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ENNHRI European Network of National Human Rights Institutions
GANHRI Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
GIHR German Institute for Human Rights
GKB Global Knowledge Brokers
ICC International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights
NANHRI Network of African National Human Rights Institutions
NHRI National Human Rights Institutions
NHRI·EU The name of the project with the longer title; “Capacity Building of National Human Rights Institutions”
OD Organisational Development
OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
RED de Americas Network of National Human Rights Institutions

KMNA Knowledge Management Needs Assessment
UNDP United Nations Development Program
This report summarises decisions and discussions held between DIHR and NANHRI at the kick-off meeting held in Nairobi, Kenya on May 24 to 26, 2016.

NANHRI and DIHR are co-applicants at the NHRI-EU project and entered into a partnership contract on 1 of May 2016. The meeting marked the formal kick-off in the partnership and aimed to agree on the projects main objectives and activities, to clarify each other’s roles and responsibilities, to ensure that NANHRI knows the requirements of the project and to initiate a capacity assessment of NANHRI.

Important decisions and matters for follow-up are listed in chapter 2, while the minutes from each of the three days is summarised in chapter 3, 4 and 5.
1 INTRODUCTION

The NHRI-EU project organises decentralised kick-off meetings with all co-applicants, to ensure a common understanding of the project, and to discuss the inception phase in details. DIHR and NANHRI signed a partnership contract in May 2016, running until October 2018. NANHRI is the biggest regional network of NHRIs, with currently 44 members, and the secretariat currently employs seven staff. DIHR and NANHRI have had previous cooperation, and the two parties therefore knows each other well. In addition, DIHR and NANHRI have had many project discussions, both physical meetings in Geneva (March 2016), and a number of Skype-conversations. The topics were project and contract issues, and the organisational development process.

In addition to ensuring a common understanding of the project and the guidelines, it was decided to carry out a capacity assessment of NANHRI. The objectives of the mission was to:

1) Present the project to NANHRI and to clarify open questions
2) Discuss and agree on the modalities for implementation of the project
3) Make a capacity assessment of NANHRI’s organisational and administrative set-up and their ability to administer EU-grants

Chapter 2 contains key decisions and urgent follow-up matters, while chapter 3-5 has summaries from the discussions during the three days.
2 DECISIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

2.1 DECISIONS

- The initial capacity assessment regarding the financial management of NANHRI indicates that NANHRI has relevant financial staff in place to be able to do budget follow up and generally follow EC rules in corporation with DIHR. However, to accommodate other network challenges and assignments, the regional coordinator position will be changed from a half-time position to a full-time position. NANHRI initially had a budget for a 50% position for a period of 33 months which will be upgraded to 100% for 33 months. The extra required budget will be reallocated for one of the DIHR salary budget lines, meaning that NANHRI gets a higher proportion of the total budget and DIHR a similar smaller proportion. The overall grant from EU remains the same and DIHR therefore consequently had to make the adjustment. This budget revision will take place during NANHRI’s second budget revision.
- Thus, and in line with the above, the budget needs to be revised, and the Regional Coordinator budget line has as mentioned been reconsidered.
- NANHRI should use the Financial Monitoring Tool template for budget revisions
- NANHRI is to present a plan with priorities and develop a timeline for implementing the priorities under organisational development area (100,000 €).
- It was agreed that DIHR should investigate solutions to the the issue of finding the exact starting date on the contract. A solution that fits NANHRI should be considered. The issue has emerged due to different signatory dates between DIHR and NANHRI with a three week period difference. (The current date in April is too late for NANHRI). This has, in the meantime, been investigated with DIHR’s in-house legal adviser and a solution has been implemented.
- DIHR is to draft an overview of the secretariat’s anticipated role in the blended learning development process, but also their role in the implementation and reporting phases.
- DIHR to share the proposed re-grants system with NANHRI, once developed.
- NANHRI communication officer to review visibility plan before DIHR finalises.
• NANHRI to share their MoU with the African Union, and to consider to include the partnership as a priority under objective 3. Sub-regional relations also to be considered as intervention area under objective 3.

• To ensure on-going communication, DIHR and NANHRI will organise monthly skype-meetings. First meeting agreed on 22nd of June, 14.30/13.30 (Kenya Time/DK Time)
• DIHR is to follow up if NANHRI’s Financial Monitoring Tool can have three currencies KES, USD to EUR, instead of just two; KES to EUR.
• NANHRI is to look into how the budget for rent of office and office supplies can be spent, in terms of running payments to the KNCHR, or make a proposal to DIHR to allocate the funds elsewhere in the budget.

