### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAHVIO</td>
<td>Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDDH</td>
<td>Council of Europe Sub-Committee on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention to End Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>Convention of States Parties to the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Disabled Peoples’ Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>European Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECtHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENNHRI</td>
<td>European Network of National Human Rights Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENO</td>
<td>European Network of Ombudsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Agency for Fundamental Rights of the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOA</td>
<td>International Ombudsmen Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOI</td>
<td>International Ombudsmen Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRI</td>
<td>National Human Rights Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>National Preventative Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAM</td>
<td>Association of Mediterranean Ombudsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCAT</td>
<td>Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE-ODIHR</td>
<td>OSCE -Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Sub-Committee on Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIEX</td>
<td>Technical Assistance and Information Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-OHCHR</td>
<td>UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

Introduction
In the context of strategic planning, 33 members (over 80% of ENNHRI’s membership) responded to a membership survey. This high response rate shows a high degree of member engagement in ENNHRI, and an interest in its future work. The survey was completed primarily by staff, but also by management and Commissioners or Ombudspersons of the member institutions.

Past Work of the European Group of NHRI
In relation to past work, members had participated in activities as set out in the chart below. Where members had not participated, this was mostly due to a lack of financial or human resources. The past work of the European Group of NHRI was generally found to be useful, although it was noted that activities could be more structured; planned more strategically; have more representative participation; and be better communicated to both members and external stakeholders.

Several ideas were put forward for improving the above work streams in the future, including:

- Better communications, including accessible centralised information and the establishment of an ENHRI website;
- A more systemised, structured and strategic approach to activities;
- The increased functionality of the Secretariat, including forward planning, linking members’ activities in advance and coordinating working groups;
- More frequent and longer membership meetings, with more scope for thematic and subgroup discussions, and better preparation and rules for engagement;
- More accessible information and time for comments on documents, especially given language difficulties (including the possibility of translation or interpretation);
- Greater member participation in decision making;
- Scope for scholarships or funding for participation; and
- A more equal sharing of participation and capacity for activities.
Current view of ENNHRI
Members set out the following key aspects for a SWOT analysis of ENNHRI.

Strengths
- Membership, including expertise, diversity and the nature of NHRIs;
- Legacy of past work, including working groups and established relationships with key stakeholders;
- Regional voice, which understands wider Europe and which together is stronger and more legitimate; and
- Permanent Secretariat, particularly as it is based in Brussels.

Weaknesses
- Limited resources, in both the Secretariat and member institutions, leading to non-participation by the latter;
- Diversity of members (priorities, status, mandate, languages, etc.), which makes coordination and consensus a challenge;
- Insufficient communications between members and profile with external stakeholders (the lack of a website); and
- Limited institutional capacity and focus, with a lack of clear role and functions.

Opportunities
- International influence and engagement, including common stands on key issues to further human rights protection in the region;
- Collaboration between members, including mutual support; sharing of information and best practice; and joint projects, advocacy and statements;
- Support to NHRIs, including capacity building and raising of NHRIs’ profile;
- New Permanent Secretariat in Brussels, seeking funding and learning from other networks; and
- Enhanced communications, for better visibility and internal communications.

Threats
- Limited funding, for both the Secretariat and members, as well as the economic crisis and worsening human rights climate;
- Diversity of membership, which impacts on members’ inclusion and ENNHRI’s focus;
- Non-participation of many members, which limits ENNHRI’s effectiveness; and
- Duplication of the work of other European networks, and high expectations, which could lead to a loss of confidence.

A vast majority (over 90%) of respondents are members of other networks of national protection bodies, which could impact members’ expectations, needs and capacity for ENNHRI’s work. The key advantages from these networks were the exchange of information and spreading best practice; training and seminars; building institutional capacity; networking; learning from experience for better (and shared) problem solving; and the enhanced protection of rights.

Preliminaries for strategic planning
In considering ENNHRI’s values, the most popular components, from those provided in the survey, were those already included in ENNHRI’s statutes, namely: respect of international human rights standards; transparency; cooperation; accountability; participation; and non-discrimination. Several members also suggested other potential values for ENNHRI, from which ‘independence’ was particularly popular.
The most popular components for ENNHRI’s vision, from those suggested in the survey, were ‘Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs throughout Europe’ and ‘enhanced promotion and protection of human rights throughout Europe’. Following these two, ‘respect for international human rights standards throughout Europe’ also received notable support, although it was noted to have considerable overlap with the second component. A few other possible vision statements were suggested by respondents.

The most popular of the possible components provided in the survey for an ENNHRI mission were the ‘facilitating communication and cooperation between European NHRIs’ and ‘supporting the effective functioning of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs in Europe’. 50% of respondents stated that the term for ENNHRI’s immediate strategic plan should be 3 years, in order to keep it relevant and allow for review in good time. 34% of respondents supported a 4 year term, in order to ensure that capacity was not used too soon for the next phase of planning.

**Future work of ENNHRI**

Members prioritised the strengthening of NHRIs in Europe as the most important potential pillar for ENNHRI’s next strategic plan, from the options provided in the survey. Within this pillar, ‘increasing the institutional capacity of NHRIs in Europe (methodological)’ was found to be the most important current area of work, particularly in relation to ‘providing training and capacity-building initiatives’, and ‘supporting the A-status accreditation of NHRIs in Europe’.

If working groups were to be set up to increase capacity on institutional methodology, the most popular subject areas were ‘monitoring’, and ‘reporting to international mechanisms’, followed by ‘human rights education’. ‘Information exchange’ was favoured as the best current method for the spread of best practice. Throughout the survey, capacity building and information exchange were repeatedly underlined by various respondents as important future activities for ENNHRI.

**Building a strong and sustainable Secretariat** had the second highest level of support, from those provided in the survey. Within this pillar, the ‘development and implementation of a fundraising strategy’ was clearly seen as the most important activity, particularly in the initial period. The next most popular activities within this pillar were ‘relationship building with critical stakeholders’, ‘building capacity (human resources)’ and a ‘communication strategy’. A website was the most popular method for enhancing communications, followed by emails or e-bulletins to members. Indeed, the need for a website was mentioned by several members throughout the survey.

The third most popular potential pillar for ENNHRI’s next strategic plan, from those provided in the survey, was enhancing the promotion and protection of human rights in Europe. Respondents recorded that this could best be achieved through ‘building the institutional capacity of NHRIs (substantive)’, followed by ‘intervening in policy development at a European level’, ‘ENNHRI statements on human rights in Europe’ and ‘providing training and capacity building (substantive)’.

If substantive working groups were to be set up, the most useful to respondents was ‘asylum and migration (including trafficking)’, followed by ‘CRPD’. Thereafter, ‘legal’, ‘detention (and torture)’, ‘older persons’ rights’ and ‘austerity (economic, social and
economic rights) were also popular. These subject areas could also be considered as relevant for capacity building initiatives.

The least popular pillar, from those provided in the survey, was **regional engagement**. However, it was also noted that regional engagement and enhancing rights are intrinsically linked and could be integrated. The value of NHRIIs coming together to form a regional voice was also underlined by several members throughout the survey. Cooperation between NHRIIs was also found to be important, through information exchange, meetings, working groups, spread of best practice, and a website.

Respondents ranked the most important mechanisms for engagement as UN OHCHR and Council of Europe, followed by the UN Human Rights Council and ‘UN treaty bodies and special procedures’. It was noted by a few members that regional mechanisms should be prioritised over international mechanisms. The most popular method for engagement was ‘partnership working and joint projects’.

Suggestions for other potential pillars for the strategic plan were:
- Development of member NHRIIs and their staff (or ‘support for members’);
- Facilitating Europe’s positive role globally in the promotion and protection of human rights;
- Preventing human rights restrictions in the financial crisis;
- Partnership working; and
- Influencing strategic communication.

**Conclusion**
Respondents to the survey provided a wealth of information which is an invaluable resource, both to evaluate past work and to discuss ideas for future work. Members’ responses have also provided a strong starting point for elaborating the next strategic plan.

Several respondents underlined that the survey and strategic plan should be considered in the context of ENNHRI’s current institutional development. In this regard, a few members stated that the strategic plan should not be too ambitious, given limited capacity. Some members also noted that priorities would likely change over the life of the strategic plan, with institution building being a greater priority in the early stages.

Members will have the opportunity to discuss member survey at the strategic planning meeting in Budapest on 13 to 15 November 2013.
2. Introduction

2.1 Context

In February 2013, a Permanent Secretariat was established to support and facilitate the work of the European Group of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs). On 7 May 2013, the European Group of NHRIs met and discussed a process for strategic planning, which would be supported by the Secretariat. At the same meeting, members agreed to change the name of the European Group of NHRIs to the European Network of NHRIs (ENNHRI).

At the meeting on 7 May 2013, members agreed that a member survey would be used to collect members’ views on their experience, evaluation and future work of ENNHRI. The results of this member survey, in addition to a situational review, will help inform a discussion paper for a first draft strategic plan. Members will have an opportunity to consult on this discussion paper before meeting in November 2013 for a strategic planning meeting.

The membership survey also serves as a resource for the past work of the European Group of NHRIs. As the European Group of NHRIs previously did not have a Permanent Secretariat, there was no central collection of information on its activities. This report helps to fill the gaps in institutional memory of the work undertaken by the European Group of NHRIs.

2.2 Methodology

The Secretariat consulted with the European Coordinating Committee (ECC) on the content and format of the member survey. The survey contained three sections, namely:

A. Preliminaries – on respondents’ views on ENNHRI in relation to SWOT and its values, vision, mission, and the appropriate term of its next strategic plan.

B. Past Work – on members’ engagement and evaluation on past activities and work streams of the European Group of NHRIs; and

C. Future Work – on various potential strategic priorities and activities for the next strategic plan, many of which respondents were asked to prioritise.

The member survey was designed to collect both quantitative and qualitative information from members. On the one hand, members were asked to select or prioritise pre-filled options, including an ‘other’ option. On the other hand, each question and section allowed scope for free form comments from members. Where pre-filled options were provided, these options had a higher likelihood of support than one would expect for additional ‘other’ options provided by members (which could not be viewed in advance by other members). This has been taken into account when drawing information from the member survey for the discussion paper for the first draft strategic plan.

In Section C of the survey, on ENNHRI’s future work, respondents had the opportunity to rank possible work in order of priority. Therefore, the results are recorded as average rankings, as opposed to percentages or numbers of respondents’ support. In order to provide more information on the results, the text of
the report also refers to those components that received the most ‘first choice’ allocations, meaning that the highest number of respondents had prioritised that component as the most important within the given field\(^1\).

Out of 40 members and one observer, 33 institutions responded to the member survey, which is over 80% of members. This high response rate shows a high level of engagement in ENNHRI as well as interest in its future work. One member confirmed that it could not submit a response due to lack of capacity and resources\(^2\), and another could only complete half of the survey for the same reasons. The full list of respondents is included at Annex A and the full survey text is set out at Annex B.

![](Q2 Who was involved in completing this survey? (Please mark all that apply).)

From the 33 respondents, a combination of members, management, staff and advisers provided input to the responses. Staff had been involved in the majority of responses (81.82% of respondents, 27 members). This is welcomed, as it is likely that many staff will not be able to attend the strategic planning meeting in November 2013. Two members indicated that an ‘other’ actor was involved in completing the membership survey, namely:

- Acting Chair and Acting Chief Executive Officer; and
- Communication and International Relations Adviser.

\(^1\) The number of choices available to respondents affects the percentages for ‘first choice’, as where there is less choice, it is more likely that one of those components will be ranked by a higher number of respondents as ‘first choice’.

\(^2\) Greek National Commission for Human Rights.
3. Past Work of the European Group of NHRIs

3.1 Overview of Responses on Past Work

Members were asked to consider various work streams of the European Group of NHRIs over the last 15 years. In this section, the report will refer to the European Group of NHRIs, as opposed to ENNHRI, as the official name change only took place in the summer of 2013.

In relation to past work, members had participated in activities as set out in the chart below. Where members had not participated, this was mostly due to a lack of financial or human resources. The past work of the European Group of NHRIs was generally found to be useful, although it was noted that activities could be more structured, planned more strategically, have more representative participation, and be better communicated, to both members and external stakeholders.

