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I. Executive Summary

Amnesty commissioned the Transnational NGO Initiative at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, USA to carry out an independent Final Assessment of Amnesty International’s Global Transition Program (GTP). GTP aimed to “have significantly greater impact by becoming a more global movement” and to result in “acting with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity and relevance as we stand alongside those whose rights are violated” (GTP Roadmap). As part of this, Regional Offices were set up across the globe. In addition, GTP sought greater integration across functions, locations and units. This vision is also reflected in other internal documents that highlight the need for “being more strongly present where we are not, and integrating better our work across all parts of the IS and the movement, and to build on the strengths that have brought us this far.”

The purpose of the GTP Final Assessment is to fulfill an accountability requirement to the movement, and Amnesty’s wider constituencies, in return for the investment by the movement. As agreed upon in the Concept Note the Assessment covers 1) Human rights Impact; 2) Visibility and Credibility of Amnesty International; 3) Engagement with Rights Holders; 4) Collaboration with Amnesty International Sections and Structures; 5) Collaboration between Global, Regional and Regional Office Functions; 6) Membership Growth and Engagement; 7) Fundraising; 8) Financial Review; and 9) Organizational Change and Internal Processes. As agreed with Amnesty, this Final Assessment will mainly focus on the work and outputs of all fully operational Wave 1 and Wave 2 Regional Offices, namely the three Regional Offices in Africa (Dakar, Johannesburg and Nairobi), the East Asia Regional Office (Hong Kong) and the Americas Regional Office (Mexico City).

This summary of findings and recommendations broadly follows the structure and sequence of the Final Assessment report. An overview of the assessment process, inclusive of caveats and limitations can be found in Annex 1: Methodology and Limitations. This assessment focuses primarily on perceptions of stakeholders about the GTP process and results and is unable to conclusively assess the overall impact of GTP. What we report here are mainly views from staff as well as from some peers and partners, and the Assessment team’s observations and interpretations about GTP. In addition, we reviewed extensive internal Amnesty generated data on finances, media outputs, human resource developments as well as external evaluations of selected individual global campaigns and of National Offices.

---

1 Nicola Duckworth, Keeping Human Rights Impact at the Heart of the Global Transition Programme, July 2013
2 See Annex VI for Concept Note
Progress in human rights impact...

Human rights impact is one of the more difficult areas to substantiate progress, and it is equally difficult to attribute its success to GTP, due to the lack of comparative baseline information or counterfactuals as well as the particularly short time-frame between this Assessment and the start of GTP. That said, a majority of Amnesty staff as well as partners and peers agree that GTP has led to more human rights impact in the two to three year period. Staff and peers and partners attribute this perception of progress to the following two changes:

More relevant and responsive regional work | Respondents point to successful regional campaigns or projects which would not have happened without the presence of Regional Offices, mainly in Africa, the Americas and East Asia. In addition, in two Global Campaigns - My Body, My Rights and Stop Torture - an external evaluation indicated that while these two campaigns had been designed and implemented parallel to and independent from GTP, the Regional Offices – where they exist – did enhance the campaigns. GTP has also had a positive impact on Urgent Actions/Appeals related to human rights defenders or individuals at risk, due to swift action, significant mobilization from local to international levels and consistent contact with local human rights defenders as well as civil society organizations.

Enhanced relevance and legitimacy | Amnesty’s enhanced relevance and legitimacy has resulted from locally relevant and responsive campaigns and projects that were enabled by being physically closer to affected people, civil society and campaign/advocacy targets. This local presence has led to a better understanding of the local context, recruitment of locally credible staff, swift actions and stronger partnerships with frontline human rights holders/defenders and local and regional media. In addition, Amnesty’s increased relevance and legitimacy are also a result of new working practices emerging as a result of GTP. Such new practices include enhanced consultations with local human rights communities and a greater diversity of approaches in engaging duty bearers, including governments. Work is now more informed by the understanding of contextual analysis as well as root causes of human rights violations. Advocacy draws more on regional norms and uses national, regional and continental human rights institutions and mechanisms to a greater degree. And, there is more internal collaboration from the early stages of research, communication and advocacy, thus supporting integration. This includes collaboration and buy-in from Sections within and outside the region.

Some staff also report adverse effects of GTP...  

A strong minority view emerged that highlighted a number of adverse effects of GTP, as well as areas where GTP has not (yet) yielded the anticipated positive change. Some of this disappointment seems attributable to many shortcomings in implementation, change management and communication. Other concerns focus on perceived or potential adverse effects on research and publication quality, significant loss of institutional knowledge,
relationships and memory and the potential for Amnesty to “crowd out” local and regional civil society

*Expanded engagement with rights holders...*

Survey findings show that GTP resulted in an increase of new partnerships, alliances and coalitions, mainly in Africa and the Americas. A majority of external survey respondents confirmed increases in contacts and exchanges of information with Amnesty. There is a broader consensus that GTP has led to a significant expansion and deepening of relationships with civil society partners, allies and coalitions, including with rights holders organizations and movements as well as with academia and think-tanks. Disaggregated data from the three African as well as the Americas Regional Offices also show, with concrete examples, expansion and deepening of relationships with rights holders organizations or social movements. In addition, Amnesty now engages more systematically with individual rights holders and defenders in its work related to Urgent Actions and Individuals At Risk. Our findings are also consistent with the findings of the recent external evaluation of two Global Campaigns.

However, some IS and Section staff also express concerns that the benefits of these enhanced relationships and engagements by Regional Offices have not yet trickled down to and/or are not coordinated with the Sections, resulting in potential confusion among external stakeholders or missed opportunities. External partners/allies/coalitions also point to a number of areas for improvement. These include the need for Amnesty to clarify its position within the regional civil society ecosystem, being self-reflective of its impact within regional and local civil society, systematically and transparently exchanging views with peers in the regions and providing systematic feedback to partners after consultation.

*Enhanced visibility and credibility...*

The perception among Amnesty staff as well as external partners and peers is that Amnesty’s visibility in the public is at least as significant as it was before GTP, if not better. Amnesty’s digital media campaigning has improved in the last two years. Further, measurements of regional media coverage, even if imprecise, suggest improved visibility in new localities, new media and in new languages.

Amnesty’s increased visibility over the past two to three years is attributed to: the ability of Regional Directors to leverage their profile and connections; engagement in local languages and with local media; increased speed of response; and a more nuanced understanding and framing of messages.

---

3 Again, we should note that we are neither able to prove nor disprove these views – as is the case for the positive views.

4 See Section V for concrete examples
Most of the concerns expressed around visibility and credibility point to GTP implementation or transition challenges such as loss of valuable relationships and consequently loss of trust and credibility. Some staff also expressed concern about potential “crowding out” of or stealing the limelight from Sections or partners/allies/coalitions as Regional Offices expand their visibility.

**Turning attention towards growth...**

The Roadmap included plans to grow membership overall, and particularly in the global South. Amnesty’s own assessments, done outside the scope of this Final Assessment, indicate concern and confusion among IS and Section staff regarding growth targets. In addition, our own findings indicate that the GTP agenda did not really task nor support Sections and Regional Offices in pursuing this goal – at least not until very recently. Ambition for membership growth hinged more on the development of National Offices in bigger countries in the global South. Growth, as articulated in Goal 5 of the new global strategy, is certainly a top priority and Amnesty at all levels has begun a concerted effort to achieve the new, more clearly defined, targets.

Estimates of membership growth caused by GTP are difficult to establish, but the data available suggests that individual financial contributions (donations and membership fees) have been flat during the 2010-2015 period. There is, however, a positive upward trend in non-paying supporter constituency across the world.

**Improvement in internal collaboration...**

**Regional Office and Sections** There are some regions such as Southern Africa and East Asia where Section staff report that collaboration with the Regional Office is enormously helpful. Sections that previously felt isolated from the London IS feel more supported by the Regional Office, due to increased engagement in capacity building and joint work as well as enhanced connection with the whole-of-organization and an increased ability to participate in Amnesty’s broader discourse. Such enhanced collaboration between Regional Offices and Sections are understood to be a function of the Regional Offices’ physical proximity, greater speed of operations, use of local languages, as well as their understanding of and sensitivity to local contexts. However, staff also note some negative effects: lack of clarity on Regional Office and Section roles, respectively; a perception of stagnation in funding levels for Sections due to the resource needs of Regional Offices; Regional Offices’ privileged position and competition for media attention and stakeholder relationships, and occasionally inadequate involvement of Sections on in-country work; and limited Regional Office capacity to support the Sections.

---

5 There are different opinions within Amnesty as to whether this perception is accurate or not; what matters here is that this perception points to communication issues that can stand in the way of good collaboration between Sections and Regional Offices
Regional Offices and London IS | The most common response heard during this assessment is that Amnesty has to spend more time clarifying the position of Regional Offices within Amnesty’s global management system. Although more clarity has been achieved in the past two years, Regional Offices continue to create new organizational dynamics and enhance their power base.

A number of dynamic tensions still exist, some of which are rooted in unclear division of labor between the Regional Offices and London IS, and the extent to which London IS shows willingness to cede further control to Regional Offices. This includes decentralizing certain ‘back office’ functions that are still largely based in London. As a corollary, Regional Offices still have insufficient resources and capacity to shoulder and effectively execute more responsibilities in what is already a complicated and demanding role.

Focusing on fundraising...

Fundraising was a clear point of emphasis for GTP. With regard to the goal of funding diversification, Amnesty’s total gross income grew by almost 30% over the strategy period, largely thanks to institutional fundraising, and the overall target of €260m was achieved. The goal to also diversify individual supporter-based fundraising, particularly in the global South, has not yet been realized. Amnesty raised a total of USD 4.2 million from three US/European foundations specifically for the process of devolution and organizational change through GTP, and foundations have made follow up commitments for 2017 onwards.

The capacity of Regional Offices and Sections to grow the supporter base as well as funding remains underdeveloped, despite more recent attention by the Member Growth and Fundraising Directorate. Staff largely perceive that other elements of the GTP agenda required so much attention that this issue was simply not one they could take on in any meaningful way.

GTP has required more money than originally budgeted...

The post implementation review of the financial aspects of GTP covering the period 2013-2017 point to the following highlights:

- Many of the assumptions driving the projections as set out in the Roadmap were unspecific and not robustly considered. This was particularly the case for future operating costs and people related costs;

- Final GTP costs are forecast to be £14.0m, £2.5m (22%) higher than the GTP Roadmap. Continuing operating costs (excluding staff) will be £2.4m per annum higher than projected in the Roadmap. This is primarily due to the loss of economies of scale but also due to depreciation of GBP. Currency exchange variation is now a greater risk factor;
• Unplanned grants of £2.8m were received to help fund the establishment of the Regional Offices, and the disposal of the London offices, made possible by the reduction in London manpower, yielded net proceeds of £11.4m. This action was not planned as part of the GTP Roadmap;

• GTP has made some progress towards the goal of moving resources to the Regional Offices and global South more broadly as London’s share of expenditure has dropped from 72% (2012) to 56% (Budget 2017), compared to the Roadmap target of 30%;

• 2017 FTE numbers in London are projected to be 306; 104 higher than the Roadmap. Driving this increase were operational decisions made independently of GTP in the 5 years since the Roadmap, as well as incorrect target FTE numbers in the Roadmap. Current forecasts suggest 632 FTEs in 2017, with 306 (48%) based in London, compared to projected 37% in the GTP Roadmap.

*Implementation and change management could have been better…and culture change, where needed, is still in its early days...*

Amnesty managed to set up a number of Regional Offices in a relatively short time. While change management has improved since the Interim Assessment, there are still a range of unresolved issues causing staff dissatisfaction, including those related to Regional Offices that are yet to be fully operational. We heard concerns surrounding not just low staff morale due to contracting conditions but also issues of inclusion, transparency and trust between staff and leadership.

Recruitment and retention, including inadequate planning to secure sufficient overlap and transfer of knowledge between staff that exited and entered, has been widely singled out as a weak link, alongside difficulty in hiring or retaining high caliber staff in some regions due to continued UK-centric recruitment practices. Many staff consider the benchmark of regional pay scales as well as benefit packages to be inadequate, while at the same time the disparity in salary levels in some regions has led to tensions between some Regional Offices and Sections.

As is true for most organizations undergoing profound changes, it is not unusual that staff blame the Amnesty’s Senior Leadership Team for GTP implementation shortcomings. The Staff Engagement Survey points to progress as well as remaining pain points – the latter particularly with regard to staff views on the Senior Leadership Team’s performance and behaviors. In addressing these issues, the work done in 2016 to review decision-making processes, inclusive of the review of the Senior Leadership Team structure, and the creation of the Majlis Forum, are a step in the right direction, although it is too early to see or predict outcomes.

It is clear that several subconscious belief systems that had been embedded in the culture of Amnesty were intentionally challenged by GTP in ways that outside observers and some of the greatest internal change champions may not have fully understood. This pertains particularly to
the widely held belief prior to GTP that Amnesty does its work primarily through high quality research and reporting, ‘from a distance.’ GTP heralded a more diverse, and more hands-on range of methods, which culturally may have been a bigger challenge than observers and proponents initially expected. Amnesty’s culture has started to change, primarily through the influx of staff with different worldviews, norms and behaviors and the shaking up of team compositions. This beginning now needs to be reinforced through intentional celebration of new behaviors, strategies and actions (through informal - but consistent - as much as formal practices) and thoughtful socialization of staff through redesign of staff onboarding, training and reward practices.

Moving forward: recommendations...

Section XII provides a detailed set of recommendations for Amnesty to consider as it transitions from GTP onto the next stages of its organizational development. We developed these recommendations based on the data we gathered through this assessment as well as lessons learned from Amnesty’s peer organizations. We also reflected on recent conversations with the Senior Leadership Team and other senior managers about what Amnesty should focus on next. The recommendations include the following: 1) Creating a new narrative for repositioning Regional Offices; 2) Developing processes for systematic organizational learning; 3) Creating more structured communication with partners, allies and coalitions; 4) Deepening organization change by addressing outstanding issues, fostering further culture change and attending to staff feedback on the Senior Leadership Team; 5) Ramping up efforts for membership growth; 6) Continuing to strengthen fundraising capacity, and, 7) Lessons from the financial review.

We strongly urge Amnesty to reflect further on the priority of these recommendations relative to the interests of the movement; and, to commit resources to improved planning (based on lessons learned) as well as investment in implementation capacity before committing to such implementation.
II. Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Final Assessment of Amnesty International’s Global Transition Program (GTP) carried out from March 2016 to May 2017. It was prepared by a team associated with the Transnational NGO Initiative, at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, USA. The assessment covers GTP from 2013 – 2016, but focuses primarily on the period from 2014 forward. We respect and thank each person who offered their time, insights and perspectives to assist in our efforts. We have sought to balance what we have heard and observed in a way that is constructive, helpful and forward looking.

Though constrained by time and budget, we have learned much about GTP over the past year. We sincerely hope that this report will be as rewarding to the broader Amnesty community as it was to us. We cannot assume that our findings and ideas presented herein reflect the entire reality of the GTP process. There are too many topics to cover, too broad a geography to consider and too many opinions to process. We took particular care to capture the diversity of opinions, inclusive of minority views found during the assessment.

While riding a taxi in London towards the Amnesty office, one of our team members experienced what Amnesty staff likely encounter frequently. When the taxi driver of Ethiopian descent, an immigrant to UK 20 years ago, realized that our team did some work with Amnesty, he said, “Your work will be rewarded in heaven” and refused our payment. This incident is one example of the deep respect that citizens all over the world hold for what Amnesty stands for.

We have structured the report in the following manner: after an Executive Summary, it addresses the Areas of Inquiry as laid out in the agreed upon Concept Note. Then we address recommendations from our findings for what, in our opinion, Amnesty should focus on next. The report ends by offering some reflections on how Amnesty’s change management and change leadership capabilities and approaches compare to those of large peer INGOs.

---

6 See Annex VII and VIII for an introduction to our team, the organizations that we are affiliated with and our work with large INGOs on organizational change, which inform this assessment
7 See Annex for the methodology behind and limitations of this Assessment
8 See Annex VI for Concept Note
III. Area of Inquiry (AOI): Human Rights Impact

The overall aim of GTP was to “have significantly greater impact by becoming a more global movement” and by acting “with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity and relevance as we stand alongside those whose rights are violated” (GTP Roadmap).

Human Rights Impact is the most important area of inquiry for this report. It is also the most difficult area to substantiate progress. More than half of the interviewees – representing all parts of the organization – suggest it is too early to assess GTP’s impact on Amnesty’s human rights agenda. Further, interviewees and respondents reminded us how difficult it is to measure human rights impact and then attribute those changes to Amnesty or GTP. In the GTP case, the lack of comparative baseline information or counterfactuals make any comparison of impacts before and after GTP difficult as well.

All that said, there are encouraging though modest signs of progress towards greater human rights impact according to staff and peers and allies. To start, the survey data from both the IS staff and the Sections indicate that most see positive results from GTP. We should be cautious given the high number of individuals offering “unable to answer” responses, but the sum of responses for “some more impact” and “significant change” are significantly more than “worsening or no change.” The interview data is similarly supportive, with Regional Offices and Sections indicating more positive change than London IS staff.

Another sign of progress towards greater human rights impact is the range of successful campaigns or projects initiated and completed, which would not have happened without the presence of Regional Offices. We find support for this in the qualitative data taken from the two surveys, the in-depth interviews and the focus group discussions. The text box below contains human rights work that was cited by at least 10 different respondents during the assessment.
Commonly Cited Human Rights Work Associated with GTP

**NORTH KOREA: CONNECTION DENIED** – The Hong Kong Regional Office campaign involving several local civil society actors that led to the issue being highlighted in a UN General Assembly resolution.

**ALBINISM IN MALAWI** – This campaign on a new issue resulted in widespread local and international media coverage, prompted the government to set up a special taskforce and led to changes in legislation and provision of assistance to people living with albinism.

**MARIKANA CAMPAIGN** – Respondents highlight the importance of Amnesty’s presence on the ground that led to quicker, more iterative strategizing and planning that involved local organizations which found great value in the information collected by the Amnesty team. Following Amnesty’s report, the Lonmin mining company began the process of addressing employee housing issues (Annual Project Impact Assessment 2016).

**BOKO HARAM CAMPAIGN** – This campaign is seen as an example of a globally relevant issue that was localized very effectively in Cameroon. Amnesty exposed crimes committed by security forces, and its activism led to the release of 84 children from detention, the ‘reappearance’ of dozens of previously disappeared prisoners and greater scrutiny of security forces.

**GAMBIA CAMPAIGN:** The West Africa Regional Office and Sections were critical in facilitating a collaboration with youth groups in the post-election work against the authoritarian regime. Amnesty’s actions, in collaboration with other civil society activists and citizens, resulted in putting the issue before the Economic Community of West African States and West African Heads of State. This aided the release of political prisoners and contributed to a peaceful transfer of power.

**TERRITORIAL, LAND, and ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS DEFENDER IN AMERICAS:** This is an example of human rights work linked with economic and environmental justice. In Guatemala, seven human rights defenders were released and the General Prosecutor dropped charges in at least one case. In Honduras, the authorities arrested eight suspects for the murder of Berta Caceres (two of them days after Amnesty’s visit to the country) and consulted with rights defenders on the implementation of a protection mechanism. In Mexico, Amnesty used campaigns and high-level meetings to push authorities to immediately carry out a risk assessment and implement measures to ensure the integrity of land defenders.

The positive spirit of the above-mentioned work is captured well in a statement from one of the interviews:

“The image of being an organization that extracted information and returned to London is being slowly replaced by an organization with a more continuous presence, engagement and accountability that takes into account the ideas and proposals of partners, allies and coalitions in the region. This has also meant working in many local languages, and engaging with local media and their scrutiny.”

**GTP Impact on Global Campaigns:** Another important point for this area of inquiry was the impact of GTP on Amnesty’s Global Campaigns. Even though Amnesty designed this work – 1) My
Body, My Rights and 2) Stop Torture – in parallel to and independent of GTP, we wanted to explore the extent to which the Regional Offices contributed to their success. As such, we collaborated with the global campaigns external assessment team to include a line of questioning about GTP in their survey instruments. The data gathered indicate that the main benefits of GTP have not yet materialized for the two campaigns in question in a major way across the globe. That said, their report did mention “there were comments that suggested that, as a work in progress, the Regional Offices – where in existence – had enhanced the campaign” with specific mention of the work in Burkina Faso for My Body, My Rights and in Mexico for Stop Torture. The report also highlighted responses from interviews and focus groups that suggest GTP has had a positive impact on Urgent Actions/Appeals related to Human Rights Defenders or Individuals At Risk, citing greater speed of action, significant mobilization from local to international levels and consistent contact with human right defenders as well as civil society organizations as important factors.

**GTP impact on HR Campaigns**

**Burkina Faso ‘My Body, My Rights’** – The message of this global campaign was localized successfully in Burkina Faso. Amnesty was able to produce several local outputs and mobilize different Sections. The success of the campaign was also attributed to the collaboration between researchers and campaigners as well as the Burkina Section, Dakar Regional Office and London office.

**‘Stop Torture’ Campaign in Mexico** - Although most of the campaign was developed in London (and later led by the Regional Office), different Amnesty programs and directorates such as Law and Policy, Research, and Campaign and Communications all worked together in an integrated way. Amnesty staff commented that being able to work outside silos in this way exemplifies the strengths of GTP.

