

# Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture

## Key results:


















- Relevant public authorities and civil society organisation protect significantly more people from Torture and other forms of violence and significantly more survivors have access to quality rehabilitation
- A number of authorities have strengthened preventive and protective mechanisms in terms of initial medical exam upon arrival to a prison, basic safeguards upon arrest, initiatives to reduce pre-trial detention, alternatives to detention, independent oversight
- Civil society actors are undertaking specialized measures related to identification, documentation, reports and/or referrals for legal, medical, and mental health services for an increased and more diversified<sup>1</sup> number of survivors
- Four communities have taken steps towards violence prevention programmes, including through improved governance
- Number of people at community level with increased protection from violence

## Justification for support:

- Implementation of the Danish development and humanitarian strategy “The World 2030” requires sustained defense of human rights, democracy and gender equality.
- DIGNITY has a mandate of high relevance to Denmark’s long-standing global leadership and commitment to the Freedom from Torture Agenda
- Globally recognized technical expertise and experience makes DIGNITY a credible partner uniquely positioned to fight torture, promote survival of victims and disseminate knowledge for torture prevention as part of efforts to protect fundamental human rights.

## Major risks and challenges:

- Contextual: shrinking democratic space, COVID-19, political instability
- Programmatic: limited organisational, administrative and financial ability amongst partners
- Institutional: loss of funding, cases of financial irregularities, and of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment
- Mitigation measures is in place to manage risks, however residual risks remain. Risks will be monitored and adaptations will be made as required.

<b>File No.</b>	2020-33246					
<b>Countries</b>	Interregional					
<b>Responsible Unit</b>	MUS					
<b>Sector</b>	15160					
<b>Partner</b>	DIGNITY – Danish Institute Against Torture					
	<i>DKK mill.</i>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>Tot.</b>
<b>Commitment</b>		53	53	53	53	212
<b>Projected ann. disb.</b>		53	53	53	53	212
<b>Duration</b>	2021-2024					
<b>Previous grants</b>	2015-2020 annual framework grant					
<b>Finance Act code</b>	§ 06.32.08.					
<b>Head of unit</b>	Henriette Ellermann-Kingombe					
<b>Desk officer</b>	Peter Bøgh Jensen					
<b>Reviewed by CFO</b>	Johannes Lech					
<b>Relevant SDGs</b>						
						
No Poverty	No Hunger	Good Health, Wellbeing	Quality Education	Gender Equality	Clean Water, Sanitation	
						
Affordable Clean Energy	Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	Reduced Inequalities	Sustainable Cities, Communities	Responsible Consumption & Production	
						
	Life Below Water	Life on Land	Peace & Justice, strong Inst.	Partnerships for Goals		

## Strategic objectives:

**Objective:** Fewer people suffering from torture in developing countries. **Outcome:** Relevant public authorities and civil society organisation protect significantly more people from Torture and other forms of violence and significantly more survivors have access to quality rehabilitation.

## Justification for choice of partner:

DIGNITY has a mandate of high relevance to Denmark’s long-standing global leadership and commitment to the Freedom from Torture Agenda. Globally recognized technical expertise and experience makes DIGNITY a credible partner uniquely positioned to fight torture, promote survival of victims and disseminate knowledge for torture prevention as part of efforts to protect fundamental human rights.

## Summary: on

The purpose of this development engagement with DIGNITY 2021-2024 is continue to support Denmark’s longstanding work for a world without torture. The engagement aims to create social change by continuously elaborating the international framework in place to combat torture and simultaneously building capacity and resilience amongst communities, experts and state authorities

## Budget:

Strengthening state authorities (prisons, police and criminal justice system) and civil society actors to prevent torture	50.972.000 DKK
Strengthening state and local authorities and civil society actors to prevent violence communities	43.460.000 DKK
Strengthening state authorities and civil society actors to provide timely and quality rehabilitation to trauma affected survivors of torture and other forms of violence	56.512.000 DKK
Administration	13.868.000 DKK
Audit	592.000 DKK
<b>Total</b>	<b>212.000.000 DKK</b>

<sup>1</sup> Including increased number from vulnerable groups



## DRAFT

### Development Engagement Document

#### Support to DIGNITY 'A World Without Torture 2021-24'

##### 1. Introduction

The present development engagement document (DED) details the objectives, budget and management arrangements for the development cooperation concerning *A World Without Torture 2021-24* as agreed between the parties specified below. The DED is annexed to the Commitment letter(s) for DIGNITY and constitutes an integrated part hereof together with the documentation specified below.

##### 1.1 Parties of development engagement

Department of Multilateral Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MUS)

And

DIGNITY – Danish Institute Against Torture

##### 1.2 Documentation

“The Documentation” refers to the partner documentation for the supported intervention i.e. Global Theory of Change and International Programmes Strategy 2021 - 2024, c.f. Annex 1 & 2

##### 1.3 Contributions

Denmark, represented by MUS (Department of Multilateral Cooperation) of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, supports this engagement with a contribution (grant) of

DKK 53 million annually over four years subject to Parliamentary approval

for the period 01-01-2021 to 31-12-2024

This contribution is earmarked to finance the activities set out in detail in the present Development Engagement Document that makes up a part of DIGNITY's wider portfolio of activities.

##### 2. Background

Torture is one of the gravest international crimes and a direct attack on human dignity. It has devastating consequences for individuals and communities, leaving torture survivors with severe psycho-social and somatic challenges, sometimes for life. Their close families typically suffer at least as much, and many children inherit their parents' traumatization. Societal costs are similarly huge because untreated trauma and other health problems after torture stand in the way of integration, employment, and development.

The exact prevalence of torture is, by definition, impossible to measure, as torture is often exercised behind closed doors in prisons, police stations, and in private settings. However, measured by relevant 'proxies' – including ratification of the UN Convention against Torture, adoption of legal safeguards and other protective measures in the justice system, establishment of mechanisms of independent monitoring

of places of detention, and referrals of traumatized victims to treatment - progress has been achieved in the global fight against torture and CIDPT over the last few decades. Nevertheless, according to Amnesty International, torture and other cruel inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (CIDTP) are still reported in 141 countries, from every region of the world. The current rise of authoritarian regimes and shrinking civic space across the world also risks triggering a new increase in the use of torture.

The fight against torture has been an important priority for successive Danish governments for decades and Denmark has together with partners established a unique platform for working with anti-torture. This is clearly reflected in the current strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action. *The World 2030* confirms the ambition for Denmark to remain a significant and long-term global defender of human rights, democracy and gender equality through - inter alia - 'cooperation between relevant Danish authorities and actors within human rights and democracy' and a 'persistent effort in the fight against torture

Even though the fight for a world without torture is not as such stated in explicit terms in the four year plan of the minister for development cooperation the present engagement is broadly in line with efforts to promote justice and equality as well as the efforts to counteract shrinking democratic space. Poverty and inequality are amongst the root causes of torture. The poor, vulnerable and marginalised, including indigenous peoples, LGBTI-persons and human rights defenders, are more likely to be subject to torture or cruel and degrading treatment than individuals in the mainstream of the society.

The MFA has decided to align the present engagement with the Guidelines for Programme and Projects on the basis of a DED in order to comply with requirements for reporting ODA to OECD-DAC. Given that DIGNITY as an organisation also runs a clinic in Denmark makes uneligible to receive core support. The format, however, has proven to be useful in terms of creating coherence between strategy, theory of change, results and budgets and have been appreciated by both sides in the formulation process. The MFA acknowledges that documentation, research, filtering of information and advocacy continue to be important parts of DIGNITY's work. Yet given the review of 2020 recommended a stronger focus on partnerships in the South the both DIGNITY and the MFA has followed through on this intent.

### 3. The partner

DIGNITY is a strong technical and strategic partner with a mandate of direct relevance to Denmark's long-standing global leadership and commitment to the global struggle against torture. DIGNITY is globally recognized for its multi-faceted technical expertise and experience making it a legitimate and credible partner uniquely positioned to fight torture, promote rehabilitation of victims and disseminate knowledge for torture prevention and rehabilitation. DIGNITY continues to respond to the evolving concept and expressions of torture in the interplay between interventions, capacity building of partners, research and norm setting activities.

DIGNITY is an independent, self-governing institution (*selvejende institution*) located in Denmark with partnerships in more than twenty countries. Established in 1982 as the *Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims* (RCT) by Dr Inge Genefke, amongst others, it was among the first such centres in the

world. In 1997, the *International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims* branched out as a membership organisation, while RCT in 2012 rebranded itself as DIGNITY - *Danish Institute Against Torture*.

Unlike other Danish CSO's and not-for-profit organisations, DIGNITY has been managed as a state-funded self-governing institution. This is in line with section 2.4.9 of the budgetary guidelines (*Budgetvejledningen*) of the Agency for Modernisation. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs therefore has a say in governance matters and must approve changes to the bylaws of the organisation. The grant is managed according to the Aid Management Guidelines as established in this DED.

In the absence of a membership constituency, governance is provided by a Board of Directors currently made up of 11-13 members: (i) Three are appointed by health profession bodies, (ii) three by research bodies, (iii) three by academic, human rights and legal bodies and finally (iv) two by DIGNITY staff.

A reform of the board composition and procedures for appointment of new members has recently been approved and initiated, not least to reflect the stronger international orientation of DIGNITY today and ensure representation on the board of relevant professional skills to guide mobilisation of resources and organisational development.

The board constitutes the highest decision-making level of DIGNITY charged with appointing a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to manage the organisation. Daily management of DIGNITY is the responsibility of the CEO together with the Chief Operations Officer (COO).

As of November 2019, a total of 136 staff members populate DIGNITY. DIGNITY has project management units funded by DAPP in Tunisia (ten staff members) and Jordan (three staff members).

DIGNITY is a relatively well-funded organisation compared to other civil society organisations engaged in anti-torture. Most of DIGNITY's income (86 %) comes from public sources in Denmark in terms of contributions from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the regions. The MFA framework grant covered by this DED amounts to DKK 53m. Total income of the organisation has increased from DKK 95m in 2005 to DKK 139m in 2019.

DIGNITY also receives DKK 45m from the Danish MFA through the Danish-Arab Partnership Programme (DAPP), leading a consortium of human rights organisations. This consortium was successful in winning a public tender for implementation of a development engagement under DAPP (2017-22). Use of these funds is guided by the administrative requirements befitting a service contract won through a competitive tender.

DIGNITY has a service agreement of up to DKK 20.7m with the Capital Region of Copenhagen for clinical rehabilitation of torture victims and traumatised refugees with a treatment capacity of 140 clients.

DIGNITY receives smaller amounts of support for specific purposes from other sources like the Swiss MFA funding specifically for anti-torture activities in Tunisia and Morocco.

In total, financial income from the Danish MFA amounted to DKK 98.8m as of January 2020, up from 90 million DKK in 2017.

DIGNITY is located in Denmark and has 123 out of 136 staff members based in its headquarters in Copenhagen with programme implementation units funded by the DAPP-programme in Tunisia and Jordan only. The current approach by DIGNITY rests on local partnerships rather than posting staff permanently and the review in 2019 has looked into prospects for a more strategic approach to partnerships. DIGNITY has committed itself to raise the share of its budget spent at programme work with partners.

Even if funding for international engagements has grown over the past decade, there would appear to be low-hanging fruits to be harvested in an analysis and rationalisation exercise to focus financially on fewer countries and regions. Looking ahead DIGNITY shall, with the grant covered in the present DED, aim at scaling up its efforts in Africa in line with the priorities of the present government. This may also allow for more coherent programming in the field, including the possibility of scaling up activities from the beginning of the intervention and replicability of successful interventions.

The present engagement will include specific emphasis on South-South learning and willingness to be part of South-South learning will be part of partner assessments. (See annex 2 for further details). DIGNITY has invested in the on-line platform FABO that will provide partners with access to training materials and other forms of knowledge produced by DIGNITY. The platform will be expanded with a solution where partners also will be able to post new knowledge and be able to access each other's learning independently without facilitation by DIGNITY.

South-South learning will scaled up by:

- building on lessons learned from DIGNITY's previous peer-exchange programmes in MENA, Africa South of Sahara and Latin America. During these programmes state agencies and civil society organisations have exchanged experiences with each other both in terms of financial management and programmatic content.
- Training of trainers (ToT) in the form of a cascade model where trainers are trained as trainers. This means that as organisations in the South are trained as trainers they do – over time – acquire the capability to train other organisations in the South.

#### **4. Theory of Change**

The objective of the Theory of Change of this engagement is to ensure that no one is subjected to torture (prevention) and that torture does not live on in traumatized victims and their families (rehabilitation). There is a strong normative and operational linkage between the fight for survivors of torture and the prevention of new human rights abuses.

The present engagement works to empower and strengthen vulnerable rights holders and civil society organizations to know and claim their rights and to strengthen the capacity and accountability of relevant authorities (duty bearers) to respect the prohibition of torture and to fulfil their obligations to prevent torture and ensure redress and rehabilitation for victims.

The present DED combines: 1) capacity development programmes with local civil society partners and state institutions, 2) international advocacy at UN and regional multilateral levels, and 3) applied research and global dissemination of new knowledge on effective prevention of torture and rehabilitation of traumatized victims.

Each of these three 'core disciplines' contributes to the theory of change:

To *prevent* torture and ill-treatment the partner helps develop and promote concrete well-documented prevention mechanisms throughout the world, including monitoring and development of prisons and other places of detention, reforming police work in accordance with international human rights standards, and documentation of torture and prosecution of perpetrators. At the same time, based on lessons learned and new knowledge generated over the last five years, the partner is supplementing the focus on preventing torture through direct engagement with state institutions with an additional focus on combatting the social 'growth conditions' of torture. This includes developing means of protecting identifiably vulnerable groups, contributing to the reduction of other forms of violence, and supporting the translation of human rights norms into practice.

Together with local partners DIGNITY works to promote the following social and political changes:

- Adoption, promotion and implementation of international, regional, and national legislation that prohibits and prevents torture
- Documentation of torture and other forms of violence for advocacy purposes, investigation and prosecution, and redress
- Reforms of criminal justice and prison authorities providing the necessary protection and humane conditions for inmates in prisons and other places of detention in accordance with relevant human rights standards
- Reforms of police and security authorities that exercise their mandate in accordance with relevant human rights standards
- Prevention of torture and other inhuman treatment in extra-custodial settings, including systematic sexual and other gender-based violence, where authorities neglect their human rights obligations to protect citizens from such abuse
- Prevention of other forms of violence, including urban violence, that breeds and may often legitimize or normalize torture.

To *rehabilitate* torture survivors the partner helps to develop and promote well-documented treatment programs that help survivors and their families throughout the world. This requires that relevant authorities have the political will and capacity to assume the responsibility of making rehabilitation accessible to all victims of torture (and other forms of violence). Moreover, it requires that there is widespread knowledge of trauma in the community, that trauma is recognized and identified, and that survivors are effectively referred to competent rehabilitation services.

Together with local partners DIGNITY works to promote the following social and political changes:

- Adoption, promotion and implementation of international, regional, and national norms and standards recognizing the right of rehabilitation for survivors of torture and the duty of authorities to provide rehabilitation

- Relevant health authorities and/or non-governmental actors provide professionally qualified and sustainable treatment and counseling services for all traumatized victims.
- Widespread knowledge and absence of stigma about trauma, including by healthcare professionals and other relevant stakeholders who should identify trauma and refer victims to treatment
- Targeted inclusion efforts for traumatized victims and their families in communities, including in relation to education and the labor market
- Development of strong and vibrant civil society capable of pushing and/or supporting relevant authorities in promoting universal rehabilitation of traumatized survivors of torture.

The present DED engagement will focus entirely on delivering results and concrete changes on the ground in developing countries, notably in Africa. Thus, international programme work under the engagement will deliver targeted capacity development of relevant civil society actors and public authorities in developing countries to help prevent torture and violence and rehabilitate traumatized victims. Accordingly, international advocacy efforts under the engagement will be targeted on influencing international norm-setting with relevance and applicability in developing countries and directly supportive of DIGNITY programme activities on the ground. Likewise, applied research and knowledge production, funded under the engagement, will be focused on documenting and disseminating best practices and knowledge-based methods of effective prevention and rehabilitation in developing country contexts.<sup>6</sup>

DIGNITY has over the past years pursued a strategy where considerable technical resources were placed in Copenhagen to support the implementation of specialized interventions with state and non-state partners in the fields of preventing torture and providing specialized care to survivors of torture. At the same time DIGNITY's implementation model with specialized interventions has led to a wide geographical intervention area with many smaller interventions in a relatively high number of countries. While these interventions have provided significant results locally, lessons learned are also that some of these interventions have limited outreach and are somewhat difficult to replicate and bring to scale. Furthermore, an important lesson learned in DIGNITY has been that these specialized interventions should, especially in Africa, be supplemented with more holistic approaches addressing also the root causes or 'ecology' of torture. This could include addressing deeply ingrained social and cultural norms, perceptions and practices that underpin violence and torture. Torture and CIDTP are often legitimized by the presence of crime, radicalization, and violence in local communities, and DIGNITY's experience with intersectoral violence prevention in urban areas shows the importance of creating enabling political, institutional, community environments that enable the prevention of violence through collaboration, dialogue, and development of leadership skills.

Against this background the ambitions for the current engagement are:

1. To increase the number of beneficiaries in programmes under the DED
2. To strengthen the focus in Africa



This means that in the coming years DIGNITY in addition to the specialized interventions will be focusing more on holistic interventions embedded in the local communities. To promote this, DIGNITY will be scaling up support to local partners in Africa both through a strengthening of the existing partnerships, where relevant, as well as through new partnerships. To support the process of entering into new partnerships with a number of new partners, DIGNITY is currently looking into the possibility of opening a regional country presence in West Africa.

The process of strengthening localization has already started with a number of interventions in Asia being closed during the present strategic period and a number of other partners having been informed that DIGNITY will initiate a process of phasing out the partnerships. Over the coming period the funds will then be allocated towards existing and new partnerships in Africa. In the first year of transition there will be a need to allocate resources to Copenhagen to have the manpower to conduct assessments of new partners and locations. Then already in year 2 DIGNITY expect to have a decision on a process to scale up support to partners in Africa, either through a country presence or otherwise and can then reduce the manpower in Copenhagen and increase transfers to partners in Africa.

Based on this theory of change, the present engagement will be translated into the following objective, outcome, and outputs:

#### 5. Development Engagement Objective and Results Framework

Project title		<b><i>A World Without Torture</i></b>	
Project objective		Fewer people suffering from torture in developing countries	
Impact Indicator		10 states and 35 local communities have tangible progress in establishing effective preventive and protective mechanisms and/or systems to provide timely access to rehabilitation including redress for survivors	
Strategic Outcome		<b>Relevant public authorities and civil society organisation protect significantly more people from Torture and other forms of violence and significantly more survivors have access to quality rehabilitation</b>	
Outcome indicator		State and local authorities and civil society organisations serving a number of direct beneficiaries and a number of indirect beneficiaries have significantly and tangibly improved preventive and/ or protective mechanisms and increased access to quality rehabilitation services.	
Baseline	Year 0	41.250	Direct beneficiaries <sup>1)</sup>
		800.000	Indirect beneficiaries <sup>2)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Individuals who are directly in touch with the intervention like victims getting access to a better treatment inmates who get better protection

<sup>2)</sup> Individuals who enjoy the benefits of the intervention without being directly in touch with the latter.

Target	Year 4	50.000	Direct beneficiaries
		1.000.000	Indirect beneficiaries
<b>Output 1</b>			
<b>Output indicator 1.1</b>		<b>Strengthening state authorities (prisons, police and criminal justice system<sup>3</sup>) and civil society actors to prevent torture and CIDTP</b>	
<b>Output indicator 1.1</b>		Number and descriptions of state and local authorities undertaking protective and preventive measures addressing torture and CIDTP	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently supporting 4 authorities in 3 countries working with a total of 5 different preventive and protective mechanisms (see footnote 1) in place, but none are yet fully effective.
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive changes <sup>4</sup> is recorded with 2 authorities in strengthened preventive and protective mechanisms.
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change towards strengthened protective and preventive mechanisms is initiated with a new authority.
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance valued no lower than '3' by peers per authority.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per authority; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority
<b>Output Indicator 1.2</b>		Number and descriptions of civil society actors undertaking specialized measures related to identification, documentation, reports and/or referrals for legal, medical, and mental health services for an increased and more diversified <sup>5</sup> ) number of survivors	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently working with 14 number of civil society organisations; there is no (or effectively no) coordination between civil society actors working on torture, gender, migrants creating a

<sup>3</sup>) A non-exhaustive list of the preventive mechanisms include: 1) safe-guards upon arrests; 2) reduction of pre-trial detention; 3) initial medical exam; 4) independent monitoring; 5) complaints and referral mechanisms to receive complaints of torture, including in places of detention in place; 6) non-coercive forms of interrogation practiced; 7) initiatives to introduce alternatives to detention; and 8) independent police oversight functioning

<sup>4</sup>) A chain of positive change is a variable from outcome harvesting that denotes mechanisms that can be reinforced and/or introduced leading to anticipated change. The chain is subject to external assessment or peer reviews.

<sup>5</sup> Including increased number from vulnerable groups

			silo effect that limits outreach to beneficiaries (in both quantity and quality).
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive change is recorded per organisation towards an increased and more diversified number of survivors.
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change towards an increased and more diversified number of survivors reached.
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per country.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance '4' or '5' by peers per organisation; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per organisation
Output Indicator 1.3	Number and significance of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders through provision of expertise on the implementation or innovation of the international framework on the prevention of torture, through research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.		
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged in international fora including multilateral and academic institutions with focus on criminal justice and torture. Baseline numbers are not available.
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 25% vs baseline.
Annual Target	Year 4		Significance of influence is rated 3 or higher by peers in 25% of cases.
<b>Output 2</b>			
<b>Output 2</b>		<b>Strengthening state and local authorities and civil society actors to prevent violence in communities</b>	
Output indicator 2.1		Number and descriptions of local authorities taking steps towards violence prevention programmes, including through improved governance	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY implements such programmes in 4 communities

Annual Target	Year 1		At least one new chain of positive change towards strengthened violence prevention mechanisms is identified in a community. The chain(s) of positive change in the first three communities is continued (vs 2020).
Annual Target	Year 2		At least one new chain of positive change towards engagement in violence prevention mechanisms is initiated with a new authority. The chain(s) of positive change in the first four countries is developed (vs 2021).
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per authority; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority
Output Indicator 2.2		Number of people at community level with increased protection from violence	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently working in 4 communities providing increased protection to a population of 294.000 of of which 60.000 are direct beneficiaries through efforts to strengthen trust between the authorities (themselves) and between the authorities and the population (incl. organisations, groups etc)
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive change is recorded per community reflecting increased trust (f.x. better relations, cooperation and higher participation).
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change reflecting increased trust (e.g. better relations, cooperation and higher participation) is recorded in a new community (group or setting)
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per community.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per community; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per community
Output Indicator 2.3		Number of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders via provision of knowledge, implementation or innovation of the international	

		framework on prevention of violence, or via research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged in international fora including multilateral and academic institutions with focus on prevention of violence. Baseline numbers are not available. Baseline numbers are not available.
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 25% vs baseline.
Annual Target	Year 4		Significance of influence is rated 3 or higher by peers in 25% of cases.
<b>Output 3</b>			
<b>Output 3</b>		<b>Strengthening state authorities and civil society actors to provide timely and quality rehabilitation to trauma affected survivors of torture, CIDPT and other forms of violence</b>	
<b>Output indicator 3.1</b>		Number of trauma-affected survivors and families having been identified, referred to and received adequate rehabilitation	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently strengthening 4 number of referral mechanisms (2019: 96 referrals) in 8 communities providing services to 1501 survivors and their families. In 2019 318 survivors were identified.
Annual Target	Year 1		Increased number reached of 10 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 2		Increased number reached of 15 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Increased number reached of 20 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 4		Increased number reached of 40 % vs baseline
<b>Output Indicator 3.2</b>		Number and descriptions of state and non-state providers with increased capacity to deliver and/or teach quality rehabilitation services	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently supporting 112 state and 422 non-state providers delivering services in 8 communities. Accessible and

			quality services are scarce with little documentation on the quality of services and referrals.
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one new chain of positive change towards increase in the number of providers of services has contributed improved access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation provided by state services or civil society actors in DIGNITY's programme countries
Annual Target	Year 2		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 50% of DIGNITY's programme countries
Annual Target	Year 3		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 75% of DIGNITY's programme countries
Annual Target	Year 4		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 80% of DIGNITY's programme countries
Output Indicator 3.3		Number and significance of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders by provision of knowledge on developing and revising the normative framework for the right to rehabilitation via research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged to make significant contributions to norm setting within the promotion of the right to rehabilitation and specialised knowledge on MHPSS internationally as well as in Danish fora, institutional and academic with focus on mental health and rehabilitation of victims of violence. Baseline numbers are not available
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 10% vs baseline; first indicators of influence in international fora.
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline. DIGNITY's influence is recorded in international fora and with focus on Africa

Annual Target	Year 4
---------------	--------

Significance of influence of DIGNITY is rated 3 or higher by peers in 10% of cases.

