



Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)

Written by: Karen Bennett, Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

Peer reviewed by:

Prof Joshua Castellino, Law Department of Middlesex University

Prof Philip Leach, Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

Nicole Piché, UK All Party Parliamentary Human Rights Group

Table of Contents

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents.....	1
Introduction.....	2
I. Project Aims and Progress.....	2
1. Offering a programme of education and training in support of HRDs' professional development, in specialised substantive subject areas, which combines the theoretical with the practical	
2. Creating a trans-national network in the region	
3. Providing the opportunity for academic validation	
4. Team building for meaningful follow-up and sustainable relationships amongst HRDs	
II. Monitoring and Evaluation Activities.....	7
1. Meetings with participants in the programme	
2. Meetings with stakeholders in the region	
3. Meetings with academics and donor agencies	
4. Note on other meetings	
III. Analysis of Outcome of Project.....	12
1. Project successes	
2. Project obstacles	
IV. Recommendations for Sustaining Central Asian Human Rights Capacity.....	20
1. Support for the Central Asian Human rights Defenders Network	
2. Developing a masters level programme in human rights/international public law	
3. Capacity-building through partnerships	
IV. Feasibility for Duplication of Programme.....	25
1. Lessons learnt	
2. Academic progress	
3. Regions suggested for duplications	
V. Concluding remarks.....	28
Annex 1: List of Participants.....	29
Annex 2: Module 1, 2 and 3 Programmes.....	30
Annex 3: Compiled Module Evaluations.....	45
Annex 4: Network Strategy Meeting Agenda.....	60
Annex 5: Draft Memorandum of Understanding for Central Asian HRD Network.....	61
Annex 6: Notes from South Caucasus HRD Network Coordinator.....	64

Introduction

We have had the privilege to work over the course of the last ten months with a diverse and dedicated group of human rights defenders (HRDs) from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. This report reflects on that journey and has three aims. The first aim of this report is to describe activities carried out during the 'Monitoring and Evaluation' visit to Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan from February 19th – 25th, 2010, which was conducted as a final component of the 'Pilot Project in Central Asia for the Human Rights Defenders' Diploma Programme.' The second aim of this report is to assess achievements made during the course of the project, and in particular, how the project was able to support the human rights defenders involved in the project. The third aim of this report is to set realistic goals for our further engagement in the Central Asia region, and to consider the broader aims of the Programme, based on our experiences in the Central Asia region.

I. Project Aims and Progress

The 'Pilot Project in Central Asia for the Human Rights Defenders' Diploma Programme' has sought both to strengthen substantive human rights knowledge and support a regional network among human rights defenders from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. The pilot project provides a potential model for developing a multi-regional approach for the support of the practice and education of human rights defenders (HRDs).

The project was carried out by the Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute (HRSJ) at London Metropolitan University, the Law Department of Middlesex University, and the UK All Party Parliamentary Human Rights Group (PHRG).¹ The project was funded by the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the HRSJ Institute was the implementer of the project.

The project work was conducted over a 10 month period from June 2009 – March 2010 in three countries in the Central Asia region. The rationale for the design of the programme was to focus on at least one country where human rights defenders are at particularly high risk in carrying out their work (Uzbekistan), and to include a second country in the same region where civil society is more developed, and might be in a position to provide support (specify Kyrgyzstan or Kazakhstan). A third country was selected that shares a need to develop the capacity of HRDs (both nationally and regionally) and has similar human rights concerns to the other countries (specify Kyrgyzstan or Kazakhstan). Our aim was to develop relationships between Central Asian HRDs and strengthen their networks. We therefore sought to ensure that HRDs would be better equipped to provide mutual support transnationally, in various ways, including: better protection mechanisms when HRDs are at risk; technical, legal and strategic advancements in their work; and developing skills and opportunities for advocacy, outreach and engagement with national institutions. In this way, the pilot project was designed to provide opportunities that have not previously been available to HRDs from this region.

We describe below the project activities carried out and assess the progress in achieving our four principal aims:

¹ The core project team included: Karen Bennett and Prof Philip Leach from LondonMet U; Prof Joshua Castellino from Middlesex U; and Nicole Piché from PHRG. Additional experts teaching on the project included Prof Douwe Korff from LondonMet U; David Keane and Nadia Bernaz from Middlesex U. In-country guest lecturers were also lending their expertise to the project, including Benjamin Moreau from ODIHR/OSCE, Natalya Seitmuratova from UNOHCHR, and Rakhilya Karymsakova, Asst. Professor from Al Farabi Kazakh National University.

1. to provide a programme of education and training in support of the professional development of HRDs, in specialised substantive subject areas (combining the theoretical with the practical);
2. to create a trans-national network in the region;
3. to provide the opportunity for academic validation of the training; and
4. team-building to ensure meaningful follow-up and sustainable relationships amongst HRDs.

1. A programme of education and training in support of the professional development of HRDs, in specialised substantive subject areas, combining the theoretical with the practical

Selection of participants

The pilot project programme supported 18 participants from the three countries (6 HRDs from each country). The selection of participants was conducted in close co-operation with British Embassy posts and international agencies working in the region. We also invited Uzbek and Kyrgyz HRDs who attended previous HRSJ Research Institute training courses (conducted in London in March 2007 and Bishkek in February 2008), and the British Embassy post in Kazakhstan worked with the HRSJ Pilot Project Coordinator to identify further participants from Kazakhstan.

The selection criteria was based on a) the extent of human rights activism, b) willingness, interest and/or ability of HRDs to take a leadership role with other civil society partners, c) the possession of fluent Russian or English language skills, d) consideration of issues related to personal safety and security in attending the training. The selection also took account of the programme's aim to strengthen networks in the region. Accordingly, we sought to achieve a degree of balance as regards: a) geography; b) gender; c) professional background (e.g. academia, law, and journalism); d) areas of human rights expertise; and e) experience. As a result, the network is inclusive of different sectors within the human rights/civil society communities both nationally and regionally. Please see Annex 1 'List of Participants.'

The three modules

There were three modules covered by the programme:

Module 1: International Human Rights Law;

Module 2: Human Rights Strategy and Management; and

Module 3: Advanced Issues in Human Rights Practice: (1) Constructive Dialogue and (2) Minority Rights and Vulnerable Groups.

The modules were taught in intensive week-long sessions in order to meet academic requirements similar to taught postgraduate level Modules at LondonMet and Middlesex Universities. However, the curriculum was designed to be specifically relevant to the needs of the Central Asian participants, taking account of their responses to pre-training questionnaires. All the module materials were translated into Russian, a language commonly shared by all participants. The training manuals were provided to participants both as hard copy manuals and on flash drives (the latter can relatively easily be carried across borders, notwithstanding security concerns).

Each module used a variety of methods of teaching, including: lectures, plenary discussions, group activities, role plays and participant presentations (see Annex 2 'Module Programmes'). There were frequent discussions about the application of theory to practice, and the comparative analyses of

situations and cases. The module also incorporated: evaluations of successful report-writing; internet security; civil society inclusion in European Union dialogue; and conflict resolution theory applicable to specific dispute resolution scenarios in human rights practice. The participants' work was evaluated by means of: 1) a multiple choice exam, 2) a 'train the trainer' in-country assignment, and 3) a written essay (see Annex 3 'Test Results'). The participants' satisfaction with the programme was evaluated through written and oral feedback (see Annex 4 'Compiled Module Evaluations').

Module 1 (International Human Rights Law) set the foundation for the course programme, and focused on particular international instruments, and the mechanisms available for redress. The module provided an introduction to regional human rights systems, and an analysis of relevant legal cases from these systems. Particular emphasis was placed on the mechanisms available in one or more of the three countries – notably the UN treaty bodies and UN Special Procedures. The participants developed their understanding of human rights law. This was evident from comparisons with their previous knowledge shown in their pre training questionnaires, and because all participants achieved pass marks (50% +) in their exam.

Module 2 (Human Rights Strategy and Management) was designed to critically examine the way in which HRDs work in this region, and to provide comparative lessons which could be applied to overcome the problems they encounter, and to respond to the practical skills-building which they need. The module covered: interview skills; conducting security risk assessments; stress management and assessing post-traumatic stress symptoms; how to create regional and international networks; accessing alternative mechanisms for protection; and writing proposals for project funding. There was a substantial amount of interaction between facilitators and participants in this module which also included participant-led group activities, in which they considered practical obstacles they face in many areas of their work (see Annex 2 'Module Programmes' - Module 2). During Module 2, a panel of representatives from funding organisations led a half day session on securing financial support and 'train-the-trainer' in-country assignments were completed by the participants with impressive and successful outcomes (see Section III for more detail).

Module 3 (Advanced Issues in Human Rights Practice) participants chose to focus on two thematic areas: 'Constructive Dialogue' and 'Minority Rights and Vulnerable Groups.' Combining theoretical training and practical application, the particular areas of focus included: conflict resolution theory, negotiation and mediation skills, transitional justice issues, and the applied practice of constructive dialogue. Lectures in constructive dialogue provided participants with a good understanding of the international legal regimes governing the use of pacific settlement of disputes and participants engaged with the relevant principles relating to the resolution of disputes both between states and intra-state. UNOHCHR and OSCE/ODIHR experts provided lectures on constructive dialogue engagement, focusing especially on confidence-building measures between civil society and governments. A good deal of time was given to discussing the role of civil society in European Union Dialogues. The second half of the module focused on 'Minority Rights and Vulnerable Groups,' including legal theory, comparative case analyses, and a focus on problems within Central Asian minority communities. The need to create special regimes (*lex specialis*) to protect individuals and communities that are particularly vulnerable in international law was also addressed. The lectures provided participants with a historical overview of efforts to protect minorities and then focused on the contemporary state of the world's minorities, with a special emphasis on Central Asia. For their essay assignments, participants were required to apply their learning to one of three topics: constructive dialogue, minority rights or vulnerable groups (see Section III Analysis of Outcome).

2. Creating a trans-national network in the region: the *Central Asian Human Rights Defender Network*

Creating a regional transnational network amongst human rights defenders was a primary aim of the programme. Participants met for one week periods during the Module sessions, which gave the group time to get to know each other through shared working projects and shared living spaces. This time together, with plans to see each other in the subsequent sessions, allowed a natural development of relationship and trust to build amongst the group. The physical conditions were important - by bringing HRDs into a 'non-threatening' space away from their usual work environments, and allowing them space and time for reflection in a stimulating and relaxed environment. The participants could then focus on meeting and engaging with peers and new acquaintances, who face both similar and different challenges in their countries. This opportunity has proven to be very useful for the participants of the programme on a number of levels (see Section III Analysis of Outcome). In addition to building transnational relations between Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan human rights defenders, the programme also provided an opportunity for HRDs from the same country to meet and discuss common issues and problems in a non-threatening, safe environment that provided added potential for team-building in a national context (see Section III Analysis of Outcome).

During the course of the project, the project team members saw, very tangibly, levels of trust developing between the participants, through both the formal and informal contacts. As noted earlier, the participants had varying levels of experience and expertise, but, importantly, each individual's work was acknowledged and respected by their peers, with a great level of mutual support for one another made evident during plenary discussions, in their group work, and through informal discussions. Carrying out intensive one week modules for eight hours a day proved to be a lot of work for everyone involved, but at no time during the project did the participants disengage, and they consistently showed a very high level of interest in and appreciation for the various topics covered in each module. It was also important to make time for informal gatherings and 'down time' throughout the week long sessions, including a more formal dinner involving all the participants and facilitators. These informal activities contributed to a relaxed and positive team spirit and further developed the confidence and trust amongst the group, which we believe contributed to participants feeling able to speak freely within the group during the training sessions.

Importantly, there are already tangible results in the form of a transnational network. At the close of Module 3, held at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek in November 2009, the participants agreed to establish the 'Central Asian Human Rights Defender Network', and appointed a Coordinator, Ms. Svetlana Oryspayeva, lawyer for the Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law in Almaty. The objectives and proposed activities of the Network are outlined in section II below

We were also able to secure additional funds from ODIHR to enable a strategy meeting for the Network members to take place at the OSCE Academy in Bishkek in February 2010. This Network meeting was scheduled to coincide with our three month follow up visit with participants of the programme, to monitor and evaluate the project and consider the further potential for the programme (see Section II for Monitoring and Evaluation Activities).

3. Providing the opportunity for academic validation

One aim of the Pilot Project was to determine how the training programme could be designed so as to provide formal recognition of participation: for credit to be given towards a masters level Diploma in Human Rights at either of the London-based Universities.

Short Courses in human rights are offered through other universities in the UK, but the specific aims of this programme are designed to respond to the professional needs of human rights defenders in a given region. By creating a curriculum designed in particular to respond to HRDs working in 'at risk' areas, the programme is unique and its development was influenced by: participants' responses to pre-training questionnaires; the project team's expert knowledge of the area; and numerous consultations and meetings with experts working in the region. In this way, the project team sought to provide real attention to detail in the course design, and gave considerable time and effort to tailoring the taught modules to the particular needs of the HRDs in this region.

The programme was successful in being approved for accreditation toward a Masters level Diploma in Human Rights at London Metropolitan University (LondonMet). The participants all passed their exams (50% pass rate) in Module 1, and all passed their practical 'in country training' assignment for completion of Module 2. Participants who pass the final coursework (a written essay) for Module 3 (assessment still in progress) will be eligible for 15 credit hours toward a Masters Diploma. The written essay work has proven to be challenging for the participants, because of language skills and their lack of academic training. However, to overcome the language problem, the LondonMet academic quality unit has approved accreditation for essay submissions in the Russian language. Participants have also received further information and support as to the requirements in producing an essay to the requisite standard. The participants have been given the opportunity to submit final essays by mid-March 2010. In our last formal meeting in Bishkek in February 2010, all participants received London Metropolitan University Certificates acknowledging their completion of the pilot programme. Their essay marks (which will be forthcoming) will then determine their eligibility for UK credit validation. London Metropolitan University offers Certificates, Diplomas and Degrees, in both an LLM in Human Rights and Masters of Arts in Human Rights and Social Justice. The HRSJ Institute at LondonMet and Middlesex University are currently pursuing other opportunities to support Masters level courses in human rights in Central Asia (see Section 2 – Project Monitoring and Evaluation Activities).

Middlesex University were involved in the evaluation of the participants, but were not satisfied that they would be able to meet the home criteria for a Masters level enrolment and thus this option was not pursued, though participants were encouraged to re-engage with the process once they had reached a satisfactory level of English language.

