



## 2.4. Freedom of Expression

The UK promotes freedom of opinion and expression, including on the internet, as an essential building block of democracy and the knowledge economy, and an enabler of human rights, as well as an end in itself. It ensures that people can exchange ideas and make informed decisions; it supports transparency; deters corruption; and exposes human rights violations. The key objective for FOE projects was to contribute to upholding freedom of expression.

**Table 10: Key Statistics for 2011-15 for FOE Projects**

<b>No. of projects approved:</b>	49
<b>No. of Projects cancelled:</b>	1
<b>Total Budget:</b>	£3,340,968
<b>Total Expenditure:</b>	£3,241,160
<b>Number of Countries:</b>	19
<b>Most number of projects:</b>	Multi (11), Belarus (6), Vietnam (5)

The programme funded 49 FOE projects worth £3.2m, representing 15% of the overall HRDP budget, making it the highest spending thematic priority between 2011 and 2015. Multi-country projects, made up 31% of all FOE spend (£1.02m) during this period. This was divided between two international implementers: the Lifeline Fund and Global Partners Digital. The most individual country projects were in **Belarus**, where six projects made up 7.9% of all FOE spend (£259,155). **Vietnam** was second with five projects but a greater percentage of the budget at 9.7% (£318,000). The remainder of FOE funding was allocated across 17 countries; with an average of 3% spend per country.

Project activity skewed slightly toward Indicators 3 and 4; as a large portion of activity focused on training, capacity building and protection for the media and social activists; though projects were funded under all FOE indicators within the HRDP strategy (see below).

INDICATOR 1	INDICATOR 2	INDICATOR 3	INDICATOR 4
<b>Aligning media/internet legislation with international standards.</b>	<b>Greater access to information for citizens</b>	<b>Capacity building for bloggers and journalists and improved quality of reporting</b>	<b>Better protection for those using the media and effective action to tackle impunity.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Media laws</b> - Azerbaijan, Belarus, [REDACTED], Vietnam</li> <li>• <b>Global internet governance</b> - Global</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Free and ethical press</b> - Mexico, Russia, Vietnam</li> <li>• <b>Public participation</b> - Nigeria, Zambia, Zimbabwe</li> <li>• <b>Parliamentarians</b> - [REDACTED]</li> <li>• <b>Radio</b> - Belarus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Promote FOE</b> - Belarus, Iran, [REDACTED]</li> <li>• <b>FOE online</b> - Bangladesh, [REDACTED], Sri Lanka</li> <li>• <b>Protection of journalists</b> - Brazil, Kazakhstan, [REDACTED], Vietnam</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> <li>[REDACTED]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Protection of journalists</b> - Brazil, Kazakhstan, [REDACTED], Vietnam</li> <li>• <b>Protection of HRDs</b> - Colombia, [REDACTED], Mexico, Zimbabwe, Global</li> <li>• <b>Accountability</b> - Azerbaijan, Colombia, [REDACTED], Mexico</li> <li>• <b>Implementing UN recommendations</b> -</li> </ul>

			Colombia
--	--	--	----------

**INDICATOR 1 - Aligning media and internet legislation with international standards**

- **China** - Promoting Legal Protection for the Media, *Great Britain China Centre, £168k 2011-13*  
 These projects looked to promote better protection for the Chinese media through the development of a judicial manual on freedom of expression (consistent application of Tort Law as it relates to media cases), training for legal practitioners on the manual and pilot implementation in local courts. While the proposed "innovative" training methodology had to be changed, the pilot implementation was a success. As a result, the Supreme People's Court distributed 3000 copies of the manual to courts across China.
- **Global** - Protecting FOE through internet governance, *Global Partners Digital, £371k, 2012-15*  
 This series of projects worked to train and guide grassroots civil society organisations (CSOs) in "swing states" (**Brazil, India, Kenya**) to participate and influence national and international debates on internet governance. As a result, the CSOs in the targeted countries participated in relevant international conferences and coordinated input to the outcome documents. They raised awareness of free expression issues relating to internet governance in their country by writing blogs, holding lectures, participating in public workshops, and sharing information via local mailing lists.

**INDICATOR 2 - Greater access to information for citizens**

- **Zimbabwe** - Liberated voices, *Kubatana, £54k, 2011-12*  
 This project used innovative tactics including, audio dramas, intersection distribution, washroom advertising and door-to-door hand delivery of information (DVDs and printed materials), to increase the availability and access to civic and human rights information in Zimbabwe's constrained media environment. There was positive feedback from the thousands of recipients, the content of which indicated a strong onward distribution trend towards secondary beneficiaries.

[REDACTED]

**INDICATOR 3 - Capacity building for bloggers / journalists and improved quality of reporting**

[REDACTED]

- **Vietnam** - NGO-led initiative to enhance protection of journalists and promote media freedom, *Centre for Research on Development Communication, £122k, 2012-13*  
 The project provided recommendations to the Vietnamese government that contributed to bringing legislation on protection of media workers into closer alignment with international standards. Revised media regulations subsequently enhanced the safety of journalists. By increasing the protection of journalists' rights, the project increased the ability of the media to represent the views of the public, thus increasing their voice.

