

# Annex I: Achievement of OHCHR's targets for Global Expected Accomplishments 2012-2013

---

## Introduction

---

OHCHR has progressively improved its transparency and accountability through an increased capacity to monitor and report on results by applying the principles and standards of results-based management (RBM). At the end of 2013, all OHCHR entities, both field and headquarters-based, reported for the first time against results that were outlined in the OHCHR Management Plan (OMP) 2012-2013, using common indicators and the online Performance Monitoring System (PMS).

This enabled OHCHR to present a reliable, evidence-based assessment of the degree to which office-wide planned targets were achieved in the course of the biennium. This data was instrumental in the decision-making processes related to OHCHR planning for 2014-2017, including on the definition of targets and the allocation of resources.

## Targets and achievements

---

In the 2012-2013 OMP, OHCHR presented global targets for the indicators of the office-wide results (11 global expected accomplishments measured by 27 indicators). These global targets represented the sum totals of the specific targets formulated at the national level in the “countries of engagement.”<sup>14</sup>

As this was OHCHR's first attempt at setting targets at the global level, it was acknowledged that some targets might be too ambitious and others too modest while the Office adjusted to planning and reporting in this way. In addition, factors beyond the Office's control might also impact on the attainment of the targets, such as the global financial climate and political changes on the ground.

As it happened, OHCHR's financial situation during the biennium required a review of and adjustments to the Office programme, as set out in the OMP. Several targets were therefore reduced due to budget cuts that were implemented in 2012 and 2013.<sup>15</sup>

Of the adjusted targets, OHCHR fully achieved or exceeded 14 of the 27 global targets that were established against office-wide indicators for global expected accomplishments. For 10 targets, achievement ranged between an encouraging 50 and 99 per cent. The percentage of achievement was below 50 per cent in relation to only three targets.

---

<sup>14</sup> “Countries of engagement” refers to those countries in which the Office plans to undertake a set of activities towards a planned result. It is not limited to countries where OHCHR has a presence.

---

<sup>15</sup> The impact of the cuts on OHCHR's results were fully reported in the *UN Human Rights Appeal 2013* and the *OHCHR Report 2012*.

GEA	INDICATORS	OMP target 2012-2013	Revised targets 2012-2013 <sup>16</sup>	Number <sup>17</sup> achieved
1	1.1 NHRIs	48	41	41
	1.2 Compliance of laws	47	43	25
	1.3 Compliance of institutions	30	22	25
	1.4 Institutionalization of training	14	14	9
	1.5 Responses to human rights violations	10	9	11
2	2.1 Ratification	30	25	18
	2.2 Withdrawal of reservations	3	3	2
3	3.1 Transitional justice mechanisms	25	16	21
4	4.1 Discriminatory laws	22	20	16
5	5.1 Participation of rights-holders	22	21	9
	5.2 Use of national protection systems	8	5	10
6	6.1 Implementation of HRM recommendations	48	46	40
	6.2 Treaty bodies reporting	29	26	23
	6.3 Standing invitations	7	7	3
	6.4 SP visits and communications	14	14	11
7	7.1 Submissions to HRMs (documents)	20	18	16
	7.2 Submission to HRMs (actors)	16	14	15
8	8.1 Regional organizations	3	3	1
9	9.1 HRM recommendations in UPR	50%	50%	50%
	9.2 Common core documents	15	15	32
	9.3 Treaty bodies harmonization	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate
10	10.1 International response to issues	6	6	5
	10.2 International response to countries	7	6	9
11	11.1 Peacekeeping operations	5	5	7
	11.2 Humanitarian operations	6	5	7
	11.3 Integration of HRBA	34	32	37
	11.4 Mainstreaming of HR in UNDAFs	20	19	29

Further analysis of the assessments of the indicators shows the following:

- ▶ Progress is apparent in making OHCHR a fully results-based organization. In spite of varying RBM capacity during the planning process, targets were largely met and plans were consistently followed through.
- ▶ Changes were made during the period of implementation to targets in some countries, to reflect challenges in implementation or new trends/situations, sometimes leading to the opening of new opportunities. This shows more clearly for some of the indicators, such as the one on transitional justice (3.1), the one on the submission of common core documents (9.2)

<sup>16</sup> This number indicates the final target after cuts were undertaken at the end of 2012 and in light of the field presences that closed.

<sup>17</sup> These numbers only apply to the 2012-2013 biennium and should not be understood as baselines for upcoming programming cycles.

and the one on mainstreaming of human rights in UNDAF documents (11.4) – it should be noted that the increase in results in these areas can reasonably have impacted results in other areas. This was also the case for some countries/regions where events of considerable magnitude that took place during the cycle rendered the results frameworks irrelevant or made reporting impossible (e.g., Central African Republic). In addition, changes in the number of OHCHR field presences also impacted on the achievement of targets (two field presences were closed, Timor-Leste Human Rights Component and Nepal Country Office; Human Rights Advisers were deployed to the Maldives and Timor-Leste; and a new Country Office opened in Yemen).

- ▶ Reports were provided on almost 100 per cent of planned results, whether or not they were achieved. In cases of non-achievement, explanations were required to ensure that lessons

could be learned from the implementation process to inform future decision-making about planning of results, target setting and the selection of strategies.

- ▶ Ensuring the compliance of laws with international human rights standards, institutionalizing training and securing the ratification of treaties have been identified as areas where results fell just short of the targets set at the national level in several cases. This evidence confirms the presumption that two years are often insufficient to achieve outcome level results in some areas and validates the soundness of OHCHR's decision to extend its programming cycle from two to four years.
- ▶ The Office found it challenging to report on indicator 4.1 since it related to the impact level (changes in actual access of rights-holders to

justice and basic services) and not the outcome level, which is measured for all other indicators. The indicator was changed for the next programming cycle.

- ▶ Some indicators were reported on for the first time using data collection forms created in the PMS. Some of these forms presented a challenge for colleagues due to the quantity of information that needed to be uploaded in order to monitor the achievement of targets (particularly indicators 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 7.1 and 7.2). The implication of this was that some of the targets (which tended to have low levels of achievement) might have been achieved to a greater extent, but the complete information was not available. Looking ahead, a number of these issues have been addressed through changes made to the indicators and/or to the data collection forms for 2014-2017.