



**UNODC**

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Independent Evaluation Section



## GUIDANCE NOTE FOR EVALUATORS

# HUMAN RIGHTS MAINSTREAMING IN UNODC INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS





UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME  
Vienna

GUIDANCE NOTE FOR EVALUATORS

HUMAN RIGHTS  
MAINSTREAMING  
IN UNODC INDEPENDENT  
EVALUATIONS



UNITED NATIONS  
Vienna, 2023

This guidance document was prepared by an external evaluation and human rights expert, Ms. Elca Stigter, under the guidance and supervision of the Independent Evaluation Section of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

The Independent Evaluation Section of UNODC may be contacted at the following:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime  
Vienna International Centre  
P.O. Box 500  
1400 Vienna, Austria  
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0  
Email: [unodc-ies@un.org](mailto:unodc-ies@un.org)  
Website: [www.unodc.org/unodc/evaluation/index.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/evaluation/index.html)

© United Nations, 2023. All rights reserved worldwide.

The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of UNODC or contributory organizations, nor does it imply any endorsement. The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries

This publication has not been officially edited.

Cover image: Cienpies Design/Adobe Stock.

Publishing production: English, Publishing and Library Section, United Nations Office at Vienna.

# CONTENTS

Acronyms .....	iv
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. CONTEXT: HUMAN RIGHTS IN UNODC MANDATES .....	3
3. RATIONALE: THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINSTREAMING HUMAN RIGHTS IN EVALUATION .....	5
4. HUMAN RIGHTS MAINSTREAMING IN EVALUATIONS .....	7
4.1 The evaluation process .....	7
4.2 The desk review .....	8
4.3 Human rights assessment as part of context mapping .....	9
4.4 Human rights-inclusive evaluation criteria .....	9
4.5 Methodology .....	11
4.6 The principle of “do no harm” – including a risk management plan .....	12
4.7 The evaluation matrix .....	12
4.8 The data-collection phase .....	12
4.9 Data analysis and writing the report .....	13
4.10 Utilization of findings .....	13
ANNEXES .....	15
I. The main human rights instruments and date of their adoption .....	15
II. Sample human rights-related questions for each evaluation criterion .....	16

# ACRONYMS

CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
CCPCJ	Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
CND	Commission on Narcotic Drugs
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families
CRPD	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances
HRDDP	Human Rights Due Diligence Policy
UNCAC	United Nations Convention against Corruption
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNTOC	United Nations Transnational Organized Crime Convention

# I. INTRODUCTION

Integrating human rights and gender equality in all evaluations is of utmost importance to all members of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), including the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The **UNODC Evaluation Policy** of 2022 provides that human rights must be mainstreamed during all stages of the evaluation process, and in all evaluation outputs, including the inception report and the evaluation report. As it is the responsibility of evaluators to ensure that this is done, all evaluation team members must be aware of the main components and methods of human rights mainstreaming for human rights-responsive evaluations.

This guidance note is meant to support the evaluation team members in mainstreaming human rights in the different evaluation phases, especially the inception phase, the data-collection phase and the analysis and report writing phase. This concerns the mainstreaming of human rights in the desk review, human rights mapping of the operational context, and the development of a human rights-sensitive evaluation methodology and conducting a risk assessment in order to apply the “do no harm” principle. In addition to, the inclusion of human rights-related questions for each evaluation criterion, a human rights perspective must also be integrated into the evaluation matrix. Further advice and support on the mainstreaming of human rights can be requested from the Independent Evaluation Section (IES).

However, please bear in mind that this overview is intended for a broad audience with different levels

## BOX 1. **UNODC Evaluation Policy** (2022), article 22 on Human Rights

**Evaluation mainstreams and contributes to gender equality, human rights and the principle of leaving no one behind.** In line with the norms and standards for evaluation: The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. *It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of no one left behind.* (article 22 – emphasis added)



of expertise on human rights, and that further action might be required on gathering human rights information dependent on the evaluation type and project evaluated.

