Annual Reports for the Years 2009 and 2010
ABOUT US

Since 1998, the ICHRP has generated important knowledge in over 30 key areas of global public policy. Our aim is to strengthen human rights advocacy through producing applied policy research. We blend the bold and change-driven concerns of human rights activists, the pragmatic preoccupations of policy-makers, and the analytical rigour of scholars. Our approach is multi-disciplinary and international, characterised by our ability to convene, as equals, actors with differing viewpoints and geo-political orientations.

In choosing our priorities, we are not solely reactive, taking the easy path or picking low-hanging fruit. We ask questions, pursue lines of enquiry and make connections that others occupying the human rights space cannot or do not do. Underlying our global approach is grounded analysis that captures cross-cutting concerns, posing challenges across contexts.

A lean and agile Secretariat with staff from different regions of the world leads the operationalisation of our strategic priorities through building global teams and translating findings into effective policy advocacy. Our commitment to diversity is institutionalised within the governing body, the International Council, whose members are leading lights in human rights activism, policy-making, academia, media, social movements, inter-governmental organisations and other communities of practice. We therefore have a unique ability to convene an invaluable network of geo-political and multi-disciplinary expertise.

We aim to strengthen human rights knowledge and policy by working closely with human rights advocates and others who can influence people in power. To an extent, our audience is project-specific, as we aim to engage different actors, organisations and communities with each project, often taking human rights knowledge to new audiences.
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ICHRP PROJECTS SINCE 1998
A NOTE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

INTRODUCTION

The period encompassing 2009 and 2010 marked two significant changes in the ICHRP. Firstly, our first Executive Director, Robert Archer, stepped down in late 2009 after more than a decade of path-breaking leadership while Maina Kiai assumed leadership of the Secretariat in the fall of 2010. Secondly, the ICHRP began transitioning to a multi-year strategic planning approach, marking a shift from a project-based approach to one framed by broader medium-term thematic priorities.

The ICHRP’s research outputs as well as its global, multidisciplinary and collaborative approach continue to make a unique and distinct contribution. During 2009 and 2010, the ICHRP focussed on research or policy advocacy around the following issues:

- Corruption and human rights;
- Plural legal orders;
- Climate change;
- Social control policies;
- Sexuality and human rights;
- Privacy and data gathering technologies;
- The rights of undocumented migrants.

The ICHRP also successfully held a Colloquium on macro-economic policies and human rights, which confirmed the value of our convening power. The publication, in collaboration with Cambridge University Press of an edited volume on climate change and human rights marked another first for the ICHRP. Similarly the co-publication of reports on corruption and human rights with Transparency International was another step towards enhancing our external engagement and reach. Two Discussion Papers on 1) sexuality and 2) privacy and data gathering technologies, marked further diversification of our outputs.

Another significant milestone was the evaluation of the ICHRP commissioned by the UK Department for International Development. The evaluation reaffirmed the value and quality of our research while underlining the need to enhance investment in sustained post-publication activities, communications and follow-up. In addition, we also prepared to take on a larger strategic approach to our operations, with the 2010 International Council meeting approving the shift to the new approach of multi-year strategic planning with thematic priorities and an allied
collection of projects. Another significant change was the shifting the Secretariat from Versoix (where it has been located since its inception) into the heart of the city of Geneva.

LOOKING FORWARD

A further change in leadership was initiated in April–May 2011 with the resignation of Maina Kiai, who was appointed UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of assembly and association. This unexpected change in leadership has nevertheless provided a context to revisit the key strengths of the ICHRP. In particular, the completion and approval by the Executive Board of the Strategic Plan 2011–2014 provides a basis for a new phase of institutional building and growth. The Plan enables us to (a) adopt a broader strategic framework to guide our work, (b) develop new methodologies of collaborative research, (c) enhance our capacity for activities oriented to policy advocacy, and (d) reconfigure institutionally.

Vijay K. Nagaraj, Executive Director
THE RESEARCH PROGRAMME 2009 AND 2010

Corruption

Status: Two reports, published in 2009 and 2010, respectively.

Brief Introduction

In 2007, the ICHRP started a project on the subject of corruption and human rights, aiming to detail the impact of corruption on human rights, to show how human rights principles and tools can help to curb corruption, and to assist anti-corruption organisations to apply human rights effectively to their work.

