

**More than the Sum of the Parts:
Report of a Global Evaluation of Peace Brigades International
(EXTERNAL VERSION¹)**

Jean Christie, May 26, 2011

Contents	Page
1. Executive Summary	2
2. Introduction and Context	3
3. Terms of Reference and Evaluation Objectives	3
4. Evaluation Methodology and Data Gathering Techniques	4
5. Evaluation, Impacts and PBI's Work – A Reality Check	6
6. Findings and Recommendations	9
6.1 General Findings Relevant to PBI's Impact	9
6.2 Findings – “Field” Projects	19
6.3 Findings – Advocacy	22
6.4 Findings – Communications	28
6.5 Findings – Country Groups	29
6.6 Findings – Impacts	34
7. Summary of Recommendations	38
8. List of Appendices	42
Appendix 1: Document Review	
Appendix 2 (A and B): Questionnaire for all PBI Entities	
Appendix 3 (A and B): Survey Monkey data	
Appendix 4: Field Visit to Colombia	
Appendix 5: Interviews Conducted	
Appendix 6: Table – Types of Advocacy	
Appendix 7: Activities by PBI Entity - Summary of Questionnaire Responses	
Appendix 8: Table – Impact Indicators	

Thank you

It has been a pleasure to conduct this evaluation for PBI, and to learn about its remarkable work. Without exception, the people I met, whether in person, on the telephone, or in writing, were generous with their time, and as helpful and forthright with their insights and reflections as they could be. All wanted to contribute critically to this evaluation, and to the continued success of PBI, which has clearly won the affection and respect of those who know it. I hope this report justifies their investment.

I offer a sincere thank you to all who made my work not only possible, but also an intellectual challenge, and a pleasure. I especially thank Emily Felt and Laura Clarke, whose active support throughout the process was consistent; Susi Bascon and PBI UK volunteers who managed to translate two questionnaires in a very tight timeframe; and Lisa Kunkel, who organized an intense and illuminating week for me in Bogotá. Finally, I thank all of the people who read the first draft of this report, and offered both corrections of fact, additional information, and comment.

Thank you

¹ This is an edited version of the evaluator's report to safeguard confidential information.

1. Executive Summary

It is difficult to summarize anything but the highest-level findings of this evaluation, the recommendations of which are quite detailed. A summary of the recommendations appears at the end of this report. High-level findings include the following:

- PBI is a values-based organization, whose mandate is clear, remains relevant, and is supported by all those who know PBI's work. PBI has a remarkable network of committed staff, volunteers and external supporters, who can be counted on to improve the impact of PBI's efforts as necessary.
- PBI is a "learning organization" that is sincerely committed to improving the quality of its work and its impact, at all levels of its intervention.
- In recent years, PBI has taken significant steps to consolidate its disparate efforts globally, including in the areas of advocacy, fundraising, communications, public image and the work of Country Groups. It has similarly taken steps to integrate its structure more fully, with an International Office that offers support to all sectors of the organization. In all these efforts, PBI appears to be on the right track, if it wishes to consolidate and make its organizational impact more visible, and get the most out of all its contributing "entities".
- Programmatically, Protective Accompaniment, defined broadly, is, and should remain PBI's "signature". Protective Accompaniment should remain at heart of everything PBI does, and how it defines itself.
- The integration of all PBI's programmatic activities is central to the success of PBI's Protective Accompaniment. Efforts should be made to illustrate the integration of PBI's different activities and organizational structures, and to deepen the integration of all PBI efforts among field Projects, Country Groups and the International Office, where weaknesses exist.
- To be effective, "impact indicators" and future PBI monitoring and evaluation will have to take account of the complex and multi-faceted nature of PBI's work, and the methodological challenges it raises. A mix of indicators and monitoring tools will be needed to assess the quality of individual activities, and (critically) their impact in combination. Attempts to assess PBI's impact on the basis of isolated activities, without reference to the whole of PBI and the context in which it works, will risk missing the essential qualities that makes PBI's work a success. Specifically, means will have to be found to assess 1) the effectiveness of the integration of PBI activities, 2) their combined contribution to the protection of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs), 3) their contribution to the context in which HRDs work, and 4) to the wider human rights movement of which PBI is a part.

2. Introduction and Context

This evaluation has taken place during a period of enormous organizational change at PBI, which includes substantial restructuring; a determined move toward greater cohesion across PBI with respect to fundraising, advocacy and communications; substantial change at the field Project level (Indonesia Project closure, Kenya Project development, Honduras mission); an initiative to reconsider the role of Country Groups and the supports they need to function well and contribute fully to PBI's mandate; and a new strategic planning exercise – to name some that I bumped into repeatedly. I have tried – in a short time, and with a very partial view of PBI – to understand this context well enough to make observations and recommendations that will be useful in light of decisions that have already been taken and directions that are at least partly set – in each case, I assume, with the aim of enhancing the global impact of PBI. During the evaluation, I saw nothing that led me to conclude that PBI was heading in the wrong direction with the decisions it has made in recent years. On the contrary: what I observed affirms that PBI is on the “right track” in addressing the issues it is facing, particularly with respect to its efforts to bring a unifying coherence to activities across PBI as a whole. I have therefore tried to build on current change processes, and to offer suggestions that will help PBI to move decisively in the directions it is already headed².

This evaluation is a kind of hybrid. It is not a project evaluation, though I formed some strong views about the quality and impact of the Colombia Project, which I observed for a week. This is the only work of PBI that I saw first-hand. Despite my best efforts, my findings may therefore be biased by my Colombia experience, and in favour of field Projects rather than other aspects of PBI's work. Beyond that field visit, I have based my recommendations on an extensive document review, responses to a questionnaire and a survey, and 28 individual interviews, in addition to those conducted in Colombia.

Despite an admittedly incomplete view, I offer evaluative comments and recommendations at a global level. If they are based on faulty assumptions, or fail to take account of information that I did not see or consider, they should be challenged, modified or discarded.

3. Terms of Reference and Evaluation Objectives

The initial Terms of Reference for this evaluation were unrealistically broad, given the time and resources available to do it. After an initial document review, two consultations with PBI's International Coordinator and one member of the Strategic Development Committee, we agreed on the following, more limited objectives for this evaluation:

² One comment in response to the first draft of this report suggested that it read more like an internal than an external evaluation, and that it reinforced current directions. If my observations and findings had led me to question the wisdom of current directions, I would have done so. But data gathered from all sources led me to believe that PBI's efforts to bring coherence to its work across key functions and entities were entirely appropriate, and would strengthen the impact of PBI as an organization. I have therefore made recommendations within that context.

- to establish **broad, organization-wide baseline data** on the types of direct and indirect accompaniment, and other “protection tools” that are used by PBI field projects, the international secretariat, and country groups;
- to gather **in-depth data on several agreed examples** of PBI activities (“or protection tools”), and to assess their impact;
- to gather **data on the implicit and explicit indicators that are already used** within PBI, to assess the quality and impact of PBI’s work;
- to **identify potential indicators to assess program quality and impact in the future**, for PBI activities at the local, national and international levels;
- to **produce a range of data gathering and monitoring instruments**, that could be adapted and used in the future by different PBI entities, for planning, monitoring and evaluation of PBI work at the local, national and international levels.
- to offer **observations and recommendations** that may be useful to the Strategic Planning process for 2012-2017.

In some cases, these objectives went beyond evaluation. Establishment of baseline data and development of indicators, for instance, usually precede an evaluation, and are more commonly planning tasks, but they seemed central to the initial Terms of Reference for this evaluation. Focusing on them meant that some other things simply could not be done in the time available. As the report will indicate, some essential organizational activities (like volunteer recruitment, fundraising and communications) received less attention than they might have. Their absence should not be read as a judgement of their importance. They were simply a casualty of limited time.

4. Evaluation Methodology and Data Gathering Techniques

The following data gathering methods were agreed at the outset of the evaluation. Instruments were developed where necessary, then used.

4.1 Document Review:

An extensive review of relevant documents internal to PBI, including past evaluations, strategic plans, project proposals etc, and a hasty website review of informal and unpublished literature from other organizations doing similar or related work, to provide comparative information about protection methods used by other organizations, and how the work of PBI fits into the wider community of human rights organizations. See **Appendix 1**.

4.2 Questionnaire for all Field Projects, the International Secretariat and Country Groups:

A survey in Spanish and English to gather organization-wide data on the activities of, and “protection tools” used by all PBI entities, plus respondents’ assessment of the quality or impact of each type of activity they carry out. The purpose of this survey was to establish baseline data on the activities of different PBI entities, and to understand the criteria people currently use to assess the quality and impact of their work. Response rate was as follows. All completed questionnaires have been given to the International Office, for future use. (See **Appendix 2**)

Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires returned
Field Projects: 5	4 (all active projects)
ISEC: 1	1
Country Groups: 15	10
Total: 21	15

Note: Because the Indonesia Project had recently closed, it did not fill out a questionnaire. Information about the Indonesia Project was gathered in interviews.

4.3 “Survey Monkey” Electronic Survey of Individuals Inside and Outside PBI³:

A confidential web-based survey in Spanish and English to gather input from a wide cross section of PBI “stakeholders”, on the quality and impact of PBI’s work. To ensure input from key categories of people external to PBI, e-links to the survey were first sent via PBI Coordinators in all Project countries to a targeted cross section of external stakeholders who know PBI’s work and could comment on its quality and impact. These included accompanied human rights defenders, other human rights defenders, other human rights organizations, NGOs and INGOs, members of coalitions in which PBI participates, donors, government officials, UN representatives, diplomats, and journalists. Once we had received a substantial response from people in these categories, the survey was opened further, via invitations from the International Office and Country Groups, to people inside PBI: current staff and volunteers, ex-staff and volunteers, committee members etc. Responses were as follows. For complete survey results, see **Appendix 3**.

	No. Responses	No. Categories Respondents (Note 1 below)	No. countries Respondents (Note 2 below)
English	85	13	12
Spanish	45	12	13
Cumulative totals (both languages)	130	14	16

Note 1. Categories of Respondents include: accompanied HRD, other HRD, current or past field volunteer, current or past CG volunteer, current or past field staff, current or past CG staff, IC member, PBI committee member, other NGO/INGO, donor, government employee, embassy staff, UN representative, journalist. There was at least one response from each category.

Note 2. Countries of Residence of Respondents include: Belgium, Canada Colombia, France, Germany, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, UK, USA

4.4 Field Visit to Colombia: Five working days in Bogotá, organized entirely by the PBI Colombia office to provide an exposure to PBI’s Colombia Project, and an opportunity to meet with a range of PBI volunteers, staff, accompanied organizations and other contacts. See **Appendix 4** for details.

4.5 Interviews: Telephone or face-to-face interviews with 28 individuals, internal and external to PBI, not including the people I met in Colombia. In addition, specific information was gathered by email from several other individuals, also not included in

³ These surveys gathered a wealth of information that is now housed in the International Office. The detail they provide is not fully reflected in this report. I encourage PBI staff and committees to review these surveys, for further insights in specific content areas.

this number. In total, I received direct input from 50+ people. See **Appendices 4 and 5** for breakdown.

4.6 Case Studies of Activities Beyond Physical Accompaniment: Three case studies were identified, to gather in-depth data on successful initiatives of different types, and the qualities that have made them successful. These included 1) combined work done by the three Americas Projects, the US Country Groups and the International Advocacy Coordinator, in relation to the Organization of America States / Inter American Commission, 2) work being done across PBI with lawyers, led by the UK and US Country Groups, and 3) PBI participation in a global Network on Women Human Rights Defenders, led by the Country Group in Spain. Time did not permit a thorough look and the third of these, and allowed for only a partial look at the second. I urge PBI to document all of these activities fully, and to learn from all of them.

4.7 Budget Analysis – PBI Consolidated Budget 2011: I had hoped to analyse PBI budgets, to understand where PBI money is raised and spent, and what that might imply for future strategic choices and impact. The budget information available to me provides only a partial view of revenues and resource allocations, because it does not include a comprehensive picture of Country Group costs, or of the funds that each raises for its own activities. For this reason, the budget review was cursory. I could not, for example, compare funds raised against staff size of the Country Groups that raised them. Further in-house analysis of this kind would be useful, if it has not already been done.

4.8 Analysis of Website Statistics: I initially proposed a selective review of PBI's website usage, as a way of establishing some baselines on the use of PBI's publications, and measuring PBI's "reach". It became clear early in the evaluation that PBI does not currently monitor its website use in way that would provide relevant data for this evaluation, and that it should not be a priority. The issue of web statistics is addressed briefly in Section 6.4 of this report, and should be considered when designing impact indicators. Once relevant baselines are established, periodic monitoring of website use can provide useful data on growing outreach, use of publications, and use of the website for various purposes.

