

Annex B – Annual HRDP Expenditure by Country – SECTION 12

Country	Number of projects per year				Total	Total Spend
	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15		
Armenia	0	1	0	0	1	£43,249
Afghanistan	1	0	1	1	3	£474,529
Angola	0	0	1	0	1	£65,811
Anguilla	0	0	1	0	1	£23,886
Argentina	1	0	0	0	1	£24,961
Azerbaijan	1	0	0	1	2	£115,834
Bangladesh	0	0	0	1	1	£50,973
Botswana	1	0	0	0	1	£78,972
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	1	2	3	£151,812
Brazil	1	2	2	1	6	£284,399
CAR	0	0	0	0	0	£0
Cambodia	2	1	2	0	5	£199,383
Cameroon	1	0	0	0	1	£25,684
Colombia	4	4	5	4	17	£1,168,444
DRC	1	0	2	1	4	£298,064
Egypt	1	0	0	0	1	£10,000
Fiji	0	1	0	0	1	£34,975
Georgia	1	0	0	0	1	£32,690
Guatemala	0	0	1	1	2	£32,134
Indonesia	1	1	2	1	5	£267,525
Japan	0	0	0	1	1	£39,022
Kazakhstan	1	5	2	1	9	£455,919
Kenya	2	0	2	2	6	£470,896
Madagascar	0	0	0	1	1	£16,801
Kyrgyzstan	1	0	0	0	1	£93,175
Libya	1	0	0	0	1	£46,054
Malawi	1	1	0	0	2	£123,531

Malaysia	0	0	1	2	3	£71,667
Mexico	2	1	3	0	6	£369,823
Morocco	1	1	2	1	5	£148,848
Multi Country	17	17	19	17	70	£5,849,250
Nepal	2	0	3	0	5	£243,297
Nigeria	3	0	1	2	6	£326,805
OPTs	1	2	0	1	4	£208,036
Philippines	2	2	2	1	7	£638,940
Rwanda	0	1	0	0	1	£61,207
Serbia	1	0	0	0	1	£29,224
Sierra Leone	1	0	1	1	3	£324,136
Somalia	0	0	0	0	0	£0
South Sudan	0	0	2	2	4	£250,647
Sri Lanka	2	1	0	1	4	£178,110
Tajikistan	2	0	0	0	2	£30,531
Tanzania	0	0	0	1	1	£42,500
Tunisia	0	0	0	1	1	£122,830
Uganda	1	1	0	0	2	£75,083
USA	0	2	1	1	4	£140,651
Vietnam	1	1	2	1	5	£318,023
Yemen	0	1	1	1	3	£359,867
Zambia	0	0	1	0	1	£149,977
Zimbabwe	2	1	2	0	5	£255,980
TOTAL	82	73	91	78	324	£21,778,493