ICHRP work on this issue has resulted in two highly-regarded publications: Corruption & Human Rights: Making the Connection (2009) and Integrating Human Rights in the Anti-corruption Agenda: Challenges, Possibilities & Opportunities (2010). The first report, Making the Connection, developed a much-needed conceptual framework, analysing how specific acts of corruption could be linked to specific human rights violations. It set out why human rights and anti-corruption practitioners have reasons to cooperate, and delineated the main features of the two traditions of practice. The second report, Integrating Human Rights in the Anti-corruption Agenda, builds on and goes beyond the conceptual framework of the first report, to address issues of implementation. It provides a practical tool for applying and operationalising human rights principles and methods in local and national anti-corruption programmes. Innovatively tackling alleged tensions between certain anti-corruption and human rights practices, the report shows how practitioners in both fields can unite efforts and effectively collaborate in the struggle to root out entrenched corruption.

Outputs

The first report is now available in five languages (English, Spanish, Thai, Armenian, Serbian). Integrating Human Rights in the Anti-Corruption Agenda has been translated into Armenian and Spanish; publication of these translations is pending.
Key Activities

The reports were released and findings were disseminated in several international fora, which drew together experts, practitioners and policymakers working on anti-corruption as well as human rights:

- The International Anti-Corruption Conference, Bangkok, November 2010 provided a high-profile launch for the 2010 report as well as the release of the Thai translation of the 2009 report, *Corruption and Human Rights: Making the Connection*.

- The launch of the Spanish version of *Making the Connection* took place in Mexico City in February 2010, in conjunction with the *Tecnológico de Monterrey* and the Mexican Chapter of Transparency International (TI). It included participants from the National Human Rights Commission of Mexico City. A further launch was held in Chile, August 2010, in partnership with the Latin American chapters of TI.

- A roundtable in Belgrade, Serbia, April 2010, included experts from TI BiH, Serbian academia and representatives from the Serbian Ombudsman and anti-corruption agency.

- The launch of the Armenian version of *Making the Connection* took place in Armenia in July 2009. Mobilizing Action Against Corruption (MAAC) and Armenia’s Human Rights Defender’s Office partnered with the ICHR for this event.

- A Mexico workshop, April 2010, on how corruption in cash transfer programmes can adversely affect human rights was held by the ICHR in partnership with the Escuela de Graduados en Administración Pública y Política Pública (EGAP) of the *Tecnologico de Monterrey*.

- The ICHR contributed to the 14th annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Forum, August 2009, Amman.

- In July 2009, the report was presented at the International Anti-Corruption Summer School (IACSS) organised by the Federal Bureau for Internal Affairs, Austria.
Outcomes

Our work on corruption has led to the mainstreaming of human rights concerns within the work of TI, the world’s largest anti-corruption NGO, who after co-publishing a second edition of the first report, also co-published the 2010 second report, which included a Foreword by TI Managing Director Cobus de Swardt. Our reports provided a conceptual human rights basis to TI’s policy-making and aligned it more closely with the human rights movement, both at the Secretariat and regional level through its chapters, where both reports have been widely distributed. The work has also aided civil society groups and anti-corruption projects in Armenia, Serbia and Latin America. In Latin America it has directly influenced the work and policy of key national institutions: informing home affairs policy in the Mexico City Commission of Human Rights, as well as implementation of the national Human Rights Action Plan at the federal level; and informing the work of the National Anti-Corruption Commission of Chile. The reports have also been widely utilised by the UNDP and the UNODC, for example at regional anti-corruption workshops. Research Director Magdalena Sepulveda Carmona was invited to join the Programme Committee of the November 2010 International Anti-Corruption Conference in Bangkok, advising on the agenda.

“The Corruption project] has impacted at numerous levels as a result of strong networking and strategic partnerships. The influence emerging from this project show influence at a deeper level with efforts to implement the ideas contained in it in country policy.”

— UK Department for International Development

“Outstanding contribution to knowledge and information on these topics”

— Frank Vogl, co-founder and Board member, Transparency International
Plural Legal Orders


Brief Introduction

The project has two central but interrelated messages for the wider human rights community: a) the importance of recognising legal pluralism, in particular with respect to family law and non-state law, especially in the area of women’s rights, and b) the importance of situating such recognition within a critical understanding of how identity and cultural and religious differences are invoked. In addition, the project also seeks to address the rule of law community and highlight the relevance of considering human rights principles in engaging with non-state law.