In combination the data sources described above allowed for a range of input, both broad and deep, from inside and outside PBI. Questionnaires, surveys and background documents allowed me to cross reference and follow up on comments made in interviews. Interviews allowed me to test emerging "findings" with people at different places inside and outside PBI, as the process evolved. All interviews were informal, and became a kind of "rolling conversation" where I could test ideas from earlier interviews and reading, with later interviewees. Comments on the first draft of this report allowed for errors of fact to be corrected in this final iteration, and in some cases for additional information to be added. The combination of data from all these sources led to the report that follows.

5. Evaluation, Impacts and PBI's Work – A Reality Check

It is important for readers, and eventually for others who may be looking for "impacts" of PBI's work, to remember that most of what PBI does falls into fields of

endeavour that have confounded evaluators for a long time. The “impacts” of human rights defence and advocacy – the two areas of PBI’s work that I looked at most closely – can not be measured as easily, for example, as the introduction of clean water into a community. In the case of a clean water project, you can follow up your well-digging at periodic intervals with measurements of improved health, child mortality rates etc, which can be attributed quite reliably to the introduction of clean water. Direct causal connections between PBI’s intervention X and outcome Y are much harder to establish, and attribution of success to PBI (even if clear successes can be found) is not clear-cut, because PBI’s interventions are among many that may have contributed to a particular outcome. In this terrain, a good dose of humility is warranted.

Many who theorize about planning and evaluation methodologies, and about organizational outcomes and impacts in complex social situations, argue that organizations can only, and should only be expected to “account for” the things they actually do themselves⁴. Beyond assessing the quality and results of its own interventions (these theorists say) the best that an organization may be able to do is to spell out clearly what it is hoping to achieve **or contribute to**, and how it expects its chosen interventions will lead to the desired outcomes – which often reach far beyond the scope and timeframe of the organization’s direct interventions. In situations where there are multiple actors and competing forces for change, where change processes are not linear, and where successful outcomes can rarely be attributable to a single cause or intervention, all an organization may be able to do is to understand clearly the nature of its relationships with other actors, to understand the “results chains” it anticipates in the web of relationships in which it operates, and to find some reasonable ways to assess the quality (or strength, or value) of its relationships with others, at each link in the results chain⁵.

Without getting too bogged down in theory, I suggest that PBI frame its efforts to establish impact indicators in this way. Doing so will immediately take you “back behind” indicators and evaluation to planning, and forward from indicators to monitoring, learning, and planning again: a path that PBI appears to have embarked on already, at the global level. An approach of this kind requires no less rigour than more linear approaches to evaluation. It is simply more realistic, given what PBI does, and how it works.

Several PBI features encourage the adoption of an approach to evaluation that looks for quality as well as impact, contribution rather than attribution, and takes account of PBI’s relationships within a wider network of actors.

⁴ The following methodologies offer ways to assess results in complex and changing contexts where there are multiple actors and variables, unintended or unexpected outcomes, and where an organization is more likely to contribute to an outcome than to be solely responsible: Contribution Analysis, Developmental Evaluation, Most Significant Changes Approach, Outcome Mapping, and Social Analysis Systems (SAS2). An e-search of these terms will unearth hundreds of papers – more and less useful. One PBI donor, Zivik, has produced a very helpful manual on monitoring effects, which draws heavily on Outcome Mapping, and is entirely consistent with this approach. See Appendix 1 for URL.

⁵ E.g. With communications: whose opinions are you hoping to influence or change, and to what end? Can you find a way to assess (by occasional user surveys or phone interviews) whether users find the communications useful, and how they use them? Is it possible to find out whether PBI communications contribute to users’ actions? With advocacy: what outcome is PBI hoping to achieve by its intervention in a particular forum? Are there others “upstream and downstream” from PBI’s interventions who can comment on the quality or value of PBI’s contributions?

- Much of **PBI's work is preventative**. It is impossible to measure with certainty the things that were (perhaps) prevented as a result of PBI's work. One cannot count people who were **not** assassinated, harassed, jailed, or falsely accused. It may be possible – and PBI should try – to gather hard data that allow PBI field Projects to compare the experience of people whom PBI accompanies against some prior baseline or background reference point, but the most reliable measure of PBI's prevention of abuses will probably be the (systematically recorded) observations of the people PBI works to protect. Rigorously gathered, this kind of information is far more than “anecdotal evidence”.
- PBI's **accompaniment methodology is intentionally non-interventionist** with respect to the substance of the work done by accompanied organizations and individuals. PBI designs its accompaniments so that accompanied local or national organizations, and not PBI, remain the principal actors and spokespeople in the practice of defending human rights in their countries. PBI's direct roles are in the selection of the organizations it accompanies, and the activities that PBI conducts as part of its accompaniments, including the things that PBI does to raise the visibility, credibility and legitimacy of the people and organizations whose safety it hopes to enhance, and whose operating space it wants to keep open or increase. These are the first order PBI interventions whose quality and impact PBI should try to assess. The achievements and impacts of its accompanied organizations may depend in part on PBI's support, but they are beyond PBI's control, and therefore require of PBI an approach to evaluation that allows for an analysis of PBI's contribution to a “bigger picture”.
- Much of **PBI's advocacy is aimed at changing the minds**, and then (if effective) the behaviours or actions of other people over whom PBI also has no formal control, who do not “report to” PBI, and who receive information and inputs from many other sources, making direct causality difficult for PBI to claim. Efforts should be made to confirm the impact of PBI's advocacy efforts on the people or institutions it is hoping to influence, but reasonable means to estimate PBI's influence will have to be found, where direct causality can't be proven.
- To further complicate things, **PBI's most effective programming integrates a range of activities to achieve its objectives**⁶. People, including HRDs, repeatedly told me that PBI's impact is greatest when several components of its work fit together and reinforce one another, in different amounts in different countries, contexts, and moments in history. It is easier to assess the component pieces one by one, than to assess the integrated whole. But doing so, without somehow keeping an eye on the big picture, and examining how the elements interact with one another, risks losing the essential analysis of how (or whether) the various pieces work together, and become “more than the sum of the parts”. Integration is hard to measure. Carefully selected case examples will be useful, to illustrate PBI's current methodology, and future efforts to integrate new forms of advocacy into it.

⁶ This was repeated to me by virtually everyone I spoke with, whether internal or external to PBI. Program integration is one of the features of PBI that sets it apart from others who work in the “protection” or “accompaniment” field.

For these reasons, this evaluation has required more than a simple, relatively mechanical look for indicators to assess PBI's various activities at different levels of programming.

6. Findings and Recommendations

The findings of this evaluation are presented in two forms: in the body of this report, and as Appendices. Appendix 6 (Table on Types of Advocacy) and Appendix 7 (Activities by PBI Entity), should be read as an integral part of these findings.

The order in which the findings below are presented should not be read as a weighting with respect to their importance. One of the most important findings of this evaluation is that PBI's impact is greatest when its many activities and entities work intentionally together, in ways that maximize the full potential of each.

6.1. General Findings Relevant to PBI Impact

6.1.1. PBI Mandate and operating principles:

PBI's mandate is clear, and seems to be well understood by "everybody" inside PBI⁷, and those external to PBI who have known it for some time. Insiders who have known PBI for a long time, however (including those familiar with PBI's work in Haiti and Sri Lanka for example) have noted a shift in the way PBI's mandate is now interpreted and described publicly. What began as a "peace organization", they say (with "peace" in its name, and "making space for peace" as its tag line) has become known, and describes itself as an organization primarily concerned with the protection of human rights defenders in conflict situations. "Promoting non-violence and protecting human rights" is the first phrase one sees on the PBI International website. Of course non-violent conflict resolution, human rights, peace-building and peace are related, and references to all of them appear in PBI materials and on the website. But the predominant description of PBI is of an organization that offers non violent protection to human rights defenders.

"Peace" in the Mandates of PBI and Country Projects:

PBI's Mandate as described on the front page of PBI International website includes a sentence about "also facilitating other peace-building activities". But non violent protection of human rights defenders is the "top line" message used to describe PBI's mandate. The mandates of the **Colombia and Mexico Projects** do not include the word peace. **The Guatemala Project mandate** refers to "Peace agreements". **The Nepal Project mandate** refers to "peace and human rights", "peaceful space", and "building peace". **The Indonesia Project mandate** includes references to "positive peacebuilding", "peaceful space" and "building peace".

How PBI describes its role in the context of formal peace processes (e.g. in Guatemala and Nepal) and in other conflict situations where peace is not part of the

⁷ Many respondents to the Survey Monkey survey raised concerns about limitations imposed by PBI's mandate, especially in relation to advocacy. My reading is that the decision to establish the International Advocacy Coordinator, and to move into the world of policy advocacy, substantially address many of those concerns.

prevailing discourse may become important as PBI seeks to place itself more visibly within the HR movement globally, and within civil society more widely.

PBI's operating principles of non-violence, non-interference, and non-partisanship appear well understood throughout PBI, though they are interpreted somewhat differently in different locations. Adherence to the principle of non-partisanship is reportedly more difficult in places where civil society organizations are often aligned to political parties.

Recommendation 1

In future efforts to consolidate PBI's common image and develop a PBI-wide communications strategy, consider and agree on whether and how peace (or making space for peace) is, or is not, reflected in PBI's public representation of its work.

6.1.2. Protective Accompaniment is PBI's "Signature" and Should Remain so:

In past project evaluations there appears to be a tension – or at least a question – with respect to the centrality of Protective Accompaniment of human rights defenders (HRDs) in PBI's work. It is my observation that whatever tension exists is narrower than this. It appears to be about the centrality of **physical** accompaniment within the wider range of activities that combine to create what has become known in PBI as Protective Accompaniment. On this question, I believe there is more agreement than disagreement. Everyone I spoke with about it, and all the questionnaire responses from field Projects agree that physical presence (or accompaniment) is critical to PBI's success and credibility, but that physical presence alone is insufficient to provide protection, without the moral and political support that PBI always ties to it, in field Project countries and beyond. What is debated – to the extent that there is debate – is the nature of PBI's physical presence within the Protective Accompaniment model, not whether a physical presence alone is enough. **In this report, I will use the term Protective Accompaniment to include PBI's physical presence with HRDs, plus the range of moral and political supports that PBI provides, in Project countries and beyond, which together offer visibility, legitimacy and protection to the individuals and organizations that PBI "accompanies".**

Whatever the internal debates and trajectory that brought PBI to its current self definition, PBI is now best known for, and is clearly deemed to have its greatest impact⁸ as a result of its accompaniment of HRDs and Civil Society Organizations. I was told repeatedly that PBI has developed and is widely recognized for its expertise on questions of security and Protective Accompaniment in conflict situations – a field which it knows "inside out" and where it "sets the standard". PBI knows how and where its "model" works, and where it is less likely to work. Survey responses overwhelmingly corroborate this. I believe Protective Accompaniment, and a continued PBI presence with HRDs "on the ground", should remain at the heart of what PBI does, and how it describes itself. Protective Accompaniment has become PBI's "niche", and is the basis of its credibility in the constellation of other human

⁸ Survey Monkey respondents in both English and Spanish rank Protective Accompaniment as the PBI activity that has the greatest impact: 68 % of English, and 72 % of Spanish language respondents said the impact of PBI's Protective Accompaniment was "high". 68% of all respondents also identified Protective Accompaniment by some description as PBI's greatest contribution to the global human rights movement.

rights organizations. Protective Accompaniment is practiced differently in different places, and through time, and can continue to be. It can also continue to be surrounded by a range of other activities (like policy advocacy) which derive from PBI's direct accompaniment, and can deepen its impact. But it is Protective Accompaniment that sets PBI apart from other organizations, gives it a clear and credible place among other human rights actors, as well as access to the critical "field-based information" that is fundamental to its credibility and its supporting work in communications and advocacy. A number of interviewees, both internal and external to PBI, cautioned PBI against moving away from its Protective Accompaniment base, fearing that in doing so PBI would end up in a "crowded field" of other human rights organizations, with little to distinguish it from the rest.

Having the well-established Protective Accompaniment niche is reason enough to keep it at the conceptual and programmatic heart of what PBI does in its field Projects, and as the foundation for any new advocacy it undertakes. There is an additional reason for keeping Protective Accompaniment at the heart of PBI's work, which may be a little less evident, but seems to me equally compelling.

PBI is a volunteer-based organization. The "elegance of PBI's model" (to quote one interviewee) is its simplicity and its inherent humility, which mean it can be implemented by relatively short-term volunteers with a wide range of educational and professional backgrounds. Physical accompaniment requires a profound commitment to human rights, rigorous training and support, and a great deal of personal discipline to be done well. But it requires no specific professional or technical expertise that is not taught by PBI during training, and/or modelled by other PBI volunteers on site. Unlike other international volunteer organizations, which aim to match individuals' professional competences with specific civil society organizations' needs, PBI recruits willing individuals who are committed to its aims, and trains them for Protective Accompaniment work on the basis of its many years of experience. Moving off that Protective Accompaniment base would require technical expertise, a different kind of volunteer recruitment, and a kind of "field" presence that PBI does not have, and, given its commitment to non-interference, does not aspire to.