Middlesex University has validated a new Masters programme (LLM in Law, worth 180 credits) which is also deliverable as either a Postgraduate Diploma in Law (60 credits) or a Postgraduate Certificate in Law (120 credits). This has meant that candidates who meet the assessment criteria and are able to undertake the appropriate reading through the course are eligible to be registered as full or part-time students at the University.

For participants to be eligible for a postgraduate certificate at Middlesex University, candidates would also be required to undertake a Work Based Learning Module, which examines the extent to which the discourses they studied during the course could be utilised in their workplace. Successful completion of this and the additional assessments for each of the three modules studied would provide the candidates with a postgraduate certificate/diploma which would act as a basis should they decide to later undertake a piece of postgraduate level research culminating in a dissertation. While several candidates were keen to pursue this option, the language barrier proved to be

insurmountable and thus it was not possible to award any candidate credits towards this Masters programme. Due to this process Middlesex does however now have the means to award such degrees in places where English is more widespread and where University external examiners can be satisfied that the candidates abroad have met the same standard as home candidates.

4. Team building to ensure meaningful follow-up and sustainable relationships amongst HRDs

The participants have made specific commitments and set deadlines for concrete activities and plans for future activities through the *Central Asian Human Rights Defender Network*. We discuss in the following section how they intend to follow-up their activities, and create a sustainable network with specific focuses. Section II will also identify external organisations which could provide assistance to their efforts.

II. Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

A monitoring and evaluation visit was conducted from February 19 – 25, 2010 in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan and Almaty, Kazakhstan.

1. Meeting with participants in the programme

i. On February 20th 2010, the project team met with 17 participants in Bishkek to discuss their progress in the programme.² The project team members gave feedback to the participants on their work during the course, described the academic accreditation system at London Metropolitan University and more generally, the system for Masters level study within the UK. We discussed the opportunity for participants to submit their final essays in Russian for credit toward a Masters level Diploma. Guidance on academic essay-writing was also provided.

ii. On February 20th and 21st the participants discussed their professional activities since our last meeting in Bishkek in November 2009. A joint research project proposal was written and submitted to Soros Foundation/Open Society Institute Office in New York. The proposed research is to be carried out by participants from Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan (The Center for Support of International Protection, Osh Kyrgyzstan and the Kazakh International Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law), to study security and protection for labour migrants in the migration process. Another participant from Kazakhstan had organised (with the assistance of others in the Network) a two day international conference on women's rights to be held in Almaty on February 22nd. She emphasised the difficulties and work involved to bring together participants from Chechnya and state authorities from Turkmenistan. A participant from Uzbekistan had contributed to the Human Rights Watch Annual Report and was attending a HRW meeting in Brussels on February 23. Other participants shared current problems they are facing in their work, and discussed particularly difficult recent human rights cases which they had worked on since the last meeting in November 2009.

On Feb 21st, the 'Strategy Meeting of Central Asian Human Rights Defenders to Establish a Regional Human Rights Defenders Network' was held at the OSCE Academy Bishkek from 9:00 am – 6:30 pm (see Annex 5 'Strategy Meeting Agenda').

² 18 participants agreed to participate in the 3 Module programme, with 17 participants completing the programme. Please see explanation on page 20, Section III. iv. Attrition

In attendance were all the participants of the pilot project programme, who are now also the founding membership base of the Network (6 HRDs from Uzbekistan, 8 HRDs from Kazakhstan, 3 HRDs from Kyrgyzstan + 1 new Kyrgyz member from the OSCE legal aid centre Bishkek). Also in attendance were: Anna Natsvlishvili, Project Coordinator and Lawyer at the Human Rights Centre (HRIDC) Georgia; ODIHR HRD Focal Point officer; OSCE Academy observers; UNOHCHR Human Rights Officer; HRW Researcher for Uzbekistan, and our project team.

The main decisions and achievements of the Strategy Meeting were as follows:

- Members completed a first draft of a Network Memorandum of Understanding (Annex 6 'Draft Moue')
- the South Caucasus (SC) HRD Network Coordinator provided advice and assistance in establishing a similar network in Central Asia (Annex 7 'Recommendations from the SC Network Coordinator')
- the scope and process for making the Network operational was discussed and agreed to in detail
- Management and leadership roles were defined in the three countries involved, with further outreach in other countries of Central Asia to be carried out by appointed Network members
- the Network will initially not be in the public domain³
- it was agreed that the priority of the Network will be to work toward establishing a regional security mechanism for HRDs at risk and their family members.⁴
- developed a plan for the review and comparative analysis of national legislation affecting NGOs' work (freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of expression, freedom of association, access to a fair trial)
- an ethical code for the Network was developed, highlighting the following points: non violent/promoting peace; confidentiality/respect of all members; non abusive/attention to personal responsibility
- the Network will be open to invite *Active Participants, Informed Participants* and *Experts*⁵
- the Network intends to expand geographically to all Central Asian countries
- the funding of Network activities was discussed, and is to be revisited when the platform is further developed

2. Meetings with stakeholders in the region

In [February 2010] the project team members met with the following stakeholders in the region to assess levels of capacity for support for human rights activities and to discuss in particular support for the Network.

- Human Rights Watch - Researcher for Uzbekistan

³ There was a lengthy discussion on networks the participants have been, or are, a part of and why these networks succeed or fail. A concern was raised that in Uzbekistan the authorities find networks threatening, thus security issues around creating the CA Network must be considered for Uzbek HRDs to take part. Also raised was the need to maintain respect and constructive dialogue with Uzbek authorities, and it must be considered carefully if the Network is to enter the public domain at a future stage.

⁴ The South Caucasus model gave the CA Network direction on setting up a regional security mechanism, mechanisms to consider are: hot line for providing swift and practical assistance to HRDs and family members in need; medical costs for HRDs in need; legal defence costs; psycho social support; relocation to another city or country.

⁵ Please see Annex 5 Draft MoU for details and definitions

- OSCE/ODIHR – OSCE Ambassador, Kyrgyzstan and ODIHR Human Rights Defender Unit Advisor
- UNOHCHR – Human Rights Programme Officers, Kyrgyzstan
- UNICEF - Head of Mission and Programme Officer, Kyrgyzstan
- UNHCR - Programme Officer (for cross border and internal migration), Kazakhstan
- USAID - Democracy and Governance Advisor, Programme Officers for Media/Communications and Human Rights Programs in Uzbekistan
- Legal Policy Research Center, Kazakhstan - Director
- Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law, Kazakhstan – Acting Director and lawyers (four of our participants)

Our meetings with the above organisations were informational, with our aim (directly or indirectly) being to assess the level of involvement, interest and commitment to support human rights defenders in the region generally, and more specifically to identify possible support links to the developing work of the Central Asian HRD Network.

Summary of meeting outcomes

Human Rights Watch will continue to directly engage with the Network members, particularly on issues of protection. UNOHCHR and ODIHR will support future meetings necessary to allow space and engagement of the Network Country leaders, in support of their planning and particularly useful initiatives. ODIHR is also interested to help support linkages of the CA Network with the South Caucasus Network and other networks, as is appropriate. UNHCR is interested in activities that promote human rights education and the UNHCR officer is interested to liaise further with the Network in this area and on issues of cross-migration (which includes interest in their proposed research project referred to earlier in this report).

We have discussed with OSCE the possibility of engagement with national institutions and specifically engagement of civil society with the Kyrgyzstan Ombudsman Office. OSCE is open to members of the Network discussing possible future activities with the OSCE Human Dimension Officer. In informal meetings with international organisation representatives, it was revealed that there are serious problems at present with the functioning of the Kyrgyzstan Ombudsman Office, and at present such interaction with the HRD Network is not advised. We had a similar response from international organisation members in Almaty in regards to the Kazakhstan Ombudsman.

UNICEF Kyrgyzstan informed us of their current projects, and made note in particular of the declining number of teachers in the country, primarily due to lack of professional training and low wages. Within the CEE/CIS region, UNICEF reports that Kyrgyzstan has a startling rate of 88% of 15 year old students ranking at the lowest level of literacy in reading, mathematics and science. Training teachers and enhancing teaching capacity is of primary concern. UNICEF is also supporting activities that address disabilities and vulnerable groups of children in rural environments, and there is the possibility that the activities of some of the Network members may benefit from knowledge and engagement with UNICEF offices (See Section IV - Recommendations for Sustaining Central Asian Human Rights Capacity).

USAID in Kazakhstan is currently working with members of the Network in Uzbekistan, and showed much interest in the three country initiative to form a regional HRD Network, with their particular interest in how the Network will address issues of security for HRDs. It appeared that USAID interest in providing project support for the Network would be better received if an international partner were engaged in a management capacity within a proposed project.

The Acting Head of the Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law showed her support for her colleagues who are active members (and the Coordinator) of the CA HRD Network. As the running of the Network represents additional work for already busy lawyers at the 'Bureau,' her support of their time devoted to the Network is encouraging. The Network members we met with at the Bureau reported that activities planned in our Bishkek meeting a few days prior were already underway, and they were satisfied that the Network members from all three countries involved are committed to achieving their aims.

We met with the Director of the Legal Policy Research Centre in Almaty. The Centre is active in numerous areas - writing position papers and making recommendations for legal reform. Areas of focus include: modernising administrative justice; legislative issues, reform and access of the judiciary; analysis of the draft law on the internet; criminal reform issues and the introduction of juries. Impressively, her office is working throughout all of the Central Asian countries. She is in close contact with many of the members of the Network in Kazakhstan and is willing to lend support to them where she can. Her suggestion is that the Network should take advantage now of the plans of the upcoming Lithuanian OSCE Chairmanship to form an NGO Council.⁶ We have informed the Network Coordinator of our meetings, and the possibility to learn more of tactical directions from information provided through the Legal Policy Research Centre.

3. Meetings with academics and donor agencies

In February 2010 the project team met with the following persons from academic institutions and donor agencies to discuss prospects for furthering human rights education nationally and regionally, with international support if needed.

Kyrgyzstan:

- American University, Bishkek - Dean of Law Faculty, Director of Social Research Center, Chair and Professor of International and Comparative Politics Dept, Social Anthropologist/Migration Specialist, Law Dept Lecturers
- OSCE Academy, Kyrgyzstan - Director
- Soros Foundation, Kyrgyzstan – Executive Director, Law Program Director

Kazakhstan:

- KIMEP University, Almaty - Dean College of Social Sciences, Chair Dept of Law, Chair Dept of Journalism, Chair of Dept of International Relations, Lecturer in Dept of Public Administration
- East Kazakh State University - Dean of Law
- Soros Foundation, Kazakhstan – Law Reform Program Coordinators

Summary of meeting outcomes

Our meetings with the above organisations were again informational, with our aim (directly or indirectly) being to assess the level involvement, interest and commitment to support human rights education in the region nationally and/or transnationally, and more specifically to discuss ways in

⁶ Please see press statement from Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on civil society engagement plans for OSCE Chairmanship 2011: <http://www.urm.lt/index.php?701356042>

which to infuse masters level teaching of human rights into higher education curricula (in law and other human rights related disciplines).

The American University in Bishkek (AU) is working to create curriculum, research and academic activities that address current human rights problems and that introduce human rights frameworks into students' thinking. Currently AU offers only undergraduate programmes, however the law faculty and the international relations department are committed to creating masters' level degrees in human rights. The law faculty has been in discussions with Soros/OSI to help finance an LLM programme, which would be the first masters' level degree in law available in Kyrgyzstan. AU believes the masters' programme will attract students from other countries of Central Asia, particularly those that cannot afford to study abroad, and those that cannot afford the cost of KIMEP University (based in Almaty, Kazakhstan) which currently offers a Masters Degree in International Relations. The Dean of the AU Law Faculty is very interested to work with our universities in establishing a Masters Programme in Human Rights. Following our Bishkek meeting, AU has sent through draft proposals of two Masters Programmes in Human Rights for our comments and is seeking academic support, such as our providing guest lecturers (see Section IV - Recommendations for Sustaining Central Asian Human Rights Capacity).

East Kazakh State University is also interested to set up a Masters Degree in Human Rights Law, and the Dean of the Law Faculty is one of the participants in our programme, a member of the CA HRD Network, and Head of the East Kazakh Office of the Bureau for Human Rights and Rule of Law. We have discussed ways in which we can partner, provide curriculum, and/or provide visiting lectureships to such a programme, and we will be discussing this further with East Kazakh State University.

KIMEP University's School of Social Sciences began discussions with us in September 2009, and in a subsequent meeting with us in February 2010, we were informed that the School is now working on many fronts to develop a Masters' degree in Human Rights Law. They are currently adding human rights curriculum into other disciplines of study (the departments represented at the meeting updated us on their current activities). KIMEP is looking into possible partnerships where we may be able to work with them to further these aims. We will continue working with them as they present their ideas.

The OSCE Centre and OSCE Academy are already active in teaching courses in human rights. We are currently discussing ideas to continue support for civil society development and human rights education in the region with them, and will continue to work with them in areas of HRD training and lectureships, possibly for their next course offered in Autumn 2010.

The Soros Foundation in both Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan are very interested to support initiatives to further human rights education in the region with state HEIs. In both countries, Soros has initiated discussions with deans of law faculties, and has sought our interest to engage with the deans to discuss practical ways in which to incorporate international (human rights) law into the curriculum. We are continuing to engage with Soros on ways in which we can approach these and other human rights education initiatives.

4. Note on other meetings

National Institutions:

We did not meet with state authorities during the Monitoring and Evaluation visit, as time constraints did not permit us to establish relationships during the duration of the taught modules,

and meetings at this stage would not have strengthened our project aims. However, we have discussed setting up further meetings with deans of taught faculties within state universities, and we would also then engage with the Ministry of Education in relevant countries, if linkages for academic programmes develop. We also would like to meet with other relevant ministries and national institutions as called for in the development of our further work in the region.

Uzbekistan:

Uzbekistan was not visited. For security reasons, the project coordinator arranged for Uzbek HRDs to travel outside of the country (to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan) to take part in the programme, and we worked closely with the British Embassy in Tashkent in providing support for the HRDs. Engagement with Uzbekistan was avidly discussed with stakeholders in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan concerned with the situation of HRDs in Uzbekistan, and much of our programme focus was concerned with supporting Uzbekistan HRDs from a regional perspective. In regards to education inroads in Uzbekistan, KIMEP noted a useful contact they have been working with in Uzbekistan in support of academic development in law, with the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan, Tashkent State Law Institute, International Affairs Department.