The final report When Legal Worlds Overlap: Human Rights, State and Non-State Law highlights human rights impacts and dilemmas associated with plural state and non-state laws, such as family laws based on religion, customary justice practices and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Drawing on examples of such plural legal orders from around the world, it proposes principles and a framework to guide human rights practitioners and policy-makers. The report also identifies challenges related to incorporation of non-state law in state law, recognition of cultural differences in law, and justice sector reform. Emphasising the contested nature of culture, especially when dealing with gender equality, religious freedom and indigenous peoples’ rights, it calls for evidence-based assessments of plural legal orders that give special attention to people on the margins of state and non-state law, and equality between and within communities.

Outputs

A CD with over 200 relevant academic and non-academic papers, reports and other documents was also produced to accompany the report. The key findings and policy recommendations outlined in the report have been compiled in the form of a two-page research briefing.1 A translation of the summary of the report is available in English, French and Spanish.

1 Available at www.ichrp.org/files/assets/233/135_research_briefing.pdf.
Key Activities

The findings of the report were canvassed at the following key international fora:

- International Conference of the Commission on Folk Law and Legal Pluralism, Zurich, August 31–September 4, 2009 (draft report presented at a panel on human rights).


The report was also extensively used and its findings presented by MUSAWAH, a global network for justice in the Muslim family, in their meetings with members of UN CEDAW and OHCHR on Islamic law and human rights principles, in Geneva, October 18–19, 2010. The ICHRP collaborated with MUSAWAH to facilitate these engagements.

The project, in particular its critical approaches to culture, law and human rights also provided a basis to collaborate with the Association for Women in Development (AWID) in planning research and advocacy on religious fundamentalisms and human rights.
Outcomes

Our work has informed policy work in key institutions like UNIFEM, whose flagship report *Progress of the World’s Women* will this year include a chapter on women’s rights in plural legal systems, drawing on our research. Our analysis and policy recommendations have also enabled strategic engagement with other international institutions like the UNDP and the World Bank, been used to strengthen critical human rights approaches to the question of culture and religion within global networks like MUSAWAH and AWID, and informed capacity building in development institutions such as Oxfam.

“An excellent statement … [the] treatment is objective and balanced, and it definitely challenges the human rights community not only to take stock, but also to take action.”

— Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Former UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of the human rights and freedoms of indigenous peoples.
Brief Introduction

The primary objective of the Colloquium was to facilitate an interdisciplinary dialogue between those primarily concerned with macroeconomic policy questions, specialists in development, actors from key international institutions and human rights advocates. The economic crisis and its human rights consequences, especially impoverishment, job losses and adverse consequences on the social security of millions, made such a discussion very relevant. Notwithstanding the significance of the economic crisis, the Colloquium aimed at exploring in conceptual and practical depth the challenges of going beyond conventional wisdom and established disciplinary boundaries on this topic.

The key task was to consider how human rights values, principles and approaches can enrich economic policy-making to address the problems and challenges that human rights advocates, economists and policymakers need to face. The central idea behind the Colloquium was to serve as a stimulus for further discussion and interaction between the discourses of human rights and economic policy-making, rather than to reach consensus on policy solutions, a task well beyond the scope of a single meeting. Its envisaged outcome was intended to contribute to shaping a future research and dialogue agenda for further interactions between the different actors and disciplines.

A list of relevant background materials, academic-, advocacy- and policy-related, were also prepared and shared with all participants in advance of the Colloquium, and copies of these were available to participants on request before and during the Colloquium. In advance of the Colloquium, participants were also invited to send in brief notes with their thoughts and ideas on specific themes, and several participants did so, which added value to the discussions.
**Participation**

Participants included specialists in the following areas: economic policy, including economists working on monetary, fiscal or trade issues; human rights and development, including specialists in areas like poverty, labour, environment and social security. Participants were drawn from universities and academic research centres, intergovernmental organisations, independent research institutions, policy think tanks and civil society/advocacy groups and networks. The Colloquium was also geo-politically and institutionally diverse with participants coming from regions and countries including Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Ghana, India, Lebanon, Mexico, South Africa, Turkey, Thailand, UK and USA and from institutions like the ILO, OHCHR, UNICEF, UNDESA, UNDP, UNRISD, WB and WTO. Representatives from several prominent advocacy groups also participated, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, ESCR-Net, Focus on the Global South, Third World Network, and the International Commission of Jurists.