There were also a number of comments that came up during the assessment, suggesting GTP has had no material impact in or caused adverse effects for Amnesty’s human rights work. Though we view these comments on the whole as minority voices, the following is a short-list of concerns that were identified a number of times in the course of this assessment:

- Concern that the greater focus on local issues diminished attention towards global work/campaigning priorities;

- Concern that the quality of research and publications declined in the short term, and/or maintaining the same quality still requires intensive accompaniment from London IS;

- Concern that some countries and Sections have been deprioritized (e.g., Uganda, Jamaica, Haiti) and/or have been left behind because of lost staff language capacity (e.g. Portuguese to serve the Lusophone countries);
• Concern that valuable relationships were lost when key London IS staff left Amnesty as a result of GTP; 9

• Concern that the presence of Regional Offices has already or will in the future "crowd out" peer NGOs at the national and regional level;

“Because we have a media manager, the media want to talk to Amnesty. Even when we state that we want the media to talk to other partners, the media still wants to talk to us. The same thing happened in the Dadab case. We had brought refugees and local organizations, but the local organizations left immediately, so we ended up getting all the media coverage. That’s not the way it’s supposed to be. We are not effectively leveraging our access to media for national human rights organizations. The focus is very much on our own visibility.”

• Concern that Regional Offices may take a softer stance on locally sensitive and/or controversial topics. 10 This had been a concern before GTP started as well.

It is difficult within the limitations of this assessment to substantiate the significance of these concerns or their prevalence across different geographies. Like many elements of this assessment, the ideas represent views that were expressed recurrently in interviews, focus group discussions and in survey responses, although they do not form the majority of voices. That said, the above concerns were mentioned frequently enough that Amnesty should consider further investigating these concerns.

**GTP Impact on process indicators:** Beyond testimonies of how GTP through locally relevant and important work contributed to direct human rights impact, respondents also spent considerable time describing the ways in which GTP has fundamentally changed the way Amnesty works, as an explanation for staff perceptions of enhanced impact. We describe these as process indicators that contribute to the organization’s effectiveness and efficiency in achieving greater human rights impact. Staff observe that Amnesty’s enhanced relevance 11 and legitimacy 12 over the past 2-3 years is due to the Regional Offices’ ability to understand the local context, respond to local issues, act more quickly, work closely with frontline human rights defenders and strengthen relationships with civil society, media and governments. They also highlight the importance of well-known Regional Office staff who are credible and adept at playing in a regional political space and have access to a wider set of regional and continental influencing mechanisms. We present below perceptions of Amnesty’s increasing relevance, driven by how Regional Offices are

---

9 For example, staff mentioned long time relationships with Sudan-focused activists
10 The emphasis of some Regional Offices on Economic and Social Rights is viewed as such by a few staff members
11 External stakeholders highlight enhanced relevance more frequently than internal Amnesty staff
12 Amnesty IS and Section staff highlight enhanced legitimacy more frequently than external stakeholders
embracing new and different ways of working, as gathered from surveys, interviews and focus group discussions:

**Change in engagement frameworks** | There are now more consultations with domestic human rights communities in order to align work, ensure value added and leverage common objectives. There are also more effective consultations with external stakeholders and greater engagement with governments rather than talking at them -- to understand their interests and motivations as a precondition for developing more effective influencing strategies. Advocacy strategies are now more likely to draw on regional norms and focus on regional institutions.

**Change in analytical frameworks** | Activism is now more informed by an understanding of contextual analysis as well as root causes of human rights violations.

> “The use of political economy as a tool to analyze work helps you locate human rights through a broader lens and issue recommendations that are realistic; that speak to what is on the ground; more tailored campaigning and Section engagement; and ensuring that research arises from and serves broader advocacy objectives in line with the strategy for change in-country.”

Another respondent said:

> “A greater focus on where we situate ourselves at the regional and national level. What is Amnesty’s role, how can we leverage voices, undertake mapping, understand the political position in the ecosystem.”

**Enhanced use of national, regional and continental human rights mechanisms** | Systematic and persistent use of and engagement with national, regional and continental human rights mechanisms has become easier - largely due to physical proximity and the profile of the regional teams - and is more integrated. Examples abound of regional teams in Africa and Latin America engaging with the African Union, Economic Community of West Africa States, Southern African Development Community, East African Community, Organization of Americas and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

> “The Authorities are very aware we are very close (in geographic terms) to them and we are monitoring human rights violations in real time. They are receiving us and answering our phone calls and letters. We have gained leverage from an advocacy point of view.”

**Integrated internal collaboration** | There is a growing sense that actors within Amnesty are more likely to work with other elements of the organization.
“Previously, our ways of working used to be quite linear: research led to a report, communications then took it out. Now it is more collaborative from the early stages, including collaboration and buy-in from Sections within and outside the region – including European Sections.”

In sum, Amnesty should feel good about perceptions of GTP’s impact on its human rights agenda. There remain a number of dissenting voices among its ranks – perspectives that should not be ignored – but positive results from projects taken at the regional levels and the significant changes in Amnesty’s approaches to work provide optimism for Amnesty’s future human rights agenda.
IV. AOI: Visibility and Credibility of Amnesty International

Specific references to “visibility” are absent in the GTP Roadmap. Rather, the documents reference “credibility” and “legitimacy” with the understanding that “visibility” is a way of operationalizing these concepts. To GTP proponents, moving closer to the ground was about ensuring Amnesty remained visible and credible to the human rights movement and emerge in new ways in the global South, “. . . as we stand alongside those whose rights are violated.”

It is impossible to know what would have happened to Amnesty’s credibility and visibility had it not implemented GTP. It is equally difficult to discern how any growth in visibility and credibility can be attributed to Regional Office presence and the new ways of working with GTP, as opposed to Amnesty’s increased emphasis on and investment in improving and tracking this aspect of their work. That said, respondents predominantly agree that Amnesty’s credibility was not negatively affected in the course of GTP. They also generally believe that Amnesty’s visibility is at least as significant as it was before GTP.

Measures of credibility are inherently complex and interviewees as well as survey respondents often conflated visibility and credibility. In recent years, Amnesty has been referenced in the Gallup NGO Poll, which indicates a strong place in the world for the organization relative to other global NGOs. Measures of social media visibility, as gathered by Amnesty, suggests the organization’s digital media presence has improved in the last two years. And further, measurements of regional media coverage suggest Amnesty has improved its visibility in new localities, new media and in new languages.

Going beyond general impressions, the Assessment data suggests that Sections and Regional Offices are more positive about the impact of GTP on visibility and credibility. IS staff in London were more likely to state that hard evidence of change is still lacking. When comparing Regional Offices and Sections, the Americas and East Asia Regional Offices were more vocal about positive change in their responses. Commonly cited reasons – meaning at least five different respondents mentioned them – to explain the positive impact of GTP on visibility and credibility are as follows:

- Regional Directors are able to leverage their personal connections and profile to establish stronger networks, attend high level meetings and receive media attention;

- More content is now being delivered in local languages;

---

13 In our assessment, we defined ‘visibility’ as Amnesty’s ability to attract attention in the general public through all types of media, while ‘credibility’ was defined as the degree to which Amnesty is trusted and believed in.

14 Despite the fact that these measurements contain some imprecisions, they indicate solid growth in visibility in new localities, new media and in new languages.

15 Amnesty has increased language services as referenced Amnesty International Language Resource Centre - Interpretation services: 2015 Activity & costs/savings report.
• Faster responses to relevant local issues;
• Better access to and greater emphasis on local media;
• Research support from Regional Offices to Sections has created more traction in the local media;
• Technical support from Regional Offices to Sections has improved web presence;
• Support from Regional Offices has been particularly helpful for smaller Sections in need of capacity and assistance in the area of media and communications;
• Diversity and cultural background of Regional Office staff has resulted in more nuanced analysis, framing and messaging.

For the concerns that did surface during the Assessment about GTP’s impact on visibility and credibility during this assessment, we grouped them into four broad categories. The first type of concern reflects transition challenges Amnesty experienced in the early stages of GTP that resulted in the loss of iconic Amnesty staff, inclusive of their contacts and networks.

“Amnesty lost credibility, acceptance and trust because we were out of the picture for a time while GTP was put in place. Our team is slowly building up this credibility again.”

A second set of concerns focus on how GTP has shuffled responsibilities and relationships for different elements of the organization. For example, a number of Section respondents express concern that they are excluded from efforts that Regional Offices make to build relationships with external stakeholders. Likewise, there is worry that the presence of Regional Offices may
take away media spotlight from Sections as well as local partners. Though clearly a minority voice, there are at least a handful of Sections that observe these concerns to be true.

“Because the Regional Office is occupying our space in the local media, we (Section) have had to fight for survival ...Unlike in the past, Regional Office staff have become the main interlocutor in the local context instead of Sections.”

A third set of concerns – views that are more prevalent among some London IS staff – is that Amnesty’s visibility and credibility has suffered as a result of diminished research and communications capacity since GTP. Such statements are not about the quality of Regional Office staff, rather a concern with the type of staff hired and their priorities once in office. It is beyond the scope of this assessment to substantiate such claims. And, to be clear, there was significant push-back from other respondents who argued just the opposite. Without baseline data, there is no way to resolve which perceptions reflect reality, but the concerns were expressed in significant enough numbers that Amnesty should investigate the validity of the following statement:

“Increased visibility may lead to increased credibility if the quality of the work is maintained. Where the research and advocacy materials are not of good quality, we may achieve greater visibility and less credibility. More noise but less impact.”

The fourth concern is about the role that Regional Offices are playing or will play regarding visibility and credibility. To start, what are reasonable expectations for Regional Offices given alternative demands and the wide range of functions required in the regions? Many respondents are concerned that the resources are not there for Regional Offices to do this work well. Beyond that, many respondents are questioning the traditional processes and links between research on the one hand and visibility and credibility on the other. One key challenge here is that research closer to the ground has to take political realities and a greater diversity of voices more seriously than Amnesty’s prior approach of concentrating the production of research output in London.

“Within the research unit we had an idea of what quality research was, but ever since we moved to the ground and have had to interact with policy makers my perspective has changed. Documenting violations and proving that it was done is not quality research. Quality research needs to be grounded within the political context. Since moving to the ground the limitations of our traditional approach are much more obvious.”

With the changing players and the changing approaches in mind, our conversations with interviewees naturally led to additional questions about Regional Office performance and what types of targets Amnesty should monitor (e.g. quantitative media hits). Such things are critical in shaping staff behavior. They are also critical in defining the staff that Regional Offices need to recruit and retain to reach those goals. This is yet another challenge for Regional Offices given
the need to balance traditional research approaches with new media needs and the toolbox required to manage them well.

In sum, Amnesty should be reasonably pleased with where visibility and credibility is headed. There is still much it can do to improve in the eyes of its many stakeholders, although some of the trade-offs identified here have to be addressed through the making of strategic choices. Future success is dependent on Amnesty’s ability to dive more deeply into understanding the capacity constraints it faces and to sustain collaborative solutions that involve Regional Offices, Sections and London based IS staff. The debate about how good quality research can be balanced with other influencing methodologies should be held in a transparent way and then be brought to a constructive resolution.
V. AOI: Engagement with Rights Holders

The GTP roadmap states: “The IS works in a participative and inclusive way with rights-holders, partners and communities and will act in their interest at all times, in line with the principle to ‘do no harm.’” We note, operationally, that Amnesty tends to focus on the larger concept of ‘stakeholders,’ which includes ‘rights holders’ among others.\textsuperscript{16}

Amnesty’s enhanced ambition and commitment to engage and empower rights holders and to assess its performance and learn from experience is reflected in the Regional Offices’ early successes of deepening relationships with rights holders. We note, based on the survey responses, interviews and focus group discussions that the benefits of these enhanced relationships have not yet trickled down to the Sections. Sections have continued to develop their own relationships, which may result in parallel communications, carrying the risk of mixed messaging and competition for turf.

A significant majority of IS and Section respondents observe increases in new partnerships, alliances and coalitions due to GTP. Staff report that GTP has led to a significant expansion and deepening of relationships with civil society partners, allies and coalitions, including with rights holders organizations and movements as well as with academia and think-tanks. This is particularly the case in the three Regional Offices on the African sub-continent and in the Americas (Wave 1 and 2). This is not the case in the South Asia and South East Asia and the Pacific Regional Offices, which have yet to establish their regional presence. In the three African Regional Offices as well as the Americas Regional Office, we note expansion and deepening of relationships with rights holders organizations or social movements, such as the Albinism Society, LGBTI movements, the Alternative Miner’s Indaba, the Somali Women’s Development Association, the Sudan Human Rights Defenders Network, youth organizations and refugee groups. Many interviewees note that this process of building new relationships is only at its beginning and that it is too early to start looking for impact. Respondents struggled to give specific examples of cases where Amnesty has built new or stronger relationships with global level rights holders organizations or movements in the past 2 to 3 years.

A majority of the external partners/allies/coalitions respondents in our survey also report increased contact and exchange of information with Amnesty. These external partners/allies/coalitions also point to a number of areas for improvement, including communicating Amnesty’s positioning with clarity, clarifying its role in the regional ecosystem of civil society organizations, ensuring there are systematic and transparent exchanges, taking the responsibility to provide feedback after consulting partners, offering better access to Regional

\textsuperscript{16} We came to this conclusion based on internal documents and solicited suggestions from the ROs for ‘rights-holder groups’ who could be targeted for our survey with peers, partners and allies. Amnesty’s current impact assessment coding also uses a broad combined category ‘CSOs / HRDs / rights holders’ which is similar to the category that is used of ‘partners, alliances and coalitions’ - this again includes rights holders.
Offices, improving Amnesty’s ability to fund smaller organizations and finally moving on from the current focus on Amnesty’s prolonged transition.

Specific examples of increasing engagement with rights holder partners are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of current partners</th>
<th>New since Regional Office established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Africa Regional Office</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa Regional Office</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas Regional Office</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa Regional Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a separate note, the 2017 external evaluation of the Global Campaigns *My Body, My Rights* and *Stop Torture* also noted significant appreciation among survey respondents about how Amnesty a) involves and draws on the experience of rights holders; b) stands in solidarity with people at risk or those who have been tortured; c) is engaged with youth groups; and d) has formed new alliances to campaign for sexual and reproductive rights. Though developed independent of one another, the common values and principles embedded within the Global Campaigns and GTP have had a positive influence on perceptions of Amnesty’s engagement with rights holders.
VI. AOI: Collaboration with Amnesty International Sections and Structures

Regional Offices (originally called regional hubs) are central to GTP as mentioned in the GTP Roadmap. This area of inquiry focuses on the successes and challenges in the collaboration between Regional Offices and Sections as reported in our data. We should note that it is very difficult to generalize the quality of their collaboration at this point, mainly because there is great variation in experiences among different Regional Offices and Sections. Some regions reported that Regional Office-Sections collaborations were enormously helpful. Others report adverse effects resulting from having Regional Offices in place, or mention that they do not yet observe much impact. We conclude that this requires more investigation and more concrete and careful contracting between Sections and Regional Offices.

The most positive statements on Regional Offices came from Sections that felt isolated from London IS before GTP. These Sections – particularly in East Asia and in Southern Africa – report a significant increase in the number of actions and media activity as well as campaigns that are designed in a more customized way for the countries concerned. They appreciate the kinds of capacity building support that Regional Offices offer, whether it involves research, campaigning, media content production, web presence improvements or Section Director support and board capacity building. This type of feedback was particularly strong in Japan, Taiwan and Zimbabwe. These Sections also feel more connected and find their concerns better represented in Amnesty’s broader discourse. Additional positive comments commonly found in the interview and focus group discussions are as follows:

- Collaboration is strengthened as Regional Office staff travel more frequently to countries/Sections than was feasible for IS staff before GTP;

- Global Campaigns have been reframed to align with locally resonating messaging and topics. Examples include LGBTI rights work resonating with younger populations in East Asia and the reframing of the global refugee campaign by focusing on the Rohingya in the case of Malaysia and Japan;

- Regional Offices are reported to better understand and work within the local context;

- Speed and responsiveness have improved because of Amnesty’s regional presence;

- Working in the same language – which is feasible for at least some of the Sections and Regional Offices - also contributes to speed and improved communication;
Sections report that having Regional Office colleagues who are from the region has meant that human rights issues are less at risk of being seen as Western ideals by governments and by their own members.

In terms of the impact of GTP on how Sections and Regional Offices engage in integrated planning, our survey findings indicate that, on the whole, IS staff observe a moderate to significant increase in the role of Sections in strategic as well as operational planning and budgeting. In other words, Section voice in planning processes has been strengthened. Interestingly however, Section staff perceive these effects to be less significant. Majories in both IS and Section staff perceive that GTP has created more alignment between Section projects and plans and IS strategy.

Respondents also report some adverse effects of the presence of Regional Offices in the regions and the collaboration between Regional Offices and Sections. Three issues emerge as particularly salient: 1) a perception that funding to Sections has suffered as a result of GTP (particularly due to the cost associated with establishing Regional Offices) and the National Offices’ needs for GTP related funds; 2) limited staff capacity within Sections as well as Regional Offices to meet GTP expectations; and 3) concerns about overlapping roles and competing agendas between Regional Offices and Sections. The resource issue is a complicated as well as a sensitive subject given some narratives within the organization that Regional Office building has diverted finances away from Sections. In actuality, the redesign of the Section assessment framework was done independently of GTP, funding to Section somewhat increased even though its growth rate declined slightly, and the assessment framework changes in general were meant to expand investments and grow all parts of Amnesty. On the other hand, Regional Offices and National Offices did receive significant parts of these new funds. However, Amnesty was able to raise institutional funding to specifically fund GTP which helped offset some of these costs.

When thinking about the second and third concerns, it is important to reflect on GTP’s theory of change and statements found in the Roadmap, namely “Regional Offices would service agreed needs from Sections and Structures within the region, driven by a clear ‘contract’.” Most simply put, such contracts – both literally and metaphorically – are still very much in development. The points that require clarification are common challenges of contracting when in collaborative arrangements: issues like who sets priorities, who takes the lead on new initiatives, how authority is distributed, how actors share credit and build on collective strengths and complementarity, and conflict resolution mechanisms. At a more granular level, the following represent common concerns raised in response to our questions about collaboration:

- Alignment between Section planning and regional planning remains weak. Regional Offices do not always involve Sections in their deliberations and actions, and there is lack

---

17 As we said in the Executive Summary, there are different opinions within Amnesty as to whether this perception is accurate or not; what matters here is that this perception points to communication issues that can stand in the way of good collaboration between Sections and Regional Offices
of clarity in some regions about the nature of the relationship: is this one of supervision or of co-creation?

- Regional Offices can appear to compete with Sections for media and stakeholder attention;

- Regional Offices can be in a privileged position when it comes to accessing and influencing important stakeholders (donors, government officials, peers). In some cases, messages towards stakeholders are not coordinated, which leads to confusion;

- Salary level differences between Regional Offices and Sections can create tensions;

- Regional Offices do not have the capacity to support all sections equally or at the same time.

Beyond these operational concerns, there is also a realization that GTP brings with it new power dynamics. For example, some Sections note how some power has shifted from the Northern Sections and London IS to the Regional Offices. These shifts were largely intended by the theory of change behind GTP but may cause mixed sentiments within Amnesty depending on who you ask and what is their level of support for GTP. Responses to surveys/interviews/focus group discussions varied widely as to whether these power shifts are sufficient or not. Some say the shifts that have happened do not embody the spirit of moving closer to the ground enough and some say this power shift has already made it harder for Amnesty to balance its need to be globally cohesive and coherent with that of being locally and regionally relevant. This balance is obviously a very important factor to monitor.
VII. AOI: Collaboration between Global, Regional and Regional Office Functions

There are few details in the Roadmap about Regional Offices and their relationship with Amnesty’s global operations, but the elements that do exist highlight the importance of collaboration between regionally based staff and Amnesty’s global staff. There are statements, also, about Regional Directors being responsible for “ensuring that regional work is aligned with strategic priorities and that coherence on Amnesty International positions are not sacrificed to regional expediency.” Finally, there is mention of the need to “specify the decision-making powers of different managers in the regional offices,” in some areas “where the decision-making will be entirely centralized, when concerning “use of force” and any other such internationally sensitive matters” and that decisions on separate matters “should be taken mainly at the regional level.”

To outside observers, the points identified in GTP documents highlight the normal tensions that exist in INGOs that embrace decentralization. Amnesty accurately predicted and is currently experiencing the impact of structural change that is much more than a simple bureaucratic move of people away from London. There is a new organizational dynamic emerging as Regional Offices develop their own power base. Indeed, both Amnesty change leaders and the majority of respondents understood that having such Regional Office influencers is a critical aspect of the GTP theory of change. How to still ensure sufficient global coherence while allowing for regional and local relevance continues to be as much a challenge as we noted in the Interim Assessment.

The most common response gleaned from this Final Assessment is that Amnesty has to spend more time clarifying the division of roles between the Regional Offices and the rest of Amnesty’s global management system. Respondents are aware that such things take time, and can be reasonably worked out once engaged in the practical exercise of establishing these offices and involving the people that step into the roles of regional staff. When the responses are more critical, they typically mention a dissatisfaction with the time it takes to address the tensions that emerge and the lack of precision in resolutions developed for the problem they experience.

“There have not been enough conversations around collaboration, especially at a “deeper, programmatic level.”

Deeper still, some respondents also pointed to the need for culture and behaviors to change both in London and in the Regional Offices.

“ROs are a different world – there is so much togetherness and shared purpose. We don’t talk about the development of London and how it needs to mirror that sense of togetherness and shared purpose.”
Job rotation schemes, as part of overall talent management strategies and career pathing, could be part of a set of solutions to this issue.  

There is resounding agreement among Amnesty staff that a number of dynamic tensions still exist, that go beyond lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities; respondents explain the root causes in three different ways:

- Some claim that this is a result of Regional Offices’ lack of interest in supporting global priorities and not due to a lack of opportunity.

  “How much alignment is expected between RO goals and global strategic goals? ROs decide their own goals without consulting London IS. It was agreed that ROs would have space to do work of local relevance, but alongside the work on global priorities.”

- Some perceive that London IS is not willing to cede more control to Regional Offices, especially when it comes to global priorities.