## 6. Risk Management

DIGNITY operates in a context of human rights defence under increasing political pressure globally and at the same time suffering from a degree of donor fatigue. This context requires monitoring and mitigation of risk at several levels:

- a. Contextual risk – there is a particular need for DIGNITY to manage risks relating to the increasing pressure on human rights agenda and human rights defenders, including among implementing partners in developing countries,
- b. Institutional risk – a degree of mission fatigue among donors of global anti-torture promotion is a reality that DIGNITY has to mitigate as it strives to diversify its resource mobilisation and develop global partnerships,
- c. Programmatic risk – when engaging in programming activities addressing urban violence, DIGNITY needs to mitigate a risk to its clear profile by demonstrating clear links to comparative advantages of DIGNITY as an actor.
- d. Financial risk – cases of irregularities, misuse and malfeasance constitute potential risks to DIGNITY's financial management. Mitigation measures include continuous oversight, maintenance of established procedures for payment, secured approval systems as well as safe and maintained financial management soft-ware.

Results and challenges in the management of these and related risks will be part of DIGNITY's annual reporting that will form the basis of annual consultations with MFA.

This DED rests on a number of important assumptions, notably that:

- Public and political support for the international anti-torture agenda is maintained at a level allowing DIGNITY to pursue its mandate in collaboration with its strategic partners,
- DIGNITY pursues its mandate in accordance with its strategic priorities and optimises the opportunities at hand to make sensible use of available resources to realise the vision of a world where fewer people are subjected to torture,
- Organisational capacity is available to avoid, and if necessary promptly react to, any staff misconduct, financial or other irregularity, to counter misuse of funds and reputational damage.

## 7. Budget

The table below presents budget summary at outcome level. The budget reflects inputs from this specific grant. If other funds are added to achieve the same outputs, then the budget and results matrix should be updated to include all co-funding. Further specifics are found in annex four – budget details.

### DIGNITY - DED BUDGET 2021-24 (04-11-20)

Budget Line	2021	2022	2023	2024	TOTAL		
	Budget 2021 (1000 DKK)	Budget 2022 (1000 DKK)	Budget 2023 (1000 DKK)	Budget 2024 (1000 DKK)	Budget All Years (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>							
<b>Output 1: Strengthening state authorities (prisons, police and criminal justice system) and civil society actors to prevent torture and CIDTP</b>	<b>24.402</b>	<b>24.402</b>	<b>24.402</b>	<b>24.402</b>	<b>97.608</b>	<b>49,4%</b>	<b>46,0%</b>
Output 1: Direct activity costs	13.281	13.528	13.394	13.253	53.456	27,1%	25,2%
Output 1: Direct transfers to partners & country offices	3.481	4.217	4.402	4.576	16.676	8,4%	7,9%
Output 1: Partners & country offices, Africa	1.874	2.610	2.795	2.969	10.248		
Output 1: Partners & country offices, other DAC	1.607	1.607	1.607	1.607	6.428		
Output 1: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs	7.640	6.657	6.606	6.573	27.476	13,9%	13,0%
<b>Output 2: Strengthening state and local authorities and civil society actors to prevent violence in communities</b>	<b>10.865</b>	<b>10.865</b>	<b>10.865</b>	<b>10.865</b>	<b>43.460</b>	<b>22,0%</b>	<b>20,5%</b>
Output 2: Direct activity costs	5.144	5.256	5.097	4.986	20.483	10,4%	9,7%
Output 2: Direct transfers to partners & country offices	3.137	3.491	3.700	3.854	14.182	7,2%	6,7%
Output 2: Partners & country offices, Africa	1.552	1.906	2.115	2.269	7.842		
Output 2: Partners & country offices, other DAC	1.585	1.585	1.585	1.585	6.340		
Output 2: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs	2.584	2.118	2.068	2.025	8.795	4,5%	4,1%
<b>Output 3: Strengthening state authorities and civil society actors to provide timely and quality rehabilitation to trauma affected survivors of torture, CIDPT and other forms of violence</b>	<b>14.128</b>	<b>14.128</b>	<b>14.128</b>	<b>14.128</b>	<b>56.512</b>	<b>28,6%</b>	<b>26,7%</b>
Output 3: Direct activity costs	6.904	6.994	6.880	6.767	27.545	13,9%	13,0%
Output 3: Direct transfers to partners & country offices	3.290	3.771	3.939	4.097	15.097	7,6%	7,1%
Output 3: Partners & country offices, Africa	2.871	3.352	3.520	3.678	13.421		
Output 3: Partners & country offices, other DAC	419	419	419	419	1.676		
Output 3: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs	3.934	3.363	3.309	3.264	13.870	7,0%	6,5%
<b>A - DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>49.395</b>	<b>49.395</b>	<b>49.395</b>	<b>49.395</b>	<b>197.580</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>93,2%</b>
- of which is spent on:*							
Direct activity costs	25.329	25.778	25.371	25.006	101.484	51,4%	47,9%
Direct transfers to partners & country offices	9.908	11.479	12.041	12.527	45.955	23,3%	21,7%
Direct allocated programme-supporting costs	14.158	12.138	11.983	11.862	50.141	25,4%	23,7%
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>							
Audit	148	148	148	148		0,0%	0,0%
Administration (7% of direct costs)	3.457	3.457	3.457	3.457	13.828	7,0%	6,5%
<b>B - INDIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>3.605</b>	<b>3.605</b>	<b>3.605</b>	<b>3.605</b>	<b>14.420</b>	<b>7,3%</b>	<b>6,8%</b>
<b>C - CONTINGENCIES</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0,0%</b>	<b>0,0%</b>
<b>TOTAL BUDGET (A+B+C)</b>	<b>53.000</b>	<b>53.000</b>	<b>53.000</b>	<b>53.000</b>	<b>212.000</b>		<b>100,0%</b>
<b>*Detailed category breakdown across outputs:</b>							
	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	% of A	
<b>Direct activity costs</b>	<b>25.329</b>	<b>25.778</b>	<b>25.371</b>	<b>25.006</b>	<b>101.484</b>	<b>51,4%</b>	
Activities	3.961	3.961	3.961	3.961	15.844	8,0%	
Investment	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%	
Salaries	19.618	19.618	19.311	19.046	77.593	39,3%	
Travel	1.750	2.199	2.099	1.999	8.047	4,1%	
<b>Direct transfers to partners &amp; country offices</b>	<b>9.908</b>	<b>11.479</b>	<b>12.041</b>	<b>12.527</b>	<b>45.955</b>	<b>23,3%</b>	
Partners & country offices, Africa	6.297	7.868	8.430	8.916	31.511	15,9%	
Partners & country offices, other DAC	3.611	3.611	3.611	3.611	14.444	7,3%	
<b>Direct allocated programme-supporting costs</b>	<b>14.158</b>	<b>12.138</b>	<b>11.983</b>	<b>11.862</b>	<b>50.141</b>	<b>25,4%</b>	
Pro rata support costs	10.096	8.076	7.921	7.800	33.893	17,2%	
Communication	1.743	1.743	1.743	1.743	6.972	3,5%	
Monitoring	1.259	1.259	1.259	1.259	5.036	2,5%	
Tools Development & Innovation	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060	4.240	2,1%	

The budget reflects a new and more transparent model of accounting for indirect costs and FAK-overhead will be phased out as of December 31 2020. The new model will commence on January 1 and be based on transparent principles of accounting where indirect costs are clearly linked to a specific output. The new model will be phased in during 2021. Transfers to the South will increase with 1.5



million DKK as of 2022 and then rise gradually till 21.7 % at end of the project period. The model will be finetuned through day-to-day dialogue, annual consultations and a review.

### 8. Management arrangement

The Management arrangement covers the full grant period from 2021-2024. The parties agree to evaluate the Management arrangement by the end of 2022.

For the current grant covering 2021-24, the management arrangement shall be as follows:

#### a. Applicable Guidelines

For eligibility of expenses, the grant is administered according to the MFA guidelines for Programmes and Projects [www.amg.um.dk](http://www.amg.um.dk) and the General Guidelines for financial management – unless exceptions or other more specific details are made in this document.

Feltkode ændret

#### b. Meeting and Reporting procedures

The following meeting and reporting schedule must be respected:

May 1 2021	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DIGNITY's certified accounts (2020) annotated by management</li> <li>Annual evaluation (2020) + report on results framework (2020) regarding DIGNITY's international work, covering the previous calendar year / previous contribution from MFA</li> <li>Financial status report (Q1 2021)</li> </ul>
Jun 2021	Technical Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted certified accounts (2020) and the Financial status report (Q1 2021).
Jun 2021	Strategic Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Evaluation (2020) and Report on Results Framework (2020), activities to date as well as the strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
Oct 1 2021	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account for the grant (2020)</li> <li>Revised budget (2022)</li> <li>Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2021)</li> <li>Annual Plan (2022)</li> </ul>
Nov 2021	Technical Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted account for the grant (2020), the revised budget (2022) and Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2021).
Nov 2021	Strategic Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Plan (2022) as well as the overall strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
May 1 2022	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DIGNITY's certified accounts (2021) annotated by management</li> <li>Annual evaluation (2021) + report on results framework (2021) regarding the DIGNITY's international work, covering the previous calendar year / previous contribution from MFA</li> <li>Financial status report (Q1 2022)</li> </ul>
Jun 2022	Technical Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted certified accounts (2021) and the Financial status report (Q1 2022).

Jun 2022	Strategic Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Evaluation (2021) and Report on Results Framework (2021), activities to date as well as the strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
Oct 1 2022	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account for the grant (2021)</li> <li>Revised budget (2023)</li> <li>Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2022)</li> <li>Annual Plan (2023)</li> </ul>
Nov 2022	Technical Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted account for the grant (2020), the revised budget (2022) and the Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2022).
Nov 2022	Strategic Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Plan (2023) as well as the overall strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
May 1 2023	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DIGNITY's certified accounts (2022) annotated by management</li> <li>Annual evaluation (2022) + report on results framework (2022) regarding the IDIGNITY's international work, covering the previous calendar year / previous contribution from MFA</li> <li>Financial status report (Q1 2023)</li> </ul>
Jun 2023	Technical Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted certified accounts (2022) and the Financial status report (Q1 2023).
Jun 2023	Strategic Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Evaluation (2022) and Report on Results Framework (2022), activities to date as well as the strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
Oct 1 2023	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account for the grant (2022)</li> <li>Revised budget (2024)</li> <li>Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2023)</li> <li>Annual Plan (2024)</li> </ul>
Nov 2023	Technical Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted account for the grant (2022), the revised budget (2024) and Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2021)
Nov 2023	Strategic Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Plan (2024) as well as the overall strategic priorities for the subsequent year.
May 1 2024	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DIGNITY's certified accounts (2023) annotated by management</li> <li>Annual evaluation (2023) + report on results framework (2023) regarding the DIGNITY's international work, covering the previous calendar year / previous contribution from MFA</li> <li>Financial status report on Q1 2024</li> <li>Draft proposal for new DED</li> </ul>
Jun 2024	Technical Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted certified accounts (2023) and the Financial status report (Q1 2024).
Jun 2024	Strategic Consultation I	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion of the submitted Annual Evaluation (2023) and Report on Results Framework (2023) as well as activities to date, and a discussion of new DED strategic priorities and time period cf. Draft proposal for new DED submitted May 1 2024.
Oct 1 2024	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Account for the grant (2023)</li> <li>Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2024)</li> <li>Final DED for subsequent time period</li> </ul>

Nov 2024	Technical Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a technical discussion of the submitted account for the grant (2023) and Financial Status Report (Q1-Q3 2024).
Nov 2024	Strategic Consultation II	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for a strategic discussion and approval of Final DED agreement between the MFA and DIGNITY.
Jun 1 2025	Submission Deadline	DIGNITY shall submit to the MFA; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accounts for the grant (2024)</li> <li>• Annual evaluation (2024) + report on results framework (2024) regarding the DIGNITY's international work, covering the previous calendar year / previous contribution from MFA</li> <li>• Final completion report on the results of the engagement and final status of the indicators listed in the results framework of the DED</li> </ul>
Aug 2025	Final Consultation on the DED 2021-2024	The MFA and DIGNITY shall meet and discuss the submitted account for the grant (2024), Annual Evaluation (2024) and Report on Results Framework (2024) and the Final Completion Report.

### c. Annual Consultations

When relevant and tentatively in the second and fourth quarter (late June + late November) of each year during the engagement period, the MFA and DIGNITY shall meet for strategic and technical discussions. At the meeting in late May the parties will discuss and approve a budget monitoring report for the first quarter of that year, the organisation's overall accounts as well as narrative evaluation and report on the results framework for the previous year. For submission deadlines, please consult section b. Meeting and Reporting Procedures. These document may guide the discussion on general developments, evolution of the partnership and future perspectives. At the meeting in late October the parties will and approve accounts for the grant's previous year, a budget for the coming year, a financial status report covering progress until month of August of existing year, as well as a narrative annual plan for the subsequent year and a revised Results Framework if relevant.

## 9. Financial Management

The following financial management arrangement applies to this development engagement:

### a. Applicable Guidelines

For eligibility of expenses, the grant is administered according to the General Guidelines for Financial Management – unless exemptions or other more specific details/condition are outlined in this document (or separate email exchange), c.f. section 8.b. below.

Reference is made to Danida's 'General Guidelines for Financial Management – for development cooperation', which can be accessed on [www.amg.um.dk](http://www.amg.um.dk) and more specifically: <https://amg.um.dk/en/tools/financial-management/>.

Feltkode ændret

Feltkode ændret

### b. Special conditions and exemptions

The following special conditions and exemptions apply to this DED only.

- For planning and reporting concerning 2020 DIGNITY shall be allowed to fully apply the existing guidelines including budgeting and reporting procedures and deadlines. For 2021-2024 the new formats shall apply.

- The output-based budget (applicable from 2021), specified according to the outputs appearing in the results framework, shall for each output be allowed to include allocated programme-supporting costs (which are linked to the specific outputs). DIGNITY shall be able to explain the link between a programme supporting cost and the given output (activity) under which it is budgeted. Furthermore, DIGNITY shall be able to present and justify budget breakdown and allocation of all the budgeted programme-supporting costs. Non-activity-specific costs must be covered by the administrative overhead (7%).
- The Budget shall include a specification of transfers to country offices /regional hubs and implementing partners.

**c. The grant and its disbursement**

The grant to DIGNITY is approved in DKK. Any loss due to variations of exchange rates between the grant in DKK and the currency/currencies of the organisation’s cooperating partners in developing countries must be covered within the grant.

Funds will be transferred in Danish kroner from MFA to:

- Account name: DIGNITY
- Bank name: INSERT
- Bank Address: INSERT
- Registration no.: INSERT
- Account no. : INSERT

DIGNITY must within 14 days after receiving the funds return a letter or e-mail with acknowledgement of receipt of funds.

**d. Accounting requirements**

DIGNITY must follow the basic four-eye principles for all payments and secure proper and solid segregation of duties. The accounts shall be drawn up to the same level of detail as is done in the budget. The total grant cannot be exceeded and shall be used for the agreed purposes only.

The grant shall be kept and accounted for separately from other funds for DIGNITY’s international or domestic activities and separate from earmarked funds from the MFA as well as from other sources.

However, in case multiple funding sources contribute to the exact same project objective as this engagement, all such funds shall be accounted for jointly and included in updated budgets (and results framework).

**e. Budget and expense ceilings**

For eligibility, the following budget and expense ceilings must be respected:

Administrative fee (non-activity specific cost)	Maximum 7% of the direct (activity-specific) costs of the activities
Contingency (unforeseen expenses, exchange rate loss etc.)	Maximum 3 % of total budget amount

**f. Budget reallocations**

DIGNITY has the discretion to re-allocate between outputs within the budget. Changes exceeding 30 % must be presented to and approved by the MFA.

DIGNITY has the discretion expense unused funds in the following year, with attention to the budget constraint provided by the funds committed at a given time and subject to ministry approval.

**g. Procurement of goods and services**

DIGNITY will manage the grant with care, consideration and due diligence. Pursuant to Danida's and DIGNITY's existing guidelines, only economy class tickets are purchased for travel.

**h. Transparent recruitment**

When recruiting permanent staff, DIGNITY shall announce positions openly and publicly and use transparent selection procedures with a view to ensure that candidates are not subject to discrimination in terms of race, colour, political views, sexual orientation or gender identity, disability, sex, age or national origin. Rotation of staff is not subject to open and public recruitment.

Prior to recruiting a new Director for DIGNITY the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should approve salary and employment conditions as well as requirement for the qualifications of the incumbent. The MFA should approve any emolument to the members of the board as well.

**i. Audit requirements**

The audit shall be administered in accordance with the requirements established in the Financial Management Guidelines. <https://amg.um.dk/en/tools/financial-management/>.

**j. Interest and unspent funds**

Interests accrued from bank holdings should be recorded as income and may be used for activities supporting the objective of this development engagement or returned to the MFA at the end of the engagement. Negative interests are to be accounted for as expenditures and may be covered by the grant.

Unused funds shall be returned to the MFA after approval of final accounts for the engagement. However, if a succeeding engagement (with a similar objective) follows this contribution, then MFA may decide to allow for transfer of unspent funds from this engagement to the next.

**10. Monitoring and Evaluation by MFA**

Progress in implementing the DED will be monitored through reporting, regular dialogue as well as the annual consultations. Reviews on performance and capacity as well as financial inspection will be carried out according to the regular rules and assessment by MFA.

The MFA shall have the right to carry out any technical or financial mission that is considered necessary to monitor the implementation of the programme. To facilitate the work of the person(s) instructed to carry out such mission, DIGNITY shall provide these with all relevant assistance, information, and documentation. The MFA reserves the right to carry out an evaluation after the termination of the grant period.

**11. Partner Assessments and Financial Management Reviews**

DIGNITY is obliged to ensure that any partner organization that administers donor funding have the capacity to adhere to the requirements from the donor with respect to financial transparency and accountability. This

Feltkode ændret

obligation is ensured by **assessments of potential partners and regularly reviews of existing partners** with the aim to assess the overall organizational capacity and adherence to applicable guidelines and requirements.

- The assessment of a potential new partner is normally conducted by a **desk-review** based on a questionnaire (Organizational Fact Sheet) to be fulfilled by the partner and a collection of relevant documents to be presented by the partner. If need be the desk-review may be followed up by a field visit or a further in-depth study that may be conducted in conjunction with local consultants and accountants. The assessment of whether this needed is on a case by case basis based on the financial capabilities of the potential partner.
- The organizational capacity and financial transparency of the existing partners are assessed by regular visits and **financial reviews** to address challenges and needs for technical assistance with respect to financial management, accounting procedures and internal control. Financial reviews are planned to be implemented every second or third year based on a risk analysis considering the size of the organization and the grant. Regular visits will be supplemented by virtual financial assessments to be conducted at a regular interval. These virtual sessions have been developed as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic but will continue to be implemented in the post-pandemic period as a supplement to regular field visits.

The partner visits are planned and organized to match the level of the organization and ensure both a realistic level of supervision and a learning environment where the partner will increase their knowledge of financial management. It is important that the element of control versus learning is balanced and adapted to the individual organization.

The general objective is to continuously supervise the technical exchange and professional dialogue between the Partner and DIGNITY as principal partners in the cooperation on the specific project engagement. The review focus on the following areas of special interest for the partnership collaboration:

- Assess the status on the accountancy and financial management in the organization.
- Identify areas, if any, within accountancy and financial management that needs special attention.
- Pay special attention to risks of corruption and if not already in place DIGNITY will introduce the Partner to anti-corruption measures.
- Develop an action plan to address issues identified during the review.

The findings and conclusions from a financial review are summarized via a standard report template based on the information, observations and results that came out of the meetings with the Partner's finance staff and management during the financial review. The project partnership between the Partner and DIGNITY is discussed with special focus on the day-to-day financial management, adherence with the requirements to the financial reporting and best practices regarding transparency and accountancy. The conclusions are followed up on a regular basis.

## **12. Anti-corruption**

No offer, payment, consideration or benefit of any kind, which could be regarded as an illegal or corrupt practice, shall be made, promised, sought, or accepted – neither directly nor indirectly – as an inducement or reward in relation to activities funded under this agreement, including tendering, award or execution of contracts. Any such practice shall be ground for the immediate cancellation of this grant and for such additional action, civil and/or criminal, as may be appropriate. At the discretion of the MFA, a further consequence of any such action can be the definitive exclusion from any projects funded by the MFA.

### **13. Child labour**

DIGNITY shall abide by the local laws and by applicable international instruments, including the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child and International Labour Organisation conventions.

### **14. Prevention of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment**

The recipient agrees to ensure that the work of the organisation is implemented in an environment free from all forms of harassment, exploitation, abuse and harassment, sexual or otherwise, especially in case of vulnerable groups.

Sexual abuse is defined as actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions. Sexual exploitation is defined as any actual or attempted abuse of position of vulnerability, differential power or trust, for sexual purposes, including, but not limited to, profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another. Sexual harassment is defined as any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature with the purpose or effect of violating DIGNITY of a person, in particular when creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.

The above definitions are referred to as Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH).

DIGNITY confirms

1. that it has adequate policies/standards or frameworks in place to prevent SEAH<sup>6</sup>;
2. that all employees have been informed about these policies/standards/frameworks; and
3. that there are appropriate SEAH reporting procedures and complain mechanisms in the organisation including the protection of victims of SEAH and that prompt and adequate action is taken if SEAH is observed, reported or suspected.

In case the development engagement includes subgrantees, the recipient is responsible for ensuring the prevention of SEAH also at the level of subgrantee.

MFA has zero-tolerance towards SEAH and will consider non-adherence to point 1, 2 and 3 as grounds for immediate termination of grant.

### **15. Transfer of ownership**

DIGNITY responsible for the implementation of the DED shall maintain updated inventories of all equipment financed by MFA, according to the existing DIGNITY rules.

### **16. Suspension**

In case of non-compliance with the provisions of this DED or violation of the essential elements mentioned in this DED MFA reserves the right to suspend with immediate effect further disbursements to the grantee under this contribution.

### **17. Entry into force, duration and termination**

---

<sup>6</sup> In line/adherence with the Inter Agency Standing Committee's Minimum Operating Standard on prevention of SEA and/or the elements on prevention of SEA of the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability.

The contribution will be announced in annual letter(s) of commitment referring to this DED.

The present engagement will have the duration of 48 months in accordance with the project period stated above.

Notwithstanding the previous clause MFA may terminate the grant upon 6 months written notice.

This DED will replace any former frame-agreement.

**18. Prerequisites**

*The cooperation with the implementing partner as specified by this DED will become effective when*

- *The finance act is approved by the Danish parliament.*
- *The Grant is approved by the Minister for Development Cooperation.  
This DED is signed by both parties.*
- *The signed commitment letter(s) is sent from MFA to DIGNITY (this DED is an annex to the commitment letter(s)).*

**19. Signatures**

**For the Danish Institute for Human Rights**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_



## Annex 1: Context Analysis

### 1. Overall development challenges, opportunities and risks

***Briefly summarise the key conclusions from the analyses consulted and their implications for the programme regarding each of the following points:***

- *General development challenges including poverty, equality/inequality, national development plan/poverty reduction strategy, humanitarian assessment.*

Even though torture is universally and absolutely prohibited by international treaty and customary law it is practiced in three quarters of the world, 141 countries, according to Amnesty International. High profile torture cases, such as the CIA secret detention programme around the world, have led to a common misconception that torture is generally confined to issues around national security and counter-terrorism. But Amnesty's finds that it could happen to anyone - petty criminals, people from ethnic minorities, protesters, student activists, and people who were simply in the wrong place at the wrong time. It is most often poor and marginalized people who get beaten, humiliated or raped by police and other officials when there is no one to protect them or hear their cries for help.

The World Organisation Against Torture estimates that the number of torture victims is large based on direct testimonies even though it is not possible to know the precise amount. A variety of strategies are used to circumvent their legal and humanitarian duties, including plausible deniability, secret police "need to know", denial that certain activities constitute torture, appeal to various laws (national or international), use of a jurisdictional argument claim of "overriding need", the use of torture by proxy and so on. Almost all regimes and governments engaging in torture (and other crimes against humanity) consistently deny engaging in it, in spite of overwhelming hearsay and physical evidence from the citizens they tortured. Through both denial and avoidance of prosecution, most people ordering or carrying out acts of torture do not face legal consequences for their actions

In many cases, torture is a methodical act. Brutal arrests, ruthless methods of interrogation and other forms of torture is still a daily practice at many police stations and prisons around the world – especially in societies where widespread corruption and modest respect for the rule of law is present. Moreover, the risk of torture is closely linked to poverty, violence and suppression. With technological development, new forms of torture have emerged, and torture manifests itself in new contexts. Torture methods and “know how” are vigorously exported across borders. Torture is a dynamic concept, so the understanding of what constitutes torture is continuously evolving through the international and regional courts' dynamic interpretation of international conventions. While torture in some countries becomes increasingly more physical and brutal, there is also an increasing tendency to utilize more refined psychological torture (e.g. threats, mock executions and manipulations). Since 9/11, the support for the absolute ban against torture has been challenged. More broadly, human rights have come under increased attack. This trend has been exacerbated with the influx of refugees and migrants towards both Europe's and the USA's borders, combined with recent years' terror attacks against cities across the world.

### Torture in Detention

It is within the first 72 hours, when persons find themselves in the custody of authorities, that the risk of being subjected to torture is highest. The global prison population has been mounting steadily in past years and is record high with 11 million prisoners worldwide in 2020. This is the result of states' penal policies favouring increased criminalization of undesirable human behaviour and issuance of long prison sentences, often leading to mass incarceration. The punitive approach to criminal justice entails that deprivation of liberty is often favoured over non-custodial sanctions, also for petty offences. The all-time high prison population is also a result of excessive use of pre-trial detention. Although pre-trial detention should be a measure of last resort, it is often the preferred option. Worldwide, over 100 state report prison overcrowding, which impacts negatively on conditions of detention, triggers inter-prisoner violence, self-harm, suicide and excessive use of force by custodial staff. As such, it challenges the prospects for ensuring humane treatment, hampers re-socialization of prisoners and affects recidivism levels negatively. On top of that, as prisons are epicentres for infectious disease, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the detrimental consequences of chronic overcrowding in places of detention. Groups at risk, like children, ethnic/religious minorities, LGBTI, migrants, poor and socially marginalized groups, increasingly end up in prison and police custody, as well as continuing to attend to and attempt to ameliorate the conditions they face there.