#### **INDICATOR 4 - Better protection for the media and effective action to tackle impunity.**

- **Russia** - Protecting media on and off-line in the most dangerous places, Article 19, £30k, 2014-15  
We responded to new restrictive media laws by funding Article 19 to work with Russian journalists and bloggers to improve their digital, physical and legal safety, enabling them to produce media content that is outside the influence of Russian propaganda. As there is limited availability of materials regarding digital and physical security in Russian, the project developed and produced a package of Russian language materials as part of follow-up "peer to peer" training sessions.
- **Mexico** - Tackling impunity in crimes against journalists, Article 19, £77k, 2012-13  
This project worked to strengthen the investigative capacities of the Federal Prosecutor's Office for Crimes against Freedom of Expression (FEADLE) in order to tackle impunity in crimes against journalists. Article 19's needs assessment identified the key areas where FEADLE lacked knowledge of investigative techniques to address cases of journalist's aggressions. This informed a tailored manual and training course for 36 prosecutors and staff from the Special Prosecutor office. Combined with public campaigns to pressure federal and state congresses to tackle impunity, this project increased both public and federal awareness in the need to deliver proper investigations and accountability over murders and disappearances of journalists and attacks upon the media.

## 2.5. Freedom of Religion or Belief

Many conflicts have their roots in the tensions between different religious communities and violence against a religious group can be a forewarning of wider conflict. Therefore, upholding religious freedom is often a crucial factor in conflict prevention and post-conflict peace building – a key reason for the inclusion of FoRB as a thematic priority.

**Table 11: Key Statistics for 2011-15 for FORB Projects**

<b>No. of projects approved:</b>	29
<b>No. of Projects cancelled:</b>	0
<b>Total Budget:</b>	£1,108,565
<b>Total Expenditure:</b>	£1,107,313
<b>Number of Countries:</b>	11
<b>Most number of projects:</b>	Multi (11), Indonesia (4), Pakistan (3)

The programme funded 29 FORB projects worth £1.1m, representing 5.1% of overall HRDP budget, making it the lowest-spending thematic priority. These projects (excluding multi-country) covered 11 countries in Asia, MENA and sub-Saharan Africa.

The highest spending projects were multi-country at £424,383 (38%), funding a variety of implementers. The most individual country projects were in **Indonesia**, with four projects comprising 24% of the budget, followed by **Pakistan**, with three projects covering 18%. The remainder of the projects spread across nine countries, averaging just 3% of the budget.

Most project activity focused on 'goal 2', the second target area in the HRDP strategy.

<b>GOAL 1</b>	<b>GOAL 2</b>
<b>Bring policies and legislation regulating FoRB into line with international standards. Ensure these standards are implemented.</b>	<b>Violence and better understanding through improved links and dialogue between civil society groups, religious leaders, religious (and non-religious) groups.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support to UN mechanisms</b> - UN Voluntary Fund, SPT</li> <li>• <b>Improve legal framework</b> - Kazakhstan</li> <li>• <b>Training judges</b> - Indonesia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Use of media to promote tolerance</b> - Indonesia, Pakistan</li> <li>• <b>Training media professionals</b> - Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma</li> <li>• <b>Train religious leaders</b> - Indonesia</li> <li>• <b>Inter-faith dialogue</b> - Iraq, Indonesia</li> <li>• <b>Civil society capacity and networks</b> - South Asia, Indonesia, Sudan</li> <li>• <b>GCERF</b> - global</li> </ul>

**GOAL 1 - Bring policies and legislation regulating FORB into line with international standards, and ensure these standards are implemented.**

- **Kazakhstan - Strengthening religious freedom, Astana Center Consulting, £36k, 2012-13**  
The project aimed to improve the legal framework for religious freedom in Kazakhstan, and to increase public tolerance and awareness about religious freedom. The Astana Centre trained over 700 people across the country, including government officials. Through training, media and publications, coupled with engagement with government officials, the project established the foundation for co-operation with the agency for religious affairs; setting the ground for future work. The influence of this project allayed initial fears that local officials would use new laws to obstruct the re-registration of peaceful religious groups.

**GOAL 2 - Promotion of tolerance, non-violence and understanding through improved links between civil society groups, religious leaders and religious (and non-religious) groups.**