International:

Just prior to our Central Asia visit, the project coordinator met with Margaret Sekaggya, UN Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders (meeting at Dublin 5th Platform for HRDs, Feb 11, 2010) to discuss research areas needed to strengthen HRD protection, with an aim to assess how best to ensure that governments engage meaningfully with civil society. Any future research activities in this area will have impact on third country human rights defenders at risk, including Central Asia.

III. Analysis of Outcome of Project

1. Project Successes

i. Increased professional capacity and standing of Central Asian HRD participants

All the participants were able to develop their skills and knowledge base, their understanding of the legitimate and valuable role they play in their societies as HRDs, and their confidence significantly, as is evidenced by the outcomes detailed below. These beneficial outcomes are in large part a result of the carefully targeted approach of the trainers, who ensured that the topics and issues discussed were geared towards the particular needs of the participants, as determined by analysing the answers given by the latter to detailed questions about the current gaps in their knowledge, and by studying and analysing the specific environment in which the participants were working.

- All the participants were able to develop their knowledge through 3 targeted and intensively-focused modules which qualified them for post-graduate level human rights study. Certification earned has credit bearing potential toward postgraduate courses at London Metropolitan University, which will be available for those who submit a final essay for academic assessment.

All participants achieved a pass mark (50 %) in the examination to test knowledge acquired in Module 1.

Formal validation of their educational attainment is an important factor in increasing their professional standing within civil society and in the eyes of the international community,

including international NGOs, international inter-governmental organisations, international funders and embassies, and may, particularly in the longer-term, give them enhanced credibility in dealing with state officials.

Certification has also made the participants more aware of the value of human rights education, particularly the importance of according due recognition to the knowledge and expertise gained so as to retain and attract more people to the human rights field, and the possibility of doing further advanced research in this area. Because of the language barriers, however, further formal education and research may not necessarily take place in the UK.

- Participants in the programme have also developed various skills and capabilities – including their ability to disseminate knowledge and skills much more widely, as was demonstrated in the presentations about the training they conducted in-country.

The trainers were impressed by all the presentations (the test assessment for Module 2), particularly in terms of their professionalism and their creativity. For example, two of the Kazakh participants targeted journalists because they felt that few of them understood the potential they had to incorporate human rights into their work. One concentrated on the teaching of better interview techniques, as learnt in the programme, and the importance of protecting their sources. Another Kazakh participant and a Kyrgyz participant targeted state officials, prison officials in the first instance and border guards in the second, to make them more aware of the human rights implications of their work, particularly on a practical level. The Kazakh training was televised locally and received a positive press review. One of Uzbek participants organised a training with younger colleagues from their organisation focusing on the use of the EU Guidelines on HRDs, with an action component to apply what they learnt with visits to a number of EU member state embassies in Tashkent and then reporting back on their experiences.

The opportunity to design and prepare training for others, utilising recently-acquired knowledge and training tools (flash drives with curriculum) was a positive experience which tested participants' understanding through their ability to teach. This underscored the importance of effective outreach in connection with their work, and of supporting the development of future HRD leaders. This is particularly relevant in the context of Central Asia, as all participants raised concerns about a younger generation being able to take over the leadership of the human rights movement in future and the difficulty of engaging with the wider population on human rights matters.

- HRDs have acquired an enhanced awareness and knowledge of human rights mechanisms available to them, and are using skills learned in the programme in order to engage more effectively with these mechanisms, particularly in connection with the submission of written communications.

A majority of participants had stated a need for more training in this area in the questionnaires that they completed at the very beginning of the programme, and in the follow-up evaluations, many of them commented on how useful this information would be in terms of their future work.

Having an understanding of how and when to refer to these mechanisms properly has provided the participants with another tangible means of raising awareness of the situation

in their countries, and of particular cases, and of engaging the assistance of international organisations to put pressure on their governments to end human rights violations.

- The increase in knowledge and skills competence will enable further knowledge transfers between the participants and other HRDs in the region, given that the participants are committed to human rights education as a priority for the Central Asian HRD Network (see Annex 5 'Draft Module').

In the feedback received, some of the participants have stated their intention to continue with the 'train the trainers' activities, and continue to teach curriculum from the taught Modules; all appear committed to improving and furthering educational opportunities for activists defending human rights in particularly challenging environments.

HRSJ and Middlesex University Law Department are currently in discussion with various universities in Central Asia to offer similar taught Modules on a larger scale (as outlined above).

- The programme also enabled the participants to reflect on the universality of human rights and the implications of such a principle for their work. Having to acknowledge the rights of those facing societal prejudice or marginalisation, often in addition to persecution and/or discrimination by state officials, in plenary discussions and group exercises, made participants more aware of those whose rights may be particularly at risk of being violated and of the need to consider how to take on board these concerns in their work. Choosing specifically to focus on minority rights in Module 3 was, in part, an acknowledgement that more needs to be done to address the problems faced by the most marginalised in their societies.

In terms of the dissemination of human rights knowledge more generally, the participants discussed the need to get a wider cross-section of society involved in the human rights dialogue, particularly the younger generation who appear to be less willing to take risks which might compromise their career ambitions and earning potential, at least in the short term. Many of the participants, as well as the project team, came to realise that creating a structure in Central Asia which allows for structured educational and professional development and advancement in this field, particularly at the university level, could help to make human rights a more respectable career choice.

ii. Increased opportunities for working collectively

The pilot project allowed participants to appreciate the positive impact of working with a much wider group of people, both nationally and transnationally, and to do this more effectively, not least by using their newly acquired knowledge and skills as a means of enhancing the perceived legitimacy and acceptance of civil society engagement in human rights work.

- A critical component of this training was to establish networks of trust to enable the pooling of scarce resources and information sharing, and provide for the development of relevant protection mechanisms. This was achieved on multiple fronts.

Allowing HRDs to build trust and to understand each other's concerns and working methods, over the course of three weeks, has resulted in the participants looking for ways to continue their collaboration in future.

Participants are now working together on individual cases, e.g., a Kyrgyz participant is working with two Uzbek participants on the case of a Kyrgyz citizen being tried in Uzbekistan for being an instigator at Andijan in 2005, and another Kyrgyz participant is working with Kazakh participants on a project examining the human rights violations connected with labour migration. Much of the impetus for the protection mechanism of the Network comes from participants' concern for their Uzbek colleagues in the programme. These working relationships mean that the participants are genuinely concerned about each other's welfare, which has obvious benefits in terms of furthering their protection.

More generally, the plenary discussions and practical exercises during the Modules have allowed the participants to reflect on what is effective in terms of their work, and what is less so, and to understand the value of sharing this analysis. This was the case both in relation to their own work and that of their colleagues. In terms of building trust and understanding the need to broaden the leadership of the human rights movement in the region, the trainers were particularly impressed by the way in which the participants ensured that everyone was given the opportunity to lead an activity or discussion group, particularly from Module 2 onward, without any prompting.

The significance of this achievement should not be underestimated. Before the pilot programme was initiated, there were few links between the various individuals and organisations involved. The situation in Uzbekistan was particularly difficult, with HRDs divided by competition to secure funding for their projects from a very limited pool, and mistrust about motives and intentions.

Feedback received from an HRW researcher who observed during trainings sessions underlines the above:

In my capacity as temporary researcher on Uzbekistan at Human Rights Watch, I work closely with the human rights community in Uzbekistan and for some years now have had working relationships with most of the Uzbek defenders who participated in the training/strategy meeting.

The Uzbek human rights community, much like other human rights communities in Central Asia, is dominated by strong personalities who often are more competitive than they are collaborative. This tendency is further exacerbated by a fair bit of suspicion of one another.

That is why it was so extraordinary to witness the human rights defenders collaborating on the draft memorandum of understanding at the strategy meeting, an event made possible, in large part, by the discussions and trainings lead by the London Metropolitan University and Middlesex University that preceded it. In one afternoon, with the guidance of xx xxx, a human rights defender from Georgia who leads a similar network in the Caucasus, the Central Asian defenders were able to put aside their differences and negotiate the wording of the draft memorandum of understanding that is to be the basis for further collaboration in the region. The negotiation process took place without the participation of any of the university lecturers or organizers, and it alone serves as great testament to the growth and education of these defenders over the last two years.

Particularly in Uzbekistan, but also to some degree in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, openly discussing human rights advocacy strategies, available international mechanisms, and even

the personal human rights experiences of defenders, all come at personal risk. From the start, the training program facilitated an essential component of successful human rights work – information sharing. In a safe environment, these defenders were able to discuss their human rights experiences while reaping the benefit of hearing others' opinions on matters of security, response and advocacy. The Network has potential to succeed, but there is real need for further support of this initiative.

Feedback from the ODIHR (OSCE) was also very positive:

The Network is at its initial steps but its members are very motivated and willing to work together. ODIHR stands ready to further support the Network, continue assessing its needs and identify means to address them. In this regards, ODIHR would like to underline the excellent collaboration with the Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute (HRSJ) of the London Metropolitan University (LMU) that initiated and led the capacity building programme of the human rights defenders that resulted in the creation of the network. LMU has been instrumental in providing opportunities to human rights defenders from Central Asia to link up, share experiences and expertise. This initiative would need to be followed-up and ODIHR would be keen on continue the fruitful cooperation with LMU.

- The participants are now well placed to create a more formalised regional HRD/NGO platform, in support of building human rights capacity both nationally and in the region. The pilot project aim to facilitate the establishment of a potentially sustainable working group or a forum amongst the HRDs has been achieved.

Evidently the specific achievement in this regard is the creation of the Network, as is illustrated by its core mission and objectives stated in the draft Memorandum of Understanding of the Network, which is to be finalised in the coming weeks. It should be emphasized that the Memorandum was drafted and agreed by the participants themselves, and that the trainers had no involvement in this - although for a number of reasons, as will be explored below, the participants would still like the project team to be involved in the development of the Network.

- In the longer term, this initiative may result in a more extensive Central Asia Network, with network members planning to include all Central Asian countries, with the aim to strengthen human rights defender networks throughout the region.

The participants have been very keen to reach out to colleagues in the other Central Asian countries, which were not involved in the pilot project and have tried to include relevant human rights and civil society representatives in their work. One of the Kazakh participants went to great lengths to ensure that a representative from Turkmenistan was able to participate in an initiative organised by her NGO.

Ultimately the setting up of a well-run and well regarded regional network will lead to increased solidarity between HRDs and human rights NGOs. Increased solidarity is likely to make the human rights movement more sustainable.

It is also likely in the longer term to increase the legitimacy of HRDs and human rights organisations and could generate more support from society more generally to engage on

these issues, because nothing devalues their work and standing more than entrenched infighting.

- The creation of meaningful support networks between the participants and other human rights organisations and the defenders in Central Asia, Europe and elsewhere has been markedly strengthened.

The Project Coordinator has worked to involve human rights organisations internationally in the planning, implementation and assessment stages of the programme. The dialogue between the project team and human rights organisations has resulted in the work and the concerns of the participants being more widely recognised, better understood, and their security risks more effectively addressed.

Ana Natsvlishvili, the South Caucasus Network of Human Rights Defenders Country Coordinator for Georgia, working at the Human Rights Center in Tbilisi, attended the follow up meeting in Bishkek in February 2010 (funded by ODIHR) to provide guidance and support toward the Central Asian HRDs' creation of a successful network. Plans for further engagement between the two regional networks are underway. The South Caucasus Network will provide a website page for the Central Asian Network during the start up period, and ODIHR and the HRSJ Institute are discussing how to further the cooperative work between the two regions (also see section II meetings).

The Pilot Project has opened new lines of communication between academics, the FCO and EU representatives, human rights defenders, associations and organisations, and intergovernmental organisations. These lines of communication provide important and potentially create sustainable partnerships in supporting human rights defenders.

Although many HRDs already had some connections with Embassy staff, academia and funders, making the HRDs aware of the importance of networking and providing them with further opportunities to engage with these officials and representatives has enabled them to work constructively with a broader range of relevant actors and will also confer added protection benefits.

That they can now do this more effectively, particularly as a group, was demonstrated by one of the Kazakh participants addressing the needs of HRDs in the region, to funders and an EU member state embassy invited to one of the training sessions. Without any prompting from the project team, she took on the role of spokesperson and summarised the concerns of her fellow participants, represented as a group. This initiative had been discussed and planned by the participants to make the most of the meeting. These types of initiatives were voiced as ways in which to succeed in 'constructive dialogue', and attest to a raised sense of confidence among participants.

iii. Strengthening links with national institutions

Throughout the programme there was discussion about the importance of HRD engagement with national institutions. The aim to address civil society engagement with national institutions and relevant government officials and departments, whilst being attentive to security risks, was met, within the realistic national contexts that the HRDs work in.

Given that ultimately, national governments are responsible, and held to account, for ensuring that rights are realised, getting the relevant governmental authorities to invest the necessary political capital and resources is crucial. But if the necessary political will is absent, which it is to a greater or lesser extent in these countries, getting HRDs to engage constructively is a very sensitive and difficult matter. It is important to identify issues on which the Governments may be prepared to engage. More generally, however, it must be recognised that the timeline will necessarily be long-term, and that potential windows of opportunity must be identified and prepared for.

The recently established Network recognises the value of establishing a constructive dialogue with governmental authorities and has included this as a key objective of the Network.

As mentioned above, some participants have already engaged with government officials to transfer their knowledge and to ensure they understand the importance of relevant human rights standards being applied in their daily work.

The fact that the participants themselves chose to focus on constructive dialogue and national institution engagement in Module 3 also illustrates their understanding of the need to work constructively with government officials, when this is a possibility, to make improvements in the human rights situation. The project team was very mindful of the concrete benefits of this session and the importance of strengthening links with national institutions, and worked to give support to the HRDs to find issues where there is the possibility of engaging with government authorities.

Our ongoing initiatives to partner with, or support, universities in the region will engage the relevant ministries (e.g. Ministries of Education in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan), and our work toward this aim is referred to in other sections of this report.

2. Project Obstacles

i. Communication barriers

The fact that trainers and participants did not share a common language presented two main difficulties.

