Amnesty International
Africa Human Rights Education Project
GTF 376

Governance and Transparency Fund
Annual Report (1 April 2009 – 31 March 2010)

30 June 2010

Contents

1. Programme Identification Details

GTF Number	GTF 376
Short Title of Programme	Africa Rights Education Programme (AHRE)
Name of Lead Institution	Amnesty International
Start date	15.09.2008
End date	14.09.2012
Amount of DFID Funding	£3,148,725
Brief Summary of Programme	Amnesty International's Africa Human Rights Education Project is a four year programme to strengthen civil society capacity to deliver locally relevant human rights education and to improve human rights for the most disadvantaged by empowering marginalised communities to promote and defend their human rights. The programme will deliver community-level human rights education in 10 countries across East and West Africa in partnership with 20 local organisations. Local partners will mobilise community level Human Rights Education Workers (project participants) and support them with resources to design and deliver a range of innovative Human Rights Education projects (micro projects). The project will anchor a culture of human rights education within specific communities, enabling communities to identify how human rights relate to their lives and the role duty bearers should play in promoting and protecting those rights, ultimately improving human rights behaviour.
List all countries where activities have taken place	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda
List all implementing partners in each country	Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF Benin), Amnesty International Burkina Faso, Amnesty International Côte d'Ivoire, Maata-N-Tudu Association Ghana, Legal Resources Foundation Kenya, Amnesty International Mali, Amnesty International Senegal, Amnesty International Sierra Leone, Amnesty International Togo, East & Horn of Africa Human Rights Education Project (EHAHRDP Uganda) Secondary partners are as follows: Amnesty International Benin, Groupe d'Etudes et de Recherches sur la Democratie et le Developpement Economique et Social (GERDES Burkina), Association des Femmes Juriste de Cote d'Ivoire (AFJCI), Amnesty International Ghana, Legal Resources Foundation (Kenya), Centre for Rights Education and Awareness (Kenya), Association pour Defense des Droits des Femmes (APDF) (Mali), Groupe Agora pour l'Education aux Droits de l'Enfant a la Paix (GRA-REDEP) (Senegal),

	Centre for Democracy and Human Rights (CDHR) (Sierra Leone), CRIFF-GF2D (Togo), Agency for Co-operation and Research in Development (ACORD) (Uganda)
Target groups – wider beneficiaries	**Communities and individuals directly benefiting from the HRE projects** 22,500 people will become aware of their human rights, empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives / the relevance of human rights in their communities. The project will reach out to a wide range of communities: marginalised and poor communities, people directly affected by human rights abuses, rural communities, people living in informal settlements, people who have had no previous access to HRE, people who have the capacity to effect change (i.e. tribal chiefs, journalists, lawyers & teachers). **National Level Participants** Partners will directly benefit from the project through on-going training, advice and support from AI. In total, the following will be involved and benefit from the project: ■ 10 project coordinators (national coordinators) ■ 24 local human rights organisations ■ 50 members of 10 partnership committees At least 20 local partners will have increased capacity to plan, co-ordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE **HRE Workers** A pool of HRE workers will be created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects
Lead Contact	Anna Bainbridge (Sandy McClure after 16 July 2010) Amnesty International Peter Benenson House 1 Easton Street London WC1X 0DW 020 7413 5879 (Sandy – 020 7413 5990) anna.bainbridge@amnesty.org (sandra.mcclure@amnesty.org)
Person who prepared this report **(if different from Lead Contact)**	Aminatou Sar Africa Human Rights Education Project Africa Regional Office Villa 22 Sacré Cœur Extension P.O. Box 47582 Dakar Senegal Tel: +221 33 864 7774 aminatou.sar@amnesty.org

2. List of Acronyms

AI: Amnesty International
AHRE: Africa Human Rights Education
CBO: Community Based Organisation
CSO: Civil Society Organisation
HRE: Human Rights Education
GTF: Governance and Transparency Fund
HRE Workers: Individuals or CBOs delivering micro-projects – alternatively known as project participants
NCs: National Coordinators
VAW: Violence against Women

3. Executive Summary

During the period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010 Amnesty International's Africa Human Rights Education project entered full implementation stage – evidenced by the development and initiation of 63 community level human rights education micro-projects across 10 countries (and the development of a further 27 micro-projects due to be initiated by the end of May 2010). HRE workers are employing a range of participatory human rights education methodologies and are benefiting from ongoing capacity building, mentoring and resource development delivered via national and regional level project structures. During the reporting period, we completed numerous activities towards the six project outputs. A summary is below:

- *Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, co-ordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE:* In each country a partnership committee is operational and guides the project strategy on a national level. Country strategy papers have been drawn up, detailing how the project will be implemented in each country, articulating strategies for organisational capacity building, tackling the most relevant HRE themes and constituencies, training HRE workers and responding to risk and cross cutting issues. Capacity building for National Coordinators has focused to date on project management, project development and monitoring and evaluation. Training on monitoring and evaluating small-scale, community level, projects has been delivered with the support of ActionAid's West Africa Regional M&E team. The Amnesty International Learning and Impact Unit has also supported the AHRE team by providing guidance on M&E plans linked to all micro projects submitted by participants and also through providing training in the field to HRE participants. Capturing and gathering success through video, audio and testimony has been emphasized and coordinators have been provided with and trained in the use of a small and user-friendly video device.

- *Output 2: A pool of 150 HRE workers (15 x 10 countries) and CBOs is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects:* In June and July 2009 up to 15 HRE workers were recruited per country. Dynamic individuals were selected but attention was given to choosing individuals affiliated with organisations. The final list includes women's leaders, youth leaders and CBOs rooted within, and with access to, specific marginalised constituency groups. A week long induction workshop for HRE workers was held from 27-31 July in Côte d'Ivoire with the primary purpose of supporting

them to design projects that directly respond to the human rights needs of their communities. This was followed by consultation with potential project beneficiaries (representatives of marginalised communities) undertaken by 77 HRE workers (across the 10 countries) between August and October 2009. However, some partners and project participants needed to postpone travel to, and consultations with, some rural communities due to Ramadan and the rainy season. As such, the original deadline for partners to submit their final baseline data and micro-project plans to the Project Management Team was extended from August until end October. Furthermore, the Project Management Team decided to build in more than the original one month scheduled for the development of micro-projects. Some proposals were found to be lacking SMART (Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound) objectives and, in a minority of cases, further capacity building was needed at the national level to bring micro-project design up to the expected standard. In the end development and assessment of micro projects was ongoing until January 2010.

- *Output 3: An increased number of people (22,500 = 150 x 50 people x 3 years) are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate:* During the reporting period 63 micro-projects were launched in communities. Each seeks to address 'informal processes' of vertical forms of accountability, and to provide access to quality and locally relevant information and tools of human rights. For example in Côte d'Ivoire, a micro-project focusing on access to health for women in the community of Sinfra – where women must currently pay 120,000 CFA (£156) for a Caesarean and 15,000 CFA (£20) for a drip in a country where more than 47% of the population live on less than £1 per day – is conducting sensitisation and mobilisation towards reducing corruption in health care. Due to the reasons outlined above micro-projects were started in early 2010 rather than in October 2009 as originally anticipated. We also decided that rather than strictly adhering to three distinct 12 month cycles of micro project implementation starting in October 2009, we would encourage more fluid development and enhancement of micro projects. As a result, in some cases micro-projects will commence in January 2010 and continue until September 2012. We originally anticipated a total of 450 projects (150 projects per 12 month cycle x 3 cycles) with each project reaching 50 people resulting in 22,500 beneficiaries in total. We now expect to reach the same number of beneficiaries through fewer but more wide-reaching and more sustainable micro-projects.

- *Output 4: People living in at least 50 communities are able to identify local human rights issues, their correspondence to human rights instruments and the relevance of human rights in their communities:* The above output has been partially reached via participatory design and development of micro projects in communities but will be fully reached at a later stage in the AHRE project when micro-projects have been operational for at least a year – key indicators of success are people formulating plans and organising projects of self-help in at least 50 communities / constituency groups.

- *Output 5: Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning, best practice, and a joint voice:* The AHRE online network space has gone live and is being used. Thematic sub-groups for the network have been set up. The Project

Participants' Induction and Training Workshop held at Grand Bassam in Côte d'Ivoire in July 2009 was an important first step towards the development of the regional network of project participants. At country level, HRE participants have been grouped into national networks and during the reporting period have participated in a number of national-level networking activities.

- *Output 6: Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change:* Various activities towards this output were scheduled for April 2009 to March 2010 and in most countries partners started the process of a) identifying local needs relating to HRE materials and b) meeting those needs. Partners have expressed however that HRE material production should happen on a rolling basis in line with micro-project implementation and as such some activities scheduled for April 2009 to March 2010 will now take place later in the project.