Several ideas were put forward for improving the above work streams in the future, including:

- Better communications, including accessible centralised information and the establishment of an ENHRI website;
- A more systemised, structured and strategic approach to activities;
- The increased functionality of the Secretariat, including forward planning, linking members’ activities in advance and coordinating working groups;
- More frequent and longer membership meetings, with more scope for thematic and subgroup discussions, and better preparation and rules for engagement;
- More accessible information and time for comments on documents, especially given language difficulties (including the possibility of translation or interpretation);
- Greater member participation in decision making;
- Scope for scholarships or funding for participation; and
- A more equal sharing of participation and capacity for activities.
3.2 Information Sharing

Nearly 90% of respondents (28 members) had been involved in information sharing through the European Group of NHRI. Respondents had exchanged information through the Chair, the Secretariat and between members, although the latter was the most frequent method.

**Examples**

Information exchange occurred through emails, internet surveys and at meetings. Although some information exchange spread across the entire membership, other instances took place within the context of working groups, sub-regional groupings, between similar types of institutions (Ombudsmans), or bilaterally. Members reported that regular updates were shared with colleagues within their institutions.

Information had been shared in relation to member research projects, joint declarations, conferences and events, published reports, future collaboration, best practice and experience, consultations, and activities in the UN and EU. Members had also exchanged information on institutional methodologies, such as the establishment of an NHRI, the accreditation process, engagement with the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), and the production of annual reports. Examples of thematic areas of information exchange included migration\(^3\), disability\(^4\), older persons’ rights\(^5\) and gender rights\(^6\).

---

\(^3\) For example, statelessness, and the criminalisation of irregular migrants.


\(^5\) On elderly care homes.

\(^6\) Follow-up to the Amman Declaration and Plan of Action.
Evaluation
Several members found the information exchange to be informative, productive and beneficial. One respondent explained that the information exchange serves to inspire members, to learn from each other’s work, and to consider new ways to develop activities and programmes. Another found it particularly useful to receive up-to-date information on events and to participate in drafting policy statements. It was also noted that information exchange strengthened interventions with regional mechanisms7. Several members stated that communication and information exchange had strengthened since the creation of the Secretariat. Although one member preferred task-specific engagement, others requested that information sharing be prioritised and occur more frequently.

One respondent found the information exchange to be efficient and smooth, but others found that it was rather ad hoc and could be improved by being more systematic and planned. Indeed, one member found that a lot of information was sent rather infrequently and another found that deadlines were sometimes too close and other times too far away. A few members stated that more time was required to work with documents and respond to information requests, particularly given the language aspect.

Members also noted the lack of clarity in information exchange, as it was not always clear if active input was requested or desired. One member stated that the email format was inadequate to communicate efficiently on a project8. One respondent welcomed the ‘survey monkey’ tool, which provided more clarity and was more time-efficient. It was suggested that the functionality of the Secretariat could be increased to reduce members’ capacity demands and ensure continued ENNHRI engagement with key mechanisms.

Ideas for improvement in the future:
- Establish an intranet or public website and forum, instead of emails;
- Clarify the information required and provide a longer time-line for responses;
- Provide regular and structured information on ENNHRI activities;
- Increase the functionality and support of the Secretariat;
- Provide a shared calendar to help with forward planning, with as much notice as possible, including EU, Council of Europe, OHCHR and ICC events;
- Explore setting up a fund for information sharing;
- Link members coming before UPR or treaty bodies in the same session, so that they could work collaboratively during these processes (through Secretariat horizon scanning);
- Provide more feedback on Bureau and Sub-Committee on Accreditation (SCA) developments; and
- Facilitate information exchange in French.

7 For example, the Interlaken process through the Legal Working Group.
8 Including its scope, meaning, perspectives and potential results.
4.1 Meetings

Nearly 85% of respondents (27 members) had attended meetings of the European Group of NHRIs in the last five years. Where one member had not attended any meetings, this was due to lack of resources.

Examples

The majority of respondents had attended meetings of the European Group of NHRIs in the context of the ICC annual meetings in Geneva. Several respondents had also attended thematic meetings of the European Group of NHRIs, such as on business and human rights, domestic protection of human rights and on National Preventative Mechanisms (NPMs). Many respondents had attended meetings organised with partner institutions, such as Council of Europe, OSCE-ODIHR, the EU Eastern Partnership Programme and FRA-NHRI annual meetings.

Many respondents had attended meetings with a section of the membership of the European Group of NHRIs. For example, several members had attended meetings of working groups, such as the Legal Working Group and the Asylum and Migration Working Group. Some members had attended meetings of the Bureau or European Coordinating Committee (ECC), including through telephone conferencing.

Reference was also made to seminars and conferences to share information and experience.

---

9 Edinburgh 2012, Berlin 2012,
10 Dublin 2008.
11 Roundtables, such as Madrid 2011.
12 Conference of NHRIs and Vilnius 2011
13 Particularly in relation to the reform of the European Court of Human Rights, including Interlaken and Brighton.
**Evaluation**

Many members found the meetings of the European Group of NHRIs to be very useful\(^{15}\). One meeting was described as ‘efficient, fruitful and motivating’\(^{16}\). The meetings enabled members to learn about and engage in the European Group of NHRIs, its role and activities\(^{17}\). Similarly, the meetings were found to be helpful in familiarising members with the NHRI system and working methods, and enhancing cooperation with partners.

Respondents also noted that meetings were useful to exchange information and be updated on human rights in Europe\(^{18}\). Furthermore, several members benefited from relating to a larger group of peers from the region, to ask for assistance or expertise on various human rights issues. Respondents reported that, through meeting with regional colleagues and discussing common difficulties, support and new solutions could be found for their work\(^{19}\). The meetings also provided an opportunity for bilateral meetings between members.

Several members found that European Group of NHRIs meetings were too brief and had insufficient preparation. Members reported that, due to time constraints and heavy agendas, there was insufficient time for in depth discussion. For one respondent, the limited space for real dialogue in the past had given an impression that decisions had been taken in advance, without members’ opportunity to participate, although improvement was noted in this regard for the 2013 Geneva meeting. Indeed, it was noted that that Secretariat had helped to improve meetings.

One respondent stated that, although stakeholders’ and members’ updates were useful, this used a lot of time that could more effectively be spent on strategic issues and decision making. It was suggested that these updates be shared with members in advance by email. Furthermore, it was underlined that the timely submission of documents to be discussed would enable meaningful preparation for the meeting, which sometimes requires the consent of fellow Commissioners. It was also noted that some meetings had limited use, due to the lack of participants\(^{20}\).

**Ideas for improvement in the future:**

- Meetings on a more frequent basis (two per year) to increase activity; and perhaps one allocated to governance issues and the other for thematic issues;
- Separate meeting of the chairs and/or chief executive officers, particularly around the strategic planning phase;
- More time for meeting, enabling more detailed work and networking;
- Effective management of agenda and timing\(^{21}\);
- More thematic\(^{22}\) and strategic discussion, instead of updates and governance;
- Information on the rules of the meetings to make discussions substantial, in particular time limits for presentations;

---

\(^{15}\) For example, discussion of ENHRI statutes and other organisational issues, Geneva 2013.

\(^{16}\) January 2008 Berlin - constitution of the Asylum and Migration Working Group.

\(^{17}\) Geneva 2011 and 2013, and meetings on NPM and OPCAT.

\(^{18}\) ICC meetings and Council of Europe roundtables.

\(^{19}\) ICC meetings and Council of Europe roundtables.

\(^{20}\) For example, Jordan 2012.

\(^{21}\) In order to help engage new and developing NHRIs and their staff.

\(^{22}\) Including experts and case studies.
Concise reports provided in advance\textsuperscript{23}, and posted on a website, to make the information more accessible and free up meeting time for discussion;

- Use of breakout groups to encourage all participants to participate;
- Avoid using jargon or overly technical language\textsuperscript{24}, for accessibility and engagement;
- Consider the need for interpreters or a fund to make provision for this;
- Greater member participation in meeting preparation\textsuperscript{25};
- Increased functionality of Secretariat; and
- Use of Skype for ECC conference calls.

### 3.3 Training

Just over 45\% of respondents (15 members) had been involved in training or capacity building offered by the European Group of NHRIs, its members, or through its partners.

**Examples**

Respondents described various training activities that took place at meetings\textsuperscript{26}, conferences\textsuperscript{27}, seminars, workshops\textsuperscript{28} and twinning projects. Nearly all of the examples involved trainings offered in collaboration with or exclusively by partnership organisations\textsuperscript{29}. The training covered thematic subjects including complaint handling, case management, international cooperation, detention, anti-discrimination, children’s rights, and the protection of rights for victims of crime.

From the EU, members had benefited from training in the framework of the Eastern Partnership Programme on subjects including ‘institutional roles and challenges’, opportunities for future collaboration\textsuperscript{30}, and various thematic areas\textsuperscript{31}, such as NPMs and business and human rights\textsuperscript{32}. The EU had also funded study visits to several NHRIs in Europe as part of the TAIEX programme\textsuperscript{33}. In addition, the FRA had organised intergovernmental meetings on disability and with equality bodies.

From OSCE-ODIHR, members had received training on policing and on gender rights\textsuperscript{34}. OHCHR had organised training on the UPR\textsuperscript{35} and on human rights education. In addition, members mentioned trainings provided by UNDP, US AID and

\textsuperscript{23} For example, members’ or working group updates.

\textsuperscript{24} In meetings and in documentation.

\textsuperscript{25} Including the choice of topics to be included in the agenda.

\textsuperscript{26} Vienna 2011.

\textsuperscript{27} 2010 Edinburgh Biennial on Business and Human Rights which initiated a capacity building of NHRIs around Europe and globally.

\textsuperscript{28} Communication workshop 2011.

\textsuperscript{29} Various trainings in the field of human rights organised by UNDP, OSCE, ODIHR, European Commission etc.

\textsuperscript{30} Also, sharing practices and learning from EU Ombudsmans (France and Poland).

\textsuperscript{31} Also, sessions on freedom of speech, media and assembly, free and independent media as a basic element of a healthy democratic country, right to a court hearing, freedom from torture and degrading treatment, rights of the child, rights of elderly persons and persons with disabilities and their social protection, as well as EU and domestic legal standards concerning principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination.

\textsuperscript{32} The workshop on UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights was led by the European Group of NHRIs.

\textsuperscript{33} Also, twinning projects in Kazakhstan, Armenia, Macedonia and Turkey.

\textsuperscript{34} Also, meeting in Vilnius.

\textsuperscript{35} Brussels 2009.
SIDA (Swedish International Cooperation Development Agency), as well as work with African NHRIs.

**Evaluation**

One respondent stated that the trainings and workshops were very useful, facilitating learning about international standards and the effective functioning of the institution\(^ {36} \). However, a few members underlined that improvement was required in relation to the participation rate, information provision on training opportunities, and the opportunity to engage in the selection process of topics and trainers.

Several respondents (6 members) were keen to attend training initiatives, but could not do so due to limited financial and human resources. It was found that these budgetary constraints made the external provision of training more important, but also precluded attendance, unless funding or reimbursement were provided. Some staff actively involved in the European Group of NHRIs were not aware of its provision of training or capacity building. One member had been informed about, and hoped to attend, a workshop on accreditation scheduled for September 2012, but the training did not take place. Several members suggested that the Secretariat could facilitate better communication and organisation of training, including peer exchange, which would also increase participation.

**Ideas for improvement in the future**

- More strategic approach to identifying key shared needs;
- Possibility for member participation in selecting training topics and speakers;
- Better promotion and awareness of training offered\(^ {37} \);
- Scholarships or funding for participation in training; and

---

\(^{36}\) Including case solving.

\(^{37}\) And consequently increased scope for member exchange.
• Functioning Secretariat to support training provision, peer exchange and
information on training through regular communications.

3.4 Events

Nearly 60% of respondents (19 members) had attended an event of the European
Group of NHRIs. Several respondents (5 members) had not attended such events,
due to financial constraints and limited capacity. It was noted that a priority must be
given to national issues, and the active participation of another network also
challenged capacity.

Examples

Members had attended events on business and human rights, austerity and human
rights, on the reform of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), on
domestic protection of human rights, and on treaty body reform. A few members
also included meetings of the European Group of NHRIs in their responses.

Evaluation

Many participants found the events to be useful in terms of both substance and
opportunities for networking. Respondents learned from successful practice of
relevant NHRIs and reported an ability to improve their activities domestically. A few
respondents suggested that events could be improved, through:

• more notice;
• more time for discussion; and
• better follow-up.