The first problem was that the delivery of the training and other related activities could only be as good as the interpretation facilities and skills available. In Bishkek, the standard of interpretation was very high. In Almaty, however, because of the high demand for interpreters by the international business community, it was not possible within the budgetary constraints to employ interpreters who were able to provide professional simultaneous standard, as opposed to consecutive interpretation. In future, therefore, we will consult a greater number of sub-contractors to understand the market costs for support needs to the project. Further consideration will be given to the availability of suitable interpretation facilities in a given location, though this often fluctuates between the time when a proposal is written and the actual project implementation dates. There apparently was a huge fluctuation in prices in Kazakhstan due to the devaluing sterling and the banking crisis, which had an impact in terms of determining the budgetary allocation required.

The lack of a common language also complicated the delivery of logistical support in Central Asia for the participants, in areas such as arranging travel to the location of the training.

More specifically, with the added security concerns to be borne in mind when dealing with participants from Uzbekistan, it was helpful to be able to speak to the participants directly or to

contact them using more secure forms of communication. The assistance of UK embassy staff and FCO staff to facilitate this when required was very responsive and very much appreciated.

Security concerns, which in some cases, limits the possibility of using the e-mail or phone, may also make it more difficult for participants from different countries to work together in future. These issues were raised in our deliberations as a group.

ii. Travel restrictions

Because of the expected difficulty (impossibility) of getting the Government of Uzbekistan to approve the necessary visas for the project activities, it was not possible to have one of the Modules delivered in Uzbekistan.

In addition, it is feared that because of the increasingly restrictive travel measures being applied, in particular to Kyrgyz citizens travelling to Uzbekistan, the ability of the participants to meet and work on projects together could be made more complicated.

iii. Lack of political will

Though the programme emphasised the importance of working with government officials to ensure that human rights obligations were being met, and the participants are willing to do this, the fact that the Governments of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan are resistant to engaging with civil society, and human rights organisations in particular, cannot be ignored.

The many reports that the trainers received about the persecution of human rights defenders in all these countries and the very serious situation facing human rights defenders in Uzbekistan warranted a cautious approach, and one in which the participants had the ultimate responsibility for deciding how much risk they were willing to take on. It should be noted in this regard that foreign governments also face unwelcome consequences when raising human rights concerns, particularly when they touch on the very sensitive realm of political and civil rights.

In fact, those government authorities in the region who should be most concerned and interested in building bridges with human rights defenders were often not very helpful and engagement with them was often counter-productive or even posed very real dangers. The project team heard negative reports, for instance, on two of the human rights ombudsmen in the region.

The programme therefore had to ensure that the participants' very real security needs were addressed and that a balance was struck between the participants' safety and encouraging engagement with government officials. Advocating engagement has important implications, and throughout the programme, these decisions were led by the HRD experts who know best their environments. The trainers could only assist, in a very general way, the participants in making judgements about whether engagement on a particular issue or case would be constructive or even prudent.

Assisting the participants in engaging more effectively with the international community becomes very important in these "at risk" contexts, because the connections made may be the only way HRDs can sustain themselves financially (it was noted that very few of the participants had a regular salary) and psychologically. The international community can also be more motivated by local human rights defenders to act in international fora, to pressure the relevant governments to do more on human rights. The interaction thus creates a virtuous circle.

Sometimes these ties can confer definite advantages in terms of protection, and are therefore useful to publicise, but sometimes the opposite is the case, and the relationships are best kept low-key.

It should be noted that the participants explained that the Government of Uzbekistan in particular is so fearful of the potential consequences of people coming together to work on human rights issues that it tries to stop this happening. Uzbek participants said that they were most likely to get into trouble with government officials when collective action was undertaken. It is for this reason therefore the Network will function informally and without publicising its membership, at its inception, so as not to bring its members, particularly those from Uzbekistan to the attention of governmental authorities.

The main thing to underline here is that getting the relevant governments to engage, without putting human rights defenders at too much risk, is a long-term undertaking which will require a joint enterprise of local human rights defenders and relevant actors in the international community.

iv. Attrition

The trainers were very pleased by the commitment shown by the participants to the training over the three Modules. Where a few participants at the onset of the programme were not available to attend, we were quickly approached by other individuals who wanted to take their places, and this did not pose a problem. Once the group was in place, there were only a few participants not able to attend Module 3 - one because of work commitments, another because he was not allowed to go by the government, and the last because of family difficulties. They were however able to complete the module, by completed their work at the next meeting.

More generally, however, the participants noted that human rights work is becoming less attractive as a profession. This is not only because of the risks it can pose to the individual and his or her family members, but because of the lack of status and the financial sacrifices involved. This is particularly true where there are other more lucrative career opportunities available for young and talented people, as in Kazakhstan for instance. But educational opportunities in Central Asia are a critical component of this problem.

As mentioned above, providing a more structured and formal educational and professional framework in the mid to long term might address some of these problems. Because these initiatives can raise the suspicions of the governments in these countries, however, the way in which this is done has to be carefully considered. Education takes many forms, and travel, further international engagement and exposure will contribute to the interest and commitment of future human rights defenders.

IV. Recommendations for Sustaining Central Asian Human Rights Capacity

Our recommendations for the sustainability of the capacity of the Central Asian Network relate to three areas in which we propose further work could be done to continue to develop ongoing initiatives:

- (1) Support for the Central Asian Human Rights Defenders Network;
- (2) Developing a masters programme in human rights law/public international law; and

(3) Capacity-building through partnerships.

1. Support for the Central Asian Human Rights Defenders Network

i. Developing contacts with inter-governmental agencies to make them aware of the emerging network, to solicit their support for the venture and to offer the network as a resource for human rights activity

The following agencies have already been contacted: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, OSCE (OSCE Ambassador, Bishkek), OIDHR, the OSCE Academy (Bishkek), UNICEF, UNHCR. It is clear that each of these institutions face considerable challenges vis-à-vis their own human rights related activities in Central Asia. Our goal was to make them aware of the recently established Network with a view to garnering support for individual HRDs and the organisations they represent, as well as creating a supporting layer of protection for the Network as a whole. Many of these agencies are engaging in concerted research and advocacy work in areas in which the Network has collective skills and specialist knowledge. Utilising the members of the Network for research projects has the important value of validating their existence and building confidence in them as individuals, and supporting organisations and the network. In addition it was felt that in terms of monitoring activities the Network could provide additional streams of information which could be utilised in international organisations' reporting of human rights issues in the region.

ii. Contact with funding organisations and agencies

The project team focussed on building links with the Soros Foundation through the Open Society Initiative (OSI) in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. OSI were informed of future activities that could be undertaken by the network and in both countries the OSI Legal Officers (with a mandate for human rights) were clearly impressed by the individual members of the Network. Contact was also made with USAID which funds projects in the region. By initiating discussions, the project team sought to act as an interlocutor between the Network and the funders. Most of the organisations that comprise the Network have experience of obtaining funding from the OSI: in fact it was clear to us, that as in other parts of the world, the competition for scarce funds can often lead to a lack of trust among human rights organisations that share similar goals. Our objective was to create 'brand awareness' of the Network, but also to seek to persuade funders that additional, specific region-wide calls for funding would not only work to strengthen human rights defenders' standing in civil society, but would also ensure greater interaction and cohesion among the various organisations that make up the Network.

iii. Research Support

One of the aims of the Network is for the members to work amongst themselves, to support and to strengthen each others research by combining their individual expertise, and where useful, to collaborate on specific research projects. The project team is also able to provide research support to the Network where possible, and when the need arises, as both universities have strengths in carrying out research. For example, one of the projects currently ongoing is to work with the Legal Resource Centre (Almaty) which produces short policy papers on the issue of minority rights. The topic has been selected to take advantage of the Kazakh presidency of the OSCE's oft-stated position to strengthen multiculturalism and diversity. These papers are also readily available to Network members, who have close associations with the Legal Resource Centre. Similarly, topic papers could be written in partnership with the Network members. The project team is also

available to provide advice, support and recommendations as may be needed, at the Network's request.

iv. Study Visits

The Universities are prepared to receive individuals from the Network who seek to undertake a study visit to the United Kingdom or to facilitate such visits to other parts of the world that offer relevant models with which the Defenders would be interested to engage. In this context the project team is willing to act as a resource to facilitate contact between other regions where HRDS are also in need of support (see Section V - Feasibility for Duplication). The support would consist of creating links between the Central Asian HRDs and others with a view to preparing a funding application to donors. In addition, Network members have expressed interest in establishing links in Russia, other Former Soviet Union countries, India and the Middle East. The project team has strong contacts in these areas and facilitating contact between appropriate organisations and the individuals concerned would be made a priority should a particular request be made. In addition both Universities have the capacity to accept scholars for a term should they wish to pursue a particular research-oriented project concerning their activities as HRDs.

v. Guidance in drafting Funding Applications

The project team is committed to providing resources towards the scrutiny and oversight of funding applications that may be made by the Network. This is an important role since there is only limited expertise in fundraising within the organisation(s), and further support is needed to make strong funding applications at an international level. In this context the project team would be able to notify the Network of appropriate funding opportunities (for joint or separate applications).

2. Developing a masters programme in human rights law/public international law

It is arguable that one of the reasons for the success of the establishment of a strong international human rights movement, has been its location primarily within University law faculties. As such faculties are traditionally among the more 'conservative' of University faculties, locating the human rights discourse within such a faculty has been crucial to its mainstreaming and sustainability in many parts of the world. The fact that large numbers of lawyers have emerged from their education with at least a rudimentary knowledge of human rights has been a contributing factor to mass human rights litigation movements that have significantly impacted on public policy. Accordingly, the project team considered that one of the less controversial, albeit longer term, routes towards embedding human rights within Central Asian countries would be to pursue Masters Programmes that either focus on International Human Rights Law, or seek to offer such an option within general LLM courses on Public International Law. In addition it would also be possible to explore developing a multidisciplinary approach to build a human rights course, relying on knowledge that already exists within various faculties within any given University. Our initial discussions with interlocutors in this direction can be classified under the following three headings:

i. LLM in International Human Rights Law funded through the European Union through Tempus and Mundus

We have had detailed discussions with two Universities: The East Kazakh State University (ranked third among public Universities in Kazakhstan) and KIMEP (a private University in Almaty that is fee-based). Both discussions envisaged a tripartite engagement with the two London Universities alongside the Kazakh University. In the context of discussions with the East Kazakh National

University, the immediate advantage that presented itself was that the Dean of the Law Faculty is an active member of the Network and one of the leading researchers in the region on human rights issues. The model explored in that context was to absorb the courses offered to the participants into a tripartite degree awarded by the Kazakh University in collaboration with the two London-based Universities. This would essentially involve a partnership whereby staff from the two London-based Universities would spend a portion of time in situ delivering up to 30 percent of the degree programme, with the rest made up from existing resources within the Law Faculty of East Kazakhstan State University. A separate, though parallel, line of enquiry was pursued with KIMEP, which is seeking involvement of the two London Universities as it brings together a range of expertise in its related faculties, such as Media, Political Science and Law. Being an English-speaking University it has privileged access to many of the funding streams under the European Union and British Council and is keen to explore these over the next few months. One route envisaged under this umbrella is for the London-based Universities to offer summer courses that can be taken for credit by KIMEP students – with these becoming central to the new programme. Both programmes are being actively worked on by Kazakh partners with outcomes and further actions expected by the summer 2010, with the goal of launching a full-fledged programme by September 2011.

ii. Joint National Masters Programmes in Human Rights Law

Unlike the previous proposal this one seeks to bring together the Heads of Law Departments state-wide to seek to build a shared course among the Law Departments of Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan respectively. The Open Society Institutes in each of the countries are keen on this particular project and such a venture would be instigated through processes already in progress in each of the States, as the Open Society Institute is already linking together Law Faculties to work on collective Legal Aid Clinics. The idea would thus be for a member of the project team, or the Defender who is the Dean of the Law Faculty of East Kazakhstan, to engage in such a discussion with counterparts in each of the regions with a view to launching two separate nation-wide programmes that would see some external involvement of faculty teaching alongside local Kyrgyz and Kazakh colleagues. The advantage of this route is the obvious support already sought to be created through the OSI. Preliminary discussions with some Deans of Law Faculties in both countries indicated strong support for this option. While a similar venture could be undertaken in Uzbekistan, at the moment this option is fraught with difficulties. Additionally, while it may be desirable/preferable to engage Faculties other than Law, this is likely at this stage to diffuse the process due to the many substantive discussions that would need to be engaged upon by Faculties who do not often follow a standardized syllabus.

iii. The Creation of a Regional Masters in Human Rights Law

There are currently three such Masters in operation: The European Masters in Human Rights and Democratization (Venice, Italy, nearly twenty years old); the Mediterranean Masters Programme (Malta, 8 years, and close to being disbanded); the Southern African Masters Programme (Pretoria, four years old). Drawing on its experience of the Venice Masters programme, the European Union has called for proposals to create masters programmes in other regions. In the last round applications have been received and considered from India and a conglomeration of Universities from the region, and Australia and a conglomeration of Universities from that region. This builds on solid European Union level funding that seeks to support regional capacities by bringing together a series of Universities across any given region to engage in a joint programme. In each case the programme is delivered in one particular location for the first term, with staff being drawn from across the participating Universities, with students travelling in their second term for courses at any

participating University in a country not of their nationality. Over the twenty year period the programme in Europe has yielded a human rights bureaucracy that is trained in issues concerning human rights and that comes with links to counterparts in other parts of the region. Such a programme would be particularly beneficial to Central Asia. In addition, the high prestige of such a course has often meant that individuals selected for it, are 'prized assets' and can gain influential policy positions within government or inter-governmental organisations. This remains a goal worth aspiring to in the region: it would have the advantage of creating a desirable and worthy course for individuals within the region while also giving human rights a much high international profile than is possible to envisage at present.

3. Capacity-building through partnerships

Our week of meetings in both Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan in February 2010 re-confirmed to the project team that one of the most difficult challenges relating to the development of human rights compliance within Central Asia is the relatively limited capacity of HRDs. We witnessed ourselves, and were told by many diverse interlocutors, of the additional capacity needed to build effective regional human rights networks. Training, education and exposure to broader concepts, including a more nuanced understanding of an international human rights perspective, are lacking in many areas. Although we cannot address the lack of capacity generally, we can explore further how best to work in partnership with HRDs (and their organisations) to ameliorate the human rights knowledge gap that exists in the Central Asian region. We believe this may be the most effective contribution we can make to improving the human rights situation, and in supporting the work of human rights defenders, who are themselves very concerned about the prospects for new generations of HRDs. The project team has accordingly begun to consult with potential partners about possible areas of collaboration in terms of research, human rights advocacy initiatives and related activities.