Part of the tension that has existed, and may continue to exist, over PBI's role in in-country peace education, peace-building or non-violent conflict resolution stems (I think) from a discomfort about whether randomly-selected foreign volunteers have the required professional competence to do these things in other people's countries. And **doing** them is qualitatively different from providing information about them to volunteers, or accompanying carefully-selected local people to do them, thus opening space for them to happen – as a consequence of accompaniment. Admittedly, the distinction between accompanying peace processes and engaging in them can be a fine line – but it's a line that PBI has learned to walk in other areas. I suspect PBI's decisions about the organizations it chooses to accompany are the most strategic, and the most politically complex choices it makes in its field Projects. This is as true for decisions to accompany organizations working for peace as it is with any other of its accompaniment choices.

Recommendation 2

Maintain Protective Accompaniment, including some form of physical presence with HRDs as the

central feature of PBI's methodology and identity, defined widely enough to permit different and new types of accompaniment within the definition, and in different combinations with other activities in different field Projects and Country Groups. Focus any program expansion or new program development on initiatives that have Protective Accompaniment at their core. For instance:

- identify and document new forms of accompaniment (e.g. mobile Protective Accompaniment teams, where permanent presence may not be necessary or appropriate), and ways to apply Protective Accompaniment to new or changing circumstances (e.g. in conflicts over land, or where conflicts are arising in the context of economic mega-projects);
- where not already doing so, and where not competing with local organizations or other INGOs that are doing it, consider training in the use of Protective Accompaniment, organizational security, and risk analysis, based on PBI's experience;
- partner with local and international organizations that have complementary skills and expertise, where Protective Accompaniment is not a sufficient response in the circumstances;
- develop advocacy programs that derive from PBI's direct accompaniment experience, and strengthen Protective Accompaniment in new ways.

Recommendation 3

For consistency of message and image, agree on, use and publicize a PBI-wide definition of Protective Accompaniment that encompasses physical presence in Project countries, plus the moral and political supports that PBI provides in Project countries and beyond, which together offer protection to the organizations and individuals that PBI accompanies.

6.1.3. Critical Pre-conditions for Effectiveness and Impact:

By reviewing documents about PBI's recent programming challenges and the corrective measures that were taken to address them, it is possible to deduce – in a kind of reverse logic – what some of the critical factors are that contribute to PBI's success, or, in their absence, to weakness and hence reduced impact. My attention was repeatedly drawn to the following critical factors, which, when absent, have undermined PBI's impact, and if present, can be expected to avert crises and contribute to a positive impact:

- a well-developed, critical analysis of the changing context in which PBI is (or will be) working, and implications for PBI;
- a clear assessment of the risks faced by civil society organizations and HRDs, and an analysis of whether Protective Accompaniment is an appropriate response to those risks;
- a clear understanding of the roles that different actors are playing in that context; including UN representatives and other international NGOs with which PBI might choose to partner, etc;
- a clear understanding of the specific roles that PBI can and can not, will and will not play;
- clear project objectives;

- a clear plan to achieve objectives, which reflects an understanding of how the program components fit together;
- **a clear assessment of the strategic relevance of accompanied organizations;**⁹
- the capacity of accompanied organizations and allies;
- clear processes and responsibilities for program decision making;
- unambiguous legal status in the country of operation¹⁰;
- competent, experienced staff who understand the context and have relevant experience working in complex political environments;
- clear indicators and processes for monitoring and evaluation against the agreed objectives.

Each of the programming challenges I learned about appears to have had weaknesses in at least one of these areas, and sometimes in several. While these issues are in many ways operational, many of them are also strategic. In any case, sound operations and good Project management are fundamental to the overall impact of PBI.

Recommendation 4

In all future project development (most immediately with the new Kenya Project, and a possible new Project in Indonesia) take care to ensure that all of the above pre-conditions are met.

Recommendation 5

As part of new Monitoring and Evaluation guidelines (see Recommendation 9 below), develop a checklist, similar to the list above, to be used regularly by all PBI Projects, to bring greater coherence to internal Project reviews, and external project evaluations.

6.1.4. Impact Indicators are Derived from Planning, and They Guide Monitoring and Evaluation:

Impact indicators are designed for monitoring performance against plans. They will only ever be as useful as the plans they are designed to monitor. More importantly, they will be useful only if they are used! To play a helpful role in monitoring, evaluation, future decision-making and planning, indicators must be linked to the outcomes that each PBI entity hopes to achieve, and the activities it will undertake to achieve them.

For indicators to be useful, each PBI entity of significant size will therefore need a clear plan which lays out the results it hopes to achieve (or contribute to) **in its sphere of action and influence**; what activities it will undertake to achieve them; and how it expects the activities to contribute to the results (the “results chain” noted in Section 5, above). PBI as a whole will have to agree on its global objectives, and its Strategic Plan will have to reflect how the work of the International Office **and all other entities** will contribute to achieving them. These plans need not be overly complicated. Though some funders may require elaborate logical framework tables,

⁹ As noted above, I suspect that PBI’s choice of accompanied organizations is among the most critical factors in determining its in-country impact. I think it will be equally critical in establishing the basis for advocacy that remains grounded in PBI’s mandate and expertise.

¹⁰ In response to the first draft of this report, several people expressed uneasiness about this criterion, fearing that it could limit PBI’s capacity to move into new Project countries. While I understand this concern, I continue to believe that the legal status of the organization must be clear before it sets up a full-blown Project in a country, in order to mitigate risk to PBI volunteers etc. This issue merits discussion, prior to the establishment of any new Projects.

experience tells me that simpler is usually better – so the logic remains clear, and a few good indicators can serve to assess progress at different levels. Importantly, whatever table is chosen to capture the logic of an entity’s strategic thinking, it should summarize and not replace the strategic thinking that goes into the planning. If the “outcome logic” is clear in people’s minds, it is usually fairly easy to reduce it to a table.

PBI is not starting from zero in this. Despite the relative isolation in which different entities have worked, there is already a great deal of consistency in their objectives, as described in the questionnaires that 15 of them filled in. The document from the IO that is now circulating to guide all PBI entities in their strategic planning for 2012-2017 is asking the “right” high-level questions about the contexts in which they work, and their future activities. Several entities are already using good logical framework tables to lay out their plans in chart form.¹¹ As PBI works towards greater coordination and coherence across entities, it would be sensible to bring further uniformity to these processes – not with any view to imposing uniformity of content on plans, but to move toward a common framework for strategic thinking, within a global Strategic Plan. This would facilitate exchange, communication and comparison, and would make for easier monitoring and evaluation across PBI as a whole¹².

Evaluation is obviously taken seriously at PBI: triennial evaluations of field Projects are the norm. In line with current efforts to bring coherence to the planning process across entities, I think PBI would benefit from some organization-wide evaluation guidelines, linked to its Strategic Planning and monitoring tools. This would impose some minimum expectations on evaluators, and would also permit easier comparisons across the entities evaluated.

Recommendation 6

Continue the current movement toward a set of common strategic questions that all PBI Projects and Country Groups use in their strategic planning (including the critical factors identified in 6.1.3. above).

Recommendation 7

Adopt a single, simple, logic table for all PBI entities to use in summarizing their strategic plans in table form.

[re: Rec. 6, there would probably be a different set of strategic questions for the IO and field Projects on the one hand, and Country Groups on the other. re: Rec. 7, the logic tables for all entities could probably be the same, with each component feeding into agreed organizational outcomes.]

¹¹ The table used by the Nepal Project, in its “Nepal Project goals and measures 2009-2012” is especially noteworthy.

¹² One respondent to the first draft of this report questioned the value of a common planning and monitoring framework / table. I continue to believe that common frameworks for thinking can facilitate communication and dialogue, while still allowing for a range of approaches to achieving common organizational objectives. Whether one or many, logical frameworks should never be used mechanically, or as a replacement for critical thinking.

Recommendation 8

Provide some basic training on the agreed logical framework for the people most closely involved in PBI's strategic planning, to demystify it, and further contribute to uniformity in the planning process across PBI.

Recommendation 9

To facilitate consistency across PBI evaluations, develop and adopt some (simple!) PBI-wide guidelines for Project and Global Evaluations, which consistently link evaluations directly to Strategic Planning instruments and relevant Strategic Plans.

6.1.5. PBI is a Values-driven, Learning Organization:

Both the reading I did and the interviews I conducted consistently reveal PBI to be (in the language of Organizational Development gurus) “values-driven”, and a “learning organization”, which is striving for continued relevance and excellence. PBI's values-base is evident in all aspects of its work. Commitment¹³ to PBI's fundamental purposes remains high across the organization. Whatever changes there may have been in the demographic profile of new volunteers in recent years, PBI staff and volunteers continue to reflect a strong commitment to the fundamental values and mandate of PBI.

Innovative practice is occurring in all parts of the organization, and deep strategic thinking about PBI is being done internally – at a near-frenetic pace these days. People that I encountered at every place in the organization are reflecting critically on their own role and PBI's impact, as well as its structure and decision-making processes. Someone, somewhere in PBI has already identified most of the key strategic concerns that I came across, and someone (or some body) is consciously addressing many of them. The challenge now is to identify and share efficiently the best forward-thinking that is being done, and to allow the best thinking to have a central place in PBI-wide discussions.

On the flip side of institutional learning is organizational memory loss. Concerns about volunteer and staff turnover, and the consequent “loss of institutional memory” were common refrains in most of the Project evaluations I read, in the interviews I conducted and in a significant number of survey responses. Both are real problems, and should be addressed. They have imposed constraints on the management, continuity and hence impact of PBI's work. But I would also point to important ways that organizational memory **has been recorded**, especially with respect to PBI's methodology of Protective Accompaniment. PBI Projects and Country Groups appear to have, use, and update a wide range of training materials and manuals, protocols for dealing with authorities, processes for analysing contexts etc. In a very concrete way, these documents, processes and procedures codify PBI's long and rich experience, and keep it alive and current. Individuals who use these things now may not know precisely where they came from. Nonetheless, they do provide an important record of PBI's history in different places. Ways should be found to document and share these Project-specific learnings for the benefit of the organization as a whole.

Recommendation 10

Identify issues¹⁴ where PBI as a whole (or sub-sets of it) would benefit from learning exchanges

¹³ The commitment of staff and volunteers came up repeatedly in Survey Monkey responses to questions about PBI's greatest strength, impact and contribution.

across entities, and create opportunities for these to happen, face-to-face, or virtually.

Recommendation 11

Identify and selectively document innovative and best practices¹⁵ at all levels of PBI operation, and build opportunities for exchange and learning about them across PBI. Locate coordination of this task somewhere in the IO. Consider placing the products of this reflection on the PBI's intranet space to encourage dialogue. Consider making some of them publicly available on the website.

Recommendation 12

Build intentional "peer review" processes into program planning and monitoring, as a way both to share experience and facilitate learning about different approaches across PBI. De-link peer review from decision-making about funding in the organization, so that questions or critique from other entities are not confused with decisions about funding. Build cross-project peer review as a component of future Project evaluations.

6.1.6. Language Divide¹⁶:

There is clearly a language divide in PBI that has limited and will continue to limit exchange between Asian and Latin American Projects, and soon Kenya. Despite best efforts to translate some documents, direct communication and exchange are not possible among many individuals within PBI Projects – not to mention among the non-Spanish, non-English speakers in PBI Country Groups and Projects. Movement within PBI has been overwhelmingly of Spanish-English bilingual people who know the Mexico, Guatemala or Colombia Projects, in the direction of Asia. The same cross fertilization has been much less frequent in the other direction, to the detriment of PBI as a whole. Several non-Spanish speakers expressed a desire to learn from the Spanish-speaking Projects, which are largely inaccessible to them, yet where so much of the organizational history resides. The same is probably true in the other direction. There is no easy answer to this – especially when resources are scarce. Clearly, for Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 to gain traction, special efforts will have to be made for exchanges across the language barrier. To be successful, some combination of selective document translation (eg. of best practices) and volunteer interpretation for peer review and exchange would have to be found.

6.1.7. Resource Constraints:

The issue of funding constraints was raised repeatedly during this evaluation¹⁷, at every level of the organization: Projects, some Country Groups, for the ISEC, and in particular for advocacy. Lack of funding played a significant role in at least two of the Project "crises" of recent years, and led in part to the creation of the International Fundraising Coordinator position, to help address funding constraints in a concerted

¹⁴ e.g. the ways different projects assess their accompaniments, and how to withdraw from them, or transform relationships over time.

¹⁵ e.g. Some that I came across include the Colombia Project's work on psychosocial support to accompanied organizations, work that is being done with lawyers in both Project countries and CGs, and participation in an international network focusing on Women Human Rights Defenders.