  “For some reasons, we were not consulted for the problem analysis of the HRD campaign, even though we have a project on HRDs and freedom of assembly and association in the Hub. It does feel that decisions are taken from London and then there is some consultation with Hubs... It should be the other way around.”

  “They (Regional Offices) are certainly being involved in verifying the problem analysis and draft objectives for the HRD campaign, but I’m not sure how much involvement there was in getting to this stage, or how much there was in the refugees campaign. It seems to be that the decision to focus only on refugees and not migrants, which effectively removes the Americas from a global campaign, could not possibly have been taken in consultation with the Regional Office leaders and staff.”

These staff also argue that there is still not enough clarity on the role of central functions based in London IS in relation to the Regional Offices: do they have an advisory role, or do they have decision-making authority over Regional Offices? This lack of clarity has led to conflict and contributed to confusion and slower work processes.

- Some expressed the view that Regional Offices lack the resources and capacity necessary to take on more responsibility even if they are willing and enthusiastic to do so, given their already demanding and complex set of tasks.

---

18 See Section XI on Organizational Change and Internal Processes for more on this
“Structurally, a Regional Office’s role is an almost impossible role. Even if we try to devolve there is only so much they can take on.”

In addition, some functions are still very centralized because 1) Regional Offices are under-resourced; 2) Regional Offices are perceived to be incapable of delivering the same quality of work as London IS and 3) certain functions are considered to be better left centralized.

“We need to get to a place where we can deliver quality work regardless of where these centers (like Law and Policy, Human Resources etc.) are placed.”

“Regional Offices are tied into the systems designed in London.”

“We need Law and Policy to be a central repository to ensure coherence. It needs to be the glue that prevents a race to the bottom resulting from relativism.”

In some ways, we expect that the role of Regional Offices will expand as they develop their capacities and can document results. The Assessment data gathered suggest there have been improvements in Regional Office role clarification over the past two years. There is growing comfort with the influence that Regional Offices have gained, the fact that London staff are more willing to listen to the Regional Directors, and that there is a better understanding of how to delegate authority when it comes to components of recruitment, some budget elements and report sign-off. Finally, creative ideas – such as working groups and governance structures -- are emerging to facilitate collaboration (e.g. the Majlis Forum that includes the Senior Leadership Team, Regional Directors and Program Directors).

Staff members have generated several ideas for improvement beyond the simple demand for more attention and investment. For instance, an idea to add more senior management capacity within Regional Offices, such as a Chief Operating Officer, may make sense in some regions and not others. Adding more capacity at other levels of staffing also came up, although the assumption that this would need to be facilitated for each region caused hesitation among respondents given resource implications. We suggest Amnesty should question this very assumption: allowing for greater flexibility in the structuring of Regional Offices (which we argue for elsewhere in this report) also could include a greater variation in staff size and composition.
VIII. AOI: Membership Growth and Engagement

In 2013, over 85 per cent of Amnesty membership was in Europe and North America, and 95 per cent of Amnesty’s income came from Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand. The GTP Roadmap included an ambitious plan to grow membership overall, and particularly in the global South. The 2010-2015 strategy period established a 5 million membership goal. Since that time, both the definition of what constitutes a “member” and the absolute targets have changed multiple times. For the current strategy period, 2016-2019, Strategic Goal 5: Maximizing our Resources and Engagement is more explicit, stating that by 2020 there will be “25 million people inspired each year to take action for human rights” and there will be “4 million donors and high value donations who will commit at least EUR 400 million a year to defend human rights.” The logic of how these strategic goals also supported the GTP agenda was largely unquestioned, since it reflected the spirit of moving closer to the ground and promised to diversify Amnesty’s voice and presence. However, internal Amnesty assessments done outside the scope of this Assessment indicate concern among IS and Section staff as to the rationale of these target numbers. In addition, our own data indicates that the GTP agenda did not really task nor support Sections and Regional Offices to accomplish this goal – at least not until recently.

Estimates of membership growth in the past five years are difficult to substantiate,\(^{19}\) but the data available suggests that individual financial contributions (donations and membership fees) have been flat during the 2010-2015 period. There appears to be a positive upward trend in the non-paying supporter constituency across the world. This includes examples such as the recent Write for Rights campaign and significant growth in numbers of supporters in India, for instance. However, non-paying supporters and their activities are difficult to track and there remains insufficient data to support a strong claim regarding increased membership, let alone changes in how supporter levels are defined and labeled.

While Amnesty has fallen short of its GTP membership goal,\(^{20}\) few respondents are openly critical of this fact. Many feel this GTP goal was simply unrealistic from the outset. Respondents also highlight that other pieces of the GTP agenda – human rights impact, visibility and credibility, putting collaborative mechanisms and practices in place between London IS and Regional Offices and between Regional Offices and Sections etc. – and the GTP implementation were simply higher priorities. As one Regional Office staff said, to reflect the relative lack of attention to or support for growing supporters by Regional Offices during the roll out of GTP thus far:

“I cannot comment on membership growth. It is kind of irrelevant at the moment for us.”

---

\(^{19}\) This is due to multiple changes in definitions for members and supporters, and because we understand that the reporting by Sections on this indicator is uneven

\(^{20}\) As articulated in the Roadmap, “Grow membership to 5 million people, predominantly in the global South”
Given where membership engagement objectives stand today, much of what came up in the interviews and focus group discussions centered on how to reimagine membership engagement objectives for the future. The topics raised generally fall into these three categories:

- The need to retool global leaders and managers to focus on this subject. Steps have been taken at the level of the Senior Leadership Team and through Global Fundraising and Engagement; 21

- The need for a credible strategy that establishes membership and engagement activity as a priority, dedicates the necessary resources (staff and finances) and provides realistic incentives for Regional Offices and Sections in the global South. The membership engagement strategy should not amount to an unfunded mandate for Regional Offices. The Global Supporter Engagement presentation made at the January 2017 Management Team week retreat is an important articulation of plans for the future. We found that the resource allocation for membership growth varied greatly across Sections with more than half of the survey respondents indicating that budgets are either insufficient or non-existent;

- After a period of shifting definitions of what constitutes a supporter, there now seem to be clear Amnesty-wide definitions for the types of engagement they are looking to develop. We assume this means that Amnesty is also developing systems to establish baselines and track progress over time. As part of the Strategy and Evaluation Unit’s mandate to strengthen data collection and evaluation, there is a sense that the organization’s interest in this has increased.

It seems that leadership saw this as a ‘stretch goal’ from the beginning and was most interested in making sure the organization was moving in the right direction. The experience of many peer

21 Indeed, the Global Fundraising and Engagement Directorate has initiated an increase in the number of full time staff devoted to supporting Regional Offices and Sections in raising funds
INGOs (e.g. CARE, Save the Children and Oxfam) certainly suggests supporter growth in Middle Income Countries requires a lot more investment (finance, tech assistance, capacity building) and more time (perhaps 7 - 10 years) to achieve success, inclusive of Section-generated supporter growth in the global South.
IX. AOI: Fundraising

Fundraising was a clear point of emphasis for GTP with two explicit goals. The first goal was to increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of its fundraising activities. The second goal was to diversify fundraising sources, in particular by tapping into both new sources of institutional funding as well as new supporter-based donations in the global South. Amnesty was generally successful on the first point, at least in terms of total funds raised. Amnesty’s total gross income grew by almost 30% over the strategy period and the target of €260m was achieved. With regard to the second point, our data suggests there has been some increase, but it is too early to assess outcomes.

According to respondents familiar with Amnesty’s culture when it comes to fundraising, prior to GTP, parts of the organization placed very little emphasis on fundraising. In the past, this function was pushed around from one Directorate to another and there were few systems in place – nor, importantly, the culture - to provide the accountability, project planning and monitoring and evaluation capabilities that institutional donors typically will want to see. Amnesty’s fundraising capacity was weak in this regard, relative to other INGOs. Beyond the simple measure of hitting overall fundraising targets, therefore, it is important to take note of the fact that the fundraising function has been elevated to the level of a Senior Director who reports directly to the Secretary General. It is also important to note that institutional fundraising is now recognized as an important fundraising tool for Amnesty. This in itself reflects a significant change in Amnesty’s organizational culture.

Another positive change brought about by GTP is the greater understanding that it can generate among London IS staff on how the establishment of Regional Offices can have a direct positive impact on fundraising. Amnesty gained significant institutional donor support based on embarking on the process of devolution and organizational change. These foundations appreciate the Regional Offices because of their proximity to the problems and because of the credibility of the Regional Office staff in the region:

“Their presence is substantially changing the London versus Regional Office dynamic.”

The movement should feel good about the ability of the Senior Leadership Team and the Global Fundraising and Engagement Directorate to access funding specifically for GTP from three major foundations, some of whom have committed to significant follow up funding for 2017 and beyond.
Increase in institutional funding to finance GTP (from 3 major donors: $4.2 million) – up and until December 2016

- Ford Global Human Rights Program: two grants, $500,000 and $1,000,000
- Open Society Foundations’ President’s Discretionary Fund: $500,000
- Oak Foundation: $1,200,000
- Open Society Foundations Human Rights Initiative: $1,000,000

While the Fundraising and Global Engagement Directorate has increased its staffing to support Regional Offices in fundraising, Regional Offices and Sections report they need more support to be able to contribute to fundraising. Our survey findings indicate that IS staff see no significant effect of GTP on fundraising capacity, while Section respondents by a large margin are even less positive about this particular contribution of GTP. Given that Amnesty was able to raise significant funding for GTP execution, it appears that London IS leadership communications on this issue has been inadequate.

Here are some views that illustrate persistent critical staff perspectives on the fundraising set-up as it relates to GTP, illustrating a disconnect with evidence of positive impacts on financial growth:

“I don’t think GTP has resulted in growth in any of these areas [finance, membership, external stakeholder engagement]: from a finance perspective, the new structure is particularly expensive. We have had to ask Sections to increase their contributions to the IS, which is actually affecting their ability to undertake work at the national level. Several Sections have had to restructure as a result (Amnesty Belgium, Amnesty Netherlands, Amnesty UK, Amnesty USA, etc.). Resources are shifted from activism towards fundraising, which is very short term thinking (people will stop donating to Amnesty if they do not feel they are actually concretely having an impact through activism). We also had to rely on external donors (such as OSF and others), which also has its risks in the long term.”

“The internal systems are not supporting more exponential growth: fundraising by the Regional Office, for example, is restricted and not on top of their budget, so that does not generate much traction. Membership growth is still in the hands of Sections while investment in membership growth is decided at the global level rather than at the regional level. Our governance systems are also not set up for exponential growth. The RAM funding mechanism does not stimulate pressure to engage in local fundraising or membership growth.”

---

23 Besides the institutional grants that we highlighted above, the sale of the Amnesty building which resulted from GTP also resulted in additional funding (see Finance Review section)
In conclusion, there are encouraging improvements in institutional fundraising capability arising from GTP as well as signs of the beginning of culture change relating to the need for all parts of Amnesty to be concerned with fundraising. There seems to be room for improvement when it comes to internal communication with regard to financial growth strategies and their outcomes. In addition, Regional Offices and Sections are asking for more emphasis on strengthening their fundraising capabilities, especially to generate more funds in the global South (which was part of the theory of change behind GTP as well as the creation of National Offices). To put things in perspective with regard to the latter, though, we should note that peer INGOs in the last 10 years have found out the hard way that developing fundraising capacity in selected new philanthropic markets in the global South – whether for institutional or small donor funding – takes much longer than they had anticipated and requires significant upfront investment and capacity building.
X. AOI: Financial Review\textsuperscript{24}

This area of inquiry is a post implementation review of the financial aspects of GTP covering the period 2013-2017. The purpose of this section is to fulfill an accountability requirement with respect to the financial investments made for GTP. We formed a view on the transformation in terms of: 1) assessing actual program costs compared to the GTP Roadmap and 2) assessing the effectiveness of GTP in delivering against its assumptions. Specifically, this section of the report, inclusive of a more detailed analysis in Annex VI, considers the following areas:

- Analysis of overall actual spend versus the GTP Roadmap
- Headcount and ongoing people costs
- Ongoing infrastructure and support costs
- The changing nature of ongoing activity expenditure
- Regional spend analysis
- Income & expenditure projections
- Operational risks

The focus of this section is on financial matters exclusively. We do not attempt to review, for instance, how the Resource Allocation Mechanism or other organizational changes made during GTP influenced Amnesty’s effectiveness of expenditures or of increasing income. Rather, we will focus on the two dimensions identified in the Roadmap, namely 1) long term financials from 2012 through 2017 and 2) one-off costs to complete the restructuring of the IS inclusive of Regional Office set up and moving of roles, mainly from the London IS base.

The GTP Roadmap included plans to grow Income from Sections (“Assessment Income”). The Roadmap, however, does not attempt to attribute this growth as being from GTP impact, as distinct from organic or other causal factors. The cause/effect does not seem to have been challenged as part of the Roadmap development, and indeed, in practice, assessment income may be quite independent of GTP changes. The projected growth was from £50.9m in 2012 to £70.6m in 2017, an increase of 39%. The most recent IS budget for 2017 is projecting a significantly lower Assessment Income at £62.2m. The result is that lower income means reduced resources to undertake Human Rights work. This reduction in capacity is further compounded by the increase in operating costs as referred to below.

In looking to 2012 as a point of comparison to today, our analysis is limited in a number of ways. Firstly, there was no analysis completed prior to implementation on the comparative cost of operating Regional Offices as opposed to the costs of similar functions in London. In this sense, also there was no traditional ‘cost/benefit’ exercise carried out. Secondly, with regard to human

\textsuperscript{24} Please note that this report section was written by Alan McLean, Independent Member of Amnesty’s International Board committee on Finance, and not by the Maxwell team. The Maxwell team only did minor editing of Alan’s draft. We thank Alan for his insights and contributions
resource costs, the assumptions about the transition were high level and we know now that the number of FTEs (Full Time Equivalent staff) included in the Roadmap for 2017 were materially incorrect. Finally, the risk and mitigation section of the Roadmap considered financial risk from the limited perspective of the one-off program costs. The Roadmap did not consider or document the risks (e.g. political, economic, legal etc.) to future operating costs of the new model, as this was fundamentally different to the pre-existing model.

It is also important to note that unforeseen opportunities and risks emerged during 2012 – 2017 that had an impact on Amnesty’s finances. For instance, Amnesty was able to realize significant value from freeing up its London office space. On the other hand, changes in the macro environment with Brexit and the Pound Sterling exchange rates emerged as an unforeseen risk that impact existing operating costs as well as projections into the future.

**Key Points**

- The one off costs of GTP as included in the Roadmap was £11.5m, of which £6.3 was staff related. The final costs are forecast at £14.0m, £2.5m (22%) higher than the GTP Roadmap. It is apparent that many of the assumptions around the cost of implementing GTP as set out in the Roadmap were high level and untested. This is particularly true in the case of people related costs. Later revisions of GTP spend (GTP Interim Assessment report) firmed up on the underlying assumptions; this is reflected in the higher cost estimates included in the Interim Assessment, where final cost was projected at £14.4m;

- Amnesty received institutional grants of £2.8m specifically to fund the establishment of the Regional Offices. There was no provision for such third party funding in the Roadmap plan;

- The sale of offices in London generated proceeds of £11.4m, net of refurbishing of retained offices. This disposal was made possible by the reduction in staff brought about by GTP where London staff numbers were lower by ca 120 people. Amnesty has invested these funds into fundraising initiatives designed to generate ongoing returns for the Movement. This obvious benefit was not envisaged in the GTP Roadmap;

- GTP has made some progress towards the goal of moving resources to the Regional Offices and global South more broadly. London share of expenditure has dropped from 72% (2012) to 56% (Budget 2017). The Roadmap target was 30%. While we expect further progress in these areas with the opening of additional regional offices, we no longer believe 30% to be a realistic target, at least not according to current plans;

- Continuing operating costs (excluding staff) will be £2.4m higher than projected in the Roadmap, and higher overall than expenditures in the pre-GTP London centric model at 2013 exchange rates. This is primarily due to the loss of economies of scale but there is
also an exchange rate effect on translating from local currencies into GBP. Depreciation of GBP will cause increased cost variance;

- Staff costs forms the largest element of the regional costs structure at 74% or £16.4m. The comparative analysis of London versus regional staff costs is complicated by factors such as location differences, staff grade mix, exchange rates etc. The analysis indicates that, on a like for like basis, and at constant 2016 exchange rate staff costs will be £0.6m higher than were the same staff located in London. However, these regional costs are exposed to exchange rate movements – the effect of recent depreciation of GBP is an additional cost of circa £3.2m annually;

- The 2017 target for FTE numbers in London was incorrect in the Roadmap; however, setting aside this error FTE numbers have grown over the GTP period, with overall FTE numbers end 2017 forecast at 632 compared to a 2012 base number of 526. Current forecast is for 306 (48%) will be London based, compared to 445 (85%) in the 2012 base number (and 37% in the GTP Roadmap).
XI. AOI: Organizational Change and Internal Processes

This section is particularly concerned with assessing Amnesty’s management of its organizational change processes since the GTP Interim Assessment (published in March 2015). We find that GTP implementation has improved considerably, though some challenges persist. We observe three positive trends. First, there is increased staff capacity assigned to change management compared to the very beginning of GTP (ranging from Transition Management Team staff to HR recruitment and staff development resources). Second, Amnesty’s change managers have engaged in more self-examination and have taken management actions to address certain organizational weaknesses. While there are still substantial numbers of staff critical of Amnesty’s change management, we see a clear trend of improvement since 2014. Third, there are encouraging signs of the beginning of needed culture change, but more needs to be done to deepen and sustain this.

Overall, was the GTP’s organizational change process managed and led effectively?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS Staff</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not managed and led effectively</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed and led somewhat effectively</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed and led very effectively</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Interim Assessment made a number of recommendations about the importance of paying attention to the need for organizational culture change to underpin Amnesty’s transformation. We understand organizational culture to be the set of often unspoken and unconscious belief systems and self-understandings that define ‘what it means to work for Amnesty’ and ‘how to be rewarded.’ Organizational culture reinforces certain behaviors over others through constant informal reward systems. Equally, any attempt at culture change needs to start with a determination of what aspects of the existing culture of Amnesty should be retained. We observe that Amnesty leaders could have done more to honor the cultural practices that continue to be important in the ‘new Amnesty’ so that staff who cherish these aspects feel heard and respected. We also observe how several subconscious belief systems that had been embedded in the culture of Amnesty were intentionally challenged by GTP in ways that outside observers and some of the greatest internal ‘change champions’ may not have fully understood. This pertains particularly to the widely held belief prior to GTP that Amnesty does its work primarily through high quality research and reporting, ‘from a distance.’ GTP heralded a more diverse, and more ‘hands on’
range of methods, which culturally may have been a bigger challenge than observers and proponents initially expected. This may be part of the reason why the kinds of changes that GTP stood for – changes that other INGOs have already experienced – have been relatively difficult to absorb for Amnesty.

As the GTP designers predicted, culture change is driven by a significant influx of more diverse and regionally rooted staff. They bring not only new knowledge and skill sets, but new worldviews, norms and behaviors. Respondents suggest that Amnesty now is more welcoming towards these fresh voices in its deliberative and decision-making bodies. Leadership has started to highlight the success and achievements of a broader set of “organizational heroes,” especially new staff and leadership in the Regional Offices. But such new practices still stand in tension with the more traditional culture – as reported by many respondents - of not celebrating specific people, actions and performance and especially their behaviors. Some respondents also commented on the lack of diversity in the London IS, consistent with human resource data from Amnesty which shows that only 21% of London employees come from outside the region/continent. Since a number of important functions such as People and Services, Global Thematic Issues and Law and Policy are still centralized in London, the lack of diversity in voices and opinions at this level contradicts the spirit of moving closer to the ground as well.

“For there to be substantive equality across the movement you have to give people from different cultures and backgrounds a chance to be part of the process. Stop assuming that expertise comes from a certain part of the globe only. Diversity needs to happen across the IS and not just in the global South offices.”

Respondents suggest there is more that Amnesty must do to entrench the new espoused values into the everyday ways of behaving in the organization. As we suggested in the Interim Assessment, besides being purposeful about recruitment and promotion practices, we recommend thoughtful redesign of staff onboarding as well as assignment processes, training, mentoring, and performance evaluation practices to help inculcate new expectations and behaviors. According to our respondents, induction and onboarding have improved somewhat, but not significantly.

Beyond the topic of organizational culture, a second important category of feedback from our respondents concerns implementation issues. While most Regional Offices were successfully established in a relatively short time, the examples of South Asia and South East Asia and the Pacific highlight the significant struggles associated with bold, rapid organizational change. They also point to political factors outside of the control of Amnesty leadership, and the vagaries of obtaining government registration and work permits, some of which peer INGOs (such as Save

---

25 As distinct from celebrating specific campaigning wins which appears more common
26 We make additional points on this in section XII on Recommendations
the Children) have also experienced and some of which are accentuated in the case of human rights INGOs such as Amnesty. There are a range of unresolved issues related to these ‘virtual Regional Offices’ that, according to respondents, point to not just low staff morale due to contracting conditions but also issues of inclusion, transparency and trust between staff and leadership inclusive of how government registration and selection of office location was pursued.

While management impacts on staff of GTP changes gradually improved, the early change management mistakes, and the two cases of South Asia and South East Asia and the Pacific in particular stand in contrast to what the GTP Roadmap stated: that “people matter.” We heard:

“GTP started awfully. People got run over and spit out. We don’t treat people like treasures.”

Some employees felt that the process was also rushed, and success was declared too soon:

“Not enough attention to the ‘how’ of GTP and rejection of the positive resistors to change.”