Annex C: Summary of Project Evaluations from 2011-14

Country & Year	Theme	Project Title & Year	Evaluation RAG Rating ¹³
Colombia (2011-12)	BHR	Business and Human Rights in Colombia	<i>N/A the 2011/12 evaluations reports did not use RAG ratings</i>
	CJS ¹⁴	Early intervention on criminal complaints	
	CS ¹⁵	Civil society implements land restitution policy	
	CS	Civil society implements land restitution policy	
Kenya (2011-12)	DEM	Tackling Election Related Violence	
	CJS	Campaigning against extra-judicial killings	
Nigeria (2011-12)	ADP	Towards Abolition of Death Penalty; Legal Defence and Assistance Project	
	DEM	Strengthening Electoral Processes in the Niger Delta; Stakeholder Democracy Network	
	FOE	Promoting Public Debate; Speakers Corner Trust	
China (2012-13)	ADP	A policy approach to further reduce the death penalty	
	BHR	Human Rights in the Chinese Textile Industry	Amber/Green
	FOE	Promoting Legal Protection for the Media	Amber/Red
	GTP	A human rights approach to prison management	Amber/Green
	GTP	Promoting best practice in investigating complaints from detainees	Amber/Green
Burma (2012-13)	DEM	Burma Rule of Law Project	Amber/Green
	DEM	Reintegration and skills for political prisoners	Amber/Red
	WR	Promoting Women's Rights in Burma	Amber/Green
India (2012-13)	BHR	India CEO Forum on BHR	Amber/Red
	FOE	Defending and strengthening freedom of expression on the Internet in South Asia	Amber/Green
	GTP	Police Complaints Authorities: Improving police accountability	Amber/Green
	UN	Universal Periodic Review; a multi-stakeholder monitoring process of India's 2 nd UPR	Amber/Red
Kazakhstan (2012-13)	BHR	Promoting UNGPs on business and human rights	Amber/Green
	DEM	Elections & Democracy in Kazakhstan	Amber/Red
	FORB	Strengthening religious freedom in Kazakhstan	Amber/Green
	GTP	Integrating safeguards against torture	Amber/Red
Vietnam (2012-13)	FOE	Enhance protection of journalists and media freedom	Green
Colombia (2013-14)	BHR	Enhancing government proficiency to implement UNGPS	Green
	DEM	Risk maps to track electoral irregularities in the 2014 elections	Green
	WR	Capacity building for effective participation of women victims of the armed conflict in Colombia	Green
Kenya (2013-14)	BHR	Nairobi Process: Pact for Responsible Business	Amber/Green
	BHR	Business and Human Rights Training Courses	Amber/Green
Zambia (2013-14)	FOE	Zambia Debates!	Green

¹³ Possible ratings of Green, Amber/Green, Amber, Amber/Red and Red.

¹⁴ Criminal Justice Systems, a 2011-12 thematic priority

¹⁵ Civil Society, a 2011-12 thematic priority

Zimbabwe (2013-14)	DEM	Democracy: Your participation required	Red
	DEM	Enabling Zimbabwe citizen observers to monitor the role of money in the general election	Amber/Red

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 November 2015 14:10
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SPF Programme VFM

[REDACTED]

You asked for examples of vfm for the Human Rights and Democracy Programme (HRDP):

The overall vfm of the programme is measured by the overall global impact of the fund against the cost to the taxpayer, and is underpinned by a rigorous programme management process.

Global Impact:

- Between 2011 – 2015 the Human Rights and Democracy Programme spent **£21.77m funding 324 human rights projects in over 66 countries** and across every region in the world, representing excellent vfm for HMG's global influence and reputation on human rights. An average of £67k per project – good vfm given the breadth of work and outcomes achieved. Enabling the FCO to have impact across a range of priority countries and issues:
 - ✓ Protecting journalists in Russia £30k
[REDACTED]
 - ✓ Responding to sexual violence in Afghanistan £90k
[REDACTED]
 - ✓ Contribution to Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund on counter extremism £150k

Programme Management:

- VFM at Project Selection:
Over five years we have received c.£100m worth of project bids, of which 20% have been funded. VFM is a key criteria in project selection by the HRDP Programme Board, including independent experts. All proposals need a comprehensive activity based budget, which is rigorously assessed against HMG financial guidance and objectives. Of projects funded, over five years there was a **97% project completion rate**.
- VFM at Project Monitoring
Posts scrutinise vfm via quarterly progress reports, quarterly financial reports, and project completion reports. These are collated at programme level to inform the SRO each quarter; high risk projects
- VFM at Project evaluation
Each year, the HRDP evaluates 10% of the projects. These follow OECD DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, including vfm. Between 2011-2015, 10% were evaluated equating to 11% of total programme expenditure. 68% of those projects received a "green" or "amber/green" rating.

Future Programming: we intend to follow the same programme management principles to ensure vfm in our next bidding round. But we intend to reshape our approach as needed to ensure it is in line with the SDSR and manifesto commitments and de-conflicts/leverages other relevant X-WH funds. Our HRDP strategy will be redrafted to be less thematic and more country/region focused, to ensure projects continue to support human rights in the countries where FCO/UK has the greatest influence and stake.

