

COST

Domain Committee "Individuals, Societies, Cultures and Health"

COST Action A28

Start Date 18/09/2004

End Date 19/09/2009

Human Rights, Peace and Security in EU Foreign Policy

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

This Report stems from the relevant Domain Committee.
It contains four parts:

- I. Management Report*** prepared by the COST Office/Grant Holder
- II. Scientific Report*** prepared by the Chair of the Management Committee of the Action.
- III. Evaluation Report*** prepared by the "ad hoc" Evaluation Panel, established by the Domain Committee, and edited by the COST Office.
- IV. DC General Assessment*** prepared by the Domain Committee

Appendices:

Confidentiality: the documents will be made available to the public via the COST Action web page except for chapter *II.D. Self evaluation* and *III. Evaluation Report*.

Executive summary of the Scientific Report (max.250 words):

I. Management Report

I.A. COST Action Fact Sheet

- **COST Action A28:** *Human Rights, Peace and Security in EU Foreign Policy*
- **Domain** *Individuals, Societies, Cultures and Health*

- **Action details:**

CSO Approval: 03/10/2003

End date: 19/09/2009

Entry into force: 01/04/2004

Extension: -

- **Objectives:** *The main objective of the Action is to increase and deepen knowledge on the functioning of national and international instruments devised to pursue human rights, peace and security objectives in order to recommend modifications of the foreign policy of the European Union. An international network will be created consisting of European human rights institutes, several of which co-operate as the Association of Human Rights Institutes (AHRI), established in 2000. Some AHRI-institutes are leading research centres in the field of human rights studies, nationally and internationally. Their multidisciplinary study of human rights issues from juridical, social-scientific as well as normative and historical perspectives, adds value to the quality and completeness of the implementation of this Action. Working Groups: 1 Peacekeeping and -enforcement in order to protect human rights 2 International Criminal Tribunals 3 Development cooperation 4 UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), other parts of the UN human rights program and the OSCE-High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM).*

- **Parties:** *list of countries and date of acceptance*

Austria 01/07/2004	Greece -	Poland -
Belgium 24/09/2004	Hungary -	Portugal 20/12/2006
Bulgaria 10/05/2004	Iceland 07/06/2006	Romania 15/04/2005
Croatia -	Ireland 01/04/2004	Serbia 13/12/2006
Cyprus 15/04/2005	Israel -	Slovakia -
Czech Rep. -	Italy -	Slovenia -
Denmark 28/06/2004	Latvia -	Spain 31/03/2004
Estonia -	Lithuania -	Sweden 04/05/2005
Finland 01/04/2004	Luxembourg -	Switzerland -
FYR of Macedonia -	Malta -	Turkey -
France -	Netherlands 01/04/2004	United Kingdom 05/07/2004
Germany 25/10/2004	Norway 01/04/2004	

- **Intentions to accept:** *list of countries and date*

- **Other participants:**

Chair: *Dr Peter MALCONTENT*
history department, Utrecht university
drift 10 3512 BS Utrecht Netherlands

DC Rapporteur: *Michael Schuster*
DFG, Germany

Science Officer: *Dr Julia STAMM*
COST Office
Julia.Stamm@cost.eu
+32 2 533 38 33