We should emphasize that such statements are much less prevalent now than just a few years ago – to an extent because the most aggrieved have left the organization, but also because some human resource practices have improved. However, such sentiments of grieving as well as resentment remind us that these narratives still exist, and that Amnesty’s ability to perform optimally hinges on its ability to continue to listen to, communicate around and redress these negative sentiments. Amnesty over the past two years has made some effort to actively listen to staff concerns and explicitly communicate its understanding of the problems that remain. Amnesty’s efforts to improve its change management performance on work permits, staff security, office location and facilities, Regional Office staff composition needs etc. have also resulted in improvements in morale.

Respondents widely singled out recruitment as still being weak, in particular the overly UK and Western-centric modes of sourcing potential candidates and insufficiently culturally diverse ways of screening and selection. Respondents reported widely that the benchmarking of regional pay scales as well as benefit packages was inadequate and there remains prolonged dissatisfaction among some Regional Office staff, resulting in expressed concerns over and difficulty in hiring or retaining high caliber staff. On the other hand, the disparity in salary levels between the Regional Offices and Sections, especially where they are co-located in the same place, has led to tension between Regional Office and Sections in some regions.

A majority of respondents perceive that the rate of turnover has decreased since 2013, which is consistent with the data provided by Amnesty on average turnover across the entire organization between 2013 and 2016. However, turnover was still identified by respondents from certain regions as an impediment to running business as usual. The average turnover rate glosses over the experiences of certain Regional Offices that are still struggling to get fully staffed. There is
also an improvement in average time to offer and the overall status of recruitment, but similar to turnover, there is great variation in the data between regions.

A third category of feedback centers on senior leadership. As is true with most organizations undergoing profound changes, it is not unusual that staff critique of GTP implementation weaknesses should fall on Amnesty’s Senior Leadership Team. Going back to our Interim Assessment, such criticism tended to focus on Amnesty leadership’s apparent inability to fully appreciate how the significant scope of GTP’s change agenda needed to be backed up by solid change management capacity. Similarly, respondents highlighted that the Senior Leadership Team’s insistence on GTP implementation needed to be balanced with an ability to inquire and listen for staff input into implementation practices. Moreover, during the Interim Assessment, we suggested more work to “design and align management systems and processes to support moving closer to the ground.” Some of this work has happened since then, including the 2016 reviews of decision making structures, inclusive of a review of the SLT structure and decision-making, although respondents note that the outcomes in terms of real changes were limited. The proposed changes in this review suggest a more inclusive, less hierarchical and more dynamic way for Amnesty to manage what has become a more complex organization. The decision to pilot the Majlis Forum as a new deliberation mechanism exemplifies a more inclusive and regionally-representative decision-making structure; its usefulness is still being put to the test, however.

In this setting, the Senior Leadership Team is to be applauded for ‘keeping the finger on the pulse’ by undertaking a Staff Engagement Survey every 18 months. This data, while not generated by our Assessment team, was part of our document review and also allowed us to insert a question on overall staff satisfaction with change management (see page 36 for the corresponding graph). While this survey overall shows encouraging improvements in staff engagement compared to 2015, it still paints a rather negative view of the Senior Leadership Team. Amnesty leadership’s score remains low for its listening abilities, approachability, its clarity of communication and the extent to which it is trusted and respected by staff. To some extent, these measures all relate back to leadership behaviors – which means that any organizational-structural measures will not address these on their own.
XII. Recommendations

We summarize here recommendations, based on our observations and the constructive feedback we received. These suggestions point to additional efforts required to realize the full potential of GTP and will hopefully add value to the conversations among Amnesty’s senior management.27 This list of priorities warrants additional reflection by Amnesty as a whole.

1. New narrative repositioning Regional Offices: There is a need for a new narrative that, as one staff said:

   “...goes beyond moving closer to the ground, beyond the distribution of Amnesty IS and to the distribution of Amnesty as a movement... (making all) regions vibrant communities for public campaigning.”

This new narrative will need to respond to fundamental questions and suggestions raised by internal and external stakeholders:

- The position of Regional Offices in the Amnesty ecosystem as a layer below London IS or as an equal player in the network of IS including London;

- The specific roles played by Regional Offices in relation to Sections and other parts of the IS as well as Regional Office relations with other regions;

- The Regional Offices’ responsibilities and accountabilities at different levels – national (including Sections, international members, countries without Sections and National Offices), regional and global.

This new narrative will provide closure to the current transition phase and begin a new phase of work that creates space for an innovative and agile way of working in the face of complex and dynamic internal as well as external contexts.

Regional Offices and London IS | There is a need for a new contract – both literally and metaphorically – between the Regional Offices and London IS to become a coherent, united, productive and accountable secretariat that can efficiently and effectively serve the mission and movement. This will involve:

- Defusing the perception of pressure on Regional Offices from London IS to produce and prove their worth on their own without London IS;

27 We recently were made aware of a draft Senior Leadership Team planning document for moving Amnesty ‘beyond GTP’: this list of recommendations both mirrors thinking by senior leadership and adds points of emphasis
• Clarifying the scope of London IS’s role vis-à-vis Regional Offices - is this an advisory role or a supervisory role? - and bringing transparency and equity in the resource allocation between Regional Offices and IS;

• Strengthening the balance between regional work and global priorities (peer NGOs call this ‘twin or dual citizenship’ capabilities);

• Strengthening inter-regional collaboration to prevent regional silos or regional block-voting by Sections;

• Allowing for greater flexibility when it comes to the Regional Office staff size and composition across regions, based on the diversity of contexts and needs.

**Regional Offices and Sections** | As the Regional Offices become more established, it is important to ensure that there is real value added to the Sections and that the latter are not sidelined. This requires developing more concrete and specific contracting agreements between Regional Offices and Sections (including where they are co-located) that spell out respective roles, responsibilities and behaviors that make for mutually respectful, supportive and accountable relationships. As part of tighter contracting arrangements, Regional Offices and Sections also need to agree on policies, practices and behavioral norms when dealing with the media and broader stakeholder relations. There is also a need to facilitate structured learning across regions about what attributes, actions and behaviors have made certain Regional Offices particularly successful at supporting Sections in their region.

2. **Systematic learning:** Amnesty is changing rapidly and significantly not only because of the external challenges and opportunities but also due to internal drivers of change - GTP and the National Offices. These contribute to the (1) evolving nature and content of Amnesty’s work, (2) growing diversity of Amnesty’s approaches and methods and (3) expanding relationships and engagements, whether with partners, allies and coalitions or advocacy/campaign targets. There is a need to systematize learning from these changes and the interaction between these three dynamics for greater human rights impact. The recent reflective document produced by the East Africa Regional Office is a good start.

3. **Structured communication with partners, allies and coalitions:** There is a need to not only compensate for the reported communication deficit felt during the transitional period but also to compare notes with partners, allies and coalitions including rights holders’ organizations and movements, based on recent learning experiences, to negotiate mutually respectful and supportive terms of future engagement and relationship. These conversations must also address the issues of possible risks of crowding out and competition. In essence, this needs to address the place and role of Amnesty in the regional human rights ecosystem.
4. **Deepening change**: Although some regions are yet to be fully established and not all National Offices are fully functional or integrated with the Regional Offices, starting a new phase of change will facilitate the deepening of ongoing processes.

**Addressing outstanding issues** | Priority should be given to acknowledging and communicating the remaining difficulties and problems (such as unresolved office locations, some chronic vacancies, continued short term contracts, the merits of salary scales, some remaining work permit issues, staff induction, resource allocations, etc.) and expressing a clear commitment with a set of concrete actions to swiftly address them in a transparent fashion. This will not only help re-energize those who are still grieving, but will also help build trust in the next phase.

**Fostering deeper culture change** | The diversity of multi-site and multi-cultural Regional Offices as part of an international secretariat is already having a positive impact on Amnesty’s culture. Articulating and embedding GTP in culture change will require acknowledging, socializing, celebrating, rewarding and appreciating diversity and developing staff’s capacity to work across differences. This could mean learning to live and work with creative tensions as well as investing in more organizational as well as individual level conflict management systems and capabilities to ensure that tensions are handled in a constructive manner. In addition, Amnesty needs to pay detailed attention to the opportunities offered by staff recruitment, reward, training, assignment, mentoring, performance evaluation and promotion systems to further embed the desired culture change.

**Attending to staff feedback on the Senior Leadership Team** | The agreed upon Action Plan is a good first step, particularly if accompanied by transparency in assessing its progress against these benchmarks and a continued gathering of feedback. Attention to and accountability for individual behaviors, as well as to how the team collectively communicates are potential additional steps, along with the introduction of regular and structured individual feedback mechanisms.

5. **Membership (constituency) growth**: We endorse and summarize below the recommendations of the External Evaluator (Simon Trace, December 2016) of Amnesty’s Growth Strategy 2011-2015, to inform the current membership or constituency growth strategy/plan:

- To improve confidence in Amnesty’s strategy to meet the current constituency goal of 25 million supporters, the IS should provide clarity around its targets, complete effective market analysis and put the necessary investment and support mechanisms in place, including capacity building plans;

- Include a participatory and bottom-up process of constituency growth target setting, with the involvement of Sections and Regional Offices, to ensure realistic constituency growth
targets are developed, owned and understood across the movement;

- Develop and clearly communicate a plan for how the target will be achieved, including the support and changes in working practices or resources that will be needed. Follow that plan through with regular monitoring and feedback on progress to all staff in all Sections and offices. Confirm/continue with the decision to drop membership as a global measurement of constituency size and growth to focus instead on two measures: activists – defined as those who are involved in a minimum number of actions per year, and donors – defined as those who make a minimum number of financial contributions a year. Accept that these two categories overlap and do not try to combine them but track them separately.

We add the following recommendations based on what we heard from Amnesty staff through surveys/interviews/focus group discussions:

- There is likely much variation across regions in how supporter engagement is best undertaken, so close listening to the experiences and perspectives of Regional Office as well as National Office staff is important, as is allowing for flexibility in how they undertake the strategy. Even though the Global Fundraising and Engagement Directorate has increased its staff support for member engagement in the global South, it is important to proactively communicate with staff to counter the impression that this work will be an additional unfunded mandate for Sections and Regional Offices;

- Now that supporter and donor definitions have been determined, the Strategy and Evaluation Unit can support the creation of systems that track progress over time against the broader goal behind GTP as well as Strategy Goal 5 to become a human rights movement that has a more globally distributed supporter base.

6. **Fundraising (income) growth**: We endorse and summarize below the recommendations of the External Evaluator (Simon Trace, December 2016) of Amnesty’s Growth Strategy 2011-2015 on Future efforts to grow income

- Continue to support the expanded FIF grant investments in fund-raising and the recent changes made to procedures to improve return on investment through more strategic choice of section, better analytics, and tight on-going monitoring and support;

- For new National Offices consider flexing Amnesty’s fund-raising guideline requirement that 75% of income must come from individual sources, at least in the initial stages of establishing such offices, but possibly also for the long term where individual giving markets alone are not strong enough to allow for financial self-sufficiency;

- Reconsider counting major donor restricted gifts passed on to the movement by Northern Sections as part of their assessment payment to incentivize growth of this income stream.
We add the following recommendations based on what we heard from Amnesty staff through surveys/interviews/focus group discussions:

- Amnesty has made important strides in the past few years to raise its institutional fundraising capabilities and change its fundraising culture. Fundraising is now beginning to be seen as a shared responsibility across all parts of the organization. In order to sustain these gains, it is important that Global Fundraising and Engagement is supported in driving this culture change for the foreseeable future;
- Regional Office and Section staff want more support to increase their own capacity to raise funding in their respective regions and countries. Amnesty has started to provide Regional Offices and Sections more resources to build this capacity, but the Regional Offices and Sections do not perceive this to be enough. Amnesty needs to ensure that there is indeed enough capacity to achieve set goals, and communicate more clearly what resources are available;
- As has been the experience of the National Offices in India and Brazil as well as that of peer INGOs, it is easier to grow the number of supporters willing to engage in actions than the number of regular financial contributors. Paying close attention to the decidedly mixed experiences of Save the Children, Oxfam, CARE and ActionAid – for example – in raising money from domestic institutions as well as small donors in Middle Income Countries is important, as is focusing the initial impetus on a small set of priority countries over and beyond the National Office countries. Similarly, realism in investing in financial and technical support to and capacity building accompaniment of Regional Offices and Sections and in projecting time horizons will be essential.

7. Finance

The case for change to “have a significantly greater impact by becoming a more global movement” is well articulated in the Roadmap. However, the Roadmap is short on hard metrics, including financial, by which success can be judged. There is little in the Roadmap that suggests the cost of the program, in the broadest sense, was challenged. In other words, how was the judgement made that the (planned) investment of £11.5 was justified.

It appears that the functional input of finance expertise in the Roadmap preparation was limited to preparation of projections and a ‘scorekeeping’ type role. Amnesty has undoubtedly made significant progress over recent years in building the professionalism of its team. The finance function is now seen as a core function across all sections of the organization, with a broad remit to add value to strategic decisions.

---

28 Alan McLean, external independent member of Amnesty International Board's Finance and Audit Committee, reviewed the internal GTP financial report. We support the reviewer’s recommendations regarding financial matters.
We recommend that the finance function be involved as part of a core team from the initiation of any major project, inclusive of what is being currently planned to go beyond GTP.

Specific recommendations are as follows:

- More time and resource should be committed to building cost and revenue models during the planning stage. All underlying assumptions should be clearly documented. For major projects, a dedicated finance resource should be appointed to enable better financial modelling and control;

- Some Regional Offices are placed in locations with very high costs of living. These factors should be researched in detail and impact calculated to help inform decisions around office locations;

- Complete, centralized records of non-financial data were not maintained throughout GTP. Doing so for the current, ‘beyond GTP’ planning will improve the capacity to monitor progress and flag where corrective action might be necessary;

- A holistic view should be taken to ensure all assumptions are internally consistent. If this had been done for GTP, this would have highlighted, for example, the disconnect between headcount assumptions and the projected operating costs;

- A cost/benefit analysis should be prepared for the current planning of ‘beyond GTP’, and outcomes should be documented. This should clearly take account of ongoing costs/revenues as well as one-off costs;

- For all major projects a number of scenarios should be developed, and sensitivity analysis on key assumptions undertaken. Done early enough, deviations from the underlying assumptions – whether it be cost, phasing etc. – can be evaluated and responded to promptly;

- The decentralization to Regional Offices has increased foreign exchange risk. IS should ensure it has the appropriate capability and expertise to manage this risk;

- It is axiomatic that organizational and structural change leads to increased risk. This is further amplified by decentralization to remote Regional Offices. IS should consider whether its risk and control framework has been adapted for this changed scenario. For example, it might consider the need for a stronger internal audit function covering all management processes.
XIII. Comparison with the Experience and Approaches of Peer INGOs

We have collaborated in similar learning reviews of organizational change processes with several INGOs, such as Save the Children, Oxfam International, and CARE International. For the past four years, we have also facilitated a Learning Group of INGO change managers from a larger group of peer INGOs. These experiences help us contextualize the information collected as part of this review. Having said that, there are of course clear limits to the extent that one can compare one organization’s experiences to the next. Amnesty is relatively complex as a multi-site, multi-stakeholder governed organization. It was historically dominated by lawyers and campaigners, which fosters an organizational culture driven by persuasion rather than inquiry. Campaigning style behavior also may permeate the organization internally, which may lead to greater internal contention compared to some of its peers.

On the one hand, there are important similarities in the change processes that Amnesty and its peers underwent in the last 10 years:

- Peers established and/or relocated their regional offices more than a decade ago, with similar objectives: to increase legitimacy, growth (financial and supporter numbers), and influence;
- Peer organizations’ recent change plans and processes have been focused on:
  a) restructuring of power sharing at the governance level, between smaller and bigger member Sections as well as between global North and global South members, and
  b) eliminating regional duplication to bring global management and coordination under one global secretariat.

On the other hand, there are some notable differences between Amnesty and its peers:

- Peers began their change processes with smaller and weaker global secretariats and without any regional offices;
- Peers in the development sector typically featured a very different composition of staff and culture compared to Amnesty’s membership-based global advocacy approach;
- Peers typically experienced less staff turnover in the process of organizational change.

Pace of change: trade offs | The comparison with peers highlights the importance of trade-offs leaders face when making choices on the pace of change. Amnesty was able to implement significant organizational changes (including both GTP and the establishment of National Offices) in a relatively short time-span of three to five years. This pace at one level is impressive and perhaps such disruptive change by definition needs to happen swiftly. The recent change
processes in some other INGOs have taken longer and have involved more significant transaction costs in terms of staff attention, resources, and distraction from programmatic responsibilities. In the end, for some INGOs such as CARE International, this slower pace has curtailed or compromised some of the initial ambitions. On the other hand, the high pace of change in combination with initially inadequate change management capacity produced a number of avoidable problems and losses documented in this report as well as in our Interim Assessment.

**Leader versus cheerleader** When it comes to Amnesty’s leadership of the change process, leaders in some peer INGOs were better able to distinguish between leading change and ‘cheerleading’ the change.29 Compared to some of its peers - for instance Save the Children, Oxfam and CARE - Amnesty leadership struggled more with balancing the urge of being seen as ‘unwavering’ with the need to use inquiry, listening and learning abilities. The frictions and tensions caused were partially ‘growing pains’ - the result of being in the ‘uncomfortable neutral, in-between zone’ - that could have been mitigated if GTP had been managed differently. In addition, leadership should listen to staff reporting new trade offs and difficulties that are an *intrinsic part* of the choices made under GTP and thus remain to be dealt with.

**Understanding resistance** Amnesty’s leadership was not as successful as Oxfam, for instance, in distinguishing two types of ‘resisters’: people who are against the very direction of travel and those who are behind the direction of travel but think the implementation is not effective or may cause avoidable damage. The latter group may well have strong support in the organization owing to its informal leadership attributes, and should therefore be involved in working through implementation models. It is our impression that Amnesty’s leadership sometimes conflated the two groups, and dismissed too quickly some constructive feedback.

**Leaders’ use of the political framework** It is hard for us to conclude how effectively Amnesty’s leadership used the ‘political’ frame in navigating its agenda through the organization. We noted during the mid-term assessment that middle management was not engaged sufficiently and that some Northern sections lost relative power and feared that they would not be able to contribute to Amnesty post-GTP in the same ways. Save the Children and Oxfam carefully mapped their stakeholder territory in terms of important power holders. They undertook individual stakeholder interviews with all powerful stakeholders to understand their context, analyzed how the planned changes would affect their power position, their funding situation or business models, what philosophical or cultural ‘redlines’ they had, and what stories they tell themselves about who they are. Even with all these political efforts, for peers the hardest negotiations were still only achieved under great time pressure and behind closed doors, with lots of ‘blood, sweat and tears’.

---

29 We are grateful to Barney Tallack, former Director of Strategy of Oxfam International and currently independent consultant, for some of the observations shared with the authors.
Senior Leadership Team cohesion | In peer INGO, it matters whether the main ‘change champions’ at formal leadership levels had good interpersonal relations as well as aligned views. This was an asset for Save the Children, while Oxfam and CARE struggled with this at times. In the early stages of GTP, Amnesty’s Senior Leadership Team was less than cohesive, so changes had to be made to its composition to get to the greater cohesion it has today.

Change management capacity | Oxfam and Save the Children had put in place much more change management capacity from the beginning of their change process: a greater number of staff tasked with change management roles (who were both sourced internally as well as externally, through consultant support) as well as more specialized and effective change management capacity. CARE and Amnesty both underinvested in change management capacity and faced frictions as a result of this underinvestment.

Learning | Amnesty and Oxfam share a methodology for iterative learning that seems to have been reasonably useful: the use of early adopter models, so that parts of the organization could test, learn and modify. This facilitated learning built momentum, and made the change process less contested. However, some staff in our interviews were still quite critical of Amnesty’s overall ability to learn in-between waves. It is difficult for us as external observers to deduce how useful Amnesty’s own internal mid-term assessment was for learning – the Transition Project Team certainly felt it to be useful.

Structural choices | One element among the many choices that organizational change leaders need to make is the one on organizational-structural choices. The Senior Leadership Team held on too rigidly to the idea of a uniform organizational structure for all Regional Offices. Staff critique on the use of the predominant Regional Office model in all regions was perhaps misunderstood once again as fundamental resistance, while it may actually have been more of a case of constructive engagement. Save the Children showed a willingness to negotiate about appropriate structures, but had clarity at the same time around what the ‘sine qua non’ were for the change process. To the extent that there was some rigidity within Amnesty’s leadership around the appropriate Regional Office structure models, this reminds us of CARE’s change management team’s adherence to the need to push for Unified Line Management, even when political will was no longer there.