4. Programme Management

No major changes have occurred in the programme management structure since the last report. The project is still delivered by the management team as outlined in the project budget – one Project Manager plus two Regional Project Coordinators. From April to September 2009 Anna Bainbridge and Kwasi Gaglo acted as interim Project Managers and Aminatou Sar was appointed as permanent Project Manager in October 2009. Assouan Gbesso joined the programme in April 2009 as Regional Project Coordinator and Kwasi Gaglo returned to his initial position as the second Regional Project Coordinator in October 2010. The Project Management Team is based in Dakar, Senegal.

5. Working with Implementing Partners

Establishing and formalising relationships with coordinating and implementing partners

Primary (coordinating) partners: No changes occurred to primary partners.

Secondary (implementing) partners: During the reporting period, two secondary partners were confirmed in Togo and Uganda. In Togo, the Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action Femme Démocratie et Développement (GF2D) was confirmed as the secondary (implementing) partner. In Uganda, the Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD) has been confirmed as secondary partner.

In Togo, the original secondary partner, the Association Togolaise pour la Défense et la Promotion des Droits Humains (ATDPDH), was suspended from the AHRE project and replaced by GF2D due to an internal conflict within ATDPDH that ended up before the courts of Togo. The Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action Femme Démocratie et Développement (GF2D) is a non-profit women's rights organisation present in all five regions of Togo. The organisation has expertise in legal aid, civic education, counselling and capacity building for grassroots associations and community leaders.

In Uganda, Agency for Co-operation and Research in Development (ACORD) was chosen as the secondary partner (a secondary partner not having been selected earlier in the project). ACORD is an Africa-led international alliance working to promote social justice. ACORD combines practical work, research and advocacy in the four cross cutting thematic areas of conflict, gender, livelihood and HIV/AIDS. The key approach running through all their thematic and geographic interventions is building momentum for social action.

6. Risk Assessment

Please find below the most up to date project risk assessment.

	Description	Rating	Cause and Consequence	Risk Management
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION				
1	Mismanagement of project funds by partners	Medium	- Unspent funds could lead to lost funds and subsequent inability to deliver certain activities and reach certain outputs. - Overspent funds will result in partners having to utilise other resources or divert time to fundraising	Project Management Team provides ongoing training on budget management to complement various guidance plus support tools already produced and standardised financial monitoring templates used by all partners.
2	Failure of partners to achieve indicators of success outlined in the project logical framework and/or inability to provide evidence/means of verification	Low	- Some of the project partners have a greater need for further capacity building in project implementation plus project reporting and data collection (success stories and lessons learned)	Project Management Team has developed training on collecting testimonies and success stories – this will be ongoing Ongoing capacity building of partners and HRE workers / project participants has been built into the project design – if necessary all funds for capacity building, training and learning can be focused into better implementation of projects on the ground – the provision of specialist mentoring and expertise on a a national basis from various local training providers is currently being explored as an option
3	Retention and capacity of HRE workers	Medium	- Partial project delivery - Budgetary impact on recruitment and training costs - Impact on beneficiaries	- HRE workers are drivers of their own projects with allocated resources, incentives and ongoing training and support - HRE workers are engaged and active in their own communities - Contingency budget to recruit and retrain HRE workers - Focus on groups and CBOs to ensure sustainability. To date only one project

	Description	Rating	Cause and Consequence	Risk Management
				participant / CBO has dropped out of the project (in Senegal) – out of a total of 93 recruited – so current indication is that project participants feel their participation in the project is beneficial to their development.
4	Fraud and financial risk	Low	- Insufficient budget - Damaged reputation - Reduced activities - Lack of skills of partner to monitor and track expenses, especially where there is no dedicated finance officer	- Robust financial and reporting procedures - Ongoing programme of support and training including project budgeting and delivery - Clarity of roles and trained staff - MOU signed by all partners has provision for AI to terminate the funding agreement if any request for Project Funds is based on misleading information or falsified documentation or is [materially] underachieving against targets or is [materially] unable to deliver on aspects of the Project (including any reporting requirements) or if Project Partners uses the Project Funds for any purpose other than the purposes set out in the MOU or if AI has reasonable grounds to suspect any fraud or misappropriation on the part of one of the Project Partners
5	The fall of the Pound Sterling	Medium	- Project budget becomes unrealistic in certain project countries - Certain activities can only be partially carried out as funds are insufficient	- Flexible approach to budgets as they pertain to each country - Allow partners to justify and implement budget and activity variation providing that the achievement of project outputs is not jeopardised - Match funding sought