While participation was largely by invitation, the Colloquium attracted very wide participation and requests for participation came in from many quarters, including, for instance, from the Scottish National Human Rights Commission, the Policy Analysis Division of the European Parliament and NGOs and universities/research institutions. The total number of participants was 80, with a core of around 60 who were present throughout the three days.²

**Report of the Colloquium**

The discussions at the Colloquium were brought together in a succinct report. The report notes the potential congruence of human rights with approaches in economics that recognise the state's central role in underpinning core functions on which societies depend, especially policies to manage public resources and to redistribute wealth. Since states have a duty to respect, protect and fulfill human rights, it argues that their policies should revisit trade-offs in economic policy to ensure they respect rights, regulate markets in a manner that will protect rights, redistribute resources in ways that are equitable and prevent impoverishment.

The report indicates how human rights advocates might engage more effectively with economic policy-making and create wider agreement

about what human rights can contribute to it. In particular, it suggests that human rights actors need to reflect on questions of social justice and structural inequity, as well as economic theory and policy, while expanding their links and alliances with economists and experts in monetary and fiscal policy, and with social movements.

**Outcomes**

The value of the Colloquium was highlighted by the fact that it eventually drew a much larger number of participants than anticipated. In the wake of the financial crisis, it was the first global dialogue involving civil society advocates, prominent economists and others scholars, and senior representatives from the ILO, UNCTAD, UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR, WTO and the World Bank. Several participants underlined the importance of initiatives such as the Colloquium in generating both expert and public debate. In fact, the lack of such debates has led to greater fragmentation in national and international policy spaces. Concretely, Pascal Lamy’s remarks at the Colloquium were featured prominently on the WTO website as well as carried by media in Geneva. The publication of his remarks led several experts and advocacy groups to respond to this remarks by way of an open letter to the WTO. The Colloquium also provided several opportunities for advocates, academics and policy-makers alike to engage with each other and opened avenues for further networking and collaboration.

---

SOCIAL CONTROL AND HUMAN RIGHTS


Brief Introduction

This project looks into the human rights implications of contemporary patterns of social control: how laws and policies construct and respond to people, behaviour or status defined as “undesirable”, “dangerous”, criminal or socially problematic. The questions it addresses include: how changing ideas of crime, criminality and risk are shaping social policy? Why does incarceration continue to be a preferred sanction? How are public health and urban governance being reshaped into regimes of discipline and punitiveness? How do contemporary policing and surveillance practices order and organise social relations? Drawing on research across five policy areas: infectious diseases, urban spaces and the poor, policing, migration, and punishment and incarceration, as well as a case study of the Roma in Europe, the report is relevant to human rights advocates and professionals working in diverse policy areas. It points to human rights challenges and ways forward with respect to ideas of crime and criminality, penal sanctions, non-criminal sanctions and “soft” controls, segregation and exclusion, protection and victim rights, privatisation, surveillance, and policy transfer regimes.

Outputs

The main report Modes and Patterns of Social Control: Implications for Human Rights Policy is available in English.

Outcomes

Our work on Social Control has highlighted the penalisation of poverty by a range of social policies as a major human rights concern. The project also provided the Council a basis to conduct an expert meeting on penalisation of poverty, which brought together human rights advocates, experts and IGO representatives, working in different areas such as urban planning and governance; public health including reproductive rights, drugs and harm reduction; governance of welfare; and, controls through use of criminal and non-criminal measures. This has contributed significantly to a forthcoming report from the UN Independent Expert
on human rights and extreme poverty to the UN General Assembly on addressing the issue of penalising people in poverty and making a case for poverty as a ground of discrimination.
**DISCUSSION PAPER ON SEXUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS**


**Brief Introduction**

In early 2008, the ICHRP began work on the subject of sexuality and human rights. The theme is both vast and controversial, and the ICHRP’s aim was to clarify the essential elements of a policy discussion of sexuality and sexual rights from a human rights perspective, and by doing so enable discussion to progress.