2.2 OTHER FOLLOW-UP MATTERS

• NANHRI has explained the complexity of the African network also in terms of being able to provide appropriate service to Portuguese and French speaking NHRI’s. The challenges related to the Eastern African sub-region was also discussed. DIHR has indicated that support could be provided from the project to improve organisation of the sub-regional informal networks. A plan for this would need to be drafted and discussed.
• NANHRI provides information to DIHR about additional members to include in the LNA survey, which has thereafter been contacted. Most responded and DIHR and NANHRI followed up jointly.
• NANHRI noticed two problems with the survey; one on error messages being in Danish only and the other that it was not clear to them that they only responded to one thematic area at the time. Both issues handled by now.
• Information about RWI’s visit (Morten Kjærum); NANHRI and RWI wants to strengthen the cooperation between the three parties, since there are have many mutual interest, however, this depends also on new activities outside this EU-grant.
• Another face-to-face meeting in 2016 either in Kenya or Copenhagen. Exact date to be decided.
3 DAY 1 – PROJECT INTRODUCTION

3.1 PROJECT INTRO

DIHR gave a brief introduction of the project in general, i.e. the global budget, other partners in the project, how the grant was negotiated and the target groups.

Secondly, the global governance structure was explained and presented as in Annex 2.

- Based on a question about UNDPs role in the Steering Committee (SC), the newly agreed governance structure from the Annual Review Meeting in Geneva was explained. It was clarified that UNDP is not part of the full SC meeting, but will be invited for a second and open part of SC meeting, where it is expected that OHCHR, UNDP and the regional network secretariats is invited. Regional Network chairs is part of the full SC meeting. Furthermore, it was asked how often the committees meet, and it was explained that both committees meet physically once a year, but that the members of the implementation committee have ongoing dialogue besides the annual meeting.

The final part of the project introduction was an elaborate presentation of the intervention logic, the expected target groups, the methodology, overall objectives, specific objectives, expected results and activities (Annex 3). Only result 3 and 4 activities was explained in details, since result-area 1 and 2 is explained in more details under blended learning (3.2.) and re-grants (3.3)

- NANHRI wanted clarification on activities 3.1.3. and 3.2.3., since they assumed that Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) was a focus area exclusively for GANHRI. DIHR explained that both the regions and GANHRI will have SCA as a focus, but that the approach will be different. The regions will focus on improving their support to members. The project can support either through technical assistance or as support for travels to members that needs NANHRIs SCA support. The exact activities will be agreed after
discussing objective 3 in details. NANHRI reminded about their initial proposal on objective 3 activity suggestions.

3.2 BLENDED LEARNING

The blended learning process is the mix of the four thematic e-learning courses and the facilitated regional workshops. The focus here was the development of the e-learning, which is already started and which is expected to be finalised early 2017. It is a four-step process and the PowerPoint is annexed as Annex 4. The e-learning development process is divided into analysis, design, development and implementation. The analysis is mainly about the Learning Needs Assessment (LNA), while the other three steps is about producing the storyboard and putting the courses into implementation.

Questions/Comments:

Gilbert asked about the selection process for the LNA-survey, and DIHR responded that selection was made based on a mix of those NHRI-s that signed up during the knowledge fair at the 29th ICC-meeting, and previous and current DIHR NHRI-partnerships.

Gilbert and NANHRI have looked at the list of African NHRI-s in the survey and suggests that we look more into the selection of NHRI-s and their mandates and priorities. An example is that some of the institutions does not prioritise some of the areas they respond to. It was agreed that NANHRI gives this kind of inside information about member NHRI-s on day 2, where we discuss the actual survey in details, and that we still have time to add more participants to the survey. It was explained that this kind of feedback is what we will be requesting, when we ask for NANHRIs feedback and approval on the LNA later in June, and that DIHR mostly has this kind of knowledge about current and previous NHRI-partners.

Margaret commented that she had tried to fill out the questionnaire, and had two comments. Firstly, there is a problem with the language. The error commands appears in Danish, regardless of whatever language chosen. Secondly, it was not clear that she had only responded to one thematic area, as she thought she would cover all areas in one round. It was explained that participants who wants to respond to more thematic areas, are very welcome to do so, but that they need to respond to the questionnaire four times. DIHR to follow-up on the two problems raised.