Administrative Officer: *Felicitas*
Ambrosius

- **Action Web site:** <http://www.costaction28.org>

I.B. Management Committee member list

Management Committee	
Chair	Vice Chair
Dr Peter MALCONTENT history department, utrecht university drift 10 3512 BS Utrecht Netherlands	Mr Geir ULFSTEIN Norwegian Center for Human Rights P.O.Box 6706 St. Olavs plass 0130 Oslo Norway
Cyprus	
Mr Van COUFOUDAKIS MC Member	Mr Ioannis TSERIoTIS MC Member Research Promotion Foundation European Union Social and Political Institute University of Cyprus 7 Lord Byron avenue, 1465, Nicosia 1465 NICOSIA Cyprus
Denmark	
Dr Hans Otto SANO MC Member Danish Institute for Human Rights Strandgade 56 1401 Copenhagen Denmark	Dr Karin BUHMANN MC Member Section for Consumption, Health and Ethics Faculty of Life Sciences University of Copenhagen Rolighedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg C Denmark
Finland	
Prof. Martin SCHEININ MC Member Institute for Human Rights Abo Akademi University Gezeliusgatan 2 20500 Turku/Abo Finland	
Germany	
Dr Heiner BIELEFELDT MC Member German Institute for Human Rights Zimmerstr. 26/27 10969 Berlin Germany	Dr Frauke SEIDENSTICKER MC Member Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte Stellvertretende Direktorin, Zimmerstrasse 26/27 10969 Berlin Germany
Iceland	
Gudrun GUDMUNDSDOTTIR MC Member THE ICELANDIC HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER Hafnarstrati 20 101	Ms Thordis INGADOTTIR MC Member Reykjavik University Ofanleiti 2 103 Reykjavik Iceland
Ireland	
Prof. William SCHABAS MC Member National University of Ireland N/A - Please update this record Galway Ireland	Dr Kathleen CAVANAUGH MC Member National University of Ireland N/A - Please update this record Galway Ireland
Norway	
Mr Geir ULFSTEIN MC Member Norwegian Center for Human Rights P.O.Box 6706 St. Olavs plass 0130 Oslo Norway	Mr Mads ANDENAS MC Member Norwegian Centre for Human Rights - nchr/University of Oslo N/A - Please update this record Oslo N/A - Please update this record Norway
Dr Arne TOSTENSEN MC Member Chr. Michelsen Institute P.O. Box 6033 Postterminalen 5892 Bergen Norway	
Portugal	
Carlos MARTINS BRANCO MC Member Portuguese Army N/A - Please update this record Lisboa Portugal	
Serbia	
Prof. Vojin DIMITRIJEVIC MC Member Belgrade Centre for Human Rights N/A - Please update this record Belgrade N/A - Please update this record Serbia	

Spain	
Natividad FERNANDEZ MC Member Universidad de Zaragoza N/A - Please update this record Zaragoza Spain	Dr Mariano AGUIRRE MC Member FRIDE N/A - Please update this record N/A - Please update this record Spain

Sweden	
Ms Christina JOHANSSON MC Member Raoul Wallenberg institutet for manskliga rattigheter Box 1155 221 05 Lund Sweden	Dr Gudmundur ALFREDSSON MC Member Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights PO Box 1155 22105 Lund Sweden

United Kingdom	
Prof. Colin HARVEY MC Member Human Rights Centre School of Law Queens University Belfast N/A BT7 1NN Belfast United Kingdom	

I.C. Overview activities and expenditure

Budget Year 2004

Total Action Budget 15,696

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
First MC meeting	18-Sep-04	Oslo	9035.73
MC Meeting	15-Dec-09	Brussels	2660.35
		Total	11696.08

General Support Grants

Title	Date	Cost
General	01-Jun-06	2,000
General	01-Apr-07	2,000
	Total	4,000

Budget Year 2005

Total Action Budget 63,509

Meetings

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
Joint MC/Working Group	15-Feb-05	Brussels (BE)	15409.58
Working Group	12-Mar-05	Turku (FI)	2272.21
Working Group	17-Jun-05	London (uk)	3385.7
In conjunction with Workshop/Conference	30-Sep-05	Galway (IE)	32641.22
Working Group	12-Dec-05	Brussels (BE)	2711.56
		Total	56420.27

Workshops

Title	Date	Place	Cost
Past, Current and Future Policies of the EU in the field of Human Rights, Peace and Security	30-Sep-05	Galway (IE)	7,089
		Total	7,089

Budget Year 2006

Total Action Budget 54,656

Meetings

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
Working Group	07-Sep-06	Brussels (BE)	1364.76
Joint MC/Working Group	08-Sep-06	Vienna (AT)	36254.4
Working Group	17-Nov-06	Brussels (BE)	875.24
Working Group	30-Nov-06	Berlin (DE)	3291.67
		Total	41786.07

STSM

Beneficiary	Date	From	To	Cost
Ms Sofia Botzios	03-Dec-06	Belfast (uk)	Belgium (BE)	800
Ms Katarina Månsson	01-Oct-06	Galway (IE)	Bradford (UK)	2500
			Total	3300

Workshops

Title	Date	Place	Cost
INDICATORS AND MONITORING SYSTEMS AS PREVENTIVE TOOLS FOR ENSURING PEACE AND SECURITY AND RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN EXTERNAL POLICY-MAKING OF THE EU	08-Sep-06	Vienna (AT)	7,570
		Total	7,570