In sum, a couple of observations across all the INGO cases we have experience with:

First, organizations and their large change processes are ultimately all about ‘people, people, people.’ Compared to some of its peers, Amnesty did not always understand this basic tenet – neither from a human resource frame nor from a political frame. Secondly, while Amnesty had some complications to deal with in navigating through GTP given its identity and structure, it has to come to terms with the fact that the benefits from change always come later than change leaders and managers need them to arrive. The transition and transaction costs of change are always higher than they were estimated to be at the outset, and these costs continue for a longer
period than proponents expect (or hope for). This, combined with a deeper sense in the NGO sector than ever before that change is a constant can make for a fairly exhausting reality check. Obtaining a stronger capability to lead and manage organizational change in the sector – and good arenas for learning from each other in this regard - thus seems to be a key asset for the future success of INGOs.
XIV. Annexes

Annex I: Methodology and Limitations

Methodology

A) Primary data collection

a. Internal Stakeholders:

i. IS and Section Survey

- A pilot survey was sent to ten Amnesty colleagues (IS and Sections) identified by the Human Resources team
- Feedback from the pilot survey was incorporated into the final survey questions
- The final survey was sent to both IS and Section staff

IS survey:

- We understand the total number of IS staff to be 568 (based on the list of staff information provided to us by Amnesty)
- We drew a sample population of 392 after excluding the following 176 persons from the population (of 568):
  - 10 staff members identified as on maternity leave
  - 63 persons who had been employed less than 6 months
  - 103 persons who were working in a Regional Office capacity in areas other than wave 1 and 2 (this includes the virtual South Asia and South East Asia and the Pacific Regional Offices)
- From among the 392 staff, 110 were randomly selected to be asked to fill out the survey based on the assumption that at a response rate of 70%, we would be able to state with relative confidence that the survey responses were representative of the population’s perceptions of GTP
- Due to a combination of low response rate (55 responses), and expressions of interest among stakeholders (beyond those who had been randomly sampled to fill out the survey), it was decided that the survey was to be made available to all IS staff through Amnesty’s intranet site
- 79 IS staff members responded to the survey (24 more than the initial wave of responses). In addition to the survey responses, we decided to undertake additional interviews (through purposeful sampling; in addition to the 40 random interviews that we had initially agreed to conduct) to hear from those who could not/did not participate in the survey
- Given the low response rate (of 79 - even after the survey was made accessible to all IS staff) and the fact that the survey was initially sent out to a randomly sampled group and later made available to the entire IS population, the validity of the survey data has limitations

**Section survey:**

- The Section survey was sent to 72 Sections, with the ask that the surveys be filled out individually by the Section Directors or by the teams collectively
- 42 Sections responded to the survey

**ii. Interviews and Focus Group Discussions**

- Four pilot interviews and FGDs were conducted face to face in Arusha during the SLDP
- Three pilot interviews were conducted remotely from Syracuse
- Feedback from the pilot interviews and FGDs were incorporated into the final interview questions

- IS interview participants were randomly sampled from the following sample populations (not including virtual Regional Offices):
  - Governance level (10 interviews) - Four Senior Leadership Team members, two International Board members, four National Board Chairs
  - Regional Office and IS staff at the management level (20) – Regional Directors, Deputies, and Directors

- 10 Section directors (from only wave 1 regions wave 2 regions) were randomly selected

- The Strategy and Evaluation Unit conducted focus group discussions with Regional Offices on behalf of the Maxwell team during their already planned Regional Office visits, due to lack of Amnesty budget to fund such visits by the Maxwell team. The Strategy and Evaluation Unit conducted focus group discussions with the Hong Kong, Dakar and Mexico City Regional Offices

- The Maxwell team conducted two Focus Group Discussions with the South Asia and the South East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office teams as well as a with a group of five union members

- The Maxwell team also conducted a few additional interviews based on a purposeful sampling of programs and directorates (Law and Policy, Global Thematic Issues, Global Fundraising and Engagement) that have been heavily affected by GTP but were not well-represented in the surveys and interviews
b. **External Stakeholders only from Wave 1 and Wave 2 regions**

i. *Surveys*

- A survey was sent out to all 200 partners/peers/allies who were identified and whose contact address were provided by the Regional Directors from the West and Central Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa, East Asia, Americas, South Asia and South East and the Pacific Regional Offices
- 26 peers/partners/allies responded to the survey

- A survey was sent out to 35 campaign targets who were similarly identified and whose contact details were provided by the Regional Directors
- 4 campaign targets have responded to the survey

ii. *Interviews*

- The Maxwell team reached out to a random sample of 3 peers/partners/allies (1 post-GTP and 2 pre-GTP) from the four wave 1 regions and a random sample of 2 peers/partners/allies (1 post-GTP and 1 pre-GTP) from the three wave 2 regions, with a total of 18 interviews
- We were able to schedule interviews with 4 peers/partners/allies

- The team also reached out to a random sample of 1 campaign target from each region, with a total of 7 interviews
- We did not receive any responses to our request for interviews

- The team has interviewed Ford, Oak, and OSF as institutional funders

**B) Secondary data collection**

Review of internal documents and internally collected data across all areas of inquiry. See Annex V for details.

**Other streams of work contributing to the Final Assessment**

We also, importantly, reviewed and presented in this report the internal data generated by the following Amnesty work streams on Finance, Visibility and Credibility, Fundraising and Membership Growth and Engagement. The lead persons in these work streams collected internal data independently of the Maxwell Final Assessment team and presented this to us. We validated its scope and quality independently.
The leads of these work streams were:

Finance: Tom Brand, Matthew McMuir and independent reviewer Alan MacLean
Visibility and Credibility: Osama Bhutta and Buffy Price
Fundraising as well as Membership Growth and Engagement: Julie Verhaar

C) Additional methodological explanation

- The examples we have highlighted in the reports are generally those which were most frequently repeated (anything more than 3-4 times whether in the qualitative part of the survey responses or interviews or FGDs) or those which accurately or most aptly illustrate the issue being discussed (based on our judgment, even if it was mentioned only once or twice)
- We have chosen to represent the best quote(s) that illustrate an issue based on our judgment of whether this was important, irrespective of the source of the quote and/or the number of times that a similar issue was raised
- We did not set out to balance the report by, for example, presenting an equal number of examples, quotes or bullet points for positive and negative perspectives. We have made an effort to present more or less all of what we heard, irrespective of frequency or source. We believe that we are responsible for (re)presenting all the voices we heard, in as much detail as possible, as accountability to the people who gave us time and opened their minds and hearts in the process. We also believe that the strength of points made or issues raised should not be judged only by its frequency but by the gravity of expression
- Our team as well as colleagues at Amnesty were aware of the absence of counterfactuals. Our inquiry, through certain survey and interview questions, offered respondents the opportunity to reflect on what occurred before and after GTP. Without any prompting from us, Informants also commented on what could not have occurred in the absence of the Regional Offices.

Important Caveats and Limitations

- This Assessment mainly collected data on staff perceptions, views and opinions of these effects. Quantitative data was limited to those that Amnesty regularly collects – e.g. data related to fundraising, finance, staff and media hits. We collected qualitative data independently from Amnesty. In addition, we relied on internal Amnesty documents and internal quantitative data collected by Amnesty, as well as external evaluations of two global campaigns and of National Office experiences. We also collected further qualitative data through a small survey of views by external partners, peers and campaign targets and through a small set of interviews with these external sources. Given the small size of these responses, we should see this data as anecdotal only
- As we point out in the Human Rights Impact section, GTP has only been underway since 2013 so it is still very early to be able to see impacts, if any. Also, the measurement of human rights work is complex as is widely acknowledged in the evaluation literature and practice.
• With some Regional Offices still in the process of being set up, this assessment is not a complete final assessment
• Global Campaigns and the determination of priority Sections per region were planned before GTP and independently from GTP; therefore, their impact cannot be entirely attributed to GTP
• Importantly, it was agreed upon between Amnesty and the External Assessment Team that Wave 3 and 4 Regional Offices and virtual Regional Offices would not be included in the interviews as these Regional Offices were not considered fully operational yet during the period of Assessment (March 2016 through April 2017); perspectives from these Regional Offices have been gleaned, however, through the surveys and through focus group discussions
• The Maxwell team asked to visit a small sample of Regional Offices but was not able to do so due to budget limits on Amnesty’s side. The Strategy and Evaluation Unit conducted three in-person focus group discussions with Regional Offices on behalf of the Maxwell team. In addition, the Maxwell team also conducted a few additional focus group discussions virtually
• It was agreed with Amnesty that input from former Amnesty staff was not solicited since that had been done in the mid-term assessment and as this assessment was meant to be more “forward looking”, with recommendations towards the future
• Amnesty requested that National Offices would not be included within the scope of this assessment because they are technically outside the scope of the Regional Offices setup and management during GTP
• We were able to send survey and interview requests only to those external stakeholders in the region whose contact addresses were provided by the Regional Offices. The number of responses received were much smaller
• We did not have the budget to translate questions/responses to interviews/surveys in languages other than English. We gave Sections the option of filling out the survey as a team, as one way of circumventing this issue. We did communicate with external stakeholders in French and Spanish via email while approaching them for interviews.
• Due to the relatively small rate and number of survey responses, no statistical analyses or tests were performed
• Amnesty was unable to provide the Maxwell team with internal data we had requested with regard to certain areas. This includes turnover data on staff who transitioned to the Regional Offices, number/percentages of consultants used in the established positions per region and Directorate, the extent to which short term staff contract extensions were used, the tenure of new staff (not just those who transitioned out to Regional Office), staff turnover by level of management, number/percentage of vacant positions (top three levels vs. the rest) and, disaggregated funding allocation/expenditure by Sections, National Offices and Regional Offices in the global South during the GTP period of the past 3-4 years.
• Although our surveys asked participants to disclose their Directorate and geographic location, only a few participants provided us with this information. This has made it impossible for us disaggregate data by region or Directorate in any meaningful way
As Amnesty could not give us the budget to transcribe interviews/focus group discussions, we took detailed notes during the interview/focus group discussions itself and documented their outcomes in debriefs.

Annex II: Interviewees, Focus Group Participants and Participant Observations

Internal Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Post Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Neve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Kang</td>
<td>Global Fundraising and Engagement</td>
<td>Global Supporter Engagement</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Global Director - Supporter Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altantuya Batdorj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anil Pant</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary General</td>
<td>Movement Support Programme</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Programme Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Neistat</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research - SD</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Senior Director for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfaq Khalfan</td>
<td>International Law and Policy</td>
<td>Law and Policy</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Programme Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Gaughran</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Global Thematic Issues</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Programme Director Global Thematic Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Jimenez Sandoval</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Americas Regional Office (Mexico, Lima &amp; Wash DC)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director - Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Kim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Power</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary General</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Director, Strategy and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champa Patel</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>South East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Holm</td>
<td>Global Fundraising and Engagement</td>
<td>Global Fundraising Support</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Global Director - Fundraising Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Doube</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Senior Director - Global Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin Zilala</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Genberg</td>
<td>Director - Global Operations</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprose Muchena</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Nevins</td>
<td>Programme Director</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnanam Devadas</td>
<td>Deputy Director - Campaigns</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Marengo</td>
<td>Deputy Programme Director, Human Rights Defenders</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fang</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaori Shoji</td>
<td>National Board Chair</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liza M. Gallardo-Martin</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Marczynski</td>
<td>Deputy Programme Director</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kagari</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director - Research</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muleya Mwananyanda</td>
<td>Deputy Director (Campaigns)</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwikali Muthiani</td>
<td>International Board Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Kouakou</td>
<td>National Board Chair</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicki Deeson</td>
<td>International Finance Director</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseo Quiroz Rendón</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organization and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Eastmond</td>
<td>People &amp; Services &amp; Organization Development</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Senior Director of Organisation Development and Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Guitard</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Campaigner Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salil Shetty</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary General</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samira Daoud</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Dakar</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara MacNeice</td>
<td>Campaigns and Communications</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Deputy Programme Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Jackson</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seydi Gassama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchamie Aimé Adi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Section Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Schultz-Jagow</td>
<td>Campaigns and Communications</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Senior Director, Campaigns and Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mackey</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Media Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Adzahlie-Mensah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Barrett Braggins</td>
<td>Global Fundraising and Engagement</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Global Trust and Foundations Relationship Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focus Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Law and Policy</td>
<td>Law and Policy; Gender, Sexuality and Identity; International Advocacy; International Law and Policy - SD Office</td>
<td>London; New York;</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Global Thematic Issues</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development and Human Resources</td>
<td>Organizational Development and Human Resources</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>South Asia Regional Office</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>West and Central Africa Regional Office</td>
<td>Dakar</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Southeast Asia and Pacific Regional Office</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>East Asia Regional Office</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Americas Regional Office</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Number of FGD Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Union</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## External Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Society Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa - SERI SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative for Women in the Horn of Africa - SIHA Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People for Successful Korean Reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIACOOP SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Observations (by two team members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CADF (Barcelona)</td>
<td>July 19-21, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Week (London)</td>
<td>February 2-3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADF (Colombo)</td>
<td>April 1-3, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex III: Survey Protocols

Question in Staff Engagement Survey (SES)

The External Assessment Team requested Amnesty to add the following questions in the SES survey as an opportunity to gauge the broader organization’s (beyond our targeted samples for the Final Assessment) perception towards the impact of GTP on human rights.

Additional open-ended questions:

1) Please explain your answer to question 3 with examples if possible.
2) What changes in ways of working should we consider to maximize our human rights impact?

GTP IS Survey

Amnesty International’s Global Transition Programme (GTP) is the organization’s process of “moving closer to the ground” with the aim of ensuring greater human rights impact by becoming a truly global community of activists, campaigners and researchers. By distributing teams to 15 Regional Offices across the World, the aim of the GTP is to empower the movement to act with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity and relevance. The reorganization aims to enable Amnesty to work in a more integrated and effective way across functions and geographies and with greater accountability to local partners.

The GTP Final Assessment will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of Amnesty’s work as a result of the GTP and covers the full period of the GTP, from 2013-2016.

This survey is being carried out by independent, external consultants at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, USA to seek the opinions and perspectives of staff in the IS, Sections, Structures and National Offices.
For more information about the team and the assessment please visit Amnesty’s GTP Final Assessment intranet page.

We welcome any questions or input and would like to hear from you: gtp.external@gmail.com

If used in the final report, any inputs will be anonymized and non-attributable.
It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete this survey.

Thank you for taking part in our survey.

**Human Rights Impact**

*By human rights impact we mean the difference we made in policies, practices, accountability or in the lives of human rights holders and defenders or in the capacity of human rights civil society organizations and movements*

1. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices established a portfolio of human rights projects and campaigns that are more relevant and specific to the region than before the GTP?

   a) Significantly more relevant portfolio
   b) Some improvement in relevance of portfolio
   c) No improvement in relevance of portfolio
   d) Worse portfolio than before
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   If you can highlight a specific example of a project or campaign that you do not believe would have happened in the absence of a Regional Office, please do so below.

2. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices developed and deployed new methods, tools or techniques uniquely relevant or specific to the region for research, campaigns, advocacy or other human rights work?

   a) Have not deployed any new methods, tools or techniques
   b) Have deployed some new methods, tools or techniques
   c) Have deployed significant new methods, tools or techniques
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

3. Overall, do you think that the GTP has resulted in greater human rights impact?

   a) Significantly more human rights impact
b) Some more human rights impact
c) No change in human rights impact
d) Worsening of human rights impact
e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples (for example, the difference we made in policies, practices, accountability structures or arrangements; the difference we made in the lives of rights holders and defenders; the difference we made in the capacity of human rights civil society organizations and movements).

4. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices helped to increase Amnesty’s legitimacy (its acceptance among important stakeholders and audiences, respect, trust received etc.) as compared to before the GTP?

   a) No change
   b) Somewhat increased acceptance and trust
   c) Significantly increased acceptance and trust
   d) Decreased acceptance and trust
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

5. In your opinion, do you think that the Regional Offices have created 1) new partnerships with allies/coalitions or 2) new access to human rights mechanisms (such as regional human rights bodies, courts, UN bodies?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New partnerships with allies/coalitions</th>
<th>New access to human rights mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant new partnerships/access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

6. In your opinion, has the presence of Regional Offices affected the ability of sections or structures to deliver human rights work with increased speed?
a) Has decreased our speed of delivery  
b) No change  
c) Somewhat increased our speed  
d) Significantly increased our speed  
e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

7. In your opinion, has the presence of Regional Offices had any unintended negative impact on Amnesty’s human rights work?

8. Moving forward, what do we need to change in the IS (inclusive of Regional Offices and London IS) to make Amnesty’s human rights work more impactful (for example, in design of decision making structures, resources or staff competencies, experience profiles and behaviors)?

Perceptions

9. To what extent have external stakeholders (peers, partners, targets etc.) noticed any changes as a result of the “new Amnesty”?

   a) Have not noticed any change  
   b) Have noticed some change  
   c) Have noticed significant change  
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

If you have noticed change, what type of changes do you think they notice?

10. How favourably do external stakeholders (peers, targets etc.) perceive the “new Amnesty”?

   a) Less favourably than before  
   b) No change  
   c) Somewhat more favourably  
   d) Significantly more favourably  
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

Visibility and credibility

By visibility we mean the degree to which Amnesty is able to attract attention in the general public and through the use of all types of media.

By credibility we refer to the degree to which Amnesty is trusted and relied upon by different stakeholders.
11. What are some characteristics, attributes or offerings of the Regional Offices that have enabled or empowered sections and structures in the regions to increase the visibility of their work? (For example, the profile of Regional Office leaders and staff, their presence in national or regional deliberative fora involving CSOs and government, the Regional Office’s ability to frame campaigns in a way that resonates with the local context)

12. What are some characteristics, attributes or offerings of the Regional Offices that have enabled or empowered sections and structures in the regions to increase the credibility of their work? (For example, the profile of Regional Office leaders and staff, their presence in national or regional deliberative fora involving CSOs and government, the Regional Office’s ability to frame campaigns in a way that resonates with the local context)

Membership and Growth

13. In which of the following areas has the GTP resulted in Amnesty’s growth? (select as many as applicable)
   a) Finance
   b) Membership
   c) External stakeholders
   d) None of the above

   Please explain your sense of the magnitude of growth, and how and why such growth took place.

Collaboration between sections and the International Secretariat (IS)

14. To what extent are sections/structures involved with the IS in
   1) strategic planning
   2) operational planning and
   3) budgeting of IS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. To what extent has this changed since the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?
Syracuse University
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Become less involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

16. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices changed the level of alignment of projects/plans between sections/structures and the IS?

   a) No change
   b) Less alignment
   c) Moderately more aligned
   d) Significantly more aligned
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

17. What should Amnesty do to further enhance collaboration between sections/structures and the IS?

**Collaboration between Regional Offices and IS London**

18. To what extent are Regional Offices involved with IS-London around i) strategic planning, ii) operational planning and iii) budgeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what extent were Regional Office leaders and campaign staff involved in consultation on the initiation, design or implementation of new global campaigns?

   a) Not involved
   b) Somewhat involved
c) Significantly involved  
d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)  

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

20. What has helped collaborations between London IS and Regional Offices in strategic planning, operational planning, budgeting?

21. What has hindered these collaborations (in strategic planning, operational planning, budgeting)?

22. What could Regional Offices or IS London do to enhance collaboration in order to increase human rights impact?

**Change Management**

23. Overall, was the GTP's organizational change process managed and led effectively?

   a) Not managed and led effectively  
   b) Managed and led somewhat effectively  
   c) Managed and led very effectively  
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)  

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

24. To what extent are you satisfied with the services provided by the organizational development and human resources, infrastructure services, law and policy, communications and campaigns, and research, to Regional Offices in the context of GTP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Development and Human Resources</th>
<th>Infrastructure Services</th>
<th>Law and Policy</th>
<th>Campaigns and Communications</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer with specific examples.
25. To what extent are you satisfied with the IS business services (IT, legal, finance etc.)?

   a) Not satisfied
   b) Somewhat satisfied
   c) Very satisfied
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

26. To what extent is there a sense of trust among London-based IS in delegating responsibility to Regional Offices?

   a) No trust
   b) Little trust
   c) Good trust
   d) Significant trust
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

27. To what extent have you seen any changes in this regard since the beginning of the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?

   a) Worsening of trust
   b) No change
   c) Somewhat more trust
   d) Significantly more trust
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

28. To what extent have Amnesty’s power distribution, management processes and systems been aligned with the purpose behind “moving closer to the ground”?

   a) Not sufficiently aligned
   b) Somewhat aligned
   c) Well aligned
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

29. Organizational culture is often defined as the unspoken, often subconscious systems of beliefs, assumptions and behaviors that reflect ‘what it means to work and succeed in Amnesty’. Staff are socialized into adopting Amnesty’s culture in conscious and subconscious ways. Amnesty’s culture influences which staff and leadership behaviors are rewarded over others, and through this, the culture is reinforced.

   What aspects of Amnesty’s culture are supportive of the principles behind “moving closer to the ground”?
30. What aspects are not?

31. What elements of the culture need to be strengthened to support GTP? How would you go about such culture change?

32. In line with the objectives of Regional Offices “moving closer to the ground” as part of GTP, what could Amnesty do to further improve the change management process and leadership?

33. Finally, is there anything that we have not addressed in this survey that you wish to bring to our attention?

**Biographic data**

34. How long have you worked with Amnesty?

   - Less than 2 years
   - 2 - 4 years
   - 5 - 10 years
   - More than 10 years

35. Which part of the IS do you work for?

   - Research
   - Global Operations
   - Law and Policy
   - Global Fundraising and Engagement
   - People and Services
   - Campaigns and Communications

**GTP Section Survey**

Amnesty International’s Global Transition Programme (GTP) is the organization’s process of “moving closer to the ground” with the aim of ensuring greater human rights impact by becoming a truly global community of activists, campaigners and researchers. By distributing teams to 15 Regional Offices across the World, the aim of the GTP is to empower the movement to act with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity and relevance. The reorganization aims to enable Amnesty to work in a more integrated and effective way across functions and geographies and with greater accountability to local partners.

The GTP Final Assessment will evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of Amnesty’s work as a result of the GTP and covers the full period of the GTP, from 2013-2016.
This survey is being carried out by independent, external consultants at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, USA to seek the opinions and perspectives of staff in the IS, sections, structures and national offices.

For more information about the team and the assessment please visit Amnesty’s GTP Final Assessment intranet page.

We welcome any questions or input and would like to hear from you: gtp.external@gmail.com

If used in the final report, any inputs will be anonymized and non-attributable.
It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete this survey.

Thank you for taking part in our survey.

**Human Rights Impact**

*By human rights impact we mean the difference we made in policies, practices, accountability or in the lives of human rights holders and defenders or in the capacity of human rights civil society organizations and movements*

2. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices established a portfolio of human rights projects and campaigns that are more relevant and specific to the region than before the GTP?

   f) Significantly more relevant portfolio  
   g) Some improvement in relevance of portfolio  
   h) No improvement in relevance of portfolio  
   i) Worse portfolio than before  
   j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

If you can highlight a specific example of a project or campaign that you do not believe would have happened in the absence of a Regional Office, please do so below.

2. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices developed and deployed new methods, tools or techniques uniquely relevant or specific to the region for research, campaigns, advocacy or other human rights work?

   e) Have not deployed any new methods, tools or techniques  
   f) Have deployed some new methods, tools or techniques  
   g) Have deployed significant new methods, tools or techniques  
   h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.
3. Overall, do you think that the GTP has resulted in greater human rights impact?

   f) Significantly more human rights impact  
   g) Some more human rights impact  
   h) No change in human rights impact  
   i) Worsening of human rights impact  
   j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples (for example, the difference we made in policies, practices, accountability structures or arrangements; the difference we made in the lives of rights holders and defenders; the difference we made in the capacity of human rights civil society organizations and movements).

4. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices helped to increase Amnesty’s legitimacy (its acceptance among important stakeholders and audiences, respect, trust received etc.) as compared to before the GTP?

   f) No change  
   g) Somewhat increased acceptance and trust  
   h) Significantly increased acceptance and trust  
   i) Decreased acceptance and trust  
   j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

5. In your opinion, do you think that the Regional Offices have created 1) new partnerships with allies/coalitions or 2) new access to human rights mechanisms (such as regional human rights bodies, courts, UN bodies?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New partnerships with allies/coalitions</th>
<th>New access to human rights mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant new partnerships/ access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer with specific examples.
6. In your opinion, has the presence of Regional Offices affected the ability of sections or structures to deliver human rights work with increased speed?

   f) Has decreased our speed of delivery  
   g) No change  
   h) Somewhat increased our speed  
   i) Significantly increased our speed  
   j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

7. In your opinion, has the presence of Regional Offices had any unintended negative impact on Amnesty’s human rights work?

8. Moving forward, what do we need to change in the IS (inclusive of Regional Offices and London IS) to make Amnesty’s human rights work more impactful (for example, in design of decision making structures, resources or staff competencies, experience profiles and behaviors)?

   Perceptions

9. To what extent have external stakeholders (peers, partners, targets etc.) noticed any changes as a result of the ‘new Amnesty’?

   e) Have not noticed any change  
   f) Have noticed some change  
   g) Have noticed significant change  
   h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   If you have noticed change, what type of changes do you think they notice?

10. How favourably do external stakeholders (peers, targets etc.) perceive the ‘new Amnesty’?

    f) Less favourably than before  
    g) No change  
    h) Somewhat more favourably  
    i) Significantly more favourably  
    j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

    Please explain your answer with specific examples.
Visibility and credibility

By visibility we mean the degree to which Amnesty is able to attract attention in the general public and through the use of all types of media.

By credibility we refer to the degree to which Amnesty is trusted and relied upon by different stakeholders.

11. With the establishment of a Regional Office covering your section/structure, do you now have better resources (financial support, material, capacity building etc.) to improve Amnesty’s visibility in your country?

   a) Actually worse
   b) No change
   c) Better than before
   d) Significantly better
   e) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

12. With the establishment of a Regional Office covering your section/structure, do you experience your work to be perceived as:

   a) More credible
   b) Less credible
   c) No more or less credible
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please explain your answer with specific examples.

13. Are there any unintended consequences of the presence of Regional Offices, setup as part of GTP, on Amnesty’s visibility or credibility that you would like to mention?

14. In the spirit of fulfilling the objectives of the GTP, what should Amnesty do to further enhance visibility or credibility?

Membership and Growth

15. In which of the following areas has the GTP resulted in Amnesty’s growth? (select as many as applicable)

   e) Finance
   f) Membership
g) External stakeholders
h) None of the above

Collaboration between sections and the International Secretariat (IS)

16. To what extent are sections/structures involved with the IS in
1) strategic planning
2) operational planning and
3) budgeting of IS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. To what extent has this changed since the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Become less involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

18. In your opinion, have the Regional Offices changed the level of alignment of projects/plans between sections/structures and the IS?

f) No change
g) Less alignment
h) Moderately more aligned
i) Significantly more aligned
j) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.
19. What should Amnesty do to further enhance collaboration between sections/structures and the IS?

**Change Management**

20. Overall, was the GTP’s organizational change process managed and led effectively?

- e) Not managed and led effectively
- f) Managed and led somewhat effectively
- g) Managed and led very effectively
- h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

Please explain your answer with specific examples.

**Biographic data**

21. How long have you worked with Amnesty?

- Less than 2 years
- 2 - 4 years
- 5 - 10 years
- More than 10 years

22. Which region is your National Office, section or structure located in?

- Africa
- Americas
- Asia and The Pacific
- Europe and Central Asia
- Middle East and North Africa

**Survey of peer and partner organizations**

As part of the external assessment of Amnesty International’s Global Transition Programme (GTP), we are seeking feedback on Amnesty’s evolving direction and change process from partners and peers. We are soliciting feedback from all peers and partners that Amnesty’s Regional Offices has given us as external reviewers.

The GTP is Amnesty’s process of moving closer to the ground, particularly to the global South, with the aim of increasing Amnesty’s human rights impact by transforming Amnesty into a more global movement. Practically, this has meant distributing teams previously based in London to 15 Regional Offices in key capitals across the globe, to act with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity
and relevance by standing alongside those whose rights are violated, and by joining others who are also working towards build rights-respecting societies.

This reorganization is also meant to enable Amnesty to work internally in a more integrated, efficient and effective way, across functions and geographies, and to deliver greater accountability to local partners.

This external assessment which covers the full period of GTP from 2013-2016, is being led by external consultants at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, USA. It aims to evaluate whether GTP has achieved its desired outcomes, and where it hasn’t, it aims to offer recommendations on how Amnesty, going forward, can deepen the impact of GTP and further enhance its legitimacy, credibility and accountability with partners, coalitions, allies – particularly, with rights holders and rights movements.

This survey will take approximately 30 min to complete. If used in the final report, please know that your responses will be fully anonymized and non-attributable.

In addition to the completed survey, please feel free to email us with any other observations that you think we as external reviewers should be aware of: gtp.external@gmail.com.

1. In your opinion, has Amnesty’s portfolio of work in the past 2-3 years become more or less relevant to your country or region than before?
   a) More relevant to my region and country
   b) No improvement in relevance of portfolio
   c) Less relevant than before
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please give examples to illustrate your answer.

2. Over the past 2-3 years, do you think that Amnesty’s work has contributed to greater or less human rights impact in your country or region?
   a) More human rights impact
   b) No change in human rights impact
   c) Less human rights impact
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   How? Please give examples to illustrate your answer.

3. To what extent has your relationship with Amnesty changed over the past 2-3 years?
4. To what extent have you observed any change in acceptance, respect or trust towards Amnesty in the past 2-3 years?

   a) No change, same level of acceptance, respect and trust as before
   b) Increase in acceptance, respect and trust
   c) Decrease in acceptance, respect and trust
   d) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please give reasons to explain your answer.

5. In your opinion and observation, what has worked well with regard to Amnesty’s efforts to move closer to the ground and establish regional offices?

6. In your opinion and observation, what has not worked well with regard to Amnesty’s efforts to move closer to the ground and establish regional offices?

7. Moving forward, what should Amnesty do to be more effective in achieving human rights impact and gaining more of your acceptance, respect and trust in your country or region?

Demographic information

8. Name of the organization (optional)

9. Name and title of the person responding to the survey (optional)

10. Geographic location

11. Length of relationship with Amnesty

11. Nature of relationship with Amnesty over the past 2-3 years (you can tick more than one box as necessary)
With national section of Amnesty in your region | With the regional office of Amnesty | With London based International Secretariat

Networking
Alliance or ally
Coalition
Receive funding from Amnesty
Provide funding to Amnesty
Joint research, advocacy or campaigning

Other (please specify)

**Campaign Target Survey**

As part of the external assessment of Amnesty International’s Global Transition Programme (GTP), we are seeking feedback on Amnesty’s evolving direction and change process from partners and peers. We have selected you and your organization through a random selection process from among the list of external stakeholders provided by Amnesty International.

The GTP is Amnesty’s process of moving closer to the ground, particularly to the global South, with the aim of increasing Amnesty’s human rights impact by transforming Amnesty into a more global movement. Practically, this has meant distributing teams previously based in London to 15 Regional Offices in key capitals across the globe, to act with greater legitimacy, speed, capacity and relevance by standing alongside those whose rights are violated, and by joining others who are also working towards building rights-respecting societies.

This reorganization is also meant to enable Amnesty to work internally in a more integrated, efficient and effective way, across functions and geographies, and to deliver greater accountability to local partners.

This external assessment which covers the full period of GTP from 2013-2016, is being led by external consultants at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, USA. It aims to evaluate whether GTP has achieved its desired outcomes, and where it hasn’t, it aims to offer recommendations on how Amnesty, going forward, can deepen the impact of GTP and further enhance its legitimacy, credibility and accountability with partners, coalitions, allies – particularly, with rights holders and rights movements.

This survey will take approximately 30 min to complete. If used in the final report, please know that your responses will be fully anonymized and non-attributable.
In addition to the completed survey, please feel free to email us with any other observations that you think we as external reviewers should be aware of: gtp.external@gmail.com.

12. In your opinion, has Amnesty’s portfolio of work in the past 2-3 years become more or less relevant to your country or region than before?

   e) More relevant to my region and country
   f) No improvement in relevance of portfolio
   g) Less relevant than before
   h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   Please give examples to illustrate your answer.

13. Over the past 2-3 years, do you think that Amnesty’s work has contributed to greater or less human rights impact in your country or region?

   e) More human rights impact
   f) No change in human rights impact
   g) Less human rights impact
   h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)

   How? Please give examples to illustrate your answer.

14. To what extent has your relationship with Amnesty changed over the past 2-3 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Exchange of Information</th>
<th>Funding from or to Amnesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. To what extent have you observed any change in acceptance, respect or trust towards Amnesty in the past 2-3 years?

   e) No change, same level of acceptance, respect and trust as before
   f) Increase in acceptance, respect and trust
   g) Decrease in acceptance, respect and trust
   h) Unable to answer (not sufficiently knowledgeable)
Please give reasons to explain your answer.

16. In your opinion and observation, what has worked well and what has not worked well with regard to Amnesty’s efforts to move closer to the ground and establish regional offices?

What has worked well
What has not worked well

17. Moving forward, what should Amnesty do to be more effective in achieving human rights impact and gaining more of your acceptance, respect and trust in your country or region?

Demographic information

18. Name of the organization (optional)

19. Name and title of the person responding to the survey (optional)

20. Geographic location

21. Length of relationship with Amnesty

11. Nature of relationship with Amnesty over the past 2-3 years (you can tick more than one box as necessary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>With national section of Amnesty in your region</th>
<th>With the regional office of Amnesty</th>
<th>With global office in London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance or ally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive funding from Amnesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding to Amnesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint research, advocacy or campaigning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)
Annex IV: Survey Responses

IS Survey

In your opinion, have the Regional Offices established a portfolio of human rights projects and campaigns that are more relevant and specific to the region than before the GTP?

- Significantly more relevant portfolio: 14%
- Some improvement in relevance of portfolio: 31%
- No improvement in relevance of portfolio: 12%
- Worse portfolio than before: 9%
- Unable to answer: 35%

In your opinion, have the Regional Offices developed and deployed new methods, tools or techniques uniquely relevant or specific to the region for research, campaigns, advocacy or other human rights work?

- Have deployed significant new methods, tools or ...: 10%
- Have deployed some new methods, tools or techniques: 32%
- Have not deployed any new methods, tools or techniques: 19%
- Unable to answer: 38%

Overall, do you think that the GTP has resulted in greater human rights impact?

- Significantly more human rights impact: 4%
- Some more human rights impact: 36%
- No change in human rights impact: 17%
- Worsening of human rights impact: 10%
- Unable to answer: 32%
In your opinion, have the Regional Offices helped to increase Amnesty's legitimacy (its acceptance among important stakeholders and audiences, respect, trust received etc.) as compared to before the GTP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly increased acceptance and trust</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat increased acceptance and trust</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased acceptance and trust</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, do you think that the Regional Offices have created 1) new partnerships with allies/coalitions 2) new access to human rights mechanisms (such as regional human rights bodies, courts, UN bodies?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant new partnerships/access</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some progress</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] New access to human rights mechanisms
- [ ] New partnerships with allies/coalitions
To what extent have external stakeholders (peers, partners, targets etc.) noticed any changes as a result of the ‘new Amnesty’?

- Have noticed significant change: 19%
- Have noticed some change: 23%
- Have not noticed any change: 7%
- Unable to answer: 51%

How favourably do external stakeholders (peers, targets etc.) perceive the ‘new Amnesty’?

- Significantly more favourably: 5%
- Somewhat more favourably: 18%
- No change: 12%
- Less favourably than before: 18%
- Unable to answer: 47%

In which of the following areas has the GTP resulted in Amnesty’s growth? (select as many as applicable)

- External stakeholders: 39%
- Membership: 17%
- Finance: 15%
- None of the above: 29%
To what extent are sections/structures involved with the IS in 1) strategic planning 2) operational planning and 3) budgeting of IS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent has this changed since the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more involved</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become less involved</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion, have the Regional Offices changed the level of alignment of projects/plans between sections/structures and the IS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more aligned</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately more aligned</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less alignment</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent are Regional Offices involved with IS-London around i) strategic planning, ii) operational planning and iii) budgeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Operational planning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly involved</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent were Regional Office leaders and campaign staff involved in consultation on the initiation, design or implementation of new global campaigns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly involved</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, was the GTP’s organizational change process managed and led effectively?

- Managed and led very effectively: 5%
- Managed and led somewhat effectively: 41%
- Not managed and led effectively: 34%
- Unable to answer: 19%

To what extent are you satisfied with the services provided by the organizational development and human resources, infrastructure services, law and policy, communications and campaigns, and research, to Regional Offices in the context of GTP?

- Very satisfied:
  - Research: 23%
  - Communications and campaigns: 20%
  - Law and policy: 30%
  - Infrastructure services: 5%
  - ODHR: 13%
- Somewhat satisfied:
  - Research: 33%
  - Communications and campaigns: 34%
  - Law and policy: 30%
  - Infrastructure services: 5%
  - ODHR: 32%
- Not satisfied:
  - Research: 5%
  - Communications and campaigns: 5%
  - Law and policy: 5%
  - Infrastructure services: 18%
  - ODHR: 41%
- Unable to answer:
  - Research: 39%
  - Communications and campaigns: 35%
  - Law and policy: 41%
  - Infrastructure services: 20%
  - ODHR: 21%
### To what extent are you satisfied with the IS business services (IT, legal, finance etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To what extent is there a sense of trust among London-based IS in delegating responsibility to Regional Offices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good trust</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little trust</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trust</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent have you seen any changes in this regard since the beginning of the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?

- Significantly more trust: 3%
- Somewhat more trust: 27%
- No change: 8%
- Worsening of trust: 14%
- Unable to answer: 47%

To what extent have Amnesty’s power distribution, management processes and systems been aligned with the purpose behind “moving closer to the ground”?

- Well aligned: 9%
- Somewhat aligned: 80%
- Not sufficiently aligned: 37%
- Unable to answer: 25%
Section Survey

In your opinion, have the Regional Offices established a portfolio of human rights projects and campaigns that are more relevant and specific to the region than before the GTP?

- Significantly more relevant portfolio: 10%
- Some improvement in relevance of portfolio: 38%
- No improvement in relevance of portfolio: 19%
- Worse portfolio than before: 17%
- Unable to answer: 17%

In your opinion, have the Regional Offices developed and deployed new methods, tools or techniques uniquely relevant or specific to the region for research, campaigns, advocacy or other human rights work?

- Have deployed significant new methods, tools or techniques: 2%
- Have deployed some new methods, tools or techniques: 40%
- Have not deployed any new methods, tools or techniques: 26%
- Unable to answer: 31%

Overall, do you think that the GTP has resulted in greater human rights impact?

- Significantly more human rights impact: 2%
- Some more human rights impact: 40%
- No change in human rights impact: 24%
- Worsening of human rights impact: 10%
- Unable to answer: 24%
In your opinion, have the Regional Offices helped to increase Amnesty’s legitimacy (its acceptance among important stakeholders and audiences, respect, trust received etc.) as compared to before the GTP?

- Significantly increased acceptance and trust: 10%
- Somewhat increased acceptance and trust: 48%
- No change: 15%
- Decreased acceptance and trust: 5%
- Unable to answer: 23%

In your opinion, do you think that the Regional Offices have created 1) new partnerships with allies/coalitions or 2) new access to human rights mechanisms (such as regional human rights bodies, courts, UN bodies?)

- Significant new partnerships/access: 10%
- Some progress: 25%
- No change: 30%
- Unable to answer: 35%
In your opinion, has the presence of Regional Offices affected the ability of sections or structures to deliver human rights work with increased speed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly increased our speed</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat increased our speed</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has decreased our speed of delivery</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent have external stakeholders (peers, partners, targets etc.) noticed any changes as a result of the ‘new Amnesty’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have noticed significant change</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have noticed some change</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not noticed any change</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How favourably do external stakeholders (peers, targets etc.) perceive the ‘new Amnesty’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more favourably</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more favourably</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less favourably than before</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the establishment of a Regional Office covering your section/structure, do you now have better resources (financial support, material, capacity building etc.) to improve Amnesty's visibility in your country?

- Significantly better: 5%
- Better than before: 33%
- No change: 33%
- Actually worse: 12%
- Unable to answer: 17%

With the establishment of a Regional Office covering your section/structure, do you experience your work to be perceived as:

- More credible: 26%
- No more or less credible: 55%
- Less credible: 2%
- Unable to answer: 17%

In which of the following areas has the GTP resulted in Amnesty's growth? (select as many as applicable)

- External stakeholders: 36%
- Membership: 27%
- Finance: 7%
- None of the above: 31%
To what extent are sections/structures involved with the IS in 1) strategic planning 2) operational planning and 3) budgeting of IS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent has this changed since the establishment and operation of Regional Offices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Operational Planning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly more involved</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat more involved</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become less involved</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion, have the Regional Offices changed the level of alignment of projects/plans between sections/structures and the IS?

- Significantly more aligned: 14%
- Moderately more aligned: 31%
- No change: 19%
- Less alignment: 12%
- Unable to answer: 24%

Overall, was the GTP’s organizational change process managed and led effectively?

- Managed and led very effectively: 2%
- Managed and led somewhat effectively: 48%
- Not managed and led effectively: 31%
- Unable to answer: 19%

External Peers/Partners/Allies Survey

In your opinion, has Amnesty’s portfolio of work in the past 2-3 years become more or less relevant to your country or region than before?

- More relevant: 85%
- No improvement in relevance of portfolio: 12%
- Less relevant: 4%
Over the past 2-3 years, do you think that Amnesty’s work has contributed to greater or less human rights impact in your country or region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More human rights impact</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change in human rights impact</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less human rights impact</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent have you observed any change in acceptance, respect or trust towards Amnesty in the past 2-3 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unable to answer</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in acceptance, respect and trust</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in acceptance, respect and trust</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change, same level of acceptance, respect and trust as before</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent has your relationship with Amnesty changed over the past 2-3 years?

- Unable to answer: 0%
- Improvement: 0%
- No change: 15%
- Less: 9%
- 60% Improvement, 55% No change, 75% Funding from or to Contact, 10% Exchange of information

Annex V: Internal Documents Reviewed

Documents Reviewed

Human Rights Impact

Amnesty’s approach to ESCR: Background note for Management Team Week Session - 31 January 2017
Casefile Review Survey Report - October 2015
Casefiles Statistics - 2014
East Asia Plan – 2014 to 2015
End of year Impact Review - 2015
Evidence for GTP from impact
Individuals at Risk Global Strategy Reporting – 3 & 4; Period: 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2013; 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2014
Keeping Human Rights at the Heart of the Global Transition Program by Nicola Duckworth - July 2013
My Body, My Rights Survey Questions
Re-Visioning Avenues for Advocacy: A Strategic Direction for the Regional Office for East Africa, the Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes - March 2017 (Draft Version)
Recommendations for the Senior Leadership Team and the IS Management Team - 2015
Impact Review Interactive Presentation - 2015
Statistics on UAs and Casefiles - 2012 to 2013
Stop Torture Survey Questions
The Populist Challenge to Human Rights by Philip Alston - December 2016
Theory of Change Summaries – 2016 to 2019
Urgent Actions Statistics - 2014 to 2015
Write for Rights Final Report – 2014 to 2015

Visibility and Credibility

AI Media Presentation – Management Week 2016
Americas Media Highlights - 2016
Amnesty in the News - Week 7 to 13 March 2016
Amnesty International Language Resource Centre - Interpretation services: 2015 Activity & costs/savings report
Amnesty International Language Resource Centre - Translation Activity Report 2014 to 2015
Global NGO Barometer – 2015 to 2016
Growth Data: Sprinklr – 2014 to 2016
Management Week Session 11 - Amnesty Manifesto
PagelInsights Amnesty Global Follower Growth – 2016
PagelInsights Example Sprinklr
Qatar Listening: Social Listening / Mention tracking results – April 2016

Membership Growth and Engagement; and Fundraising

Followers, Supporters, Contributors Definition
Lessons from 2015 SARs
LTP Updated
Management Week Session 13 & 14: Internal Engagement Strategy - 2017 to 2018
Management Week Session 11 - Proposal Growing and Sustaining IM and Supporters
Section Growth Targets & Results Analysis - September 2016
Supporter Engagement Report - December 2016
Supporter Growth: Africa, Americas, Asia, Europe and MENA - 2016 to 2019

Financial Review

Analysis of Cost of Employment by Location - 2016
GTP Final Assessment: Finance Review - 2013 to 2017
GTP Final Assessment: Finance Review Summary - 2013 to 2017
IS Finance Policies Applied to Regional and Overseas Offices - September 2015
Change Management and Internal Processes

- Brussels Office Salary Scale - 2016 to 2017
- Engagement Survey 2015 Results Report for International Secretariat
- IS Engagement Survey 2016
- IS People Survey Result Reports - 2016
- Local vs Non-local Employees per Office Location
- London Office and SLT Salary Scale - April 2016 to March 2017
- ODHR Metrics Report - October 2013
- Recruitment Metrics - 2015 to 2016
- Regional Office Salary Scale - 2016 to 2017
- Review of SLT Structure and Decision: Making Interview Summary and Next Steps - June 2016
- Staff Numbers in Regional Offices - 2012 to 2017
- Turnover Analysis - August 2013

Other Background Documents

- Amnesty International Employee Engagement Survey 2016 - Overall narrative V2
- Dimensions of Change Framework
- Governance Programme Information
- GTP Dashboard Reports - June 2016 to July 2016
- Information on Regional Directors
- Information on Regional Offices
- Majilis Meeting Agenda and TOR - 3 Feb 2017
- Salil’s Monthly Updates - October 2016 to December 2016
- South Africa RO Q1 Report - January 2016 to April 2016
Annex VI: Key Internal Documents

GTP Final Assessment Concept Note

Amnesty International members and staff only

AI Index: ORG 10/3748/2016
To: GTP-GMT Sub-group
From: Minar Pimple & Richard Eastmond
Date: 31 March 2016

Summary

This concept note is designed to outline how we will evaluate the Global Transition Programme (GTP) in 2016. It is a starting point for us to agree with the GTP-GMT sub-group the content and areas for measurement for the GTP Final Assessment report to be issued in 2017. The scope flows from the following statement.