38 Equinet.
40 Brussels 2013.
41 Madrid 2011.
42 Belfast 2012.
43 In the context of the ICC annual meeting and the 5th roundtable of European NHRIs.
3.5 Working Groups

Just over 50% of respondents (17 members) had been involved in a European Group of NHRIs working group or other loose cooperation framework. In addition to the working groups and other frameworks listed in the chart below, one respondent also underlined involvement in the drafting of the strategic plan. Members had also attended meetings, and provided support or comments to draft statements or policy papers. Some (3) members expressed an interest in (re)participating in working groups in the future.

General Evaluation

Many respondents (15) stated that the European Group of NHRIs' working groups were useful. In general, respondents reported that the working groups were efficiently managed and provided a good opportunity to share experience. Several (4) members expressed an interest in participating in working groups, but were unable to do so, due to a lack of capacity, resources, language accessibility, time or institutional approval mechanisms. This was particularly true due to the longterm commitment involved.

Some respondents noted that working groups could be improved through greater accessibility, transparency, effectiveness and participation. Furthermore, a few members stated that there was insufficient information available about the functioning of the working groups, and that a more structured approach, with feedback to other ENNHRI members, would be useful. One respondent found that there was insufficient time to comment on documents, especially given language difficulties.

It was suggested that working group organisation could be improved by:

- sharing capacity among more NHRIs and the Secretariat;
- establishing a website to enhance communication and information exchange;
- applying a more strategic approach to working groups, identifying both outcomes and audiences; and
- encouraging more partnership working.

Evaluation of Specific Working Groups

The Legal Working Group had the highest participation (46.88% of respondents, 15 members). Members had been particularly active in relation to the reform of the ECtHR and the preparations for the Brighton conference. Respondents valued this collaborative work highly, and appreciated the well-coordinated and active engagement of members. The methodology of the Legal Working Group was well-received by members, including the meeting agendas, regular email contact and a webpage in development.

It was noted that many members of the Legal Working Group struggle to commit time and resources, which can constrain collaborative approaches. It was suggested that the Legal Working Group could benefit from assistance in its organisation and

---

44 With regular standing items as well as workshop sessions focusing on key practical and thematic issues and challenges.
support for members to participate, such as grants for NHRIs which do not have resources to attend. Ideas for future collaboration included:

- a more structured working method;
- enhanced sharing of information about the Council of Europe and the EU; and
- a central registry of new cases before the ECtHR.

Nearly 40% of respondents (12 members) had participated in the **CRPD Working Group**. Members found this working group to be particularly useful where they had (or would soon have) a mandate under Article 33 CRPD. Respondents valued the ability to exchange good practices of other independent mechanisms, to receive information on and to discuss the interpretation and implementation of CRPD, and to receive information on new developments at the EU and UN level. The collaboration was particularly appreciated due to the practical application of content related issues.

Several ideas were put forward for the future, including:

- Increased support and participation from ENNHRI members and Secretariat;
- Financial support for members, to improve attendance at meetings;
- More structured sharing of information on the EU and Council of Europe;
- Co-operation and information exchange with other ENNHRI working groups;
- Publication within ENNHRI and ICC networks of activities and work plan; and
- Support from the Secretariat, including:
  - Participation in the CRPD Working Group’s bi-annual meetings;
o Assistance with organising CRPD Working Group events; 
o Assistance to promote CRPD Working Group interventions and activities; 
o Communication of working group activities within ENNHRI and ICC; 
Facilitation of cooperation with other working groups; 
Initial networking with key stakeholders within EU, Council of Europe and UN and updating the CRPD Working Group on relevant developments; 
Mainstreaming of disability and UNCRPD within ENNHRI strategic plan and activities; and 
Establishment of a CRPD Working Group webpage on an ENNHRI website.

However, it was also noted that the Secretariat’s role should not take the place of the CRPD Working Group in relation to high level meetings and input to specific topics. Rather, it was suggested that the Secretariat’s role should be concentrated on facilitating information sharing and capacity building in the short term, and perhaps coordination and drafting of common statements in the medium term, as well as high level networking to promote and make initial contacts on behalf of the CRPD Working Group.

The Asylum and Migration Working Group had received participation from 25% of respondents (8 members). Members found this to be useful due to the high degree of expertise among the group. Some respondents were interested in participating in the Asylum and Migration Working Group in the future, and it was the most popular thematic area for future activities (see section 6.5.2 of this report).

The Asylum and Migration Working Group was launched in 2010. It has since made an (unsuccessful) EU application for funds, and does not currently have sufficient resources or capacity. It was noted that the work of the Asylum and Migration Working Group would improve immeasurably through:
- Support from the Secretariat for the organisation, communication and mobilisation of members; and
- Some funding for travel expenses.

Although 28% of respondents (9 members) had been involved in work on Business and Human Rights, this was described as ad hoc initiatives, which had not been formalised into a working group. Similarly, despite six members’ participation (19% of respondents) in activities on Human Rights Education, this had not been formalised into an operational working group, due to a staff vacancy at the relevant member
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45 For example, assistance with the proposed side-event to be held in parallel to the CRPD Committee session in either April or September 2014 in Geneva.
46 For example, the COSP statement and position papers.
47 Particularly relevant given EU accession to CRPD and Secretariat’s location in Brussels.
48 For example, European Commission and European Ombudsman.
49 For example, input on specific topics such as EU and human rights or participation of disadvantaged groups in EU Parliamentary elections in 2014.
50 This would enable the CRPD Working Group to build on its existing dialogues with stakeholders.
51 Led by the German Institute of Human Rights in 2012.
52 Such as a university charter.
institution. One respondent asked for an ENNHRI member volunteer to lead this work.

### 3.6 Regional and International Engagement

Just over 80% of respondents (26 members) had been involved in the European Group of NHRIs’ engagement with regional and international human rights mechanisms. Where respondents had not engaged with human rights mechanisms through the European Group of NHRIs, this was due to a lack of capacity (1 member) or because the members engaged directly with those mechanisms (2 members, particularly where the mechanisms have a country presence).

#### General Evaluation

The engagement with regional and international human rights mechanisms included meetings, joint declarations, parallel reporting, capacity building and country-specific action plans. In general, respondents described the engagement as informative and useful, facilitating strategic involvement in partnership projects. However, it was also noted that, due to the lack of a Secretariat and strategic plan, the European Group of NHRIs had not been ‘punching its weight’. One respondent noted that members would benefit from official NHRI recognition in each of the human rights mechanisms, and also from more balanced participation between members.

#### Specific Human Rights Mechanisms

The most frequent involvement in European Group of NHRIs engagement was with the Council of Europe (59.38% of respondents, 19 members). This engagement took place in the context of meetings, joint submissions, capacity building, the Peer to Peer Project, and attendance at CDDH and convention negotiations.

The most common engagement with the Council of Europe was on the reform of the ECtHR, including meetings and submissions from the Legal Working Group, whose sustained effort in this regard was acknowledged. Some members used this work to initiate cooperation with their government offices (3 respondents). The meeting in Madrid 2011 on the Interlaken Declaration was found to be useful, but more follow up was requested in the future. The European Group of NHRIs and the Council of Europe had also engaged in meetings on migration and the execution of judgments.

One respondent reported that it had led European Group of NHRIs’ engagement in the negotiations of the Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (CAHVIO), including a written statement and participation in three negotiation meetings. Several proposals were included in the
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53 German Institute for Human Rights, efforts to establish working group in 2012.
54 However, on reading the detail of the responses, it was noted that some engagement discussed in the survey took place independently of the European Group of NHRIs.
55 One respondent included Equinet as an ‘other’ mechanism, although for the purposes of this paper it is considered a ‘network’.
56 For example on the development of that country’s NPM.
57 2007-2012.
58 Athens 2011 (‘efficient and fruitful’).
adopted convention, following good coordination among those NHRI s involved, but a substantial amount of work rested with one member.

The second most frequent involvement in European Group of NHRI engagement was with **UN OHCHR** (56% of respondents, 18 members), including meetings, joint statements and capacity building. In relation to the **Human Rights Council** (50% of respondents, 16 members), respondents had provided support and comments on European Group of NHRI s’ submissions to the Human Rights Council and also engaged on the UPR, including a capacity building meeting in Brussels.

In relation to **UN treaty bodies and special procedures** (44% of respondents, 14 members, engaged), several members had collaborated in the Belfast statement on the strengthening of the treaty bodies system. In addition, members send alternative reports to the treaty bodies when their country is under review. One respondent had been involved in negotiations on the CRPD, and another referred to its input to the joint statement for the Open-Ended Work Group on Ageing. Just over 30% of
respondents (10 members) had engaged with UNDP through the European Group of NHRIs, for example in efforts to support the establishment of a Turkish NHRI.

Just over 43% of respondents (14 members) had been involved in the European Group of NHRIs’ engagement with FRA (the Agency for Fundamental Rights of the EU). Several members had attended the annual FRA-NHRI meetings, and one respondent was particularly encouraged by the decision to bring together NHRIs with other national protection bodies in October 2013. One respondent stated that there was insufficient real dialogue among actors during the FRA meetings, but another noted a good exchange of information and networking between meetings. A few respondents had been involved in commenting on FRA’s Multi-Annual Framework and strategic plan.

Over 37% of respondents (12 members) had engaged with OSCE-ODIHR through the European Group of NHRIs, including on capacity building. One respondent reported that engagement with OSCE on the NHRI commitments process (2011) had not been sufficiently useful, as the debates within OSCE were not truly interactive and NHRIs were not involved in the negotiation process of the commitments.

Although 35% of respondents (11 members) had engaged with the EU Institutions through the European Group of NHRIs, one respondent found that the lack of engagement with European Commission was unhelpful. One member outlined engagement on the implementation of Art. 33 CRPD in the EU context, and another noted that collaboration had been coordinated by the Chair.

3.7 Policy Statements

Just over 50% of respondents (17 members) had been involved in the elaboration of policy statements released by the European Group of NHRIs. A few respondents explained their reasons for non-participation in policy statements, which included a lack of mandate, ICC accreditation or limited involvement in the European Group of NHRIs as a whole. Two respondents set out their intention to be actively involved in policy statements in the future.

Examples

Respondents had been involved in European Group of NHRIs policy statements, including submissions, oral statements and Biennial Declarations. The statements were elaborated either through the entire European Group of NHRIs, or through its working groups. Thematic examples include:

- European Group of NHRIs
  - Statement on the multi-annual framework of FRA;
  - Two statements on CAHVIO;
  - Several statements on business and human rights;
  - Submission to CEDAW on women’s access to justice;
  - Statement on the rights of older persons; and
  - Joint NHRI statement on sexual orientation and gender identity.
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59 Ombudsmen and equality bodies.
60 Particularly in selected policy areas where they have the most to contribute.
61 Alone if in mandate or, if helpful, with reference to thematic Ombudsmans within the jurisdiction.
62 On the convention and its explanatory memorandum.
63 June 2013.
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- Legal Working Group
  - Statement on the reform of the ECtHR64;
  - Amicus curiae on the rights of disabled women; and
  - Oral statement to Brighton Conference65.
- CRPD Working Group
  - Statement on the application of Art 33(2) CRPD to the EU66.
- Asylum and Migration Working Group
  - Statement on the rights of non-removable persons and the Stockholm Programme67; and
  - Common position on Recast Directives Asylum Procedure and Reception Conditions68.

Q15 POLICY STATEMENTS: Have you been involved in the elaboration of any policy statements released by the European Group of NHRIs?

Some respondents found that communication for policy statements within the European Group was clear and efficient, that it was useful to make a joint statement, and that the process was satisfactory. However, several respondents found that the process needs to be systemised69 and more time made available for members to work on the statements. It was suggested that long-term strategy and planning in advance would be useful, with identified areas of expertise, and that future strategic common positions should be discussed by the membership before elaboration.

Some respondents noted the low levels of member participation in the elaboration of policy statements. For one respondent, there was concern that democratic principles

64 Process satisfactory.
65 April 2012.
66 August 2012.
67 October 2009.
68 January 2012.
69 As evidenced by the recent experience on the older persons statement.
were undermined. Indeed, a minority of respondents had been involved in elaborating common policy statements. For another respondent, there was concern that the huge amount of work that is required to produce a decent proposal for a common statement was shouldered by one institution (such as a working group chair), without the support or participation of other members.