### Urban Violence

The global growth in the number of people living in urban areas is one of the 21st century's biggest challenges. Densely populated urban areas in poor and unstable societies are hot-spots of violence and torture. These areas are dangerous and have limited or no presence of public services, security or other government authorities, instead they are often controlled by non-state authorities. Urban violence is characterized by a high degree of conflict between different violent networks and types of actors, including vigilante groups, and competing political actors and state officials. In some countries, gangs form de facto governance structures for instance in prisons, and carry out taxing and policing functions in urban slums. In other places, community organizations exercise authority on behalf of the state.

### People on the move

Increasingly restrictive migration laws, policies and practices across the EU and other destination countries have pushed growing numbers of migrants to irregular routes and methods, exposing them to serious human rights violations such as unlawful killings, torture and ill-treatment, slavery and forced labor, rape and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence along their journey. These violations are perpetrated both by State officials and non-State actors such as armed groups, smugglers and traffickers. Migrants are regularly held in prolonged and often arbitrary detention under appalling conditions without access to lawyers or judicial guarantees. The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture (SRT) identified in a 2018 report, that the prevalence of torture victims among irregular migrants ranges up to 76%, with the overall average being 27%. Even when focusing exclusively on recognized refugees and asylum seekers, this translates into at least 7 million victims of torture worldwide. The widespread and increasingly systematic human rights violations against migrants has been referred to as "one of the greatest tragedies of our time".

### Rehabilitation

With the widespread use of torture and other forms of political violence, the global need for rehabilitation is immense. For many reasons, torture survivors do not necessarily identify themselves as torture survivors and consequently only a limited number of survivors seek rehabilitation for the violation of their human rights, they have been exposed to. However, some torture survivors will seek assistance for their somatic and mental health problems. It is therefore necessary that the system or civil society are able to identify, refer and respond to the needs of survivors of torture.

Torture victims who seek international protection face particular challenges, e.g. if their vulnerability is not taken into account during the asylum determination, when reception conditions are inadequate or where they are detained. This not only prejudices their fair treatment during the asylum process but also prevents them accessing adequate healthcare, including rehabilitation services.

- ***Status and progress in relation to SDGs, in particular those that are special priorities for Denmark.***

SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Like adults, children experience inter-prisoner violence, self-harm, suicide and excessive use of force by custodial staff during their time in detention. Survivors of torture and other forms of violence often experience a decrease in adaptive functioning to an extent in which it becomes a barrier for their participation in family, work, and community life, as well as engagement in development initiatives. In other words, if the effects of trauma are not addressed, survivors of torture and other traumas are left behind. They cannot meaningfully participate in society and therefore risk becoming further marginalized. However, while there is recognition of the need for the generic MHPSS services, there is little interest among donors to support the more specialized structures as these are expensive and less cost efficient.

SDG 5: Achieve Gender equality and empower all women and girls

The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture's recent report on domestic violence emphasizes the need to apply a gender-sensitive understanding of torture that encompasses gender-based violence, also when perpetrated by private actors. The composition of the prison population is changing, with a significant rise in women in detention (50% since 2000). In poor urban areas, men and boys tend to be the primary victims of public acts of violence, while women and girls bear the blunt of violence in the home, which is often rendered invisible by harmful gender norms and inequities in the use of public space and services.

SDG 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Rapid urbanization has created continuously growing poverty pockets of slums in and around the major cities. Slum areas are some of the most dangerous and unsafe areas in the world. Additionally, global growth of cities is a challenge as cities are often corrupt and marred by multidimensional violence, including torture by authorities and crime-related and gender-based violence that the state can be seen to fail to protect citizens against. These cities are often characterised by the fact that violence is a part of everyday life and that poor city dwellers live without being recognized as legal, political and social individuals.

SDG 16: Promote Peace, Justice and strong Institutions

As cities grow, the pressure on social, infrastructural and political systems increase. Therefore, at present there is a lack of access to democratic representation, security and other basic services. The shrinking of civic space as a part of a broader democratic recession has notably taken place in Egypt, Jordan, Kenya and the Phillippines. These uncertain circumstances affect especially the poorest and most vulnerable population groups and – together with widespread violent practice – form the basis for torture. In some poor urban areas, both state and non-state authorities use violence against those they consider to be in opposition to them, either to control their constituencies or to impose dominant moral norms.

***List the key documentation and sources used for the analysis:***

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

Domestic violence is estimated to affect at least 35% of women worldwide at some point in their lives. Source: UN Women <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/ending-violence-against-women/facts-and-figures>

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

DIGNITY Strategy 2019-21: <https://www.dignity.dk/wp-content/uploads/DIGNITY-Strategy-2019-2021-ENG.pdf>

DIGNITY Strategy 2021-2025

Strategy for Denmark's engagement with DIGNITY 2020-21

Frontline Defenders Global Analysis 2019. Front Line Defenders, 2020

Global Prison Trends 2020. Penal Reform International and Thailand Institute of Justice.

United Nations Global Study on Children Deprived of Liberty 2019 <https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/urbanisation-et-migration>

United Nations Support Mission in Libya and UNHCR. Desperate and Dangerous: Report on the human rights situation of migrants and refugees in Libya, December 2018.

Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/37/50, 26 February 2018.

Melzer, N. (2019). Migration-related torture: One of the greatest tragedies of our time. *Torture Journal*, 29(1), 125-126.

UN Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/31/57. 5 January 2016

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

Domestic violence is estimated to affect at least 35% of women worldwide at some point in their lives. Source: UN Women <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/ending-violence-against-women/facts-and-figures>

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

DIGNITY Publication Series on Torture and Organised Violence No. 15: 'Psychosocial models for prevention and wellbeing: Addressing authority-based violence in urban neighbourhoods', 2017.

UN Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/31/57. 5 January 2016

## 2. Fragility, conflict, migration and resilience

***Briefly summarise the key conclusions and implications for the programme of the analysis of the below points:***

- ***Situation with regards to peace and stability based on conflict analysis and fragility assessments highlighting key drivers of conflict and fragility, protection and resilience, organised transnational crime and illicit money flows and how conflict and fragility affect inclusive private sector development and women and youth***

Increasingly restrictive migration laws, policies and practices across the EU and other destination countries have pushed growing numbers of migrants to irregular routes and methods, exposing them to serious human rights violations such as unlawful killings, torture and ill-treatment, slavery and forced labor, rape and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence along their journey. These violations are perpetrated both by State officials and non-State actors such as armed groups, smugglers and traffickers. Migrants are regularly held in prolonged and often arbitrary detention under appalling conditions without access to lawyers or judicial guarantees. The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture (SRT) identified in a 2018 report, that the prevalence of torture victims among irregular migrants ranges up to 76%, with the overall average being 27%. Even when focusing exclusively on recognized refugees and asylum seekers, this translates into at least 7 million victims of torture worldwide. The widespread and increasingly systematic human rights violations against migrants has been referred to as "one of the greatest tragedies of our time".

Migrants in particular face challenges: Migrants are subjected unlawful treatment and torture by both state officials and non-state actions during their journey. Migrants are regularly held in prolonged and often arbitrary detention under appalling conditions without access to lawyers or judicial guarantees. When seeking international protection, torture victims's treatment face challenges during the asylum process if their vulnerability is not taken into account. This not only prejudices their fair treatment

during the asylum process but also prevents them accessing adequate healthcare, including rehabilitation services.

**List the key documentation and sources used for the analysis:**

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

Domestic violence is estimated to affect at least 35% of women worldwide at some point in their lives. Source: UN Women <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/ending-violence-against-women/facts-and-figures>

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

DIGNITY Strategy 2019-21: <https://www.dignity.dk/wp-content/uploads/DIGNITY-Strategy-2019-2021-ENG.pdf>  
DIGNITY Strategy 2021-2025

Strategy for Denmark's engagement with DIGNITY 2020-21

Frontline Defenders Global Analysis 2019. Front Line Defenders, 2020

Global Prison Trends 2020. Penal Reform International and Thailand Institute of Justice.

United Nations Global Study on Children Deprived of Liberty 2019

<https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/urbanisation-et-migration>

United Nations Support Mission in Libya and UNHCR. Desperate and Dangerous: Report on the human rights situation of migrants and refugees in Libya, December 2018.

Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/37/50, 26 February 2018.

Melzer, N. (2019). Migration-related torture: One of the greatest tragedies of our time. *Torture Journal*, 29(1), 125-126.

UN Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/31/57. 5 January 2016

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

Domestic violence is estimated to affect at least 35% of women worldwide at some point in their lives. Source: UN Women <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/ending-violence-against-women/facts-and-figures>

Relevance on the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment to the context of domestic violence. UN GA A/74/148 12 July 2019

DIGNITY Publication Series on Torture and Organised Violence No. 15: 'Psychosocial models for prevention and wellbeing: Addressing authority-based violence in urban neighbourhoods', 2017.

UN Human Rights Council. Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. A/HRC/31/57. 5 January 2016

### 3. Assessment of human rights situation (HRBA) and gender<sup>1</sup>

***Briefly summarise the key conclusions and implications for the programme of the analysis of the below points:***

Even though torture is universally and absolutely prohibited by international treaty and customary law it is practiced in more than two thirds of the world.

The use of torture is driven by a range of factors, including increased acceptance of torture in the fight against terror/drugs/crime, growth in the number of detainees, urbanization, violent conflict involuntary migration etc.

There is growing attention to the applicability of the UN Convention Against Torture to the unique experiences of women and girls as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons. The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture's recent report on domestic violence emphasizes the

<sup>1</sup> The purpose of the analysis is to facilitate and strengthen the application of the Human Rights Based Approach, and integrate gender in Danish development cooperation. The analysis should identify the main human rights issues in respect of social and economic rights, cultural rights, and civil and political rights. Gender is an integral part of all three categories.

need to apply a gender-sensitive understanding of torture that encompasses gender-based violence, also when perpetrated by private actors.[2] In light of its sheer magnitude[3] and recognizing that in terms of intentionality, purposefulness and severity of the inflicted pain and suffering, domestic violence often falls nothing short of torture and CIDTP “cannot be regarded as a private matter but constitutes a major human rights issue of inherently public concern that requires examination, inter alia, from the perspective of the prohibition of torture and ill-treatment.

Additionally, there is a growing trend to detain children, at younger ages and for a longer time in detention. There are now 1.3-1.5 million children deprived of liberty, of them 410.000 in criminal justice institutions and 330,000 in migration-related detention. Furthermore, it is estimated that 1 million children are in police custody annually.

The fight against torture has been a key priority for Denmark since the mid 1990’s. Denmark submits a biennial ominous resolution at the UN General Assembly and a biennial thematic resolution at UN Human Rights Council.

### **The Convention Against Torture/ The Committee Against Torture**

The Committee Against Torture (CAT) is a body of human rights experts that monitors implementation of the United Nations Convention against Torture by state parties. The Committee is one of eight UN-linked human rights treaty bodies. The body is headed by a member of DIGNITY’s staff, Jens Modvig till the end of 2021. All state parties are obliged under the Convention to submit regular reports to the CAT on how rights are being implemented. Upon ratifying the Convention, states must submit a report within one year, after which they are obliged to report every four years. The Committee examines each report and addresses its concerns and recommendations to the state party in the form of "concluding observations." Under certain circumstances the CAT may consider complaints or communications from individuals claiming that their rights under the Convention have been violated.

#### ***Identify key rights holders in the programme***

Right holders include victims of torture, torture survivors and people in risk of being exposed for torture og inhuman treatment.

#### ***Identify key duty bearers in the programme***

Duty bearers include government institutions at all levels as well as regional and international institutions.

#### ***Are additional studies / analytic work needed? How and when will it be done?***

List additional studies that will be carried out as part of the preparation phase, including studies that will be carried out jointly with others or by partners / other donors.

## **5. Matching with Danish strengths and interests, engaging Danish actors, seeking synergy**

***Briefly summarise the key conclusions and implications for the programme of the analysis of the below points:***

Internationally, Denmark is perceived as the leading state in the fight against torture. This is due to a long term commitment to the agenda for the last four decades which accelerated with the adoption of United Nations Convention Against Torture (UNCAT). Denmark was the 10th country to ratify the convention triggering that the convention entered into force in 1987. At the same time the Rehabilitation Centre for Torture (that later was transformed into DIGNITY) was established. These developments led to a stronger Danish focus on the anti-torture agenda through a whole range of instruments, mechanisms and institutions like the UN resolution, the UN Voluntary Fund for Torture Victims, the Council of Europe, the EU a number of international and Danish civil society organisations. All these efforts which have been further elaborated year after year have contributed to the perception that the fight against torture is part of the Danish story in relation to Denmark's international human rights policy image and in development cooperation.

The organisations fighting against torture face, like other human rights organisations, a challenging landscape in terms of funding. While the fight against torture was a bit of a cause celebre in the 1980's and 1990's it suffers from fatigue in the present century. New agendas like shrinking civic space, support to human rights defenders and digital access are on top of the agenda and attract more interest and more funding. As an international lead on torture likeminded countries expect Denmark to continue to fund the area while they focus their attention elsewhere.

***List the key documentation and sources used for the analysis:***

***Are additional studies / analytic work needed? How and when will it be done?***

List additional studies that will be carried out as part of the preparation phase, including studies that will be carried out jointly with others or by partners / other donors.

**6. Stakeholder analysis**

***Briefly summarise the key conclusions and implications for the programme of the analysis of the below points:***

DIGNITY is a self-governing institution with a high degree of specialized knowledge in terms of preventing torture and mental health. DIGNITY get its legitimacy from its vision of a world without torture and its track record in terms of shaping global standards, building an international architecture and creating capacity on the ground.

International norms and standards is a frame of reference for DIGNITY's work. DIGNITY aims to influence state authorities like prison management, police officers and civil servants in the justice sector to abide by the international norms with a view to prevent torture and empower victims. The approach is to spur change through the iterative interplay between international standards norms and actions from institutions, communities and individuals from below.

**The key stakeholders and their main interestests, capacity and contribution include:**

	Key Stakeholder	Main interests	Capacity	Contribution
1	Communities, organizations( including women and youth organizations), Nations, activists, experts, and networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rights holders, voicing the need for recognition, respect, protection and promotion of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rooted in their own communities.</li> <li>Legitimacy among its constituency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to DIGNITY's strategic and programmatic development and communication.</li> </ul>

		<p>their rights (UNCAT).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empowerment through project and technical support from DIGNITY.</li> <li>• Advocacy of their rights at local, national and international level together with a well-established intl. organization.</li> <li>• Solid documentation of their HR situation that they can use at all levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional strength and administrative capacity.</li> <li>• Advocacy skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and development of projects/activities in selected countries</li> <li>• Implementation of projects.</li> <li>• Advocacy at local, national and international level together with DIGNITY</li> <li>• Production of documentation of their human rights situation/violations.</li> <li>• Direct engagement in and contribution to regional and international processes</li> </ul>
2	Governments as duty bearers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced knowledge of obligations.</li> <li>• Engage in dialogue with affected individuals communities, organisations and state authorities.</li> <li>• Receive technical assistance on obligations to develop policies and programs that respond to the demands of survivors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duty bearer.</li> <li>• HR obligations under international law.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity for implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enter into a constructive dialogue with survivors and advance legal and policy issues on rights.</li> <li>• Participate in activities of partner projects, receive information and news, participate in meetings.</li> <li>• Implement intl. agreements, obligations.</li> </ul>
3	National, regional and international HR Institutions and other UN bodies (HRC, UPR, CAT, CTI, Council of Europe)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of their mandate.</li> <li>• Collect and filter documentation/information as guidance for implementation of the UNCAT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legitimacy and authority given by member states.</li> <li>• Work guided by international and regional human rights framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global/regional advocacy platforms for advocacy and dialogue between indigenous peoples? and States, national human rights institutions and other stakeholders.</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish alliances with support organisations</li> <li>• Engage in dialogue on human rights situations and actions to be taken.</li> <li>• Need active CSOs for monitoring and push States to fulfil their obligations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor States' human rights performance.</li> <li>• In some cases can establish jurisprudence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring State's human rights performance.</li> <li>• Provide recommendations and technical advice to States.</li> </ul>
5	UN Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that their policies, projects and programs are aligned with the UNCAT and have no adverse impact.</li> <li>• Ensure that their programs benefit indigenous peoples' communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Legitimacy</li> <li>• Normative work.</li> <li>• National level programmes with funding</li> <li>• Financial and technical capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political influence at national level (UN country teams).</li> <li>• Advocate for inclusion of anti-torture measures in relevant decision-making processes at country level.</li> <li>• Implement policies on indigenous peoples rights.</li> </ul>
6	CSO and NGO networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solid documentation informs their work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisational and advocacy</li> <li>• Media outreach</li> <li>• Alliance building, outreach, connections, influence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate platform to reach other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Support to the cause and strengthen our voice.</li> <li>• Provide possible campaign platform.</li> </ul>
7	Development Cooperation Agencies/Ministries of Foreign Affairs (Nordic Governments), European Union (European Commission and European Parliament), Embassies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that their policies, strategies, programs comply with international human rights standards and UNDRIP.</li> <li>• Ensure that their programs benefit indigenous peoples.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence at political levels</li> <li>• Development of strategies and policies.</li> <li>• Technical advice on project management.</li> <li>• Donor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong allies and supporters of indigenous peoples at political level.</li> <li>• Financial contribution.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information about the situation of indigenous peoples, their demands and aspirations.</li> </ul>		
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

***List the key documentation and sources used for the analysis:***

DIGNITY: Institutional strategy 2021 – 2024  
 DIGNITY: thematic strategies on prevention, research and development  
 MFA: Review og DIGNITY 2020  
 MFA: Evaluation of Danish Support to Human Rights 2006 - 2016

## **ANNEX 2: PARTNERS**

---

### **1. SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**

While aiming at impacting a wider range of stakeholders with the ability to influence our vision of a world without torture DIGNITY is collaborating with stakeholders at three levels:

1. Civil Society
2. Governmental level including research institutions and local government authorities
3. The multilateral level including relevant international organisations and with senior DIGNITY staff in key positions in CAT as well as the CPT

As it is evident from the context analysis DIGNITY is working in a continuous changing and volatile political environment both at the international and local levels. The partners at the three abovementioned levels are inter alia the cornerstones of DIGNITY's international programmes as they form an upwards stream of evidence and experience based advocacy from the civil society to governments and international governance bodies and at the same time a downward stream of translation of new norms to local legislation and practices. With the clear ambition to strengthen the translation into practices and social change on the ground, the civil society organisations are paramount to the objective of the overall agreement of fewer people suffering from torture in developing countries. Therefore, the first criteria in the selection of our partners is that they have access to our end beneficiaries and important stakeholders.

Over the coming grant period DIGNITY will engage with a range of new partners as part of its geographical focus on Africa and regions of origin. These partners are yet to be identified and the list below is therefore not exhaustive.

### **2. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING PROGRAMME PARTNERS**

Partnerships between DIGNITY and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are an integral part of what constitutes sound international development processes. We strongly believe that strengthening capacity-development linkages between North- and South-based NGO's can bring about positive change and mutual benefits based on their individual comparative advantages. DIGNITY is strategically – and geographically – well-placed to simultaneously interact with the Western donor landscape, and to conduct (inter)national advocacy. In turn, South-based NGOs possess empirical knowledge and experience as well as local presence.

We believe that by jointly implementing projects, both DIGNITY and the local partner(s) strengthen our legitimacy by serving as a direct link from the Western donor landscape to the local settings. In other words, the sum of the partnerships – if successfully managed – can potentially be greater than the sum of the individual parts.

Pre-selection of partners is based on specific criteria as well as a pre-assessment of the potential partner to identity, values, organisational management, financial systems and programmes.

Implementation through and by local partners by increased direct transfers of funds will be emphasised. Independence' analysed and justified in terms of the following indicative criteria: 1) formal/legal status 2) governance structure, 3) financially diversified source of funding and 4) degree to which it is rooted in local community (e.g. through volunteers, membership base, local donation). A suggested definition of local and independent partners excludes transfers to country and regional offices, functioning as extensions of the DANIDA-funded organisation.

The specific selection criteria are as follows:

- Partners must have access to beneficiaries, relevant stakeholders and authorities
- Partners must be committed to reach a joint purpose and objectives
- Added value from the partnership must be clear
- Partners must have a certain level of capacity and relevant knowledge to play a key role nationally and engaging in learning and development processes
- Partners must be willing to share experiences and knowledge for the benefit of the beneficiaries
- Partners must be independent local NGOs with their own statutes

When a potential partner has been selected, a more in-depth assessment on the technical, programmatic and organisational capacities of the partner is carried out. This assessment serves to ensure consistency with the information provided and gives the basis on which a development plan must be jointly elaborated. The development plan provides guidance for how to strengthen and monitor capacities and progress with the aim of transferring responsibilities to partners and strengthening their position in terms of their specific expertise. Needs for capacity development efforts, training and mutual commitments must be clearly reflected in a partnership agreement.

### **3. BRIEF PRESENTATION OF PARTNERS**

*[Provide a brief presentation of each partner and the justification for selecting the partner. Present relations between partners and potential synergies that will be pursued during the programme. Reference can be made to the details provided in Annex 1: Context Analysis. For country programmes the presentation can be made by thematic programme with a separate sub-heading.]*

#### **PRISON WATCH SIERRA LEONE (PWSL), SIERRA LEONE**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Prison Watch Sierra Leone is an indigenous human rights NGO formed in 1996, which serves as a focal point relating to all issues of detainees/prisoners and detention in the country. The organisation's main objective is to monitor human rights violations and abuses in detention

centers throughout the country. Since its inception, PWSL has monitored and reported on prisons and detention conditions and provided training for detention officers and civil society members on human rights.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** DIGNITY began working in Sierra Leone in 2005, within a post-war context where the discourse around international development in the country was dominated by the themes of trauma, peace-building, and reconciliation and the state was characterised as weak or fragile. Following fieldwork during the first half of 2006, DIGNITY began to engage with the justice sector, a sector that was subject to considerable intervention at that time but where prisons were not prioritised.

The fieldwork conducted in 2006 showed a dysfunctional prison system where detainees were subject to conditions of prolonged uncertainty and judicial limbo as they awaited trial or languished beyond their official sentence length. Conditions were deplorable and degrading; resources were scarce; management was inefficient and poorly structured; prison staff were demoralized and disillusioned, only in partial control and heavily dependent on prisoner leaders to maintain order. International development efforts ostensibly targeting the most vulnerable and marginalised citizens failed at that time to directly address the pressing issues of the prisons system. Civil society voices were critical and for the most part external.

Issues, as identified in 2006, persist to this day, with the Human Rights Report 2016 of the US State Department stating that the most significant human rights problems included unlawful killing and abusive treatment by police, prolonged detention and imprisonment under harsh and life-threatening conditions, and widespread official corruption in all branches of government. Sierra Leone remains one of the world's poorest countries and its infrastructure and institutions reflect this. Adding to the challenges, the World Bank notes how Sierra Leone's post-war developmental trajectory was disrupted by the Ebola outbreak (2014-16), and the current Covid-19 is once again adding pressure on the country's health system.

DIGNITY's current partnership activities with PWSL aim to contribute to torture prevention and human rights protection in the field of law enforcement and detention. Through a four-pronged strategy featuring monitoring, knowledge generation, innovative social interventions, and advocacy, DIGNITY and PWSL work towards the development of more humane and norm-compliant practices of law enforcement and detention and a reduction in degrading treatment and the excessive use of force; duty bearers being held accountable for their actions; and increased interaction between civil society, policy-makers and state officials on the prevention of torture and CIDT.

## **CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF VIOLENCE AND RECONCILIATION (CSVR), SOUTH AFRICA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) is an independent, non-governmental, organisation established in South Africa in 1989. CSVR is a multi-disciplinary institute that seeks to understand and prevent violence, heal its effects and build sustainable peace at community, national and regional levels. Through research, intervention and advocacy CSVR seeks to enhance state accountability, promote gender equality, and build social cohesion, integration and active citizenship. While primarily based in South Africa, the organisation works across the African continent through collaborations with community, civil society, state and international partners such as DIGNITY.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** The prevalence of torture and Cruel, Inhumane and Degrading Treatment (CIDT) is hard to measure. However, several reports point to its shockingly ubiquitous occurrence in South Africa and the African Region. In this context, The CSVR has over 25 years of

experience in the management and implementation of projects in the field of torture, CIDT, violence and complex trauma. The organisation is comprised of highly experienced and qualified technical staff as well as well-developed managerial systems and processes.

As such, DIGNITY has since 2005 been in a fruitful partnership with CSVr on developing and implementing a model for family rehabilitation intervention. The overall aim of the current project is to improve access to quality and timely mental health and psychosocial rehabilitation services for survivors/victims of torture in South Africa and Regionally. Activities will take place both in CSVr's clinics in Johannesburg and Pretoria through model development, testing, and documentation as well as in the Marikana community through the integration of mental health into CSVr's community approach, thereby transferring highly specialised interventions to a community level. This will increase outreach to those whose vulnerabilities make it difficult to access highly specialised services in the clinics (such as refugees, asylum seekers, women, children; LGBTIQ+ etc.)