3.3 RE-GRANTS
The re-grants process and the proposed system was presented, and is attached as Annex 5.

Questions/Comments:

- The link to blended learning was briefly touched upon, and let to a discussion on how we ensure the best organisation of the two cross-regional workshops for M&R. NANHRIs proposes that DIHR tries to find money for two more workshops on M&R, to avoid making the cross-regional.
- NANHRI informed that they currently carries out blended learning (e-learning and face-to-face workshop) with the Association for the Prevention of Torture (APT). They would like to see our system for the re-grants, which is currently not part of their plans with APT. DIHR will share the system with NANHRI as soon as possible.
- NANHRI doubts that we can begin implementation in 2017, since the e-learning will only be done during first quarter of 2017. DIHR said that some of the e-courses will progress faster than others, and we aim to make it according to the proposed timeline, but that we will ask for a no-cost-extension if needed.

3.4 VISIBILITY

EU has some basic visibility requirements, which means that we need to remember to add EU’s logo and a text of acknowledgement and/or a disclaimer on public material. Furthermore, EU has some recommendations on visibility, which the project considers. The presentation is attached as Annex 6.

Questions/Comments:

- NANHRI requests that their communication staff will be involved in the development of the visibility plan.
- We had a short discussion on the tools, and the suggestions were press releases, social media, website and newsletters.
- Clarification was also asked on which part of the EU we want to invite, and the idea is to invite EU HQ for very big events, which DIHR will do if needed. NANHRI should invite the national EU delegation when we carry out a workshop or if there is a media event in relation to the implementation of the re-grants.
- The budget for visibility was discussed, and the answer is that we only have funds for the actual production of project leaflets and banners, but not for expenses related to press releases or special invitations to targeted
journalists etc., unless increased communication becomes a priority under objective 3.

3.5 AOB

NANHRI informed that Morten Kjærum from Raoul Wallenberg Institute (RWI) and NANHRI discussed the option of making a tripartite agreement between RWI, DIHR and NANHRI to ensure synergies. We agreed to discuss it again on day 2 and 3.

Even though some DIHR staff was delayed and absent on day 1, we agreed that DIHR reorganises the agenda and tries to accomplish everything before end of day 3 (final agenda as Annex 1)
4 DAY 2 – CAPACITY ASSESSMENT, FINANCE & ADMIN, BLENDED LEARNING

4.1 ABOUT NANHRI

NANHRI gave a number of presentations, organised as below:

- Introduction to organization and organogram (no. of staff, profiles)
- Presentation of Strategy and future plan
- Current economy, financial turnover and donors (size and sustainability of economy)
- Governance structure of the African network
- Annual report on annual activities
- Previous organizational baselines / assessments - by RWI and other
- Previous evaluations and recommendations to NANHRI on financial management and organizational development
- Current financial management system

4.2 BLENDED LEARNING CONTINUED FROM DAY 1

The overall blended learning process, including the link to the regional workshops was discussed (presentation the same as 3.2). We discussed NANHRI’s role in the different steps of the blended learning process – from development to implementation and reporting. In addition to the very brief overview given through the presentation, we agreed that DIHR comes up with an overview of NANHRI’s anticipated role, but also mentioned that the role is also to be clarified in collaboration with the regional coordinator function on the project.

NANHRI and DIHR then went through the LNA questionnaire (for NHRIs) to ensure that NANHRI had a complete understanding of the questions being asked to their members, but also to get NANHRI’s view on what the e-learning should contain. The completed questionnaire was handed over to DIHR e-learning advisor and included in the LNA survey.
observed that Margaret expressed good knowledge with regards to the different stakeholders.

Generally, NANHRI presented a good overview of their financial state, in terms of where they generate their overall income, and how the imbalance in payment membership fees create deficit in expected results. It seems from the overview, that NANHRI has gained a lot of income from currency exchange gains, which has helped cover NANHRI's general administration costs.

NANHRI has 44 members, around 17 of these are in the A category and pay their fees annually. Around 23 members have not paid their annual fee, and in NANHRI’s opinion, this can partly be due to some members prioritizing GANHRI membership fee first. Another challenge also lies in the fact that the region is being divided into sub regions, though without any formal sub-secretariats. This may be a positive thing for understanding the sub regional issues and challenges faster, and for NANHRI to accommodate issues sub-regionally. But it is still uncertain what other effect this has on the region.