On the basis of preliminary research, it became clear that a number of conceptual challenges need to be addressed. The ICHRP therefore commissioned a paper from Professor Alice M. Miller, a leading academic in the field, to examine the content of sexual rights, the evolution of their discussion, and problematic issues that need further consideration.

The paper, *Sexuality and Human Rights: A Discussion Paper* (so-called because it departs from the ICHRP’s regular model of consultative research), sets out many of the questions, conflicts and dilemmas that mark this subject and impede discussions of sexuality and sexual rights. It frames the issue in ways that is useful and fresh for activists, policymakers and human rights practitioners, and helps those working in the field of sexuality to measure the potential relevance of human rights, and human rights advocates to look more inclusively and more deeply into the subject of sexuality.

The ICHRP convened a meeting of experts and academics in Geneva on 6 and 7 July 2009, to assess the findings of the discussion paper and to make recommendations. The ICHRP has further developed its work on sexuality in a project focused on sexuality, sexual health and human rights, in collaboration with the World Health Organisation.

**Outputs**

In September 2010, the report was translated into Spanish in collaboration with the *Campaign for an International Convention on Sexual and Reproductive Rights.*
Key Activities

The findings of the report were disseminated and canvassed at the following key international fora:

- ICHR expert meeting, Geneva, July 2009;
- UNHCR Roundtable on ‘Asylum-Seekers and Refugees Seeking Protection on Account of Their Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity’, Geneva, September 2010;
- 10–12 November 2010: International Congress on Gender Equity Policies, Buenos Aires;
- 13–14 July 2009: ‘Justice, Gender and Sexuality’ conference organised by the Human Rights Center at the University of Chile and the Red Alas Network.
Discussion Paper on Privacy and Data-Gathering Technologies

Status: Expert meeting of September 2010 reviewed draft Discussion Paper.

Brief Introduction

The project has three primary aims: a) to revisit the notion of a right to privacy in order to take account of the actual environment in which personal data today circulates; b) to examine the governance of personal data particularly in contexts where global data gathering and dissemination techniques penetrate locations lacking traditions and protections of privacy; and c) to distinguish overlapping human rights concerns in this domain that may coincide with those relating to privacy – such as, for example, the right to non-discrimination.

Outputs

The project has two phases. In the first phase a Discussion Paper will be published. A review meeting held in Geneva in September 2010, involving leading experts from relevant interdisciplinary backgrounds, warmly endorsed the draft of the Discussion Paper.

The general view was that the ICHRIP project was a valuable contribution that identified several points in need of further investigation in a complex and often confused field, and should continue this work into the next phase. The discussion paper will be published in mid-2011.

In its second phase, the project will produce targeted recommendations for specific audiences: policymakers in the field of data protection and human rights monitoring (governmental and inter-governmental), advocacy NGOs in the field of human rights and privacy, and academics working in related fields (surveillance studies, privacy studies, human rights, data protection). The project will commission several research papers and, on that basis, publish a synthesis paper and focused and targeted policy briefs.

At the time of writing this report, the Discussion Paper was complete and being readied for printing.
Outcomes

The broad aim of this project is to drive the discussion on privacy policies with relation to human rights issues towards the following results:

- Human rights actors develop a broad and multi-perspective basis for addressing privacy as a matter of advocacy, sensitive to historical and cultural contexts;

- Recognition by UN bodies of new standards with regard to data technologies and new dimensions of the right to privacy;

- Integration of human rights approaches in data governance and mapping of the overlaps between the right to privacy and other issues.
Brief Introduction

The ICHRP published a volume containing articles by a range of well-known experts on climate change and human rights in 2009, in collaboration with Cambridge University Press. *Human Rights and Climate Change* was the first collection to deal systematically with a range of theoretical and practical concerns regarding the human rights dimensions of climate change. It made a key contribution to advancing the role of human rights in climate change debates. The volume contains 11 essays that examine the questions raised by climate change policies: accountability for extraterritorial harms; constructing reliable enforcement mechanisms; assessing redistributional outcomes; and allocating burdens, benefits, rights and duties among perpetrators and victims, both public and private. The book examines a range of so-far unexplored theoretical and practical concerns that international law and other scholars and policy-framers will find increasingly difficult to ignore.