## BOX 2. **UN Charter** Article I (3) on Human Rights

1. The Purposes of the United Nations are:  
3. [...] promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion;



Please note that guidance on non-discrimination and leaving no one behind, including gender equality and in relation to access to justice, is given in a separate guidance note.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The guidance is available here: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html>

BOX 3. Key United Nations/UNODC human rights documents (see annex I for the main human rights instruments)

**Position Paper on UNODC and the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (2012)**



**Note by the Executive Director on Drug Control, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: A Human Rights Perspective (2010)**

**Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on UN Support to Non-UN Security Forces – Guidance Note and Text of the Policy (2015)**



## 2. CONTEXT: HUMAN RIGHTS IN UNODC MANDATES

UNODC mandates, as enshrined in the **drug control conventions**, the **United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)** and **United Nations Transnational Organized Crime Convention (UNTOC)**, all reaffirm the importance of full respect for human rights. UNODC governing bodies, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ) have further consistently provided UNODC with specific mandates, such as the need to integrate human rights in responses to drugs, crime and terrorism. The human rights framework for UNODC is captured in the **UNODC Position Paper on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights** (2012), and the **Note by the Executive Director on Drug Control, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice: A Human Rights Perspective** (2010). Of particular relevance are human rights related to the areas of security, health and justice, including the UNODC specific mandate on guarding and protecting United Nations standards and norms on **crime prevention** and **criminal justice**.

The importance of human rights mainstreaming in the United Nations has been reiterated and confirmed over time on various occasions. In the 2005 **World Summit Outcome** document, Member States resolved that the promotion and protection of human rights should be both mainstreamed throughout the United Nations system and integrated into national policies. This implies that “all actions of UNODC, including programming and technical assistance, should take every opportunity to further the realization of human rights” (UNODC Position Paper on the Promotion

### BOX 4. Duty bearers and rights holders

International human rights are best viewed as claims of the individual. The primary obligation for meeting these claims lies with the relevant State. States ratify international human rights treaties and States are the primary subjects of international law in general. The term “duty bearers” is used to reflect the obligations of States towards “rights holders”, which represent all individuals in the concerned State. This is the definition in international human rights law. However, “duty bearer” is defined differently in programming, which encompasses also non-State actors, i.e. any actor with either duties or responsibilities for a development intervention.

and Protection of Human Rights, 2012: 5). This responsibility of UNODC covers three areas, which are correlated to the three areas of the State obligation with respect to human rights (see box 5), namely, to promote human rights (in all actions), to respect human rights (“do no harm”) and protect human rights (within mandates).

### BOX 5. The State obligation on human rights: three areas

The State obligation can be divided into three main areas:

- Respect rights (to avoid violating rights)
- Protect rights (to prevent others from violating rights)
- Fulfil rights (to provide positive assistance or services necessary for the claims of the individual to be met)

In 2011, the Secretary-General endorsed the **Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on United Nations support to non-United Nations security forces** (HRDDP), which comparatively has a very narrow scope of application. The policy is to protect the United Nations from being linked to the violations of others, and to safeguard the reputation of the United Nations. This policy is particularly important for UNODC when working with State actors, such as security forces, in the context of programming and project implementation.

The **2030 Sustainable Development Agenda**, adopted by the General Assembly in 2015, is anchored in human rights, and offers a global strategic framework and direction to ensure that no one will be left behind. Among others, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 on peace, justice and strong institutions, offers strategic direction to the work of UNODC.

### 3. RATIONALE: THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINSTREAMING HUMAN RIGHTS IN EVALUATION

The mainstreaming of human rights in evaluations is for accountability and organizational learning. Integrating a human rights perspective is of utmost importance for the following reasons:

- To assess the level of achievement of the overall mission of the United Nations in general, and UNODC in particular, and to ensure compliance with the the Charter of the United Nations and obligations under international law
- To assess compliance with the human rights due diligence policy for the legitimacy, credibility and public image of the United Nations

- To identify results, good practices and lessons learned in order to lead to more effective interventions and more sustainable results.