The partnership between CSVr and DIGNITY builds on complementary competences, mutual technical competences and credibility to enhance sustainable solutions for the benefit of TOV survivors/victims. The partnership particularly seeks to enhance synergetic effects of each organisations' complementarity within the following areas:

- Facilitation of access to new learning and knowledge on the integration of mental health into a community approach, thereby enhancing the possibilities to document and scale up new evidence-based approaches and methods
- Facilitation of data sharing; thereby enabling dissemination of important learnings and promising practice and norm-setting (e.g. through joint publications) as a means to influencing policies and practices for the benefit of TOV survivors
- Facilitation of North-South, South-North and South-South learning, thereby enhancing capacity building of like-minded organisations and institutions as well as relevant duty-bearers

## **THE COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND GOOD GOVERNANCE (CHRAGG), TANZANIA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** The Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance (CHRAGG) is the Tanzanian National Human Rights Institution and Ombudsman institution, formally independent from the government. CHRAGG has the mission to independently promote and protect all human rights, duties and principles of administrative justice in order to enhance democracy, rule of law and good governance in Tanzania. CHRAGG was established under Article 129(1) of the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania of 1977 as amended by Act No. 3 of 2000 and became operational on the 1st of July 2001 under the CHRAGG Act of 2001. The CHRAGG Act was updated in 2003 and allowed CHRAGG to operate in Zanzibar. One of CHRAGG's core functions as also stipulated in the CHRAGG Act is to monitor places of detention. CHRAGG is the only body officially mandated to conduct independent monitoring visits to places of detention, while NGOs have difficulties accessing those places.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** There are over 200 places of detention in Tanzania, spread across its 33 regions. These places are too often characterized by deplorable conditions, including overcrowding (partly due to the extensive use of pre-trial detention), and accommodation, nutrition and health care services below national and international standards. Independent monitoring of places of detention is thought to be one of the most effective ways to prevent torture and ill-treatment and address deplorable conditions in these places. CHRAGG's mandate and access to places of detention highlights the relevance of a partnership between CHRAGG and DIGNITY.

In October 2017, CHRAGG and DIGNITY met to discuss the current situation, challenges and the needs of the institution in order to professionalise and scale-up independent monitoring visits to places of detention. Two specific challenges were identified: 1) Limited capacity to monitor places of detention for adults, including health-related capacity, 2) Lack of guidelines and tools to monitor places of detention for adults. A project was developed to address these issues and a contract was signed in 2018. The overall development objective of the agreed project was to strengthen CHRAGG's monitoring capacity which in turn will contribute to improved conditions and treatment in places of detention for adults in Tanzania.

During phase one of the project, a baseline assessment of the current capacity of CHRAGG to monitor places of detention for adults, and of current guidelines, tools, procedures and practices in place was conducted. The baseline assessment report paved the way for essential discussions between CHRAGG and DIGNITY on the topic as well as shaped the detailed workplan for the project. Phase two of the project, focuses on strengthening CHRAGG's monitoring methodology, procedures and practices, in line with international standards and best practice of preventive monitoring. An essential part of this phase is developing relevant guidelines and tools on monitoring places of detention for adults. The project cooperation with CHRAGG up to now implies a need for further capacity building in the area of preventive monitoring.

### **THE LIBERIA ASSOCIATION OF PSYCHOSOCIAL SERVICES (LAPS), LIBERIA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** The Liberia Association of Psychosocial Services (LAPS) is a Liberian non-governmental organization, established in August 2007 and is dedicated to bring relief to survivors of war trauma and torture as well as GBV of all age groups, so as to enable them effectively function in their communities.

LAPS strives to achieve this goal through a wide range of activities, including raising community awareness on psychosocial and mental health related issues; trauma recovery and associated psychosocial activities, training of community members and leaders as well as partner organizations and agencies, and continuing capacity building of its own psychosocial counsellors.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Fourteen years of civil war in Liberia has not only killed thousands of people, but also damaged much of Liberia's infrastructure including health and social service provision, with the capital city of Monrovia being greatly impacted. Vast numbers of rural communities have migrated to urban areas. Now that the civil war has ended, many of the internally displaced persons (IDPs), in particular young adults have been compelled by the current situation to remain in Monrovia, as Monrovia is viewed to be the place with most potential for acquiring a better standard of living. Besides the influx from rural Liberia, resident numbers of Monrovia are also increasing due to more children being born. As a result, new communities have emerged in locations surrounding Monrovia that, in the past, were regarded as uninhabitable. Consequently, the population of Monrovia has increased greatly relative to the size of the city, as well as compared to the available infrastructural and social services. Monrovia is now overcrowded, hosting about 40 percent of Liberia's total population of 4,9 million people (approx. 2 million people). The presence of young adults who lack professional skills in these new communities, has contributed to the overall increased rate of unemployment in Monrovia as a whole.

No concrete action has been taken by shifting governments to minimize the growing risks that are being posed to the survival needs of these groups of young people. Instead, the young peoples' relationships with law enforcement officers keeps getting worse. In response, the young people have been very violent in communicating their resentment in the ways they are being treated. The continuation of this fragile social relationships between young

people and state actors in a quickly growing Monrovia is a “breeding ground” for continuous torture and violence as well as, posing a threat to the post-war stability and recovery efforts of Liberia.

From June 1, 2015 to December 31, 2018, DIGNITY supported LAPS in identifying at risk groups and offered them services with the overall goals of making them functional members of society and prevent urban violence in one of Monrovia’s slum communities called Samuel K. Doe Community. During the years LAPS in collaboration with the other members of the Global Alliance (GA), developed local psychosocial approaches that focused on combining preventative and healing work through community-led interventions with risk groups, their families, their neighbors’ and wider communities, as well as, the authorities that perpetrate violence to maintain order.

The current partnership engagement builds on the results and lessons learned from the above-mentioned project in SKD community. It focuses on expanding outreach and secure sustainability of the intervention efforts at the same time focus on targeted advocacy work nationally and internationally to influence normative framework and social change.

The partnership builds on complementarities between DIGNITY and LAPS. LAPS is a key actor in facilitating access to mental health care for poor and marginalised populations in Liberia and they also play an important role in national mental health networks to ensure experience and coordination among formal and informal health structures, as well as training of other stakeholders such as Médecins Sans Frontières (MFS) in stress management and self-care. DIGNITY provides technical and organisational support and facilitates access to DIGNITY’s network and alliances

## **MIDRIFT HURINET, KENYA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Midrift Hurinet is a Non-profit organization founded in 2008, with the aim to empower citizens, the state and non-state actors to inculcate a culture of human rights, peace, safety, and security in Kenya. Through inter-sectoral partnership and collaboration geared towards collective action for collective impact, it drives positive and sustainable change in realization of Sustainable Development Goals (Goal 5&16) and all those goals that address known risk factors associated with violence. Midrift Hurinet currently operates in the counties of Nakuru, (with plans to start in Baringo, and Kisumu- post-poned by COVID-19 security measures)

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Nakuru and Naivasha Municipalities experience high levels of violence: Organised violence; Gender Based Violence (GBV); Political Violence; resource-based violence, and so-called ‘everyday violence’. The latter is the form of violence that people experience as part of their everyday life in the public and private domains e.g. theft and beatings. These forms of violence have multifaceted causal factors and are interrelated. The violence affects everyone; the business community, families and especially women and children; the youth - many of whom are socially and economically disenfranchised; school going children, motorcycle and bicycle operators. The presence of organised gangs which were not demobilised after the 2007/2008 Post Election Violence; and the mushrooming of new form of violent gangs is a threat to the resident’s security as well as to peaceful general elections scheduled for August 2017. There is widespread Gender Based Violence mainly against women and children. The GBV cases are entrenched due to a culture of violence that doesn’t acknowledge nor respect the rights of the women and children.



While there are actors that seek to prevent the violence, there is poor coordination between these stakeholders and therefore duplication of efforts and lower impact of the interventions. This poor intersectoral coordination is due to poor leadership among the stakeholders in coordinating the violence prevention efforts; lack of a platform to engage; and, until recently, poor understanding among some stakeholders on the need for a coordinated effort on violence prevention.

However, DIGNITY partner MidRift Hurinet has made progress in the promotion of intersectoral dialogue and coordination in urban violence prevention. Still, much more efforts are required to promote effective intersectoral coordination of violence prevention initiatives. Initial problem analysis (2016) identified that these initiatives include to set up a County urban violence prevention policy; data collection on violence reporting, analysis, sharing and responses to the reported violent incidents.

The current project activities with Kenyan partner MidRift aims to establish mechanisms for urban violence prevention in Nakuru and Naivasha municipalities, Nakuru County. More specifically, DIGNITY's collaboration on urban violence prevention with Midrift aims to develop facilitators to scale up Place-Based leadership Development as a means to enhance mindset change towards creating collective impact.

In addition, The International Rehabilitation unit in DIGNITY started exploring opportunities for an intervention in relation to the Inter-sectoral Urban Violence Prevention (IUVP) intervention that has been ongoing in Nakuru County since 2015. The initial work has shown attractive opportunities as there are great gaps in the rehabilitation of survivors of violence in the area; the local partner has shown ability to undertake work on rehabilitation; the local stakeholders involved in the IUVP intervention are willing to work with mental health concerns, and new stakeholders have expressed competence and interest in greatly improving the rehabilitation of survivors of violence in Nakuru county.

## **AFRICAN CENTRE FOR TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF TORTURE VICTIMS (ACTV), UGANDA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** ACTV's vision is "A world free from Torture". The mission of the organisation is to advocate against torture and provide holistic care to survivors. It is licensed by the Ugandan Ministry of Health to operate medical referral centres that provide physical and psychological treatment in support to other rehabilitation of torture survivors from Uganda and neighboring countries. ACTV is also accredited to International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT). In line with DIGNITY, ACTV has a holistic approach to rehabilitation, combining various disciplines including physical and psychological support, medical treatment, social work and legal advices. Besides the clinical work, ACTV uses a community approach which includes community counsellors and peer support groups as well as collaboration with CBOs who provides basic psychological support and counselling.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Uganda generally experience security concerns, tensions between political and cultural authorities and shrinking space for civil society. At community level this is often transformed into violence in various forms, including authority-based violence, GBV, and harmful traditional practices. The high level of conflict and violence has devastating impact on peoples' mental health condition. In the Kasese district where ACTV and DIGNITY is working, the number of people with severe depression, anxiety and PTSD is high. At the same time there is a significant gap in the provision of rehabilitation services - formal structures to provide psychosocial services to survivors of torture and violence is almost non-existent.

ACTV is generally recognized as an organisation with a high degree of credibility at local, national and international level. At local level, ACTV plays an important role as a civil society actor carrying providing MHPSS to survivors of torture and violence and carrying out awareness raising e in local communities. At national level, ACTV carries out advocacy for the ratification of the OPCAT and the implementation of the Prevention and Prohibition of Torture Act No. 3 of 12 and they play an important role in promoting compensation for survivors of torture. Besides, ACTV has been given the mandate to train the police, the military and prison staff and they play an important role in training relevant people on the Istanbul protocol and in bridging the gap between lawyers and medical staff.

The partnership between ACTV and DIGNITY seeks to enhance access to timely and quality rehabilitation to survivors of torture and other forms of violence in the sub-counties of Bwesumbu and Maliba local in Kasese District of Uganda through the implementation of ACTV's community. The partnership between ACTV and DIGNITY takes advantage of the existing complementary competences. As such, DIGNITY plays a particular role in terms of ensuring appropriate capacity development and efforts to scale-up and influence policies and practices, e.g. through facilitation of south-south learning, regional networking and advocacy. ACTV is key to facilitating outreach to beneficiaries, ensuring testing and documenting the MHPSS interventions and strengthening collaboration with relevant authorities and stakeholders.

## **HURA, UGANDA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Human Rights Activists Elgon Sub-Region (HURA) is a registered Human Rights NGO in Uganda operating in Eastern Uganda. It started its operations in 2012 and it works to protect and promote the rights of the citizens. It is an independent, not for profit, non-partisan organization. HURA's area of operation stretches across the six districts of Bugisu sub-region, Sebei sub-region, Greater Tororo District and some districts of Eastern Busoga.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** The current collaboration is a 'junior' part of DIGNITY's Intersectoral Urban Violence Prevention (IUVP) programme, and the selection of the intervention area Mbale municipality and the collaboration with HURA was started with pilot activities in 2017, as part of the results from the comprehensive DIGNITY pre-investigations in 2014-2016 aimed at starting up IUVP programme activities in East Africa. The criteria for selection was based on lessons learned from the Central American IUVP programme, namely:

- Security – avoiding partners & stakeholders get killed.
- Political will – especially at police and local government. (To get success the collaborative cross sector work needs to be demand driven)
- Stakeholders - Leaders/NGOs with implementation capacity
- Blue ocean- not red ocean of competing violence prevention initiatives. (difficult to measure impact, - factor of attribution)
- Manageable size of municipality – often not the capital city, but municipality outside (national politics melt into local politics in capital city - too much or too little political interest)

The implementing partner, HURA is relatively young and weak, while all the other above criteria are met in Mbale. Therefore, main pilot activities aim to establish the needed capacity at the partner organization.

The current mini- project is part of DIGNITYs Intersectoral Urban Violence Prevention (IUVP) programme and has extensive south-south collaboration and mentoring from MidRift Hurinet, Kenyan IUVP program.

The overall objective is to establish mechanisms of urban violence prevention in Mbale Municipality, and activities are rather limited and centered on creating basic conditions for collective action in violence prevention. The specific objective focus on:

- Strengthening institutions for violence prevention
- Enhanced Intersectoral dialogue on urban violence prevention
- Established partnership between Police, Mbale Municipal Government, CSOs and other stakeholders on urban violence prevention.
- Capacity building of HURA through the learning visit to MidRift Nakuru and Financial Management training and Quick books.
- Strengthening South-South Collaborations in Urban Violence Prevention

In addition, the collaboration aims towards the creation of a ‘middle ground’ between police and citizens in Uganda, which will strengthen community policing, amongst other, through providing up-to-date information on the rights and duties of the Uganda Police Force and of the citizens in relation to policing.

## **ASSISTANCE ASSOCIATION FOR POLITICAL PRISONERS (AAPP), MYANMAR**

---

**PRESENTATION:** The Assistance Association for Political Prisoners (Burma), known as AAPP, is a human rights organization based in Mae Sot, Thailand and Yangon, Burma. AAPP advocates for the release of all remaining political prisoners in Burma and the improvement of their quality of life during and after incarceration. AAPP has developed rehabilitation and assistance programs for those political activists who have been released while continuing to document the ongoing imprisonment of political activists in Burma.

Anchored in its long-term activism, strong membership base and commitment to human rights, AAPP is the most central CSO in prison reform in Myanmar. AAPP has recently expanded its activities from political prisoner issues to the broader justice sector and prison reform activities – including closer dialogue with authorities, legislators and the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission, advocating for UNCAT, ICCPR related issues and legislative reform (including the prisons law; the human rights commission law and the laws related to freedom of expression).

AAPP has successfully adapted to the on-going political transformations within Burma. AAPP works to achieve national reconciliation and to help transform Burma into a free and democratic society, where no political prisoners remain incarcerated and individuals’ civil and political rights are protected, fulfilled, and maintained.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Decades of authoritarian rule and military dictatorship in Myanmar, has led to a widespread lack of trust in and fear of the state system and its ability to maintain the rule of law, including the Child Rights Act, enacted July 2019. Due to Myanmar’s ethnic and cultural diversity, a plurality of community-based justice systems exists in parallel to the formal justice system. Most families resolve conflicts using community-based justice systems, to avoid the formal justice system which is seen as unsympathetic and overly punitive. With limited resources, child-

offenders from poor families, orphans, or street children, are unable to avail themselves in the avenue of community-based justice systems which often relies on payments between families. Their cases are most often processed in the formal justice system, causing an overrepresentation of the most vulnerable groups in youth detention centres. The end-beneficiaries of this project are the most vulnerable children whose pathways in and out of Myanmar's juvenile detention system are poorly understood.

In 2020, AAPP and DIGNITY engaged in a pilot project to improve research-based understandings of juvenile detention in Myanmar to enhance the protection of children against violence and abuse. The joint vision of working for both prevention of and rehabilitation after torture underscores the potential for increased collaboration as well as efficient and synergetic implementation strategies in the future. AAPP's key strengths include ability and willingness to engage in dialogue with state authorities, legislators and other actors involved with penal reform as well as its demonstrated access and skill in working with children in conflict with the law made AAPP a strong partner in the pursuit of developing knowledge on youth detention in the region<sup>1</sup>. AAPP's strengths complement well DIGNITY's ambition to develop knowledge that attends to the dynamics that might give rise to torture and expose children in detention to human rights violations as well as practices and processes that might inhibit their exposure to violence and abuse.

This project constitutes the first phase of a longer term AAPP-DIGNITY partnership. In its knowledge generations, the project aims to elicit a range of institutional effects and the perspectives of different actors on juvenile detention, and this way attend to the dynamics that might give rise to torture and expose children in detention to human rights violations as well as practices and processes that might inhibit their exposure to violence and abuse.

## **FORPOST, UKRAINE**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Forpost has, since 2014, on a voluntary basis, offered psychological assistance to people traumatized by torture and conflict. Since February 2015, Forpost has, in cooperation with SICH, been providing a complex rehabilitation programme which includes psychological, medical, legal and social assistance to survivors of ill-treatment and torture, including victims from the conflict in Eastern Ukraine.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** The main office of Forpost and their rehabilitation center is situated in Dnipro City – the fourth largest city of Ukraine with around one million inhabitants. Its location determines its role as the key transit point between central and eastern Ukraine. This is one of the reasons why the center has high number of clients from the eastern conflict areas. The center has good collaboration with the medical hospitals in the city which allows them to refer their clients for medical treatment if needed. It can also refer clients for legal assistance at the local legal aid group SICH. Forpost is comprised of highly experienced and qualified technical staff as well as well-developed managerial systems and processes. Based on the results of DIGNITY's pre-investigation missions in Ukraine, the currently on-going EU project was developed, which aims to strengthen the capacity of non-state and state health and legal professionals in the provision of an intersectoral and integrated approach to torture and CIDTP survivors, including referral, legal and rehabilitative services and advocacy on torture and CIDTP.

---

<sup>1</sup> DIGNITY has engagements in South East Asia with a thematic focus on juvenile justice, for example, "Following the Child" in the Philippines (with partners Balay and CLRDC) and "Botnar"-project in Indonesia.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION GROUP, UKRAINE**

---

**PRESENTATION:** NGO Human Rights Protection Group – SICH: SICH is a registered non-profit organisation, formally established in 2014. SICH has over the last years, carried out over thirty visits to detention facilities in Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk and Zaporizhia regions. SICH carry out monitoring on the basis of Article 24 of the Correctional Code of Ukraine. According to their mandate, SICH has the right to access all places of detention.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** SICH pursues litigation for purposes of compensation as well as accountability for victims of torture. To date, 58 petitions have been submitted to the European Court of Human Rights which involve applicants who are torture survivors. These cases were also used in international reports and transmitted to the EU national parliaments and the International Criminal Court. The main office of Forpost and SICH and their rehabilitation center is situated in Dnipro City – the fourth largest city of Ukraine, with around one million inhabitants. Its location determines its role as the key transit point between central and eastern Ukraine. SICH also has a regional office in Kramatorsk. SICH staff are currently teaching at the University of Customs and Finance in Dnipro and Oles Honchar Dnipro National University. Through affiliations with these universities, our partners have direct access to different faculties and student associations in the eastern part of Ukraine. Based on the results of DIGNITY's pre-investigation missions in Ukraine, the currently on-going EU project was developed, which aims to strengthen the capacity of non-state and state health and legal professionals in the provision of an intersectoral and integrated approach to torture and CIDTP survivors, including referral, legal and rehabilitative services and advocacy on torture and CIDTP.

## **VIASNA, BELARUS**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Human Rights Center "Viasna" is a non-governmental human rights organization, created in 1996 during mass protest actions of the democratic opposition in Belarus. Viasna was initially a group created to help the arrested rally participants and their families. That's why Viasna originally had the name "Viasna-96". On 15 June 1999 the organization was registered as the Human Rights Center "Viasna". It is a national NGO with the central office in Minsk and regional organizations in the majority of Belarusian cities. Viasna has about 200 members all over the country.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Viasna is one of the very few human rights organisations, which is documenting cases of torture. Viasna has documented at least 500 cases of torture against detainees, testifying to their massive and systematic use since August 11, 2020. DIGNITY's current partnership activities with Viasna aim to support Belarussian civil society to document torture and provide rehabilitation to survivors of torture by providing capacity building and producing a practical guide for laypeople on how to document ill-treatment inflicted by the authorities in Belarus.

## **PUBLIC COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE IN ISRAEL (PCATI), PALESTINE**

---

**PRESENTATION:** The Public Committee against Torture in Israel is an Israeli NGO established in 1990 that monitors the use of torture and ill-treatment by Israeli security services against Palestinians under detention. PCATI's mandate includes the prevention and eradication of all forms of torture and CIDT in Israel and the protection of human rights in general. Means to accomplish this include provision of legal support, documentation of

institutional torture and violence, legal advocacy, legislative advocacy, public outreach, international civil society cooperation/coalition work and international advocacy.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** Although Israel is a signatory to the UNCAT and other relevant human rights instruments, torture is still not criminalized in Israel. Moreover, accountability procedures remain inefficient and are often artificial, thereby granting perpetrators impunity. “Enhanced interrogation methods” (that amount to torture) continue as a long-standing tool used by the Israeli Security Agency, the Israeli Police and the Israeli Prison Services against groups of the society considered to be security threats, and in particular, the use of torture methods that leave no visible marks (referred to as non-physical torture, no-touch torture or psychological torture) is increasing. Meanwhile, there is a tendency of the Israeli society at large to become more and more extreme in their opinions against human rights, and the police and security services’ use of torture enjoys wide public acceptance because it is applied mostly against Palestinians who are perceived in the Israelis’ mindset as potential terrorists. For more than two decades, PCATI has been challenging this acceptance of torture and ill-treatment and the high degree of impunity within the Israeli security and legal systems.

DIGNITY started its collaboration with PCATI in 2014. PCATI is uniquely placed as the only Israeli organization specifically mandated to defend the prohibition of torture and other forms of ill-treatment. Furthermore, they are heavily engaged in coalition building and cooperation with likeminded Israeli and Palestinian NGOs. PCATI’s broad access to victims of torture in detention, their insight into the use of non-physical torture as well as the large amount of data from their legal database (containing data on more than 4,000 Israeli cases of torture from the past 20 years) are particularly valuable to DIGNITY in the current project phase.

The current joint project aims at enhancing the use of big data (patterns and trends) as a tool in increasing duty bearers’ awareness of their responsibility to ensure that allegations of non-physical torture are investigated according to international standards, that perpetrators are prosecuted and punished, and that victims are adequately redressed. More specifically, the focus is on monitoring and documenting incidences of torture, in particular with a view to documenting the use of non-physical torture; continue testing new methods of documenting non-physical torture; refining the collection, analysis and use of quantitative data; and strengthening advocacy efforts at national and international level for the eradication of non-physical torture methods. PCATI is a part of an international Expert Group on Psychological Torture (consisting of various researchers, human rights activists, lawyers psychologists and doctors and set up jointly by DIGNITY, REDRESS and PCATI in 2015), which currently focuses on developing and testing new protocols, as supplements to the Istanbul Protocol, for documenting non-physical torture such as sleep deprivation, threats and solitary confinement.

## **LAWYERS FOR JUSTICE IN LIBYA, LIBYA**

---

**PRESENTATION:** Lawyers for Justice in Libya (LFJL) is a key human rights organisation in Libya that was established during the 2011 uprising by a group of six lawyers who wanted to support Libya’s transition to a state which embodies the values and principles of human rights and the rule of law and is a society committed to justice. LFJL maintains a growing network of talented Libyan lawyers and activists, currently in excess of 70 individuals and organisations, who work on the ground across all regions in Libya. It also works closely with the Coalition of Libyan Human Rights Organisations (the Coalition), which it brought together in order to share knowledge and engage in joint advocacy activities. LFJL has formed partnerships with a

number of organisations engaged in the fight against torture in Libya and international organizations, such as REDRESS based in London and DIGNITY.

**JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION:** LFJL and DIGNITY began an equal partnership cooperation in 2014 with the aim of supporting the capacity building of the emerging civil society in Libya and of key professionals. Criteria for selection since have been justified by their engagement in the documentation of torture, litigation and advocacy for victims of torture. LFJL has, through its network in Libya, access to victims of torture and their families. Moreover, LFJL has accountability actions before international and regional mechanisms including the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights and the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations. LFJL is considered to be the most established and best qualified among Libya’s human rights NGOs and has great credibility among actors both in and outside Libya. The organization is known for its impartiality and “clean/straight line” concerning violations from all sides.