Extract from ICM Decisions 2013 (AI Index: ORG 53/006/2013) on the Global Transition Programme:

“[There will be]... a full-scale evaluation under Board oversight including independent external input, for the Chairs Assembly and ICM of 2017.”

27 August 2013

Distribution
This is an internal document

1. Document Purpose
- This concept note is a summary of the proposal and brief description of the approach to the final assessment of the Global Transition Programme (GTP) in 2016/17 and the objectives to be pursued.
- This document will form the basis of a detailed work plan to be developed by the GTP Final Assessment Working Group which will define how and what we will carry out in the assessment in 2016/17.

2. Summary and Context
At the 2013 International Council Meeting (ICM) it was agreed that a full-scale assessment of the GTP will take place by the end of 2016 (ahead of the 2017 ICM) to enable the movement to better assess the Human Rights impact of the changes that the GTP has achieved.

The ICM Decisions 2013 stated:

“The International Council reiterated the need for robust governance oversight and evaluation of the GTP. We will build on the valuable work of the Reference Group to strengthen trust and confidence. The SG has established a strong on-going monitoring system with quarterly reporting to the International Board and the Global Management Team. There will also be an interim
The GTP interim assessment was conducted in 2014 to evaluate the Wave one Regional Offices in their first year and review the progress made in the implementation of the GTP overall. This report was supplemented by Syracuse University’s external review which compared our transition with the change programmes of other INGOs and made recommendations for the work we needed to do in some operational aspects of the Programme. Both reports were shared with the movement in April 2015. Drawing on actions proposed by each assessment, a consolidated GTP Interim Assessment Action plan was developed in April 2015 and has been updated and monitored by the GTP-GMT subgroup on a monthly basis, and with the International Board at each of their meetings.

ICM Requirements for a final assessment
The ICM Decisions 2013 document set out broad requirements for the final assessment:

- “By end 2016 building on the information gathered through the ongoing monitoring and the results of the interim assessment, a full evaluation will take place extending the interim assessment and in the context of the overall investment made by the movement in the GTP and the GTP Roadmap;
- **Who will be involved in the evaluation:** Regional Office and relevant other staff, Sections, external stakeholders (partners and other bodies);
- **Who is responsible:** SLT, working closely with GTP Subgroup of GMT, the evaluation team to be established to include key internal stakeholders, independent external experts and independent member of the IEC’s Finance and Audit Committee; and
- **Who reviews the report and recommendations:** IEC (with a view of presenting to the ICM in 2017).”

An ICM circular provided further detail of the vision and requirements of the evaluation, where the importance of “having an external and independent evaluation can help those involved shed light on the successes and difficulties resulting from the decisions taken; their recommendations can help decision makers to improve their performance. It is an essential tool of democratic management.”

Independent overview and analysis
The GTP Final Assessment process will be led by an independent team from Syracuse University. Amnesty International first collaborated with Syracuse University while conducting the GTP Interim Assessment in 2014/15. The Syracuse team was tasked with producing an external review of the GTP change management process. They have agreed to engage with us again for the GTP Final Assessment with the added role of providing independent analysis and accountability, as well as overall coordination, of the process.
In addition, Alan McLean, an independent member of the IEC’s Finance and Audit Committee, and Ramesh Singh have also joined the GTP Final Assessment working group as independent external experts.
Within the assessment period, it is likely that we will also draw on the expertise of our Regional Advisory and Oversight Groups (RAGs and ROGs) in order to carry out an independent review of discreet areas of work in particular regions.

3. Purpose of the GTP Final Assessment

The purpose of the GTP Final Assessment is to fulfil an accountability requirement to the movement, and our wider constituencies, in return for the investment by the movement as a whole. By supplementing the indicators developed by a working group of staff and managers from across the IS (detailed in the 2014 GTP Baselines document), with independent analysis, focus groups, interviews and surveys, this evaluation will provide a picture of effectiveness and efficiency in terms of increased volume, quality, speed and relevance of Amnesty’s work as a result of the GTP. It will cover the full period of the Global Transition Programme, from 2013-2016. While this is intended to be the final evaluation of the GTP it is expected that the assessment will generate recommendations for our future planning and operations, beyond the GTP, and will form part of our business as usual learnings and reflections cycle going forward.

4. Scope: Monitoring Effectiveness and Efficiency

Through the monitoring mechanisms laid out in this section, the Assessment will review the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization, in light of the GTP, broken down into the following areas of enquiry:

1. Human Rights impact
2. Visibility and credibility of Amnesty International
3. Engagement with rights holders
4. Collaboration with Amnesty International sections and structures
5. Collaboration between global, regional and Regional Office functions
6. Membership growth and engagement
7. Fundraising
8. Financial review
9. Organizational change and internal processes

Monitoring mechanisms

Further work is currently being carried out to refine the scope and monitoring mechanisms for these areas of enquiry. The summaries provided below are indicative of what will be explored in each area.

1. Human Rights impact

Using the monitoring and evaluation systems that will be rolled out in 2016, we will build a picture of the impact of the GTP on our capacity for delivering human rights impact and, wherever possible, draw conclusions on the human rights impact to date. Data will be drawn mainly from existing impact review information and will be augmented with other additional data as necessary. Regional Offices will be asked to include in their reflections on their impact if, how and why the GTP has improved Amnesty’s capacity for impact and whether it has delivered specific human rights impact in their region using the evidence from our project work. In addition Regional Offices will be asked to document a number of case-studies when a particular success is achieved that in
their view would have been unlikely to have been achieved in the absence of a Regional Office in that location.\textsuperscript{30}

Additional elements such as joint projects with other NGOs and the request for participation in national and regional events and processes, among other examples, will also be useful success indicators and evidence.

The following indicators of internal organizational efficiency for human rights impact may also be drawn on to measure the speed of Amnesty’s responses to human rights violations:

- time between occurrence of violation and the IS response – urgent actions;
- time to turn around a research report - from research inception to report launch;
- level of delivery deadlines met for planned media work.

2. Visibility and credibility of Amnesty International

This area of enquiry will explore the GTP’s contribution to enhancing Amnesty's brand visibility and reputation, including establishing Amnesty as a locally (nationally or regionally) relevant global human rights organization.

We will use anecdotal and survey reporting via the Regional Content Managers and Sections to draw a picture of how GTP has strengthened or limited local relevance, for example: through the provision of tools and campaigning materials at Section-level.

Analytics tools such as Meltwater\textsuperscript{31}, Sprinklr\textsuperscript{32}, web-traffic analysis and data from email and mobile use for petition will be used to draw a picture of the:

- level of pick-up of reactive media work in National, Regional and International media;
- number of Amnesty mentions in key media, including social media;
- quality of media mentions for planned and reactive work.

3. Engagement with rights holders

To understand the impact of the GTP on engagement with rights-holders and partners, the assessment will mix internal perceptions of IS teams and national entities, with external perceptions of a selection of organizations or individuals. This assessment will be predominately based on qualitative data drawn from questionnaires and interviews.

In addition Regional Offices will be asked to provide evidence to what extent the GTP has enabled participation of rights-holders and local partners in all stages of projects. Key questions for the Regional Offices include:

- Who is engaging with us?
- Are they initiating engagement with us or are we initiating it with them?
- Have we engaged with or supported rights-holders’ initiatives?
- Do our interactions tend to be one-off, periodic, or ongoing, and why?

\textsuperscript{30} It should be noted that it will most likely not be possible to effectively source direct evidence of any negative effects of the GTP on human rights impact. It will be important to take this into account when using this evidence in analysis.

\textsuperscript{31} Meltwater - regular reports on media mentions. For the GTP Interim Assessment, media-related data was available only at the international level. Meltwater analytics have now been refined and can be broken down by region for the 2015-2016 period.

\textsuperscript{32} Sprinklr - monthly dashboards that track performance of social media activity; across a range of platforms including Facebook and twitter for both London-based and region-based social media accounts.
• Have we redirected resources away from other local actors?
• What is our reputation in areas where we are relatively new?
• How have we been influenced by or responsive to other actors?
• What is the level of participation by rights-holders in project planning and implementation?

4. Membership growth and engagement
This area of enquiry will assess the GTP’s contribution to growth - in members, funding and mobilisation by monitoring:

- Number of members, supporters and activists and diversity of membership (disaggregated by Regional Office / age / gender); and
- Number of campaign actions taken by members/ supporters / activists – online and off-line

5. Fundraising
For this area of enquiry we will:

- review the fundraising done by IS and Sections to facilitate the GTP and draw on anecdotal evidence from our main funders (Open Society Foundation, Ford and Oak)
- provide an assessment of how GTP grants from (Open Society Foundation, Ford and Oak) were spent;
- provide a report on how we have been able to leverage the Regional Offices to increase trusts and foundation income going forward;
- report on the number of Sections with membership/supporter growth targets (contributing to the 25 million target in Goal 5)
- report on the number of Sections with fundraising targets (contributing to the 4 million donors and €400 million target in Goal 5)
- carry out an assessment of how the Fundraising Investment Fund grants are spend – drawing on monthly reporting on donor-funding and finance data

We anticipate that our review will be high-level as it is likely that it will be too soon to assess the impact of the Fundraising and Engagement directorate, which was first established in September 2015. In addition, as of March 2016, we are only aware of a few Sections that have membership/supporter growth targets contributing to the global 25 million supporter target in Goal 5.

6. Collaboration with Amnesty International Sections and structures
This area aims to examine whether collaboration between the IS and Sections and structures has led to a recalibration of global versus regional/local priorities and ways of working.

Drawing on impact review, interview, focus group discussions and survey data, we will review the incidences of joint planning and implementation between Sections and structures and the IS. We will explore the role of the Sections and structures and the IS in joint projects and the scale of the engagement including the number of joint projects, reports and outputs.

7. Collaboration between global, regional and Regional Office functions
This area of enquiry will examine the efficiency of provision of global and regional services to Regional Offices and if ways of working have adapted sufficiently to reflect the new organization.

8. Financial review
This area of enquiry will review the financial aspects of the Global Transition Programme (GTP) covering the period 2013-2016. Using the assumptions outlined in the GTP Roadmap as the baseline for our comparative analysis we will review:

- overall actual spend vs the GTP Roadmap, including a review of the overall GTP investment and analysis of:
  - how/why budget increased
  - how the increased budget was mitigated by additional funding (external grants)
  - the impact on free reserves.
- headcount and people costs
- one-off and ongoing infrastructure costs, including Capital Expenditure vs Operating Expenditure
- regional spend, including the shift of expenditure to the Global South and income projections following increased investments in fundraising
- the changing nature of human rights expenditure, for example looking at:
  - activity spend of Africa Regional Offices in 2016 vs Africa Programme in 2013; and
  - key or priority project spend vs activity.

9. Organizational Change and internal processes

This area of enquiry will build on the External GTP Review of the change management process carried out as part of the GTP Interim Assessment in 2014/2015. Drawing on the GTP Interim Assessment Action Plan, we will assess the progress made on recommendations outlined in the interim assessment that relate to this area of enquiry. Perceptions of the change management process will be gathered through the following mechanisms:

- 2016 staff engagement survey, drawing on comparative data from the 2013 and 2015 surveys. In 2016, in addition to the pre-set questions, we will ask open-ended questions about any remaining tensions between Amnesty culture’s and the GTP objectives. This will be followed up on in interviews and focus groups.
- Interviews carried out by Syracuse University with a selection of external stakeholders e.g. advocacy targets, partners, and peer organizations
- Engagement with the staff and union
- GTP Interim Assessment Action Plan - supplemented by interviews and focus group discussions.

This area of enquiry will also provide a high level assessment of the GTP operational processes drawing on business as usual sources, including:

- Monthly management accounts
- Recruitment and vacancy analysis (e.g. time to hire and diversity of candidates)
- Visa provision
- Monthly Dashboards and organizational KPIs.
5. Limitations and exclusions

Limitations
The impact analysis of this evaluation will be limited due to:

- The phased ‘three-wave’ approach to setting up the Regional Offices. Although the majority of our Regional Offices will operational as planned, during 2016, there have been delays in the set-up and the extent to which each office has been established varies significantly. Therefore it will be difficult to assess all areas of enquiries across all locations.
- The GTP full scale assessment will mainly focus on the work and outputs of the six fully functioning Regional Offices in Africa (Dakar, Johannesburg and Nairobi), East Asia (Hong Kong), the Americas Regional Office (Mexico City) and Europe and Central Asia (London, Brussels and Moscow).
- Some baseline data is not available for the whole period of the GTP and some data is no longer deemed relevant.
- Due to capacity limitations, we may need to share the focus of reporting across Regional Offices e.g. the West and Central Africa Regional Office may be requested to assess work with partners and the East Africa Regional Office maybe be ask to monitor relationships with decision-makers.
- As we do not have the resources to carry out an in-depth evaluation of everything, the working group has selected a smaller number of indicators that, collectively, aims to provide an indicative picture of the change, rather than a definitive and exhaustive one.

Exclusions
- This evaluation will not cover the National Offices.

6. Key reporting outputs

- The final report will be restricted to 30 pages, with appendices.
- A first draft/ overview of assessment progress and initial findings will be shared the movement for comment in Spring 2017.
- The GTP Final Assessment Report will be shared with the movement at the ICM in September 2017.

7. Key dependencies

- IS and movement-wide impact evaluation (cut-off point: end 2016/early 2017)
- ICM September 2017

8. Roles and responsibilities

The table below outlines the proposed roles and responsibilities in relation to the delivery and outputs of the GTP Final Assessment. This will be further refined with respect to the details/expected contribution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| External evaluation team    | • Tosca Bruno-van Vijfeijken, Syracuse University  
• Steven J Lux, Syracuse University  
• Shreeya Neupane, Syracuse University  
• Ramesh Singh, International Organization Director, Greenpeace International  
• Alan McLean, independent FAC member | • Contribute, validate and agree the design of the assessment  
• Provide independent assessment and analysis, oversight and advice for the overall project  
• External stakeholder interactions  
• First draft report  
• Final Report |
| Steering Committee          | • Esteban Beltran, GTP-GMT sub-group and Section Director, AI Spain  
• Richard Eastmond, Senior Director, ODHR  
• Minar Pimple, Senior Director Global Operations  
• Catherine Power, Director of Strategy and Evaluation | • Oversight, including providing feedback, reviewing the report and providing recommendations to SLT and IB  
• Responsible for Regional Offices and report delivery and distributing to the movement |
| Project Team                | • Buffy Price, Project Manager  
• Helen Bailly, Project Manager  
• Philippa Dunn, Head of Operations for the Language Resource Centre  
• Tim Ludford, Lead Advisor, Impact and Evaluation | • Project Management of the GTP Assessment Working group |
| Human Rights Impact subgroup| • Ramesh Singh, International Organization Director, Greenpeace International  
• Minar Pimple, Senior Director Global Operations  
• Catherine Power, Director of Strategy and Evaluation | • Data gathering and analysis |
| Visibility and Credibility subgroup | • Jane Clancey, Head of Brand  
• Philippa Dunn, Head of Operations for the Language Resource Centre  
*Others tbc* | • Data gathering and analysis |
| Organizational Change subgroup | • Tosca Bruno-van Vijfeijken, Syracuse University | • Data gathering and analysis |
9. Timescales and key milestones
The key activities and milestones are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity/ Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise format for reporting, responsibilities and timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree external/ independent review approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree reporting methodology and framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign off concept note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Human Rights Impact subgroup finalises scope and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April–June</td>
<td>GTP Assessment working group develops and completes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Project work-plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Stakeholder mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Indicator mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Project design and methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interview protocol design
- Survey protocol design
- Sampling approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>• Interim check-in of progress and review of any potential risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17 July 2016</td>
<td>• CADF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>• Staff engagement survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 - January 2017</td>
<td>• Begin to conduct GTP Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct focus groups and qualitative discussions (Sections, staff, Union, partners, RAG etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb/ March 2017</td>
<td>• GTP Final Assessment Report v1 - Initial preparation of report to SLT with headlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26 March 2017</td>
<td>• CADF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>• Share findings with relevant Sections and RAG for input and narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation to GTP-GMT sub-group on preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share with International Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree process of monitoring key recommendations emerging from the assessment with the GTP-GMT subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share how we will report to the Board and movement via Chairs Assembly and ICM 11-15 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM 11-17 September 2017</td>
<td>Findings presented by the International Board and SG to the Chairs Assembly and ICM 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2017</td>
<td>Share the report with the movement and process for monitoring key recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost and budget implications
- External consultants
- Travel budget

### References and source information
- GTP Reference Group Report ORG 30 002 2013
- GTP Roadmap ORG 30 001 2013
- GTP Baselines POL 50 002 2014
- GTP Interim Assessment ORG 30 1027 2015
- GTP external review: Syracuse University study
- GTP Interim Assessment Action Plan
Finance Review

This area of enquiry will review the financial aspects of the Global Transition Programme (GTP) covering the period 2013-2017.

We will consider the following areas of review:

1. Analysis of overall actual spend versus the GTP Roadmap
2. Headcount and ongoing people costs
3. Ongoing infrastructure and support costs
4. The changing nature of ongoing activity expenditure
5. Regional spend analysis
6. Income & expenditure projections
7. Operational risks

The scope of this review is purely financial. The results should be considered alongside other Areas of Enquiry to conclude the extent to which the additional costs and risks of GTP are supported by increased human rights impact.

SUMMARY

- Net overall GTP one-off cost is close to original projections, while ongoing costs are higher than envisaged in the Roadmap. The project has achieved its aim of moving resources to the global south, and has freed up £10.1m to be invested in future income growth.
- Net one-off cost to the movement is currently forecast to be £11.2m against the £11.5m original projection (due to the contribution of three Global Foundations which offset the additional costs). The ongoing costs of the GTP will be absorbed into an overall budget framework where assessment income is £8.6m (12%) less than the GTP Roadmap, whilst headcount is 94 (17%) more than the Roadmap.
- Final GTP costs are forecast to be £14.0m, £2.5m (22%) higher than projected in the GTP Roadmap but £0.4m lower than the £2.9m project overspend projected in our GTP interim assessment in 2015.
  - Overspends were driven by:
    - Inaccuracies in data used for the GTP Roadmap - reforecasts published after the GTP Roadmap were much more accurate and predicted total one-off costs of £14.4m.
    - Changes in political climate (such as the coup in Thailand) leading to delays in the establishment of regional offices. This contributed to higher project staff costs, higher redundancy costs, and other cost increases related to inflation,
    - The establishment of multiple-location regional office models.
    - Higher than expected staff-related costs such as relocations and recruitments.
  - Overspend on GTP has been offset by grant income totalling £2.8m.
- On an ongoing basis, the new regional office model will cost more than the pre-existing model, due to additional infrastructure costs and, latterly, foreign currency movement:
  - Estimated using GTP Roadmap (January 2013) exchange rates, regional office staff costs would be £0.5m (4%) lower than the equivalent London cost but additional infrastructure costs add £2.4m (39%) of expenditure a year (taking into account a small reduction in London running costs).
  - By applying current (January 2017) exchange rates, regional office staff costs increase by £3.7m and infrastructure costs by £0.5m.
- The magnitude of cost increases will depend critically on future currency exchange rates and the organisation is exposed to greater risk in this regard. These risks were not anticipated in the GTP
Roadmap.

- GTP has achieved an increase in the allocation of resources to the global South, with 40% of 2017 expenditure budgeted in the global South compared to 21% in 2012. Further reallocation of funds and resources to regional offices would be required to achieve the target of 64% by 2017 set out in the GTP Roadmap.
- The IS is budgeting an increase in the proportion of income spent on direct Human Rights works compared to the GTP Roadmap, with 57% of assessment income budgeted to be spent on Human Rights work in 2017 compared to 55% in the Roadmap.
- Overall lower income than GTP Roadmap has resulted in reduced expenditure by the IS across Grants and direct IS Human Rights work compared to the Roadmap, although the impact has been lessened by the IS utilising Free Reserves to run a planned deficit in 2017 thereby increasing the ratio of income spent on Human Rights work.
- The sale of premises in London generated a profit of £10.1m from proceeds of £16.5m and was possible due to the reduction in staff brought about by GTP. Investment of these funds into fundraising initiatives is designed to generate ongoing returns for the Movement. This benefit was not envisaged in the GTP Roadmap.