This volume was an outcome of the research conducted by the ICHRP for its 2008 report *Climate Change and Human Rights – A Rough Guide*. This report, a first of its kind, helped orient human rights thinking about climate change by framing the relevant issues clearly. It mapped the principal areas of human rights concern raised by climate change, explored the possible benefits and challenges of adopting human rights tools and principles in the climate change domain and identified areas for further research and advocacy. It continues to be well received by human rights and climate justice advocates as well as policy-makers.

In 2010, the ICHRP also began research into the human rights dimensions of climate technology policy. This report will provide guidance to policymakers on the relevance of human rights principles and practices to technology transfer policies that are central to both adaptation and mitigation measures.
**Outputs**

The final report on climate change and technology transfer will be distributed in 2011.⁵

**Outcomes**

Our work on human rights and climate change has informed several key policy documents including those of the World Bank, the OHCHR and the FAO, and country submissions to the UN Human Rights Council. We were also consulted in the formulation of the 2009 UN Human Rights Council resolution on climate change, which paved the way for the recognition of human rights dimensions and obligations in relation to climate change in the outcome document of the 2010 Cancun Conference of the Parties (COP). In addition to framing policy debates, our work on climate change is also amongst the most widely cited in research and academic publications.

“What this [ICHRP and CUP] collection does for the first time, however, is think through the human rights implications of climate change and ask how the substantial body of international human rights law and experience relates to that phenomenon. … As the present collection progressively clarifies, if we build human rights criteria into our future planning, we will better understand who is at risk and how we should act to protect them.”

— Mary Robinson.

---

⁵ At the time of writing this annual report, a public consultation and review of a draft report was complete and finalization of the report was underway.
**Brief Introduction**

Securing peace and ending armed conflict and indiscriminate acts of violence against civilians present significant challenges to peace and the protection of human rights in South Asia and around the world. Central to an effective response to this challenge is to understand how public discourse, especially within the media, can be steered towards enabling a more transparent, well-informed policy response with positive human rights outcomes. The Kathmandu Roundtable on Conflict, the Media and Human Rights in South Asia (organised along with the Centre for Media and Cultural Studies of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences and Panos South Asia) brought together senior media professionals, social scientists, peace and human rights advocates, and security analysts to consider how conflict, peace and human rights questions are discussed in the public domain, especially in the media, in South Asia. The Roundtable was held in Kathmandu on 20 and 21 November 2010.

The Roundtable was intended to strengthen ongoing efforts towards developing a more layered representation of internal conflicts in South Asia, so as to include human rights concerns. The discussions were aimed at developing a better understanding of the nature of the state, media and civil society interactions and dynamics in the region, which have such a significant impact on public discourse and policy. Hence, in addition to analysing and questioning the dominant vocabularies within the media on contemporary conflicts in the region, the Roundtable also intended to enable consideration of working towards a plural media that reflects the diverse positions on these conflicts.

**Outputs**

A report on the Roundtable presents, succinctly, some of the most important issues and questions discussed at the Roundtable. While it broadly reflects the structure of the agenda, it is not a detailed record of discussions at the Roundtable. On the contrary, it focuses on some of the most important broad themes of the discussion and seeks to present important insights emerging from the discussions relevant to these themes. The report also includes brief contributions from some of the participants on specific issues.
Brief Introduction

Migration policies across the world are driven by three core concerns: law and border enforcement, economic interest, and protection. This report argues that official policies are failing partly because one of these concerns, protection, has been marginalised. Intensified efforts to suppress migration have not deterred people from seeking security or opportunity abroad but drive many into clandestinity, while the promotion of open economic markets has attracted millions of people to centres of prosperity but tolerated widespread exploitation. As a political consequence, discussion of migration is widely polarised and distorted by xenophobia and racism.

The report suggests that it is in governments’ interest to affirm their legal and moral responsibility to protect everyone, including migrants. Human rights law provides a baseline of essential protection for migrants, and also some key components of a more balanced and rational policy approach. A substantial appendix summarises the rights of irregular migrants in international law.

Outputs

In addition to the main report, a summary (16 pages) is available in English, French and Spanish.