In other words, evaluations can offer recommendations to inform planning and implementation on how to strengthen the mainstreaming of human rights, and by doing so, offer concrete directions for the road map for duty bearers to comply with their human rights obligations under international law and support the fulfilment of human rights for rights holders.



# 4. HUMAN RIGHTS MAINSTREAMING IN EVALUATIONS

## BOX 6. Example: Lesson learned on human rights

In the **mid-term cluster independent in-depth evaluation of the Global Maritime Crime Programme** (GMCP), completed in 2020, the following lesson learned on human rights was provided in the report: “Promoting human rights and gender is effective when it is presented as contributing to law enforcement and justice, rather than as just an obligation. This requires the mobilization of proper gender and human rights expertise in programming, planning, execution, and monitoring.” (p. 40)



evaluation team, the evaluation process can be divided into the following five phases in which human rights must be mainstreamed:

- Inception phase (with the inception report as the first output of the evaluation)
- The data-collection phase (in which interviews, focus group discussions and online surveys, or any other method(s), as appropriate, will be carried out)
- The data analysis and drafting of the evaluation report phase (which will result in the first draft of the evaluation report)
- Several rounds of reviews of the draft evaluation report, the preparation of the evaluation brief and PowerPoint presentation
- Follow-up by means of the management response and implementation of recommendations (the “utilization” of key findings)

## 4.1 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation process starts with preparing the evaluation terms of reference by the project manager, with the support of IES, and in assembling the evaluation team. The evaluation terms of reference represents the first evaluation output in which human rights must be mainstreamed, and is an important document for the evaluation team at the start of the inception phase. The second key activity is identifying and recruiting the evaluation team members with the right profiles, including human rights expertise.

After the approval of the evaluation terms of reference, and following the recruitment of the

**Inception phase.** In the inception phase of the evaluation, the responsibilities for the work will need to be distributed within the evaluation team, and it is important to clarify who will be responsible for the different human rights-related responsibilities. These include collecting further internal and external human rights-related documents, conducting the desk review on human rights for the different evaluation criteria in addition to a summative human rights assessment to

get an understanding of the human rights context of the project, adding human rights-related questions under each evaluation criteria, and developing a human rights-sensitive evaluation methodology and related tools. All team members will have human rights-related responsibilities, and either the team leader or the human rights expert on the team, if the team is granted such an expert, must ensure coherence in approach.

The evaluation team will subsequently start with the evaluation by means of reviewing the evaluation terms of reference, by analysing them from a human rights perspective using the different inter-related steps of the inception phase.

In the inception phase, and reflected in the inception report, human rights must be mainstreamed in the desk review (in relation to each evaluation criterion and by completing a human rights assessment on the context of the project), the main questions under each evaluation criterion, the methodology (methods/sources), limitations (based on a risk assessment in order to implement the “do no harm” principle), the evaluation matrix and in the data-collection instruments (also reflecting human rights-responsive questions under each evaluation criteria). Further information will be provided in this guidance note for these different components

## 4.2 THE DESK REVIEW

The identification of internal UNODC sources and external sources must be done in a human rights-inclusive manner. Internal documents concern relevant project documentation, including the project document, progress reports, reports from consultants, training/evaluation assessments and so on, which will need to be reviewed by a human rights lens (see evaluation criteria).

### BOX 7. Human rights sources: suggestions

- Data on ratification/accession of international and regional human rights instruments
- HRDDP (and related sources)
- Security Council resolutions
- United Nations declarations, principles, standards and recommendations, including those issued by United Nations bodies such as the General Assembly (e.g. United Nations Standards and Norms on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice), and the Human Rights Council
- Interpretation of core treaties by monitoring bodies (e.g. courts such as the European Court or the Inter-American Court of Human Rights or committees of independent experts, such as the United Nations Human Rights Committee, and the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child)
- Reports of independent think tanks and other non-governmental organizations, such as human rights organizations
- Sources of national human rights institutes

Internal human rights sources include the 2012 UNODC position paper “UNODC and the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights”. External human rights sources contain information on international human rights instruments and their application, United Nations guidance documents, national-level human rights-related documents, and reports from international and national non-governmental organizations. See the box for further information.