¹⁶ This evaluation did not directly address the issue of language in PBI. It came up largely in the context of organizational learning and exchange. In response to this evaluation, several people noted that the issue of language extends much more broadly, to include work in committees, communications among entities etc. Because I did not look at this issue, I can only suggest that it be addressed as necessary in .

¹⁷ 19 of 123 (15%) of survey respondents who answered the question about limitations to PBI impacts, specifically identified funding as a constraint.

way. Serious efforts are now being made to coordinate fundraising across PBI, and to build support for “central” activities into funding proposals. These are important steps, but it will take time for them to show results. In the meantime (if I read the figures correctly) less than 5% of PBI’s consolidated budget¹⁸ is allocated to communications and advocacy expenses, of which less than 6%¹⁹ is allocated to the ISEC. The remaining 94% is Project-specific²⁰.

These numbers do not reflect the national-level or EU, OAS or UN advocacy work being done by Country Groups, whose budgets are not included in the 2011 Consolidated Budget. Nonetheless, they do indicate that if PBI is to move ahead with the advocacy and communications recommendations below (among others) it will have to build up the resources available for these things at the ISEC level, and, perhaps, for CGs. Recommendations below reflect an incremental approach in the areas of advocacy and communication, partly in an effort to be strategic about fundraising priorities.

6.1.8. Humility:

From my personal encounters with current and past PBI people, and in conversation with people external to PBI, it became clear that humility is a quality that runs deep in PBI. It is implicit in PBI’s accompaniment methodology, but also appears to be a choice in the way PBI presents itself to the world, and orients new volunteers. PBI does not readily toot its own horn. This is a significant organizational strength, and probably one source of PBI’s credibility in Project countries over the years. It is also a likely source of PBI’s reported “invisibility” at the global level – a concern which merits attention²¹. Finding a new balance between invisibility and bragging is part of the current effort to raise PBI’s profile and broaden its impact at the policy level, without losing the essence of how PBI works. In striking this balance, PBI should stay true to its organizational humility, which sets it apart from many other organizations, and earns it a good deal of respect.

A Glimpse of PBI’s Work in Colombia:

Near the beginning of this evaluation I spent a week in Bogotá – not to evaluate the Colombia Project, but to get an insight into PBI’s work “on the ground”. This short exposure – limited though it was – gave me a glimpse of what the Colombia Project does, how it works, and how it is viewed by people inside and outside PBI. I spent time at the PBI Office and the Volunteer House. Individually or in work teams, I met with 13 staff people responsible for most aspects of PBI’s work in Colombia, coordination with the Project’s advocacy staff in Europe and the USA, and liaison with other parts of PBI. I met a Brussels-based advocacy staff person who was in Colombia for a visit; several volunteers who had been in the country for different lengths of time; and four new volunteers who were in Bogotá for orientation. I took part in several of their training sessions, and so got a sense of the rigour and intensity of PBI orientations. I met with one high profile lawyer who is accompanied by PBI, and three accompanied organizations, to hear first-

¹⁸ 168,865 of total budgeted expenditures of 3,535,403, or 4.8%.

¹⁹ 9,620 of 168,865, or 5.7%

²⁰ Figures in notes 17 and 18, and resulting percentages in the text may under-represent actual expenses so much that they are irrelevant. I am told that in the current budget, based on more complete data, the percentage for advocacy rises to 15%, if salaries are counted. For planning purposes, it would be helpful to have accurate figures that take account of all entities, all advocacy staffing, and expenses.

²¹ This issue of “visibility” was raised directly in PBI’s International Secretariat Evaluation in 2008, and is being addressed as a consequence of the recommendations of that evaluation.

hand how they perceive PBI's accompaniment, and how it facilitates their work. I met with two donor organizations, one INGO coalition in which PBI participates, and HR officers at two embassies who are in regular contact with PBI. Though brief, this exposure gave me a strong and consistent impression of the quality and impact of PBI's work in Colombia, and the ways people assess it.

Accompanied HRDs are extremely positive about PBI's accompaniment, an impression corroborated by later survey results from Colombia. HRDs are unambiguous in stating that PBI's support allows them to continue their work with greater security, in complex and difficult circumstances, with greater peace of mind. According to the people who feel it most acutely, PBI presence **does** have a deterrent effect. HRDs, INGOs and embassy staff who know of accompaniment initiatives by other organizations frequently noted that PBI "sets the standard", and is "in a class of its own".

For HRDs, the strength of PBI's approach is the integration of its various component parts: physical, political and moral accompaniment; advocacy with authorities at all levels (including in the Vice-Presidency); contact with and coordination of briefings for diplomats; emergency response when necessary; and regular communication with the outside world, including via periodic speaking tours. Those external to PBI spoke about the reliability of the information that PBI is able to gather, the balanced and fact-based tone in which it is presented, and its careful and targeted use.

I was especially struck by the very high regard and the confidence in which PBI is held by the two embassy staff I met²², who clearly depend on PBI for "accurate and un-polemical information of the highest quality." They respond quickly when PBI requests their urgent action; frequently contact PBI for situation-specific information; and attend PBI-arranged briefings by HRDs when invited. They see PBI as a serious, credible, balanced, rigorous and professional organization, with "no agenda of their own, except a concern for human rights and the safety of the people they accompany." They could not have been more complementary about PBI. The same is true of other INGOs and the coalition in which PBI participates, where PBI is clearly viewed as a leader.²³

Several PBI staff expressed concerns about "ending accompaniments"²⁴. Except to suggest a PBI-wide look at ways to gracefully reduce commitments to organizations that may be in less need of accompaniment than they once were, I did not see enough to offer specific advice in this regard. I can point out that it is a sign of positive impact that organizations value their ongoing relationship with PBI, and wish it to continue. It is also worth noting that new organizations continue to request accompaniment, which is another indication that PBI is doing something right.

Nor can I pretend to assess whether PBI has chosen the "right", or the best mix of organizations to accompany, for maximum strategic impact in the current Colombian context. I think I can safely

²² I have some experience in NGO encounters with international embassy staff. It is usually evident whether such meetings are treated as *pro forma* duties, or if NGOs are taken seriously. The diplomats I met clearly do not see their relationship with PBI as *pro forma*. They view PBI as an important and professional interlocutor, whose representatives understand the potential and limitations of diplomatic contacts, and whose own diplomatic skills can be relied upon. These diplomats went out of their way to tell me so.

²³ I should note that I did hear about a "smear campaign" against PBI that is being played out in the press, challenging PBI's "neutrality" and linking PBI with the political views of the organizations it accompanies. I was not in Colombia long enough to assess this, or its impact on PBI's work. Clearly it is the kind of thing that has to be managed carefully, if it is not to damage PBI's impact.

²⁴ This issue also cropped up periodically in survey responses.

say that the accompanied organizations were strategically chosen, when they were chosen. They are still involved in some of the highest-profile, most “emblematic” human rights cases in the country, and are working in some of the most critical human rights contexts in Colombia²⁵. This too is a significant indicator. I can also affirm that new organizations have been added to PBI’s roster²⁶. PBI’s relationship with the people and organizations I met began in 1994, 1998, 2004, and 2009. This is a longstanding Project, but not a static one.

6.2. Findings – “Field” Projects and Cross-Project Comparisons

6.2.1. Integration of all Program Elements is Critical in Protective Accompaniment:

Questionnaires from all PBI Projects, interview and survey responses from HRDs themselves, make it clear that the effectiveness of PBI’s accompaniment is the result of its multi-pronged nature, in-country and via the many activities of Country Groups internationally, including Support Networks, speaking tours, political contacts, contacts with government officials, and other forms of advocacy. As noted above, physical accompaniment (or presence) and the critical fact-finding it facilitates, are effective precisely because they are combined with PBI’s capacity to communicate effectively, and to mobilize political support when needed, on short notice, locally, in Europe, North America and elsewhere.²⁷

As a way to illustrate this integration, each Project could develop one or two short (say one-page) case studies, that quickly show how the various components of PBI’s work – in-country, with CGs, and in collaboration with other organizations – combine to have an impact that is more than the sum of the parts. These examples, updated periodically, could be used both in funding proposals and as impact “indicators” of PBI’s effective multi-faceted approach²⁸.

All four Project questionnaires, the HRDs I met, and some funders that I interviewed, made special note of the quality of PBI’s working relationships with key diplomats in Project countries, and their willingness to act on requests from PBI. Because such credibility and support is so pivotal to PBI’s Protective Accompaniment methodology, PBI should make a special effort to gather information on the nature and quality of its relationships with key members of the diplomatic corps in each Project country.

Recommendation 13

In all new program expansion or developments, including into advocacy at the regional and international levels, ensure that Protective Accompaniment remains at their core, and that all

²⁵ A representative the Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL) noted in an interview that most of the high profile legal cases from Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico that CEJIL litigates in the OAS system involve people that are associated with PBI-accompanied organizations. This provides an independent assessment of the strategic nature of the accompaniments that PBI accepts. CEJIL sees PBI as a “very important player” and ally in the countries where both CEJIL and PBI operate. (See also box in 6.3.3, page 24)

²⁶ Some survey respondents and interviewees suggested that PBI had been accompanying the same organizations “for ever”. While there may be difficulties in letting go of past relationships, it is inaccurate to suggest that there have not been additions and changes to the Colombia program.

²⁷ Several interviewees and many survey respondents noted that it is this integration of strategies that distinguishes PBI from other organizations that accompany HRDs, on the one hand, and from NGOs that provide (valued) support from afar, but are not present ‘on the ground, on the other.

²⁸ I tested this idea on one funder, who felt it would be helpful in illustrating PBI’s methodology.

component pieces remain integrated, so that each reinforces the other.

Recommendation 14

Develop one or two short case studies in each Project, to illustrate in concrete ways how PBI’s integrated approach functions, when it works well, to combine PBI’s many activities, and take advantage of PBI’s presence in different locations.

Recommendation 15

Whether by periodic survey or by some other means, gather assessments by in-country diplomats about the value of their working relationship with PBI, and the use they make of information passed on to them by PBI. Use this information as one indicator in assessing the impact of PBI’s in-country Protective Accompaniment work.

6.2.2. Geographic Limitation, Project Size, Staffing, Duration and “Critical Mass”:

PBI is well aware of the discrepancy in the size of its field Projects. As **Table 1** indicates, the Colombia Project accounts for well over half of all volunteers in the field at a given time, and has a staff (at 27+ positions) that is three times the size of the next largest staff complement (nine people, in Nepal) and four times the staff of Mexico and Guatemala Projects (with seven each). I was unable to assess whether this is a problem beyond the perspective of “optics”.

Table 1: Project Size, Staffing, Location of Staff

Country Project	Start Date	Staffing – FTEs *			Volunteers	
		Int’l	National	Advocacy	“Field”	Support
Colombia		14	10 (2 part time)	5	38 (4 locations)	
		27 + FTEs / 29 people in 3 places: Bogotá, Brussels Washington				
Mexico		7 people (3 part time)			10 (2 locations)	
		7 people in 3 places: Mexico City, London, Spain				
Guatemala		6		1	10	27 + translators
		7 people in 5 places: Guatemala City, Brussels , Valencia, Santander, Netherlands				
Nepal		5	4	0	10-12	
		9 people in 2 places: Kathmandu and Ottawa				

* **Note:** FTE = full time equivalent

Clearly, on the basis of volume and the number of volunteer alumni alone, PBI is best known these days for its work in Colombia. The Colombia Project may also have achieved a “critical mass” due to its size that PBI Projects do not have elsewhere. I was unable to judge this. If it has not already been considered, the issue of minimum Project size for visibility and impact may be worthy of further attention. Past evaluations, the survey conducted for this evaluation, and some interviews do suggest that PBI’s geographic weight in Latin America may limit its impact on the global policy scene. Current efforts to establish a Project in Kenya, to consider a new

Project in Indonesia, and to construct a more visible “whole-of-PBI” image of the organization are three concrete efforts to respond to these concerns. My only advice in this regard, consistent with comments above, would be to caution against expansion at the expense of quality, and to ensure that new programming be built on the foundation of PBI’s recognized experience and expertise. In the future, particularly when considering new advocacy roles for PBI, two other observations seem important – also evident from Table 1 above. One is that some Projects have Project-specific staff in Europe and North America specifically dedicated to advocacy. The other is the geographic dispersal of staff.

Most of the Europe-based staff are not located in the cities most relevant for advocacy – in particular Brussels and Geneva. Two Projects have staff in Brussels. No PBI entity has a presence in Geneva, including the Swiss CG, whose base is in Bern²⁹.

6.2.3. Crisis management situations:

The evaluator noted that in the course of gathering information, some participants referred to crises situations in recent years (crises in the project itself, not its work providing protection for HRDs). Examples were given for Indonesia, Nepal and Mexico.

