Affairs Section further stipulated requirements for their cooperation specifically related to the protection of civilians.³⁰

31. Furthermore, in 2023, UNMISS developed a framework agreement between the HRC and the UNMISS UN Police aimed at strengthening coordination and cooperation.³¹ The agreement was reciprocal in its character and included working methods, including a section on information-sharing, related due diligence procedures, detecting and reporting human rights violations and abuses. A similar agreement had already been established between HRC and UNMISS armed forces in 2019,

²⁵ Interviews with HRC Officers.

²⁶ DPO "Policy on Peacekeeping Intelligence", Ref. 2019.08.

²⁷ DPO "Policy on Joint Operation Centres (JOC)", Ref 2019.20.

²⁸ Handbook for Child Protection Staff in United Nations Peace Operations in, DPO and DPPA, 2023; DPO Policy: The Protection of Civilians in United Nations Peacekeeping, 1 May 2023; The Handbook for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence, DPO and DPPA, 2020.

²⁹ MONUSCO Standard Operating Procedure (2022) "Information sharing on human rights violations/abuses for MONUSCO components and personnel", para. ref MONUSCO-2022-01076.

³⁰ MONUSCO. 2022. "Directive Conjointe Sur la Collaboration Entre la Section des Affaires Civiles et le Bureau Conjoint des Nations Unies aux Droits des l'Hommes de la MONUSCO".

³¹ "Terms of Reference for cooperation between the UNMISS Human Rights Division (HRD) and the UNMISS UN Police (UNPOL)".

addressing wider cooperation including information sharing.³² For information sharing between the human rights division and other substantive sections, such as the civil affairs unit, information was shared in regular meetings and in the production of regular reports, such as the quarterly report on civilian casualties, and with mission analytical capabilities.³³

32. Lastly, in 2024, MINUSCA developed a new mission-wide SOP relevant to information sharing on human rights cases, especially regarding human rights due diligence when providing support to non-UN security forces³⁴ and when dealing with protection cases where individuals were under imminent threat.³⁵

33. Based on the above, OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 6

34. Recommendation 6 reads as follows:

UNAMID, MONUSCO and MINUSMA³⁶ should, while engaging with civil society organizations (CSOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), seek to:

- (a) clarify mutual roles and expectations, including the emphasis to be given on economic and social rights;**
- (b) give due credit in public reports, where feasible;**
- (c) circulate public reports to CSOs/NGOs widely including in local languages; and**
- (d) enhance capacity to use technology (e.g. mobile phones) for better monitoring and reporting on human rights.**

Indicator: Documentation demonstrating enhanced engagements with CSOs/NGOs on the identified issues.

35. The MONUSCO HRC, United Nations Joint Human Rights Office (UNJHRO), has conducted several activities in response to this recommendation. In 2019, 2021, and 2022, it organized workshops for citizen movements, journalists, and human rights organizations on three separate occasions each year. Topics included economic, social and cultural rights, as well as investigation methods.³⁷ Organizations were also trained on the creation of the “governing document” of a CSO as

³² “Terms of Reference for Cooperation between UNMISS Military Component (Force) and UNMISS Human Rights Division (HRD)”, para 8-10, Annex B.

³³ In line with the DPO “Protection of Civilians in United Nations Peacekeeping Policy” from May 2023, page 30; and DPO 2019 SOP on Integrated Reporting from Peacekeeping Operations to UNHQ, Ref.2019.10.; the DPO, DPPA, OHCHR, OSRSG-SVC Policy on “United Nations Field Missions: Preventing and responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence”, para 23 and 34-35, Ref. 2019.35

³⁴ MINUSCA Standard Operating Procedure on Implementation of the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on Support to non-UN Security Forces (HRDDP), 2020, Ref. MINUSCA/PBPO/SOP/2020/02

³⁵ MINUSCA Standard Operating Procedure on Handling of Individual Protection Cases, 2024, Ref. MINUSCA/PBPO/SOP/2024/02.