These sources can, among others, be used for undertaking a human rights assessment of the project/programme’s context, and also a mapping of the main human rights stakeholders – duty bearers and rights holders.

### 4.3 HUMAN RIGHTS ASSESSMENT AS PART OF CONTEXT MAPPING

Conducting a human rights assessment in the inception phase is key to getting a better understanding of the context of the project, and the extent to which the project has addressed certain human rights concerns. This contextual analysis must be tailored to the main focus areas of the project, and must entail an analysis of the ratification of international and regional human rights instruments, the incorporation of these obligations in national law and policies, the main human rights concerns, the commitment of government entities to address human rights concerns as well as the role of civil society therein. Additionally, a mapping of duty bearers and rights holders is also important to help determine the selection of interviewees and participants of focus group

#### BOX 8. Human rights assessment: sample questions

[to be tailored to the project/programme that is evaluated]

Which international human rights instruments have been ratified, and how have these obligations been integrated into national law?

What are the main human rights concerns in the areas of justice, security and health?

What is the level of government human rights commitments? How does it show in practice?

What is the level of capacity?

How active are civil society organizations on human rights issues?

Which entities are the duty bearers? And the right holders?

discussions, for instance, and explore the level of capacity and coordination between different entities. Rights holders can be interviewed or invited to take part in a survey as direct or indirect beneficiaries of the project and/or as actors that might offer an outsiders' human rights perspective on the design and implementation of activities and on results achieved.

Also, depending on the thematic area covered by the project, representatives of trade unions, the judiciary, the most marginalized or affected communities, religious leaders, parliamentarians, the private sector and the media could be included in the list with interviewees.

At the same time, the principle of "do no harm" should be of overriding concern in the selection of interviewees, and in the data-collection methods selected for the evaluation, which could be further discussed with the project team (see also paragraph 4.6 on the principle of "do no harm").

### 4.4 HUMAN RIGHTS-INCLUSIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Human rights-responsive evaluations require the integration of guiding questions on human rights for each evaluation criterion. In the table below sample questions have been offered that could be considered and further tailored to the evaluation. Further sample questions for each evaluation criterion can be found in annex II.

In the case of independent project evaluations, given that only six evaluation questions will be allowed to guide the evaluation process, and with limited space for the desk review, only one human rights-sensitive evaluation question will

TABLE I. Evaluation criteria and sample questions on human rights

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SAMPLE QUESTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Relevance	What is the relevance of the project for addressing the needs of duty bearers and rights holders? How?
Efficiency	Has human rights expertise been mobilized and used in designing and implementing the intervention? Have international and/or national human rights experts been used to support the design, implementation and monitoring, and to what effect?  Has human rights due diligence been considered in (a) the selection of beneficiaries and participants in events and training; and (b) procurement of equipment?
Coherence	What are the synergies with other interventions in the same field of other organizations, such as United Nations organizations and civil society organizations, including those covering human rights?
Effectiveness	What have been the effects of the intervention on human rights?
Impact	What have been the significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, effects or potential effects on social, cultural, economic and/or civil, political human rights?
Sustainability	What have been the holistic and enduring changes in human rights systems or norms?
Human rights, and other cross-cutting issues	To what extent has the project design, implementation and results fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalized groups, including people with disabilities?