Her findings include this:

I believe sound day-to-day, anticipatory management, by paid staff, is necessary in an operation of the scale and complexity of PBI, working as it does in the sensitive terrain of human rights. Who does the management, and what structures they use to do it are issues for PBI to resolve, and are beyond the scope of this evaluation. I do think it is important to name the need for management, and to ensure that it gets done. Far better it be done as a matter of course, than in the form of “crisis management”, after problems have escalated. Crisis prevention (as PBI surely knows!) is easier and more desirable than crisis management after-the-fact.

Recommendation 16

Address the issue of Project management in all relevant structures of PBI. Move to establish a staff position in the International Office responsible for monitoring and supporting Projects with program development, management, and problem solving. Build a group of experienced people with combined professional skills in program and organizational management, project evaluation and Protective Accompaniment, who can be called upon quickly by staff, to provide support to new Projects, and to address problems before they become crises. Link Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 (about documenting best practices, peer review) to this position, when established.

6.2.4. PBI as Security Trainer:

I learned too little about PBI’s role in providing security training in Project countries to comment decisively about it, especially in the absence of comprehensive information about what other organizations, including spin-offs of PBI, do in this area. All four PBI Projects already provide training, and rate its quality as high (2 Projects) or very high (2 Projects). Two Projects report having improved their training in the recent past, and two report having increased it. All four, however, refer to their limited capacity even to provide training for the groups they accompany, let

²⁹ As noted below in Section 6.3 on Advocacy, I think these latter two issues will have to be addressed in PBI’s long-term planning. .

alone to the many other HRDs who request it. Limited capacity for follow-up is an additional concern, noted by two Projects.

There appears to be both a demand and a potential role for further PBI work in training, either independently or (as some survey respondents and interviewees suggest) in collaboration with local or other international organizations. A significant number of survey respondents also suggest training as a way for PBI to extend its impact. Given PBI's expertise, the issue of training clearly merits further consideration. With insufficient information about what others are doing, I am unable to recommend how to proceed. I nonetheless suggest that PBI consider training in a coherent way, and in light of what others are doing.

6.3 Findings – Advocacy

[**Note:** All advocacy recommendations are grouped together at the end of Section 6.3, because several of them relate to more than one of the sub-headings below.]

6.3.1. Different Types of Advocacy (Incidencia and Cabildeo):

The words advocacy, incidencia and cabildeo are used to describe a range of activities, some of which PBI has done for a long time, others of which are new, or still in gestation. Different types of advocacy are done by people at different places in the PBI structure, and “driven” by different realities and contexts. All are intended to help PBI meet its mandate of protecting HRDs.

Advocacy on behalf of accompanied individuals and organizations has been done for many years. It includes in-country representation to authorities and the diplomatic corps, and is done by staff and volunteers. This in-country advocacy is reinforced by a range of activities by Country Groups, in the form of urgent actions and speaking tours – also in support of HRDs accompanied in PBI Projects. These aspects of advocacy are Project-driven, with the programmatic support of CGs. Three Projects also have advocacy staff based in Europe and Washington, who act as direct extensions of the Projects, and mobilize political support for PBI work in Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia. These, too, have been largely Project-driven.

In 2008, the International Advocacy Working Group (IAWG) was created to help coordinate and bring conceptual clarity to a new kind of advocacy across PBI. More recently, the position of International Advocacy Coordinator was established in the IO. These initiatives intend to raise PBI's advocacy to a new level, by bringing the collective experience of PBI to bear on international or multilateral policy frameworks, debates and processes that have the potential to affect HRDs more widely than Project-specific advocacy can do. This new type of advocacy is intended to tap the multiple resources of PBI, for greater impact at an international level. It will require not only a knowledge of PBI's Projects and accompanied HRDs, but of the many contexts in which policy negotiations take place. To be effective, it will require the contributions of all PBI entities.

It will be important to separate these advocacy activities conceptually, in order to understand the objectives and intended impacts of each, and to identify relevant indicators of success. **Appendix 6** presents a suggested framework for thinking about advocacy in this way, based on the information I had to work with. A variation of this grid, corrected for accuracy, might be a useful planning tool for the IAWG, to help

conceptualize PBI's advocacy work, to understand and negotiate how advocacy at different levels might fit together, and to help carve out priority roles for each of the International Advocacy Coordinator, Country Groups and Field Projects.

6.3.2. IAWG and Advocacy Coordinator:

The Advocacy Coordinator position is still new, and the IAWG not a lot older. Both are critical steps in PBI's effort to broaden its advocacy impact beyond the Project level, by building a PBI advocacy strategy in the international arena. Both decisions appear to have wide support within PBI³⁰. Not surprisingly, both the staff person and the Working Group are still finding their feet: looking for ways to build a common PBI advocacy agenda from the base, rather than imposing it from the "centre".

Minutes of the last two IAWG meetings indicate that it is doing the groundwork it "should be" doing: identifying possible common themes (the "what" of coordinated advocacy) and possible arenas for joint intervention (the "where"). A modified version of **Appendix 6** might help zero in on the "who" and "how", as the IAWG continues its exploratory and planning work.

I agree with the Working Group's approach of building a common advocacy agenda on the basis of current common interests (e.g. rule of law, impunity) and identifying arenas which PBI already knows (in particular the OAS / Inter American Commission, the EU, and some UN bodies). I would underscore the wisdom of building PBI's advocacy capacity incrementally, and ensuring that it remains firmly grounded in PBI's experience. I suggest documenting new experiences as they are developed, and assessing them from the perspective not only of content, but of the organizational structures through which they are done, the level of cross-entity involvement they attract, clarity of roles etc.

6.3.3. Project-specific Advocacy and Lack of Coordination in Brussels and Washington:

As signalled in **Appendix 6**, I think the trickiest immediate issue facing the IAWG will not be in finding common themes or venues for PBI's global advocacy work, but in finding a way to integrate Project-specific advocacy into a global PBI advocacy strategy. Nobody I spoke with and no respondents to questionnaires or the survey suggested that Project-specific advocacy was inappropriate or should be stopped. On the contrary, it is recognized as an important aspect of PBI's advocacy – to be extended to all Projects if possible. Many people did point to the isolation in which Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico-specific advocacy has been done to date, and expressed a desire for greater coordination initially, and increased cooperation in the longer term – among Project-specific advocacy positions (people!), the CG representatives who are working in the same or overlapping geography, and the IO. Others have expressed concern about the imbalance of having project-specific advocacy being done for some PBI Projects, and not others.

These issues will have to be addressed head-on, and new forms of cooperation tested and assessed. New efforts should build intentionally on some of the promising examples of collaboration that I heard about, such as recent joint work by the three Americas Projects, PBI USA, and the international office in relation to the Inter American Commission hearing (see box below), work on women HRDs etc.

³⁰ Advocacy came up repeatedly in survey responses to questions about what PBI could do better, or do more of, to address current limitations or to have a greater impact.

On a very practical note, PBI should move as soon as possible to house PBI advocacy staff under the same roof in cities where there is more than one of them. Physical proximity alone will not create collaboration, but it would certainly facilitate it. Longer term, PBI should move toward consolidating nodes of PBI advocacy in the centres where advocacy is most likely to be done: national capitals, Washington, Brussels, and (eventually) Geneva. As staff turnover occurs, new advocacy staff should be hired in these locations.

A Promising Case of Collaboration: Joint PBI -CEJIL Work in the Inter American Commission

The Inter American Commission on Human Rights (IAC, based in Washington) and the Inter American Court of Human Rights (based in San Jose, Costa Rica) are two bodies of the Organization of American States that address human rights in the Americas. The Commission has a special office on Human Rights Defenders, but did not have a Special Rapporteur on HRDs. The Washington-based Centre for Justice and International Law (CEJIL), a close associate of PBI, litigates within these bodies on behalf of victims of human rights abuses throughout Latin America. Many of the people that CEJIL represents from Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico are PBI-accompanied HRDs, who are under “precautionary measures” ordered by the Commission and “provisional measures” ordered by the Court.

In April 2011, CEJIL coordinated participation by Latin American human rights organizations in a public hearing on HRDs at the Inter American Commission in Washington. PBI was among the regional organizations invited to sign on as “petitioner” for the hearing. By CEJIL’s report, PBI’s input, data and recommendations – coordinated among the Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia Projects, the International Advocacy Coordinator and PBI USA – were some of “the best, most substantial, fact-based and objective” inputs received. They were rigorous and professional, and widely recognized as such, by Commission representatives and other NGOs.

One of CEJIL’s advocacy objectives for the hearing was to have the IAC establish a Special Rapporteurship on HRDs, similar to the Special Rapporteur in the UN. Days after the hearing, the IAC announced the new position. CEJIL now believes that PBI is “extremely well positioned” to establish good working relations with the new Rapporteur, a Mexican who already knows and respects PBI. This would be especially important, at a time when his role is still being defined.

This area seems ripe for deeper collaboration among PBI’s field Projects, the USA CG, and the International Advocacy Coordinator. Similarly, collaboration with CEJIL should continue, in order to strengthen the legal protections that are being developed within the OAS system for HRDs in the Americas. This collaboration has the potential to link on-the-ground experience directly with advocacy on issues where PBI is known to have important expertise, and to involve multiple PBI entities in a common effort that will enhance the impact and recognition of PBI as a whole. It is an example of the multi-directional collaboration that could be developed in other forums, across PBI, and with other organizational allies.³¹

Source: Project Questionnaires, interviews with Project staff and CEJIL

³¹ I did not look carefully at the work that PBI has done with respect to the EU Guidelines on Human Rights Defenders, but this is another area on which several PBI CGs and the IO have already worked in various ways, and where a focused effort could be made. As with the IAC example, PBI could gather evidence from its Projects about how the EU Guidelines are, or are not, being implemented, and then make experience-based representation to individual European governments (via CGs), the European Parliament and the EU.

6.3.4. Advocacy Themes and Arenas:

Good work is already being done by the IAWG to identify unifying themes around which PBI as a whole can organize its coordinated advocacy efforts. The themes they have identified³² correspond almost exactly with the list I made³³ as I read Project documents, conducted interviews, and mentally flagged cross-cutting issues.

Similarly, the possible forums for intervention match very closely the list I compiled, prior to reading the IAWG minutes. I also gathered information from UN websites, and made the following list of UN Special Rapporteurs and Representatives, whose mandates cover the themes and interests the IAWG identified.

UN Special Representatives and Special Rapporteurs relevant to PBI mandate:

UN Special Representative for: human rights and the business community³⁴

UN Rapporteurs on: extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; torture; human rights defenders; the independence of lawyers and judges; violence against women; freedom of expression; trafficking persons; indigenous people

An Area to Explore: Adapting Protective Accompaniment to the Extractive Sector, and Developing a Parallel Advocacy Strategy

Perhaps because I have a personal interest in corporate accountability in the extractive sector, I was repeatedly struck by the possibility of an enhanced role for PBI, in the context of growing concerns about HR violations committed on behalf of transnational mining corporations, other “foreign economic interests” and “mega-projects” in the countries where PBI works. I wondered if PBI as a whole could adapt, deepen and extend its in-country role of Protective Accompaniment to organizations working with communities resisting such projects, and combine its field-presence and well-respected information-gathering role with a rights-based advocacy strategy in the multilateral arena, and with the home-governments of offending corporations. Like any organization-wide initiative, a decision to move in this direction would require detailed research, a comprehensive risk analysis, a careful, incremental approach and clear allies. It is entirely possible that the deterrence effect of Protective Accompaniment would simply not work in many such contexts, given the nature of the armed perpetrators where corporations are involved. I nonetheless suggest it be considered as a possible new unifying theme, for the following reasons.

- It is an important, relatively new issue that increasingly is confronting PBI’s accompanied organizations, and the global human rights movement as a whole.
- It is already on the minds of a lot of PBI people, including staff in at least three field Projects, ex-volunteers and some CGs. Several PBI entities and some accompanied organizations are already addressing, or are looking at ways to address the issue.
- It has the potential to link PBI work on the ground, with advocacy at the UN and with national governments.
- It links to and could build on other expressed interests of PBI, including accompaniment of organizations working with threatened communities; work on economic, social and cultural rights;

³² These are reflected in the minutes of IAWG meetings of November 2010 and February 2011.

³³ My list included: impunity; rule of law, criminalization of HRDs; women HRDs: indigenous peoples; support to communities facing HR violations by non-state actors, and in particular mega-projects in resource extraction, hydroelectricity, agriculture etc; military aid. Of these, all but the last, which was USA-specific, appear on the IAWG list of themes to consider.

³⁴ The UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights does not appear to be in PBI sights, and would be highly relevant to any work done on HR violations and “economic interests” / transnational corporations / resource extraction etc.

and with indigenous peoples' organizations, for example.