	Description	Rating	Cause and Consequence	Risk Management
6	Community/project participants' expectations are not met	Low	- Expectation of community that they will *receive* something from project such as salaries, computers, digital cameras, additional running costs or direct service delivery	- Clear explanation to beneficiaries in the community on the level/scope of the project, including what the project can do and what it can't do - Linking communities with other NGOs who can support them in their needs such as health care and clean water
EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT				
7	Seasonal events and climate (for example the rainy season, Ramadan) hamper/stop project implementation	High	- Project activities stop due to fasting - Project activities stop due to farmers preparing fields - Communities become difficult to access due to flooding and damaged roads	- Planning takes into account these events into the activity schedule, avoiding these periods for activity implementation
8	Elections	Medium	- Elections are due to be held in the following countries: Côte d'Ivoire – end of 2010, Senegal – March 2012, Benin – March 2011, Burkina Faso – 21 Nov 2010, Mali – April 2012, Uganda – 2011, Kenya – Dec 2012. - Pre- and post-election periods are tense, people tend to stay at home and some people are displaced through insecurity and violence. Micro-projects are likely to stop during these times. - Politically active project participants may use their micro-projects for political gain to increase votes for the candidate they support or for themselves, therefore blurring the project boundaries - Project participants may be against the ruling government and may therefore be targeted by government during pre-election periods	- Politically active project participants to keep a low profile and minimise project activities during the election period - Project management to advise project participants to avoid mixing up project activities and their political activities
9	Change in government, traditional or local/religious authorities	Medium	- During the lifetime of the project there will be elections at national and local level - The new authorities may hamper or stop project implementation	- Introduce the project to the new leaders and seek their approval
10	Change in attitude of community leaders once project implementation starts	Medium	- Community leaders no longer buy into project once implementation starts - Community leaders threaten/ intimidate/ reject project participants	- Involve community leaders in all phases of project implementation - Clearly explain to them what we are doing at each step, how we intend to do it,

	Description	Rating	Cause and Consequence	Risk Management
			- Other communities hear about intimidation and pull out as they fear similar consequences	and seek their inputs, suggestions, recommendations and guidance
11	Change in attitude of local authorities or government once the project implementation starts	Low	- Local authorities fear unrest or increased capacity and engagement of local rebellion communities and don't allow implementation - Government stop or block the project because they are uncomfortable with implementation	- Support project participants in maintaining continuous contact with authorities and try as much as possible to involve them in the process, or to make them aware of their activities prior to the event - Maintain good relationships and seek support from other powerful authorities such as traditional or religious leaders supporting the project
12	Risk to individual beneficiaries in claiming their rights	Medium	- Relationships and status quo in the community change as individual beneficiaries challenge other community members on HR violations - The beneficiaries don't have the means to tackle HR violations because of lack of access to justice services or funds to pay for services - Individual beneficiaries may drop out of the project because they feel exposed	- NCs to advise project participants to liaise with their peers in the community to make links with those who can help - Project participants to refer and link up beneficiaries to volunteer lawyers, legal advice, counselling services -The high risk countries are those where an election is about to happen (local or national). Projects participants pay a courtesy visit to the local authorities explaining what they intend in the target village or community. However, we are advising some project participants to suspend their activities during pre and post electoral periods. This is the case for example in Uganda were the micro project in Tororo will be temporarily suspended because the project participants are refugees and are particularly open to intimidation around election time.

7. M&E Arrangements

- Monitoring and Evaluation arrangements reflect those outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Operational Plan submitted in our Inception Report (31 March 2009)[1].
- Partners undertook a comprehensive assessment of the project baseline in their country from April 2009 to August 2009 (see baseline report submitted in November 2009).
- National Coordinators in each country supported a pool of project participants (HRE workers) to undertake participatory consultation with members of the marginalised communities and constituency groups targeted for micro-projects as part of the project planning and design process (see baseline report submitted in November 2009).

8. Log Frame Changes

We submitted an amended log frame in November 2009 representing baseline data collated on three primary levels (project management team, project partners and HRE workers/CBOs and community leaders). No changes have been made to the log frame since then.