External donors have been fully funding program expenses, this year RWI’s grant will end, and some of the NHRI.EU funds will be able to cover the same expenses.

We asked “how can we, DIHR best assist NANHRI on these challenges?” NANHRI said, a better accounting system would help and maybe one more person in finance, to not make the area so vulnerable. This is further discussed in the budget part.

In terms of the overall understanding of the general accounting, the recording of finances etc., NANHRI’s finance officer Jane Kimotho showed very strong knowledge in the financial management area. Challenges with their accounting software as it is right now; income statement is fine, the balance sheet is mixed up, budget is not entered in the system, you have to keep it manually in excel. Jane mentions that they have looked into Navision Dynamics as a new potential software. Katrina asked into the VAT status of NANHRI, which per diem rates are used for travel etc. Time registration and how to calculate the salary rate was discussed, the importance of 3 quotations when purchasing anything, and keeping documentation till up to 5 years after project ends, to ensure eligibility of expenses. Deadlines where briefly mentioned and how to amend or request for changes in the budget.

DIHR also asked NANHRI, how they would manage the funds when organising a workshop or other event with members in their own countries, and the finance officer of NANHRI quickly explained that they would not transfer any funds, but
merely manage it themselves, and that a previous experience/example, under DIHR partnership was a clear mistake from NANHRI’s side.

The experience NANHRI has with several donors, shows in Jane’s understanding of the different requirements donor have, although NANHRI has not worked with EU funds before, Jane and Margaret seemed to understand the importance of having read all the guidelines we have sent. Jane then shared the NANHRI financial and administrative guidelines, as well as the NANHRI travel policy. We went through the Financial Monitoring Tool, and Jane did not seem to have any problem understanding how to use it. DIHR shares the opinion of Jane opinion that the financial area is vulnerable, when Jane is the only one showing strength and actual knowledge in the area.

It was agreed, that NANHRI would approach and ask DIHR for any big or small questions when in doubt regarding the financial management of EU funds.

4.4 ORGANISATIONAL NEEDS AND PROJECT SET-UP

NANHRI has just been through a strategy planning process assisting by RWI. In general, NANHRI has various partners including RWI, UNDP, Konrad Frideric Stiftung and also regional organistaions such as ECOWAS and AU. HRE partnership has been entered with the University of Nairobi.

Main issues highlighted during the discussions with DIHR were:
- Variations in the region and the informal sub-regional networks such as the eastern African, western African, Portuguese speaking sub-regions.
- The limited language capacity at the moment at NANHRI which means that limited service is provided to Francophone and Portuguese speaking members. NANHRI highlighted that francophone members in surveys done shown most appreciation of NANHRI’s services, but this could also be explained with limited expectations since many francophone NHRIIs are no able to pay their membership fees.
- Fundraising is a challenge for NANHRI as well as NHRIs in the region and an area for further strengthening.
- NANHRI is relying on a regional based network and pool of experts in relation to accreditation advice for NHRIIs in the region. This needs to be further clarified to ensure strategic coordination.
- DIHR initial assessment show that much more activities could be done in case a French / Portuguese speaking officer were assigned to coordinate activities for the sub-region. The issue needs further planning and discussion.
- The project set-up in NANHRI’s case is as follows:
- A regional coordinator will be responsible for identified assignments, the regional coordinator position will be split between the Director and the deputy officer
- A financial assistant will be monitoring and reporting on finances
5.1 ADMINISTRATION, CONTRACT AND REPORTING

5.1.1 CONTRACT

A review of the recently signed contract showed that DIHR and NANHRI in principle agrees about the content, but NANHRI was unsure about the actual starting date. DIHR pointed towards paragraph 3 which states that the contract begins the day following the date when both parties have signed, but NANHRI pointed towards the date on top of the contract on page 1 (earlier), and the fact that NANHRI signed on the 20th of April, but that DIHR signed on the 8th of May. DIHR explained that it is normal for us with two to three weeks administration time, but also agreed that we can liaise with our legal advisor to see if we can come up with a solution that fits better for NANHRI.