3.8 Organisational Positions

Just over 25% of respondents (9 members) had held an organisational position in the European Group of NHRIs. Members reported holding or having held positions on the European Coordinating Committee (ECC), ICC Bureau, Subcommittee on Accreditation (SCA), Finance Committee, and as Chair.

The most common reason (5 respondents) for not seeking to hold an organisational position in the European Group of NHRIs was the lack of ‘A’ status accreditation. Other members did not seek such positions due to resources constraints (2 respondents); the need to establish a new institution domestically; the need for internal approval from multiple Ombudsmans; and the limited involvement in the work of European Group of NHRIs. Several members (7 respondents) showed an interest in seeking an organisational position in the future.

It was suggested that in the future there should be:

- A rotation for NHRIs holding organisational positions, so that all members could be actively involved in activities; and
- Awareness raising of the purpose, importance and benefits of holding organisational positions to increase willingness for members to apply.

---

70 There was found to be a steep learning curve for this role.
4 Current view of ENNHRI

4.1 SWOT

Respondents provided a wealth of information on ENNHRI’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. This information has been grouped, for ease of reference, and is set out under each of the key headings, with first a summary overview.

Strengths
- Membership, including expertise, diversity and the nature of NHRIs;
- Legacy of past work, including working groups and established relationships with key stakeholders;
- Regional voice, which understands wider Europe and which together is stronger and more legitimate; and
- Permanent Secretariat, particularly as it is based in Brussels.

Weaknesses
- Limited resources, in both the Secretariat and member institutions, leading to non-participation by the latter;
- Diversity of members (priorities, status, mandate, languages, etc.), which makes coordination and consensus a challenge;
- Insufficient communications between members and profile with external stakeholders (the lack of a website); and
- Limited institutional capacity and focus, with a lack of clear role and functions.

Opportunities
- International influence and engagement, including common stands on key issues to further human rights protection in the region;
- Collaboration between members, including mutual support; sharing of information and best practice; and joint projects, advocacy and statements;
- Support to NHRIs, including capacity building and raising of NHRIs’ profile;
- New Permanent Secretariat in Brussels, seeking funding and learning from other networks; and
- Enhanced communications, for better visibility and internal communications.

Threats
- Limited funding, for both the Secretariat and members, as well as the economic crisis and worsening human rights climate;
- Diversity of membership, which impacts on members’ inclusion and ENNHRI’s focus;
- Non-participation of many members, which limits ENNHRI’s effectiveness; and
- Duplication of the work of other European networks, and high expectations, which could lead to a loss of confidence.

4.1.1 Strengths

Membership
The key strength identified by respondents (15 members) was ENNHRI’s membership, including networking and communication. Members’ expertise was noted as a strength by 8 respondents, in relation to both human resources, and also learning from other regional networks. It was noted that ENNHRI has strong NHRIs

---

71 Including professionalism, human resources
72 Such as Equinet and European Network of Ombudsmen.
in its membership, including strong Bureau members, and a large number of ‘A’ status institutions. The unique character of ENNHRI’s members was also recorded as a strength, with NHRIs acting as a bridge between civil society and the state, as well as between the national and regional/international levels. The fact that the ICC accreditation process is recognised throughout the world was also stated to be a strength.

The size and diversity of ENNHRI’s membership was also noted as a key strength by respondents (8 members). This leads to a diversity of experience and information exchanged, allowing members to draw on each other’s specialities to develop excellent shared work. Indeed, information exchange was often noted as a strength in itself (7 members), which leads to the promotion of best practice among members and building professional capacity and expertise. Respondents noted that members’ capacity and willingness to engage was a strength, resulting in mutual cooperation and creativity in problem solving. In addition, ENNHRI’s strategic litigation capacity was noted as a strength.

**Legacy**

Many respondents (12 members) noted that ENNHRI’s past work was a key strength, with much experience, contacts and a strong history of taking an active role in the development of NHRIs and on thematic issues. Several respondents (5 members) noted that ENNHRI’s established working groups were a strength. In addition, several respondents (5 members) noted the strength of ENNHRI’s established relationships and cooperation with key partners, including ICC, UN OHCHR, Council of Europe, OSCE-ODIHR and FRA. It was noted by one respondent that ENNHRI has a good structural vision.

**Regional Voice**

Several respondents (8 members) found that ENNHRI’s ability to intervene with regional mechanisms was a strength, including with Council of Europe, FRA, and OSCE. It was noted that this could contribute to national implementation of regional standards through common positions and interventions. It was also noted that ENNHRI enabled an increased presence for members in the European and international arena. Many respondents (11 members) stated that NHRIs had a stronger voice by coming together and that their common positions had greater legitimacy. It was considered a strength to be able to represent regional interests and needs within human rights mechanisms or networks. Its joint strategy was also noted as a strength. It was recorded that the breadth of ENNHRI’s membership gave it an invaluable regional perspective on the situation for human rights and for NHRIs in greater Europe (not just EU based).

**Permanent Secretariat**

Several respondents (6 members) noted the establishment of a Permanent Secretariat as a strength, particularly for the strategic plan and to exchange

---

73 In relation to the different missions, mandates, cultures, internal structures and national legal systems.
74 Such as the Legal Working Group and the CRPD Working Group. It was noted that these should now blend well with the Secretariat.
75 Such as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).
76 Including ICC.
information\(^{77}\). The fact that the Secretariat was based in *Brussels* was also seen as a strength by three (3) respondents, as it gave an increased presence at the EU level.

### 4.1.2 Weaknesses

**Limited Resources**

The most frequently noted weakness for ENHRI was limited resources (17 members). This related to *funding, human resources* and *capacity* in both the Secretariat and member institutions. It was noted that the Secretariat is unlikely to receive development assistance funds\(^{78}\) and also that its financial future was uncertain. Several respondents (10 members) also noted *non-participation* as a weakness, where an insufficient number of NHRI's were supporting key ENNHRI work. This resulted in an unequal level of participation, potentially *unrepresentative decision making*, and a few members shouldering a high level of ENNHRI’s work.

**Diversity**

Although diversity had also been noted as a strength, many respondents (11 members) underlined that this diversity brings practical challenges. The diversity includes different *priorities; levels of development; status; mandate; institutional structure; time, financial and capacity resources; legislative and political environments; and language barriers*. It was noted that, in such a diverse group, it is difficult to organise activities and share information that are relevant to all members, and also to speak with one voice on policy areas. Two respondents recorded that members’ insufficient compliance with the Paris Principles was also a weakness for ENNHRI.

**Insufficient communication and profile**

Several (10) members noted that there was insufficient communication and sharing of information *between members*. Many members were unaware of ENNHRI’s (and ICC’s) activities and events, and one found it difficult to find answers to information requests, as there is no connected forum or information channel for all institutions. In this regard, two members viewed the lack of a *website* as a weakness. Several (8) members also found that external communication was weak, with a *lack of visibility* and recognition for ENNHRI. It was noted that ENNHRI’s voice is still not heard widely and it has *inadequate influence* with regional mechanisms. One respondent noted the confusion between NHRI’s and equality bodies for some countries.

**Limited institutional capacity and focus**

Several (7) members noted that ENNHRI’s limited *institutional capacity* was a weakness in terms of infrastructure, well-established Secretariat, institutional background and effective working methods. Indeed, one respondent noted that there were mixed results from some of its projects. Two members found a weakness in the time required to reach consensus for joint action\(^{79}\) and another stated that there were too many members. It was also noted (4 members) that ENNHRI has a *lack of*  
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\(^{77}\) One respondent noted that the improved exchange of information already showed the usefulness of the Secretariat.

\(^{78}\) Which funded other regional NHRI networks.

\(^{79}\) Particularly given that members can’t meet often.
**focus**, due to multiple fields of action, unclear priorities and a lack of clear role\(^{80}\). One respondent stated that ENNHRI has a lack of understanding of the specific needs of Ombudsman institutions. It was also noted that too much international work could interfere with national tasks, and it was important for ENNHRI to support national work more than vice versa.

### 4.1.3 Opportunities

**International influence and engagement**

Many (14) members, saw an opportunity for ENNHRI to influence the international and regional human rights dialogue. It was noted that together European NHRIs can be more influential in the international arena, through the elaboration and presentation of *common stands on key issues*. Several (5) members noted ENNHRI’s opportunity to *engage with key stakeholders*, forming a bridge between international and national human rights systems. A few respondents underlined ENNHRI’s long term contacts and good relationships with international and regional organisations as an opportunity. On the international level, it was noted that ENNHRI could act as a "channel" towards the *UN*, engage with *OHCHR*, and have a possible role for lobbying\(^{81}\), as well as cooperating with the ICC and its other regional networks.

On the **regional level**, several (6) members noted the opportunity for ENNHRI to engage with a broad range of bodies including OSCE, Council of Europe and the EU, and share its best practices with these partners. It was underlined that ENNHRI has the possibility to make its *voice heard in the European policy-making process*, with access to multilateral negotiations and increased presence at the European level. This was particularly set out in regards to engagement with the *Council of Europe* and the *EU*.\(^{82}\) Three respondents noted the opportunity to strengthen and *further human rights in the European region*\(^{83}\) and, hence, facilitate the development of a credible regional human rights system.

Other respondents underlined that ENNHRI operates within the most *advanced regional human rights structure* globally, where there are many strong regional actors in civil society and inter-state human rights mechanisms. This enables many actors to support the same agenda, which can have a global impact. One respondent underlined that there is a growing number of NHRIs, which is an opportunity in itself, and will further ENNHRI’s influence.

**Collaboration between members**

Many (12) members also noted the opportunity for ENNHRI to enhance cooperation between European NHRIs, including *joint projects, advocacy and statements* and through shared human resources. It was believed that a united network\(^{84}\) could strengthen systems of human rights protection at the national and regional levels by
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\(^{80}\) Also, a lack of clear functions and goals was noted.

\(^{81}\) For example, for OHCHR to pledge to support and campaign for the ratification of the International Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers.

\(^{82}\) It was noted that there was an opportunity to raise the profile of NHRIs within the EU, with possibilities for joint action on its human rights instruments and policies, particularly given its recent accession to CRPD.

\(^{83}\) And positively influence human rights across the EU and more widely in Europe.

\(^{84}\) With one aim and unified information stream.
mutual support, and fill gaps in the European human rights landscape. This could be very powerful, if coordination is successful. A particularly popular aspect of collaboration between members was the sharing of information and best practice (noted as an opportunity by 7 members). This included, cooperation and information sharing through meetings and conferences, staff exchanges, and sharing experiences for institutional development. One respondent noted the need for greater commitment from NHRIs. Another underlined the need to set up legacy systems to replace lost expertise within the group.

Support to NHRIs
Many (13) respondents noted the opportunity for ENNHRI to support NHRIs in Europe, in terms of both institutional capacity and profile. Several (7) members suggested that ENNHRI could facilitate members’ capacity building. It was noted that intra-NHRI capacity building would require a startup resource to scope need and research funding streams. One respondent suggested that capacity building could be provided in collaboration with OHCHR. Another underlined the opportunity to provide assistance in the (re-)accreditation process and communication with ICC and SCA.

Several (5) respondents stated that there was an opportunity for ENNHRI to raise the profile of NHRIs throughout Europe, including within the EU. It was also underlined that ENNHRI could promote the role of NHRIs within the UN and other international organisations. Some (4) members also noted the opportunity for ENNHRI to improve NHRIs’ standing domestically, using the European level to improve national situations and mustering support for NHRIs “under attack”.

Permanent Secretariat
Several (9) respondents viewed the establishment of the Permanent Secretariat as an opportunity for ENNHRI. It was believed that this would allow for more coordination, direction and coherence in ENNHRI’s work, which would lead to strengthening ENNHRI’s role and developing capacity among its members. It was particularly mentioned that the Secretariat could blend well with working groups, drive the implementation of the strategic plan and capitalise on its location in Brussels.

Although two respondents stated that the Secretariat was well established and had already demonstrated its usefulness (information exchange), two other respondents underlined the opportunities that are inherent in new beginnings, given that the Secretariat is in the process of being operationalised. Two respondents noted that there were opportunities for funding, from donor support and for capacity building with civil society. Two members noted that ENNHRI had an opportunity to learn from other networks, including other regional groups of NHRIs that have been established for a longer time.

Communications
Respondents (9 members) saw enhanced communications, both internal and external, as a key opportunity for ENNHRI. Several (5) members saw an opportunity for ENNHRI to inform the public of ENNHRI’s activities, providing for better visibility, a strong reputation, good media relations and the presentation of a joint approach.
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85 Through, for example, sharing information and experience, or by supporting a strategic programme of human rights education and intra-NHRI capacity building.