General Support Grants

Title	Date	Cost
General	01-Jun-06	2,000
	Total	2,000

Budget Year 2007

Total Action Budget 20,081

Meetings

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
MC meeting	01-Mar-07	Brussels (BE)	9344.29
Working Group	08-Mar-07	Hague (NL)	5447.08
Working Group	19-Apr-07	Brussels (BE)	3289.7
		Total	18081.07

General Support Grants

Title	Date	Cost
General	01-Apr-07	2,000
	Total	2,000

Budget Year 2008

Total Action Budget 61,665

Meetings

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
Joint MC/Working Group	07-Sep-07	Belgrade (RS)	42792.42
Working Group	14-Dec-07	Brussels (BE)	2715.58
Working Group	07-Mar-08	Åbo/Turku (FI)	3075.9
Working Group	11-Apr-08	Brussels (BE)	2831.92
		Total	51415.82

STSM

Beneficiary	Date	From	To	Cost
Ms Erna Mathiesen	04-May-08	Reykjavik (IS)	Beograd (RS)	1556
			Total	1556

Workshops

Title	Date	Place	Cost
Joint MC & WGs and Annual Workshop	07-Sep-07	Belgrade (RS)	8,693
		Total	8,693

Budget Year 2009

Total Action Budget 43,712

Meetings

Meeting Type	Date	Place	Cost
Final Conference	19-Feb-09	Utrecht (NL)	27597.07
		Total	27597.07

Workshops

Title	Date	Place	Cost
Final Conference	19-Feb-09	Utrecht (NL)	10,000
		Total	10,000

Dissemination

Title	Date	Cost
Indicators and Monitoring - Systems as Preventive Tools for ensuring Peace and Security and Respect for Human Rights in External Policy-Making of the EU'	02-Feb-09	3,000
The effectiveness of international criminal tribunals	20-Aug-09	3,115
	Total	6,115

II. Scientific Report

II.A. Results achieved

Objectives and structures

The main objective of the Action was to increase and deepen knowledge on the functioning of national and international instruments devised to pursue human rights and peace & security objectives, in order to assess and recommend changes to different fields of EU foreign policy.

This objective was pursued through the work of four Working Groups:

- WG I: Peacekeeping and –enforcement in order to protect human rights
Coordinator: Prof. Tom Hadden, UK
- WG II: International Criminal Tribunals
Coordinator: Prof. William B. Schabas, Ireland (acting coordinator in latter part of action: Dr Cedric Ryngaert)
- WG III: Development Co-operation
Coordinator: Dr. Arne Tostensen, Norway
- WG IV: UN-High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), other parts of the UN-human rights system and the OSCE-High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM)
Coordinator: Prof. Martin Scheinin, Finland

The Action heavily built on the Association of Human Rights Institutes (AHRI), established in 2000. Many AHRI-institutes are leading research centres in the field of human rights studies, nationally and internationally, which engage in a multidisciplinary study of human rights issues from legal, social science as well as normative and historical perspectives.

Outcomes

The Action's work-plan has been completed almost in full, and in many respects more has been achieved than was originally envisaged. The assessment of existing instruments in the field of human rights and peace & security was fully completed. In addition, the vast field of development policy has been added to that assessment exercise. Recommendations for revision of EU policies have equally been elaborated, in close co-operation with stakeholders from the European Union institutions in particular, in each of the four Working Groups (see reports in attachment).

It was gradually realised that an integrated, comparative analysis of the findings of the four Working Groups was far too ambitious to be completed with the limited funds made available by a COST Action. However, the findings of each Working Group were already so vast and relevant in their own right, that the Action has achieved more than it had originally envisaged (see further under II.B Dissemination of results).

Through sustained interaction with policymakers and practitioners throughout the Action's life, the assessments and recommendations have benefited from their input, which in turn has strengthened the relevance and potential impact on policy and practice. The findings of WG III e.g. were presented to staff from the EU institutions in June 2008 at a meeting in the European Parliament.

Activities

The Action has organised a highly visible and successful annual workshops, which gathered a large part of the European human rights research community, including many Early Stage Researchers, as well as key UN, OSCE, Council of Europe and EU experts and practitioners. The annual conferences took place in Oslo (2004), Galway (2005), Vienna (2006), Belgrade (2007) and Utrecht (envisaged 2008, postponed to early 2009) (for more details, please refer to the annual progress reports and II.B).

The conferences served three main goals:

1. To assess progress made in the overall Action's activities;
2. To work on sub-themes in the four working groups;
3. To explore a specific overarching focus or theme, such as future EU policies, preventive tools or the former Yugoslavia.