Is this the sort of thing you were after? Happy to discuss

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Multilateral Policy Directorate, FCO
Multilateralism Matters: More Impact, Greater Reach

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 13 November 2015 12:32
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: SPF

[Redacted] afraid I don't quite understand the request. Do you mean project evaluation? Our programme was evaluated by DG Ops (yesterday's enclosure), so Pete should be able to explain how vfm was considered by the DG Ops Evaluation Board. We have done our own internal evaluation which looks at vfm – will come up with some wording on that. Could we discuss quickly on the phone?

Thanks,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Multilateral Policy Directorate, FCO
Multilateralism Matters: More Impact, Greater Reach

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 13 November 2015 12:27
To: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

This is helpful. As part of a different HMT request (for 1500 today!), can you provide a (brief) explanation of the VFM metrics applied to programme evaluation – both for existing activity and future expansion/ reallocation.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

HRD Programme Quarterly Review: Q2, June 2015 – September 2015 (+ October)

ATTENDEES:

- Rob Fenn - SRO
- [REDACTED] - Deputy Head
- [REDACTED] Human Rights Advisers
- [REDACTED] Team Leader, Comms & Programme
- [REDACTED] - HRDP Manager
- [REDACTED] HRDP Deputy Manager

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER																											
<p>Programme Strategy Objectives and Indicators (overall RAG rating)</p>	A/G	A	<p>Overall the Programme has been rated Amber for this quarter, projects progressing but bidding round date delayed and spend quite low at 29%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>#</th> <th>INDICATOR</th> <th>RAG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Project appraisal/selection</td> <td>A/G</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>HRDD Initiatives</td> <td>A/G</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Implementation/monitoring</td> <td>A/G</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Risk/issue analysis</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Financial management</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Evaluation</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Communications</td> <td>A/G</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Resources</td> <td>A/R</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For consideration in meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When to hold 16/17 HRDP Bidding Round Board's views on the draft Internal Review. How to manage increasing resource restraints 	#	INDICATOR	RAG	1	Project appraisal/selection	A/G	2	HRDD Initiatives	A/G	3	Implementation/monitoring	A/G	4	Risk/issue analysis	A	5	Financial management	A	6	Evaluation	A	7	Communications	A/G	8	Resources	A/R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> SRO emails Paul Williams to provide an overview of how the HRDP is managed (via the Q1 report), an explanation of the delegation of the role of "SRO", and; a case for why/how the Spending Review will impact the HRDP. Complete 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> SRO emails Paul Williams to provide an update on the HRDP (via the Q2 report)
#	INDICATOR	RAG																														
1	Project appraisal/selection	A/G																														
2	HRDD Initiatives	A/G																														
3	Implementation/monitoring	A/G																														
4	Risk/issue analysis	A																														
5	Financial management	A																														
6	Evaluation	A																														
7	Communications	A/G																														
8	Resources	A/R																														