#### 4. SUMMARY OF KEY PARTNER FEATURES

*[Provide a brief presentation of key features of each partner by using the table below. Reference can be made to annex a. and to other analyses, including the financial capacity assessment. For country programmes the presentation can be made by thematic programme with a separate sub-heading.]*

Partner name <i>What is the name of the partner?</i>	Core business <i>What is the main business, interest and goal of the partner?</i>	Importance <i>How important is the programme for the partner’s activity-level (Low, medium high)?</i>	Influence <i>How much influence does the partner have over the programme (low, medium, high)?</i>	Contribution <i>What will be the partner’s main contribution?</i>	Capacity <i>What are the main issues emerging from the assessment of the partner’s capacity?</i>	Exit strategy <i>What is the strategy for exiting the partnership?</i>
Prison Watch Sierra Leone	Monitoring of human rights violations and abuses in detention centers and police stations throughout the country  Fostering dialogue	High. DIGNITY’s project constitutes currently all of PWSL’s activities.	Medium to high, as the outcomes and outputs specified in the agreement is a product of joint development between DIGNITY and PWSL	Monitoring visits and advocacy  Data collection and analysis  Facilitating trainings  Advocacy reports and meetings	Strength:  Large network with monitors around the country and access to all detention facilities in the country as well as several police stations. Strong relations with prison	No exit strategy has been drawn up but the development of this is part of the next project phase.  However, ongoing capacity development constitutes and

	<p>Dissemination of knowledge around detention conditions and changing public perception of prisoners and the penal system</p> <p>Legislative reforms of the penal system</p>			Dissemination of knowledge	<p>authorities and other relevant state institutions.</p> <p>Weakness:</p> <p>Small secretariat with risk of loss of knowledge and connections in the case of staff turnover.</p>	important part of strengthening the independency of PWSL
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	<p>Provision of high-specialised MHPSS</p> <p>Transfer of highly specialised MHPSS to community level</p> <p>Dissemination of knowledge and advocacy to influence normative framework</p>	<p>Medium: DIGNITY's support constitutes approximately 50 % of total funding to the organization</p>	<p>High: Priorities and projects are jointly developed and programmatic interventions are clearly linked to the CSVR's strategic objectives</p>	<p>Adapting tools and the model to be contextually relevant,</p> <p>Facilitating access to new learning and knowledge on the integration of mental health into a community approach,</p> <p>Data collection and sharing</p> <p>Facilitating North-South, South-North and South-South learning,</p>	<p>CSVV is generally a strong organisation with high degree of expertise both in mental health and research.</p> <p>They also have high capacity within financial administration</p> <p>There is a need for CSVV to strengthen their communication- and fundraising skills</p>	<p>Ongoing capacity development constitutes and important part of strengthening the independency of CSVV</p> <p>An exist strategy will be jointly developed in the beginning of 2021. It will focus on CSVV's role as a key regional actor and their potentials for gaining access to more funding</p>



	Facilitation of south-south learning and joint advocacy					
The Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	Preventive monitoring of places of detention.	High in the sense that DIGNITY is the only partner who supports capacity building in this area. Relatively low considering activity-level since the partnership has started out with a small-scale project.	Medium, as the objectives and outputs specified in the agreement is a product of joint development between DIGNITY and CHRAGG.	CHRAGG will mainly be contributing to the development of guidelines and tools for monitoring places of detention.	CHRAGG is not conducting preventive monitoring visits but rather only fulfilling their mandate of inspections to the extent resources allow.  CHRAGG has low capacity within financial administration.	During the project guidelines and tools will be developed which CHRAGG can continue to use after the end of the project. The capacity building is targeting a large group of monitors with the aim of changing practices within the monitoring mechanism followed up through a systematic MEAL plan.
The Liberia Association of Psychosocial Services	Provision of MHPS in local communities  Violence prevention and awareness raising  Establishment of referral	High: DIGNITY's support constitutes almost all funding to the organization	High: Priorities and projects are jointly developed and programmatic interventions are clearly linked to the LAPS strategic objectives	Adapting tools and the model to be contextually relevant  Facilitating access to new learning and knowledge on the integration of mental health into a community approach	LAPS is a recognized organisation both at local and national level. They are experienced in providing basic MHPSS and violence prevention and	Ongoing capacity development constitutes and important part of strengthening the independency of LAPS  The next project phase will be developed in the

	<p>mechanisms in local community</p> <p>Key actor health coordination network with health authority and relevant stakeholders at national level</p> <p>Advocacy for improved access to MHPSS services</p>			Data s collection and sharing	<p>have competent and experienced technical staff.</p> <p>LAPS has low-medium capacity in financial administration and low communication and fundraising skills</p>	<p>beginning of 2021. This will focus on closing the capacity gaps of LAPS and the development of an exit strategy</p>
Midrift Hurinet	<p>Evidence based urban violence prevention at municipality level, with focus on establishing collaborative networks of sector leaders able to work together across all relevant urban sectors achieving collective impact on the theme (IUVP).</p> <p>In collaboration with local health</p>	High. DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes approximately 70% of total funding to the organization	High. Strong partnership where all program concepts are developed in participatory partnership workshops, with inputs from continuous evaluations and latest evidence on 'what works'	Development, implementation and validation of a 'bottom up' approach focusing on 'local governance' with anticipated mid-to-long-terms 'trickle up' effects (as different from national governance), and implementation of Constitutional Infrastructure and national policing laws and regulations (constitution as an instrument of change) at municipality level, - drawing inspiration from 'middle-ground ' Human	Impact assessment show: Strong capacity to implement trust-building approaches, through place-based leadership development challenging and changing mind-set, values, relations and relationships aimed at creating 'rich interconnectivity', creating resourceful	Scaling up the place-based leadership development programme for preventing violence and creating safe communities, and local anchoring in 'backbone structures' will create a larger pool of sector leaders with cross sector collaboration and enhance the out-reach of the

	<p>authorities, providing basic MHPSS to survivors of GBV and awareness raising mental health and GBV</p> <p>Strengthening referral mechanisms</p>			<p>Right Based Approaches and Human Security Approaches. Strong outreach: Reached 12.000 direct beneficiaries (49% women) in the last phase, and is now scaling up.</p>	<p>collaboratives of leaders and their constituencies and in establishing effective referral mechanisms</p>	<p>organization toward creating 'critical mass' and 'tipping point' sustainable actions, in the intervention municipalities. This very systematic and impactful work attracts interests and financing from other international agencies. Diversification of funding has gained momentum in the latest year.</p> <p>Midrift is in dialogue with the Ministry of health in terms of integrating the MHPS activities in the local health clinics</p>
African Centre for Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture Victims	Provision of holistic rehabilitation both in their clinics, in prisons and in local communities	Low: DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes approximately 10 % of total funding	High: Priorities and projects are jointly developed and programmatic interventions are clearly linked to	Testing new methods and sharing knowledge generated through the interventions and studies with relevant authorities and stakeholders	ACTV has strong organisational capacities. It operates two clinics, one in Kampala and one in Gulu with highly	No exit strategy has been developed. However, ongoing capacity development constitutes and

	<p>Transferring high expertise to community level through a community model</p> <p>Advocacy for the ratification of the OPCAT and the implementation of the Prevention and Prohibition of Torture Act No. 3 of 12</p> <p>Training the police, the military and prison staff and they play an important role in training relevant people on the Istanbul protocol</p> <p>Board member of IRCT</p> <p>Observer status at the African Commission of People and Human Rights</p>	to the organization	the ACTV's strategic objectives	Facilitating south-south network of members throughout the country as well as a wide range of relationships with important partners, networks and institutions	<p>specialised clinical staff, M&amp;E units and a programme management team</p> <p>They have medium capacity in financial administration</p>	<p>important part of DIGNITY's exit strategy with ACTV</p> <p>All activities takes place in collaboration with relevant authorities to ensure local anchoring and ownership potentials for scaling up and gaining access to access to funding.</p>
Hura	Evidence based urban violence	Very High. DIGNITY direct	Low: All project concepts are	Organizing that leaders come together for	Latest DIGNITY assessment:	DIGNITY is considering

	prevention at municipality level, with focus on establishing collaborative networks of sector leaders able to work together across all relevant urban sectors achieving collective impact on the theme	financial support constitutes 90%+ (of a very limited budget though)	developed in participatory partnership workshops, with inputs from lessons learned from Kenya and Central America IUVP programs and latest evidence on 'what works', - but HURA has t been unable to contribute with any substantial added value to the project concepts.	workshops, so far where DIGNITY provides the main capacity building.	Weak organizational capacity. The organization is able to implement simple 'service delivery' - humanitarian type programs, such as the Covid-19 preventive measures, and very basic intersectoral coordination,- but has a very long way still before becoming a 'development organization' able to implement a IUVP program.	reorganizing the activities in Mbale, Uganda, including assessing the need for a different implementation partner/modality than HURA.
CIPREVICA	Evidence based urban violence prevention at municipality level, with focus on establishing collaborative networks of sector leaders able to work together across all relevant urban sectors achieving	Medium: DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes 30% of total CIPREVICA funding	High: Strong partnership where all program concepts are developed in highly participatory partnership workshops, with inputs from continuous evaluations and	High.: Strong partnership where all program concepts are developed in highly participatory partnership workshops, with inputs from continuous evaluations and latest evidence on 'what works'  Develop ment, implementation and validation of a	Latest assessment show: Strong capacity to innovate, communicate, adapt and create critical lessons learned on relevant actions in very violent urban contexts, with implications beyond the CA-	Scaling up the actions from 2 to 4 intervention municipalities, with an optimized and more cost-efficient intervention model, and strategic evaluations will create increased legitimacy of the partner

	collective impact on the theme		latest evidence on 'what works'	'bottom up' approach focusing on 'local governance' using a working model building on: Research and building evidence; Building Knowledge Communities through capacity building by sector; Creating Practice Communities, by providing technical assistance to initiatives by sector; Intersectoral knowledge exchanges;. Social laboratories, where strategic support is given to local intersectoral initiatives for intersectoral urban violence prevention. Strong outreach: Reached 15.000+ direct beneficiaries (66% women) in the last phase and is now scaling up.	IUVP program, heavily influencing the development of the IUVP program in Africa. Expert organization in capacity building (educación popular- adult education) on both presential and virtual platforms. One of DIGNITY strongest partners in terms of financial administration.	organization in the region. DIGNITY and CIPREVICA have been using this to create stronger diversification of funding in the later years paving the way for DIGNITY to withdraw.
Assistance Association for Political Prisoners	Provide assistance and training to current/former political prisoners and their families.	Low. DIGNITY's 12-month support constitutes 15 % of AAPP's 2020 organizational budget.	Medium, as the project's outputs and objectives were jointly developed by AAPP and DIGNITY.	Human resources for research and access to juvenile detention centres for researchers  Skills needed for tailoring study design	In assessing the capacity of AAPP, DIGNITY identified a need to include capacity building elements on the application of up-to-date financial	To ensure sustainability of the intervention, the project aims at strengthening AAPP's capacity to conduct research activities

	<p>Offer mental health counseling and training CBOs in mental health counseling.</p> <p>Promoting human rights through human rights awareness sessions and training, documentation, and transitional justice.</p> <p>Documenting violations of human rights and disseminating knowledge of political prisoner issues.</p> <p>Collaborate with CSOs, governments, and international organizations on prison reform as well as institutional, legislative, and policy reforms relating to civil</p>			<p>and protocol to be suitable for the local context.</p> <p>Carrying out the study</p> <p>A strong network for advocacy.</p>	<p>management software.</p>	<p>for the purpose of becoming a stronger advocate for penal reform in Myanmar, and eventually carry out research on juvenile justice independently. DIGNITY will continuously monitor the progress of its project engagement with AAPP.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	and political rights.					
Children's Legal Rights and Development Center	Legal assistance, welfare and rehabilitation services to children in conflict with the law	Medium: Partner has other national and international donors.	Medium: The outputs specified in the agreement are developed and implemented by CLRDC in close cooperation with DIGNITY and Balay.	Partner is in charge of coordinating and implementing activities with State and local authorities/communities. DIGNITY provides technical support.	CLRDC is a small organization with highly qualified staff. Partnership with DIGNITY in a large EU-funded project will enable CLRDC to expand the scope of its activities and help to attract new funding.	Partnership is time-bound and lasts for the duration of the EU-funded project, until January 2023.
Forpost	Medicolegal documentation of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment rehabilitation of torture survivors and their families advocacy	Medium: DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes 35% of Forpost annual income	Medium: The project was developed in close collaboration with Forpost	Programme coordination and oversight during implementation Coordination of the referral network of health and legal professionals	Highly experienced and qualified clinical psychologists as well as well-developed managerial systems and processes.	No special requirements after end of contract
Human Rights Protection Group	Medicolegal documentation of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or	Medium: DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes 40% of PWSL annual income.	Medium: The project was developed in close collaboration with SICH	Programme coordination and oversight during implementation	Highly experienced and qualified lawyers, and human rights defenders as well as well-developed managerial	No special requirements after end of contract



	punishment Monitoring of human rights violations				systems and processes	
Viasna	Monitoring of human rights violations in Belarus Documentation and litigation of torture inflicted by the authorities in Belarus Advocacy	Low: DIGNITY does not provide any direct financial support to Viasna. DIGNITY provides technical and capacity building assistance	Medium: The project was developed based on Viasna's needs	Coordination of the trainings	Highly experienced and qualified lawyers, human rights defenders	No special requirements after end of contract
Public Committee against Torture in Israel	Monitoring and documenting torture of particularly Palestinian detainees.  Changing the public perception of and attitude towards the use of torture  Legislative reforms and an end to the impunity provided to perpetrators	Medium. DIGNITY direct financial support constitutes a maximum of 10 % of PCATI's annual income. But PCATI benefits from DIGNITY's network and connections as well as particular legal and medical knowledge.	Medium. The outputs in the agreement is the result of joint negotiations between PCATI and DIGNITY. However, some outputs have been a requirement for funding from DIGNITY.	Monitoring visits Legal services Data collection and analysis Advocacy meetings Testing and local adjustment of relevant documentation protocols Development of alternative reports to relevant UN bodies	Strength: Passionate and highly qualified staff able to adjust quickly to new circumstances. Large amount of insightful data ready to be used for advocacy and research. Access to detention facilities and victims of torture as well as duty bearers. Broad outreach and strong working relations/coalitions with other	Good fundraising strategy and broader donor portfolio in place

					<p>Palestinian and Israeli NGOs.</p> <p>Weakness: Online presence and digital means need overhaul in order to adjust to the challenges of today.</p> <p>Opportunities: Can test and contextualize new protocols on non-physical torture. Could contribute with knowledge and methodology sharing in broader engagement with other Israeli and Palestinian organisations.</p> <p>Threats: Under continued pressure as a result of shrinking space and laws restricting access to funding etc.</p>	
Libyan Lawyer for Justice	Preventing torture and seeking accountability of	High in the sense that DIGNITY not only provides	High – LFJL is the main shaper	LFJL has its own network of lawyers operating in Libya;	LFJL is a young human rights CSO that is managed	Exit strategy will depend very much from the

	perpetrators and access to justice for victims	financial support but is able to positively influence the LFJL when it comes to the methods of documentation and shaping of international advocacy	of the action in Libya	given the very difficult conditions on the ground the capacity to produce documentation and keep a regular level of activities is LFJL main contribution and it is essential for the time being	by a 'new' generation of human rights defenders as opposed to many other CSOs operating in North Africa. Their accountability is high and their system of data management is setting best practice	contextual development in Libya and if DIGNITY will be to engage further parties in multi-faceted programmes, the exit strategy will develop around this. DIGNITY meets LFJL as a already self-standing entity, and partnership can continued/stopped as long as there is mutual strategic interest.
--	------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Results Framework

Project title		<b><i>A World Without Torture</i></b>	
Project objective		Fewer people suffering from torture in developing countries	
Impact Indicator		10 states and 35 local communities have tangible progress in establishing effective preventive and protective mechanisms and/or systems to provide timely access to rehabilitation including redress for survivors	
Strategic Outcome		<b>Relevant public authorities and civil society organisation protect significantly more people from Torture and other forms of violence and significantly more survivors have access to quality rehabilitation</b>	
Outcome indicator		State and local authorities and civil society organisations serving a number of direct beneficiaries and a number of indirect beneficiaries have significantly and tangibly improved preventive and protective mechanisms and/or increased access to quality rehabilitation services.	
Baseline	Year 0	41.250	Direct beneficiaires
		800.000	Indirect beneficiaires
Target	Year 4	50.000	Direct beneficiaires
		1.000.000	Indirect beneficiaires
Output 1		<b>Strengthening state authorities (prisons, police and criminal justice system<sup>1</sup>) and civil society actors to prevent torture and CIDTP</b>	
Output indicator 1.1		Number and descriptions of state and local authorities undertaking protective and preventive measures addressing torture and CIDTP	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently supporting 4 authorities in 3 countries working with a total of 5 different preventive and protective mechanisms (see footnote 1) in place, but none are yet fully effective.

<sup>1</sup>) A non-exhaustive list of the preventive mechanisms include: 1) safe-guards upon arrests; 2) reduction of pre-trial detention; 3) initial medical exam; 4) independent monitoring; 5) complaints and referral mechanisms to receive complaints of torture, including in places of detention in place; 6) non-coercive forms of interrogation practiced; 7) initiatives to introduce alternatives to detention; and 8) independent police oversight functioning

Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive changes <sup>2</sup> is recorded with 2 authorities in strengthened preventive and protective mechanisms.
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change towards strengthened protective and preventive mechanisms is initiated with a new authority.
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance valued no lower than '3' by peers per authority.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per authority; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority
Output Indicator 1.2		Number and descriptions of civil society actors undertaking specialized measures related to identification, documentation, reports and/or referrals for legal, medical, and mental health services for an increased and more diversified <sup>3</sup> ) number of survivors	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently working with 14 number of civil society organisations; there is no (or effectively no) coordination between civil society actors working on torture, gender, migrants creating a silo effect that limits outreach to beneficiaries (in both quantity and quality).
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive change is recorded per organisation towards an increased and more diversified number of survivors.
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change towards an increased and more diversified number of survivors reached.
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per country.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance '4' or '5' by peers per organisation; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per organisation

<sup>2</sup> A chain of positive change is a variable from outcome harvesting that denotes mechanisms that can be enhanced and/or introduced leading to anticipated change. The chain is subject to external assessment or peer reviews.

<sup>3</sup> Including increased number from vulnerable groups

Output Indicator 1.3		Number and significance of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders through provision of expertise on the implementation or innovation of the international framework on the prevention of torture, through research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged in international fora including multilateral and academic institutions with focus on criminal justice and torture. Baseline numbers are not available.
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 25% vs baseline.
Annual Target	Year 4		Significance of influence is rated 3 or higher by peers in 25% of cases.
Output 2		<b>Strengthening state and local authorities and civil society actors to prevent violence in communities</b>	
Output indicator 2.1		Number and descriptions of local authorities taking steps towards violence prevention programmes, including through improved governance	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY implements such programmes in 4 communities
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one new chain of positive change towards strengthened violence prevention mechanisms is identified in a community. The chain(s) of positive change in the first three communities is continued (vs 2020).
Annual Target	Year 2		At least one new chain of positive change towards engagement in violence prevention mechanisms is initiated with a new authority. The chain(s) of positive change in the first four countries is developed (vs 2021).
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per authority; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per authority
Output Indicator 2.2		Number of people at community level with increased protection from violence	

Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently working in 4 communities providing increased protection to a population of 294.000 of of which 60.000 are direct beneficiaries through efforts to strengthen trust between the authorities (themselves) and between the authorities and the population (incl. organisations, groups etc)
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one chain of positive change is recorded per community reflecting increased trust (f.x. better relations, cooperation and higher participation).
Annual Target	Year 2		The chain(s) of positive changes recorded in year one is continued in year 2; at least one new chain of positive change reflecting increased trust (e.g. better relations, cooperation and higher participation) is recorded in a new community (group or setting)
Annual Target	Year 3		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per community.
Annual Target	Year 4		Chains of positive changes are continued. At least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance 4 or 5 by peers per community; in addition, at least one chain of positive change is recorded with significance no lower than '3' by peers per community
Output Indicator 2.3		Number of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders via provision of knowledge, implementation or innovation of the international framework on prevention of violence, or via research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged in international fora including multilateral and academic institutions with focus on prevention of violence. Baseline numbers are not available. Baseline numbers are not available.
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 25% vs baseline.
Annual Target	Year 4		Significance of influence is rated 3 or higher by peers in 25% of cases.

Output 3		<b>Strengthening state authorities and civil society actors to provide timely and quality rehabilitation to trauma affected survivors of torture, CIDPT and other forms of violence</b>	
Output indicator 3.1		Number of trauma-affected survivors and families having been identified, referred to and received adequate rehabilitation	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently strengthening 4 number of referral mechanisms (2019: 96 referrals) in 8 communities providing services to 1501 survivors and their families. In 2019 318 survivors were identified.
Annual Target	Year 1		Increased number reached of 10 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 2		Increased number reached of 15 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 3		Increased number reached of 20 % vs baseline
Annual Target	Year 4		Increased number reached of 40 % vs baseline
Output Indicator 3.2		Number and descriptions of state and non-state providers with increased capacity to deliver and/or teach quality rehabilitation services	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY is currently supporting 112 state and 422 non-state providers delivering services in 8 communities. Accessible and quality services are scarce with little documentation on the quality of services and referrals.
Annual Target	Year 1		At least one new chain of positive change towards increase in the number of providers of services has contributed improved access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation provided by state services or civil society actors in DIGNITY's programme countries
Annual Target	Year 2		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 50% of DIGNITY's programme countries
Annual Target	Year 3		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 75% of DIGNITY's programme countries



Annual Target	Year 4		Chain of positive changes towards increase in the number of providers of services is continued and has contributed to increased access to improved trauma-informed rehabilitation for trauma-affected survivors in at least 80% of DIGNITY's programme countries
Output Indicator 3.3		Number and significance of cases where DIGNITY's expertise has influenced stakeholders by provision of knowledge on developing and revising the normative framework for the right to rehabilitation via research, publications, manuals, guidelines and reports.	
Baseline	Year 0		DIGNITY's influence is acknowledged to make significant contributions to norm setting within the promotion of the right to rehabilitation and specialised knowledge on MHPSS internationally as well as in Danish fora, institutional and academic with focus on mental health and rehabilitation of victims of violence. Baseline numbers are not available
Annual Target	Year 1		Baseline number is available.
Annual Target	Year 2		Number of cases of influence is increased of 10% vs baseline; first indicators of influence in international fora.
Annual Target	Year 3		Number of cases of influence is increased of 15% vs baseline. DIGNITY's influence is recorded in international fora and with focus on Africa
Annual Target	Year 4		Significance of influence of DIGNITY is rated 3 or higher by peers in 10% of cases.