- **South Asia - Network of FoRB human rights defenders, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, £91k, 2013-15**  
The project supported Christian Solidarity Worldwide to hold two regional conferences, in Colombo and New Delhi, to establish a network of human rights defenders working on religious freedom in South Asia. While the network is new, there is evidence of more engagement by members. The Bangladeshi members of the network approached their law minister to encourage the government of Bangladesh to adopt legislation similar to India's Prevention of Communal and Targeted Violence law.
- **Indonesia - Debating religious freedom using traditional and new media, Indonesian Association for Media Development, £170k, 2011-13**  
This project used traditional and new media to expand media reach on religious tolerance in Indonesia. It funded 13 hour-long weekly radio programs to encourage informed debate; broadcast on 54 radio stations to an audience of 1.6 million. Tempo TV produced 10 interactive shows broadcast on 25 local television stations to a potential audience of 30.1 million. Six public debates, held on university campuses were also broadcast, involving the audience through Facebook and Twitter. As a result of the project, many groups have become more vocal on religious tolerance and popular TV stations now cover the issue.
- **Iraq - Grassroots reconciliation, Foundation for Relief and Reconciliation in the Middle East, £20k, 2011-13**  
Cannon Andrew White worked to promote reconciliation in Iraq through dialogue between religious leaders, across the sectarian divide at grassroots level. The creation of a monthly Peace Council provided more regular engagement between the grassroots and High Council, and identified the need to engage more with the minority Mandian and the Yazidee communities. The project helped to open up discussion on the challenge faced by unrecognized Protestant churches in Iraq being unable to own land, and how to communicate to Islamic leaders the need to change that policy.
- **Global - Contribution to the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) to build community resilience against religious extremism, GCERF, £150k, 2014/15**  
A global public-private partnership, GCERF was established to support local, community-level initiatives aimed at strengthening resilience against violent extremism agendas. GCERF works in partnership and consultation with governments, civil society, and the private sector in beneficiary countries to support national strategies to address the local drivers of violent extremism. Its emphasis is on youth engagement, vocational training, and women's advocacy to promote resilience among at-risk populations. It will support grassroots projects in the pilot countries of Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria by the end of 2015.
- **Burma - Responsible media coverage of religious freedom and conflict, Religion News Service, £46k, 2014/15**  
With FCO funding, the Religion News Service trained reporters to go beyond easy conflict narratives, helping them to write more nuanced stories about the role faith and secularism play in conflict, cultural identity and community. The training addressed problems around emotive language, biases and stereotypical imagery known to stoke inter-communal tensions in Burma. The journalists drafted a resolution that committed them to upholding those principles and published news stories not usually covered in local media.

## 2.6. Global Torture Prevention

Torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is prohibited in international law. The UK considers torture to be an abhorrent violation of human rights and human dignity, and consistently and unreservedly condemns the practice. See our 2011-2015 [Torture Prevention Strategy](#) for more information on our policy.

**Table 12: Key Statistics for 2011-15 for GTP Projects**

<b>No. of projects approved:</b>	34
<b>No. of Projects cancelled:</b>	2
<b>Total Budget:</b>	£3,051,836
<b>Total Expenditure:</b>	£3,038,117
<b>Number of Countries:</b>	13
<b>Most number of projects:</b>	Multi (11), China (8), Kazakhstan (3)

The programme funded 34 GTP projects worth £3.04m, representing 14.3% of the overall budget. While there were no specific priority countries for GTP work, the HRDP was able to fund projects in 13 countries (excluding multi-country projects) including eight countries of concern. Multi-country projects, the majority of which were implemented by the Association for the Prevention of Torture, made up 49% of all GTP spend (£1,474,092). The most individual country projects were in **China**, where eight projects made up 23% of all GTP spend (£711,609). The remainder was allocated across 12 countries; with an average of 2% spend per country.

Only two projects (both in the OPTs) out of 34 were cancelled. Given the politically sensitive nature of torture prevention work, this is a good result. It suggests that risk assessment and mitigation has been sound, and that implementers have found ways of working constructively in difficult operating environments such as China, Libya, Sudan and Uzbekistan.

Project activity spread reasonably over the three goals identified in the GTP strategy (see below). There is some overlap between the three goals, and many projects understandably had activities across components of two/three goals.

GOAL 1	GOAL 2	GOAL 3
<b>Legal frameworks to prevent and prohibit torture exist and are enforced</b>	<b>States have the political will and capacity to prevent and prohibit torture</b>	<b>Organisations on the ground have the expertise / training to prevent torture</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ratify and implement UNCAT - Burma, Fiji</li> <li>• Ratify and implement OPCAT, including NPM - Bahrain, Brazil, Morocco, Nigeria, Kazakhstan, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey</li> <li>• Legal frameworks - OPTs</li> <li>• Support to UN mechanisms - UN Voluntary Fund, SPT</li> </ul>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal investigations - Mexico</li> <li>• Training police - Indonesia</li> <li>• Training prosecutors and judges - Brazil, [REDACTED] Uganda, Uzbekistan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic litigation - Africa</li> <li>• Training lawyers - Brazil, Uganda, Uzbekistan</li> <li>• Accountability/ documentation - [REDACTED] Nepal, [REDACTED]</li> <li>• Rehabilitation - Uganda</li> <li>• Medical professionals - Philippines</li> <li>• GTP handbook</li> <li>• Vulnerable groups – OPTs (children)</li> </ul>



## 2.7. Women's Rights

The UK promotes gender equality and tackles violence against women and girls as a matter of principle. Societies are likely to be healthier, more prosperous and more peaceful where women's rights are enjoyed and protected.