³⁶ As UNAMID and MINUSMA had closed their operations, it was not possible to assess if they implemented this recommendation.

³⁷ For example, “Formation de journalistes pour les droits de l’homme”, organized 15-16 December 2020, included sessions “Notions des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels” and “Méthodes d’investigation des violations des droits de l’homme”.

well as strategic planning. During these and other sessions, CSO and NGO roles and responsibilities were also discussed.³⁸

36. MONUSCO also documented training activities on social media, which included sessions on fake news.³⁹ Furthermore, UNJHRO has increased the number of and the cooperation with protection networks where communication by mobile phones was paramount.⁴⁰

37. Regarding giving credit to CSOs and NGOs in MONUSCO public reports, this was rarely done due to the risk it might cause to partners.⁴¹ In certain cases, it was possible to name specific partner organizations, but this was generally not the case. The do no harm principles were often cited as the basis for this assessment.⁴² MONUSCO tried to recognize local partners in other ways such as in bilateral dialogues with donors.⁴³

38. MONUSCO also had also not translated reports into local languages. However, information about the reports was disseminated in local languages through local radio and sensitization exercises such as those held with journalists in Kinshasa in December 2020 and May 2022.

39. Based on the above, OIOS assessed the above recommendation as implemented.

Recommendation 7

40. Recommendation 7 reads as follows:

OHCHR, in coordination with DPO, should ensure uniformity in the results and outputs indicators where appropriate, and consistency and completeness of reporting for human rights components in peacekeeping operations.

Indicators: Results and outputs indicators and reporting practices of human rights components are reviewed, and actions taken to ensure uniformity where appropriate.

41. The responsibility to design indicators belonged within missions. There have not been any centralized attempts to identify global human rights-related indicators for PKOs. An analysis of a sample of quarterly human rights reports published by missions, and Secretary-General reports to the Security Council indicated that some basic information was included in all reports. For example, these reports often included the total number of victims, divided by gender and specifying incidents and victims killed. However, there were also differences when victims were categorized in crime groups; UNMISS used the four categories: (1) killed, (2) injured, (3) abducted and (4) conflict-related sexual violence.⁴⁴ MINUSCA used a broader set of categories: physical and mental integrity; right to property; right to life; conflict-related sexual violence; liberty and personal integrity; forced recruitment; unlawful attacks; slavery; and discrimination⁴⁵ – hence considerably more detailed than UNMISS.

³⁸ For example : « Session de formation des points focaux du Rassemblement des Femmes Syndicalistes de l'Administration Publique (RASFSAP) en DESC et audit social » where roles and responsibilities were discussed 29 November 2021. See also « Fiche Technique Jeudies Académiques, 28 Sep 2020, page 4-5.

³⁹ Training session “*impact des Fakenews face à la consolidation de la démocratie*” organized in Kinshasa, 30 September 2020.

⁴⁰ Interviews with HROs and other mission staff.

⁴¹ According to all key stakeholders interviewed.

⁴² All interviewees asked about this cited the do no harm principles.

⁴³ Interviews with MONUSCO HRC staff corroborated with HR Officers in other missions. Generally, the do no harm principles were referenced as the basis of why partners cannot be more formerly recognized.

⁴⁴ For example, UNMISS HRD January-March 2024 Brief on Violence Affecting Civilians.

⁴⁵ See: MINUSCA October – December 2023 Human Rights Quarterly Brief on the Central African Republic.

42. HRC staff working on planning and follow-up has received mission-specific support from OHCHR Geneva and New York offices. This consisted of written guidance provided at the beginning of planning or budget cycles, online sessions as well as ad hoc needs-based support throughout the year.⁴⁶ OHCHR also provided general guidance such as the “OHCHR Guidelines for Country/Regional Programmes”.⁴⁷

43. According to HRC planning officers, the introduction of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment System (CPAS) has served as a platform for intra-mission cooperation, but there was no evidence that mission human rights divisions used the platform to align indicators across missions or requested CPAS to customize a space to upload relevant global indicator data.⁴⁸

44. A review of the planning documents in the three missions indicated a degree of coherence between strategic guidance, such as mission concepts, strategies, CPAS, and AWP. However, the degree varied over the years, particularly CPAS, which was scarcely populated in some years and highly populated in others.⁴⁹ Furthermore, correspondence was sometimes higher between outputs in AWP and stakeholder outcomes (rather than outputs) in CPAS.

