The world is changing and Amnesty International is changing with it.

We are embarking on a new global strategy that seeks to address some of the biggest challenges the human rights movement is facing today. Our commitment to achieving the Strategic Goals drives us to learn, to innovate and to steadily adapt the way we understand and approach human rights change.

We will develop a strong analysis of how and why human rights abuses happen, linking causes with effects and problems with solutions – with the active agency of those affected.

We will take on those responsible for abuses – be it states, corporations or global institutions, exposing the links between inequality, discrimination, injustice and repression.

We will act effectively and quickly to change the lives of individual people who face suffering and injustice while maintaining our focus on longer-term structural changes.

We will grow the human rights movement and people’s capacity to claim their rights, investing more energy in working and learning alongside diverse global, national and local groups.

Our Impact & Learning system is designed to help us understand, improve, and tell this story of change. We will use it to monitor and evaluate our work in line with the Strategic Goals, to generate evidence of our progress and challenges, to communicate results, and to identify where we need to intensify or adjust our approach – in a single project, or across our movement as a whole.
Our purpose is to understand change. We will map outcomes at project level, with regional and Goal analysis, to build a picture of movement-wide impact that cracks the ‘how’ behind human rights change. What creates the most significant change and when does influence on our stakeholders work?

This work will be underpinned by these principles.

**ADAPTATION**

Actively support review and reflection, regularly adjusting plans and strategies to respond to external changes.

**INNOVATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING**

Invest in evaluation and learning initiatives to strengthen knowledge around new or particularly challenging areas of work.

**COLLABORATIVE ANALYSIS**

Expand on project team review to systematically include perspectives and evidence from enabling teams, from Sections and structures and from partners who’ve helped deliver our work.

**EXTERNAL VALIDATION**

Best practice to include outreach to external organizations, networks, communities and where possible, targets, to test and review our internal impact analysis.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

To rights holders, communities, our partners and donors to share the story of AI’s contribution towards human rights change; To ourselves, to enable effective decision-making across our organization.

**MORE**

**COLLABORATIVE ANALYSIS WITH OUR PARTNERS**

Over the next four years we will support more teams to be more systematic in the way they solicit feedback from partners, communities and other external stakeholders in their annual review. We will support spaces for assessing impact with partners inside and outside of AI. Imagine, for example, an annual project review run as a participatory storytelling workshop where stakeholders reconstruct an impact story of influencing the authorities to better understand what made the government shift!
Outcome mapping with an expect-like-love progression of indicators is a monitoring and evaluation framework used by many organisations whose work is on complex social issues and whose impact depends on influencing behaviours and relationships.

What you expect to see should be broadly within the control of the project. It should be realistic, plausible, probable and represent the minimum results for the project to have been a success in this area.

What you would like to see will reflect results that are progressively more difficult to guarantee. What you would like to see are outcomes that you positively anticipate as possible, but in addition to your own efforts there are more external variables in play that stand between your project and the achievement of these outcomes. What you would love to see are close to a ‘best-case’ scenario – it is our ambition to achieve them but alignment of significant external variables will be needed to bring the change closer to the tipping point.

With more time and work you are more likely to progress up this scale. Depending on the ambition of your project, the journey to successful achievement of your objectives will include achieving a combination of what you would ‘like’ and ‘love’ to see with different stakeholders.

---

**DIMENSIONS OF CHANGE, STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS AND OUTCOME MAPPING**

Throughout the last ISP we asked project teams to think of their impact in terms of four dimensions of change, which sought to break down human rights impact into constituent parts relevant for Amnesty. This approach included a standardized set of questions, applied across all projects.

The Dimensions of Change helped us think about one particular model of how human rights change is achieved, derived from a traditional model in Amnesty projects. It starts with mobilisation of people, and ends, we hope, in changes in rights-holders’ lives, after changes in policy and law.

For the Strategic Goals period we’re asking teams to get more specific in how they articulate the changes or outcomes they are trying to achieve with specific stakeholders. We’ll move from standardized dimensions to a more flexible approach that can be tailored to project aims. The approach builds on and reinforces what projects do already; an analysis of what stakeholders they must engage and whose behaviour they must try to alter, in order to achieve their objectives.

We are doing this using a simple outcome mapping framework (based on an indicator progression we will call expect-like-love) outlined below. This tool can provide more specific aggregate lessons, such as with which stakeholders we are most able to achieve change, and why.

---
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WHO DOES WHAT AND WHEN?

The Impact and Learning System will rely on several building-blocks to provide layers of evidence and lessons at project, regional and global strategy levels. At project level, ongoing reflection should contribute to strategy adjustment throughout the year, with the results of a more thorough review captured annually, and used as the basis for regional and global analysis.

Reviews and assessments will be carried out at IS and S/s level, by integrated teams. For IS-led projects, annual reviews will be complemented by a process of project monitoring, to run in parallel with quarterly forecasting. This will allow us to more systematically monitor whether projects are on track or at risk, to assess how that status affects the health of each Strategic Goal, and to identify any course corrections that may be needed throughout the year.

All IS staff will be expected to spend a minimum of 5% of their time on impact assessment and learning across the year. Sections and structures will lead reviews of their priority projects and will contribute to reviews of IS projects, particularly global priorities such as the Global Campaigns and our Human Rights Education work.

PROJECT ANALYSIS (OF ALL IS-LED PROJECTS AND AGREED S/S PRIORITY PROJECTS)

Who: Project Manager with core project team, enabling IS programmes, key Sections and structures and (where feasible) partners.