In addition to the Central Asian links established and described in this report, the two London-based Universities would be in a position to work in partnership with HRDs in the region in relation to other specialised, thematic areas, by involving other colleagues at the Universities with alternative fields of expertise, or duplicated elements of the described pilot project training, as is appropriate.

For example, we were contacted after our February visit to Bishkek by NGO 'Blagodat' based in the city of Osh in southern Kyrgyzstan's Ferghana Valley. Blagodat had heard of our project with the Central Asian Human Rights Defenders, and are interested in related opportunities for trainings or other types of support for their defence attorney and staff. Our local contacts in Kyrgyzstan described Blagodat as a well-respected NGO with the mission to protect the rights and support the interests of vulnerable members of society, and are working to increase awareness among local government officials, community organizations and the media regarding key problems affecting the most disadvantaged segments of the ethnically diverse southern Kyrgyzstani population. One of our colleagues, Jonathan Watkins, an HRSJ Associate, and independent consultant in the field of human rights and mental health, has several years' experience of working in Central Asia, and is concerned of the serious human rights violations within the social and healthcare systems. He very much encourages building human rights capacity within this sector, and believes a similar training programme for NGO working in this sector will have a large impact on their future work in the region⁷.

⁷ Jonathan Watkins stresses "human rights abuses occur on a massive scale throughout Central Asia with resulting disadvantage to vulnerable and marginalised groups, impacting the largely invisible groups of children and adults who are vulnerable because of disability. Civil society organisations in Central Asia have little support in their work to implement the principles of the United Nations Convention on the rights of the Child and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. A comprehensive approach to supporting human rights

V. Feasibility for Duplication of Programme

1. Lessons learnt

The lessons learnt from this project have been invaluable and can be summarised as follows:

- i. Our initial assessment of a need among Human Rights Defenders for professional qualifications has been borne out. It was clear that each and every participant in our programme, and many from the organisations we subsequently engaged with, believed that a postgraduate qualification in Law/Human Rights would be beneficial, especially since the education we provided went significantly beyond 'basic training' on how to use international instruments.
- ii. The module content was appropriate and is justifiably pitched at Level Four (Masters Level in the United Kingdom). Many participants had significant levels of undergraduate education and a programme that addresses the best talent would need to be pitched at Masters level for it to have the effect of professionalizing and validating the credentials of the most promising HRDs.
- iii. The opportunities for the further academic development of HRDs is significantly limited by the situations in which they work, the conditions attendant to this work and the lack of respect for their spheres of operation.
- iv. A Masters level qualification would have the salutary effect of building knowledge, skills and confidence among HRDs, while from an external perspective, providing credibility to those they necessarily interact with. The group unanimously expressed this position, validating our initial assumption in undertaking a project of this nature.

2. Academic process

In terms of the processes attendant to replicating this programme, both Universities now have validated programmes that could be drawn on, should a similar programme be undertaken in other jurisdictions. Against the positives identified above the following are key factors that would need to be heeded, especially should a fully-fledged Masters in Law programme become feasible for HRDs:

- i. For a Masters level qualification it is crucial that candidates are able to assimilate the knowledge from a wide variety of sources. The vast amount of literature in the subject is still written in English, and while we sought to overcome this barrier through translation, a fully-fledged Masters level qualification is necessarily premised on a significant body of reading that would need to be undertaken through primary and secondary sources written in English, or alternatively French/Spanish. The amount of literature in Russian on these subjects is relatively limited, and falls, in our opinion, short of an international level specialisation in human rights law. This means that other routes (such as an LLM in International Law where there is considerable writing in Russian) with a significant human rights component, is more feasible for non-English speakers.
- ii. The model of study for a programme of this nature is necessarily based on significant self-study of materials. This means that candidates need to have good research skills, and while the courses focussed on some aspects of research skills, this would need to be developed if the award they finally receive is to have merit in an international setting.

defenders in Central Asia should recognise the human rights abuses of marginal groups and should include partnerships with the civil rights defenders in CSOs working with them in every-day situations.”

iii. It is important to have a strong local academic base that can supplement the work done through the international exchange of academic and practical knowledge concerning human rights. In our Network we had a very strong link through the presence of the Dean of the East Kazakh University as well as the Kazakh Bureau of Human Rights. However the difficulty of working through Russian, rather than English, meant that considerably more time is required to develop this further. Proposals are currently under consideration that could still yield a fully accredited Masters in International Law with Human Rights at this University, concurrent with the necessary governmental clearances.

3. Regions suggested for duplication of programme

As a result of the issues and constraints discussed above, we would suggest that the ideal theatre to reproduce such a model would lie in a common law jurisdiction where HRDs are likely to have some legal or related training, or access to the training necessary to complete their education.

In the following regions the collective experience of the project team and the ground conditions indicate that a programme could be designed that would yield Masters Level Awards, and have an impact on regional cohesion amongst human rights defenders. These are our initially proposed areas, and though the programme could be duplicated in other regions as well, our rationale for this selection meets many of the programme specifications. If they were to progress as areas of duplication for the programme, a further scoping exercise would be done.

In the first region, English is relatively widely spoken enabling lessons to be learned in the Central Asian context to be duplicated. This is in some respects a real advantage in the learning experience in terms of university validation. The prime candidates for this, in locations where the project team has some contacts through previous work would be:

i. India, Nepal, Bangladesh

With the lessons learnt above it seems that for a programme of this nature to result in the award of Masters level degrees it would be most logical to conduct it in countries that have an education system that is English-language oriented. The advantage of focussing on these three countries is as follows:

- a. All three countries have a significantly large number of Human Rights Defenders, who, like their counterparts in Central Asia, have a deficit in legal education (while having a reasonably good range of skills). A programme of this nature would be attractive to Defenders in countries that place a high value on post-graduate education, and where such education is generally in short supply.
- b. With the three countries having a common law system with judicial institutions that are similar to the United Kingdom, a programme of this nature could result in important knowledge transfer from the UK to the target countries, but also in horizontal knowledge transfer between Defenders in the region.
- c. Despite their proximity, there is relatively sparse interaction between Defenders in the three countries. At the highest level Defenders do have interaction but this is usually through Geneva, London and New York. Creating a forum of exchange within the region would have significantly positive consequences for regional human rights activity.
- d. India is particularly well endowed with human and physical resources that could act as a significant counterpoint for sustained human rights defender activity not only in the region, but

also in the wider Asian context. The relative comparative advantage of costs and the proximity of the country to the other regions where human rights activity is growing could result in the creation of a major hub of human rights defender activity that could be beneficial to similar networks not only in Asia, but also across the Indian Ocean.

- e. Members of the project team have long-standing associations with several high quality defenders from the three countries and can also draw on considerable engagement with authorities engaged in public policy including human rights commissions, the judiciary, policy makers and journalists (with one member of the project team having worked as a journalist in India). This in turn could have a salutary effect on the work of Defenders. In terms of the NGOs that work within human rights the project team can call upon the logistical and moral support of well-known organisations such as the Human Rights Law Network, India (India) and the Peoples Union of Civil Liberties (India) – two organisations that have impacted upon human rights policy through grass-roots level and significant case law at the Supreme Court of India. In Bangladesh the organisation would be facilitated through the close links that are already in place between members of the project team and Ain O Shailesh Kendre and BRAC, both highly influential defender organisations. In addition there are also good links between the Universities and the leading law faculties across the region.
- f. Middlesex University has five regional offices across India that service the region, and is also in the process of opening a campus in New Delhi (September 2010) which would make the logistics of organising programmes of this nature relatively simple, both in terms of physical space as well as outreach activities to defenders across the country and within the two other countries. The Middlesex University campus, located in New Delhi, would be in a position to host events, thus significantly reducing costs.

ii. Russia, Ukraine, Moldova and/or Belarus

Keeping in mind the core content delivered in Central Asia, a further option for duplication of the programme arises in the context of Russia, Ukraine, Moldova and/or Belarus (a programme vis-a-vis three of these four countries). Significant and widescale human rights violations continue to be reported in each of these countries, with HRDs in Russia and Belarus in particular being placed under significant pressure, and being subject to substantial restrictions, by the authorities. This area has the following particular advantages in the context of the feasibility and duplication of this project:

- a. London Metropolitan University, through its training, research and international human rights litigation programme (undertaken by a centre within HRSJ - the European Human Rights Centre (EHRAC)), has an outstanding reputation in the region. This reputation necessarily means that they work with some of the most experienced and talented individuals working in the human rights field. In addition staff involved in this project understand the particular context well and would be able to deliver a programme of this nature tailored to suit the peculiarities of the region.
- b. The engagement with law faculties and human rights entities in the former Soviet States of Central Asia has been a learning experience for the staff, and a programme of this nature could be approached with significantly enhanced confidence about the extent to which human rights regimes can be mainstreamed within the legal systems that still operate close to the structure that they inherited.
- c. The materials in Russian that have been developed in the course of this module would be directly usable in this region. As a result, one of the main difficulties with tailoring materials would be overcome at no extra cost.

For these reasons we would argue that the programme developed in the Central Asian context has particular resonance for duplication first and foremost, in other parts of the former Soviet Union. As in the Uzbekistan context, the lack of access to any one of these countries (Belarus, for example) can be overcome by organising two sessions in one of the other countries. In this manner the knowledge and experience gained from one setting could easily be put to good use in replicating the project in a similar context that faces similar issues. The caveats that have been identified above would remain the same, however, as we have demonstrated in the context of Central Asia, these can be overcome.

VI. Concluding Remarks

This is an opportune moment to reflect on the extent to which this programme has met the feasibility and duplication objectives set down at the outset. We believe that the programme itself has achieved each of these objectives and in the context of building a regional network has surpassed them. Combining both theoretical knowledge with its application in scenarios that were directly relevant to the work of the HRDs was a vital element of the programme. The project has been instrumental in establishing a viable, active support network, which has already benefitted from contact with another transnational human rights network (South Caucasus). We would also highlight the depth and range of productive contacts that have been made with universities in the region, with funding bodies and other stakeholders. We would therefore suggest that the feasibility of our approach has been justified.

We have proposed a follow-up strategy with two 'routes'. The first envisages additional work in the Central Asia region itself, by providing further support to the network of HRDs that has recently been established, through collaboration in developing academic human rights courses, and by partnering with HRDs in carrying out research and other human rights advocacy initiatives. The project team believes that excellent, constructive relationships have been established, not only with the HRDs, but also with universities, funding bodies and international organisations all of which have a real interest and stake in the development of human rights in the region. It would therefore be a considerable lost opportunity not to follow up on the achievements of the pilot project in the region.

A second 'route' envisages the duplication of the pilot programme in other regions – either (i) India, Nepal, Bangladesh or (ii) Russia, Ukraine, Moldova or Belarus. These two regions have been suggested principally because of perceived need and because of the project team's established links with individuals and organisations working in the human rights field in those regions.

Furthermore, as a result of our experience in delivering the pilot programme, in terms of methodology we would also propose to explore the following in any duplication of the project in other regions:

- the inclusion in the programme of distance-learning elements (thus cutting down on costs and travel time);
- involving some of the Central Asian HRDs in new programmes in other regions, thereby developing peer-to-peer, trans-regional support networks; and
- identifying an in-country implementing partner organisation (such as a local university) to provide substantive, logistical and/or administrative support.

ANNEX 1: List of Participants

Name & Organisation	Country
Ms. Inara Aldybayeva, Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights	Kazakhstan
Ms. Svetlana Oryspayeva, Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights	Kazakhstan
Ms. Julia Juznetsova, International Centre for Journalism "Media Net"	Kazakhstan
Mr. Yevgeniy Golenduhkin, North Kazakhstan Public Monitoring Committee	Kazakhstan
Mr. Mikhail Frolov, Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights	Kazakhstan
Ms. Gulmira Kuatbekova Kazakhstan International Bureau for Human Rights	Kazakhstan
Mrs. Gulzi Nabiyeva, Zharia	Kazakhstan
Mr. Kuat Rakhimberdin, East Kazakhstan State University	Kazakhstan
Mr. Akylbek Tashbulatov, Foundation for Assistance of Legal and Economic Reforms	Kyrgyzstan
Mr. Azimjan Askarov, Vozduh	Kyrgyzstan
Feruza Rustamovna Tashpuatova NGO 'AIR'	Kyrgyzstan
Shukhrat Ganiev, Humanitarian Legal Centre	Uzbekistan
Vasila Inoyatova, Ezgulik	Uzbekistan
Bakhtiyor Khamraev, Human Rights Society of Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan
Akhmadjon Madmarov, HRD, Margilan, Ferghana Valley	Uzbekistan
Abdusalom Ergashev, Rapid Reaction Group	Uzbekistan
Elena Urlaeva, Human Rights Alliance of Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan

Please note 3 participants from Bishkek Kyrgyzstan dropped from the programme at its onset, and were replaced by HRDs immediately available from Kazakhstan during Module 1 training in Almaty.