86 Specifically DPOs, in relation to CRPD.
Some (4) members underlined the opportunity to improve *internal* communications between members, working groups and the Secretariat. One member noted that new technologies offered an opportunity for ENNHRI’s future communications.

### 4.1.4 Threats

**Limited funding and economic crisis**

Many (12) respondents found the lack of adequate funding to be a threat to ENNHRI’s sustainability. In relation to the Secretariat, it was noted that the lack of resources and funding leaves the office overstretched, and might impede its progress in becoming a viable institution. ENNHRI’s *members* are also facing a reduction in financial resources and the payment of membership fees will be a challenge for some NHRIs operating with a low budget.

In addition, several (8) respondents found the *economic crisis* in Europe to be a key threat to ENNHRI. It was noted that this will have an impact on available resources and fundraising opportunities. It was also noted that the financial crisis, austerity measures and budget cuts (which in some cases lead to inappropriate mergers) threaten the functionality and even the existence of some ENNHRI members. This was also linked to the *worsening human rights climate*, which is a threat to ENNHRI, in relation to political intervention, a weakening of NHRIs, a bypassing of human rights on security grounds\(^{87}\), and threats against vulnerable minority groups\(^{88}\).

**Diversity and focus**

The diversity of ENNHRI’s membership had been noted as both a strength and a weakness. In addition, several (8) members found this *diversity* to be a threat. It was found that the different priorities and needs among members, and the diverse range of NHRI ‘types’, coupled with the broad geographic reach, could impede joint action. This also has an impact on *inclusion*, which could also be a threat to ENNHRI. One respondent found it a threat that ENNHRI does not provide a practical benefit for each and every member, while another believed that ENNHRI does not sufficiently take account of national peculiarities and traditions, or the stands and experiences of the Eastern European members. One respondent noted that ENNHRI should in this phase focus on the whole European region (not only the EU Member States)\(^ {89}\).

A few (3) members also noted that ENNHRI’s lack of *focus, purpose and identity* could be a threat. Another stated that ENNHRI risked becoming overly formal and bureaucratic.

**Non-participation**

Some (6) respondents found the passivity, apathy and *non-participation* of members as a threat to ENNHRI’s future. It was noted that it is difficult to guarantee the involvement of all, and that it may take time for members to actively engage with ENNHRI’s new structures and work. During this time, ENNHRI would not be able to fulfill its potential. Another respondent stated that the poor involvement of members in activities might result in an ineffectiveness of ENNHRI itself. Finally, one respondent
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\(^{87}\) Also set out as a limitation of fundamental freedoms and human rights for the claimed reason of combating terrorism.

\(^{88}\) Such as Roma and LGBTQ.

\(^{89}\) Also not only on EU foreign policies.
pointed out that ENNHRI risks becoming a network of a few individuals, rather than a network of membership institutions.

**Duplication and expectations**

A few (3) members saw the potential duplication of work as a threat to ENNHRI. It was recognised that ENNHRI has parallel functions to other European networks and there was a threat that various undertakings might be repeated. Finally, two respondents found that the new and high expectations to be a threat to ENNHRI, which could lead to a loss of confidence. However, another respondent noted as a threat the lack of awareness and familiarity regarding the role of NHRIs, both within the EU institutions, and some member states. This could limit ENNHRI’s potential in advancing the human rights agenda at the EU level.

**4.2 Networks**

In considering the current view of ENNHRI, it is worth noting that many members are also members of other international, regional, sub-regional or cross-regional networks of national protection bodies. This could impact on members’ expectations of and needs from ENNHRI. It could also impact on their capacity to engage with ENNHRI and participate in activities. From the 2013 survey results, the vast majority of respondents (90%, 30 members) were involved in other networks. Of these, 7 members (21.88% of respondents) hold or intend to hold organisational positions within these networks.

The respondents set out many advantages that they receive from membership of these networks. As an overview, the most common advantages cited are set out in the chart below.

---

**Cited Advantages of Other Networks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>No. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of Information</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from Experience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Seminars</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading Best Practice</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Institutional Capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared/Better Problem Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Protection of Rights</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Research and Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

90 As opposed to equality bodies.

91 Including a member of the European and world boards of IOI, Equinet chair (and host) and chair of its legal working group, Vice President of the Federación Iberoamericana de Ombudsman, and a member of the management board for the Association Francophone de Commissions Nationales de Droits de l’Homme.

92 It is recognized that there is some overlap between these categories.
Additional Networks
Over 40% of respondents (14 members) indicated that they were involved in networks other than those provided for in the survey. These are set out in the table below. Some respondent underlined that it concentrated on national networks, which

---

93 Some of these were repeated from the pre-filled survey options and so have not been included in this chart.
are not included in the survey, and another did not belong to networks due to a limited mandate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>No. Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Mediterranean Ombudsmen (AOM)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association of Ombudsmen and Mediators of la Francophonie (AOMF)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Ombudsman Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Francophone de Commissions Nationales de Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Human Rights Institutes (AHRI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Rights Ombudsmen Network of South East Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum for the Rights of the Child</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference of Ombuds-Institutions for the Armed Forces</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Ombudsman Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Europe NPM Network</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific Networks**

The International Ombudsman Institute (IOI) has the highest number of ENNHRI members, with 45.45% of respondents (15 members). Respondents found that key advantages of IOI were interesting trainings, seminars and conferences, with the possibility of a scholarship for staff. Also, members could share information and best practice easily, both at conferences and online, including information on other member institutions. The European Ombudsmen Institute (EOI) also had over 40% of respondents as members (14 ENNHRI members), and its main advantages were recorded as information sharing and trainings.

One third of respondents (11 ENNHRI members) were also members of the European Network of Ombudsmen (ENO). The key advantage of ENO was recorded as the exchange of experience, best practice and information through a daily newsletter and an online forum for discussions. ENO also facilitates cooperation on case handling and enables members to meet with colleagues at seminars and meetings.

Equinet (the European Network of Equality Bodies) had just over 30% of respondents (10 ENNHRI members) in its membership. Members reported being particularly involved in Equinet’s working groups. The benefits were found to be similar to membership of ENNHRI, namely the opportunity to network with other similar bodies and learn from each other’s experience and best practice. Members regularly exchange information on current projects and activities, as well as on
national legislation and caselaw. However, one respondent underlined that time constraints limit the extent to which it can benefit from the network, and there is significant demand to disseminate its experience\(^{94}\).

One respondent also commented on the **Association of Mediterranean Ombudsmen** (18.18% of respondents, 6 ENNHRI members) and the **Federación Iberoamericana de Ombudsman** (3.13% of respondents, 1 ENNHRI member). These networks serve to facilitate the exchange of information and experience among members\(^{95}\), develop relations with institutions, organisations and individuals whose objectives are similar, and promote awareness of the role of ombudsmen and mediators in various contexts.

The **Eastern Partnership** (9.09%, 3 ENNHRI members) was helpful for members to exchange best practice, receive staff training, gain knowledge of European human rights standards, and find common approaches to the resolution of problems. One respondent reported that the Council of Europe’s **NPM Network** (3.03%, 1 ENNHRI member) provided a newsletter and valuable training workshops. Another respondent stated that the **Association Francophone de Commissions Nationales de Droits de l’Homme** (3.03%, 1 ENNHRI member) had the advantage of exchange with other NHRIs which are not limited to the European context\(^{96}\).

\(^{94}\) Due to the particular nature of its legal powers, domestic legislation and opportunities for data monitoring/analysis.

\(^{95}\) Including the collection and circulation of data and the outcome of studies.

\(^{96}\) The majority of the members are from African countries.
5 Preliminaries for Strategic Planning

5.1 Values

Respondents’ most popular choices for ENNHRI’s values, from those provided in the survey, were those included in ENNHRI’s statutes, namely:

- **Respect of international human rights standards** (87.88%, 29 members);
- **Transparency** (87.88% of respondents, 29 members);
- **Cooperation** (81.82% of respondents, 27 members);
- **Accountability** (78.79% of respondents, 26 members);
- **Participation** (69.70% of respondents, 23 members); and
- **Non-discrimination** (69.70% of respondents, 23 members).
Some respondents identified other principles that they would like to see included within ENNHRI’s values. These are set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Value</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal treatment and respect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Based Approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a culture of human rights and fostering a culture of societies which honour human rights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentarity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these additionally suggested values, it is noted that there is some overlap with those already suggested in the member survey. For example, a human rights based approach is already represented through the values included in ENNHRI’s statutes (as requested at the 7 May 2013 meeting). Several respondents (4 members) suggested that **independence** should be an ENNHRI value, related to accountability and transparency, and providing a reference to the Paris Principles.

One respondent suggested **solidarity** among members as an ENNHRI value, given that it would be critical to future projects and not all members have the same level of resources or development. Similarly, one respondent asked that **equal treatment and respect** be included as an ENNHRI value. One respondent suggested including **complementarity** as an ENNHRI value, referring to the added value that ENNHRI could have in both the promotion and protection of human rights.

One respondent stated that **participation** and **inclusion** should be key values for ENNHRI to help it be more effective and useful to members. In order to ensure participation, it was suggested that interpreters be provided at meetings and that capacity building be central to ENNHRI’s work. **Transparency** and **accountability** were also underlined as key values, facilitated through greater information sharing and accessibility of information through a website.

Although it did not receive overwhelming quantitative support, one respondent underlined **universality, indivisibility and interdependence** as important aspects of the respect for the human rights standards. One respondent noted that, although **upward harmonisation of international and regional human rights standards**

---

97 It was believed that, in order to help facilitate consensus, solidarity and peer to peer approach would be needed to achieve ENNHRI’s full potential.
98 For the Secretariat and for members.
99 To avoid a language barrier.
100 Capacity building would be important for both new and more established members, and needs assessment could help prioritise members’ capacity building needs. Support from the Secretariat was requested for horizon scanning, information provision, facilitated joint work, training, grants and support.
101 Including more information on the network, for example Bureau meeting minutes which could be posted on line; and working group reports, which should be shared in writing before network meetings.
could be included as an ENNHRI value, this does not leave room for a margin of appreciation.

It was noted that all values should acknowledge and value the cultural context within which each NHRI was established and operates. One respondent stated that ENNHRI does not need to have values, and this should rather be a matter for each member institution.

5.2 Vision

An overwhelming level of support was provided for two suggested components for an ENNHRI vision, namely:

- **Paris Principles-compliant NRHIs throughout Europe** (93.94% of respondents, 31 members) and
- **Enhanced promotion and protection of human rights throughout Europe** (90.91% of respondents, 30 members).

Respect for international human rights standards throughout Europe received the support of 26 members (78.79% of respondents), however a few members pointed out that this component had considerable overlap with ‘enhanced promotion and protection of human rights throughout Europe’, and that the two could be merged into one aspect of ENNHRI’s vision.
Some respondents suggested other components for ENNHRI’s vision, namely:

- ENNHRI as an influential, effective and visible actor in Europe;
- ENNHRI as an independent network of competence for human rights;
- Raising the authority (prestige) of NHRIs at the national, regional and international levels;
- Enhancing the role of NHRIs in prevention of human rights violations and restoration of violated rights;
- Education and awareness raising of human rights;
- Building capacity in communities and government;
- Human rights in practice as a tool to enhance dignity and autonomy;
- Building a human rights culture; and
- Support for victims.

In relation to the vision of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs throughout Europe, one respondent underlined that capacity building and strengthening member institutions should be prioritised. Another respondent noted that ENNHRI should not exclude non-‘A’ status members. It was underlined that ENNHRI should not focus only on NHRIs which are already accredited as Paris-Principles compliant institutions but also support institutions in the process of (re-)accreditation and facilitate communication with the SCA/ICC.

Another respondent felt that ‘Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs throughout Europe’, though important, should not be a purpose in itself, but rather a means of achieving enhanced promotion and protection of human rights throughout Europe, whereby effectively functioning NHRIs are a precondition to reaching this goal.

### 5.3 Mission

An overwhelming level of support was provided for two of the suggested components for an ENNHRI mission, namely:

- **Facilitating communication and cooperation between European NHRIs** (90.91% of respondents, 30 members); and
- **Supporting the effective functioning of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs in Europe** (87.88% of respondents, 29 members).