The annual conferences were complemented by separate Working Group meetings in between. Gradually, the intensity of these meetings increased, and a joint concluding meeting of WG III and IV took place in March 2008 in Åbo/Turku.

Throughout the Action, a large number of Early Stage researchers was actively involved. They did not so much take part through targeted activities such as STSMs (of which at least four took

place), but played a central role in the mainstream activities of the Action. At each annual conference, parallel PhD sessions were organised to discuss on-going research. In addition, many Early Stage researchers played a pivotal role in the Working Groups. Two of the academic book publications which came out of the Action were prepared under the (co-)leadership of Early Stage Researchers (i.e. Salomon, Ryngaert and Vandenhole).

Synergetic and follow-up activities

Given the highly successful results of this Action, and the high degree of commitment and enthusiasm of those involved, it was decided to follow-up on the work done by applying for a new COST Action. A new application, focusing on the role of the EU in UN human rights reform, was submitted. This new Action, IS0702 was launched at the final A28 Action conference, in early 2009. The Action has also been instrumental in creating a network for applications with other European funding agencies, such as a Collaborative Research Project on detection technologies, counter-terrorism, ethics and human rights, funded by the European Union Framework 7th Programme - Security Theme (Detector, 2008-2011), and an ESF supported Research Networking Programme on Transnational Human Rights Obligations (Glothro, 2010-2014). It has also led to sustained bi- and multilateral cooperation between participants and their institutions.

II.B. Dissemination of results

- *Action related Publications and Reports (list)*

The publications and reports listed here are strictly confined to those which were prepared as a collaborative effort within the Action's working groups. Publications and reports, individually or jointly prepared by some members of the Action, can be found in their respective publications lists.

Each working group issued a final report with policy conclusions and recommendations (see attachments):

- WG I: Peacekeeping and -enforcement in order to protect human rights: A Responsibility to assist: Human Rights Policy and Practice in European Union – Crisis Management Operations
- WG II: International Criminal Tribunals: Recommendations for the European Union
- WG III: Human Rights and Development: Implications and Recommendations for the European Union
- WG IV: Preventive and Reactive Approaches to Human Rights Protection: Recommendations to the European Union

In addition to the reports, four high quality academic publications, all of which are mentioned in the COST library, were produced:

- T. Hadden (ed.), *A Responsibility to Assist*, Oxford, Hart, 2009, 155 p.
- C. Ryngaert (ed.), *The Effectiveness of International Criminal Justice*, Antwerp, Intersentia, 2009, 280 p. (published in the International Law Series)
- M.E. Salomon, A. Tostensen and W. Vandenhole (eds.), *Casting the Net Wider: Human Rights, Development and New Duty-Bearers*, Antwerp, Intersentia, 2007, 462 p.
- J. Kozma, M. Nowak and R. Smith (eds.), *Indicators and Monitoring Systems in External Policy-Making of the EU*, Vienna, NWV, 2009, 178 p.

- *Workshops*

Five workshops were organised:

- 2009, Utrecht: Final Conference on Human Rights, Peace and Security in EU Foreign Policy
- 2007, Belgrade: The International Community in the Aftermath of the Yugoslavia Crisis. Restoring Peace and Human Rights Enforcement, Justice, Development, and Prevention
- 2006, Vienna: Indicators and Monitoring Systems as Preventive Tools for Ensuring Peace and Security and Respect for Human Rights in External Policy-Making of the EU
- 2005, Galway: Past, Present and Future Policies of the European Union in the Field of Human Rights, Peace and Security
- 2004, Oslo: Human Rights, Peace and Security in EU Foreign Policy

- *Web site (description)*

The website www.costaction28.org offered information on the objectives of the COST Action, the composition and activities of the management committee and the working groups, as well as on STSMs and working group meetings.

- *Scientific Cooperation*

Cooperation and contacts were established, in particular with other scholars working on the topic of the Action (e.g. invited as keynote speakers at workshops), and with policymakers and practitioners. Sustained co-operation took place inter alia with (representatives of) the following organisations and bodies:

- UN: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights; UN Treaty Bodies; UN Rapporteur on Torture; UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism; UN Independent Expert on Minority Issues
- OSCE: Office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities
- EU: European Parliament, European Commission, Secretariat of the Council

- *Transfer of results*

Findings and recommendations were communicated to policymakers and practitioners, in particular within the EU institutions, through their active involvement in the work of the Working Groups, and in the case of WG III, through a meeting at the European Parliament, at which EU representatives were invited to react and comment on the Working Group's findings.