5.1.2 BUDGET

The budget was then presented by KAVP. Most budget lines were clear and didn’t cause any questions, but especially the regional coordinator and the budget for regional workshops in the African Region was discussed. NANHRI is concerned that the regional coordinator is only half time, and asked DIHR to try to find further funds to make it a full-time position. NANHRI also said that they have the most members of the four networks, but only have the same number of participants allocated, which means that they have to deselect a high number of NHRIs for each workshop, and therefore asked DIHR to reallocate further funds for their workshops if funds becomes available. DIHR promised to investigate solutions for both.

As NANHRI is not paying rent directly, this part of the budget might be amended, it was agreed, that we will take up this discussion again, NANHRI already had a few suggestions for adjusting the budget, and will present a written proposal for these changes in the budget, incl. explanations.
Gilbert did also express his concern, of whether the project funds is a support to the network or support to implement the project. Kristine said that the objective is not only to implement the project. In this stage, the overall activities of objective 3 has not been discussed further, but Kristine said we will re-look at everything once we know more.

5.1.3 ADMINISTRATION

DIHR did a short presentation with key points regarding to the importance of documentation of expenses on the EU funded projects for the whole NANHRI team. Basically to ensure that not only administrative and financial persons understand the requirements, but for everyone in the team to know and understand how to contribute in making the financial management and reporting of the EU funds easier.

5.1.4 NARRATIVE REPORT

The narrative report was discussed and the differences between quarterly, annual and final narrative report was explained. One template is used for the quarterly and the annual report, but the quarterly focuses mostly on chapter 2. The project completion report has its own template. Both reports are annexed to the contract and are therefore already available to both parties.

5.2 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

The DIHR finance director interviewed the NANHRI’s director on the basis of NANHRI’s strategy of 2015-2019, focusing on the study NANHRI had done on their stakeholders and the SWOT analysis.

Observations that were made from the interview are:

1) More members are on the way and how can NANHRI gear its secretariat in this extend?
2) Inclination for regional fractions – should they be welcomed or opposed?
3) Internal development of Human Rights experts in the region – to be able to “walk” on their own, do it on their own, and being less dependent on external consultants from Europe and the US etc.
4) Proactive decision making on how the engagement is maintained – when something that has been built up quickly can swiftly be torn down

A stakeholder analysis were implemented with the purpose of identifying stakeholders and categorising these according to significance and influence.
trend being that the regional African organisations are regarded as highly important and with high influence. DIHR was regarded as highly important but with little influence in the region.

The process showed that there is a need to discuss further how NANHRI should address each stakeholder – seen from the four angles in the analysis. It will create a larger internal strategic understanding and match of expectations in relation to the various partnerships.

5.3 OD, STAFF & WAY FORWARD

OD and agreeing on some more concrete steps:

• MoU with African Union and collaboration between NANHRI and AU to be shared with DIHR and explored
• Sub-regional relations to be explored including how NANHRI can organise itself to ensure improved service for French speaking and Portuguese speaking NHRI

NANHRI preferences for the 100,000 €:

• Priorities difficult to agree now, and NANHRI to look into the proposal sent one year ago. NANHRI to review their own proposal and re-send to DIHR. But DIHR reminds to also look ahead at new options that has emerged in the interim period and after signing the contract with EU.

Regional coordinator terms

• Terms to be finalised and to include the full implementation of the project. Potentially a task that needs to be fulfilled by more than just one NANHRI-staff (in addition to the financial officer).

Budget revision

• Budget has to be revised, but the contract would also need a small amendment (on the budget part). Especially important to look at the Regional Coordinator budget line and the office rent budget line.
• NANHRI to come up with a timeline on the readjustment on the budget and the priorities for the organisational development area (100,000 €).
• NANHRI to come up with a proposal for the first budget revision, using the Financial Monitoring Tool template handed over to NANHRI.
AOB

- A monthly skype-meeting to be put in the calendar for ensuring on-going communication. First meeting agreed for 22\textsuperscript{nd} of June, 14.30 (Kenya Time)/13.30 (DK Time)
- Another face-to-face meeting in 2016 either in Kenya or Copenhagen. Exact date to be decided.
- Information about RWI visit (Morten Kjærum); NANHRI and RWI wants to strengthen the cooperation between the three parties, since we have many mutual interest. But depends on new activities outside this EU-grant that would need to be funded for. It was agreed that NANHRI would initiate a conversation on this whereby the three partners will discuss and perhaps develop concrete plans to make the tripartite partnership work.