1. ANALYSIS OF OVERALL ACTUAL SPEND VERSUS THE GTP ROADMAP

a) GTP One-Off Costs

One-off costs of the GTP include infrastructure set-up, redundancy, recruitment and relocation costs, and salaries for those employees whose role has been 100% focused on GTP delivery.

The current forecast\(^{33}\) of total GTP one-off are compared to forecasted expenditure laid out in the GTP Roadmap, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Forecast</th>
<th>GTP Roadmap</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Related Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outplacement</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.2</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>8.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Set-up Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMT &amp; Other Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 GTP has not yet finished meaning the current forecast encompasses actual costs from 2012 to August 2016 plus forecast costs from September 2016 to the end of 2017, as per the most recent reforecast performed at Q3 of 2016.
Final GTP costs are forecast to be £14.0m, £2.5m (22%) higher than projected in the GTP Roadmap but £0.4m lower than the £2.9m project overspend projected in our GTP interim assessment. As noted in the GTP interim assessment:

“Changes in the GTP budget projections occurred largely as a result of firming up many of the assumptions around the people-related costs of transition, which at the time of preparing the Roadmap were largely untested. The key factors which have impacted the GTP budget are:

- Concluding the International Reward Framework after the Roadmap, which gave more clarity on salary scales and employee benefits
- The differing mix of people joining the Regional Offices has impacted salary related benefits and therefore costs (i.e. the proportion that are single or in partnerships, with/without children etc.)
- The number of local vs international hires, together with varying costs of relocating individuals globally results in changeable relocation costs
- The number of colleagues in the Regional Offices versus those remaining in London has varied since initial calculations.”

Details of the expenditure on each type of cost are outlined below.

**Staff Related Costs**

**Relocation Costs** are expected to be £1.6m (726%) higher than projected. This is due to both the average cost per relocation and the overall volume of relocations being higher than assumed per the GTP Roadmap:

- The average relocation cost per person is approximately £19k, £14k higher than estimated in the GTP Roadmap. These increased costs are due to a number of staff relocation benefits laid out in the International Reward Framework (IRF) developed after the GTP Roadmap and therefore not included in our initial projections. Note: Actual per person relocation costs vary considerably depending on individual circumstances such as geographical location, family size, schooling and local customs laws.

The total number of individuals (both existing employees and new hires) relocated to Regional Offices is expected to be 98, 54 higher than the 44 anticipated in the GTP Roadmap. The GTP Roadmap assumed that all new hires would be recruited from local candidate pools so that relocation costs would only be incurred by existing employees moving to a regional office. In reality, it has sometimes proved both difficult to source suitable candidates from local labour markets and not consistent with the need for the offices to represent the diversity of the Regional served. This has led to an increased number of international relocations requiring relocation. In addition, the GTP Roadmap did not conceive of the use of short-term assignments (STA) in establishing regional offices. We had 9 STAs, of which 3 converted to a permanent role in location so whilst having an important role in supporting the transition process, STAs have driven double relocation costs in 6 cases.

**Recruitment costs** are forecast to be £1.2m, £0.5m (80%) higher than estimated in the GTP Roadmap and £0.3m lower than anticipated at the GTP interim assessment. The drivers of the variance are:

- The average per person recruitment cost is £5k, compared to £3k estimated in the GTP Roadmap.
This is due to:

- Advertising across a number of mediums required in order to reach candidate pools
- Higher interview costs as candidates are based over a wider geographical area than expected in the GTP Roadmap
- Re-advertising of some roles as suitable candidates not found in initial round of recruitment
- The total number of recruitments is projected to be 236 compared to 219 in the GTP Roadmap due to a smaller number of existing employees permanently relocating with their roles than anticipated.

**Redundancy costs** are forecast to be £5.1m, £0.4m (7%) lower than the £5.5m assumption in the Roadmap. The drivers of the variance are:

- A total of 156 employees are estimated to be made redundant at the conclusion of the GTP, this is 61 fewer than projected in the GTP Roadmap because we were able to redeploy 80 staff, more than anticipated.
- The variance in actual headcount versus the GTP Roadmap is offset by a higher than expected average redundancy cost per person of £33k, compared to £25k in the GTP Roadmap.
- Higher redundancy costs were in part due to implementation delays that have a knock on effect on final redundancy calculations which are based on salary and length of service.

**Outplacement costs** amount to £0.1m and relate to training and support given to employees who were made redundant. These costs were not factored into the GTP Roadmap.

A summary of the variances of GTP Roadmap assumptions for one-off staff related cost is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Roadmap</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redundancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>£1,541k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per employee</td>
<td>£33k</td>
<td>£25k</td>
<td>(£8k)</td>
<td>(£1,173k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(£51k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per employee</td>
<td>£5k</td>
<td>£3k</td>
<td>(£2k)</td>
<td>(£477k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(£270k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per employee</td>
<td>£19k</td>
<td>£5k</td>
<td>(£14k)</td>
<td>(£1,327k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(£1,756k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure Set-up Costs**

**Facilities costs** relate to the capital and operating expense of refurbishing and fitting out new offices. These costs will be substantially lower than estimated and the current forecast total is £1.4m, a reduction of £0.7m (32%) against the £2.1m projection in the GTP Roadmap. Wave 1 office set up costs were £87k on average, against the £346k forecast, and actual spend for office set-up for waves 2 and 3 averaged £136k against the forecast of £162k. These savings are offset by the £0.2m additional spend on offices in Tunis, East Jerusalem, Washington, and the European Institutions Office in Brussels, that had not been anticipated at the time of the GTP Roadmap.
IT costs are expected to be £2.1m, £0.3m (17%) higher than the GTP Roadmap with the variance due to spend on additional offices that were not planned at the time of the GTP Roadmap. The £66-167k estimate for each office in the GTP Roadmap was broadly accurate, with the exception of the Africa regional offices where actual £105k spend was considerably lower than the projected £167k. These savings were achieved through an unused contingency built into the GTP Roadmap for wave 1 and because the media ISDN rooms were not built.

During the course of GTP, two solutions for the installation of IT were created: a Full IT Solution and a Small Office IT Solution, the latter applied to Washington, East Jerusalem and Moscow, with a Full IT Solution adopted for all other offices. The average cost per office of each IT solution was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full IT Solution</th>
<th>Small Office IT Solution</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost</td>
<td>£115k</td>
<td>£21k</td>
<td>£90k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition Management Team (TMT) & Other Project Staff costs** relate to the TMT and staff working solely on GTP to support the Regional Office set-up (across IT, Finance, Media, Research Support and Human Resources) and induction and training of new staff. The total cost of £1.8m exceeds the estimate in the GTP Roadmap of £1.2m by £0.6m (46%) and is attributed to the delays in the completion of GTP. The GTP Roadmap projected that TMT costs would only be incurred from 2012 to 2014, however GTP project staff have been required up until the expected GTP completion date in 2017. Furthermore, the GTP Roadmap underestimated the level of support that would be required from staff in London generally and regarding training and induction of new Regional Office staff.

**Other costs** total £0.5m and mainly relate to security (£0.2m), external consultancy advice (£0.2m) and legal fees (£0.1m). These costs were not captured in the GTP Roadmap assumptions and account for the £0.5m overspend.

**b) External Funding**

A total of £2.8m ($4.2m) in grant funding was awarded to Amnesty by the Ford Foundation, Open Society Foundations (OSF) and Oak Foundation specifically to fund the set-up of the regional offices.

As US organisations, Ford and OSF were not able to fund capital expenditure so their grants were used to cover Staff related costs in the main. The Oak Foundation GTP-funding was unrestricted.
The grants were straightforward to manage due to their minimal reporting requirements and broadly non-restrictive nature. As such, obtaining and managing the grants did not reduce the Fundraising team’s capacity to perform business as usual work. Furthermore, the GTP grants were the first significant sums of money received by the International Secretariat from OSF, Oak and Ford in recent years and have led to the establishment of strong relationships with each foundation. Future funding has been secured from Ford ($5m from 2017 to 2021) and OSF ($4m from 2017 to 2020) with Oak also showing an intention to fund Amnesty in the future. Such funding may not have been secured without the establishment of these relationships during the GTP.

c) Impact on Free Reserves
As the GTP Roadmap did not anticipate this external funding the £2.5m overspend in the GTP budget has been offset by this additional income. Overall, the net impact on Free Reserves will be £11.2m, £0.3m less than estimated in the GTP Roadmap. However, the funding was not obtained to mitigate against the GTP overspends and it is likely that the same grants would have been obtained had the GTP budget stayed in line with the Roadmap. Therefore had GTP one-off cost overspends not occurred, the net impact on Free Reserves would be £8.7m.

2. HEADCOUNTER AND ONGOING PEOPLE COSTS
a) Headcount by location
The current forecast number of full time equivalents (FTEs)\(^3\) in December 2017 (post GTP completion) is 632 compared to 538 estimated in the GTP Roadmap. The forecast assumes 326 FTEs (52% of the total FTEs) will be based outside of London, compared to 336 FTEs (62%) in the Roadmap. The breakdown by region is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Workers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) Global includes New York, Geneva and the LRC offices in Paris and Madrid.
\(^**\) ECA includes the EIO office in Brussels (15 FTEs) which was acquired in 2015 and not planned as part of the original GTP Roadmap. ECA also includes staff based in London who work for the ECA programme (38 FTEs).

FTEs in London are 104 higher than planned in the Roadmap. A conscious decision was made by the IS to retain higher numbers of staff in London than originally planned in the Roadmap, in order to maintain programmatic centres of excellence in London. Additionally operational decisions made independently of

\(^3\) Full time equivalents (FTEs) is a measure of working hours that represents one full time employee. For London employees 35 hours represents one FTE. For example if there are two employees; one that works 35 hours and one that works 17.5 then total FTEs would be 1.5 (35/35 + 17.5/35).
GTP in the 5 years since the Roadmap has led to increased London headcount. Finally an inaccurate assessment of current FTEs when the Roadmap was prepared in 2012 accounts for some of the variance. The total number of FTEs based outside of London is 10 lower than outlined in the Roadmap. This is not significant and represents changes to the detailed Regional Office organisational models that were agreed following the publication of the GTP Roadmap. This also accounts for significant variances in the number of FTEs in each region with fewer in Africa and Asia and more in MENA and ECA. These variances are also due to inaccuracies in calculating headcount by region when the GTP Roadmap was set. The increase in ECA is because of the likely treatment of ECA as within London at the time of the Roadmap, and the increase in MENA is due to growth of the headcount and the addition of the Tunis and East Jerusalem offices that were not planned in the Roadmap.

b) Ongoing staff costs

‘Staff costs’ include salaries, social security and employer pension contributions and represent the largest part of total ongoing regional office costs. In 2017, regional office staff costs are budgeted at £16.4m - 74% of the total regional office budget of £22.1m. In order to access the total impact of moving closer to the ground on ongoing costs, it is important to compare the cost of staff in regional offices against the equivalent cost of staff based in London.

The cost of employment varies considerably from office to office, for any given Grade. The annual cost per employee for each location, when converted to GBP, is shown below:

![Annual Employment Cost per Employee - translated at GTP Roadmap (January 2013) exchange rates](image)

The chart above shows annual cost per employee for each location using London as a benchmark at 100%. Costs include gross salary, social security, employer pension contributions, medical and life insurance. Amounts are based on a Step 1 salary, as per the 2016/17 salary scales.

Using the GTP Roadmap (January 2013) exchange rates, the graph illustrates that the majority of locations have lower staff costs than London. The exceptions are Hong Kong, European offices and USA offices which are more expensive because of the higher cost of living, higher social security charges (for European offices) and higher medical insurance costs (for USA offices). Based on the 248 FTEs forecast to be located in new regional offices by the end of GTP, we estimate that total annual staff costs would be £0.5m (4%) lower than were the same staff located in London. However, this figure is highly dependent on the exchange rates applied: under current exchange rates (as of January 2017) the cost would be £3.2m (18%) higher than the London equivalent due to the weak Pound. See Appendix A for the annual employment cost per
employee by location when January 2017 exchange rates are applied, which demonstrates how the majority of locations are currently more expensive than London, although this is offset by income which has increased as a result of rate changes.

The difference between staff costs in regional offices and London will change over time as salary scales are adjusted each year to reflect changes to the country’s inflation rates and the exchange rate between the local currency and the hard currency that salaries are paid in. As such, the cost of employment will increase at different rates between different locations, as shown below for Wave 1 offices.

The graph above shows annual cost for a Grade 5 employee using the London 2014/15 cost as a benchmark at 100%. Costs include gross salary, social security and employer pension contributions. Converted to GBP at January 2017 exchange rates.

Therefore the effect of having staff in regional offices is an increased exposure to foreign currency exchange risk, and economic and political risks which may affect inflation rates. This is discussed further in Section 7. Operational risks.

c) Other staff costs
Other ongoing staff related costs for regional offices are incurred by the central human resources team and are summarised below.

Medical insurance is not required for London based staff but represents a large additional cost for all regional office staff (excluding the EIO). The total budget in 2017 for medical insurance is £0.6m and is expected to increase to c£1.0m once the full cohort of regional office staff is recruited. Projected annual cost per regional office employee is £3k, but increases to £23k for USA-based staff.

Life Insurance costs are three times greater for regional office staff than London staff. However the total cost remains relatively low at £0.1m.

Relocation costs are anticipated to increase as a result of GTP with a higher proportion of international recruitments for regional offices required compared to London based roles. The average cost of relocation as part of GTP was £19k but varies significantly depending on locations, family sizes and individual
circumstances. For example, the cost for an individual with no family relocating to Tunis is on average £14k whereas the cost for a family of four relocating to the USA is £32k.

3. ONGOING INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT COSTS
This section reviews the ongoing cost of running regional offices. We consider all support functions (workplace services, IT, finance, security and legal) and how these costs have increased in relation to the opening of new regional offices and decreased in London with the reduction in office size.

a) Regional Office costs
Operating expenditure on regional office support costs in 2017 is budgeted at £2.1m, equal to 10% of the total Regional Office budget. This covers the cost of workplace services (£1.6m), IT (£0.3m), security (£0.1m) and finance (£0.1m). Included within this figure is a high-level estimated cost of £0.2m for the South East Asia and South Asia offices, which have not yet been established.

The graph below gives the 2017 budget for regional office support costs, on a total basis and per employee.

In addition to the above, there are staff costs in regional offices that relate to support functions. Most regional offices have a Finance and Office Manager and a Finance and Office Assistant to manage workplace and financial matters. The 2017 budget for these staff costs is £0.8m.

There is no capital expenditure budgeted for regional offices in 2017 because all offices are new and should not require significant refurbishment or replacement of assets. In future years capital expenditure is expected to remain low as all regional offices are leased with landlords liable for most capital cost. Replacement of laptops, other IT equipment, air conditioning units, security systems and fire systems will be the main capital expenditure incurred, and is estimated to cost around £0.2m per year based on their theoretical working life.

b) Proceeds from sale of property / costs reductions in London
In June 2015, the IS sold the properties at 25-28 Easton Street in London. The sale of the property was possible due to the reduction in London staff brought about by GTP. The profits of £10.1m, and proceeds of £16.5m, generated by the sale were invested in refurbishing the remaining London property and provided as grants to Amnesty Sections aimed at increased fundraising income.

In addition to the profit generated upon sale, the reductions in ongoing workplace operating expenditure resulting from the disposal of these London office premises are expected to total around £0.2m per year, equal to a 13% saving. This is not proportionate to the 45% reduction in real estate footprint because of the nature of the fixed costs to support the office space in London.

Overall capital expenditure for the reduced in size London office is not expected to decrease significantly. However, the disposal of part of the office will reduce the capital expenditure risk as the likelihood of major future repair and replacement work is decreased.

c) Estimated net effect
An additional £2.1m in operating expenditure for regional offices and £0.8m for support staff costs will be offset by a £0.2m saving in London. Therefore, the estimated net effect will be an increase in expenditure of £2.7m each year. Note, this is based on budgeted exchange rates: using January 2013 GTP Roadmap rates the increase would be £2.4m, or £2.9m using the latest January 2017 rates. The increase in support costs is due to a loss of economies of scale as a result of regionalisation.

Capital expenditure is not expected to change significantly. However, the capital expenditure exposure is reduced due to selling part of the London premises in exchange for taking new offices under lease.

Finally, note that this analysis does not include analysing the additional resources required by the London support functions in relation to regional offices. The scope of work of the London support functions has increased in scale and complexity as a result of moving closer to the ground, including the creation of new roles such the Global Security Advisor and Global Mobility officer.

4. THE CHANGING NATURE OF ONGOING ACTIVITY EXPENDITURE
The final component of regional office spend is in relation to the direct costs of performing human rights work. This includes, for example, the cost of travelling on missions, hosting conferences, engaging consultants and publishing campaigning material. In 2017, the regional office budget for these activities is £3.6m, 16% of the total regional office budget.

An assumption made before the start of GTP, but not specified in the GTP Roadmap, was that the direct costs of performing human rights work would reduce as a result of moving closer to the ground. As a simple example, it was anticipated that travel costs would reduce due to regional office staff needing to travel shorter distances to reach the sights of human rights abuses.

It is difficult to prove or disprove this hypothesis through review of financial records. Major changes in the way the organisation operates have occurred in the years since GTP began and therefore is not possible to compare the cost of human rights projects on a like for like basis. Anecdotal evidence suggests that cost savings, or cost increases, vary on a case-by-case basis but are not always as straight forward as expected. For example, the cost of travelling from an African regional office to another African country can be more expensive than the cost of travelling to the same country from London due to limitations of internal transport in Africa and the fact that flights are often routed via a hub airport outside the continent.

Equally we have not been able to track if the overall cost of missions has increased or decreased, or increased in frequency.
5. REGIONAL SPEND ANALYSIS

The GTP Roadmap stated ‘The increase in assessment allows us to increase our spend on resources in the global South from 21% in 2012 to 64% by 2017 in line with our strategy, while retaining a strong Global Hub in London’. In 2017, budgeted spend on the global South is 40%, and increases in relative spend can be seen in all non-London regions (excluding ‘Global’). This evidences that there has been a change in resource allocation on the global South in the intended direction.
The extent to which this has occurred is far lower than predicted. Predominantly, this is driven by variances in headcount with many more staff based in London than the GTP Roadmap assumed, due to incorrect assumptions around current FTEs in the Roadmap and a decision to retain more programmatic staff in London. In addition, in 2017 the South East Asia and South Asia offices are in the process of being established in their regional locations. An increase in resource allocation to the global South will be seen once all offices are established but still to a lesser extent than predicted in the GTP Roadmap. High-level budget modelling calculates that by 2021, 53% of total expenditure could be allocated to the global South if all additional income in the next five years is allocated to the regional offices.

6. INCOME & EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS

The current forecast estimates total income over the 6 year period between 2012 and 2017 to be £360m, £25.1m less than the Roadmap, primarily due to lower assessment income.

Expenditure over the same period was planned to increase as a result, with the increased income to be spent on higher expenditure in the Global South (see section 5), including annual increases in Grants to Sections and Structures ‘from £4.5m to £14m’ by 2017.

As income projections are now lower than the Roadmap, this has affected the IS’ ability to achieve this expenditure increase, with total planned Grants to Sections and Structures of £52.6m, £12.8m lower than the Roadmap and Operational Costs £9.2m than the Roadmap.

Despite this we have seen Human Rights work undertaken directly from the IS has increase over the GTP to £35.2m annually, which although below the Roadmap target of £39m, still represents an increase in direct Human Rights expenditure, with 57% of assessment income budgeted to be spent on Human Rights work in 2017 compared to 55% in the Roadmap.

Overall lower income than Roadmap has resulted in reduced expenditure by the IS across Grants and direct IS Human Rights work, although the impact has been lessened by the IS utilising Free Reserves to run a planned deficit in 2017 thereby increasing the ratio of income spent on Human Rights work.

7. OPERATIONAL RISKS

In previous sections of this report, the ongoing cost implications of operating regional offices have been reviewed. Another consideration is how the operational risk faced by the organisation have grown, which may have future financial implications. The main risks are summarised below:
Foreign currency exchange risk: Total expenditure of £22.1m is budgeted for regional offices in 2017 and all will be paid in foreign currencies. As such, the organisation is exposed to considerable additional foreign currency exchange risk, as the cost of regional offices operations will increase or decrease depending on exchange rates. The risks can be mitigated, though not eliminated, through methods including hedging but these bring about additional fees and administrative burden.

Economic and political risk: The costs incurred by regional offices will vary depending on the country’s economic and political conditions. This will affect not only the cost of purchases from third party suppliers but also staff costs since salary scales are linked to inflation rates and employment taxes will be determined by local governments. Operations of regional offices could be restricted by local authorities.

Security risk: As the International Secretariat’s global footprint has increased, so has its assumption of risk in some of the regions where we operate. Ensuring we do our best to keep staff safe and secure in these locations could incur significant costs through a variety of necessary measures, including physical security, training programs, and support platforms.

Legal risk: Operating in a greater number of legal jurisdictions increases the risk of non-compliance, for example in relation to employment law. This may bring about future costs for legal advice, penalties and compensation.

APPENDIX A – ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT COSTS PER EMPLOYEE – JANUARY 2017 EXCHANGE RATES
Below is the same graph presented in section 2. Headcount and ongoing people costs. However this graph uses the latest exchange rates as of January 2017 whereas the original uses GTP Roadmap (January 2013) rates. The weakening Pound means that nearly all locations are more expensive than London as of January 2017.

The chart above shows annual cost per employee for each location using London as a benchmark at 100%. Costs include gross salary, social security, employer pension contributions, medical and life insurance. Amounts are based on a Step 1 salary, as per the 2016/17 salary scales.
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