45. Based on the above, OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented. Nevertheless, OIOS encourages OHCHR and PKOs to agree on a harmonized set of human rights indicators for consistent reporting and to further align language for consistency and completeness in publications.

Recommendation 8

46. Recommendation 8 reads as follows:

The Secretary-General should take the appropriate steps to incorporate specific human rights references in his compacts with the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General.

Indicators: Human rights references incorporated and assessed in the Secretary-General’s compacts with SRSGs.

47. In 2020, the Secretary-General approved a new compact template that incorporated language referring to the 2011 policy on Human Rights. A review of SRSG compacts for MONUSCO, UNMISS, and MINUSCA confirmed that 14 out of 15 compacts discussed both programme, strategic, and/or special objectives.

48. A significant improvement was further achieved in 2022/23 when the compact format introduced a section on the management of resources with a dedicated area on field missions. Human rights was part of this area and indicators of achievements had also been introduced, allowing systematic follow-up that could be also compared across different PKOs.

49. On the basis of the above actions, OIOS assessed the recommendation as implemented.

⁴⁶ Interviews with Human Rights Officers and email correspondence between OHCHR HQ and missions.

⁴⁷ Published in 2024, Chapter 3 covers results, indicators, and theories of change.

⁴⁸ See: Terms of Reference Governing Arrangements for the Comprehensive Performance Assessment System (CPAS) in the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS), revised 22 Sep 2020; Standard Operating Procedure Managing the Comprehensive Performance Assessment System in MONUSCO, 1 Mar 2023.

⁴⁹ MONUSCO, UNMISS and MINUSCA have different CPAS maturity rates. For example, UNMISS CPAS is more incomplete for 2021 than 2023 because syncing their data directly in the platform did not occur until 2023; MINUSCA CPAS data also showed inconsistent temporal reporting and disaggregation until 2023. MONUSCO CPAS, focusing on human rights, contained excellent data from 2021 but became more scarcely populated for 2023, likely due to the transition period.

Recommendation 9

50. Recommendation 9 reads as follows:

OHCHR should finalize and circulate its guidance materials on improving human rights contribution in early warning and prevention and sensitize staff in its application.

Indicators: Guidance materials developed and disseminated.

51. In May 2017, OHCHR issued its “OHCHR Guidance Note on Human Rights Risk Assessments and Early Warning Analysis” and circulated it to all OHCHR staff as well as making it available on the OHCHR intranet.⁵⁰ After the guidance note was circulated, staff were regularly sensitized and advised on its application through briefings, advice, and regular emails.⁵¹

52. OHCHR has also taken other initiatives to strengthen the preventive aspects of its work. In 2018/19, OHCHR rapporteurs held a consultative process with national and international stakeholders, resulting in a report focusing on how OHCHR can strengthen its preventive work.⁵² This report also acknowledged the interdependence between human rights preventive work, early warning and sustaining peace, and provided recommendations on these issues.

53. Furthermore, in a joint initiative, OHCHR and DPPA underlined the importance of seeing the inextricable links between human rights and mediation in its 2023 report on enhancing the quality and effectiveness of mediation efforts through human rights.⁵³ This report underlined the role of prevention for these two fields as well as providing support to, and fostering a closer relationship between, mediation and human rights practitioners.