Thereafter, the two other suggested components for an ENNHRI mission received notably less, but still considerable support, namely:

- **Facilitating European NHRIs’ engagement with regional and international human rights mechanisms** (78.79% of respondents, 26 members); and
- **Facilitating the establishment of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs in Europe** (72.73% of respondents, 24 members).

---

102 Ideally, this would include a focus on supporting newer and smaller NHRIs, and building joint work between members to enable them to be more effective both in their own work and at a regional, network level. In particular we should aim as a network to have a well-developed approach to joint work for issues that will have most impact across Europe for example on Roma or LGBTI issues.
A few respondents suggested additional components for ENNHRI’s mission, namely:

- Fully enable the participation and effectiveness of its members;¹⁰³
- Build effective engagement or enhancement;
- Develop systems to act as a resource for NHRIs;
- Promote best practice among members;
- Facilitate and coordinate policy advice at the European level;
- Develop links with other regions and international bodies working to protect human rights; and
- Build protected links with other regions’ NHRIs.

Some respondents provided suggestions for areas of work that should be included within ENNHRI’s mission. These included:

- Peer exchange of knowledge and experience;¹⁰⁴
- Support in communicating with the SCA and ICC;
- Capacity building, taking into account the limits to members’ resources and capacity; and

---

¹⁰³ It was underlined that ENNHRI’s strength will come from its joint work and effectiveness.
¹⁰⁴ Including on NPM activities.
Maintaining central records as an information resource on, for example, members' prior work; contacts of members' experts in relation to thematic areas; and research on European and UN standards.

Two respondents underlined that ENNHRI should not focus only on NHRIs which are already accredited as 'A' status Paris-Principles compliant institutions, but also support institutions in the process of (re-)accreditation.

5.4 Term

51.52% of respondents (17 members) stated that the next ENNHRI strategic plan should have a term of 3 years. Two respondents noted that a three year term allows for new developments to be incorporated and to review the effectiveness in good time, while allowing for flexibility. One respondent noted that any term longer than three years would risk the prospect of the strategic plan becoming irrelevant in a rapidly changing external environment.

One third of respondents (11 members) recommended that the strategic plan should have a 4 year term. Two respondents underlined the importance of sufficient time to achieve the vision set out in the plan and avoiding many unachieved goals. It was noted that too short a plan would result in resources needed for development and support being spent, too soon, on planning for a new strategy. Only 9.09% of respondents (3 members) supported a 5 year strategic plan at this time.

---

105 Including reports or submissions of other NHRI on an issue or to UN committee or Human Rights Council, such as a shadow report.

106 For example, on transgender rights, prison standards or the right to remedies, among others.

107 IOI has a four year strategic plan, corresponding to its four-yearly world conference.

108 Following up on something there was not time enough to implement.
Respondents also recognised that the time frame might be different for the first strategic plan, as opposed to those in the future. One respondent suggested that, as it is the first strategic plan for the newly established ENNHRI, it should run for a shorter period than is normally used for strategic plans by other institutions\(^\text{109}\). However, another respondent suggested that a longer term would be more appropriate, given that the non-achievement of the goals in the strategic plan should be particularly avoided in the first strategic plan.

Two members noted that the term of the strategic plan should take into account other planning cycles, such as that of ICC, other members and the appointment of ENNHRI’s chair. Another called for regular revision of the strategic plan to keep it updated, including regular assessment of goals' implementation, and the setting up of new objectives and action plans. It was also suggested that each strategic plan or time period could focus on specific subject themes or have each year dedicated to analysing a specific issue or problem.

\(^{109}\) FRA which is now consulting a strategic plan for 2013-2017.
6 Future Work of ENNHRI

6.1 Overview

Members prioritised the strengthening of NHRI's in Europe as the most important potential pillar for ENNHRI’s next strategic plan, from the options provided in the survey. Within this pillar, ‘increasing the institutional capacity of NHRI’s in Europe (methodological)’ was found to be the most important current area of work, particularly in relation to ‘providing training and capacity-building initiatives’, and ‘supporting the A-status accreditation of NHRI’s in Europe’.

If working groups were to be set up to increase capacity on institutional methodology, the most popular subject areas were ‘monitoring’, and ‘reporting to international mechanisms’, followed by ‘human rights education’. ‘Information exchange’ was favoured as the best current method for the spread of best practice. Throughout the survey, capacity building and information exchange were repeatedly underlined by various respondents as important future activities for ENNHRI.

Building a strong and sustainable Secretariat had the second highest level of support, from those provided in the survey as potential pillars for ENNHRI’s next strategic plan. Within this pillar, the ‘development and implementation of a fundraising strategy’ was clearly seen as the most important activity, particularly in the initial period. The next most popular activities within this pillar were ‘relationship building with critical stakeholders’, ‘building capacity (human resources)’ and a ‘communication strategy’. A website was the most popular method for enhancing communications, followed by emails or e-bulletins to members. Indeed, the need for a website was mentioned by several members throughout the survey.

The third most popular potential pillar for ENNHRI’s next strategic plan, from those provided in the survey, was enhancing the promotion and protection of human rights in Europe. Respondents recorded that this could best be achieved through ‘building the institutional capacity of NHRI’s (substantive)’, followed by ‘ENNHRI statements on human rights in Europe’, ‘intervening in policy development at a European level’ and ‘providing training and capacity building (substantive)’.

If substantive working groups were to be set up, the most useful to respondents were ‘asylum and migration (including trafficking)’, followed by ‘CRPD’. Thereafter, ‘legal’, ‘detention (and torture)’, ‘older persons’ rights’ and ‘austerity (economic, social and economic rights)’ were also popular. These subject areas could also be considered as relevant for capacity building initiatives.

The least most popular pillar, of those provided in the survey, was regional engagement. However, it was also noted that regional engagement and enhancing rights are intrinsically linked and could be integrated. The value of NHRI’s coming together to form a regional voice was also underlined by several members throughout the survey. Cooperation between NHRI’s was also found to be important, through information exchange, meetings, working groups, spread of best practice, and a website.
Respondents ranked the most important mechanisms for engagement as UN OHCHR and Council of Europe, followed by the UN Human Rights Council and ‘UN treaty bodies and special procedures’. It was noted by a few members that regional mechanisms should be prioritised over international mechanisms. The most popular method for engagement was ‘partnership working and joint projects’.

Suggestions for other potential pillars for the strategic plan were:
- Development of member NHRIs and their staff (or ‘support for members’);
- Facilitating Europe’s positive role globally in the promotion and protection of human rights;
- Preventing human rights restrictions in the financial crisis;
- Partnership working; and
- Influencing strategic communication.

6.2 Key Pillars

Out of the four possible key pillars for the immediate strategic plan, respondents prioritised the **strengthening of NHRIs in Europe** by some margin. It also received the most first place rankings (33.33% of respondents or 11 members). The strengthening of NHRIs in Europe was also given a ‘second choice’ allocation by 16 members (48.48% of respondents).

Respondents prioritised **building a strong and sustainable Secretariat** and **enhancing the promotion and protection of human rights in Europe** in second and third place respectively. These two potential pillars also received a high number of first place rankings, with 10 members each (30.3% of respondents).

**Regional engagement** received a much lower average ranking and was only allocated in first place by two members (6.06% of respondents).

Q17 Please rank, in order of priority, the following potential key pillars of work for ENNHRI’s strategic plan, 1 being the most important. (If you believe that any of the below should not be included as a key pillar for this strategic plan, please mark as N/A).
The only additional suggestions for other potential pillars were:

- Facilitating Europe playing a positive role globally in the promotion and protection of human rights;
- Preventing human rights restrictions in the period of the world economic and financial crisis;
- Development of staff and NHRI's (and not just Secretariat)\(^{110}\);
- Support for members;
- Partnership working; and
- Influencing strategic communication.

With some of these alternative pillars included, one respondent ranked building a sustainable secretariat in sixth place and regional engagement in seventh place (or as a subset of other pillars).

In relation to strengthening of NHRIs in Europe, two respondents noted the positive example of the Asia Pacific Forum\(^ {111}\). One respondent underlined that capacity building of NHRIs should be the priority, which could take many forms. It was suggested that a needs assessment process could help direct attention. One member specified that it would benefit from expertise on accreditation and underlined that ENNHRI could foster understanding for different forms of NHRIs\(^ {112}\). Another suggested that strengthening NHRIs should be carried out in a 'self-serving' manner (e.g. through website information) while secretariat capacity is low.

One respondent pointed out that, while building a sustainable secretariat should be a priority at this initial stage, the more substantive pillars of regional engagement and enhancing rights should receive greater priority when the organisational framework and capacity is in place. Indeed, another respondent noted that, although building a sustainable secretariat is an essential precondition, this should be balanced against the main purpose to enhance human rights in Europe.

Two respondents noted that regional engagement and enhancing rights are intrinsically linked and could be integrated. One respondent clarified that it understood 'regional engagement' to entail joint action in European fora such as amicus curiae briefs and lobbying for legislation in the EU, among others.

### 6.3 Strengthening NHRIs in Europe

#### 6.3.1 Key Components

Within the category of Strengthening NHRIs in Europe, increasing the institutional capacity of NHRIs in Europe (methodological) had a markedly higher average ranking than the other components, which was also reflected in the high number of first place rankings (10 members, 31.25% of respondents). However, it is noted that this component is relatively descriptive of the overall pillar.

---

\(^{110}\) Asia Pacific have identified and responded to this need very effectively.

\(^{111}\) In relation to training staff and Commissioners and needs assessment (and follow up action) for building institutional capacity.

\(^{112}\) Especially regarding Ombudsman institutions.
In terms of specific activities to strengthen NHRIs, providing training and capacity-building initiatives (methodological) and supporting the A-status accreditation of NHRIs in Europe were the most popular, with second and third place average ranking respectively. Thereafter, supporting the establishment of NHRIs in Europe and facilitating the spread of best practice were not far behind, in fifth and sixth place respectively.

In relation to other components, respondents suggested the following:
- Summer School for staff;
- Leadership events;
- Facilitated sharing with key mechanisms;
- Engagement with information experts;
- Management groups; and
- Mentoring opportunities for new and developing NHRIs, including scope for short-term secondments and attachments.

In relation to training and capacity-building initiatives (methodological), one member noted that this should focus on trans-boundary issues that touch upon all NHRIs. One respondent requested that the Secretariat undertake efforts (together with key partners) to help strengthen NHRIs. One member underlined that the
Secretariat and members must fully understand NHRI standards in order for ENNHRI to support A-status accreditation and the establishment of new NHRIs.

6.3.2 Working groups (methodological)

In relation to working groups on methodological subject areas, monitoring was the most popular subject in terms of average rating, followed closely by reporting to international mechanisms. In terms of respondents’ ‘first choice’ allocations, these two categories were reversed, with reporting to international mechanisms being the first priority for 10 members (31.25% of respondents), followed by monitoring for 6 members (18.75% of respondents). Human rights education was also a popular subject in average ratings, though slightly below the first two.

Following the above most popular subjects, accreditation, NPM operations, communications and complaints handling all had a similar and moderately popular average rating.
The suggestions for other working groups (methodological) were:
- Corporate governance - institutional developments;
- Monitoring and investigations;
- Case management - legal services;
- Policy development;
- Human rights leadership; and
- Asylum and Migration (though this is considered later in the survey).

One respondent believed that only four subject areas were crucial for any NHRI to establish its authority, independence and legitimacy, namely:

a) monitoring, which establishes its knowledge base, and develops experience using the main tools available to it;

b) communication, i.e. approaching and communicating with own government;

c) international reporting, i.e. approaching the international mechanisms if own government is not responding/reacting; and

d) human rights education, i.e. ensuring that practitioners understand how they can contribute to implementing human rights obligations.

One member suggested that working groups should only be established where there is a need to work together at a certain time, but that they should not be permanent, having a specific goal and work for a scheduled time to reach that goal. Another warned that, if these were to be additional to current working groups, commitment and individual NHRIs’ capacity would need to be confirmed in advance, with the support of management.

6.3.3 Spreading best practice

In order to spread best practice, information exchange was the clear priority for respondents, receiving the highest average rating. This component also received easily the most first choice ratings (11 members, 34.38% of respondents). The next most popular means through which to spread best practice were working groups and best practice guides respectively. With less popularity than the above mechanisms, staff exchanges also received a notable average rating.

Fifteen members (46.88% of respondents) identified other as being a potential working group to strengthen NHRIs, although all with a ‘last place’ allocation. The only suggested ‘other’ working groups were:
- Joint publications; and
- Joint projects.