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER																																							
<p>1. Project Appraisal and Selection</p>	<p>G</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>Amber/Green – a number of new projects started in Q2. Launch date of FY16/17 bidding round uncertain.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="363 996 874 1543"> <thead> <tr> <th>Theme</th> <th>No. projects</th> <th>Budget</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ADP</td> <td>14</td> <td>£585,759</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BHR</td> <td>9</td> <td>£721,993</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DEM</td> <td>7</td> <td>£505,934</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FOE</td> <td>9</td> <td>£702,376</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FORB</td> <td>6</td> <td>£497,776</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GTP</td> <td>9</td> <td>£718,963</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WR</td> <td>7</td> <td>£561,910</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSVI</td> <td>12</td> <td>£1,655,004</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Initiatives</td> <td>2</td> <td>£159,788</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LE Staff</td> <td>6</td> <td>£60,997</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M & E</td> <td>3</td> <td>£35,463</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>75 (+9)</td> <td>£6,205,963</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul data-bbox="906 831 1380 1599" style="list-style-type: none"> • New Projects – we are funding three new PSVI projects in Bosnia, DRC and Kosovo worth £110k, plus two HRDD initiatives. • Spending Review – we bid to increase our budget to <u>£10.6m</u>; risk that this incorporates WFD (which would mean an increase of only £1m). • 16/17 Strategy – needs to be drafted, subject to HRDD cogs papers. <u>Inclusion of PSVI is a question.</u> • Bidding round - unlikely to launch until January, (for discussion) will impact 16/17 project implementation. Allocation to be confirmed by ExCo in January. 	Theme	No. projects	Budget	ADP	14	£585,759	BHR	9	£721,993	DEM	7	£505,934	FOE	9	£702,376	FORB	6	£497,776	GTP	9	£718,963	WR	7	£561,910	PSVI	12	£1,655,004	Initiatives	2	£159,788	LE Staff	6	£60,997	M & E	3	£35,463	Total	75 (+9)	£6,205,963	<ol data-bbox="316 499 1364 831" style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Subject to SR, work with priority posts that did not receive funding to develop stronger proposals for FY16/17. Subject to SR. 3. Plan to evaluate FY14/15 projects in some countries where there were no successful bids for this year. Not planned 4. Update any future guidance and strategy to reflect the lessons learned from previous round. Next quarter. 5. Support PSVI team to source and manage new PSVI projects that are HRDP-funded. Complete 	<ol data-bbox="587 168 1093 499" style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Launch HRDP bidding round in Q4 (January) 3. Use the HRDD cogs papers and HRDP Internal Review to inform the 16/17 HRDP strategy 4. Rob explore with colleagues where PSVI funding sits in MPD
Theme	No. projects	Budget																																										
ADP	14	£585,759																																										
BHR	9	£721,993																																										
DEM	7	£505,934																																										
FOE	9	£702,376																																										
FORB	6	£497,776																																										
GTP	9	£718,963																																										
WR	7	£561,910																																										
PSVI	12	£1,655,004																																										
Initiatives	2	£159,788																																										
LE Staff	6	£60,997																																										
M & E	3	£35,463																																										
Total	75 (+9)	£6,205,963																																										

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER
<p>2. HRDD Initiatives</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>Amber/Green – HRDP are now funding two initiatives: Magna Carta Partnerships (MCP) £100k, and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (NIHRC) to Chair the Commonwealth Forum of National Human Rights Institutions (CFNHRI), £59k.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MCP – progressing well. Launched in September, since then we have received 12 Expressions of Interest, 3 approved (Eritrea, Mexico, Thailand). Allocated £19,020 (19%) to date. £30k worth of projects to be considered at the MCP Board on 17 Nov. Small risk that we will be unable to fund enough projects, but steady stream coming in. NIHRC - approved in principle but waiting for NIHRC to finalise proposal and budget. Delay as proposal was not up to standard. Should complete and contract this month. No payment made yet. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>6. Get in touch with NIHRC to finalise contract and agree date for first payment</p>
<p>3. 15/16 Project Implementation & Monitoring</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>Amber/Green – vast majority of contracts with implementers have been signed and projects have started. Good progress being made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 93% of all projects have now started. None cancelled. Three delayed. [REDACTED] Two new (Kosovo, NIHRC). We have received 99% of Q1 reports and 76% of Q2 reports. Increase on reporting from last year. Significant activity has already taken place. Of HRDD's 12 projects, we have 60% of Q2 reports – none from FORB or FOE (two chased by ADP). BHR project management improved this FY. 		<p>7. Continue to chase Posts for outstanding QMRs</p> <p>8. [REDACTED] to follow-up with FOE and FORB teams on their quarterly reports and project management</p>