## BOX 9. Example: Good practice human rights mainstreaming

The evaluation of the project "Support to the Prevention of Radicalization to Violence in Prisons and Probation Settings in the Kyrgyz Republic" (2021) provided a more in-depth analysis including on the alignment of the intervention with international conventions and rules, use of relevant UNODC guidance, the terminology of rights holders and the application of the "do no harm" principle. This was the conclusion of the UNODC Independent Quality Assessment of UNODC Evaluation Reports - 2021 Synthesis Report. The principle of "do no harm" was applied during the evaluation process by the evaluation team, in close consultation with project management, and with respect to different evaluation criteria. The evaluation found that the principle of "do no harm" was not strongly present in all project outputs, such as the process and tools related to the classification of the prison population and the assessment of risks and needs of prisoners convicted of crimes associated with extremism. The evaluation concludes that this might be related to the absence of an explicit do no harm approach in the project design (p. 28), which was subsequently taken forward in a recommendation on strategic priorities (p. 39).





be mandatory. This, however, should not stop the evaluation team from integrating a human rights perspective into the other questions, which could be made more explicit by operationalizing the leading questions into subquestions.

## 4.5 METHODOLOGY

Evaluating projects that deal with drugs, crime, corruption and terrorism requires flexible and participatory approaches that include a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. Methods often include the desk review (elaborated on above), semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, observation on-site and online surveys. The level of security in a country, and the human rights situation, could have an impact on the choice of methods for the evaluation – in a less secure environment rights holders and also duty bearers might feel more at ease in individual interviews instead of group discussions, for instance. The **UNODC Toolkit for Evaluating Interventions on Preventing and Countering Crime and Terrorism** (2021) offers further information on other methods that could be used too for data collection.

The selection of potential interviewees, their number and profiles, is also an important task when preparing the methodology. The inclusion of representatives of independent national human rights institutions, civil society organizations, human rights defender and regional and international human rights entities on this list may be highly relevant in order to obtain human rights-related information, either as beneficiaries of the project/programme/policy and/or as actors that might offer an outsiders' independent human rights perspective on the design and implementation of activities. Also, depending on the thematic

### BOX 10. The significant change method

One method highlighted in the recently published **UNODC Toolkit for Evaluating Interventions on Preventing and Countering Crime and Terrorism** (2021) is the most significant change method. This is a participatory evaluation methodology that involves the collection and selection of critical stories of change produced and analysed by a broad range of stakeholders. It emphasizes the centrality of culture and the "lived experience" of communities in the design and conduct of the evaluation. Advantages include that it is best for identifying difficult-to-measure, higher-level impacts, both intended and unintended, and both positive and negative, and also when evaluating human rights interventions that lack clear outcomes and indicators. It is a simple approach and is easy to use in its purest form but, as with most participatory methods, can be time-consuming.

area of the project/programme or policy, representatives of trade unions, the judiciary, the most marginalized or affected communities, religious leaders, parliamentarians, the private sector and the media could be included in the list with interviewees. The principle of "do no harm" should be of overriding concern here.

When developing the data-collection tools, such as the interview forms, the questionnaires for the survey(s) and/or the guidance notes for the focus group discussions, ensure that further information is provided on informed consent, the voluntary nature of the exercise, anonymity and the usage of the information collected.

In addition, human rights-related questions must be included in evaluation tools for all evaluation criteria, if applicable.

## 4.6 THE PRINCIPLE OF “DO NO HARM” – INCLUDING A RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

In the methodology section of the inception report, reference to ethical principles in evaluation must be made, and applied during the evaluation.

The inclusion of a risk management plan is good practice for all evaluations. Such a plan should be used to identify potential risks and develop mitigation strategies to enable completion of the evaluation. This is especially important when dealing with sensitive subjects or in conflict-affected areas where the safety, security and well-being of all evaluation participants, data collectors and evaluators need to be given special consideration. For instance, a conflict sensitivity analysis may identify the potential impact of the evaluation process on local dynamics and security.

A human rights-compliant evaluation is therefore an evaluation in which risk management planning has been done in order to avoid doing harm.

## 4.7 THE EVALUATION MATRIX

In the evaluation matrix human rights-sensitive subquestions and indicators can be added to the different evaluation criteria. This matrix offers a useful opportunity to review the extent of human rights mainstreaming thus far, and strengthen this by means of introducing additional questions and/or indicators.