Outcomes

The report, *Irregular Migration, Human Smuggling and Human Rights*, has been generally positively received. It was launched in Geneva by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. The ICHR has also been invited to engage and participate in debates and fora on the issue. The expert who worked with the ICHR on finishing the project has subsequently been employed with the OHCHR working on migration issues, and this has provided an opportunity to feed findings from the research directly into key institutional decision making. ICHR’s ability to follow up further on the project or to make a bigger impact has been limited as a result of limited human resources.
“This report is an extremely useful compilation of relevant migrant rights legislation for civil society organisations. It provides very good conceptual and legal analysis and training material.”

— Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women (GAATW).
FINANCE

FISCAL YEAR 2009

The ICHR P fiscal year for 2009 encompassed the period from 1 January 2009 through 31 December 2009.

The 2009 accounts were audited by an independent auditor, Mr. Marc Bétemps, in accordance with Swiss requirements and approved by the Executive Board in May 2010. ICHR P accounts comply with Swiss Accounting Standards.

Income and Expenditures

ICHR P expenditures in 2009 were CHF 1’651’246.13. Each project has its individual budget, which in most cases covers more than one year.

Income amounted to CHF 1’634’401.02. After the impact of prior year adjustment charges of CHF 13’329.51 and an exchange gain of CHF 5’161.31, the Net Result for the year is a deficit of CHF 25’013.31.

The ICHR P received almost all its 2009 income in the form of grants, as indicated (in CHF) in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs (GTZ), Germany</td>
<td>37’693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland</td>
<td>92’375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands</td>
<td>310’997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DFAE), Switzerland</td>
<td>23’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)</td>
<td>6’613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Aid (UK)</td>
<td>30’572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID), UK</td>
<td>604’905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>347’124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development &amp; Cooperation (SDC)</td>
<td>140’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Foundation for Democracy</td>
<td>7’258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</td>
<td>21’629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contributions</strong></td>
<td><strong>1’622’166</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 December 2009, the accumulated surplus amounted to CHF 52’037.89, in addition to the Capital of the Foundation of CHF 50’000.00.
Foreign Exchange and Interest

Donations received and expenses incurred in foreign currencies are translated into Swiss francs at prevailing rates. Year-end monetary assets and liabilities are translated at 31st December 2009 rates. This resulted in a net exchange gain for the year of CHF 5'161.31.
**Fiscal Year 2010**

The ICHRFP fiscal year for 2010 encompassed the period from 1 January 2010 through 31 December 2010.

The 2010 accounts were audited by an independent auditor, Mr Marc Bétemps, in accordance with Swiss requirements and approved by the Executive Board in April 2011. ICHRFP accounts comply with Swiss Accounting Standards.

**Income and Expenditures**

ICHRFP expenditures in 2010 were CHF 1’428’159.69. Each project has its individual budget, which in most cases covers more than one year.

Income amounted to CHF 1’482’056.59. After the impact of prior year adjustment charges of CHF 26’957.02 and exchange losses of CHF 35’888.25, the Net Result for the year is a deficit of 8’948.37.

The ICHRFP received almost all its 2010 income in the form of grants, as indicated (in CHF) in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Society Institute</td>
<td>15’919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Federal Government (DFAE), Switzerland</td>
<td>10’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDC, Switzerland</td>
<td>155’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Geneva, Switzerland</td>
<td>20’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Geneva, Switzerland</td>
<td>10’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway</td>
<td>109’130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID), UK</td>
<td>495’930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands</td>
<td>233’303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland</td>
<td>39’153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>349’017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>28’212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGI – Aspen Institute</td>
<td>13’278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contributions</strong></td>
<td><strong>1’478’945</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 31 December 2010, the accumulated surplus amounted to CHF 43’089.52, in addition to the Capital of the Foundation of CHF 50’000.00.
Foreign Exchange and Interest

A high proportion of ICHRP income is received in US Dollars, Euros and UK Sterling; most expenditures are in Swiss Francs. Donations received and expenses incurred in foreign currencies are translated into Swiss francs at prevailing rates. Year-end monitory assets and liabilities are translated at 31st December 2010 rates. Volatile exchange rates in 2009, notably sharp falls in the US dollar, Euro and UK Sterling led to an exchange loss of CHF 35’888.25.
GOVERNANCE