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER
<p>4. Risk/Issue Analysis and Management</p>	A/G	A	<p>Amber – CSO space presenting a greater risk. A couple of projects are in regions affected by current crises/conflict, leading to delayed delivery. Key risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Risk Projects – Three projects are “high risk” as they have not yet started: [REDACTED] These are worth £169,894, so in the unlikely event all are cancelled they will be covered by the over-allocation. Posts are working to get these started. If no progress by December they will be cancelled. • Civil Society Space (Amber) – increasing concern is how new “anti-NGO” laws affect project implementation. [REDACTED] (UNDP awaiting approval). Ongoing risk in China is the draft NGO law. • Projects cancelling/stalling due to crises/conflict (Amber) – £1m worth of projects in high-risk countries of Iraq, Syria, and South Sudan (one FORB, five PSVI). Post are closely monitoring these, but spend is low at £100k (10%). Recent incident in the DRC, project participants attacked. Project is continuing, spend (if anything) will increase. • Risk of under-spend against budget (Amber) - we tried to mitigate an under spend by over allocating the budget; over allocation likely to decrease as projects usually under spend on their budget. 	<p>6. Maintain regular contact with posts at high risk. Escalate to SRO if situation worsens and under spend looks likely. Ongoing</p>	<p>8. If high risk projects are still stalled by December then consult with Post on cancellation.</p> <p>9. Maintain regular contact with posts in high-risk countries. Discuss likelihood of under spend. Escalate to SRO if situation worsens.</p> <p>10. Create new list of “back-up” projects in unlikely scenario of possible under spend.</p>

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER																				
<p>5. Financial Management</p>		A	<p>Amber – spend to date still quite low at Q2 (note – inc. October spend). Rate of spend is increasing, though needs to increase more rapidly. Still over allocated to manage the risk of under-spend.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="414 851 683 1585"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #cccccc;">Q1</th> <th colspan="2" style="background-color: #cccccc;">Q2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FCO Allocation</td> <td>£5.5m</td> <td>£5.5m</td> <td>£5.5m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual Forecast</td> <td>£5,950,324 (8% over allocation)</td> <td>£6,205,963 (13% over allocation)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Spend</td> <td>£298,265 (5%)</td> <td>£1,615,926 (29%)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HRDP FPCI</td> <td>74% (June)</td> <td>77% (October)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget remains over allocated this year, to manage the risk of under spend. If you add on the remainder for the PSVI projects and HRDD initiatives (c. £315k) the <u>over allocation now increases to £6,205,963 (13%) and we have spent 26% of that full allocation</u>. This is high, but we anticipate that it will reduce. If needed, there will be the option to absorb additional ODA spend later. • The HRDP Q2 Finance Performance Compliance Indicator (FPCI) is at 77%, an improvement to this time last FY (60%). We are continuing to prioritise clearing the backlog of accruals, invoices on hold and open POs to get to the Q3 target of 90%. • Receiving errors at Post from last FY (worth -£75,749) is impacting HRDP spend to date. [redacted] to resolve. 	Q1		Q2		FCO Allocation	£5.5m	£5.5m	£5.5m	Actual Forecast	£5,950,324 (8% over allocation)	£6,205,963 (13% over allocation)		Total Spend	£298,265 (5%)	£1,615,926 (29%)		HRDP FPCI	74% (June)	77% (October)		<p>7. Address all outstanding accruals on system and continue to work with posts to improve HRDP's FPCI scores – Progress has been made (ongoing)</p> <p>8. Send a further reminder for officers to receipt spend on PRISM promptly, via the August newsletter – reminders and targeted emailing has been producing results</p> <p>9. If Q2 spend is still low, discuss handling options at Q2 meeting with SRO. Complete</p>	<p>11. Continue to address all outstanding issues (e.g. accruals) on system, working with closer with posts to improve HRDP's FPCI scores</p> <p>12. Create a "high risk list" of projects with 0% spend. Inform project officers via email and telephone. Include these as on the risk register and proactively resolve with Post. Update SRO in December.</p> <p>13. [redacted] handover management of HRDD budget to [redacted] to build financial management resilience in HRDD.</p>
Q1		Q2																							
FCO Allocation	£5.5m	£5.5m	£5.5m																						
Actual Forecast	£5,950,324 (8% over allocation)	£6,205,963 (13% over allocation)																							
Total Spend	£298,265 (5%)	£1,615,926 (29%)																							
HRDP FPCI	74% (June)	77% (October)																							