### BOX 11. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations

The **UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation** are explicit on the principle of do no harm: “It is necessary to achieve a compromise between the risks an evaluation exposes stakeholders to, on the one hand, and maintaining the social change objectives of the evaluation, on the other. Every possible measure should be undertaken to ensure that no stakeholder be put in danger through an evaluation. There are many types of harm to anticipate and consider in evaluations. Examples include discomfort, embarrassment, intrusion, devaluation of worth, unmet expectations, stigmatization, physical injury, distress and trauma. Political and social factors may also jeopardize the safety of participants before, during or after an evaluation. While ‘do no harm’ applies to all settings and all stakeholder groups, it is a particularly important concept in conflict settings and when working with the least powerful. In these circumstances, a double safety net needs to be in place.” (UNEG, 2020: 11).

## 4.8 THE DATA-COLLECTION PHASE

The data-collection phase allows for the implementation of the planned methodology outlined in the inception report. This means that stakeholders have to a large extent already been selected, partially based on an analysis of their responsibilities and obligations as duty bearers and rights holders and of relevant stakeholders that could provide alternative perspectives on particular human rights areas. There is always some space to select further interviewees or respondents if deemed relevant from (among others) a human rights perspective during the course of the evaluation.

Continued monitoring of the application of the ethical principles outlined in the inception report, and the implementation of the risk management plan, is pivotal in order to avoid doing harm and to give due consideration to informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity in the utilization of data obtained during interviews, focus group discussions, surveys and other data-collection methods. Political and social factors that could potentially jeopardize the safety of participants before, during or after an evaluation might become more visible and clearer to the evaluation team during field visits. While the “do no harm” principle applies to all settings and all stakeholder groups, it is a particularly important concept when working with the least powerful, including in conflict settings.

**BOX 12. Example: Main findings in human rights mainstreaming, including unforeseen impact**

The evaluation of the **Sustainable Livelihoods and Development in Myanmar 2014-2019 Subprogramme** (2018) found that “even if the special programme did not have a HR mainstreaming strategy in place, the evaluation found some positive results in this area. Securing (quasi) property rights by supporting the issuing of and titles and community forest certificates is strengthening the target populations’ human rights situation in government-administered areas. In conflict areas, where the population has suffered from human rights violations in the past, UNODC is playing an active role in mediation and conflict prevention. Even though the role of UNODC in the wider context of the peace process is probably negligible, there appears to be a noticeable impact in the targeted areas, where villagers reported that national army forces no longer intrude into village areas, possibly because of UNODC presence and monitoring.” (UNODC, 2018: 28)



## 4.9 DATA ANALYSIS AND WRITING THE REPORT

Following the data-collection phase, the phase for data analysis and drafting the report allows for triangulation of data, including with human rights resources if needed, and also statistical analysis. The narrative with key findings gradually takes shape when conducting analysis. The risk management plan with respect to the utilization of data, and the application of the principle of “do no harm”, also needs to be considered at this stage (see box 11 for further guidance on this issue).

It is important when drafting the report to not only include at least a paragraph on human rights (responding to human rights questions) under each evaluation criteria, but also to bring this together in the conclusion (e.g. one paragraph on human rights), at least one recommendation on human rights and one reference to human rights as either a lesson learned or a good practice. This means that human rights are fully integrated into the entire evaluation process, and considered from the planning to the very end, with the project team then given the role to implement the human rights recommendation and by doing so further human rights in a particular area.

## 4.10 UTILIZATION OF FINDINGS

The presentation of the evaluation findings by the project team, the dissemination of the evaluation report, and the option to read the evaluation findings and recommendations (see the **UNODC IES evaluation reports webpage**) are all opportunities to share human rights-sensitive analysis with internal and external stakeholders, including duty bearers and rights holders. Thus,

the mapping undertaken initially could also be used to explore the inclusion of a larger group of stakeholders to discuss how the key findings could be considered and capitalized on to further the human rights agenda in a certain country.