Annex 4 DIGNITY - BUDGET 2021-24 (04-11-20)

Budget Line	2021			2022			2023			2024			TOTAL		
	Budget 2021 (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs	Budget 2022 (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs	Budget 2023 (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs	Budget 2024 (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs	Budget All Years (1000 DKK)	Share of direct costs	Share of total costs
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>															
<b>Output 1: Strengthening state authorities (prisons, police and criminal justice system ) and civil society actors to prevent torture and CIDTP</b>	<b>24,402</b>	49.4%	46.0%	<b>24,402</b>	49.4%	46.0%	<b>24,402</b>	49.4%	46.0%	<b>24,402</b>	49.4%	46.0%	<b>97,608</b>	49.4%	46.0%
<b>Output 1: Direct activity costs</b>	<b>13,281</b>	26.9%	25.1%	<b>13,528</b>	27.4%	25.5%	<b>13,394</b>	27.1%	25.3%	<b>13,253</b>	26.8%	25.0%	<b>53,456</b>	27.1%	25.2%
Output 1: Activities	1,632			1,632			1,632			1,632			6,528		
Output 1: Investment	0			0			0			0			0		
Output 1: Salaries	10,624			10,624			10,545			10,459			42,252		
Output 1: Travel	1,025			1,272			1,217			1,162			4,676		
<b>Output 1: Direct transfers to partners &amp; country offices</b>	<b>3,481</b>	7.0%	6.6%	<b>4,217</b>	8.5%	8.0%	<b>4,402</b>	8.9%	8.3%	<b>4,576</b>	9.3%	8.6%	<b>16,676</b>	8.4%	7.9%
Output 1: Partners & country offices, Africa	1,874			2,610			2,795			2,969			10,248		
Output 1: Partners & country offices, other DAC	1,607			1,607			1,607			1,607			6,428		
<b>Output 1: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs</b>	<b>7,640</b>	15.5%	14.4%	<b>6,657</b>	13.5%	12.6%	<b>6,606</b>	13.4%	12.5%	<b>6,573</b>	13.3%	12.4%	<b>27,476</b>	13.9%	13.0%
Output 1: Pro rata support costs	5,442			4,459			4,408			4,375			18,684		
Output 1: Communication	943			943			943			943			3,772		
Output 1: Monitoring	681			681			681			681			2,724		
Output 1: Tools Development & Innovation	574			574			574			574			2,296		
<b>Output 2: Strengthening state and local authorities and civil society actors to prevent violence in communities</b>	<b>10,865</b>	22.0%	20.5%	<b>10,865</b>	22.0%	20.5%	<b>10,865</b>	22.0%	20.5%	<b>10,865</b>	22.0%	20.5%	<b>43,460</b>	22.0%	20.5%
<b>Output 2: Direct activity costs</b>	<b>5,144</b>	10.4%	9.7%	<b>5,256</b>	10.6%	9.9%	<b>5,097</b>	10.3%	9.6%	<b>4,986</b>	10.1%	9.4%	<b>20,483</b>	10.4%	9.7%
Output 2: Activities	1,212			1,212			1,212			1,212			4,848		
Output 2: Investment	0			0			0			0			0		
Output 2: Salaries	3,534			3,534			3,400			3,314			13,782		
Output 2: Travel	398			510			485			460			1,853		
<b>Output 2: Direct transfers to partners &amp; country offices</b>	<b>3,137</b>	6.4%	5.9%	<b>3,491</b>	7.1%	6.6%	<b>3,700</b>	7.5%	7.0%	<b>3,854</b>	7.8%	7.3%	<b>14,182</b>	7.2%	6.7%
Output 2: Partners & country offices, Africa	1,552			1,906			2,115			2,269			7,842		
Output 2: Partners & country offices, other DAC	1,585			1,585			1,585			1,585			6,340		
<b>Output 2: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs</b>	<b>2,584</b>	5.2%	4.9%	<b>2,118</b>	4.3%	4.0%	<b>2,068</b>	4.2%	3.9%	<b>2,025</b>	4.1%	3.8%	<b>8,795</b>	4.5%	4.1%
Output 2: Pro rata support costs	1,855			1,389			1,339			1,296			5,879		
Output 2: Communication	313			313			313			313			1,252		
Output 2: Monitoring	226			226			226			226			904		
Output 2: Tools Development & Innovation	190			190			190			190			760		
<b>Output 3: Strengthening state authorities and civil society actors to provide timely and quality rehabilitation to trauma affected survivors of torture, CIDPT and other forms of violence</b>	<b>14,128</b>	28.6%	26.7%	<b>14,128</b>	28.6%	26.7%	<b>14,128</b>	28.6%	26.7%	<b>14,128</b>	28.6%	26.7%	<b>56,512</b>	28.6%	26.7%
<b>Output 3: Direct activity costs</b>	<b>6,904</b>	14.0%	13.0%	<b>6,994</b>	14.2%	13.2%	<b>6,880</b>	13.9%	13.0%	<b>6,767</b>	13.7%	12.8%	<b>27,545</b>	13.9%	13.0%
Output 3: Activities	1,117			1,117			1,117			1,117			4,468		
Output 3: Investment	0			0			0			0			0		
Output 3: Salaries	5,460			5,460			5,366			5,273			21,559		
Output 3: Travel	327			417			397			377			1,518		
<b>Output 3: Direct transfers to partners &amp; country offices</b>	<b>3,290</b>	6.7%	6.2%	<b>3,771</b>	7.6%	7.1%	<b>3,939</b>	8.0%	7.4%	<b>4,097</b>	8.3%	7.7%	<b>15,097</b>	7.6%	7.1%
Output 3: Partners & country offices, Africa	2,871			3,352			3,520			3,678			13,421		
Output 3: Partners & country offices, other DAC	419			419			419			419			1,676		
<b>Output 3: Direct allocated programme-supporting costs</b>	<b>3,934</b>	8.0%	7.4%	<b>3,363</b>	6.8%	6.3%	<b>3,309</b>	6.7%	6.2%	<b>3,264</b>	6.6%	6.2%	<b>13,870</b>	7.0%	6.5%
Output 3: Pro rata support costs	2,799			2,228			2,174			2,129			9,330		
Output 3: Communication	487			487			487			487			1,948		
Output 3: Monitoring	352			352			352			352			1,408		
Output 3: Tools Development & Innovation	296			296			296			296			1,184		
<b>A - DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>49,395</b>	100.0%	93.2%	<b>49,395</b>	100.0%	93.2%	<b>49,395</b>	100.0%	93.2%	<b>49,395</b>	100.0%	93.2%	<b>197,580</b>	100.0%	93.2%
<i>- of which is spent on:*</i>															
Direct activity costs	25,329	51.3%	47.8%	25,778	52.2%	48.6%	25,371	51.4%	47.9%	25,006	50.6%	47.2%	101,484	51.4%	47.9%
Direct transfers to partners & country offices	9,908	20.1%	18.7%	11,479	23.2%	21.7%	12,041	24.4%	22.7%	12,527	25.4%	23.6%	45,955	23.3%	21.7%
Direct allocated programme-supporting costs	14,158	28.7%	26.7%	12,138	24.6%	22.9%	11,983	24.3%	22.6%	11,862	24.0%	22.4%	50,141	25.4%	23.7%
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>															
Audit	148	0.3%	0.3%	148	0.3%	0.3%	148	0.3%	0.3%	148	0.3%	0.3%		0.0%	0.0%
Administration (7% of direct costs)	3,457	7.0%	6.5%	3,457	7.0%	6.5%	3,457	7.0%	6.5%	3,457	7.0%	6.5%	13,828	7.0%	6.5%
<b>B - INDIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>3,605</b>	7.3%	6.8%	<b>3,605</b>	7.3%	6.8%	<b>3,605</b>	7.3%	6.8%	<b>3,605</b>	7.3%	6.8%	<b>14,420</b>	7.3%	6.8%
<b>C - CONTINGENCES</b>	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0</b>	0.0%	0.0%
<b>TOTAL BUDGET (A+B+C)</b>	<b>53,000</b>		100.0%	<b>53,000</b>		100.0%	<b>53,000</b>		100.0%	<b>53,000</b>		100.0%	<b>212,000</b>		100.0%

\*Detailed category breakdown across outputs:

	Amount	% of A	Amount	% of A	Amount	% of A	Amount	% of A	Amount	% of A
<b>Direct activity costs</b>	<b>25,329</b>	<b>51.3%</b>	<b>25,778</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>25,371</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>25,006</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>101,484</b>	<b>51.4%</b>
Activities	3,961	8.0%	3,961	8.0%	3,961	8.0%	3,961	8.0%	15,844	8.0%
Investment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Salaries	19,618	39.7%	19,618	39.7%	19,311	39.1%	19,046	38.6%	77,593	39.3%
Travel	1,750	3.5%	2,199	4.5%	2,099	4.2%	1,999	4.0%	8,047	4.1%
<b>Direct transfers to partners &amp; country offices</b>	<b>9,908</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	<b>11,479</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>12,041</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>12,527</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>45,955</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
Partners & country offices, Africa	6,297	12.7%	7,868	15.9%	8,430	17.1%	8,916	18.1%	31,511	15.9%
Partners & country offices, other DAC	3,611	7.3%	3,611	7.3%	3,611	7.3%	3,611	7.3%	14,444	7.3%
<b>Direct allocated programme-supporting costs</b>	<b>14,158</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>12,138</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>11,983</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>11,862</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>50,141</b>	<b>25.4%</b>
Pro rata support costs	10,096	20.4%	8,076	16.3%	7,921	16.0%	7,800	15.8%	33,893	17.2%
Communication	1,743	3.5%	1,743	3.5%	1,743	3.5%	1,743	3.5%	6,972	3.5%
Monitoring	1,259	2.5%	1,259	2.5%	1,259	2.5%	1,259	2.5%	5,036	2.5%
Tools Development & Innovation	1,060	2.1%	1,060	2.1%	1,060	2.1%	1,060	2.1%	4,240	2.1%

## Annex 4 B

### Kommentar til DED-budget

#### Baggrund

DIGNITYs økonomi er gennem de sidste ti år vokset og blevet mere forskelligartet og kravene blandt interessenter og donorer har udviklet sig. Fra at være domineret stort set alene af en rammebevilling fra UM og en driftsaftale med Region Hovedstaden, er vores økonomi i dag mere kompleks og diversificeret. Der er kommet nye bevillinger til fra en række nationale, internationale og private donorer og vi genererer desuden indtægter fra salg af forskellige ydelser. Udviklingen stiller nye og store krav til vores økonomistyring, da vi gerne vil levere en klar og transparent fortælling indadtil og udadtil om, hvem vi er, hvad vi laver og hvordan vi laver det, samtidig med at vi vil tilfredsstille de enkelte donoreres forskellige og ofte omfattende krav til bevillingsstyring og administration.

Opbygningen af vores nuværende økonomistyring er gennem årene sket som en knopskydning af de processer og systemer, som var sat op til at håndtere få og relativt enkle bevillinger, herunder særligt rammen fra UM. Det betyder, at økonomistyringen ikke har været helhedstænkt og at den indtil nu ikke har været opbygget på den mest hensigtsmæssige måde. Da vi nu står i den situation, at vi skal overgå til et nyt UM DED-bevillingsformat, som også introducerer et nyt budgetformat uden FAK, men med en pro rata-fordelt support cost-struktur, har vi valgt at gentænke vores økonomisystemer og processer fra grunden, så de kommer til at passe til vores fremtidige behov. De skal kunne bruges til intern og ekstern rapportering og fungere stringent og relativt simpelt, uafhængigt af hvor pengene kommer fra.

Udgangspunktet har været at skabe en platform for vores økonomistyring, som lægger grundstenen for en fair og transparent administration af vores midler set i forhold til alle vores donorer. Vi har derfor arbejdet på at bygge et system op, som ikke er styret af de enkelte bevillinger, men som kan rumme de udmøntningsforskelle, der selvfølgelig er mellem de forskellige donorer og bevillinger. Platformen skal suppleres af et veludbygget Business Intelligence system, som vi bruger til at bearbejde tallene, så vi kan tilgodese de visninger, der er behov for indadtil og udadtil.

#### Omkostningsfordeling

DIGNITY er først og fremmest en videns- og projektbaseret organisation. Vi lever af at sælge timer og ekspertise i vores projekter. Derfor er timerne, som vi leverer af afgørende betydning for, om vi når vores mål og om vi gør det på den bedste og mest effektive måde. Vi har derfor fokuseret på, hvordan vi fremadrettet kan gøre timerne til omdrejningspunktet for, hvordan vi fordeler vores projekt- og programunderstøttende fællesomkostninger (pro rata support costs). Et spørgsmål har været, hvordan vi skaber en fair og transparent fordeling af administrative omkostninger og fællesomkostninger imellem de forskellige finansieringskilder. Vi er landet på en fordeling, der baserer sig på antal årsværk, idet vi mener, at der knytter sig en række fællesomkostninger til det at være medarbejder i DIGNITY, uanset lønniveau og anciennitet, og det derfor er rigtigst at fordele omkostningerne på medarbejderne.

Vores udgifter er herefter opdelt således:

- a) Direkte aktivitetsomkostninger:

- Dækkes 100% af bevillinger.
  - Herunder falder blandt andet project management, teknisk bistand, aktivitetsspecifik kommunikation og partnerstøtte.
- b) Projekt- og programunderstøttende fællesomkostninger (pro rata support costs):
- Skal bæres af projekterne, men kan ikke nødvendigvis henføres direkte til et bestemt projekt.
  - Herunder falder blandt andet HR, IT, husleje/Facility management, sikkerhed, generelle understøttende systemer og lønbogholderi.
- c) Administrationsomkostninger:
- Herunder falder direktion og bestyrelse, generel administration og compliance, arbejdsmiljø/APV, strategisk efteruddannelse, advokatbistand, driftsbogholderi og overordnet økonomistyring, revision af organisationsregnskab samt konsulentbistand, der ikke direkte relaterer sig til økonomisystemets arkitektur.
- d) Strategiske egne midler:
- Skal dækkes af eventuelle resterende administrationsbidrag, fundraisede frie midler og evt. egenkapitalen.
  - Herunder falder blandt andet national advocacy, politisk kommunikation og privat fundraising

Efter en grundig og omfattende gennemgang af systemer, opsætning, organisation og omkostningsstrukturer er vi kommet frem til en gennemsnitlig årssats på ca. DKK 240.000 pr. medarbejderårsværk, som vi mener er fair, går på tværs af organisationen og på sigt skal være ens for alle vores donorer. Dette danner sammen med medarbejdernes ansættelsesomkostninger grundlaget for en timepris, som hvert enkelt projekt i udgangspunktet skal betale i henhold til timeregistreringen. Vores model er i princippet en 'break even-model, der fuldt indfaset vil betyde, at alle bevillinger dækker de faktiske omkostninger, der svarer til, hvor stor en andel af de fælles ressourcer, de trækker på. Med det nye system ved vi nu, hvad det koster at have en medarbejder ansat og dermed også, hvor meget en bevilling skal betale. For så vidt angår administrationen skal det naturligvis dækkes 100% af administrationsvederlaget fra de respektive bevillinger, herunder de 7% fra UMs bevilling.

Principielt kan vi kontinuerligt (og i realtime) efterprøve beregningen af satsen, eftersom vi kender de aflagte timer løbende og finanskonti med fællesomkostninger er klart definerede. Rent operationelt hælder vi imidlertid imod en model, hvor vi laver tre beregninger i løbet af året. Den første laver vi i forbindelse med det kommende års budget for at fastlægge timetillægget. Den anden laver vi i forbindelse med revision af budgettet ved halvåret. Her vurderer vi om der eventuelt skal ske en tilpasning af timetillægget. Halvårsberegningen bør dog fremdeles have status som en kontrolberegning, idet vi gerne vil have en model med et fast årligt tillæg. Endelig laver vi en efterkalkulation i forbindelse med årsafslutningen, som dokumentation for at timetillægget flugter med de faktiske aflagte timer og realiserede omkostninger.

### **Det fireårige DED-budget**

Overgangen fra en rammeaftale og en afvikling af FAK over til et nyt DED-format og et mere transparent system med en break-even model til fordeling af de projekt- og programunderstøttende fællesomkostninger vil skulle indfases over flere år. Der vil være en periode, hvor nuværende bevillinger fases ud og nye kommer til og hvor den nye årssats pr. medarbejderårsværk vil blive anvendt. Det vil i praksis betyde, at det vil tage tid at indsluse og få fuldt udbytte af vores nye økonomistyringstilgang. Da vi har forstået, at en overgang til et nyt aftaleformat ikke er en spareøvelse og ikke skal betyde, at DIGNITY skal spare på de projekt- og programunderstøttende fællesomkostninger, så vil der i en periode, indtil vores nye model er fuldt indfaset, være behov for at enkelte donorer i en periode dækker lidt mere end den nye årssats pr. medarbejderårsværk vi stiler efter.

Derfor arbejder vi i det fireårige DED-budget med, at UMs bidrag til de projekt- og programunderstøttende omkostninger beløber sig til DKK 300,000 per år per medarbejderårsværk. Det betyder de facto, at prorataandelen for 2021 er 19,4%. Der er tale om et loft snarere end en fast sats. Det vil sige, at DIGNITY kan bruge op til DKK 300.000 per år per medarbejderårsværk, men at DIGNITY også over den fireårige DED-periode vil forsøge at nedbringe satsen yderligere. DIGNITY vil samtidig, som det fremgår af budgettet, arbejde for en løbende forøgelse af andelen af overførsler til partnerne i det globale syd fra 22,8% i 2021 til 25,3% i 2024 og en nedgang i lønomkostninger under de direkte aktivitetsomkostninger fra 37,8% i 2021 til 35,9% i 2024. Også her er den tale om minimumsambitioner.

Med fortsat respekt for vores implementeringskapacitet og ekspertise er det derfor vores håb at kunne nedbringe UMs andel af betalingen for pro rata support costs i DED'en hen over de fire år og sikre, at den sats, som UM betaler, ligger tættere på DIGNITYs break-even model - måske endda hurtigere end skitseret, samtidig med at vi forøger overførslerne til vores partnere i syd og nedbringer vores lønomkostninger i Danmark.

<b>Tabel 1: Foreløbige estimater af hhv fællesomkostninger og udgifter, der afholdes af administrationsvederlag/egne midler</b>				
<b>Beskrivelse</b>	<b>Årsværk</b>	<b>Løn</b>	<b>Øvrige omkostninger</b>	<b>I alt</b>
HR	2,24	1.551.000	520.000	2.071.000
IT	3,19	2.576.000	1.750.000	4.326.000
Husleje/Facility Management	2,53	1.146.000	8.587.000	9.734.000
Security	0,53	425.000	150.000	575.000
Generelle understøttende systemer, inkl lønbogholderi, tidsregistrering mv	2,29	1.506.000	921.000	2.427.000
<b>Fællesomkostninger (pro rata support costs) i alt</b>	<b>10,78</b>	<b>7.204.000</b>	<b>11.928.000</b>	<b>19.132.000</b>

<b>Tabel 2: Foreløbige nøgletal</b>	
<b>Beskrivelse</b>	<b>Værdi</b>
Samlede fællesomkostninger (pro rata support costs)	19.132.000 kr.
Estimeret samlet antal årsværk	92
DED 2021, samlet antal årsværk	32
Antal årsværk der indgår i fællesomkostninger	10,78
Årssats pr. medarbejderårsværk (break even model)	236.000 kr.
DED, budgetteret årssats pr. medarbejderårsværk	300.000 kr.

## Annex 5: Risk Management Matrix

DIGNITY's risk management is based on the DIGNITY Organizational Risk Assessment (2020) and DIGNITY General Security Plan (2016).

### CONTEXTUAL RISKS (Monitored in relevant contexts at local and national level)

RISK FACTOR	LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	RISK RESPONSE	RESIDUAL RISK	BACKGROUND TO ASSESSMENT
COVID-19 global outbreak or similar scenarios hinders local and international travels and F2F encounters	Major	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain IT systems with redundant capacity</li> <li>Maintain travel security and crisis management organisation</li> <li>Identify and support partner relevant IT-resources</li> <li>Support partners acquisition of necessary resources (telephones, IT, PPE) to manage project portfolio in high-risk settings or without F2F encounters</li> <li>Develop e-learning capability and on-line training formats</li> <li>Facilitate reprogramming based on local resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A residual infection-risk remains</li> <li>IT-systems are unable to carry extra traffic</li> <li>Telephones systems do not have adequate coverage or are unsafe for sensitive conversations</li> <li>Local capacity for reprogramming unavailable or insufficient</li> <li>Capability and capacity in e-learning insufficient for emergency needs</li> </ul>	Much of DIGNITY beneficiaries are reached by DIGNITY partners through F2F encounters, whether in clinics, prisons and detention centres or in communities. Infectious diseases interrupts this work as well as F2F encounters with partners.
Instability in strategic economic sectors affect state revenue and state expenditure in DIGNITY partner countries	Major	Medium	Monitor socio-economic conditions in partner countries and reprogram when necessary	Rapid or short term changes that cannot be mitigated constitutes a residual risk	MiC and LiC economies often depend on a few key areas of economic activity (primary commodities or tourism) to generate foreign exchange and state revenue. Economic depression in key sectors generate falls in state revenues triggering social unrest and/or elite struggle leading to political volatility
Political- or regime change which forces DIGNITY to close a strategic cooperation at country-level with loss of investments as a consequence	Medium	Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-going risk-assessments at country and project level in cases with high programmatic threat level (e.g. Philippines, Jordan, Tunisia, Algeria) ensures that DIGNITY can reprogram and thereby protect its investments.</li> <li>ensure availability of resources for support functions when needed by DIGNITY partners</li> </ul>	Rapid or short term changes that cannot be mitigated constitutes a residual risk. Political changes are permanent with no openings for further cooperation.	Important to conduct thorough context analysis before entering into partnerships in a given country.
Natural or man-made catastrophes forces DIGNITY to change	Medium	Insignificant	DIGNITY follows best-practice guidelines and cooperate with partners on reprogramming activities during the	A short-term loss of partner installations, capability and capacity must be expected.	DIGNITY has learned from the Ebola crisis in terms of reprogramming and loss of partner activities. Also, the current Covid-19 pandemic has forced DIGNITY to make



country- or partner strategies			emergency relief phase in coordination with national and international authorities		changes to program activities and seek new avenues for project implementation i.e. use of audio visual and online training and designing new projects to cater to the problems arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.
Large scale mobility and migration affect state stability in partner country	Medium	Medium	Develop additional capabilities and capacity in humanitarian responses	Rapid or short term changes that cannot be mitigated constitutes a residual risk Risk of brain drain and loss of staff in partner organisations	Migration is on the rise and we see large scale problems arising from the current situation. Migrations affects not only the countries from which migration takes places, but in particular those countries to which migrants flee.
Violent crime and insecurity affect populations and partner staff	Major	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build partner capacity and capability in monitoring threat levels and in handling critical events</li> <li>Ensure proper work-place insurance is available in partner organisations</li> <li>Ensure partners design programs which have outcomes on trust and dialogue</li> </ul>	Residual risk remains, as risks affect staff also outside work hours	Violent crime is a very important factor in many of the countries in which we work. An assessment of the scope of the problem is essential before DIGNITY establishes its presence in a partner country.
Threats towards human rights defenders	Major	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen capacities of partners to provide mental health care for afflicted persons</li> <li>Build urgent action networks with regional and local organizations</li> <li>Identify relevant context specific protection measures</li> <li>Develop IT and cyber security capacity relevant for HRDs</li> </ul>	There is a considerable risk of projects and programs not being implemented due to shrinking space for human rights defenders, which cannot be fully mitigated .	HRDs take considerable risk in their work. Threats manifest themselves in all areas of life. More recently cyberthreats have expanded. Exposure to recurrent threats and trauma, may negatively affect capacity. COVID-19 has further affected the ability of human rights defenders to work. We also see authoritarian regimes on the rise, which considerably diminishes the possibility for human rights defenders to work freely.

### PROGRAMATTIC RISKS

RISK FACTOR	LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	RISK RESPONSE	RESIDUAL RISK	BACKGROUND TO ASSESSMENT
DIGNITY programmes (country or thematic) fail due to mismanagement, design flaws or wrong resourcing	Low	Minor	s small set of well-tested program concepts TCIDT+P in different arenas and a well-M&E system that periodically provides data on level of beneficiaries maintain risks assessment work at program and	Irrespective of good ME, programs and project may underperform due to unpredictable events or other locally specific issues	When implementing programs lack of effect at beneficiary level may materialize. Such situations may be due to a variety of specific and/or general issues. Documenting effects (or their absence) and identifying the causes is the key objective of the ME system. A functioning M/E system will mitigate most if not all risks
DIGNITY South-South partner networks fail to deliver input for	Low	Minor	Ensure that networks are user driven, adequately supported, and partners are	Success of South-South partner networks can never be fully ensured, but possibility of	South – South Networks are important to support. They provide peer-input for partners and ensure that DIGNITY

advocacy, knowledge and policy development			resourced so as to be able to contribute to and benefit from the networks	delivery failure is significantly reduced via the risk responses stated here	continues to be relevant to these by calling attention to emergent issues and needs.
DIGNITY losses access to UNHRC, relevant treaty bodies and other UN bodies decreasing the effects of DIGNITY Advocacy work	Low	Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure good working relations with all major country representations in Geneva</li> <li>• Ensure continued contributions to Treaty Bodies and special rapporteurs when relevant</li> <li>• Contribute to Treaty Body Reform process</li> <li>• Collaborate with relevant INGOs in the humanitarian, development and human rights arenas in Geneva</li> </ul>	If adequate risk response is in place, most likely only factors outside the influence of DIGNITY can pose a risk to our access to UNHCR etc.	Representation in the UN system is politically driven, DIGNITY has a very strong representation in the UN System and works to maintain this. However, such representation is based on the state parties interest and work should focus on addressing these whenever possible.
DIGNITY research fails to deliver relevant input for advocacy and programs due to poor quality, lack of funding or poor management	Low	Significant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build strong alliances with relevant research groups in partner countries</li> <li>• Institutionalize research collaboration with centres of excellence globally</li> <li>• Ensure R&amp;D is demand driven</li> </ul>	Risk of delivery failure is always a possibility when conducting research, however it is significantly reduced by e.g. ensuring that R&D is demand driven and proper prioritized	Results from R&D activities are by definition unpredictable.

#### INSTITUTIONAL RISKS

RISK FACTOR	LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	RISK RESPONSE	RESIDUAL RISK	BACKGROUND TO ASSESSMENT
Significant loss of key donor funding	Unlikely	Major	Continuous dialogue and advocacy, public stress of the importance of human rights in Danish foreign policy and systematic implementation of review and organizational strategy	External factors beyond the influence of DIGNITY, which potential can stress the MFA's financial priorities remain a possibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DIGNITY has well established procedures for maintaining positive dialogue (reporting, strategic discussions, negotiations) with the MFA</li> <li>• The MFA has recently (2019) completed a successful review of DIGNITY</li> </ul>
Embezzlement, fraud and corruption	Unlikely	High	Established procedures for payments. Two-step approval system. Proper, secure and maintained financial management software	Risks of financial crimes can never be fully mitigated, but proper systems and procedures in place ensure that incidents in most cases will be caught within a limited time frame, thus hindering long-term financial criminal activities impossible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DIGNITY management and administrative staff (financial and ICT) prioritize financial security measures</li> <li>• MFA Review of DIGNITY emphasised increased measures against financial crimes</li> <li>• DIGNITY has recent experience in C-cases and are continuously developing best-practice responses</li> </ul>
Breach of physical premises at HQ	Low	Medium	Maintenance of shell security and alarm as well as precautions when staff / security / desk encounters unknown persons in – or after – workhours. Also, maintenance of	Breach remains a risk especially after work hours and outside of security presence on site.	General Security Plan (2016) and Action cards for physical breach of premises at HQ

			procedures for security rounds of the premises		
Breach to GDPR compliance	Medium	Low	Training of employees on a continuous basis, well-working DPO set-up, continuous update of GDPR internal site and procedures	Human error in sensitive data processing remains a factor although significantly reduced due to organizational emphasis, mandatory internal courses for all staff on a continuous basis and DPO-setup which conducts case-management on an ad-hoc basis	Looking at domestic GDPR breaches to compliance since May 2018, it is evident that (human) errors will be made when a large number of staff processes a significant portion of possibly sensitive data. However, DIGNITY's GDPR-setup (in place since January 2018) is mitigating the possibility to a large degree
Cases(s) of SEAH (sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment) within DIGNITY or partners	Unlikely	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and implementation of Policy for anti-harassment and offensive behaviour</li> <li>• Possible whistle-blower scheme</li> <li>• Appointment of shop stewards</li> </ul>	Possibility of SEAH can never be fully mitigated, however likelihood is arguably reduced via policy and reporting schemes	Develop baseline and assessments throughout partner countries and organisations. SEAH remains at the top of the agenda in many countries as a result of the Me too campaign.
Case(s) of child abuse with partners	Low	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and implementation of child protection policy</li> <li>• Whistle blower scheme</li> <li>• Training of partners to comply with policy</li> <li>• Ethical committee reviews DIGNITY interventions prior to implementation to ensure child protection is included</li> </ul>	There is a residual risk of abuse when working directly with children and adolescents. Training of partners and implementing policies and reporting will reduce this risk.	Cases of child abuse have not been found in any partner organisations until this point. It will be an area that will be continuously monitored under the partnership agreements.
HQ Security – flood and fire	Unlikely	Major	Site security emergency plan. Non-return valves installed, all doors flood-secure, servers and other material elevated above floor-level, and flood insurance in place – Municipality of Copenhagen Site security emergency plan, fire material in place, and evacuation drills held on a continuous basis	Residual risks remain due to external factors outside of DIGNITY's control	DIGNITY has installed a proper security group, which continuously monitors security risks for the organisations in HQ and abroad.
Country Office security – flood and fire	Unlikely	Major	Maintain premise-specific security plans for both Amman and Tunis	Residual risks remain due to external factors outside of DIGNITY's control	DIGNITY has installed a proper security group, which continuously monitors security risks for the organisations in HQ and abroad.