ANNEX 2: Module 1, 2, 3 Programmes

Human Rights Training for Human Rights Defenders

Training Location: Almaty, Kazakhstan

Programme Schedule for:

Module 1 International Human Rights Training, September 10 – 12, 2009

Day 1: Thursday, September 10th

Morning

9:00 - Welcome and Introductions (Karen Bennett)
Aims & Objectives, Training Schedule, Training Methodologies & Materials

9:15 - International Human Rights: Overview of the Legal Framework (Prof Douwe Korff)
UN Human Rights Treaties & Treaty Bodies
ICCPR, ICESCR, CEDAW, CERD, CAT, CRC
Locating UN documents on the Internet

10:30 – Break

11:00 - International Human Rights: The Legal Framework
- Declaration on Elimination of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief
(Continued – Prof Douwe Korff)

12:30 Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 - Applications of International Human Rights Standards in Key Issue Areas for
Kazakhstan (Plenary Discussion led by Prof Douwe Korff)

15:00 – Break

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

15:30 - Case Study Analysis (Prof Douwe Korff/Karen Bennett/participant groups)

17:00 - Close

Day 2: Friday, September 11th

Morning

9:00 - Human Rights Monitoring and Evaluation - Case Study Presentations (participant groups)

10:20 - Identify key thematic issues for Day 3 pm discussion*

10:30 –Break

11:00 - Seeking Redress through the United Nations (Prof Joshua Castellino)
UN Special Procedures

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – International Instruments, Selected Articles from ICCPR: Interpretation and Application in Practice (Prof Joshua Castellino)

Article 14 (the right to a fair trial); Article 19 (the right to freedom of opinion and expression)

15:00 - Break

15:30 – International Instruments, Selected Articles from ICCPR: Interpretation and Application in Practice (Prof Douwe Korff)

Article 6 (the right to life); Article 7 (freedom from torture); Article 10 (the right of prisoners to be treated with humanity and respect)

17:00 - Close

Day 3: Saturday, September 12th

Morning

9.00 – Overview of ICCPR First Optional Protocol and Procedure for Seeking Redress through
Individual Complaints brought to the Human Rights Committee (Prof Douwe Korff)

- How the individual complaint mechanism works

10:30 - Break

11:00 Analysis of Complaints to HRC under ICCPR First Optional Protocol (Prof Joshua
Castellino)

12:30 – Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Specific Mechanisms for Human Rights Defenders (Karen Bennett)
- UN Declaration on HRDS; Complaint Mechanism to the Special
Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders; Human Rights Networks and
Regional Mechanisms

14:45 – Break

15:15 – Group Discussion on Key Issue*
-Legal analysis; national and regional engagement; HRD involvement; mechanisms
available; best practices

16:15 - Trainers Response to Evaluate Best Practice for Key Issue (Prof Douwe Korff, Prof
Joshua Castellino, Karen Bennett)

16:45 – Evaluations

17:00 – Close

* Group should decide most prevalent issue(s) for discussion together with trainers Human Rights
Training for Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan Human Rights Defenders

Training Location: Almaty, Kazakhstan

Programme Schedule for:

Module 2 Human Rights Strategy & Management September 14 - 18, 2009

Day 1: Monday, September 14

Morning

9:00 - Welcome and Introductions
Aims & objectives, training Schedule, training Methodologies & materials
(Karen Bennett)

9:15 - Focus on digital/internet use - security issues in human rights work (Prof Douwe Korff)

10:30 – Break

11:00 – Human rights in Central Asia: identify problem areas in human rights environment (Prof Douwe Korff leading group discussion)

- country comparative analysis and discussion

12:30 - Lunch

Day 1 Afternoon

13:30 - Engaging with national institutions/mechanisms in human rights work (Prof Joshua Castellino)

15:00 – Break

15:30 – Redress and Reform: Taking a petition to regional and international bodies

- Introduction of Module 3 Options
(Prof Joshua Castellino)

17:00 - Close

Day 2: Tuesday, September 15

Morning

9:00 – Defining Human Rights Defenders

- Human rights fact finding, monitoring and conducting interviews (Karen Bennett)

10:30 – Break

11:00 – Approaches to fact finding, monitoring and interview (Karen Bennett, Nicole Piché, participants)

12:00 - Importance of networks in human rights practice (Nicole Piché)

12:30 - Lunch

Day 2 Afternoon

13:30 – Importance of networks in human rights practice (Nicole Piché)

14:15 - HRD security issues, steps for protection and mechanisms for assistance (Nicole Piché, Karen Bennett)

15:00 - Break

15:30 – HRD Security Issues (continued)

16:00 - Stress management and post traumatic stress in human rights work (Karen Bennett, Nicole Piché, participants)

16:55 – Reading assignments for Day 3 and 4

17:00 – Close

Day 3: Wednesday, September 16

Morning

9:00 - More Effective Written Communication (Nicole Piché, Karen Bennett)

-Material Analysis and Participant Feedback

10:30 – Break

11:00 – General Communications, Language and Cultural Challenges (Nicole Piché, Karen Bennett,
David Keane)

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Shadow Reports: Accessing UN Treaty Body Mechanisms (David Keane)
Part A: General Overview

15:00 - Break

15:30 – Part B: Examples of Shadow Reports to the UN
(David Keane)

17:00 - Close

Day 4: Thursday, September 17

Morning

9:00 - Part C: Shadow Reports of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan
Group Activity (David Keane and group)

10:30 – Break

11:00 – Part D: Drafting a Shadow Report
Writing Exercise (David Keane and group)

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Organisational structure; team building; identifying priorities and focus (window of opportunity exercise) (Nicole Piché)

15:00 - Break

15:30 – Tactical Approach to Human Rights (Karen Bennett, Nicole Piché)

Assignments for Module 3:
- Module 3 topic decision
- In Country Outreach: Training Assignment Discuss

17:00 - Close

Day 5: Friday, September 18

Morning

9.00 – Advocacy to International Organisations (OSCE, Freedom House, others TBC)

- Participants discuss and prepare for network presentations (coffee available)

10:30 – Visit from International Actors Working in Region*

- International organisation presentations
- Q and A with participants

12:30 - Networking and Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 - Identifying funders; writing a grant proposal and formulating a budget (Karen Bennett)

15:00 – Break

15:30 – Review Module 1 & 2; Q & A of Assignments for Module 3 (Karen Bennett, Nicole Piché)

16:45 – Evaluations

17:00 – Close (please refer to the attached training programmes)

Human Rights Training for Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan Human Rights Defenders

Programme Schedule for:

Module 3: Advanced Issues in Human Rights:

Topic 1: Constructive Dialogue

Topic 2: Minority Rights and Vulnerable Groups

Training Location: Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
November 23 -27 2009

Day 1: Monday, November 23

Morning

9:00 - Welcome and Introductions
Aims & objectives, training schedule, training methodologies & materials
(Karen Bennett)

9:30 - Dispute Resolution in International Law
(Nadia Bernaz)

10:30 – Coffee Break

11:00 – Conflict Resolution: Conceptual Analysis
(Karen Bennett and Nadia Bernaz)

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Transitional Justice Mechanisms
(Nadia Bernaz)

14.30 - Negotiations: Theories and Conceptual Analysis

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

(Nicole Piché)

15:30 – Coffee Break

16:00 – Application of Conflict Resolution Strategies – Questions and Discussion
(Karen Bennett, Nadia Bernaz, Nicole Piché w group)

17:30 - Close

Day 2: Tuesday, November 24

Morning

9:00 – European Union Dialogues and Other Constructive Engagement with Government
(Nadia Bernaz and Natalya Seitmuratova, UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights)

10:30 – Coffee Break

11:00 – ODIHR/OSCE Focal Point for Human Rights Defenders, Networks of Defenders in the
OSCE Region
(Natalya Seitmuratova and Benjamin Moreau, OSCE/ODIHR)

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Role Play for Constructive Dialogue: Practical Application
(All trainers work w/ participants groups)

14:30 - Presentations of Group Work on Role Play

15:30 – Coffee Break

16:00 –Creating an Effective Platform:
Central Asian Human Rights Defender Network
(Karen Bennett and Nicole Piché to lead with Group)

17:30 – Close

Day 3: Wednesday, November 25

Morning

9:00 – Exam for Module 1
(Karen Bennett to administer)

10:30 – Break

11.00 - Presentations of 'In Country' Assignment (for Module 2)
(Panel of assessors: Philip Leach, Karen Bennett, and Nicole Piché)

5 x 15 minute presentations and Q and A

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Presentations of 'In Country' Assignment (continue)
(Panel of assessors: Philip Leach, Karen Bennett, and Nicole Piché)

7 x 15 minute presentations and Q and A

15:30 – Coffee Break

16:00 – Presentations of 'In Country' Assignment (continue)
(Panel of assessors: Philip Leach, Karen Bennett, and Nicole Piché)

5 x 15 minute presentations and Q and A

17:30 - Close

Day 4: Thursday, November 26

Morning

9:00 - Theoretical Foundations of Minority Rights Law: Definitions, Non-Discrimination, Equality and Diversity
(Joshua Castellino)

10:30 – Coffee Break

11:00 – International Regimes for the Protection of Vulnerable Groups
(Joshua Castellino)

12:30 - Lunch

Afternoon

13:30 – Chechnya: A Case Study
(Philip Leach)

14.30 – Applying International and Regional Standards to Central Asia and Former Soviet Union Countries
(Philip Leach)

15:30 – Break

16.00 - Applying International and Regional Standards to Central Asia and Former Soviet Union Countries (continued)
(Philip Leach)

17:30 – Close

Day 5: Friday, November 27

Morning

9.00 – Global Challenge of Minority Rights Law: an Intercontinental Analysis
with Case Studies
(Joshua Castellino)

10:30 – Coffee Break

11.00 – Remedies to Systemic Discrimination
(Joshua Castellino)

12.30 – Lunch

Afternoon

13.00 – When are groups vulnerable?
1) Gender 2) Political Prisoner 3) Children 4) Migrant workers
(Philip Leach, Karen Bennett, Joshua Castellino)

14:30 – Legal Practice Terminology: Analysis of Russian/English Language Problems in Human
Rights
(presentation prepared by Natalya Prilutskaya, Philip Leach to lead discussion)

15.30 – Coffee Break

16.00 – Discussion, Questions, Feedback and the Way Forward
(plenary discussion)

17:30 – Evaluations and Close

ANNEX 3: Compiled Evaluation Responses

Collated Feedback Forms –Module 1

(September 10-12,2009 - Training evaluations from Kazakh participants only)

1. What did you find most useful?

Participants found all topics relevant and appropriate to their professional activities. Overall the professionalism of the lecturers and their practical and theoretical background were most useful. Discussions on issues such as torture and other thematic human rights problems relevant in their work were found to be very valuable. Practical information on how to submit applications to the Human Rights Committee and the Committee Against Torture, and understanding how to use UN Special Procedures and their mechanisms available was valuable to the group. Additionally, being introduced to useful website addresses and links were also listed as being very relevant.

Response 1 Discussion of issues such as torture and other human rights violations, how to submit applications to the Human Rights Committee, the Committee Against Torture, applying to the special rapporteur, Amnesty International, useful internet addresses and links.

Response 2 In terms of my professional activity, the topics of the lectures and training materials were very useful and appropriate

Response 3 Most useful: the professionalism of the lecturers, their practical and theoretical background.

Least useful: none

Response 4 Everything was relevant.

Response 5 1. Development of the UN, the defence of human rights.
2. Protection of human rights activists

Response 6 For someone who is not a lawyer, I found all of the topics discussed interesting. In particular, it was useful when specific examples were given.

2. Quality of seminars/lectures

Overall there was a very high level of professionalism and in-depth knowledge of practical solutions to problems. The material was presented clearly and explained very well, despite the fact that interpretation was used, the information was clear and accessible to both lawyers and non-lawyers.

Training slides were used appropriately and the material was well developed, including the quality diagrams and the examples. Additionally, the wide range of questions discussed alongside the attention that was given to participants was much appreciated.

Response 1 Very high level of professionalism and in-depth knowledge of practical solutions to problems (inside view).

Response 2 The material was presented extremely clearly and explained very well.

Response 3

In particular, I would like to thank Dao for the diagrams and the wide range of questions discussed.

Karen – for the interesting presentation of the training materials and attention to participants' questions.

Dzhorshou – for the professionalism and presentations.

Response 4 Very interesting, clear, well-explained. It was very useful that we had the opportunity to ask questions at any moment

Response 5

1. Accessible, despite the fact that interpretation was used.
2. Slides were used well and material was well developed.
3. Very interesting examples of judicial practice.

Response 6

The information was clear and accessible, even to someone who is not a lawyer.

3. Were the training materials useful?

Materials were found to be very useful and accessible. Participants found them to be a source to be referred to in the future. Although there were some difficulties with finding the UN documents (in the Annex reference section of manuals).

Response 1 Very useful.

Response 2 The materials were useful.

Response 3 Yes.

Response 4 Yes, of course. They were very accessible.

Response 5 Yes, they were useful. There were some difficulties with finding the UN documents (references).

Response 6 Yes, I will keep referring to them in future.

4. Were the topics discussed useful in terms of your professional activity?

The topics were entirely relevant and very helpful for the participant's current and future work. In particular, topics such as 'working with the UN' and the specific methods for redress available to human rights activists were appreciated (for example, applying to the special rapporteur etc.).

Response 1 The topics were entirely relevant, they will be very helpful in our work.

Response 2 The topics were relevant and will be useful in future.

Response 3 Yes, very relevant.

Response 4 Yes, of course.

Response 5 Yes, very. In particular, working with the UN.

Response 6 Yes. In particular, the specific methods available to human rights activists (for example, applying to the special rapporteur etc.)

5. Was the seminar well organised?

There was a very high level of organisation in all aspects of the seminar. These aspects included attention to interpretation, training materials, the venue and coffee breaks/ lunches.

Response 1 Very high level of organisation in all aspects of the seminar.

Response 2 Without doubt.

Response 3

Interpretation – excellent.

Organisation – excellent.

Training materials – good.

I feel that the materials could be better structured, to avoid wasting time.

Response 4 All aspects were good.

Response 5

Yes.

Venue – excellent.

Interpretation – good.

Training materials – excellent.

Coffee breaks/lunches – excellent.

Response 6

I would give it 5 out of 5.

6. Do you feel it is useful to receive training and meet with other human rights activists?

It is extremely useful for making new contacts and exchanging information with human rights activists. It also helps establish a network to facilitate future professional activity and to create opportunities for beginners to get help and advice from the more experienced. Over all it provided an opportunity to discuss new ideas and projects.

Response 1 It is extremely useful for making new contacts with human rights activists and establishing a network to facilitate future professional activity, to create opportunities for beginners to get help and advice from the more experienced.

Response 2 Definitely useful, sometimes essential.

Response 3 Yes, of course. Firstly, it is important to make new contacts. Secondly, it is vital to exchange information. Thirdly, it provides an opportunity to discuss new ideas and projects

Response 4 Yes, of course.

Response 5 Blank

Response 6 Very useful.

7. Any other comments:

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

Participants commented that it would be good to get advice on specific practical questions and to discuss examples from international legal practice. There was also one suggestion for more practical exercises.

Due to the training lasting several days, one participant found 9am – 5pm too long for training sessions and therefore difficult to absorb information towards the end of the day. While the majority of participants replied 'Thank you'.

Response 1 It would be good to get advice on specific practical questions.

Response 2 It would be good to discuss examples from international judicial practice.

Response 3 Please organise a trip to London, to your university, so we can see how everything works there.
Thank you!

Response 4 More practical exercises would have been good.

A big thanks!