II.C. Self evaluation

Among the main successes of the Action are the sustained commitment of its members, the high degree of participation in mainstream activities by Early Stage Researchers, the sustained interaction with policy makers and practitioners from diverse institutions, the production of four high-quality academic publications, and the follow-up activities generated.

The vast majority of members of the Action have actively participated throughout the Action. This sustained commitment has allowed the Action to steadily continue the work embarked upon, and to produce a considerable set of recommendations as well as collaborative academic publications. Early Stage Researchers have been very active in the mainstream activities of the Action. Some have played a pivotal role in the Working Groups. Two of the academic book publications were prepared under the (co-)leadership of early stage researchers.

The sustained interaction with policymakers and practitioners of UN, OSCE, Council of Europe and EU institutions, at the annual workshops, in Working Group meetings, and through the preparation of publications has allowed the Action to check the value of preliminary research results for policy and practice, and to make them even more relevant. On the other hand, the likely impact of the findings on policymakers and practitioners has increased given their sense of ownership of these findings, and the fact that they have taken the time to sit down and discuss ideas with scholars. In addition to many individual and co-authored publications, the Action produced no less than four high-quality book publications, all of which explicitly gave credit to COST. Norad, the Norwegian aid agency, provided funding for wide dissemination to research institutions in the South in particular of the WG III anthology.

Finally, the Action has been followed up by a new COST supported Action on the role of the EU in UN human rights reform, and has facilitated the creation of networks for obtaining funding from other European agencies.

The Action could probably have done more in bringing the work of the separate working groups together, and in providing overarching recommendations. However, that has proven to be an ambition far beyond what can be reasonably expected from a COST Action (which only facilitates meetings, but does not fund substantive research activities), given the vast areas of research covered by the Action.

A difficulty that the Action encountered, but managed to overcome, was the sustained engagement with and opportunities for exchange with policymakers and practitioners, in particular from EU institutions. Given the heavy workload of these people, they committed only hesitantly initially. Nonetheless, once they felt that there was a lot for them to share and to learn in the process, quite some of them participated enthusiastically.

II.D Reports from Working Groups

Report from Working Group 1

The major purpose of Working Group 1 was to describe and assess the current decision-making structures and procedures on military, police and civilian crisis management missions throughout the world undertaken by the European Union under its common foreign and security and defence policies. It is part of a wider review under COST Action A28 of human rights components of all European Union foreign policy.

European Union interventions or missions in non-member countries are a relatively recent development. They have been undertaken to ensure more effective co-ordination of humanitarian, peace-keeping, and peace building efforts by Member States in response to conflicts and crises throughout the world and perhaps also to project the role of the European Union as a major world actor in this sphere.

These missions may take various forms. At one end of the scale they may involve the deployment of military forces in peace-keeping or peace enforcement operations, as in the Democratic Republic of Congo. They may involve the deployment of military and police personnel in a preventive role as in Macedonia or in the aftermath of more serious conflict with a view to maintaining public order or controlling criminal activity, as in Bosnia. Or they may involve the provision of civilian support for the rebuilding or redevelopment of democracy and the rule of law in countries where governmental structures have been destroyed or have broken down. The European Union, as will be seen, has tended to concentrate its engagement at the lower end of this scale of military, policing and civilian intervention, leaving it to other bodies or coalitions to organise active military interventions.

Liaison and interaction with these other bodies, the United Nations, NATO, the African Union and voluntary coalitions, is also an essential element in decision-making and deployment at every level. Though the European Union can and occasionally does act independently, it is more usual for decisions to be made in co-operation with other international bodies whether for joint intervention at an initial stage or for the handover of continuing interventions from one body to another. This involves complex and sometimes difficult diplomatic and military negotiations on which of the various international bodies, or in default of agreement which coalition of willing states, should undertake a particular operation.