- There is a body of international law that could form the basis of PBI advocacy in this field, which would allow PBI to play a role while maintaining its non-interventionist and rights-based approach. In countries where abuses are occurring, PBI could focus on states' responsibilities to protect the rights of their citizens. In the "home states" of offending corporations, CGs could focus on the need for accountability of corporations based in those countries, and their adherence to national and international law.
- Unlike other non-state actors, transnational companies may be more sensitive to national and international law, and in any case have international reputations that they try to protect. They may be more likely than other rights violators to be deterred by a competent international presence, and international public opinion. If the right Protective Accompaniment and advocacy strategies could be found, they might be more likely than some perpetrators of abuses to be deterred.
- PBI's field experience and could bring reliable first-hand information to advocacy efforts (and legal cases) that are being mounted globally.
- PBI's emerging and existing lawyers' committees and networks could be tapped to bring critical legal expertise to this role. (See Box in 6.5, pp. 30 below.)
- National and international organizations and coalitions are already working to hold companies accountable for HR violations, with which PBI entities, including several CGs already collaborate, and could collaborate more, at a level and with a degree of public profile of its choosing.
- The UN is already addressing the concerns of business and human rights (via the UN Special Representative on Human Rights and Business).
- New frameworks, however weak, are being developed, which would provide another point of entry and engagement.

6.3.5. PBI's Niche in a "Crowded Field" of Human Rights Advocates:

As conversations turned to PBI's role in advocacy, many interviewees cautioned PBI to be strategic in its choices. I do the same. Many people reminded me that human rights advocacy is a crowded field, which includes large organizations with whom it would be counterproductive and foolish to compete. PBI was repeatedly advised to develop its advocacy agenda in areas where PBI can "add value" to the wider human rights movement. Given the input I received, I think that will be in the area of PBI's recognized and respected capacity to bring reliable, field-based evidence and experience to policy processes and debates. Before embarking on any new advocacy initiatives, PBI would be wise to analyse the global policy context with respect to human rights advocacy, and to learn about the actions that others are already pursuing. PBI will have to identify the critical issues that are (or are not) already "on the agenda" in policy forums: which ones are of particular relevance to PBI: and what other civil society actors³⁵ are already doing about them. Much of this is surely already known. PBI will then have to assess its potential role carefully. Are there gaps that PBI might help fill? What unique contributions might PBI make? How could PBI most usefully collaborate with others? How could the different PBI entities work together to get maximum impact out of PBI's contribution? And, critically, can proposed new work be funded from sources that don't re-direct funding from existing PBI work?

Advocacy Recommendations

Recommendation 17

Distinguish among the different types of advocacy that PBI does (as per **Appendix 6**) and identify the

³⁵ e.g. Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Human Rights First, Protection International, regional networks and organizations, and UN bodies, Representatives and Rapporteurs, for example.

lead and collaborating roles of different PBI entities in each case. Address those areas of current tension or un-clarity – most specifically the respective roles and potential collaboration among Project-specific advocacy staff and CGs in Washington and Brussels.

Recommendation 18³⁶

In the short term, develop multiple-entity advocacy strategies in the OAS, the EU, and one UN body, to be followed in other forums as analysis is done, momentum builds, and as time and energy permit.

Recommendation 19

Carefully assess and document learnings from all new advocacy strategies across PBI, from the perspective of content, the quality of collaboration with other organizations, the internal structures through which it is done, the level of PBI entity involvement, clarity of roles, quality of working relationships etc.

Recommendation 20

Take concrete steps toward coordination among all PBI advocacy staff in locations where they currently work in isolation. Move quickly to establish common office space for all PBI advocacy staff in locations where there is currently more than one advocacy staff person. Work toward consolidating PBI's advocacy presence in Washington, Brussels and Geneva. As advocacy positions become vacant, hire new advocacy staff to be physically present in these locations. Consider eventual relocation of the International Advocacy Coordinator to one of these locations³⁷.

6.4 Findings - Communications

6.4.1. External Communications:

Because the 2008 International Secretariat Evaluation had already identified the need for a higher profile and a more consistent image for PBI internationally, and because there are communications professionals much better equipped than I am to advise on IT and communications strategy, I spent less time considering PBI communications than other issues. I did, nonetheless, spend several hours on PBI's International website, viewed a number of PBI videos, and read a sampling of PBI publications available electronically. I also browsed the websites of all Projects, and several Country Groups. I took part in a training session for new volunteers on the Colombia Project's communication strategy and tools. I read some, and skimmed a good many other PBI Colombia publications. In general, to my unprofessional eye, PBI publications appear to be of good quality. From these sporadic encounters, I agree with the conclusions of the earlier evaluation: that consistency of message and image, and the strategic use³⁸ of communications need more attention than quality. These two issues, plus the balance between paper and electronic communications and the

³⁶ Work in these three forums has already begun. This recommendation encourages continued work in these areas, and implicitly cautions against too many new initiatives until existing efforts are consolidated across PBI, with enough funding and time to make success possible.

³⁷ I understand that the decision to locate the International Advocacy Coordinator in the IO was taken to ensure that his work would not be skewed in favour of one forum. There is also a logic to having all international Coordinators in one location, for ease of communication among them. Until an advocacy agenda and the specific tasks of the Advocacy Coordinator are agreed, it is difficult to know where the optimal location for the position might be. The intent of Recommendation 20 is to concentrate advocacy staff in locations where advocacy will be done .

³⁸ Several people told me that they skimmed, but did not read PBI print publications, despite their quality, for reasons of "information overload". Embassy staff and CEJIL specifically underscored the importance of purpose-specific communications, regardless of format.

potential use of social media, are the strategic communications issues I heard most about during this evaluation – all in the context of limited resources. Along with staff capacity, these are the issues that a PBI communications strategy will have to address.

PBI is aware of all these concerns. The Online Communications Coordinator has made a proposal for a modest expansion of that role, which reflects one coherent view of how communications in PBI could be enhanced incrementally. I don't know enough to comment on his specific recommendations, but they appear to have merit, and to be in line with the directions in which PBI is headed.

6.4.2. Internal communications:

As with external communication, I did not look specifically at PBI's internal communications. Nonetheless, I repeatedly heard and read about the need for greater communication, cooperation and synergy across PBI³⁹, in virtually all directions: among Projects, between Projects and Country Groups, among advocacy, fundraising and communications functions, and between each of these and Projects. Responses to the first draft of this report underscored this in a variety of ways. Many people also pointed to relatively new international working groups and IO positions, and more face-to-face meetings as positive developments in addressing some of the perceived communications weaknesses. I did not look at this issue sufficiently to offer reliable advice, and the recommendations below respond only partially to the communications concerns that people have raised. I can only suggest that internal communications be addressed comprehensively in PBI's communications strategy.

Communications Recommendations

Recommendation 21

In strategic thinking about IT and communications in all PBI entities, and in PBI as a whole, pay particular attention to consistency of message and image; the intended use and audience for all communications; the paper / electronic balance, and social media.

Recommendation 22

Agree on the most urgent IT and communications priorities for PBI at the international level, and develop a phased plan to introduce them incrementally. Build IT and communication lines into all new Project, Advocacy and Fundraising budgets, including sufficient staffing at the IO to ensure that priority tasks can be accomplished.

Recommendation 23

In all future program development, including new advocacy initiatives, consider ways to use PBI's website programmatically, and build an IT and communications component into program plans (and budgets).

Recommendation 24

As with advocacy, build mechanisms to ensure that coordination on communications occurs among PBI entities. From the outset, consider how communications, including website use, will be part of new Advocacy and Fundraising strategies.

³⁹ Many responses from PBI entities to the initial questions on the Questionnaires, many responses in the Survey Monkey Surveys, and many internal interviews referred to the need for greater communication and collaboration across PBI.

Recommendation 25

Consider the potential for (a few, carefully planned) collaborations with IT students, Schools of Journalism etc, to increase the contributions of skilled volunteers in building PBI capacity in these fields.

Recommendation 26

Consider ways to use the PBI intranet more deliberately for internal exchanges and learning, of the kind proposed in Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 above.

Recommendation 27

Find ways, including periodic reader surveys and monitoring of relevant data on website use, to provide hard data for assessing the utility (as opposed to the circulation) of PBI publications and web-based documents. Use the most relevant of these to provide data to assist in evaluating communications approaches and products.

6.5 Findings - Country Groups (CGs)

According to all PBI publicity, Country Groups are a critical component of PBI's integrated Protective Accompaniment strategy. They play essential roles on the "front and back ends" of all volunteers' field experience, including in the recruitment and pre-departure training of volunteers, and in integrating volunteers back into national groups on their return home. In addition to their programmatic roles in direct support of accompanied HRDs (see below), many also play a critical role in fundraising – not only for their own activities, but for PBI's field Projects. Despite these contributions, some Country Groups feel like "poor cousins" in PBI, which (they say) claims to value their contributions as equals, but in reality views their work as secondary to the "more important" work of field Projects, and not an integral part of it.

This evaluation did not look critically at relationships between Country Groups and field Projects. It did, however, establish, for the first time, baseline data about what all the CGs do, and how each assesses the impact of its activities⁴⁰. **Appendix 7** is the result of that information gathering, and should be seen as an integral part of this evaluation. It is intended to make visible the collective contribution of CGs to PBI, and to help PBI in developing a coherent, organization-wide strategy to address the needs of Country Groups and support their contribution to PBI's overall impact. PBI is now making a concerted effort to address the place of CGs in the organization, including via a new international Working Group with participants from all active CGs, which will look at their resource needs, and propose ways to support them better in what they do. This is a welcome development.

As **Table 3** below indicates, CGs have strikingly different capacities. What they are able to do depends to a great extent on whether the groups are staffed, and how much volunteer time they can rely on. Of 15 PBI Country Groups and Associate Groups that received questionnaires about what they do, ten completed them. This response rate itself may be indicative the discrepancy that exists in their capacity. **Appendix 7** summarizes the activities that CGs report doing⁴¹. **Table 4**, below, tabulates the activities they do most frequently. Of the ten groups that filled in the questionnaire,

⁴⁰ One specific objective for the evaluation was to gather such baseline data. Individual questionnaire responses from all respondents are now in the IO. I suggest that the Working Group on Country Groups look at them for further information about CG needs, and the critical issues that CGs are facing..

nine had coordinated HRD speaking tours, and the tenth (relatively new in her job) expected to do so in the coming year. Accompanied HRDs reportedly find these tours extremely valuable. All field Projects rate the quality/impact of these tours as very high (1) or high (3). CGs rate them a little less highly⁴², but see these speaking tours, when they are done well, as a high point of their PBI work, not only because they publicize the work and challenges faced by the HRDs that PBI accompanies, but also for recruiting new volunteers and motivating CG staff and members. Speaking tours provide Country Group members with a continued personal contact to PBI's work "on the ground", and remind them of the importance of their own contribution to it. Numerous comments were made about the factors that contribute to a successful speaking tour⁴³, which it would make sense to gather together, as a future guide for all who do them.

Of the eight CGs that assessed their response to emergency requests (Q21), three rated their quality/impact as high, two as medium, and three as limited. CG quality/impact ratings for "support networks" (Q2) also included several responses in the "limited" category. Two CGs specifically mentioned the weak response by Support Networks, and another the difficulty of measuring the impact of the letters that are written. One field Project also questioned the strength of its European Support Network. Similar comments were made in the online survey. Because Support Networks are seen to be relatively weak, and because they are so central to PBI's methodology, a coordinated look at ways to improve them seems merited.

Further analysis of the questionnaires completed by CGs (and others) for this evaluation would almost certainly yield additional information that would be useful to the Working Group on Country Groups. It might suggest other measures to assist CGs in their individual and combined efforts. An "induction kit" for CGs has already been proposed, to be made available to all CGs. A draft table of contents has been developed. If they are not already included, suggestions for organizing a successful tour might be added to the package, along with suggestions for effective emergency response, building successful Support Networks etc.

Table 3: Country Group Staffing and Capacity

Table 4: CG Activities

CG	Paid staff (FTE ⁴⁴ = full time equivalent)	Volunteers	Activity	No. CGs doing it (total = 9)
Australia	less than 1	12-15	Speaking tours (Q15)	9

⁴¹ It should be noted that different Country Groups and Projects appeared to interpret activities in the table somewhat differently. If such a table is useful for future monitoring and planning, it will be important to ensure that each activity is defined, so that everyone interprets terms in the same way.

⁴² Of 9 CGs that ranked them, none rated their quality/impact as very high; 6 rated as "high", 2 "medium", and 1 "limited".

⁴³ Questionnaires reveal that the following factors are important to maximize the impact of HRD speaking tours: clear objectives (so an appropriate program can be planned); sufficient preparation time for CGs to make the most of the visitors' presence; knowledge and communication skills of the visitors; political resonance of their message in the host country; and identification of useful action that can be taken there; and effective follow up. From my own experience, I would add to this list "good briefings for the visitors", so they understand who they are meeting with and what they might expect to "get" from each planned event.

⁴⁴ FTE is the approximate number of full time staff, calculated by adding all part time staffing allocations. These figures come from questionnaires filled in by Country Groups.