54. This stronger focus on prevention and early warning has yielded some positive effects on the three missions. In MONUSCO, human rights early warning activities were used to detect deteriorating situations due to increased levels of violence. It was therefore closely related to enhancing conflict prevention, and MONUSCO worked on strengthening early warning capacities in CSOs as well as national institutions and UN Country Teams.⁵⁴ Early warning was also one of five priorities for the MINUSCA HRC, which was also reflected in its Annual Workplan.⁵⁵ MINUSCA also published an SOP on early warning, where human rights work had a prominent role.⁵⁶ The UNMISS HRC Annual workplan for 2023 also had a dedicated section to using human rights data for early warning,⁵⁷ and an OIOS

⁵⁰ Confirmed by email correspondence provided to TeamMate+.

⁵¹ See emails from Georgette Gagnon, Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division, sent to Heads of Field Presence dated 15 Nov 2018 and 24 Aug 2020 respectively. The latter related to a webinar underlining the importance of “shifting to prevention”, according to the priority of the Secretary General.

⁵² OHCHR (2020). “Overview of consultations on the contribution of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations” report number A/HRC/43/37

⁵³ In OHCHR and DPPA (2023). Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of mediation efforts through human rights: DPPA-OHCHR Practice Note. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/DPPA-OHCHR-Joint-Practice-Note-20231101.pdf>

⁵⁴ MONUSCO UNJHRO AWP 2021, “Strengthened joint early warning mechanisms leading to better assistance to victims and prevention of HRV”; PS5: “Human rights information and analyses are integrated in early warning and analysis systems and influence international and national policy-making, strategies and operations to prevent, mitigate or respond to emerging crises, including humanitarian crises and conflict”; and

⁵⁵ MINUSCA HRD Workplan 2023-2024. “Priority 1. Contribute to the early warning and the information collection to ensure the PoC and prevent human rights violations/abuse (Prevention)”

⁵⁶ MINUSCA Standard Operating Procedure – Early warning and rapid response. Dated 1 May 2019 and revised 1 May 2020.

⁵⁷ Annual Workplan – South Sudan (UNMISS) (2023), Pillar Result PS5.

review of inputs to JOC for weekly and regular reports displayed a conscious effort to identify trends as part of an early warning and prevention strategy.⁵⁸

55. On the basis of the above, OIOS assessed the recommendation as implemented.

III. Early Results

56. Human rights is one of the three pillars of the United Nations, and work to strengthen the pillar remains ongoing. This continued progress has been seen in all parts of the Organization, including peacekeeping operations. The implementation of the recommendations from this OIOS evaluation include the following positive early results:

57. An increased focus on early warning and responsiveness which has enhanced early warning capabilities. Peacekeeping missions have become more skilled in detecting, responding to, and preventing human rights incidents from escalating.

58. Increased standardization of how human rights monitoring methods are applied in peacekeeping missions, which has resulted in harmonized language and increased usefulness of data in reports to Member States.

59. Enhanced UNJHRO support to CSOs and NGOs in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has in turn strengthened their strategic engagement with the government on human rights issues.

⁵⁸ Sample of reviewed HRD daily and weekly reports from 2024.

Annex 1: Comments received from OHCHR, DPO, MONUSCO, MINUSCA and UNMISS

OHCHR management response

60. In response to your memorandum of 5 September 2024, I am pleased to provide herewith the response of OHCHR to the Final Draft Triennial Review Report on the implementation of the Office of Internal Oversight Services recommendations in the report on the Evaluation of the effectiveness of Human Rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations.

61. First, we would like to express our appreciation to you and your staff for the spirit of consultation throughout the process, including the data collection, circulation for input and the consideration to our comments on the draft report.

62. We particularly appreciate the attention paid to our comments made on the finalization of the Manual on human rights monitoring and ways in which further core aspects or emerging areas of the monitoring methodology could be made public for non-OHCHR stakeholders.

63. The report is welcomed and provides valuable insights for the continued strengthening of our contribution to the integration of human rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations.

64. The Office welcomes OIOS assessment of eight recommendations implemented, and one partially implemented. OHCHR is committed to finalizing the revised Manual on human rights monitoring, and to consider ways in which further core aspects or emerging areas of the monitoring methodology could be made public for non-OHCHR stakeholders.