**Table 13: Key Statistics for 2011-15 for WR Projects**

<b>No. of projects approved:</b>	45
<b>No. of Projects cancelled:</b>	1
<b>Total Budget:</b>	£2,771,106
<b>Total Expenditure<sup>8</sup>:</b>	£2,713,133
<b>Number of Countries:</b>	21
<b>Most number of projects:</b>	Multi (7), Philippines (4), Burma, China, Iraq & Yemen (3)

The programme funded 45 WR projects worth £2.71m, representing 12.4% of the overall budget. These projects (excluding multi-country) covered 21 countries in all regions of the world, and included ten countries of concern. Only one project was cancelled (a project in India), the highest completion rate for all themes. Multi-country projects (from a range of implementers) were the most prevalent with seven projects making up 15% of all WR spend. The most individual country projects were in the **Philippines**, where four projects made up 12% of all WR spend. This is an interesting outcome given that the Philippines is not generally viewed by HRDD as a priority country for women's rights. It can mostly be attributed to the projects focused on entrenching women's rights in the draft Bangsmaro Basic Law as part of the reconciliation process in the country. The countries with three projects each, also covered a significant portion of the WR spend **Burma** at 10%, **China** at 6% and **Yemen** 14%.

Project activity spread reasonably over the three indicators identified in the HRDP strategy, with slightly more projects focused on Indicator 2 (see below).

<b>INDICATOR 1</b>	<b>INDICATOR 2</b>	<b>INDICATOR 3</b>
<b>Discriminatory laws and policies reformed/removed. Laws/policies tackling VAWG developed</b>	<b>Initiatives developed that prevent VAWG by challenging societal attitudes and behaviour.</b>	<b>Increased participation of women in political and public affairs.</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honour killings - Global</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Access to justice</b> - Afghanistan, Mexico</li> <li>• <b>Training criminal justice officials</b> - Anguilla, Argentina, Eritrea, Iraq, Sri Lanka</li> <li>• <b>Advocacy training</b> - Georgia</li> <li>• <b>UPR</b> - Kazakhstan</li> <li>• <b>Strategic litigation</b> - Africa</li> <li>• <b>Capacity building</b> - Multi-OTs</li> <li>• <b>Security and justice</b> - Nepal</li> <li>• <b>Media reporting</b> - Pakistan</li> <li>• <b>Access support services</b> - Brazil</li> <li>• <b>Accountability/prosecutions</b> - Colombia</li> <li>• <b>Public awareness</b> - Sri Lanka</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Empowering leaders</b> - Armenia, Yemen</li> <li>• <b>Governance institutions</b> - Philippines, Yemen</li> <li>• <b>Empowering victims of conflict</b> - Bosnia, Colombia, Syria</li> <li>• <b>Women participation laws</b> - Nepal, Tunisia, Philippines</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> This reflects actual expenditure as recorded on Prism. It has not been adjusted for accounting errors. The correct figure, when adjusted is £2,617,885. The percentage spend was calculated from this amount.



**INDICATOR 1 - Discriminatory laws and policies reformed or removed. Constitutions, legislation and policies tackling VAWG developed in line with international commitments**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**INDICATOR 2 - Initiatives that prevent violence against women and girls, particularly by challenging societal attitudes and behaviour.**

- **Afghanistan** - Improving access to justice, *Action Aid & Reflect, £90k, 2011-12*  
The project improved access to justice through the collective and informed involvement of women, community leaders, paralegals and parliamentarians in Banyan province. The project worked with members of over forty Community Development Councils (CDCs) and reached more than 2000 women via a "peer to peer" training model. Sixty paralegals received 25 days training on eliminating violence against women so they are now equipped to deal with cases as they arise.
- **Iraq** - Training criminal justice officials, *Adroit Consultants, £77k, 2012-14*  
At the request of the Kurdish Interior Minister, this "train the trainer" project was designed to equip 18 police officers from Family Protection Units in the Kurdish region of Iraq to teach other officers how to deliver an effective police response to cases of violence against women. In partnership with local police, NGOs and academics, it also produced a training curriculum and manual. This continues to be used by the Ministry of Interior and the EU integrated Rule of Law Mission in Iraq, demonstrating long-term impact.

**INDICATOR 3 - Increased participation of women in political and public affairs**

[REDACTED]

- **Philippines** - Participation in the Basic Law of Mindanao, *Conciliation Resources, £245k, 2013-15*  
These two projects looked to enhance women's participation in politics and governance through inclusion of key provisions in the Bangsamoro Basic Law (BBL), the intended governing framework of Mindanao from 2016. The key output was a set of recommendations for inclusion in the BBL; this was informed by a detailed consultation with over 2700 women across sectors in the Bangsamoro. Through this funding, the local partners have been able to establish networks with key leaders and interlocutors in the peace process; an important step in making sure women's voices are represented in the future Bangsamoro legislative actions and programming.

## 2.8. Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict (PSVI)<sup>9</sup>

At the G8 Foreign Ministers' meeting in April 2013, the former Foreign Secretary committed to spend "£5million from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to support grassroots and human rights projects on sexual violence against women and girls and wider projects on violence against women and girls". In 2013, PSVI became one of the HRDP's priority areas.