Response 5 Blank

Response 6 I feel that 9am – 5pm is too long for training sessions. It is difficult to absorb information towards the end of the day. Especially as the training lasted several working days.
Thank you for everything else.

Collated Feedback Forms –Module 2

(September 14-18, 2009 - Training evaluations from Uzbek, Kazakh and Kyrgyz participants)

1) What did you feel was most relevant part of the training to you and what was least relevant?

All aspects of the training were deemed as useful to the participants. Security issues, new tactics in human rights practice, and drafting alternative reports seemed to be the most useful, while internet security was seen as the least useful.

Response 1: All the materials presented at the training corresponded to my professional interests

Response 2:1 Questions of obtaining assistance by means of international mechanisms of protection of human rights

2 Questions of grant applications to the EU Commission

3 Meeting with donors

Response 3: Knowledge and materials which you gave us is a valuable asset which I would use every day in my work.

Response 4: Writing alternative reports; Missions of the EU , Subject : strategy and tactics

Response 5: Topics were relevant – those in particular we have heard of for the first time such as "security".... (illegible 1 word) were subjects in communication etc

Response 6: Topic which corresponded to my professional interest most was – access to the UN bodies. European mechanisms were the least interesting topic from the point of view of my professional interests

Response 7: Strategic considerations in my work

Response 8: Writing alternative reports, Organisational structure, making of a team for the project

Response 9: Most interesting topics were

1. Security and protection of human rights defenders, their work and necessary documents
2. Networking of the human rights defenders in Central Asia
3. Writing of alternative reports

Response 10: Security of human rights defenders. Tactical and strategic considerations. Human rights defenders work in different cultural environments.

Response 11: -Writing alternative reports, New tactics, Position of the human rights defenders in the countries of Central Asia

Response 12: Most interesting were the problems of security of human rights defenders. Least interesting were subjects of using the Internet and modern technologies.

Response 13: In any event all provided at the training materials will be relevant to the human rights defenders work.

Response 14: Literally everything was emphasized correctly.

Response 15: Security of the human rights defenders, prevention of torture, procedural questions of creating applications to the Human Rights Committee, organisation of dialogue, choice of strategy and tactics – all those subjects were very useful and interesting.

Response 16: The least – informational security. The most – special procedures, Human Rights Committee, writing of alternative reports.

Response 17: Preparation, writing and presentation of alternative reports to the UN Committees.

2) Please comment on the delivery of the lectures, their content and their clarity.

All participants found the delivery of the lectures professional and clear. One participant stated that there were some unfamiliar phrases used but they relate it to their lack of knowledge in the field. The participants state that the training materials were highly professional, handouts were clear, easily understood and very useful.

Response 1: Excellent

Response 2: Very high level of information presentation, high interactive complex of materials

Response 3: Trainers were highly professional. I am grateful to them all.

Response 4: Level – clear and accessible

Response 5: High level, topics are ... (illegible 1 word) (Accessible format of the presentation of materials even though there were difficulties with interpreting (comprehension?). It would have been good whilst studying subject on "security" to have an access to the computer/use a computer. Was so difficult to understand and memorise.

Response 6: Good

Response 7: Excellent

Response 8: 5 out of 5 on the 1 to 5 scale!

Response 9: In general I understood everything. Sometimes I came across unfamiliar phrases – probably due to my lack of experience and knowledge in this area

Response 10: I consider this training to be conducted on a high professional level.

Response 11: High level

Response 12: OK

Response 13: All very accessible, we have received a lot of information. All materials are clear, comprehensible and accessible.

Response 14: Accessible, clear and strict to the point!

Response 15: Good level

Response 16: Good level, good, comprehensible and coherent presentation of the material.

Response 17: High level of material presentation during delivery of lectures by all trainers, content of the lectures was rich, and they were conducted well.

3) Did you find the training materials useful?

All participants considered the training materials to be very useful. One participant mentioned the need to translate one session materials into English, however both English and Russian translation of all documents on their flash-drives, so they will have access to the documents in both languages.

Response 1: You bet!

Response 2: All the materials were extremely useful – especially those indicated in my answer to Q1

Response 3: Yes and I will use them every day in my practice

Response 4: Yes , very

Response 5: Hand outs were both useful and interesting. Just have to formulate it correctly and translate it into English.

Response 6: Yes

Response 7: Yes, particularly establishing goals and aims in the topic on strategy and tactics.

Response 8: Undoubtedly

Response 9: Yes, thank you. Particularly materials about the necessity of tactical considerations.

Response 10: Yes

Response 11: They were and will be very useful for me in the future

Response 12: Yes

Response 13: Very useful especially the examples given.

Response 14: Yes – in most cases

Response 15: The materials allowed to understand more and to learn more about the activities in protecting human rights.

Response 16: Yes, very useful. All the materials are well structured and contain a wealth of useful information

Response 17: Very useful

4) Do you feel that you will apply what you have learnt from the sessions to your daily practice?

All participants have agreed that the sessions were very applicable to their work, although some topic sessions were more applicable than others, depending on their field of practice.

Response 1: Certainly! I cannot think otherwise.

Response 2: Most of the subjects we have studied here are applicable in practice

Response 3: Yes

Response 4: Yes

Response 5: Yes, especially in the conditions of restrictions on rights and freedoms, active (?illegible 1 word) of the state in the activities of NGOs protecting human rights.

Response 6: Yes, definitely applicable

Response 7: Yes

Response 8: Yes

Response 9: Yes, they are applicable. But not all of them as we have just started developing our work.

Response 10: Yes

Response 11: Yes, they are. For example, I'll use them when I will organize seminars

Response 12: Yes

Response 13: Of course!

Response 14: Yes

Response 15: Mostly applicable

Response 16: Yes, of course

Response 17: Obligatory

5) Were you satisfied with the facilities available? Please rate the services provided :

Overall participants were happy with the organisation of the training. One participant mentioned the interpretation was good while 2 other participants said there were problems with the interpreters. One participant also mentioned that arrival and hotel allocation on the first day were not organised properly. They were all happy with the facilities although one participant requested not sharing a room during module 3.

Response 1: I am happy with it. I would evaluate it as “ excellent”

Response 2: All organisational questions were taken very good care of

Response 3: Yes

Response 4: Yes, I am happy with it. Translation (interpreting) was good, hotel and support were of high class.

Response 5: Yes, conditions are great. Conference facilities are great. There was a problem with the poor quality interpreting.

Response 6: Yes, I am happy with the organisation of the seminar. But for the future it would be more ethical to provide a single room for each participant.

Response 7: Yes. Hand outs

Response 8: 5 out of 5 on the 1 to 5 scale!

Response 9: In general – happy. But there was quite a lot of information given in a short space of time – I wish there were more practical tasks (case studies).

Response 10: Yes

Response 11: Yes, thank you. They are on a high level, especially work documents, and international agreements etc.

Response 12: Meeting at arrival and hotel allocation on the first day were not organised properly. Conference facilities, translations and hand outs – good.

Response 13: Thank you – everything was organised at a proper level.

Response 14: Everything was ideal.

Response 15: Training was well organised. Sometimes there was a problem with interpreting.

Response 16: Excellent organisation of the training

Response 17: I don't have any complaints – everything was wonderful!

6) Do you feel you it is beneficial to train and meet with HRDs from other countries in your region, and is it a positive learning experience? Do you intend or feel able to sustain relations in the future?

All participants agree that training and meeting with HRDs in the region is important to their work and will improve their work greatly. They also mention that it would be great to include all Central Asian countries, as Turkmenistan and Tajikistan were not represented.

Response 1: You are uniting us and it is wonderful!

Response 2: Useful. We are planning to maintain contacts

Response 3: Yes, very

Response 4: Yes. Connections are necessary from both strategic and tactical point of view.

Response 5: Yes, very useful. It gives an opportunity to find out about the situation in the region, exchange information. Also to find out how foreign lawyers work.

Response 6: Training and a possibility to meet up are both very useful indeed. We will of course stay in touch as much as we can.

Response 7: Yes

Response 8: Yes

Response 9: Of course. Because this gives confidence to people, opens a possibility of an experience exchange and allows people to learn from one another.

Response 10: Yes

Response 11: It's very useful because of specifics of their work. Such people have to know what's going on in the Central Asian countries.

Response 12: Very useful in relation to the training and meeting other human rights defenders from other countries. Will establish permanent links with them

Response 13: Experience exchange and comparative analysis in the protection of the human rights activities. Such meetings are very fruitful for future work.

Response 14: Undoubtedly – it increases the level of self-education. Meetings are necessary – exchange of experience, creation of networks, mutual help and support

Response 15: Such training is useful and necessary. Meeting human rights defenders from other countries helps in experience exchange between us, also helps to set new goals and directions.

Response 16: Yes, we are already cooperating on some cases with our colleagues from Uzbekistan and other colleagues from different parts of Kazakhstan

Response 17: It is really necessary to add to the training a possibility of participation by our colleagues from other Central Asian countries – Tadjikistan and Turkmenistan

7) Please add any further comments you wish to make.

Participants wish for more breaks, separate hotel rooms, a possible forum for continued distance-learning... maybe through a website, more contact with local human rights mechanisms, and a possible cultural event within the city as a group (trip to the theatre, museum etc.) Also some participants mentioned the interpreters were not completely familiar with the material and terminology.

Response 1: Any comments would be excessive – my only wish – it would have been great to get some respite on the last day of it.

Response 2: I propose introducing distance-learning mechanisms (to provide consultation and support in the future). Create a website where we would be able to ask for assistance from foreign experts (translations, creation of texts etc).

Response 3: It would have been nice to have a separate room for each participant

Response 4: To the trainers Karen and Nicole – we need more breaks!

Response 5: Please attract to your work more local experts.

Response 6: It would be very useful to organise an additional (one more) session like this to familiarise ourselves with the European human rights protection organisations and institutions.

Response 7: Visiting museums of Bishkek?

Response 8: More “meaty “ sessions are required

Response 9: It would be possible on a last day to organise something cultural – visit to the theatre, museum, just a short walk together – this will bring people together and would allow an opportunity to find out each other better.

Response 10: Invite the same interpreters (from Alma-Ata) to Bishkek. Thanks for the memory (USB) stick.

Response 11: Thank you for your work! I hope we will see you soon and I'll know a lot about human rights with your help.

Response 12: Please allocate single rooms for us and allow at the very least half a day to see the city and to rest.

Response 13: I would abstain from further comments .Thank you!

Response 14: I would suggest to have training which is no more than 5 days in duration. Also – it would be good to hear about mechanisms, different (including legal) means of problem solving!

Response 15: Better use of the alternative ways of carrying out of the training.

Response 16: It is necessary to familiarise the interpreters with the HR terminology beforehand. Thank you very much!

Response 17: Working days were very busy, somewhat tiring

Collated Feedback Forms –Module 3

(November, 2009 - Training evaluations from Uzbek, Kazakh and Kyrgyz participants)

1) What did you feel was most relevant part of the training to you and what was least relevant?

All aspects of the training were deemed as useful to the participants. Security issues, new tactics in human rights practice, and drafting alternative reports seemed to be the most useful, while internet security was seen as the least useful.

Response 1: All the materials presented at the training corresponded to my professional interests. Besides we ourselves have previously defined which will be the key subjects to consider.

Response 2: Questions of obtaining assistance by means of international mechanisms of protection of human rights – corresponded to the sphere of my professional interests best.

Response 3: Most relevant were: constructive dialogue and justice mechanisms of transitional period.

Response 4: Most relevant – mechanisms of protection of minority rights. Least relevant – nothing.

Response 5: Topic: Use of different strategies in conflict negotiations.

Topic: Means of dealing with systemic discrimination.

Response 6: Most relevant were the following topics: resolution of disputes, protection of rights, EC and others. Least relevant topics – were none.

Response 7: Most relevant were the following topics: protection of minority rights. Least relevant topics – were none.

Response 8: Topics for the materials are very important as all the materials presented correspond to our professional expectations.

Response 9: We find materials from all 3 Modules to be very important. I obtained knowledge of Use of international documents in internal mechanisms (literal translation of a Russian text which does not make sense either)

Response 10: Justice in the transitional period, minority rights. All topics were very interesting and up to date in their importance.

Response 11: Constructive dialogue, theoretical grounds of legislation of minority rights.

Application of international and regional standards to the conditions of Central Asia and former Soviet Union countries.

Response 12: All the materials were important and corresponded to the sphere of my professional interests.

2) Please comment on the delivery of the lectures, their content and their clarity.

All participants found the delivery of the lectures professional and clear. One participant stated that there were some unfamiliar phrases used but they relate it to their lack of knowledge in the field. The participants state that the training materials were highly professional, handouts were clear, easily understood and very useful.

Response 1: Very high level of information presentation. Many thanks to the professionalism of interpreters – it is due to them all the information became easily accessible to us

Response 2: Sometimes the lectures were dragging on a bit. Lecture content – 4!Lecture clarity- 5!

Response 3: Very high level of information presentation, highly interactive complex of materials. I appreciated the fact that I could always ask a question if I wished to.

Response 4: Level – clear and accessible. Information presentation – clear.

Response 5 Very good.

Response 6: Everything was performed in an excellent way.

Response 7: Level is accessible and lectures were clear.

Response 8: Everything was great, very accessible!

Response 9: High level

Response 10: Excellent.

Response 11: Excellent.

Response 12: High level

3) Did you find the training materials useful?

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

All participants considered the training materials to be very useful. One participant mentioned the need to translate one session materials into English, however both English and Russian translation of all documents on their flash-drives, so they will have access to the documents in both languages.

Response 1: Undoubtedly. I will use the training materials in my future work

Response 2: Yes

Response 3: Yes and I will use them every day in my practice

Response 4: Yes , very

Response 5: Yes

Response 6: The materials provided are interesting for me as they give many examples and shed light on many interesting subjects which I can apply in practice.

Response 7: Yes, very.

Response 8: Thank you! Of course, these materials will be used as manuals in our work.

Response 9: Very and very.

Response 10: Very.

Response 11: Yes.

Response 12: You bet!

4) Do you feel that you will apply what you have learnt from the sessions to your daily practice?

All participants have agreed that the sessions were very applicable to their work, although some topic sessions were more applicable than others, depending on their field of practice.

Response 1: To some extent.

Response 2: Without a doubt.

Response 3: Applicable. Especially related to this subject: constructive dialogue.

Response 4: Yes

Response 5: Yes, widely applicable.