# ANNEXES

## I. THE MAIN HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS AND DATE OF THEIR ADOPTION

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (21 December 1965)

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (16 December 1966)

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) (16 December 1966)

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)  
(18 December 1979)

Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)  
(10 December 1984)

Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (20 November 1989)

International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICMW) (18 December 1990)

International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances (CRPD)  
(20 December 2006)

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (13 December 2006)

## II. SAMPLE HUMAN RIGHTS-RELATED QUESTIONS FOR EACH EVALUATION CRITERION

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SAMPLE QUESTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Relevance	<p>What is the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international human rights norms and standards to which that institution/ government adheres? Does it address certain gaps therein?</p> <p>What is the relevance of the project for addressing the needs of duty bearers and rights holders? How?</p> <p>Relevance design: has human rights analysis been undertaken with respect to the causes of the issue addressed in the intervention, the human rights effects of this issue (e.g. crime) on different duty bearers and rights holders (e.g. male/female/age/ethnicity/etc.) and how the intervention addressed these effects?</p> <p>Have human rights-responsive indicators been developed and used for monitoring and reporting?</p> <p>Is the design of the intervention appropriate for addressing cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights and disability inclusion?</p> <p>Has the “do not harm” principle been considered in the design and applied in practice?</p> <p>Did the project have any (potential) negative impact on human rights – such as aiding or assisting human rights violations? Has a risk mitigation strategy been completed?</p> <p>Has the project furthered the realization of rights in the identified areas of concern?</p> <p>Has the project contributed to increased capacity of national counterparts to promote full compliance with their international human rights obligations?</p> <p>Has a human rights assessment been made of partner civil society organizations and private sector entities (e.g. with respect to procurement)?</p>
Efficiency	<p>Has the budget been designed in a human rights-responsive manner, and have annual expenditures had an effect on the extent to which human rights have been addressed by the intervention?</p> <p>Did the human rights situation have an effect on the timely implementation of the intervention?</p> <p>Has human rights expertise been mobilized and used in designing and implementing the intervention? Have international and/or national human rights experts been used to support the design, implementation and monitoring, and to what effect?</p>

EVALUATION CRITERIA	SAMPLE QUESTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Efficiency ( <i>continued</i> )	<p>Has staff security, especially of national staff, been sufficiently taken care of (in particular in contexts when the United Nations speaks up about human rights concerns)?</p> <p>Have intervention governance arrangements been inclusive, with representatives of human rights establishments and/or voicing human rights concerns if deemed necessary?</p> <p>Have human rights been considered in monitoring and reporting?</p> <p>Have human rights been considered in inputs and outputs (e.g. selection of participants (gender/diversity/leaving no one behind incl. persons with disabilities; training curricula; profile trainers; procurement)?</p> <p>Has human rights due diligence been considered in the selection of beneficiaries and participants in events and training?</p>
Coherence	<p>Internal coherence:</p> <p>What are the synergies with other human rights interventions of the government and the implementing organization? (the part related to the government could arguably also be placed under external coherence)</p> <p>Is the intervention aligned with relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government entity adheres to? (this could, arguably, also be placed under external coherence)</p> <p>External coherence:</p> <p>What are the synergies with other human rights-related interventions of other organizations, such as United Nations organizations and civil society organizations?</p> <p>Have partnerships with human rights organizations been initiated, maintained, used and strengthened? How and to what effect?</p>
Effectiveness	What have been the effects of the intervention on human rights?
Impact	<p>What have been the significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, effects (or potential effects) on social, cultural, economic and/or civil- and political human rights?</p> <p>What have been the holistic and enduring changes in human rights systems or norms?</p>
Sustainability	What have been the holistic and enduring changes in human rights systems or norms?
Human rights, and other cross-cutting issues	To what extent has the project design, implementation and results fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalized groups, including people with disabilities?







Independent Evaluation Section  
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime  
Vienna International Centre  
P.O. Box 500  
1400 Vienna, Austria  
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0  
Email: [unodc-ies@un.org](mailto:unodc-ies@un.org)  
Website: [www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)