**Table 14: Key Statistics for 2011-15 for PSVI Projects**

<b>No. of projects approved:</b>	31
<b>No. of Projects cancelled:</b>	1
<b>Total Budget:</b>	£3,437,682
<b>Total Expenditure<sup>10</sup>:</b>	£3,138,888
<b>Number of Countries:</b>	12
<b>Most number of projects:</b>	Colombia (5), Burma (4), Bosnia and Herzegovina (3)

The programme funded 31 PSVI projects worth £3.1m, representing 14.3% of the overall budget; making it the second highest spending thematic priority, despite funding only starting in 2013.

These projects covered 12 countries (excluding multi country projects), the majority of which were in PSVI priority countries (Bosnia, Burma, Colombia, DRC, Iraq, Nepal, South Sudan, and Syria).

PSVI projects were the most expensive projects funded by the HRDP— with an average budget of £100k, compared to other thematic priorities, which tended to have an average budget of £60k. This is partly due to the costly nature of running projects in conflict or post-conflict zones (e.g. Iraq, South Sudan, and Syria) and the inflated security and running costs that comes with it. It is also because the FS mandate to spend £5m over three years meant that projects could be slightly more ambitious in scale and budget. Equally, as a result of this commitment, funding for non-PSVI projects was reduced, as the HRDP did not consistently increase in size to match this spending commitment (only in 2013).

The PSVI projects will be evaluated separately by the FCO's PSVI Team.

<sup>9</sup> This review will not analyse PSVI project impact and spend to date, as the policy is not owned by HRDD.

<sup>10</sup> This reflects actual expenditure as recorded on Prism, and has not been adjusted for accounting errors. The correct figure, when adjusted is £2,617,885. The percentage spend figures have been calculated from this amount.

### 3. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LESSONS LEARNED

#### 3.1. Methodology

Robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is an integral part of FCO programme and project management. Implementation partners were required by grant contract to submit quarterly progress reports, quarterly financial reports, and project completion reports to the UK Mission of the host country. These were reviewed and given supporting commentary, then passed to the HRDP Team for record keeping and comparison across the programme. The project monitoring reports, along with financial data, informed quarterly programme reports to the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), allowing for oversight of progress, risk management and impact.

HRDP also aims to formally evaluate approximately 10% of projects each year. These project evaluations follow the FCO evaluation template and guidance, which used the [OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance](#); focusing on the project's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Independent evaluators in HMG (inc. DFID, Programme Office), members of the HRDP Team, contracted specialist Human Rights Advisers, and external independent experts carried out the evaluations. The criteria that guided the choice of projects for evaluations were projects that:

- had expenditure of £150,000 or over,
- were in countries/Posts receiving a high level of HRDP funding,
- could be replicated elsewhere,
- could test the impact of specific thematic areas; and/or
- could provide lessons of success or failure.

#### 3.2. Key findings from evaluations

From 2011-15, **34 projects were evaluated in ten countries**; this included the five countries with the greatest number of HRDP projects in that period (Burma, China, Colombia, India and Kazakhstan), covering all of the thematic areas under the HRDP<sup>11</sup>. These projects equate to **11% of total programme expenditure**.

Non-sensitive evaluation summaries were published [online](#) as part of government transparency data for ODA expenditure. See Table 15 for a summary and [Annex C](#) for a more detailed breakdown of the evaluated projects per country.

**Table 15: Summary of project evaluations**

FY Projects Completed	No. Projects	Countries Covered	Value of projects
2011-12	9	Colombia, Kenya, Nigeria	£833,833
2012-13	17	Burma, China, India, Kazakhstan, Vietnam	£1,043,417
2013-14	8	Colombia, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe	£424,822
2014-15	<i>Pending</i>	<i>China, India, Indonesia, Philippine and several multi-country projects</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>£2,302,072</b>
<b>%</b>	<i>10% of projects</i>	<i>15% of countries</i>	<i>11% of spend</i>

Of the 34 projects evaluated, 25 were RAG rated using the following criteria:

<sup>11</sup> PSVI will be evaluated separately in 2015/16.

- **Green** - project performed well under each of the evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and project management
- **Green/Amber** - project performed well under most criteria and adequately in others
- **Amber/Red** - project performed adequately under some criteria but poorly in others
- **Red** - project performed poorly under most criteria

This representative sample of projects (8%), offered the following results:

- **Seventeen projects (68%) received a green or amber/green rating**  
This is considered a good outcome for the fund, particularly given the politically sensitivities and operational difficulties experienced in many of those countries.
- **Eight projects (28%) received an amber/red rating**  
This lower rating was given due to factors including, difficulties in administering the project, unrealistic expectations surrounding activities or impact, and political reasons within country that led to cancellation or delay.
- **One project (4%) received a red rating**  
This was largely because the project was cancelled due to a change in the timing of elections in Zimbabwe. However, none of the project budget was spent and the money was reallocated to a different project.