Annex 7 – Communication Plan

What? (the message)	<u>When?</u> (the timing)	How? (the mechanism)	Audience(s)	Responsible
<p><u>Torture as a wide-spread human rights violation</u></p> <p>Torture is a devastating crime for individuals and communities and is still a prevalent phenomenon worldwide. Torture is still taking place in approx. 2/3 of all countries.</p>	<p>Specific project- or programme-based outputs feed into communication streams on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Opportunities for communication: International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, DIGNITYS annual poll on attitudes in the Danish public on the use of torture.</p>	<p>We write op-eds, give interviews for Danish and international radio, television and newspapers (online platforms) to maintain awareness on torture as a widespread human rights violation. We also communicate the message through live events, talks and produce joint statements with relevant partners to engage the public in the fight against torture.</p>	<p>All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to media outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors and other traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions, multilateral organizations and donors.</p>	<p>DIGNITY</p>
<p><u>The global fight against torture and violence</u></p> <p>DIGNITY is the leading global knowledge center on torture and violence</p>	<p>Specific project- or programme-based outputs feed into communication streams on an ad-hoc basis.</p>	<p>We publish our research in national and international scientific journals and engage with researchers worldwide on the global fight</p>	<p>All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and</p>	<p>DIGNITY</p>

<p>prevention. We disseminate cutting-edge experiences, best practice, manuals and reports on most effective ways to fight torture and violence.</p>	<p>Research seminars, articles, content for our communication platforms, workshops and conferences with relevant external actors.</p>	<p>against torture violence. But we also translate our research into reader-friendly articles, op-eds and interviews on different platforms and media outlets. Our research is often combined with programme-based findings and presented in articles and videos.</p>	<p>post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors, traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions, multilateral organizations and donors.</p>	
<p><u>Traumatic consequences of torture</u></p> <p>Trauma and mental health problems in refugee populations and other victims of human rights violations are a most pressing issue. For instance, recent studies show that up to 40% of all Syrian refugees suffer from serious trauma from war, torture and flight. Hence posing a tremendous barrier for</p>	<p>New research on trauma from torture and case stories from victims feed into the communication streams on an ad- hoc basis.</p> <p>Research seminars, articles, content for our social platforms, workshops and conferences with relevant external actors.</p> <p>Opportunities: International Day in Support of Victims of Torture,</p>	<p>Case stories from our work are essential in showing the human consequences of torture and to convey to the public the physical and mental trauma they live with every day. Through articles, short statements, events, videos, photos and our general communication we always try to tell the story of the traumatic</p>	<p>All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors, traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions, multilateral organizations and donors.</p>	<p>DIGNITY</p>

development and integration	DIGNITYS annual poll on attitudes in the Danish public on the use of torture.	consequences of torture.		
<p><u>The global fight against trauma</u></p> <p>DIGNITY is the leading global knowledge center on rehabilitation of traumatized victims. We disseminate cutting-edge experiences, best practice, manuals and reports on most effective ways to rehabilitate traumatized victims from trauma and provide psycho-social support to vulnerable communities in developing countries.</p>	<p>Specific project- or programme-based outputs feed into communication streams on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Research seminars, articles, content for our social platforms, workshops and conferences with relevant external actors.</p> <p>Opportunities for communication: International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, World Mental Health Day</p>	<p>Both new research on rehabilitation of traumatized refugees and case stories are essential in showing the human consequences of torture and war and to convey to the public mental trauma they live with every day. Through articles, short statements, events, videos, photos and our general communication we always try to tell the story of refugees with trauma, the impact of our interventions and our work to ensure that they gain access to professional rehabilitation.</p>	<p>All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors, traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions and donors.</p>	DIGNITY
<u>Human rights defenders</u>	Specific project- or programme-based outputs	We write op-eds, give interviews for Danish and	All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in	DIGNITY

<p>Strengthening civil society actors to prevent torture and CIDTP is key in order to achieve DIGNITY's overall objective of a world where fewer people are tortured. We experience shrinking civic space from many of our civil society partners in repressive societies. It is important to enhance and improve support to these human right defenders</p>	<p>feed into communication streams on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Research seminars, articles, content for our social platforms, workshops and conferences with relevant external actors.</p> <p>Opportunities: International Human Rights Defenders Day</p>	<p>international radio, television and newspapers (online platforms) to raise awareness on the conditions that many of our civil society partners experience for advocating for human rights and holding governments to account for their actions.</p>	<p>Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors, traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions, multilateral organizations and donors.</p>	
<p><u>Capacity building</u></p> <p>Many state authorities possess the will, but not the capacity to fight torture and CIDTP. Therefore, we engage in partnerships with reform-friendly state actors in relevant developing countries, in order to prevent torture and rehabilitate torture victims. We disseminate experiences from these reform partnerships.</p>	<p>Specific project- or programme-based outputs feed into communication streams on an ad-hoc basis.</p> <p>Research seminars, articles, content for our social platforms on positive reforms, workshops and conferences with relevant external actors.</p>	<p>We write op-eds, produce videos, photos and articles for our platforms on reform stories from developing countries and work with civil society organizations, research institutions and state actors to combat torture in places where people are deprived of their liberty.</p>	<p>All our productions (video, text, podcast) are designed to reach a broad audience in Denmark and abroad. We give interviews to outlets like Al Jazeera, the Danish newspaper Politiken and post relevant content on Instagram and Twitter as well.</p> <p>Target groups: General public, media, politicians and other decision makers, torture survivors, traumatized victims, civil society organizations, research institutions, multilateral</p>	<p>DIGNITY</p>

			organizations and donors.	
--	--	--	---------------------------	--



## ANNEX 7: Financial contributions from the Danish MFA (2019)

<b>Financial contributions</b>	<b>2019</b>
National Preventive Mechanism (Ombudsman)	800.000
UM Rammeaftale	53.000.000
DAPP (Consortium)	45.000.000
CISU Civilsamfund i Udvikling	176.000
<b>Total Danish MFA</b>	<b>98.976.000</b>
Danish Regions	20.700.000
Total Danish public funding	119,676,000
Other sources of income	19,324,000
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>139,000,000</b>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Danida

**Desk Appraisal Report**  
**Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture**  
**2021-2024**

## Table of Content

Abbreviations.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Overall rationale and justification incl. preparation process .....	3
2.1 Relevance of the engagement and its objectives .....	3
2.2 Adequacy of the preparation process .....	4
2.3 Overall quality of the development engagement support design .....	5
3. Assessment of the documentation.....	6
3.1 Theory of change, objectives and results framework.....	6
3.2 Choice of partners and measures to support capacity development .....	8
3.3 Development effectiveness .....	9
4. Management and Organisation .....	9
4.1 Management, reporting and review mechanisms .....	9
4.2 Budget and financial management.....	11
4.3 Sustainability and exit strategies.....	12
4.4 Risks and assumptions.....	12
Annex 1: Terms of Reference .....	14
Annex 2: Preliminary screening note.....	18

This Review Report is an internal document presenting findings, observations and recommendations of a Desk Appraisal. The report will provide input to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the way forward for implementation of support to DIGNITY. Assessments and recommendations are not necessarily shared by Management of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

## Abbreviations

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Definition</b>
AMG	Aid Management Guidelines
CAT	Convention Against Torture
CPT	Convention on the Prevention of Torture
DA	Desk Appraisal
DAC	Development Aid Committee of the OECD
DDD	Doing Development Differently
DED	Development Engagement Document
DIGNITY	Danish Institute Against Torture
DKK	Danish Krone
ELK	Evaluation, Learning and Quality Department of the MFA
EU	European Union
FRU	Financial Management and Support Department of the MFA
HLPF	High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
KIP	Key Implementation Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
MUS	Multilateral Cooperation Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
OCA	Organisational Capacity Assessment
ODA	Overseas Development Aid
PC	Programme Committee
ToC	Theory of Change
UNCAT	United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
UPR	Council of Development Policy

## 1. Introduction

The proposed Development Engagement “Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture 2021-2024” continues Denmark’s long-standing partnership with DIGNITY. The proposed grant remains at the level of DKK 53m annually over four years, subject to Parliamentary approval. However, the modality of support has been modified from the previous more flexible funding with wide discretion for DIGNITY to manage funds and cover its core functions to earmarked funding. This is part of a general change in the agreements of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) with human rights and democracy organisations with a view to enhancing the documentation of concrete results that are in line with Danish policy priorities.

The objective of this Desk Appraisal (DA) is to provide quality assurance of the design and documentation of the new engagement in line with Danida Aid Management Guidelines (AMG) as per the Terms of Reference (cf. Annex 1).

Proposed support for DIGNITY was already examined by the Danida Programme Committee (PC) on 5 February 2020 when an organisational strategy was discussed. The PC approved of the substance and scope of support but resolved that support should align to Aid Management Guidelines for Programmes and Projects and comply with the established format for Development Engagement Documents (DED). The grant preparation phase has since been quite thorough and has involved comprehensive consultations between MUS and DIGNITY.

An MFA team consisting of Lars Adam Rehof, Department of Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK), and Anders Stuhr Svensson, Department of Financial Management and Support (FRU), worked on the desk appraisal during October 2020 and submitted a preliminary screening note on 30 October 2020 focusing on financial management observations. On 1 November 2020, external consultant Verner Kristiansen who had previously assisted with the formulation of an organisational strategy for DIGNITY and reviews of DIGNITY’s engagement under the Danish Arab Partnership Programme was contracted for four days to finalise the desk appraisal for the Department of Multilateral Cooperation (MUS). Hence, this last phase of the desk appraisal is mainly based on a review of the documentation provided by MUS as the responsible MFA unit.

In summary, this Desk Appraisal endorses the proposed support for DIGNITY and provides a number of suggestions and recommendations for revision of the Development Engagement Document (DED) and subsequent reporting and dialogue, not least in relation to improved documentation of results and increased focus on localisation of the engagement in the Global South, to be monitored closely during an inception phase defined as January to June 2021:

#1 It is recommended that “Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture 2021-2024” be presented to the Council for Development Policy (UPR) following completion of documentation in accordance with recommendations of this Desk Appraisal.

## 2. Overall rationale and justification incl. preparation process

### 2.1 Relevance of the engagement and its objectives

In the assessment of this Desk Appraisal, ‘Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture’ with its objective of ensuring that no one is subjected to torture (prevention) and that torture does not live on in traumatized victims and their families (rehabilitation) constitutes a highly relevant engagement in line with Denmark’s long-standing commitment to anti-torture and the evidence emerging from independent reviews of DIGNITY as a partner with a strong track record of long-term professional commitment to rehabilitation and prevention.

Policy priority to anti-torture is strongly reflected in the strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action. *The World 2030* confirming the case for Denmark to remain a significant and long-term global defender of human rights, democracy and gender equality through - inter alia - ‘cooperation between relevant Danish authorities and actors within human rights and democracy’ and a ‘persistent effort in the fight against torture’.

DIGNITY constitutes a strong technical and political partner in substantiating this policy objective with a mandate of high relevance to Denmark’s long-standing global leadership on the torture agenda. DIGNITY is globally recognized for its technical expertise, thus making it a legitimate and credible partner with a unique historical and contemporary position.

In pursuit of the strategic vision of ‘A World where fewer people are subjected to torture’, enshrined in DIGNITY’s strategy for 2019-21, three priority areas are indicated:

- (i) Protection against urban violence,
- (ii) Prevention of torture in places of detention, and
- (iii) Rehabilitation of torture and trauma victims.

Interestingly, DIGNITY includes a definition of torture in its strategy for 2019-21 which draws on the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT). According to DIGNITY’s current strategy, referring to the definition used by UNCAT, the following four elements are considered and required by a court to rule whether alleged ill-treatment amounts to torture:

- (a) Severe pain or suffering
- (b) Intentionality
- (c) Specific purpose, and
- (d) Official capacity

DA notes that point (d) Official capacity is of particular relevance for DIGNITY’s engagement in programming on urban violence and this aspect of the proposed engagement design that would seem to merit attention in assessing reporting and planning annual consultations, as detailed in Section 2.3.

## 2.2 Adequacy of the preparation process

Preparation of documentation for the proposed MFA support to DIGNITY from 2021-2024 has been a lengthy process comprising independent assessments as well as comprehensive dialogue between DIGNITY and MFA, not least when it comes to the overall theory of change, documentation of results and specific agreement modalities.

DIGNITY has been a partner of the Danish MFA since its establishment in 1982 as the *Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims*, one of the first such centres in the world. Relations with DIGNITY were historically managed by the MFA Legal Department, entering a cooperation agreement with DIGNITY in 2015 that did not include a sunset clause and was based on the framework agreements used by MFA to regulate grants for CSO strategic partners.

Administrative responsibility for DIGNITY moved from the Legal Department to the Department for Humanitarian Action, Migration and Civil Society (HMC) in 2017. An MFA review in line with Danida Aid Management Guidelines (AMG) was launched by HMC in 2019 and found DIGNITY to be a relevant and highly competent partner for Denmark, even if weaknesses were noted regarding documentation of results and a theory of change that was found lacking at global level.

As of January 2020, administrative responsibility for DIGNITY migrated to the MFA Department for Multilateral Cooperation and an organisational strategy in line with the ones used for core support to multilateral partners was elaborated and submitted to Danida's Programme Committee in February 2020. However, while approving of the substance of the strategy, the Programme Committee recommended that a Development Engagement Document be used in order to comply with AMG and ensure a stronger ODA-profile in the utilisation of the grant.

The Desk Appraisal notes that the preparation process appears somewhat turbulent but on the positive side to have included close interaction between MFA and DIGNITY with ensuing potential for a period of cooperation with more stability and focus on substantial results for the intended beneficiaries rather than cooperation modalities. However, the change of modality from core or softly earmarked to earmarked funding is not clearly reflected in the documentation and while in the assessment of the Desk Appraisal details are not required it may be worth reiterating the overall rationale for the chose modality in the DED.

#2 It is recommended to add a brief outline to Section 2 of the DED the rationale behind the change in support modality and emphasize MFA's commitment to keeping a balance between the focus on results in the Global South related to own funding, and maintaining a strong expert organisation that can be relied on to operationalize Danish policy objectives on torture prevention and rehabilitation.



### 2.3 Overall quality of the development engagement support design

Overall, the Desk Appraisal finds that design of the development engagement reflects high professional standards of DIGNITY in prevention and rehabilitation where the position of DIGNITY as a global leader in its field is evident in the descriptions. Documentation of torture, inspection of places of detention, co-creation of locally adapted manuals on rehabilitation techniques with civil society or government partners and advocacy engagement with duty-bearers such as Ministries of Justice or prison staff are all areas where DIGNITY is held in high esteem as most recently evidence by a mid-term review of a comprehensive human rights engagement lead by DIGNITY across the Middle East and North Africa<sup>1</sup>.

#### Urban violence

However, comparative advantage is less clear to the Desk Appraisal when it comes to the description of the rationale for engaging in protection of communities against urban violence. The DED refers to ‘Prevention of other forms of violence, including urban violence, that breeds and may often legitimize or normalize’, yet the precise scope of this area of engagement and how the key competence of DIGNITY comes into play when intending to address complex issues of drugs- or criminal gang-related and domestic violence is not evident to the Desk Appraisal.

The DED does not justify how these loosely defined ‘other forms of violence’ are linked to the criteria of (d) Official capacity, referring to the definition by UNCAT in its Article 1 that torture is “when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity’.

#3            It is recommended that programming and implementation of DIGNITY initiatives on urban violence are monitored and made the subject of critical attention when assessing progress reporting and dialogue to assess outcome of the grant during annual consultations.

#### Localisation benefits

Localisation of programme spending has been an important topic of discussion as part of the preparation process of this DED. The Desk Appraisal finds this interest both relevant and timely, not least in light of the fact that the proposed grant for DIGNITY draws on Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and hence the need to be able to document that ODA-funding produces results in developing countries. The model for programme delivery practiced by DIGNITY involves close partnerships in a number of countries throughout the world but with most staff based in Denmark. Out of a total of 136 staff members, 123 are based in Denmark.

---

<sup>1</sup> Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2017-2022) - Mid-Term Review Report (draft)

The DED refers to plans for increased localisation most explicitly in Section 7 where the budget mechanisms of annual increases of DKK 1.5m to the Global South are specified to gradually rise to 21.7% of the total grant by 2024. The remaining parts of programme documentation are remarkably silent on this point, except for Section 4 of the DED declaring that ‘the present DED engagement will focus entirely on delivering results and concrete changes on the ground in developing countries, notably in Africa’.

#4 It is recommended that DED references to localisation ambitions be clarified in Section 5 to (a) explain the background, process and expected benefits of gradually stronger localisation of support to the Global South and (b) reconcile the DED references to a gradually incremental target for transfers to the Global South of 21.7% by 2024 with the notion the notion that focus will be entirely on developing countries, notably in Africa.

### 3. Assessment of the documentation

#### 3.1 Theory of change, objectives and results framework

When the review of DIGNITY performance and organisational capacity was completed by MFA in January 2020 it was concluded that DIGNITY had most likely delivered the outcomes in its strategy for 2015-19, but that lack of systematised approach to reporting and documentation made it difficult to find evidence that all the outcomes had been delivered<sup>2</sup>.

Consequently, top of the list of review recommendations was that DIGNITY should develop a global Theory of Change, improve documentation of results and consolidate DIGNITY as a primarily internationally focused organisation. This would imply a revised composition of the Board and development of an advocacy strategy for the whole of the organisation.

The DED contains a narrative account of the Theory of Change but does not have a model illustration attached. The desired change by this engagement is that no one is subjected to torture (prevention) and that torture does not live on in traumatised victims and their families (rehabilitation). This is achieved by engaging with right-holders and civil society groups to know and claim their rights and strengthen the capacity and accountability of relevant duty-bearers (typically Ministries of Justice, local authorities, armed forces, police and prison services).

As outlined in Section 2.3, the Desk Appraisal finds the wider programming area of prevention of ‘other forms of violence, including urban violence’ to be the most problematic when taking the comparative advantages of DIGNITY into account. Annex 1 of the DED contains a context analysis attempting to justify urban violence as a programming area but without linking challenges to the comparative advantage of DIGNITY.

---

<sup>2</sup> Review of DIGNITY – MFA & Nordic Consulting Group, Final Report - 20 January 2020, p. 5ff

The context analysis argues, that ‘global growth in the number of people living in urban areas is one of the 21st century’s biggest challenges. Densely populated urban areas in poor and unstable societies are hotspots of violence and torture. These areas are dangerous and have limited or no presence of public services, security or other government authorities, instead they are often controlled by non-state authorities. Urban violence is characterized by a high degree of conflict between different violent networks and types of actors, including vigilante groups, and competing political actors and state officials. In some countries, gangs form de facto governance structures for instance in prisons, and carry out taxing and policing functions in urban slums’<sup>3</sup>..

The Desk Appraisal has no doubt that urban violence is a real challenge in a number of developing countries. Furthermore, the line of argument that the UNCAT category of ‘Official capacity’ has a degree of responsibility for violence amounting to torture in a country where they have jurisdiction (if not necessarily control) has a degree of logic to it in principle and is echoed by some, but not all international stakeholders in anti-torture circles.

The key question justifying special attention to this Theory of Change-related programming aspect in reporting and annual consultations is DIGNITY’s comparative advantage and prospects for documenting tangible results at country level with this approach. In the assessment of the Desk Appraisal, engaging at the deep end in terms of organisational comparative advantage carries a considerable risk of watering down an otherwise clear organisational profile on rehabilitation and prevention and an ensuing brand value.

This challenge of documentation is also reflected in the results framework of the DED. The proposed framework represents an improvement compared to earlier versions in the sense that baseline and targets in most cases have been defined and quantified. However, the framework of the DED (version submitted on 4 November 2020) and its Annex 3 (submitted on 1 November 2020) differ as the latter has neither baseline nor target for the Strategic Outcome of the engagement. This would seem to indicate last-minute elaboration of indicators. Also, the categories of ‘direct and ‘indirect beneficiaries’ are not defined, neither is it explained which means of verification are intended. This would seem to indicate that the overall definition of the outcome and its quantification remains to be clearly conceived.

#5 It is recommended that the results framework of the DED and Annex 5 be completed to include clarity on what is understood by ‘direct’ and ‘indirect beneficiaries’ and the intended means of verification of the outcome indicator as well as an operational definition in output 2.2 (Violence in communities) of what defines a ‘chain of positive change’ and the intended means of verification to measure progress against set targets.

---

<sup>3</sup> DIGNITY Draft Development Engagement Document - Annex 1: Context Analysis, p. 2

### 3.2 Choice of partners and measures to support capacity development

The delivery model of DIGNITY involves collaboration with stakeholders at three levels:

1. Civil Society partnerships
2. Governmental level including research institutions and local government authorities
3. The multilateral level including relevant international organisations and with senior DIGNITY staff in key positions in CAT as well as the CPT

Annexes of the DED on context analysis were found by the Desk Appraisal to comprise satisfactory descriptions of partner selection criteria in the context of context analysis. DIGNITY's track record in identifying and building the capacity of local partners has been confirmed by numerous external assessments, most recently in the context of the MENA region<sup>4</sup>. matched by numerous reviews

DIGNITY is working in a continuously changing and volatile political environment at both international and local levels. Partners are reported to form an upwards stream of evidence and experience-based advocacy from the civil society to governments and international governance bodies and at the same time a downward stream of translation of new norms to local legislation and practices. With the ambition to strengthen the translation into practices and social change on the ground, CSOs are paramount to the objective of fewer people suffering from torture in developing countries. Therefore, the first criteria in the selection of partners is that they have access to our end beneficiaries and important stakeholders.

The specific selection criteria are as follows:

- Partners must have access to beneficiaries, relevant stakeholders and authorities
- Partners must be committed to reach a joint purpose and objectives
- Added value from the partnership must be clear
- Partners must have capacity and relevant knowledge to play a key role nationally
- Partners must be willing to share knowledge for the benefit of beneficiaries
- Partners must be independent local NGOs with their own statutes

In Annex 2 of the DED on DIGNITY Partners, it is stated that 'partnership Over the coming grant period DIGNITY will engage with a range of new partners as part of its geographical focus on Africa and regions of origin. These partners are yet to be identified (...)'.  
#6

It is recommended that DIGNITY ambitions to engage with a range of new partners as part of the stronger geographical focus on Africa and the ability of DIGNITY to draw on their own best practice from the MENA region be monitored closely in reporting and discussed during annual consultations.

---

<sup>4</sup> Danish Arab Partnership Programme (2017-2022) - Mid-Term Review Report (draft)

### 3.3 Development effectiveness

The Desk Appraisal notes that focus of DIGNITY in pursuing a localisation agenda is very much on local partnerships with strategic right-holders and duty-bearers, in other words with a combination of government institutions and civil society partners. The proposed support is well aligned to local partner needs and relevant human rights defenders in the respective country contexts. The experience of DIGNITY as consortium lead on a human rights and dialogue engagement consortium under the Danish Arab partnership Programme, DAPP (2017-2022) might be of relevance to build on as the organisation increases its presence in the context Africa.

Coordination with other development partners is less evident in the proposed documentation, possibly as a reflection of the extent to which DIGNITY is an organisation with its staff and expertise concentrated at HQ level in Denmark and only relatively modest presence in Danish Arab Partnership Programme focus countries such as Jordan and Tunisia. The potential for coordination with development partners at implementation level might be worth exploring, not least as DIGNITY expands into country contexts in Africa where their local presence was less significant historically.

Effectiveness in the context of Danish funders of DIGNITY might also hold potential for better coordination and synergy effects. The share provided by MFA of DIGNITY's total income in 2019 of DKK 139m is a significant DKK 98.9m. The present DED accounts for the lion's share with DKK 53m but support for the human rights and dialogue consortium under DAPP is DKK 45m, a significant amount even if this amount is shared by DIGNITY and four other consortium partners.

Denmark's collaboration with DIGNITY also comprises high-profile norm-setting in relation to international human rights processes and fora. This is why effectiveness discussions should also include relevant staff of the MFA Legal Affairs department.

#7 It is recommended that light-touch donor coordination be organised in preparation of the Annual Consultation by the MFA Multilateral Cooperation Department to include, as a minimum, the Departments for Legal Affairs, MENA, Financial Management and Support and with option of inviting the Danish Regions and the Parliamentary Ombudsman.