BOARD MEMBERS

The ICHRP Executive Board directs the organisation and selects the priorities of ICHRP research. Board members are also members of the International Council and are subject to the same terms of service. Board members serve in a private capacity and do not represent their institutions.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

The International Council has up to 30 members. These individuals are leading lights in human rights activism, policy-making, academia, media, social movements, inter-governmental organisations and other communities of practice. Council members are appointed by the Board on the recommendation of an appointments committee composed of at least one Board member and two Council members. Council members meet annually to advise the Board on new themes for research. Council members may serve for up to six years. They serve in a private capacity and do not represent their institutions.

The following individuals served on the International Council during the years 2009 and 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the International Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fouad Abdelmoumni (Morocco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanim Al-Najjar (Kuwait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Alpizar Duran (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fateh Azzam (Palestine)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akila Belembaogo (Burkina Faso)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Beirne (UK)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapan Kumar Bose (India)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Brown (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Clarke (Trinidad &amp; Tobago)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyse Doucet (Canada)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiebile Dramé (Mali)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imrana Jalal (Fiji)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hina Jilani (Pakistan)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Board Member.
† Term ended in 2009.
‡ Term ended in 2010.
SECRETARIAT

A lean and agile Secretariat based in Geneva with staff from different regions of the world leads the operationalisation of the strategic research priorities selected by the Executive Board. The Secretariat builds global teams and translates findings into effective policy advocacy.

DIVERSITY CHART

Table 3. Diversity Chart 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secretariat %</th>
<th>Council %</th>
<th>Consultants %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Secretariat %</th>
<th>Council %</th>
<th>Consultants %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Secretariat %</th>
<th>Council %</th>
<th>Consultants %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary/Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Numbers for the Secretariat include all staff members during the period from 2009 through 2010 regardless of work status (part-time, temporary, etc.). For a current list of Secretariat staff, visit [www.ichrp.org/en/staf](http://www.ichrp.org/en/staf).
ICHRP PROJECTS SINCE 1998

- Access to human rights: improving access for groups at high risk
- Armed groups: approaches to influencing their behaviour
- Assessing the impact of human rights work: Challenges and choices
- Bridging international justice and national institutions in the aftermath of mass atrocities
- Business: obligations under international human rights law
- Climate change and human rights
- Climate change: technology policy and human rights
- Colloquium on Human Rights in the Global Economy
- Corruption and human rights: Integrating human rights in the anti-corruption agenda
- Corruption and human rights: making the connection
- Crime: managing public order in countries in transition
- Foreign aid to the justice sector reform
- Human rights and security panics: Changing the public discourse
- Human rights at the heart of climate justice: An Observatory on human rights and climate change policy
- Impact assessment of Human Rights activities
- Individual responsibilities in international human rights law
- Integrating human rights in governance: Urban local government, anti-corruption and national human rights mechanisms
- Legal pluralism and human rights
- Local government: delivering public services
- Local government: links with human rights
- Mapping multicultural justice: Universal human rights and identity-based grievances
- Media: reporting human rights issues
- Migration: human rights protection of smuggled persons
- Military intervention: NGO responses to human rights crises
- National human rights institutions: effectiveness and legitimacy
- National human rights institutions: measuring effectiveness
- Peace agreements: the role of human rights in negotiations
- Penalising poverty: A Platform-Network for collaborative research and advocacy
- Privacy in the information age: human rights and the governance of data technologies
- Racism: economic roots of discrimination
- Racism: trends and patterns in discrimination
- Rights and responsibilities of human rights organisations
- September 2001: impacts on human rights work
- Sexuality and human rights - Discussion Paper
- Sexuality, health and human rights: A knowledge-resource of jurisprudence and law
- Social control policies
- Standard-setting: lessons learned for the future
- Terrorism and human rights
- Towards accountability: Binding human rights obligations for corporations
- Transnational obligations and economic and social rights
- Trends in human rights: tenth anniversary report
- Universal jurisdiction.
ICHRP
17 rue Ferdinand-Hodler
CH-1207 Geneva
Switzerland

Phone: +41 (0) 22 775 33 00
Fax: +41 (0) 22 775 33 03
ichrp@ichrp.org

www.ichrp.org