Canada	1 +	15-20 + 10 Board	Emergency. response actions (Q21)	9
France	1 + 10 office vols	10	Advocacy with national governments (Q17)	9
Germany	9 part time staff + 1 long term office vol + 4-6 returned vols	80	Advocacy in coalitions (Q19)	8
			Communications – public profile (Q24)	8
Italy	0 staff + 12 office vols	22	Publications - Advocacy (Q3)	8
Netherlands	1 (soon 1 +)	40+	Support Networks (Q2)	7
Spanish State	2 + FTE, 4 people)	30-40	Peace education (Q6)	7
Switzerland	2 + FTE, 4 people	15-20 4-5 interns	Conferences (Q16)	7
			Lawyers Networks (Q20)	6 + interest
UK	2 + FTE, 5 people	65	Field delegations (Q13)	5
			UN mechanisms (Q14)	5
USA	1 FTE + 2 part time	40+	Alliance building (Q25)	5

Sources: Evaluation Questionnaires, Country Groups Performance Matrix 2010, individual correspondence

In addition to the more “traditional” work of PBI Country Groups, like Support Networks and speaking tours, several CGs have taken the lead on newer types of activities with the potential to extend PBI’s Protective Accompaniment in new arenas, and new ways. Time did not permit a close look at the ways CGs contribute to advocacy in coalitions, their advocacy with national governments, or on Women Human Rights Defenders, for example. As time permits, it would be useful to conduct an organization-wide review of work in each of these areas, and others on Table 4 where work is already being done by a substantial number of CGs. Such reviews would initially consolidate information about what CGs are doing, and could then be used by CGs themselves and by the new Working Group, to identify innovative practices, facilitate exchange, and propose future work that builds on current practice in a concerted way, across PBI.

This evaluation did look briefly at one of the innovative initiatives being led by CGs, as described in the box below, on CGs’ work with lawyers. Short case studies of this kind could be prepared to describe other types of work done by several Country Groups, to illustrate concretely their place in PBI’s overall strategy of Protective Accompaniment.

Country Group’s Lawyers’ Networks – A Case Study

Six Country Groups are at some stage of developing lawyers’ networks to support Human Rights Defenders in PBI’s Field Projects. A seventh CG is beginning to do so. Two field Projects have already established lawyers’ networks, and a third is beginning work along this line⁴⁵. Among these efforts, work by PBI UK and PBI USA to create successful Lawyers Committees, and by PBI UK to establish an “Alliance for Lawyers at Risk” appears most advanced.

⁴⁵ See Appendix 7, Q 20. CGs in Canada, France, Germany, Spain, UK and USA are already working to establish lawyers networks. PBI Netherlands is beginning to do so. Colombia and Mexico Projects already have lawyers’ networks. Nepal is developing one.

Together, these initiatives are an important extension of PBI's Protective Accompaniment, and are worthy of special attention. They have the potential to extend protection of HRDs beyond their own countries; to deepen advocacy efforts on behalf of HRDs, by drawing on expert legal advice and support; to extend PBI fundraising efforts into important new "constituencies"; and to raise PBI's profile in any number of ways, with an influential sector in the field of human rights law and policy. In some cases, liaison with such networks may also permit PBI field Projects to reduce their physical accompaniment of some organizations or individuals, by linking HRDs directly with outside people who can take appropriate, informed and quick action on their behalf, when needed.

The following paragraphs highlight work with the legal community that has been done by PBI in the UK, where PBI's Alliance for Lawyers at Risk was formally launched at a high profile event in London in November 2010, attended by 120 legal professionals. This launch followed five years of groundwork, during which PBI UK established a Lawyers' Committee and progressively built relationships with influential lawyers, legal academics and key legal bodies - often organized around the speaking tours of HRDs.

In 2008, the Law Society, with support from PBI, sent a delegation of 41 lawyers to Colombia, accompanied by the Director of PBI UK. This visit opened the eyes of participating British lawyers to the realities facing Colombian HRDs, established relationships between the British and Colombian lawyers, and strengthened relationships between PBI, the British lawyers and the legal bodies in which they play a role.

In 2009, with support from PBI UK's Lawyers Advisory Committee and several influential legal patrons who had been recruited (including a retired High Court Judge), PBI invited 800 lawyers to a well-publicized event, for which interest was sparked by the timely publication of an article written by one of the patrons in the influential *Times of London*.

As a result of these and other efforts, the Alliance for Lawyers at Risk was launched in late 2010, with the participation of human rights defenders from PBI Projects, and the support of key UK legal bodies, including the Bar Council, the Bar Human Rights Committee, the International Bar Association, The Law Society, and the Solicitors International Human Rights Group. This institutional support was matched by the public support of 66 individual founding members, including many with leadership roles in the above bodies, academic institutions, the Chancery and the Criminal Bar Associations, and the Solicitors' Human Rights Group.

To quote the PBI UK booklet written for its launch, "*The Alliance draws on the expertise and resources of the British legal profession to link with lawyers at risk abroad, helping to protect them and promote their work. Members can give their support in various ways:*

- *Establishing a direct link with individual lawyers or legal organisations in need of protection*
- *Participating in fact-finding delegations to affected countries*
- *Voicing concerns in specific cases of danger*
- *Assisting in the preparation of submissions to governments and amicus curiae briefs*
- *Advising on the review of codes and legislation to ensure their compliance with international legal standards*
- *Helping with the training of local lawyers, including producing training manuals or*

helping them to access local support

- *Providing financial support for PBI's protection work*
- *Publicly endorsing the objectives of the Alliance.*

Alliance membership is steadily growing. Its potential is still being developed. Since the Alliance was launched just six months ago, its members have undertaken many of the tasks listed above, and have organized visits to Mexico and Nepal, where they were welcomed by PBI-accompanied lawyers. The Alliance has recently submitted a large funding proposal to the British Foreign Office, requesting support for further development of the Alliance, and such activities as training and workshops for lawyers and diplomats, and work on EU Guidelines.

This focused work with lawyers is consolidating a new form of Protective Accompaniment, in an area where PBI itself does not have expertise, but can facilitate important relationships that would not be established otherwise, and which enhance PBI's capacity to offer comprehensive protection to HRDs at risk. PBI UK has developed this approach strategically in Britain, and has collaborated closely with PBI USA in thinking about how the UK experience might be relevant in the US context, and across PBI. PBI would be wise to document all its work with lawyers, and to ensure that its future work with lawyers, in all PBI entities, benefits from the collective experience of PBI as a whole, and integrates "best practice" from all CGs into a comprehensive PBI strategy.

Source: questionnaires, interviews, "PBI Alliance for Lawyers at Risk" booklet, Alliance for Lawyers at Risk 2011 needs assessment and workplan

Recommendation 28

Document the chronology and nature of all CGs' work with lawyers, and the links between this work, HRDs in field Projects, advocacy and fundraising. Facilitate exchange across PBI on work being done with lawyers' networks in all entities, to ensure learning from innovative practices, and collaboration among CGs, with Projects and with advocacy and fundraising initiatives. Develop short case studies to profile this work for funders and website users. Think strategically about involvement of the legal community as part of PBI's accompaniment strategy.

Recommendation 29

Review individual responses by Country Groups (and other entities) to the questionnaire that was completed for this evaluation, to ensure maximum learning about the needs of CGs, and their assessment of the ways in which their impact could be enhanced.

Recommendation 30

Segment CGs into those that are more and less active, and clarify expectations for each, so the less strong / active / staffed CGs are relieved of the pressure to "do everything", and so they can concentrate on a few things, and do them well. Encourage each group to develop an annual plan spelling out what it will contribute to PBI's global objectives.

Recommendation 31

Review the functioning of Support Networks across PBI, in light of the relatively weak assessment of their impact.

Recommendation 32

Consider the potential of individual CGs developing specific expertise, by geography, theme etc, for the benefit of PBI as a whole. (e.g. The Australia CG could focus on Nepal or Indonesia if a new

Project is developed, USA on the OAS or New York based UN agencies, Switzerland on one or more of the UN agencies based in Geneva, etc.)

Recommendation 33

Continue development of a minimum “starter kit” for new CG staff, that helps orient them to PBI and provides information about organizational resources and people they can call on for help and advice. Include in the kit information about “how to do” some of the things that they do most frequently, like speakers’ tours, and other items from Table 4 above.

Recommendation 34

Ensure that Country Groups in places where advocacy is taking place (Brussels, Geneva, Washington) are an integral part of advocacy plans.

6.6 Findings –Impacts

PBI’s current efforts to develop 2012-2017 Strategic Plans for field Projects, Country Groups, and PBI as a whole, will make it easier to establish realistic indicators that help assess impacts and progress against each plan. If the plans really are strategic, they will also provide a framework for designing the Terms of Reference for future strategic evaluations⁴⁶, whether of Projects, or PBI as a whole. No plan can anticipate everything. Nor should it be expected to. But good plans should become useful reference points against which to assess progress towards intended outcomes, to analyse why intended outcomes were not achieved (or achievable), and to understand how unexpected changes may have caused the plans themselves to change.

6.6.1 Impacts Beyond the Scope of PBI Intervention:

Appendix 8 lays out a framework with suggested indicators to help PBI assess the outcomes of the activities that PBI itself carries out: the Protective Accompaniment and related work that PBI undertakes to meet its objectives. As noted in Section 5, it will never be possible for PBI to measure the impacts of things beyond the scope of its own intervention, and outside PBI’s control. Except in rare circumstances, and as much as PBI or its funders might wish it, PBI will never be able to know, let alone measure with certainty the impact of its work on whole countries where it operates, or, in the case of its policy-level advocacy, on whole geographic regions or “the world”. (Nor will anybody else be able to do so, if they are honest!) PBI **should** be able to gather relevant data about some of the significant things achieved by the people and organizations it accompanies, which would allow PBI to illustrate the ripple effect of its interventions in the national context. I have not put this level of impact in **Appendix 8**, which focuses on outcomes against PBI’s own objectives, which I characterize generically as “increased visibility of HRDs”, “increased safety of HRDs”, and “widened space for HRD’s work”, though in fact objectives vary in detail from Project to Project, and CG to CG.

I nonetheless suggest that each PBI Project try to identify **a few** country-level indicators that would give a high-level impression of how PBI’s work **contributes to** the human rights movement in each country, or **helps change** the context where human rights activists operate. I suspect that such indicators will parallel the strategic

⁴⁶ As a matter of principle, I think all monitoring and all evaluations, whether internal or external, should be as strategic as the plans they are intended to evaluate against. I would encourage PBI to introduce the concept of “strategic evaluation” into all its monitoring and evaluation efforts.

thinking that PBI already does, in choosing partners in the first place. For instance, each Project might think of ways to illustrate the strategic (or symbolic) importance of the work being done by its accompanied HRDs, as a group. This could be done (may already be done!) by mapping PBI's accompanied organizations in each country, to illustrate the geographic reach of their combined activities, the range of issues they address, and their relevance to the national context. It might identify such things as:

- the “emblematic” or precedent-setting nature of the work that some accompanied organizations are doing;
- critical cases they have successfully brought through the courts;
- important convictions they have achieved, that challenge impunity;
- ways in which they have brought public or media attention to HR violations (keeping spaces open);
- ways they have worked in international spaces (like the OAS) to improve HRD visibility and protection;
- ways they have addressed HR violations in new areas, like economic, social and cultural, rights; rights of LGBT communities; indigenous peoples’ land rights etc.
- ways they draw on or take advantage of the full range of PBI resources available to them, including PBI’s International Office, Country Groups, speaking tours, Support Networks and lawyers’ networks, advocacy efforts etc.

Likewise, it ought to be possible to trace the follow-up that is done by others in response to PBI’s specific advocacy efforts in different locales, and at different levels, to illustrate the “downstream” effects of PBI’s advocacy, and hence its contribution to policy or other change (as in the OAS example, in 6.3.3., page 24).

If the achievements of accompanied organizations can be linked to PBI’s support, for instance with testimonies from accompanied organizations about the importance of PBI’s contribution, then PBI can place itself in the results chain, even if PBI can’t legitimately claim the successes or achievements entirely as its own.

In cases such as these, or to illustrate the impact of Action Alerts, a few simple narrative case studies would help to illustrate the bigger picture, and show how the integrated whole works.

It may also be useful for PBI to talk with donors about the indicators they would find useful, in defending PBI to their own project granting committees⁴⁷. Given the complexity of PBI’s work, and the difficulties of attribution and measurement noted in Section 5 above, it may be helpful to engage funders in thinking about how best to measure the success of what PBI does. While PBI’s impact indicators should first and foremost be useful to PBI, it would be helpful to know how donors approach this issue, and what suggestions they might have.

Recommendation 35

In each Project, and (eventually) in coordinated advocacy initiatives, develop ways to illustrate the integrated role of all contributing PBI entities in the countries or forums where they work, and to show PBI’s contribution to successes within a wider network, beyond PBI’s direct control. When successes occur, develop narrative case studies to illustrate the “downstream effects” of PBI Protective Accompaniment or advocacy work.