### 3.3. Key Lessons Learned

#### 3.3.1. Relevance

*Whether project(s) addressed a genuine human rights issue, which was timely to support.*

- **Political appetite for change** - successful projects tapped into a growing or existing political movement for change. HRDP is a small fund; the best projects spotted these opportunities and designed projects to increase momentum for change.
- **The implementer needs to be internally credible** - for projects that are working towards legislative change; the implementer must be credible to the government, with access to influence the legislature. For this reason, there may be cases where a local implementer could be preferred over an unknown international implementer.
- **Work with other donors, but manage risks** - leveraging funds with the EU/other donors can add value for money, but it is important to be clear at the design stage how UK funding adds value. It is important to agree administrative procedures before implementation.

#### 3.3.2. Efficiency

*Whether the project(s) used the least costly resources possible to achieve the desired results.*

- **Use SMART<sup>12</sup> indicators** - implementers should make sure the purpose and outputs are measurable and activities are realistic (a problem with the projects evaluated in India and Kazakhstan). Baselines are essential to measure outputs and distil realism in the project. Posts should know what SMART indicators look like and scrutinise them carefully.
- **Activity changes must be recorded** - these should be agreed and recorded in writing between the FCO and the implementer and reflected in the reporting. This prevents ambiguity if cancellation or disputes arise. Consult with project beneficiaries when designing key activities to reduce the risk of significant changes during project implementation.

<sup>12</sup> Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely.

- **Funding is not guaranteed** - Post/HRDD should maintain an element of challenge with regular implementers, even when they are trusted partners that have successfully implemented projects before. This is especially important in holding implementers to agreed budgets and timescales; an issue that arose with some of the projects implemented by ERIS.

### 3.3.3. Effectiveness

*Whether the project(s) delivered the purpose and key output(s).*

- **Study visits can be effective, if well designed** – evaluations in China showed that they could have real impact and offer value for money when objectives are clear, anchored to relevant technical expertise, and supported by sustained follow-up. Exposure to (UK) experience and practice can shift a human rights issue, particularly when piloting work in a sensitive area.
- **Robust risk management** - post should work with the implementers at the beginning of the project to make sure that the likelihood and impact of any risks are assessed, and that effective mitigation strategies are in place. This prevents delays later on.
- **Training courses should include an evaluation** - best practice includes a “baseline” exercise before and after the course (e.g. a questionnaire) to measure its effectiveness.

### 3.3.4. Sustainability

*Whether the project(s) delivered benefits that led to further funding or support from other donors*

- **Flexibility to fund multi-year projects is essential** - achieving any sustainable change in human rights takes time, often beyond the traditional 12-month project window. In many cases, the best results through the HRDP were achieved through “repeat funding” (death penalty projects in China for example). The single-year funding window is a resource-intensive process; better approach would be to allow bids for multi-year funding.

### 3.3.5. Impact

*Whether the project(s) delivered benefits/outcomes in addition to the stated project purpose*

- **A template “follow-up mechanism” is needed for long-term results** - project initiatives could be enhanced by a follow-up strategy after project completion. Several of the projects evaluated (India) did achieve outputs after the completion of the project, but this was not captured in the project completion reports, demonstrating the importance of good follow-up.

### 3.3.6. Project Management

*The quality of project management by the relevant UK Mission or London desk officer.*

- **Capable Project Manager** - employing a capable in-country Project Manager who has credibility with local civil society organisations and can develop a strategy for Post’s approach to human rights project work is important to the effective sourcing and delivery of projects. This was evident in the evaluations of our projects in Colombia and China.
- **Management Information** - there should be established mechanisms at Post for capturing lessons learned and transferring the lessons to newly appointed staff. Information on past projects should be stored and easily retrievable.
- **Collaborate with DFID** - better coordination between government departments working in the same countries can help reduce duplication and improve project design

- **HRDP needs to share best practice** - HRDP should share information and best practice from other projects in an accessible format. This will help other Posts to make strategic links, and learn from the successes and failures of other, in often cases similar, projects.

## **4. LOOKING AHEAD: OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME**

### **4.1. Wider FCO Programme Context**

Future funding for human rights and democracy work is subject to the outcome of the Spending Review (SR). One of the decisions that will come out of the SR is whether human rights and democracy project work is funded through a standalone human rights and democracy fund, such as the HRDP, or whether it should form part of a broader programme fund, such as the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF), or a new “golden thread” fund. Based on the findings of this review, there is good evidence that a standalone human rights fund can be well managed and have impact.

### **4.2. Human Rights and Democracy Department: 2015 onwards**

In July 2015, Ministers agreed a new approach to the FCO's human rights and democracy work in line with the government's manifesto commitments, focused on three pillars:

- **Democratic Values**
- **The Rules-Based International System**
- **Human Rights for a Stable World**

Subject to the outcome of the SR, it would make sense for any new fund to be structured to deliver strategic projects under each of the three pillars. However, a decision will need to be made whether a new fund prescribes narrow objectives within each pillar (similar to the focused “thematic” approach under the existing HRDP), or whether objectives are defined more flexibly to support a broader range of human rights activity at post. Based on this, target areas might be interpreted in a HRDP strategy as follows:

*NOTE: the following three sub-sections will be completed once the cogs papers are finalised.*

#### **4.2.1. Democratic Values**

#### **4.2.2. Supporting the Rules-Based International System (RBIS)**

#### **4.2.3. Human Rights for a Stable world**

### 4.3. Structural Options

Each financial year, the HRDP reviews its approach to funding, both in terms of the target areas under thematic priorities and country focus, and in terms of the application and approval process.