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER
6. Evaluation	A	A	<p>Amber – we have received 69% of project completion reports and planned some 14/15 evaluations. Behind the curve on publishing evaluations. First draft of internal review complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 71 completed (and eligible) projects we received 69% of all Project Completion Reports. We expect to have all reports by the end of Q3. • Evaluation plan developed and approved by Board. Evaluations planned in Indonesia/Philippines (Nov), China (Jan) and India (Jan/Feb) • Still need to commission external evaluations of Association for the Prevention of Torture (APT) c. £1m last 4 years, and Global Partners Digital c. £500k. • Kazakhstan, Kenya, Zimbabwe yet to be published – undermines HRDP's credibility. • Internal Review - the first draft complete, for discussion. 	<p>10. Kenya and Kazakhstan evaluations to be published on the HRDP SharePoint page & Gov.uk. Incomplete</p> <p>11. Chase posts for outstanding PCRs. Ongoing.</p> <p>12. Develop FY15/16 evaluation plan; circulate to Board for decision. Complete</p> <p>13. Discuss options for an external evaluation of PSVI projects. Incomplete</p> <p>14. Circulate first draft of internal review. Complete</p>	<p>14. Undertake Indonesia/ Philippines evaluation in Nov.</p> <p>15. Commission external evaluator for APT.</p> <p>16. Publish all evaluations. In future, these will be approved by Steven Fisher (rather than Rob).</p> <p>17. Chase outstanding PCRs.</p> <p>18. [REDACTED] to discuss an external evaluation of PSVI with PSVI team.</p> <p>19. Final draft of Internal Review.</p> <p>20. Draft some options for a "hybrid" funding structure.</p>

INDICATOR	Q1 RAG	Q2 RAG	EXPLANATION & POINTS FOR DISCUSSION	ACTIONS FROM Q1 & UPDATE	ACTIONS NEXT QUARTER
<p>7. Stakeholder Analysis and Comms</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>Amber/Green - there has been fairly low external engagement this quarter as bidding round has not started. Poster campaign underway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch of the Magna Carta Partnerships bidding round at a high-profile event with Baroness Anelay. • [REDACTED] kicked off a "poster campaign" to get images from projects that we can use on Human Rights Day. Will be able to reuse at HRDP launch. • Lots of external and internal interest on bidding round. Several meetings with interested NGOs. E.g. Physicians for Human Rights, Action Aid. 	<p>15. Check Minister's travel plans, schedule comms activity around initiatives/ projects. Ongoing, recent comms around PSVI projects</p> <p>16. Commission poster campaign. Underway</p> <p>17. Programme Team speak to the five "most effective" posts for tweets. Incomplete</p>	<p>21. Launch poster campaign in Q3 as part of Human Rights Day – cross MPD comms potential.</p> <p>22. Hold HRDP bidding round and launch event in Q4 (Jan).</p>
<p>8. Resources</p>	<p>A/G</p>	<p>A/R</p>	<p>Amber/Red – continued limited capacity of the HRDP team to effectively manage the programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the SR, there is a condensed timeline for the 16/17 HRDP bidding round, so the busiest time for the HRDP team will clash with project evaluations (Posts preferred Nov/Jan dates) and the creation of the Annual Report. <u>This will impact our capacity for effective programme management over the next two quarters.</u> • Constraints are reduction of B3 slot from the Comms team, and HR Adviser contracts expiring in January (Advisers support HRDP in the bidding round). 	<p>18. Explore options to limit the number of (HRDD-led) multi-country projects for FY 16/17 Input into the Internal Review</p>	<p>23. Rob to speak to Paul Williams about resource constraints.</p> <p>24. [REDACTED] to see whether resource can be found from PTF or MPD surge team.</p>