## 4. Management and Organisation

### 4.1 Management, reporting and review mechanisms

Proposed management arrangements of the DED consist of a short reference and link to Danida's Aid Management Guidelines for Programmes and Projects and the General Guidelines for Financial Management followed by a comprehensive overview of reporting deadlines and timing of technical and strategic consultations envisaged for June and November every year from 2021 to 2024. The parties have agreed to evaluate arrangements by 2022.

The Desk Appraisal finds the proposed arrangements to be satisfactory and in light of the fact that a comprehensive performance review was completed as recently as January 2020 does not see an acute need for more review or evaluation during the proposed grant period.

However, as already indicated in earlier recommendations of this Desk Appraisal, there are plenty of aspects that in the assessment of the Desk Appraisal would merit close monitoring in the outlined reporting and annual consultation mechanisms for dialogue with DIGNITY during the four-year period. These include but are not necessarily limited to documentable progress on these three priorities that are all characterised by medium to long-term time horizons.

### **I. Promoting prevention of torture in places of detention**

Torture prevention constitutes the classic mandate of DIGNITY and has not lost its relevance with numbers of detainees steadily rising on a global scale. Integration of research, norm-setting and interventions gives DIGNITY a platform for prevention which a unique position of long-term funding makes it possible to take to a large scale.

Implementation of dignified standards of confinement is a clear mandate and far from exhausted as prevention of terrorism is frequently used as an excuse to compromise safeguards and ill-treatment under authoritarian rule is gaining foothold in many parts of the world. DIGNITY's role in global advocacy makes it a strong Danish partner in multilateral norm-setting and merits the following attention points:

- Stronger focus on Danish priority countries and regions in the global South
- Clearer links between research, norm-setting and development results to step up DIGNITY's global advocacy role
- Translation of DIGNITY's global Theory of Change into tangible results in developing countries

### **II. Aid-effectiveness and progress of localisation**

Long-term funding comes with expectations on a process of continuous improvement when it comes to organisational fitness for purpose and achievement of results on the basis of cost-effectiveness.

Important avenues for improved effectiveness include governance reform, focus on translation of ODA-resources into results in developing countries and transparent budgeting. Reform points meriting attention during annual consultations during this strategy period relate to:

- Reform progress on composition and appointment of the Board
- Localisation focus on investment in developing country results
- Financial transparency expressed in outcome-based budgets

The strategy period (2019-21) allows for testing the methodology required to establish a baseline for DIGNITY to demonstrate a gradual increase in the share of ODA-resources invested in developing country results. With methodology and baseline established and tested, the period from 2022-24 will allow for quantifiable targets to be set during consultations in 2021.

### **III. Protection against urban violence**

Urban violence is one of three overall DIGNITY priorities and responds to the ever-broader understanding currently evolving of what constitutes torture. Global growth of cities is a challenge as cities are often corrupt and marred by multidimensional violence, including torture by authorities and crime-related and gender-based violence that the state can be seen to fail to protect citizens against. At the same time, DIGNITY needs to be mindful of the strength of its core mandate and the particular comparative advantages that flow and do not from it.

Protection against multi-faceted manifestations of violence responds to large-scale human rights violations that resonate with context analyses underpinning Danish development engagements, not least in Sub-Saharan Africa. The scope of urban violence ambitions nonetheless merits critical attention in programme design, implementation and dialogue on results:

- Documentation of tangible and scalable urban violence results
- Comparative advantage of DIGNITY in broad violence context
- Demonstration of relevant links with torture by authorities

#### **4.2 Budget and financial management**

Section 7 of the DED provides an overview of the budget according to each output area and with specifications under each of these about the share that is transferred to partners in developing countries, by (i) Partners and country offices in Africa and (ii) Partners and country offices, other DAC. This presentation of the budget is quite explicit and detailed about what funds are expected to be used on.

In this regard, the budget clearly addresses two concerns that have increasingly been raised in relation to the flexible Danish framework funding to civil society and human rights organisations; 1) the difficulty of linking the use of funds to the delivery of tangible results of relevance to Danish priorities; 2) the difficulty of ensuring that a reasonable share of the funds are actually used in developing countries, given that these grants are financed through development assistance budgets. The budget format and costing model is based on a model that has been developed jointly with other relevant MFA departments - Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Engagement (HCE) and Financial Management Support (FRU). The aim has been to provide a more solid basis for assessing both effectiveness and efficiency.

The Desk Appraisal notes that financial management of the DED involves phasing out of the earlier FAK-overhead by end of January 2020. This should make for a more transparent model of accounting for indirect costs.

Ambitions on localisation are translated into the DED as stipulations that transfers to the Global South will increase with DKK 1.5m every year as of 2022 and gradually rise to a level of 21.7% of the total grant at the end of 2024. The Desk Appraisal finds that this quite specific requirement merits careful monitoring in reporting.

#8 It is recommended that performance in increasing transfers to the Global South to 21.7% is monitored closely, not only to establish if agreed targets are met but also to ensure a continuous dialogue with DIGNITY during and between Annual Consultations on benefits and challenges of this transition process.

### 4.3 Sustainability and exit strategies

Financial sustainability is a critical issue for DIGNITY. Income for rehabilitation services rendered to Danish Regions constitute just under 15% of the budget and the share of the total budget of DKK 139m coming from MFA represents more than 70%. This creates a classical situation of dependency on one donor which is only made more difficult by the evidence of a degree of international donor fatigue when it comes to funding anti-torture<sup>5</sup>.

When it comes to sustainability and exit strategies in DIGNITY support to partner organisations in the Global South, this is not an issue that is clearly addressed in the documentation, possibly due to the fact that DIGNITY has had such a strong presence in Denmark and pressure has been on the organisation to spend more resources in the Global South.

Nevertheless, the Desk Appraisal finds that it could be relevant for DIGNITY to define some key criteria and principles to provide more clarity on what are some of the factors that may lead to the conclusion, renewal or transformation of a partnership e.g. by defining clearer milestones including considerations about organisational development issues such as capacity to engage women and youth in preventive measures that demonstrate clear focus and links with comparative advantages of the organisation.

### 4.4 Risks and assumptions

The Risk Management Matrix included as Annex 5 of the DED is comprehensive and has been updated recently with clear and convincing details on the risk of future Covid-19 outbreaks or similar scenarios hindering local and international travel.

---

<sup>5</sup> Mid-Term Review of support to the *International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT)* – MFA March 2020



DIGNITY operates in a context of human rights protection and promotion under increasing political pressure globally and at the same time suffering from a degree of donor fatigue. Societies with high levels of corruption have been shown to also have high levels of torture. This context requires monitoring and mitigation of risk at several levels:

- a. Contextual risk – there is a particular need for DIGNITY to manage risks relating to the increasing pressure on human rights agenda and human rights defenders, including among implementing partners in developing countries,
- b. Institutional risk – fiduciary risk and a degree of mission fatigue among donors of global anti-torture promotion is a reality that DIGNITY has to mitigate as it strives to diversify its resource mobilisation and develop global partnerships,
- c. Programmatic risk – when engaging in programming activities addressing urban violence, DIGNITY needs to mitigate a risk to its clear profile by demonstrating clear links to comparative advantages of DIGNITY as an actor.

Results and challenges in the management of these and related risks will be part of DIGNITY's annual reporting that will form the basis of annual consultations with MFA, as specific in Annex A on management arrangements.

This engagement rests on a number of important assumptions to be monitored closely and discussed during annual consultations, including but not necessarily limited to:

- Public and political support for the international anti-torture agenda is maintained at a level allowing DIGNITY to pursue its mandate in collaboration with its strategic partners,
- DIGNITY pursues its mandate in accordance with its strategic priorities and optimises the opportunities at hand to make sensible use of available resources to realise the vision of a world where fewer people are subjected to torture,
- Organisational capacity is available to avoid and, if necessary, promptly react to, any staff misconduct, financial or other irregularity, to counter misuse of funds and reputational damage.

The Desk Appraisal concludes that risk scenarios are adequately described with a high degree of realism in risk response and background to the assessments and merit continuous review and discussion during and between Annual Consultations.

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Date: November 1, 2020

F2: 2020-37978

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### Desk appraisal of Danish Support to DIGNITY – “A World Without Torture”

##### 1. Introduction

These terms of reference (ToR) sets out the objectives, outputs and scope of work for a desk appraisal of Danish Support to DIGNITY – “A World Without Torture” (2021-2024).

##### 2. Background and context

###### Background

The fight against torture has been an important priority for successive Danish governments for decades and Denmark has together with partners established a unique platform for working with anti-torture. This is clearly reflected in the current strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action. *The World 2030* confirms the ambition for Denmark to remain a significant and long-term global defender of human rights, democracy and gender equality through - inter alia - ‘cooperation between relevant Danish authorities and actors within human rights and democracy’ and a ‘persistent effort in the fight against torture’.

DIGNITY is globally recognized for its multi-faceted technical expertise and experience making it a legitimate and credible partner uniquely positioned to fight torture, promote rehabilitation of victims and disseminate knowledge for torture prevention and rehabilitation. DIGNITY continues to respond to the evolving concept and expressions of torture in the interplay between interventions, capacity building of partners, research and norm setting activities.

DIGNITY has been subject to a number of reviews and evaluations, most recently in January 2020. The review concluded in broad terms that DIGNITY was a relevant partner for Denmark yet it should improve its ability to document results and prepare a global theory of change.

For a number of years the MFA has provided funding to DIGNITY in line with the now out-phased rules for NGO-partners. The coming support for 2021-2024 will follow the guidelines for programmes and projects.

## Context

Torture is one of the gravest international crimes and a direct attack on human dignity. It has devastating consequences for individuals and communities, leaving torture survivors with severe psycho-social and somatic challenges, sometimes for life. Their close families typically suffer at least as much, and many children inherit their parents' traumatization. Societal costs are similarly huge because untreated trauma and other health problems after torture stand in the way of integration, employment, and development.

The exact prevalence of torture is, by definition, impossible to measure, as torture is often exercised behind closed doors in prisons, police stations, and in private settings. However, measured by relevant 'proxies' – including ratification of the UN Convention against Torture, adoption of legal safeguards and other protective measures in the justice system, establishment of mechanisms of independent monitoring of places of detention, and referrals of traumatized victims to treatment - progress has been achieved in the global fight against torture and CIDPT over the last few decades. Nevertheless, according to Amnesty International, torture and other cruel inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (CIDTP) are still reported in 141 countries, from every region of the world. The current rise of authoritarian regimes and shrinking civic space across the world do risk triggering a new increase in the use of torture.

### **3. Objective**

The objective of the appraisal is to quality-assure and provide recommendations for the Development Engagement Document, and its related cover note and annexes that makes up the underlying documentation for the Danish support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture. The appraisal will assess the quality of the proposed documentation against the MFA's Aid Management Guidelines, including follow up on recommendations from the Programme Committee.

### **4. Outputs/deliverables**

The outputs of the appraisal will be:

- An Appraisal Report with specific recommendations to the appropriation documentation to be submitted to MUS;
- A Summary of Recommendations Overview of the specific recommendations to be submitted alongside the Final Appraisal Report.

### **5. Scope of Work**

The scope of work will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following tasks:

1. Overall rationale and justification incl. preparation process
  - Assess the relevance of the development engagement and its objectives in a global and/or national context and its compatibility with Danish development policy;
  - Assess justification and rationale of the development engagement support design;
  - Assess the adequacy of the preparation process, i.e., whether the necessary analyses have been prepared, including a stakeholder analysis, and whether there has been sufficient consultation with and participation by key stakeholders and target group representatives, where relevant;
  - Consideration by the development engagement of relevant previous experiences and lessons learned;
2. Project/Programme
  - Assess of the development engagement objectives and quality of the results framework;
  - Assess contribution towards poverty reduction and human rights, relevant Danish thematic strategies including gender equality and the four HRBA principles;
  - The political, social, technical, institutional and financial feasibility of the development engagement;
  - Assess commitment to the development engagement by the partner and major stakeholders and capacity of partner institution(s) to absorb and manage the support;
3. The management and organisation of the development engagement including reporting and review mechanisms;
  - The adequacy of the proposed financial management system including accounting, auditing and procurement mechanisms;
  - Budget including budget allocation expected efficiency and costing;
  - The sustainability of the expected outcome of the development engagement including exit strategy;
  - The adequacy of the proposed monitoring system (quality of baseline data, indicators);
  - The assumptions, risks and pre-conditions, i.e. whether these have been sufficiently analysed and whether relevant mitigating measures are included (ref. to Danida Guidelines for risk management);

## **6. Method of work**

An external consultant will conduct the appraisal. The appraisal will be undertaken in accordance with Danida's Aid Management Guidelines.

The work will comprise a desk study. During the desk study, the team will review key documents provided by MUS.

## **7. Timing**

The appraisal will commence from 1 November 2020 and is expected to be completed by 9 November 2020 in accordance with the following schedule:

1 November                      Appraisal initiated

9 November with MUS – presentation of findings and recommendations

## **8. Team composition**

One external consultant.

## **9. Background documents**

List of background documents to be finalised in consultation and uploaded to a sharepoint location which the Consultant will have access to. Documents to be compiled includes:

- Development Engagement Document + annexes
- Underlying documentation as set out in the list of supplementary materials.
- Other documents as relevant

Copenhagen, November 1 2020

## Annex 2: Preliminary screening note

### DIGNITY appropriation 2021-24 preliminary screening note

30-10-2020

F2 # 2020-33246

<b>I. Programme document/operational plan and results framework</b>	
<b>MFA Appraisal Team (LAR/ASS)</b>	<b>MUS Comment</b>
Dignity's operational plan for 2021, including results framework, to be annexed.	<i>As part of the formulation process, it has been agreed that DIGNITY forwards their operational plan for discussion and approval at the strategic consultations to be held early in January 2021.</i>
A clear recommendation from the last review was that DIGNITY interventions should be focused on torture prevention, geographically concentrated in African and emphasis should be on advocacy and scalability (to ensure cost-effectiveness and impact and balance between different interventions areas). This should be included in the operational plan	<i>Øget fokus på Afrika og scalability er reflekteret i teksten i DED og flerårigt budget. Vil også blive reflekteret i årsplan og resultatramme for 2021. Prevention fylder fremover markant mere end rehabilitering i DIGNITY's vores internationale arbejde. der er fokus på advocacy med skarpt og direkte syd-relevans i vores resultatramme.</i>
Reference to the Danish common academic pay scale (fællesakademisk lønskala) as norm setting for salary levels in the organisation.	<i>Agree.</i>
No baseline established for several outputs – is this acceptable?	<i>Agree. DIGNITY will insert details and figures.</i>
<b>II. Risk management</b>	
Add a section on financial/fiduciary risks as part of the risk management chapter	<i>Agree. Will be inserted.</i>
<b>III. Budget</b>	
Include principles related to the inclusion of a transparent and documented fair share of indirect costs, documented through transparent and reasonable cost allocation mechanism e.g. through pro rata, time registration-key, full time equivalents, head count or similar.	<i>Agree – the concrete text regarding the modality shall be included either directly in the text or as a supplementary appendix, which shall be considered an integral part of the DED.</i>
Is the proposed model in line with other similar organisations?	<i>The model has been developed over the past year by DIGNITY using an experienced consultant, that the MFA also use on these matters. The model has been informed by previous reports on FAK-overhead and the consultations with Spa-partners.</i>
2021 could be accepted as a transition year. From 2022 the chosen cost allocation model should be applied to all grants.	<i>Agree. This has been communicated to DIGNITY that concurs. No</i>

For eligibility of funds, the pro-rata costs must be subject to ex-post correction based on actual accounting registrations. Unused funds that cannot be traced back to factual accounting figures as per the registrations cannot result in free or unallocated funds.	<i>The ministry can approve an increased pro-rata costs for 2021 but beyond that year the Ministry can not approve an increased pro-rata costs for the present grant. The partner has been informed as such in an email.</i>
Transfers are divided between Africa and other DAC in output 1 and 2 but not 3 (this applies only to budget in DED)	<i>Point taken. This has been rectified.</i>
Dignity's total aggregate income, including all other funding sources (perhaps excluding funds from local municipalities for treatment in Denmark) – risk of cross-subsidizing?	<i>Agree. A table will be attached as an annex.</i>
Budget commentary explaining priorities and relation to outputs	<i>This is part of an annual plan</i>
<b>IV. Financial management</b>	
<b>Appraisal team comments</b>	<b>MUS comments</b>
What is the guiding principle for which themes to be included in DED chapter 9 (financial management)?	<i>There has been a need to adapt the FMG to the particular needs of providing support to self-governed institutions based in Denmark. Parts of the FMG with particular relevance for this purpose has been inserted in the section on financial management. But as a governing principle all minimum requirements of the FMG shall be observed, unless otherwise noted under special conditions. "For eligibility of expenses, the grant is administered according to the General Guidelines for Financial Management – unless exemptions or other more specific details/condition are outlined in this document (or separate email exchange), c.f. section 9.b. below."</i>
Consider changing reallocation threshold to 30 % of outputs, which will be in line with SP-guidelines	<i>Agree.</i>
It is not possible to reallocate between years but to expense unused funds in the following year	<i>Agree. – suggested change to "DIGNITY has the discretion expense unused funds in the following year, with attention to the budget constraint provided by the funds committed at a given time and subject to ministry approval."</i>
Audit requirements are not clear and not in line with FMG	<i>A specific note has been added so as to indicate that the audit must always comply with the requirements set out in the FMG: "The audit shall be administered in accordance with the requirements established in the Financial Management Guidelines. <a href="https://amg.um.dk/en/tools/financial-management/">https://amg.um.dk/en/tools/financial-management/</a>". Section suggesting appendix statement has been removed.</i>

<p>Consider adding a section on monitoring of partners – programmatic and financial (DIGNITY partnership approach).</p>	<p><i>Agree. The following para will be inserted:  Programmatic and financial monitoring of DIGNITY partners.  DIGNITY will implement a multiannual plan for programmatic and financial monitoring of local partners to assess and document, on a continuously basis, capacity and performance in delivering results with Value for Money and ensure compliance and accountability. The monitoring could encompass field visits by controllers (follow-up on implementation of activities); checks on procurement standards applied, HR (i.e. safeguarding, sexual harassment and bullying policies), and anti-corruption policies; and systematic follow-up on recommendations from previous monitoring visits.</i></p>
<p>Duration of grant 24 months?</p>	<p><i>Concur – this is not correct. The duration of the DED-document is 48 months while the duration of the grant is 12 months.</i></p>
<p>Mid-term review, what will be the basis for the review?</p>	<p><i>DIGNITY will continue to produce yearly reports and plans as part of the DED, see section 8 b on Meeting and Reporting procedures</i></p>



## Summary of recommendations of the appraisal

[The final appraisal report<sup>1</sup> must include this table summarising the recommendations regarding the further preparation of the *[country programme/programme/project]*. The recommendations<sup>2</sup> of the appraisal report requiring action from the responsible unit are presented in the left column below, and the table must be signed by the appraisal team leader (TQS representative) and received by the responsible unit no later than 14 days after the end of the appraisal process. The right column is filled in by the responsible unit, when the final *[country programme/programme/project]* documentation has been prepared, and the table is forwarded to the Under-Secretary for Global Development and Cooperation and TQS as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks before the planned presentation of the appropriation to the Council for Development Policy, i.e. two weeks before the request for inclusion of the appropriation on the agenda of the Council for Development Policy is forwarded to TQS.

It is important that the text is easily understood by members of the Council for Development Policy (and the general public) without reading the full appraisal report. See the attached guidance for completion of the template with some important writing tips and suggestions. This explanatory text and the guidance should be deleted before submission.]

<b>Title of (Country) Programme</b>	<b>Support to DIGNITY - A World Without Torture (2021-2024)</b>
<b>File number/F2 reference</b>	<b>2020-33246</b>
<b>Appraisal report date</b>	<b>9 November 2020</b>
<b>Council for Development Policy meeting date</b>	<b>26 November 2020</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> This table is mandatory for appropriations over DKK 39 million, but may also be useful in the case of appropriations below DKK 39 million.

<sup>2</sup> The number of recommendations should under normal circumstances not exceed 10; in case of large and complex (country) programmes this maximum may be exceeded.

**Summary of possible recommendations not followed**

**(to be filled in by the responsible unit)**

**Overall conclusion of the appraisal**

The proposed Development Engagement “Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture 2021-2024” continues Denmark’s long-standing partnership with DIGNITY. The proposed grant remains at the level of DKK 53m annually over four years, subject to Parliamentary approval. However, the modality of support has been modified from the previous more flexible funding with wide discretion for DIGNITY to manage funds and cover its core functions to earmarked funding. This is part of a general change in the agreements of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) with human rights and democracy organisations with a view to enhancing the documentation of concrete results that are in line with Danish policy priorities.

The objective of this Desk Appraisal (DA) is to provide quality assurance of the design and documentation of the new engagement in line with Danida Aid Management Guidelines (AMG). Proposed support for DIGNITY was already examined by the Danida Programme Committee (PC) on 5 February 2020 when an organisational strategy was discussed. The PC approved of the substance and scope of support but resolved that support should align to Aid Management Guidelines for projects and Programmes and comply with the established format for Development Engagement Documents (DED). The grant preparation phase has since been quite thorough and has involved comprehensive consultations between MUS and DIGNITY.

The DA notes that the area of Urban Violence is a subject of critical attention when assessing progress reporting and dialogue during annual consultations.

In summary, this Desk Appraisal endorses the proposed support for DIGNITY and provides a number of suggestions and recommendations for revision of the Development Engagement Document (DED) and subsequent reporting and dialogue, not least in relation to improved documentation of results and increased focus on localisation of the engagement in the Global South, to be monitored closely during an inception phase defined as January to June 2021.

**Recommendations by the appraisal team**

**Follow up by the responsible unit**

<b>Country programme/Programme Level:</b>	
<i>[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant e.g. justification and rationale of the country programme/programme, preparation process and strategic linkages between country programme vis-à-vis the country policy document. etc.]</i>	
[Title]	
[No.]	
<b>Thematic Programme Level:</b>	
<i>[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant e.g. consideration of relevant Danida strategies; follow-up to the recommendations of the Danida Programme Committee; programme design including rationale, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and partner choices; adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda; budget; risks and risk management; etc.]</i>	
[Title]	
[No.]	
<b>Engagement Level</b>	
<i>[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant e.g. capacity of partners; results framework; budget allocation; risks and risk management; engagement management; monitoring and reporting; etc.]</i>	
<b>Programme Design</b>	
1. It is recommended that “Support to DIGNITY – A World Without Torture 2021-2024” be presented to the Council for Development Policy (UPR) following completion of documentation in accordance with recommendations of this Desk Appraisal.	Concur

<p>2. It is recommended to add a brief outline to Section 2 of the DED the rationale behind the change in support modality and emphasize MFA's commitment to keeping a balance between the focus on results in the Global South related to own funding, and maintaining a strong expert organisation that can be relied on to operationalize Danish policy objectives on torture prevention and rehabilitation.</p>	<p>The MFA has decided to align the present engagement with the Guidelines for Programme and Projects on the basis of a DED in order to comply with requirements for reporting ODA to OECD-DAC. Given that DIGNITY as an organisation also runs a clinic in Denmark makesin ineligible to receive core support. The format, however, has proven to be useful in terms of creating coherence between strategy, theory of change, results and budgets and have been appreciated by both sides in the formulation process. The MFA acknowledges that documentation, research, filtering of information and advocacy continue to be important parts of DIGNITY's work. Yet given the review of 2020 recommended a stronger focus on partnerships in the South the both DIGNITY and the MFA has followed through on this intent.</p>
<p>3. It is recommended that programming and implementation of DIGNITY initiatives on urban violence are monitored and made the subject of critical attention when assessing progress reporting and dialogue to assess outcome of the grant during annual consultations.</p>	<p>Concur</p>

<p>4. It is recommended that DED references to localisation ambitions be clarified in Section 5 to (a) explain the background, process and expected benefits of gradually stronger localisation of support to the Global South and (b) reconcile the DD references to a gradually incremental target for transfers to the Global South of 21.7% by 2024 with the notion the notion that focus will be entirely on developing countries, notably in Africa.</p>	<p>In the coming years DIGNITY in addition to the specialized interventions will be focusing more on holistic interventions embedded in the local communities. To promote this, DIGNITY will be scaling up support to local partners in Africa both through a strengthening of the existing partnerships, where relevant, as well as through new partnerships. To support the process of entering into new partnerships with a number of new partners.</p>
<p><b>Theory of change</b></p>	
<p>5. It is recommended that the results framework of the DED and Annex 5 be completed to include clarity on what is understood by ‘direct’ and ‘indirect beneficiaries’ and the intended means of verification of the outcome indicator as well as an operational definition in output 2.2 (Violence in communities) of what defines a ‘chain of positive change’ and the intended means of verification to measure progress against set targets.</p>	<p>Direct beneficiaries are individuals who are directly in touch with the intervention like victims getting access to a better treatment inmates who get better protection.</p> <p>Direct beneficiaries are individuals who enjoy the benefits of the intervention without being directly in touch with the latter.</p> <p>A chain of positive change is a variable from outcome harvesting that denotes mechanisms that can be reinforced and/or introduced leading to anticipated change. The chain is subject to external assessment or peer reviews.</p> <p>The intended means of verification is outcome harvesting.</p>
<p><b>Capacity development</b></p>	
<p><b>Partnerships</b></p>	



I hereby confirm that the responsible unit has undertaken the follow-up activities stated above. In cases where recommendations have not been accepted, reasons for this are given either in the table or in the notes enclosed.

Signed on November 10 by Henriette Ellermann-Kingombe.