One respondent noted that funding would be required in order to operationalise working groups and staff exchanges. Another noted that the effort of best practice guides and publications are disproportionate to the effectiveness.

One member underlined that facilitating the spread of best practice requires not only knowing what others do, but the comparison of results, methods and effectiveness. Another noted that there was much overlap between options, and that strategic priority areas should be identified.
6.4 Building a Strong and Sustainable Secretariat

6.4.1 Key components

In order to build a strong and sustainable Secretariat, respondents clearly set out the development and implementation of a fundraising strategy as the most important area of work for the next strategic plan. This received the highest average ranking and also the highest number of ‘first choice’ and ‘second choice’ rankings (7 members, 21.88% respondents and 9 members, 28.13% of respondents respectively).

The second most popular area of work to build the Secretariat was relationship building with critical stakeholders, which is interesting, as engagement with regional actors was the lowest priority of those options suggested for key pillars for the next strategic plan. Building the capacity (human resources) of the Secretariat was the next most popular average ranking (with 6 ‘first place’ allocations), followed by a communication strategy and supporting and reporting to the ECC and members respectively.
In relation to the **fundraising strategy**, one respondent underlined that funding is a precondition for the Secretariat to function properly, and others noted that long-term funding required both fundraising (which takes a lot of staff time) and relationship building with critical stakeholders, in addition to membership fees. Two members stated that fundraising should only be a priority in the initial phase⁹¹³.

One respondent noted that **organisational formalities**, including cooperation between the Secretariat and Chair / ECC and developing communication channels (which save time for the Secretariat) should be given priority at the initial stage, after which support for members¹¹⁴ could rise in priority. One member stated that funding and capacity would be required for the many forms of **communication**. It was suggested that the Secretariat could learn lessons from other networks, such as the European Network of Ombudsmen, where cooperation and exchange of information is very useful, informative and effective.

Some respondents noted that ENNHRI members could support the Secretariat, through exchanging staff and making full use of their prominent experts. Given this,

---

¹¹³ Another respondent stated that the development of the strategic plan is critical during this period.

¹¹⁴ For example capacity building.
and the established relationships with critical stakeholders, one member believed that a successful Secretariat could be established with minimal outlay and a small number of specialised and expert staff. It was suggested that the Chair and Secretariat intensify lobbying activities towards EU pillar institutions and join forces with key partners in advocating better implementation of crucial human rights standards within the EU.

6.4.2 Communications

The overwhelmingly most popular method for ENNHRI’s communications was a website, with a markedly higher average rating and 71.88% of respondents’ ‘first choice’ allocations (23 members). The second most popular method was e-bulletins to members, receiving 46.88% of respondents’ ‘second choice’ allocations (15 members) and membership emails (‘first choice’ for 6 members, 18.75% of respondents). These two methods were much more popular than any of the other suggestions offered in the survey, but also much less popular than an ENNHRI website.

One respondent underlined that the initial focus should be on developing communication channels which save time for the secretariat, while making relevant information available for members. It was suggested that a website would be ideal to achieve this goal, and ideas for initial content were:
a) legislation and contact points for all European NHRIs;
b) information as to how different European NHRIs work;
c) activities undertaken;
d) information on and for ENNHRI working groups;
e) subject specific and thematic information; and
f) a list of members’ recent reports and submissions for resource purposes.

It was also suggested that an RSS feed could inform members when new information was posted.

A distinction was made between internal and external communications. A few respondents underlined that internal communications should be the priority for the initial stage. One member pointed out that, in this regard, the difference between an e-bulletin to members and membership emails was unclear.

A few members noted that general external communication, for example via a public e-bulletin, social media and press releases, was currently not a priority because they require too much time and may not be very effective. It was suggested that specific communication may be more effective, and that ENNHRI members could distribute press releases themselves, with themes distributed among members. Another member noted that it could be difficult to coordinate press releases among members.

However, two respondents stated that external communications should be prioritized, through press releases, a public online bulletin and social media, which would enable ENNHRI to respond more quickly, efficiently and with greater reach. One respondent suggested that the communications strategy could be directed to the EU institutions. Finally, one member underlined the need for funding and capacity in order to roll out a communications strategy.

6.5 Enhancing Promotion and Protection of Human Rights

6.5.1 Key Components

In order to enhance the promotion and protection of human rights, the most popular of methods suggested in the survey was to increase the institutional capacity of NHRIs in Europe (substantive), which received the highest average rating and also the most ‘first choice’ allocations (31.25% of respondents, 10 members).

The second and third most popular average ratings were intervening in policy development at a European level and making ENNHRI statements on human rights issues in Europe, which received a similar level of support. These also received the second and third most frequent ‘first choice’ allocations, with 18.75% of respondents (6 members) and 15.63% of respondents (5 members), although in the opposite order. Providing training and capacity-building initiatives (substantive) was also a popular method, with the fourth highest average rating and the most ‘second choice’ allocations (8 members, 25% of respondents).
Only one alternative suggestion was included for other, namely:
- Draw UN standards\textsuperscript{115} to the attention of Council of Europe and EU.

Two respondents suggested that the Secretariat could undertake efforts, together with key partners, to enhance the overall human rights structure in Europe and help strengthen NHRIs' role in the promotion and protection of human rights at the national and European level. It was recommended that the Secretariat's work in this regard be concentrated on:
- Coordinating common policy making initiatives and common statements on human rights issues;
- Supporting joint litigation initiatives\textsuperscript{116};
- Coordinating human rights impact assessment on EU legislation, with FRA;
- Increasing the awareness on human rights sensitive legislation in Europe\textsuperscript{117};

\textsuperscript{115} Including recent developments and special procedures, to raise standards and drive human rights agenda.
\textsuperscript{116} European Court of Human rights, Court of Justice of the European Union.
\textsuperscript{117} With FRA, Equinet, and Council of Europe on the Lisbon Treaty, EU Charter, and Social Charter.
• Increasing awareness of remedies available in human rights cases\textsuperscript{118}; and
• Advocating the adoption of international human rights treaties in the EU.

6.5.2 Working groups (substantive)

\textsuperscript{118} Including the European Court of Human Rights, and the role of NHRIs in the court’s reform.
Of the substantive working groups subject areas suggested in the survey, **asylum and migration (including trafficking)** was clearly noted to be useful for the highest number of respondents, with support for over three quarters of respondents (78.13% of respondents, 25 members). Following this, **CRPD** was indicated to be useful by a very high proportion of respondents (71.88%, 23 members).

Four other suggested subject areas for working groups also received over 50% of respondents’ support, namely **legal** (59.38% of respondents, 19 members), **detention (and torture)** (56.25% of respondents, 18 members), **austerity (economic, social and cultural rights)** and **older persons’ rights** (each with support from 53.13% of respondents, or 17 members).

Four subject areas received over 45% of respondents’ support, namely **gender and racism / Roma** (each with 50% of respondents, 16 members), and **business and human rights** (46.88% of respondents, 15 members).

### 6.6 Regional Engagement

#### 6.6.1 Mechanisms
In terms of average rating, respondents’ clearly indicated that ENNHRI’s engagement efforts with regional and international human rights mechanisms should be prioritised towards **Council of Europe**. Thereafter, the **UN OHCHR** and the **UN Human Rights Council** also received similar and notably high average ratings.

In terms of ‘first choice’ allocations, UN OHCHR and the Human Rights Council each received the same (highest) number (with 21.88% of respondents, or 7 members), and thereafter the Council of Europe and EU each received support from 15.63% of respondents (5 members). ‘Second choice’ allocations were most frequent for Council of Europe (8 members, 25% of respondents), followed by UN OHCHR and UN treaty bodies and special procedures (6 members, 18.75% of respondents).

Respondents suggested that engagement was also important with other networks, including Equinet, networks of Ombudsmans, and the ICC.

It was recognised that prioritising human rights mechanisms is a huge challenge for ENNHRI, which in the longer term should aim to be active in relation to all of them. One respondent underlined that the priority of relations with other mechanisms must be governed by ENNHRI’s priorities of subjects. Another respondent suggested that prioritisation could be addressed through:

- clarifying division of labour between the global and regional level. A distinction could be made between ICC, with its Geneva representative, and ENNHRI, with its ECC and Secretariat;
- giving priority to regional and European mechanisms according to their relevance for pan-European institutions and themes;
- assessing a realistic level of engagement with the various mechanisms according to objectives and realistic expectations of results; and
- limiting engagement with UNDP and possible assistance to developing NHRIs in other regions to those competent individuals and (few) NHRIs who have capacity for this, without Secretariat priority in the first strategic period.

### 6.6.2 Methods of Engagement

Respondents also had the opportunity to prioritise methods of engagement with human rights mechanisms. The highest average rating by quite some margin, from those methods suggested in the survey, was for **partnership working and joint projects**. This also corresponded to a markedly high number of ‘first choice’ allocations, from 50% of respondents or 16 members.

The other three suggested methods for engagement provided in the survey received a similar average rating, in the following order **contributing to policy or convention development, submitting statements or evidence** and **attending meetings**. Of these, ‘submitting statements or evidence’ received the most ‘first choice’ allocations (25% of respondents, 8 members) and ‘contributing to policy or convention development’ received a high number of ‘second choice’ allocations (40.63% of respondents, 13 members).

One respondent made an **other** suggestion, namely:

- holding the regional mechanisms constructively accountable.
One member noted that partnership work and joint projects would be beneficial, but more so in later strategic periods. Another stated that attending meetings is not useful, unless ENNHRI actively contributes. One member underlined that individual NHRIs should perhaps have the mandate to engage, rather than the Secretariat.

### 6.6.3 Coordination between NHRIs

One member pointed out that cooperation with other NHRIs, rather than with other regional organisations, would be more useful.

From the various actions suggested in the survey to enhance cooperation between NHRIs in Europe, information exchange was the most popular in terms of average ranking. After this, three activities received a similar average ranking, namely, meetings, working groups and spreading of best practice. Following not far behind these four, an ENNHRI website also had a relatively high average rating.

In terms of ‘first choice’ allocations, the website received the most support (28.13% of respondents, 9 members), followed by ‘working groups’ and ‘information exchange’ (18.75 of respondents, 6 members each). ‘Second choice’ allocations were most frequent for the ‘spreading of best practice’ (25% of respondents, 8 members), followed by ‘working groups’ (21.88% of respondents, 7 members).

One respondent noted that face-to-face meetings, short-term secondments and shadowing attachments are vital to build relationships and enable activities such as
mentoring and capacity building. It was suggested that ENNHRI could play an important role in matching expertise with funding opportunities, to ensure institutional capacity for projects. It was also suggested that members explore work with governments to source funding streams to support activity. One respondent stated that there are currently sufficient meetings. Another cross-referred to its comments on communication and website content (see section 6.4.2).

Q28 COOPERATION BETWEEN NHRIs ACROSS EUROPE: Please rank the following actions to enhance cooperation between NHRIs in Europe according to which you believe would be most important for ENNHRI during this strategic plan.

Answered: 32  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information exchange</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading of best practice</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff exchange</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer support</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify...)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, a Northern Irish NGO was successful in securing funding for post-conflict peace building in the Balkans but lacked expertise in tackling homophobic bullying.
7 Conclusion

Respondents to the survey provided a huge wealth of information on ENNHRI. The information will be a resource to help document the past work of the European Group of NHRI. ENNHRI will be able to draw on members’ evaluation of this past work, and their ideas for improvement, to help advance its activities going forward. Furthermore, the high level of member participation in prioritising work for the future will help find a starting point for the strategic planning process.

Two respondents underlined the need to keep the strategic plan realistic and not too ambitious, given the limited resources of the Secretariat and many members. Indeed, one respondent pointed out that, throughout the section on future work, some very relevant actions and topics were marked as ‘not applicable’, given the limited capacity, requiring difficult choices to choose priorities which may be realistic in the first strategic period.

Throughout the survey, several respondents noted that the priorities would likely change over the life of the strategic plan. Some underlined that institution building should be a priority in the first stage, including fundraising, establishing a website and setting up organisational formalities. At the same time, it was noted that support to members, such as capacity building, and regional engagement would come more to the fore in a later stage of the strategic plan.