MONUSCO management response

65. Your interoffice memorandum dated 5 September 2024 (Ref: IED-2024-01543) forwarding the subject draft report for review and comments is acknowledged with thanks.

66. In general, MONUSCO welcomes OIOS assessment of eight recommendations as implemented, and one as partially implemented. The Mission is committed to collaborating as needed with OHCHR in reflecting emerging areas and issues in the review of the OHCHR Manual on human rights monitoring. Specific comments are as follows:

67. Recommendation #1 - UNMISS, MONUSCO and MINUSCA had not developed specific action plans but focused on developing a series of strategic and operational documents supported by guidance from headquarters in New York and Geneva. These included standard operating procedures (SOP), mission concepts and strategic visions, as well as annual work plans. Although this recommendation was considered implemented, coherence and effectiveness could be strengthened with mission-specific action plans rather than relying on a set of several guidance documents, concepts and plans.

68. Response: MONUSCO/JHRO took note of the recommendation and agrees with OIOS that mission-specific action plans could contribute to increasing coherence and effectiveness. In that

regard, MONUSCO would like to inform that it developed specific action plans on hate speech and HRDDP and developed an SOPs on information sharing on human rights violations, and on enhanced cooperation between JHRO and CAS. A specific Task force on Private Military security companies/contractors has also been established to ensure a coherent approach with these actors.

69. Recommendation #3 relates to ensuring regular publication of human rights reports. MINUSCA, MONUSCO and UNMISS all produced public reports on at least a quarterly basis. MINUSCA and UNMISS reports were accessible on their respective missions' websites, whilst some MONUSCO reports could be retrieved on the mission website. OIOS assessed this recommendation as implemented.

70. *Response: MONUSCO would like to clarify that all its cleared public reports in line with OHCHR/DPA/DPKO-DFS Policy on Public Reporting by Human Rights Components are published and available on the MONUSCO website. The monthly trends on human rights situation are also available on MONUSCO website.*

71. The Mission appreciates the opportunity given to comment on the findings and recommendations in the draft report.

MINUSCA management response

72. Thank you for your interoffice memorandum dated 5 September 2024 (IED-2024-01543) and sharing with me the Final Draft Triennial Review Report on the implementation of the Office of Internal Oversight Services recommendations in the Report on the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Human Rights monitoring, reporting and follow up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations.

73. We are pleased that the Review Report noted the positive contribution played by the integration of Human Rights as a prominent component of MINUSCA's political strategy and my compact, as well as the adoption of impactful SOPs and annual workplans containing detailed human rights- related output indicators.

74. We extend our gratitude to the Evaluation and Inspection Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, and in particular Ms. Patty Chang for her guidance during this review process.

UNMISS management response

75. We acknowledge receipt of your memo dated 5 September 2024 and the draft report on the 2024 Triennial Review of the implementation of recommendations in the OIOS evaluation report, on the effectiveness of human rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations.

76. UNMISS commends OIOS for its professionalism during the evaluation process and appreciates the inclusion of all comments and insights from Human Rights Officers in the final draft report.

77. UNMISS welcomes OIOS' verification of the implementation of eight recommendations from the 2019 evaluation, with one critical recommendation partially implemented. The Mission notes the additional recommendations to OHCHR to revise and redraft its "Manual on Human Rights Monitoring" and develop easy-to-understand material for non-human rights staff and external stakeholders.

78. I would like to thank OIOS for the continued support provided to the work of UNMISS.

DPO Management response

79. I thank you for sharing the final draft triennial review report on the implementation of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) recommendations in the report on the evaluation of Human Rights monitoring, reporting and follow-up in the United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations (IED-24-019).

80. My department has reviewed the report, and we appreciate that our comments were adequately reflected in the final draft. Human rights reporting is a crucial mandate of many of our peacekeeping operations, and we remain committed to working closely with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to continue strengthen our work as per the recommendations identified.

81. I take this opportunity to thank you for the continuing support that OIOS has been providing to DPO, on this and on other important issues.