What: Assessment of project progress against objectives and outcome indicators; Identification of the project’s ‘most significant change.’

When: Annually, during one of four review windows.

How: Collaborative workshop with the project team.

SUB-REGIONAL AND REGIONAL ANALYSIS

Who: Regional Management Team with regional project managers, enabling IS programmes, key Sections and structures.

What: Aggregation of project level analysis; Review of sub-regional or regional external developments and trends; Identification of patterns in regional ‘most significant change;’ Assessment of regional impact against Strategic Goal outcomes.

When: Annually, during Q4.

How: Strategic mapping exercise and trends analysis workshop within each Regional Office.

MORE

CROSS-REGIONAL LEARNING

The new Impact and Learning System will put more emphasis on spaces for cross-regional learning to make sure we make the best of operating as a distributed yet inter-connected movement. This will mean creating and supporting learning groups between project managers working on similar themes in different regions (for example those working on HRD protection mechanisms in Mexico, Afghanistan and West Africa).
The Impact & Learning system toolkit will provide helpful guidance to support every stage of the review process. A range of tools are being developed to help teams carry out their analysis and specific templates will be used to capture findings at every review level. The Strategy & Evaluation Unit will be on hand to provide support and facilitation.

**THEORY OF CHANGE ANALYSIS**

**Who:** Theory of Change (ToC) Lead with designated Strategy Review Groups (per Strategic Goal Theory of Change) composed of experts in ToC areas drawn from across the movement.

**What:** Aggregation of project level analysis; Mapping of project level outcomes against ToC outcomes; Analysis of external developments and trends; Assessment of impact and identification of patterns of ‘most significant change’ across each ToC.

**When:** Annually, during Q1, and aligned to Management Team Week

**How:** ToC assessment and trends analysis exercise by each ToC group; emphasizing review of priority projects.

**MORE**

**HORIZON SCANNING**

The Impact and Learning system will encourage us to look more systematically outside AI and even outside the traditional human rights sector to build the knowledge necessary for addressing human rights challenges. Strategy review groups will be tasked with assessing progress against Theory of Change outcomes, and will also dedicate resources to scanning the external environment for global trends that we need to factor in our strategies till 2019 and beyond.

**ORGANISATIONAL CAPABILITIES ANALYSIS**

**Who:** Organisational & Support and Governance project teams with contributing IS programmes and key Sections and structures.

**What:** Aggregation of project level analysis into review of specific organizational capabilities. (i.e Digital Strategy, Finance Strategy).

**When:** Annually, during Q1, and aligned to Management Team Week

**How:** Strategic mapping exercise and trends analysis workshop with cross-functional teams.

**STRATEGIC GOAL ANALYSIS**

**Who:** Strategic Goal Lead with ToC groups and cross-programme input.

**What:** Aggregation of Regional, Theory of Change and Organizational Capabilities analysis; Assessment of impact against specific Strategic Goal outcomes.

**When:** Annually, to be completed by Q1. Bi-annually by external evaluators.

**How:** To be implemented through a combination of data analysis and participatory review.
### Building Blocks for Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 2016</th>
<th>Q3 2016</th>
<th>Q4 2016</th>
<th>Q1 2017</th>
<th>Q2 2017</th>
<th>Q3 2017</th>
<th>Q4 2017</th>
<th>Q1 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One annual review in a choice of quarterly windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of Change, Organisational Capabilities and Goal by Goal Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### More

**Analysis of National Entity Impact**

We will enhance our understanding of national entity contribution to the Strategic Goals and rely on all parts of the movement to build a global picture of our impact. Through the Performance Measurement Framework, the Ss facing component of our Impact & Learning system, Sections and National Offices will evaluate their nationally-led projects as well as their contribution to movement-wide priorities like the Global Campaigns. Ss contribution to specific IS projects will be most effectively captured when strategic national entities are engaged in project teams from initiation phase, for planning, implementation and review purposes.

### Learning for Strategy and Innovation

Making sure we generate the knowledge we need to improve and adapt our strategies is a key ambition of the system with an emphasis on increasing cross-regional sharing, horizon scanning and learning more from and with our partners and stakeholders.

Our annual impact and learning reviews will be complemented by series of thought-provoking learning initiatives that will target specific strategic challenges and generate concrete insights on how to achieve more impact or innovate in our tactics and approaches. The learning initiatives will take different formats – deep-dive workshops, seminars, action-learning sets, peer evaluations, collaborative inquiries – and each initiative will investigate a long-standing stumbling block to human rights impact (i.e. how to empower Human Rights Defenders in countries we have no access to) or a strategic opportunity (i.e. how to use technology to adapt our research methodologies).

Our learning programme will emphasize looking inward, at our progress and challenges, and outward, to understand how changes in the external world affect our work and aims.
UNDERSTANDING OUR IMPACT

If we are to learn, adjust and hold ourselves accountable, we require solid evidence produced through rigorous assessment of our work. There are a number of ways that the Impact and Learning System will produce information that we can use to make better decisions in our projects and for our regional and global strategies. The results of this system are shown below.

The evidence and knowledge we generate through our impact and learning system will tell us what is driving our human rights impact, and where to ramp up or make adjustments in our strategies. In the longer-term, the information we produce from this system will allow us to adjust our priorities to respond to a changing world and be the most impactful Amnesty we can be.

For more information or support please contact the strategy and evaluation unit (SEU) seu@amnesty.org or find us on the third floor of the IS-London office.