One member noted that some questions in the survey were quite difficult to answer in isolation and could more easily be answered following discussions with members on the current situation. Indeed, all members will have an opportunity to discuss the outcomes of the member survey and work together to elaborate a strategic plan at the strategic planning meeting in Budapest on 13 to 15 November 2013.
## ANNEX A

### Respondents to the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ENNHRI Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Albania</td>
<td>Albanian People’s Advocate Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Austria</td>
<td>Austrian Ombudsman Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Belgium</td>
<td>Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>The Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bulgaria</td>
<td>Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Croatia</td>
<td>Ombudsman of the Republic of Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Denmark</td>
<td>The Danish Institute for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finland</td>
<td>Finnish Human Rights Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Georgia</td>
<td>Office of Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Germany</td>
<td>Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Great Britain</td>
<td>Equality and Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ireland</td>
<td>Irish Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kosovo</td>
<td>Ombudperson Institution of Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Latvia</td>
<td>Ombudsman’s Office of the Republic of Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lithuania</td>
<td>Seimas Ombudsman of the Republic of Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Luxembourg</td>
<td>Commission Consultative des Droits de l'Homme du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. (FYR) Macedonia</td>
<td>Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Netherlands</td>
<td>Netherlands Institute for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian Centre for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Poland</td>
<td>The Human Rights Defender of The Republic of Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Portugal</td>
<td>Portuguese Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Romania</td>
<td>Romanian Institute for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Serbia</td>
<td>The Protector of Citizens of the Republic of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovak National Centre for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Spain</td>
<td>Defensor del Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sweden</td>
<td>The Swedish Equality Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Switzerland</td>
<td>Federal Commission against Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Ukraine</td>
<td>Ukrainian Parliamentary Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Uzbekistan</td>
<td>National Human Rights Centre of the Republic of Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Observer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B

ENNHRI Strategic Planning Member Survey 2013

SECTION A: PRELIMINARIES

1. Please state the name of your institution

2. Who was involved in completing this survey? (Please mark all that apply)
   - Members (Board / Ombudsman(s) / Commissioner(s))
   - Management
   - Staff
   - Other (please specify)

3. VALUES: Please consider which of these (the first six of which are listed in the interim statutes) should be included as values for ENNHRI's work and also add any other suggested values for ENNHRI. (Please mark all that apply)
   - Respect of international human rights standards
   - Transparency
   - Accountability
   - Participation
   - Cooperation
   - Nondiscrimination
   - Inclusion
   - Universality, indivisibility, interdependence
   - Upward harmonisation of international, regional and national human rights standards
   - Other (please specify below)
   - Uncertain / No opinion

Comments

4. VISION: This will set out the future that ENNHRI will strive to achieve. Please select any of the following as possible components of an ENNHRI vision and add any that you feel should be included. (Please mark all that apply)
   - Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs throughout Europe
   - Enhanced promotion and protection of human rights throughout Europe
   - Respect for international human rights standards throughout Europe
   - Access to justice for victims of human rights violations in Europe
   - Other (please specify below)
   - Uncertain / No opinion

Comments

5. MISSION: This will set out how ENNHRI will work to achieve its vision. Please select any of the following that you feel should be components of an ENNHRI mission, and add any that you feel should be included. (Please mark all that apply)
   - Facilitate the establishment of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs in Europe
   - Support the effective functioning of Paris Principles-compliant NHRIs in Europe
   - Facilitate communication and cooperation between European NHRIs
6. TERM: Please select the term for which you think the strategic plan should run.
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- Other (please specify below)
- Uncertain / No Opinion

7. SWOT: Please set out what you consider to be ENNHRI’s main:
- strengths;
- weaknesses;
- opportunities; and
- threats.

8. OTHER NETWORKS: Are you a member of any other network of national protection bodies? (Please mark all that apply)
- Euro-Arab Human Rights Dialogue (NHRIs)
- Commonwealth Forum of NHRIs
- Association of Francophone NHRIs
- Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries
- Iberico-America (NHRIs)
- Visegrad Four (NHRIs)
- Eastern Partnership (NHRIs)
- European Network of Ombudsmen
- International Ombudsman Institute
- International Ombudsman Association
- European Ombudsman Institute
- Equinet (equality bodies)
- European Network of Ombudspeople for Children
- Other (please specify below)
- None
- Uncertain

If YES: what are the benefits of each network to you; and do you hold an organisational position? Any other comments?

SECTION B: PAST WORK

9. INFORMATION EXCHANGE: Have you been involved in any information exchange through any of the following methods of the European Group of NHRIs? (Please mark all that apply)
- Through Chair
- Through Secretariat
- Between members
- None
- Uncertain

If YES: in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?
10. MEETINGS: Have you attended any meetings of the European Group of NHRIs in the last five years?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Uncertain
   If YES: in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

11. TRAINING: Have you been involved in any training or capacity building offered by the European Group of NHRIs or its members, including through partnership organisations (eg UNDP, OSCEODIHR, other)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Uncertain
   If YES: in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

12. EVENTS: Have you attended any events organised by the European Group of NHRIs?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Uncertain
   If YES: in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

13. WORKING GROUPS: Have you been involved in any Working Groups or or other loose cooperation frameworks of the European Group of NHRIs? (Please mark all that apply)
   - Legal
   - CRPD
   - Accreditation
   - Asylum & Migration
   - Human Rights Education
   - Business & Human Rights
   - Uncertain
   - None
   If YES: which one(s); in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

14. REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT: Have you been involved in the European Group of NHRIs' engagement with any of the following regional or international human rights mechanisms? (Please mark all that apply)
   - Council of Europe
   - UN Human Rights Council
   - UN treaty bodies and special procedures
   - UN OHCHR
   - UNDP
   - EU Institutions
   - FRA
   - Other (please specify below)
   - Uncertain
   - OSCE-ODIHR
   - None
If YES: in which context; was it useful; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

15. POLICY STATEMENTS: Have you been involved in the elaboration of any policy statements released by the European Group of NHRIIs?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Uncertain
   If YES: in which context; how was the process satisfactory; and how could it have been improved? If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to be involved in the future? Any other comments?

16. ORGANISATIONAL POSITIONS: Have you held any organisational positions within the European Group of NHRIIs (eg ECC, SCA)?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Uncertain
   If YES: please state the position and comment on the processes and work included. If NO: why not; and what would increase your willingness to hold a position in the future. Any other comments?

SECTION C: FUTURE WORK

17. Please rank, in order of priority, the following potential key pillars of work for ENNHRI’s strategic plan, 1 being the most important. (If you believe that any of the below should not be included as a key pillar for this strategic plan, please mark as N/A).
   - Other (please specify below)
   - Enhancing Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Europe
   - Strengthening NHRIIs in Europe
   - Regional Engagement
   - Building a Sustainable Secretariat

18. Please specify any alternative or additional key pillar(s), if you think they should form part of ENNHRI’s next strategic plan, and / or any other related comments

19. BUILDING A STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE SECRETARIAT: In order of priority, please rank the following potential components of this pillar, with 1 being the most important for this strategic plan. (If you think any component is not currently a priority for ENNHRI, please mark as N/A).
   - Developing and implementing a fundraising strategy
   - Strengthening governance and accounting mechanisms
   - Building capacity (human resources)
   - Supporting and reporting to the ECC and membership
   - Developing and implementing a communications strategy
   - Other (please specify below)
   - Facilitating ENNHRI contribution to ICC activities
   - Relationship building with critical stakeholders
20. COMMUNICATIONS: In case 'Developing a Communications Strategy' is a component of this strategic plan, please rank the following potential communication methods in order of priority for ENNHRI's work in this area, with 1 being the most important. (If you think any method is not currently a priority for ENNHRI's work, please mark as N/A)
- ENNHRI website
- E-bulletin to members
- Public e-bulletin
- Social media (twitter, facebook)
- Membership emails
- Subject-specific email groups among membership
- Press releases
- Other (please specify)

21. Please specify any alternative or additional components for 'Building a Strong and Sustainable Secretariat' or 'Communications', if you think that they should be included, and / or add any other related comments.

22. STRENGTHENING NHRIs IN EUROPE: In order of priority, please rank the following potential components of this pillar, with 1 being the most important for this strategic plan (If you think any component is not currently a priority for ENNHRI, please mark as N/A).
- Supporting the A-status accreditation of NHRIs in Europe
- Increasing the institutional capacity of NHRIs in Europe (methodological)
- Supporting the establishment of NHRIs in Europe
- Other (please specify below)
- Providing training and capacity building initiatives (methodological)
- Capacity Assessment, Gaps Analysis, or similar exercises
- Facilitating the spread of best practice
- Setting up working groups (methodological)

23. WORKING GROUPS: In case 'Setting up Working Groups' is a component of this pillar, please rank the following subject areas according to current usefulness for your institution, with 1 being the most useful (If a subject area is not currently a priority for your institution, please mark as N/A).
- Accreditation
- Reporting to international mechanisms
- Monitoring
- Human rights education
- Corporate governance
- Case management
- Communication
- Other (please specify below)
- NPM operations
- Complaints handling

24. BEST PRACTICE: Please rank the following possible methods of spreading best practice among members according to the approach that you think should be
taken by ENNHRI during this strategic plan, with 1 being the most preferred. (If you think a method should not currently be prioritised, please mark as N/A)

- Best practice guides
- Publications
- Working groups
- Staff exchanges
- Information exchange
- Other (please specify below)

25. Please specify any alternative or additional components for 'Strengthening NHRIs in Europe', 'Methodological Working Groups' or 'Spreading of Best Practice', if you think that they should be included, and / or add any other related comments.

26. HUMAN RIGHTS MECHANISMS: Please rank the following human rights mechanisms in order of priority for ENNHRI's engagement efforts, with 1 being the most important (If you think engaging any of the following mechanisms should not currently be a priority for ENNHRI, please mark as N/A).

- UN Human Rights Council
- UN OHCHR
- OSCE-ODIHR
- FRA
- Other networks of protective bodies (NHRIs, Equality Bodies, Ombudsmans; please specify below)
- EU Institutions
- UN treaty bodies and special procedures
- Other (please specify below)
- Council of Europe
- UNDP

27. METHODS OF ENGAGEMENT: Please rank the following methods of engagement with regional/international human rights mechanisms in order of priority, with 1 being the best approach for ENNHRI during this strategic plan (If you think any method should not currently be prioritised, please mark as N/A).

- Attending meetings
- Submitting statements or evidence
- Partnership working, joint projects
- Contributing to policy or convention development
- Other (please specify below)

28. COOPERATION BETWEEN NHRIs ACROSS EUROPE: Please rank the following actions to enhance cooperation between NHRIs in Europe according to which you believe would be most important for ENNHRI during this strategic plan, with 1 being the most important (If you think any action is not currently a priority for ENNHRI, please mark as N/A).

- Website
- Staff exchange
- Working groups
- Peer support
- Meetings
• Spreading of best practice
• Other (please specify below)
• Information exchange

29. Please specify any alternative or additional components for ‘Regional Engagement’, ‘Methods of Engagement’ or ‘Cooperation between NHRIs’, if you think that they should be included, and / or add any other related comments.

30. ENHANCING PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: Please rank the following actions in order of priority, with 1 being the most important for ENNHRI during this strategic plan (If you think any action is not currently a priority for ENNHRI’s work, please mark as N/A.)

• Intervening in policy development at a European level
• Organising public events on key human rights issues in Europe
• Increasing the institutional capacity of NHRIs in Europe (substantive)
• Setting up working groups (substantive)
• Intervening in strategic litigation at a European level
• Making ENNHRI statements on human rights issues in Europe
• Providing training and capacity building initiatives (substantive)
• Other (please specify below)

31. WORKING GROUPS: In case ‘Setting up Working Groups’ is a component of this pillar, please indicate, from the subject areas listed below, those that would be most useful to your institution. We are aware that each of these subjects is important but, if a subject area is not currently a priority to your institution or if you would be unlikely to engage in an eventual working group, please do not mark it as a priority here.

• Legal
• CRPD
• Asylum & Migration (including human trafficking)
• Business & Human Rights
• Gender
• Austerity (economic, social, and cultural rights)
• Detention (and torture)
• Children's rights
• Older persons’ rights
• Freedom of expression / media
• Human rights defenders
• Racism / Roma
• LGBTI
• Environment
• Data protection
• Security and human rights
• Post 2015 Development
• Other (please specify below)
• Transitional justice

Comments, including any specific priorities

32. Please specify any alternative or additional components for ‘Enhancing the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Europe’, if you think that they should be included, and / or add any other related comments.

33. Please use this space for any other comments that have not been covered in the rest of the member survey.