⁴⁷ This is reportedly being done by some Country Groups, with enlightening results. It would be helpful for the International Fundraising coordinator to collate and disseminate these findings.

Recommendation 36

Engage actively with all major donors, to find out how they would assess PBI's impacts, and what indicators they would find helpful to assess PBI against its own objectives, and in the wider context. Collate the findings from these donor interactions in the International Fundraising Coordinator's Office, and make them available to the International Fundraising Working Group, and all entities that do fundraising.

Recommendation 37

Adopt the concept of "strategic evaluation" in PBI, and ensure that all future monitoring and all evaluations are as strategic as the plans against which they are conducted.

6.6.2 Tracking PBI Alumni:

It became evident to me early in this evaluation that PBI has made a huge, but largely un-recorded contribution to the global human rights movement. As one Colombian interviewee noted: "PBI is a fantastic human rights school", which has given first-hand experience to hundreds of people who have later moved on to populate the human rights movement that has grown up around them in the last two decades. Just the list of people interviewed for this evaluation illustrates this fact.

In recent years, a number of international volunteer organizations have begun tracking their alumni, in an effort to understand how the volunteers' international experience helped to shape their later life, study and work choices. Doing such a study retroactively would be difficult, unless PBI has an active database of past volunteers. In the shorter term, a reasonable body of anecdotal data could probably be found, if someone, like a volunteer or a student linked to each willing Country Group, had the interest and time to track it down. Otherwise, it would be relatively easy for PBI to set up a simple future study, to monitor (say) one annual cohort of volunteers over (say) a ten year period, to learn how volunteers' PBI experience shapes their later choices. It could be as simple as five or ten questions, sent to the same people annually for ten years, asking them about what they are now doing in their volunteer, study and work lives, and whether they think their PBI experience helped shape their choices. Once again, PBI could not claim full credit for what volunteers do later in their lives, but the results of such a study would be another way of illustrating the impact of PBI as an organization on the wider human rights movement. Another organization I know has begun to track its interns in this way, in an effort to understand how their internship contributes (or not) to the professional development of young human rights lawyers and activists.

Recommendation 38

Conduct a simple longitudinal study of one cohort of PBI volunteers, to track what becomes of them following their PBI experience.

6.6.3 New Instruments for Use in Future Monitoring and Impact Measurement:

This evaluation has developed or identified the following instruments, which may be of use in future monitoring and evaluation:

- A Questionnaire on Activities by PBI Entities: to be used immediately, and updated periodically

- Survey Monkey Surveys⁴⁸: a free or very inexpensive online tool that can be tailored for any number of survey uses, by any PBI entity
- A Framework for Advocacy Planning and Monitoring: to be adapted for accuracy and used in future planning
- A Framework for designing impact indicators at all levels of PBI activity (Appendix 8)
- A Checklist for Project management, monitoring and planning (in Appendix 8)

⁴⁸ See <http://www.surveymonkey.com/TakeATour.aspx>

7. Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In future efforts to consolidate PBI’s common image and develop a PBI-wide communications strategy, consider and agree on whether and how peace (or making space for peace) is, or is not, reflected in PBI’s public representation of its work.

Recommendation 2: Maintain Protective Accompaniment and some form of physical presence with HRDs as the central feature of PBI’s methodology and identity, defined widely enough to permit different and new types of accompaniment within the definition, and in different combinations with other activities in different Field Projects and Country Groups . Focus any program expansion or new program development on initiatives that have Protective Accompaniment at their core. For instance:

- identify and document new forms of accompaniment (e.g. mobile Protective Accompaniment teams, where permanent presence may not be necessary or appropriate), and ways to apply Protective Accompaniment to new circumstances (e.g. in conflicts over land, or where conflicts are arising in the context of economic mega-projects);
- where not already doing so, and where not competing with local organizations or other INGOs that are doing it, consider training in the use of Protective Accompaniment, organizational security, and risk analysis, based on PBI’s experience;
- partner with local and international organizations that have complementary skills, where Protective Accompaniment is not a sufficient response in the circumstances;
- develop advocacy programs that derive from PBI’s direct accompaniment experience, and strengthen Protective Accompaniment in new ways.

Recommendation 3: For consistency of message and image, agree on, use and publicize a PBI-wide definition of Protective Accompaniment that includes a combination of physical presence, moral, and political support that combine to offer a degree of protection to those organizations and individuals that PBI “accompanies”.

Recommendation 4: In all future project development (most immediately with the new Kenya Project, and a possible new Project in Indonesia) take care to ensure that all of the above pre-conditions are met.

Recommendation 5: As part of new Monitoring and Evaluation guidelines (see Recommendation 8 below), develop a checklist, similar to the list above, to be used regularly by all PBI Projects, to bring greater coherence to internal Project reviews, and external project evaluations.

Recommendation 6: Continue the current movement toward a set of common strategic questions that all PBI Projects and Country Groups use in their strategic planning (including the critical factors identified in 6.1.3. above).

Recommendation 7: Adopt a single, simple, logic table for all PBI entities to use in summarizing their strategic plans in table form.

Recommendation 8: Provide some basic training on the agreed logical framework for the people most closely involved in PBI's strategic planning, to demystify it, and further contribute to uniformity in the planning process across PBI.

Recommendation 9: To facilitate consistency across PBI evaluations, develop and adopt some (simple!) PBI-wide guidelines for Project and Global Evaluations, which consistently link evaluations directly to Strategic Planning instruments and relevant Strategic Plans.

Recommendation 10: Identify issues where PBI as a whole (or sub-sets of it) would benefit from learning exchanges across entities, and create opportunities for these to happen, face-to-face, or virtually.

Recommendation 11: Identify and selectively document "best (or innovative) practices" at all levels of PBI operation, and build opportunities for exchange and learning about them across PBI. Locate coordination of this task somewhere in the IO. Consider placing the products of this reflection on the PBI's intranet space to encourage dialogue. Consider making some of them publicly available on the website.

Recommendation 12: Build intentional "peer review" processes into program planning and monitoring, as a way both to share experience and facilitate learning about different approaches across PBI. De-link peer review from decision-making about funding in the organization, so questions or critique from other entities are not confused with decisions about funding. Build cross-project peer review as a component of future Project evaluations.

Recommendation 13: In all new program expansion or developments, including into advocacy at the regional and international levels, ensure that Protective Accompaniment remains at their core, and that all component pieces remain integrated, so that each reinforces the other.

Recommendation 14: Develop one or two short case studies in each Project, to illustrate in concrete ways how PBI's integrated approach functions, when it works well, to combine PBI's many activities, and take advantage of PBI's presence in different locations.

Recommendation 15: Whether by periodic survey or by some other means, gather assessments by in-country diplomats about the value of their working relationship with PBI, and the use they make of information passed on to them by PBI. Use this information as one indicator in assessing the impact of PBI's in-country Protective Accompaniment work.

Recommendation 16: Address the issue of Project management in all relevant structures of PBI. Move to establish a staff position in the International Office responsible for monitoring and supporting Projects with program development, management, and problem solving. Build a group of experienced people with combined professional skills in program and organizational management, project evaluation and Protective Accompaniment, who can be called upon quickly by staff, to provide support to new Projects, and to address problems before they become

crises. Link Recommendations 9, 10 and 11 (about documenting best practices, peer review) to this position, when established.

Recommendation 17: Distinguish among the different types of advocacy that PBI does (as per **Appendix 6**) and identify the lead and collaborating roles of different PBI entities in each case. Address those areas of current tension or un-clarity – most specifically the respective roles and potential collaboration among Project-specific advocacy staff and CGs in Washington and Brussels.

Recommendation 18: In the short term, develop multiple-entity advocacy strategies in the OAS, the EU, and one UN body, to be followed in other forums as analysis is done, momentum builds, and as time and energy permit.

Recommendation 19: Carefully assess and document learnings from all new advocacy strategies across PBI, from the perspective of content, the quality of collaboration with other organizations, the internal structures through which it is done, the level of PBI entity involvement, clarity of roles, quality of working relationships etc.

Recommendation 20: Take concrete steps toward coordination among all PBI advocacy staff in locations where they currently work in isolation. Move quickly to establish common office space for all PBI advocacy staff in locations where there is currently more than one advocacy staff person. Work toward consolidating PBI's advocacy presence in Washington, Brussels and Geneva. As advocacy positions become vacant, hire new advocacy staff to be physically present in these locations. Consider eventual relocation of the International Advocacy Coordinator to one of these locations.

Recommendation 21: In strategic thinking about IT and communications in all PBI entities, and in PBI as a whole, pay particular attention to consistency of message and image; the intended use and audience for all communications; the paper / electronic balance, and social media.

Recommendation 22: Agree on the most urgent IT and communications priorities for PBI at the international level, and develop a phased plan to introduce them incrementally. Build IT and communication lines into all new Project and Advocacy budgets, including sufficient staffing at the IO to ensure that priority tasks can be accomplished.

Recommendation 23: In all future program development, including new advocacy initiatives, consider ways to use PBI's website programmatically, and build an IT and communications component into program plans (and budgets).

Recommendation 24: As with advocacy, build mechanisms to ensure that coordination on communications occurs among PBI entities. From the outset, consider how communications, including website use, will be part of new advocacy strategies.

Recommendation 25: Consider the potential for (a few, carefully planned) collaborations with IT students, Schools of Journalism etc, to increase the contributions of skilled volunteers in building PBI capacity in these fields.

Recommendation 26: Consider ways to use the PBI intranet more deliberately for internal exchanges and learning, of the kind proposed in Recommendations 9, 10 and 11 above.

Recommendation 27: Find ways, including periodic reader surveys and monitoring of relevant data on website use, to provide hard data for assessing the utility (as opposed to the circulation) of PBI publications and web-based documents. Use the most relevant of these to provide data to assist in evaluating communications approaches and products.

Recommendation 28: Document the chronology and nature of all CGs' work with lawyers, and the links between this work, HRDs in field Projects, advocacy and fundraising. Facilitate exchange across PBI on work being done with lawyers' networks in all entities, to ensure learning from innovative practices, and collaboration among CGs, with Projects and with advocacy and fundraising initiatives. Develop short case studies to profile this work for funders and website users. Think strategically about involvement of the legal community as part of PBI's accompaniment strategy.

Recommendation 29: Review individual responses by Country Groups (and other entities) to the questionnaire that was completed for this evaluation, to ensure maximum learning about the needs of CGs, and their assessment of the ways in which their impact could be enhanced.

Recommendation 30: Segment CGs into those that are more and less active, and clarify expectations for each, so the less strong / active / staffed CGs are relieved of the pressure to "do everything", and so they can concentrate on a few things, and do them well. Encourage each group to develop an annual plan spelling out what it will contribute to PBI's global objectives.

Recommendation 31: Review the functioning of Support Networks across PBI, in light of the relatively weak assessment of their impact.

Recommendation 32: Consider the potential of individual CGs developing specific expertise, by geography, theme etc, for the benefit of PBI as a whole. (e.g. The Australia CG could focus on Nepal or Indonesia if a new Project is developed, USA on the OAS and / or some of the New York-based UN agencies, Switzerland on one or more of the UN agencies based in Geneva, etc.)

Recommendation 33: Continue development of a minimum "starter kit" for new CG staff, that helps orient them to PBI and provides information about organizational resources and people they can call on for help and advice. Include in the kit information about "how to do" some of the things that they do most frequently, like speakers' tours, and other items from Table 4 above.

Recommendation 34: Ensure that Country Groups in places where advocacy is taking place (Brussels, Geneva, Washington) are an integral part of advocacy plans.

Recommendation 35: In each Project, and (eventually) in coordinated advocacy initiatives, develop ways to show the contribution of PBI entities in the countries or forums where they work, and to show PBI’s contribution to successes within a wider network, beyond its direct control. When successes occur, develop narrative case studies to illustrate the “downstream effects” of PBI accompaniment or advocacy work.

Recommendation 36: Engage actively with all major donors, to find out how they would assess PBI’s impacts, and what indicators they would find helpful to assess PBI against its own objectives, and in the wider context. Collate the findings from these donor interactions in the International Fundraising Coordinator’s Office, and make them available to the International Fundraising Working Group, and all entities that do fundraising.

Recommendation 37

Adopt the concept of “strategic evaluation” in PBI, and ensure that all future monitoring and all evaluations are as strategic as the plans against which they are conducted.

Recommendation 38: Conduct a simple longitudinal study of one cohort of PBI volunteers, to track what becomes of them following their PBI experience.

8. Appendices

Appendix 1: Document Review

Appendix 2A and 2B: English and Spanish Questionnaire for all PBI Entities

Appendix 3A and 3B: English and Spanish Survey Monkey data

Appendix 4: Interviews Conducted

Appendix 5: Field Visit to Colombia

Appendix 6: Activities by PBI Entity - Summary of Questionnaire Responses

Appendix 7: Table – Advocacy

Appendix 8: Table – Indicators

JC / May 26, 2011