Response 6: Yes, applicable in my daily work e.g. : conflict resolution, carrying out of the negotiations, dispute resolution and others.

Response 7: Yes

Response 8: All the topics highlighted are the topics we come across in our everyday work, all this is happening.

Response 9: Yes

Response 10: Yes

Response 11: Possibly.

Response 12: Yes!

5) Were you satisfied with the facilities available? Please rate the services provided :

Overall participants were happy with the organisation of the training. One participant mentioned the interpretation was good while 2 other participants said there were problems with the interpreters. One participant also mentioned that arrival and hotel allocation on the first day were not organised properly. They were all happy with the facilities although one participant requested not sharing a room during module 3.

Response 1: Yes

Response 2: All organisational questions were at a very high level. Das ist fantastisch!

Response 3: Everything was very well organized apart from one thing – I would have much preferred to have soup for lunch.

Response 4: Yes. High class facilities.

Response 5: Yes, I am happy with the organisation of the seminar.

Response 6: Both the seminar and organisation of the seminar were excellent.

Response 7 : Yes.

Response 8: Many thanks!!! Everything was organised as it ought to be.

Response 9: Yes

Response 10: All conditions were excellent.

Response 11: Yes.

Response 12: All OK!

6) Do you feel you it is beneficial to train and meet with HRDs from other countries in your region, and is it a positive learning experience? Do you intend or feel able to sustain relations in the future?

All participants agree that training and meeting with HRDs in the region is important to their work and will improve their work greatly. They also mention that it would be great to include all Central Asian countries, as Turkmenistan and Tajikistan were not represented.

Response 1: It goes without saying, that such training sessions are very useful and in most part necessary. In the future I will try to maintain my connections with the human rights defendants from other countries.

Response 2: Connections are a lifeline for us, we need to exchange our experience, find out new information.

Response 3: This is very important and, in my opinion, is one of the real results of this training (within the scope of functioning of the network which has been created here).It is very useful to

meet up with human rights defenders from other regions, exchange our experience. I hope there would be forthcoming meetings in the process of work delivered by our network. It will be great.
Response 4: Yes. Yes.

Response 5: Useful indeed. We will of course cooperate.

Response 6: Yes, useful. It gives an opportunity to exchange information and experience.

Response 7: Yes

Response 8: Meeting with the human rights defendants from other countries was very useful. We exchange experience, common problems – which do become common. And we will of course, stay in touch. Human rights – without borders!

Response 9: Yes.

Response 10: Without a doubt.

Response 11: Yes

Response 12: We network and maintain our connections since the first training took place.

7) Please add any further comments you wish to make.

Participants wish for more breaks, separate hotel rooms, a possible forum for continued distance-learning... maybe through a website, more contact with local human rights mechanisms, and a possible cultural event within the city as a group (trip to the theatre, museum etc.) Also some participants mentioned the interpreters were not completely familiar with the material and terminology.

Response 1: Please include intermediate tests in the context of the programme. It will facilitate the learning of the material obtained and will allow the trainers to see the results of their work.

Response 2: In my opinion it is necessary to add role plays to the learning – because the texts are mostly too dry and it is difficult to memorise the content of the lectures. So do add more problem solving activities.

Response 3: I am counting on our future cooperation. Thank you for the legal education obtained. I wish you all the best and we will meet again.

Response 4: Thank you for the training. Thank you! Thank you for the human rights defendants' network!

Response 5: Thank you very much for the opportunities given to us.

Response 6: left blank

Response 7: All was well. Most important is the creation of the network.

Response 8: We wish you good luck in everything you do in your work! You have undertaken a great work and your mission is completed.

Response 9: The most important is a birth of a new organisation with a participation of three countries.

Response 10: To find an opportunity to meet more often!

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

Response 11: Lets organize training for all of us in England. Organise seminars at each others' offices training in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan , Uzbeks NGO – e.g. with visits to each NGO. Thank you for your work! And good luck to all of you!

Response 12: We were informed that just one representative from each country will be invited to London. This is not fair. All of us – or no one! P.S. I did not understand correctly.

ANNEX 4: Agenda for CA Network Meeting

Strategy Meeting of Central Asian Human Rights Defenders to Establish a Regional Human Rights Defenders Network

Date: Sunday, February 21, 2010

Time: 09:00 am – 6:00 pm (meeting may run longer, TBD)

Place: OSCE Academy, Bishkek Kyrgyzstan

Participants: TBC

Meeting Agenda

- 9:00 Welcome and Introductions** (ODIHR and/or London rep)
- Objectives established for the meeting; roundtable introductions
- 9:15 Background of 'Central Asian Network'** (Svetlana Oryspayeva, Lawyer for Kazakhstan Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law, HRD Network Coordinator)
- Development and review of what was discussed and agreed to at November session in Bishkek.
- Introduction of two initial key areas the Network would like to focus on*:
1) create a regional network for protection of human rights defenders and their family members, and to consider a response mechanism for providing assistance to HRDs when arbitrarily put in detention, 2) enhance education and access of human rights information in the region through trainings with targeted professionals, i.e. lawyers, doctors; youth groups and students; state bodies
- 10:30 Establishing an Effective Regional Human Rights Network** (Benjamin Moreau, ODIHR and South Caucasus HRD representative)
- Presentation on what was established for the region of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia
- Review of South Caucasus Memorandum of Understanding
- Comments/advice from lessons learned, what is working best and what problems the South Caucasus Network faces
- 11:30 Questions and Discussion** (Plenary)
- 12:00** Lunch Break
- 13:00 Presentations of individual positions on how best to approach key areas of interest** (Central Asian Network participants, round the table)
- * Each Central Asian HRD Network members will prepare in advance and give brief individual comments on how they would like to see the Network carry out the work of these two initial key areas (HRD protection and human rights education).
- 14:30 Feedback, questions, discussion** (Chaired by international/non-Central Asian participants)
- Organising of ideas for implementation; regional versus national plans of action; assessing realistic goals; considering obstacles and needs for support
- 15:00** Coffee Break
- 15:30 Drafting of Memorandum of Understanding** (Chaired by Network member)
- 17:30 Identify activities and a schedule for execution of tasks** (Chaired by Coordinator)
- 18:00** (or later) **Close of meeting**

ANNEX 5: DRAFT Memorandum of Understanding for the CA Network

Draft

Memorandum of Understanding of the Network

I. Human rights defenders network in the countries of Central Asia

Network (hereinafter – the Network) – is voluntary informal association of non-governmental organizations, as well as NGOs and civil groups from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan.

Mission – to promote developing an effective mechanism for the protection of human rights defenders through the establishment of a sustainable network of human rights organizations in the region.

II. Objectives of the Network

- 1) Strengthening civil society in the countries of the region and on the international level;
- 2) Cooperation and information sharing, developing effective partnership throughout the Network.
- 3) Establishing a constructive dialogue with governmental authorities;
- 4) Conducting effective campaigns and actions in order to protect human rights defenders and members of their families;
- 5) Lobbying for the implementation of international standards in the field of protection of human rights defenders in the national legislation of the countries of the region;
- 6) Human rights education.

III. Principles of the Network

- 1) Respect for Human Rights and human dignity;
- 2) Recognition of the principle of equality regardless of race, nationality, language, origin, religion and other circumstances;
- 3) Rejection of any forms of violence, promotion and support for peace initiatives and the culture of peace;
- 4) Legality, justice, tolerance, humanity and openness;
- 5) Confidentiality – non-proliferation of information in case of threat to life of human rights defender (s)/members of his/their family (ies);
- 6) Personal responsibility and non-abuse of status as a member of the Network.

IV. Rules of joining the Network

Members of the Network may choose the degree and forms of engagement in the work of the Network by themselves.

1) Informed members.

International non-governmental organizations, as well as NGOs and civic groups from the region and other countries may join the Network as *Informed members*. In order to become an Information member and receive information about the work of the Network, it suffices to send a request in a prescribed form to the coordinator of the Network and to fill out an application form on the web-site and to declare accession to the Memorandum.

2) Active members.

Organizations and groups joined the Network at the moment of its establishment are considered its first *Active members*.

To join the Network as actual members new organizations and informal groups are required to:

- share the principles of membership in the Network;
- be an information member at the moment of filing an application;
- secure support of at least two active members.

Candidates for the status of an active member should submit an application to the Network Coordinator who verifies the information and makes a decision on inclusion in the Network on the basis of two recommendations.

3) *Experts of the Network*

Representatives of the Network members, as well as individual experts may be invited to the Network as experts on the basis of a recommendation of any of the Active members of the Network.

VI. Network management

The Network is a voluntary informal association of non-governmental organizations from the countries, their representatives, independent human rights defenders and initiative groups of citizens interested in the activities of the Network in Central Asia.

Network management is carried out by the Coordinating Council (CC) which is a collegiate body operating on the basis of the Regulation on "CC".

At the initial stage CC will be composed of three persons (active members) who are country coordinators, and the Network Coordinator who carries out overall coordination of the Network activities. Each of the CC members has one vote, while the Network Coordinator has a right to two votes.

The Coordinating Council approves various Regulations regarding the activities of the Network.

CC also carries out the following functions:

- decides on the organization of meetings and workshops of the Network (on its own initiative or on request of any of the Active members of the Network);
- enroll new active members to the Network (on the basis of the recommendations of two organizations-members of the Network);
- carries out other powers related to network management which are not within the competence of the CC.

VII. Order of introducing changes to the present document.

A 2/3 of the total composition of the Network members has a right to change the present document. Decisions on changes to the original text of the Principles should be adopted by consensus.

Plan

1. Development and discussion of the draft Regulation on CC – by March 24, 2010.
2. Approval of the Regulation on CC –by March 31, 2010.
3. Distribution of the main directions of activity among members of the Network (by March 15, 2010):
Development of the information strategy (Yulya – by March 15),

Analysis of the national legislation in the field of NGOs operating, freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of expression, freedom of association, access to a fair trial (country coordinators - by April 1, 2010),

Elaboration of the recommendations in order to bring the national legislation into compliance with international standards (country coordinators - by April 1, 2010).

Data gathering on individual cases (to be submitted by all members of the Network, collected by the country coordinators – by May 15, 2010).

Creation of a web-site – is planned.

4. To inform the human rights communities in Tajikistan and Turkmenistan - Inara.

ANNEX 6: Recommendations from South Caucuses Network Coordinator

Anna's recommendations on creating an HRD Regional Network

- 7) First of all, it is necessary to define the objectives of the Network and the objectives of participation in it before receiving financial support.
- 8) 2 objectives – creating the Network and involving HR defenders in its activity and sharing information
- 9) Sharing experience in tactics and strategies for HR defenders' protection.
Providing practical help and financial support. Providing medical assistance, legal and counselling advice, social rehabilitation.
- 10) Resources for providing temporary accommodation.
- 11) Joint drafting of applications, letters, statements addressing various organisations.
- 12) Informative component, development of a common database. Questions about the legitimacy of information sources.
- 13) Creating a website
- 14) Tracking situations and trends with HR defenders.
- 15) Support of HR defenders' families.
- 16) Monitoring trial proceedings against HRD
- 17) Organising joint activities.
- 18) The right to speak for everyone and on behalf of everyone
- 19) Definition of the Network members' duties: someone is monitoring, someone is analysing, someone is providing concrete help to a particular person
- 20) Members themselves should follow the Code of Ethics
- 21) Joint drafting of the reports. Reason – draw attention to a certain problem. It is effective, as more organisations would focus their attention on that problem.
- 22) Regularly inform all the Network participants about coming events and what has been done.
- 23) Compile a questionnaire (in order to confirm genuine data)
- 24) Stay in touch with journalists
- 25) Choose the "right" coordinator, who can speak English (preferably), be self-motivated
- 26) Distribution of funds - financial support of the project should be decentralised. It is necessary to send the funds to coordinators from each country in order to provide a faster response and to prevent conflict situations in future.
- 27) It is necessary to choose a moderator of the Network so that in case of a conflict situation among participants they can act as a referee.
- 28) Organising training for the members about the Network's activity and its coordination.

- 29) The problem of the Network's members understanding of the essence of the issue
- 30) Trying to organise monitoring in courts.
- 31) Communication – if a fast response is needed, it is necessary to contact a coordinator from a certain state and he would sign it [the response] on behalf of every member of the Network.
- 32) Strategies – public statement, confidentiality. Thinking about every step in order to prevent an HRD themselves from negative consequences in future.
- 33) HR defenders' safety.
- 34) PR-campaign for the Network, speaking about the Network without mentioning its members in order to protect HR defenders from the authorities' pressure.
- 35) Spread information among other members of the Network instead of keeping it for ourselves.
- 36) Help strategy. It is necessary to use different approach – if the grounds of the state's accusation are unreasonable, it is necessary to take measures for denying this information (by the decision of all the members of the Network)
- 37) Every member of the Network has a right to sign any statement on behalf of the Network. Every participant makes a decision themselves.
- 38) Precise information about what governance mechanisms various states use in international practice is required. Which conventions, covenants. And protocols signed by a certain state. What decisions are made by particular organisations and Network members.

Participants' suggestions.

- 7) Not to abuse other members' trust and support.
- 8) Share contacts of both members and authorised persons.
- 9) Support particular projects financially, instead of the Network's activity itself.
- 10) Financial support for the whole Network, not the projects inside it.
- 11) Sign the Collaboration Memorandum (The Statute of the Network), pointing out that the Network does not follow political objectives.
- 12) Create a HRD data base.
- 13) Access to donors' contacts.
- 14) Developing contacts with international organisations dealing with HR protection.
- 15) Recurrent organisation of meetings for sharing experience and problems.
- 16) Creating a website of the Network.
- 17) Creating local work groups.
- 18) Experience continuity and young people's involvement in the HRD movement.
- 19) Organising schools and educational programmes.
- 20) Implementation of constant legal advice for the Network members
- 21) Coverage of the principles and possibilities for activities (resources) of a particular organisation

Monitoring and Evaluation Report + Feasibility of Pilot's Success for Programme
The Diploma in Human Rights Programme – Pilot Project (Central Asia)
Implemented by: Human Rights and Social Justice Research Institute, London Metropolitan University

- 22) Distributing duties amongst Network members
- 23) Implementation of typical questionnaires in order to define strategies
- 24) Creating a forum (educational course) based at any university in order to enable volunteers to obtain a degree in Human Rights
- 25) Using protection mechanisms in international organisations.