Working Group produced a final report called the *Responsibility to assist*. The main focus of the report is not to provide a detailed analysis and assessment of the success or failure of particular missions. On the contrary, the full range of information and internal reviews which would be necessary for detailed assessments of that kind are not made available by the European Union. It is to describe in plain language the often rather complex and confusing structures that have been built up over the past decade and to assess the past, current and potential future contribution of the European Union to this wide range of interventions on a number of different levels. Some of the major issues to be addressed may be summarised as follows:

1. The policy objective

What is the underlying policy objective for the European Union? Is it primarily to promote democracy, the rule of law and human rights in non-EU states; or alternatively to assert its role as a major contributor to international action to achieve international peace and stability with the capacity to deploy rapidly; or is it a combination of both?

2. The process of decision making

How is the decision to intervene in any particular conflict or crisis made? How do the current

procedures work in practice and are they appropriate and how might they be improved?

3. Procedures for liaison with the UN, NATO and other bodies

What are the formal and informal procedures for liaison and co-operation with other international agencies and how could they be improved?

4. The distinction between military, police and civilian missions

What are the reasons for the different procedures for decision-making on military, police and civilian missions and could they be better co-ordinated?

5. Accountability during the deployment

How are the mandates and rules of engagement for particular interventions drawn up and are there sufficient provisions for ensuring effective accountability for all those engaged in European Union missions?

6. The financial other costs involved

The major costs of European Union interventions are borne by individual member states rather than from the EU budget. Is this appropriate or should more of the costs be covered by contributions from all member States?

7. The overall effectiveness of the intervention

How is the effectiveness of individual interventions assessed and what improvement in the system might be made?

Report from Working Group 2

Working Group 2 focused on the added value of international criminal tribunals in fighting impunity for crimes against international law and fostering political reconciliation in affected States. It aimed to identify best practices which may inform the choice between the establishment of international criminal tribunals and recourse to other mechanisms, and which may render existing or future tribunals more effective institutions. This work led to the development of a report, published as a book.

The first part of this book analyzes how such tribunals, if the international community decides to establish them, could be effective institutions. Obviously, the tribunals' conduct of their own legal proceedings, within their mandate, may go a long way to make the tribunals effective mechanisms of post-conflict justice (e.g. prosecutor's choice of suspects, outreach, human rights protection, victims' participation...). It will be argued, however, that effectiveness will, in fact, for a large part depend on factors outside the tribunal's control, such as the presence of the right political parameters and the financial, logistical, and other support of States.

The second part of the volume contrasts international criminal justice with other judicial or political mechanisms aimed at dispensing justice or reconciling communities. An answer will be sought to the question whether national, as opposed to international justice avenues, amnesties for grave crimes, or restorative justice mechanisms (reparations, housing restitution) could sometimes be more effective than international criminal tribunals.

Report from Working Group 3

Working Group III of COST Action A28 has devoted its work to the relationship between human rights and development, with a focus on economic, social and cultural rights enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The deliberations resulted in a 462-page anthology co-edited by Margot E. Salomon, Arne Tostensen and Wouter Vandenhoele under the title *Casting the Net Wider: Human Rights, Development and New Duty-Bearers*. It was published in late 2007 by Intersentia in Antwerp and has been distributed widely to libraries and institutions in Europe and developing countries. This wide distribution and the production of the book were facilitated by a grant from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad).

Report from Working Group 4

Working Group IV was on one level related to a comparison between and study on the respective roles of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. However, the reference to the UN High Commissioner was

aimed to include also other parts of the United Nations human rights program, and the reference to UN and OSCE institutions was not intended as a plan to neglect other international and European institutional frameworks, such as the Council of Europe (with its own Human Rights Commissioner), or the European Union itself.

WG IV operated through a design of variable geometry. It convened at the annual AHRI/COST Conferences but also in between those events as a COST Working Group but usually also attracting other experts interested in a particular topic. For instance, WG IV brokered a first-ever meeting between the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities and the UN Independent Expert on Minority Issues. It fed into other processes at the UN level, such as the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, and the OHCHR project on developing indicators for the work of the UN human rights treaty bodies. These three interfaces with external human rights actors continue their own lives after the closing of COST Action A28 and correspond to the three legs of practical activities by WG IV. Academics engaged in WG IV have been able to provide input to ongoing processes of human rights monitoring and promotion.

Recommendations for the European Union:

1. The EU should continue with its involvement and input, including at the level of academic networking and research, in the overall process of promoting and protecting human rights anywhere in the world, including through the work of intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations, Council of Europe and OSCE.
2. There is a clear need for improving the level of knowledge and expertise among EU policy-makers, including national governments, the Commission and the European Parliament, about the work and achievements of other intergovernmental organizations in the field of human rights.