There is a question in designing any new fund about the balance between *flexibility* and *focus*: how to manage the desired flexibility for posts to respond to the country context, while balancing strategic policy direction with accountability to London. The starting point for any new fund will be that Ministers have agreed to approach human rights under the three new pillars, but also given a clear steer that FCO posts should have more discretion about how they react to human rights and democracy issues in country. A new fund will therefore need to allow for that greater flexibility, while providing direction and oversight that project work properly reflects the those pillars.

Options for the future structure of human rights and democracy funding are as follows:

- 1) **Status Quo** (*centrally managed, global fund*)  
A global, flexible fund, tending towards countries of human rights significance to the UK.
- 2) **Prioritised** – (*centrally managed, priority countries only*)  
This would be the same approach as the “status quo” fund, but would only be only to defined list of priority countries.
- 3) **Devolved** – (*geographical desks/posts managed, priority countries only*)  
Other FCO Programmes devolve funding to specific countries, to allow Posts to have their own bidding rounds. For example, the Arab Partnership Fund devolves to specific countries in the MENAD region, and the Prosperity Fund devolves to priority emerging markets. Priority posts/regions then run their own bidding rounds. A devolved HRDP would:
- 4) **Hybrid** - (*combination of prioritised and flexible centrally administered fund*)  
In a hybrid model, the majority of the fund would be spent on priority countries. However, recognising that high-impact projects can also take place in ‘non-priority’ countries, a small percentage would be kept separately and administered centrally. The focus for this “flexible” funding would be high-impact projects for non-priority countries, and also for multi-country, regional and/or thematic activity, that has potential for high global strategic impact.

See Table 16 on p.32 for a comparison of the options.



Table 16: Summary of options for the HRDP from 16/17 onwards

OPTION	AIM	PROCESS	RESOURCE	RISKS
<p><b>1. Status Quo</b></p>	<p>Global change across thematic HR priorities, with a tendency towards countries of particular HR significance to the UK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Centrally managed by London</li> <li>Global: open to all Posts</li> <li>Posts/implementers bid to themes</li> <li>Posts manage projects, multi-country projects managed by HRDD</li> <li>Has a thematic focus on a <u>set list of priorities</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resourced by 2x FTE in HRDP</li> <li>Supported by 2x Human Rights Advisers (20%)</li> <li>Supported by HRDD desk officers (15%)</li> <li>LE staff funded according to business need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource intensive and creates significant work for the FCO network, with only 34% of proposals funded.</li> <li>Thematic focus – can't always fund CoCs</li> <li>Localised CSOs may miss out to larger, thematically focused INGOs</li> <li>External challenge by NGOs – "why does the FCO not fund X priority?"</li> <li>Fund projects that are 'nice to have' but not always the most relevant</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Prioritised</b></p>	<p>Change across human rights in priority countries only.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding <u>only open to countries of HR significance to the UK</u> (including Geneva)</li> <li>Centrally managed by HRDP in London, supported by Post</li> <li>Funding must fit under three "pillars" of human rights policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resourced by 2x FTE in HRDP</li> <li>Supported by 2x Human Rights Advisers (20%)</li> <li>Supported by HRDD desk officers (15%)</li> <li>LE staff funded according to business need in priority countries only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flexibility of the fund is limited; it would be less responsive to more "urgent" human rights priorities</li> <li>Choosing the priority countries would be a challenge, particularly given the likely crossover with NSC and DFID priority countries</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Devolved</b></p>	<p>Change across human rights in priority countries only.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding <u>only open to countries of HR significance to the UK</u> (including Geneva)</li> <li>Management devolved to local or regional boards (chaired by relevant Geographical Director), supported by final HRDP Board in London</li> <li>Funding must fit under three "pillars" of human rights policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resourced by 2x FTE in HRDP</li> <li>Supported by 2x Human Rights Advisers (20%)</li> <li>LE staff funded according to business need in priority countries only</li> <li>Directorates would support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flexibility of the fund is limited; it would be less responsive to more "urgent" human rights priorities.</li> <li>Directorates would need to be willing to prioritise countries in their regions and provide resource.</li> <li>Choosing the priority countries would be a challenge, particularly given the likely crossover with NSC and DFID priority countries.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. 'Hybrid'</b></p>	<p>Global change across human rights issues where they are most important to the UK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of funding (e.g. 75%) only open to countries of HR significance to the UK (including UKMIS Geneva).</li> <li>Minority of funding (e.g. 25%) is centrally managed by HRDP</li> <li>Funding must fit under three "pillars" of human rights policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resourced by 2x FTE in HRDP</li> <li>Supported by 2x Human Rights Advisers (20%)</li> <li>LE staff funded according to business need in priority countries only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directorates would need to be willing to prioritise countries in their regions (six geographic + UKMIS).</li> <li>Could be difficult to get agreement. Directorates would need to be willing and able to provide resource.</li> </ul>

## Annex A – Recommendations from 2012 HRDP Evaluation

Recommendation for HRDP	Implementation
1) The HRDP <b>fosters its distinct character</b> of <i>speed, flexibility of delivery, willingness to accept/manage risk, small projects; and leveraging funds for projects by bigger donors.</i>	This USP of the programme is clear to Posts and potential implementers in the HRDP strategy and bidding guidance.
2) Acquire and share <b>knowledge of other human rights work across HMG</b>	In 2012, the programme team worked with Finance Directorate to better understand and quantify the amount the FCO as a whole spends on human rights projects. (2011/12 estimate was that the FCO spent £16.5m – not for external use). Our human rights spending across the FCO has also since become a feature of the FCO's Annual Human Rights Report, as shown in p. 26 of the current (2014) report. HRDD has also developed "How To..." notes on human rights work for the network.
3) <b>Identify the c. £10 million</b> of annual HMG funds spent on non-HRDP human rights work.	Complete in 2013.
4) Consider a further <b>reduction of Target Areas (themes) for the Programme</b> ; and that the number of <b>priority countries for the Programme is rigorously assessed</b> for where real impact can be secured, <b>and</b> where projects are least likely to succeed.	In spring/summer 2012, the programme tightened the strategic focus of the fund, reducing the number of themes from 8 to seven and amending several target areas. e.g. specifying that torture prevention projects should focus on pre-trial detention.  In 2013, PSVI was added to the HRDP as a target area following a Ministerial directive.
5) Reiterate the importance of <b>integrating projects into Post Country Business Plans.</b>	Post guidance in subsequent bidding rounds has made this point clear.
6) Provide full <b>analysis and documentation of cancelled projects</b> , or those that do not achieve desired impact, to inform risk management.	Cancelled or failed projects are frequently subject to evaluations. In addition, all documentation and rationale (emails, quarterly reports) are stored and used to inform lessons learned and improve future iterations of the HRDP strategy.
7) Examine the methodologies for measuring human rights impact with a view to <b>having HRDP indicators</b> in place for measuring the programme's impact by the end of FY 2011/12.	The HRDP strategies since have included indicators.
8) That Target Areas (themes) be considered for possible building blocks of Programme impact; and that consequent amendment of current programme forms be considered	New programme forms were developed by SPF in 2014.
9) HRDP Team liaises with the FCO's central Programme Office to consider <b>how comparable impact assessment metrics</b> for all the FCO Policy Programmes can be put together.	Completed in 2012.
10) Maximum <b>project duration lengthens</b> from one year to at least two years.	The application of this recommendation has been used where possible (PSVI), but has been difficult to administer regularly where funding has not been guaranteed due to the central dissemination of funds on an annual basis. To

	be considered as part of the future HRDP structure.
11) <b>Post and HRDP responsibilities are clarified</b>	Guidance since 2012 has included tailored information about the responsibilities for Post and the HRDP team with respect to project management and reporting.
12) Encourage <b>prompt production of project completion reports</b> ; ensure lessons are learnt	All guidance for Post makes this requirement clear. Receipt of PCRs is logged on the HRDP-managed spreadsheet, and blanks are followed up. This review is also evidence of meeting this recommendation.
13) Take a structured approach to <b>recording, disseminating and acting upon lessons learnt</b>	Lessons learned are shared with Posts on our <a href="#">SharePoint</a> site, as are "How to do human rights" notes.
14) Consider the merits of <b>publishing lessons learnt</b> on the internet in the interests of transparency	All (non-sensitive) project evaluations are published <a href="#">online</a> , and lessons learned are shared with Posts on our <a href="#">SharePoint</a> site. <i>More to be done in this space.</i>
15) Consider a <b>database of project implementers</b>	A full database of 2011-2015 HRDP projects, including spend by country and implementer, is complete.
16) Review the <b>role of the Programme Board</b> , particularly with regard to the amount of <b>time it spends considering project proposals</b> .	Using feedback and lessons learnt from 2012/13 we refined the bidding process to give Posts more time to produce quality bids and reduce the administration burden of assessing projects in London.
17) The practice of <b>monthly financial reporting is re-examined</b> with a view to reducing the reporting load. Enable <b>less scrutiny for well performing posts</b> .	In 2013, monthly financial reporting was reduced to quarterly financial reporting, with the exception of the final quarter (January – March). Furthermore, funds were devolved to China and Colombia from, 2014 onwards, as these were "top performing" Posts. Devolved funds to be considered as part of the future structure of the HRDP.
18) Greater informal <b>virtual communication is encouraged between Post Programme officers</b> to disseminate best practice.	This was facilitated by the 2014 Human Rights Network Conference in March, attendance of overseas project officers at human rights training courses, shared access to <a href="#">SharePoint</a> , the use of the <a href="#">Human Rights Community</a> on FCO net, and the encouragement for regions to create "regional human rights networks" that are supported by HRDD.