9. Emerging Impact on Governance and Transparency

The GTF indicator most applicable to our project is:

Accountability – Increased respect for human rights, the rule of law, a free media and freedom of faith and association by governments at different levels – *5 .1: Perceived understanding of human rights and ability to claim rights improves for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups.*

The AHRE project's primary mechanism for increasing access to and respect for human rights is its community level micro projects. The AHRE project increases accountability and access to human rights at the micro (community) level. As such, changes in civil society capacity and collective voice to demand improved governance and transparency are likely to occur at a local and/or traditional authority level rather than at the national government level.

Lack of participation amongst poor and marginalised communities, (particularly women - the project has a significant focus on women's rights and gender discrimination as well as rural communities which are most geographically and socially marginalised – for example in Ghana we are working largely in the far North of the country) will be addressed by facilitating access to quality and locally relevant information, and to human rights tools. 63 human rights education micro-projects have already been launched across the 10 countries during the reporting period. Whilst these projects are still in their infancy, testimonies from beneficiaries already demonstrate an increased engagement with human rights and, above all, the active participation of the communities involved in the implementation of the project. Please find below two case studies of progress achieved in relation to GTF indicator 5.1 (perceived understanding of human rights and ability to claim rights improves for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups).

---

[1] The only change made to date was a correction of a typo in the timetable which indicated that the mid-term evaluation would take place at the same time as the end of project evaluation.

Case study from Benin

GTF programme number	GTF 376
GTF programme log frame indicator to which this case study is contributing	**O3 OV1:** Increased participation in civil society: 22,500 people in marginalised groups report an increased understanding of human rights issues and the ability to apply the knowledge and tools for social [and political] change [promoting and protecting human rights] **O3 OV2**: A broad range of communities and groups access the programme (and demonstrate enhanced critical understanding / capacity to assert their rights) including at least 11,250 women, 1,000 young people, 10,000 people living in remote communities and 500 people with disabilities. Communities in at least 4 regions of each country access the programme
What is the evidence for the example given?	Video recordings of conversations with members of a Counselling Committee established via the project (recorded during a support and monitoring visit to Benin from 16 to 22 May 2010)

What has changed?
As the result of a micro-project launched in early 2010, teachers and secondary school girls attending a school in Djougou, Benin, are now aware that sexual harassment in schools is not only a violation of students' human rights but is also an offense punishable by law. A seven-member Counselling Committee made up of members of the school's Parent-Teacher Association, student representatives, teachers and school authorities has been established to receive and deal with complaints from victims. Culprits are being counselled and recidivists handed over to law enforcement agencies. The Committee plans to award prizes to teachers who have had exemplary relationships with their girl students at the end of the academic year.

Who has benefitted?
Secondary school students and teachers in Djougou, Benin.

How the change occurred?
Members of the Parent-Teacher Association, school authorities, elected teachers and students were trained by the project participant, a local head teacher and long-standing human rights activist and member of Amnesty International, and the local Police Superintendent on sexual harassment and Law 2006-19 relating to sexual harassment in schools. Police officers were identified to deliver the training with the project participant to give weight to the project and to serve as a deterrent to offenders.
From this group, 7 people were selected to form a Committee comprising 1 school authority representative, 2 Parent-Teacher Association representatives, 2 girl

students, 1 boy student and 1 teacher. The purpose of the Committee is to offer guidance and advice to the students, deal with complaints from girls students about teachers and confront perpetrators by issuing warnings and reporting to the police if it happens again.

A peer education programme was also set up. One girl from each of the 35 classes was identified and trained on sexual harassment by the project participant as a peer educator. Each girl then educates her classmates (15 girls and 45 boys per class) on sexual harassment, cascading the information.

Why this change is useful?

The Committee was set up in January 2010 and has already dealt with 5 cases of sexual harassment of students.

School girls are now refusing their teachers' sexual advances and are coming forward freely to report or talk to peers about harassment from their teachers without fear of being victimised. Girls now have the freedom to continue their education without fear of reprisals from harassing teachers.

The Parent-Teacher Association is now formulating plans to replicate this model in other schools in the area.

Where has this change occurred?

Djougou in the north of Benin.

Case study from Burkina Faso

GTF programme number	GTF 376
GTF programme log frame indicator to which this case study is contributing	**O3 OV1:** Increased participation in civil society: 22,500 people in marginalised groups report an increased understanding of human rights issues and the ability to apply the knowledge and tools for social [and political] change [promoting and protecting human rights] **O3 OV2**: A broad range of communities and groups access the programme (and demonstrate enhanced critical understanding / capacity to assert their rights) including at least 11,250 women, 1,000 young people, 10,000 people living in remote communities and 500 people with disabilities. Communities in at least 4 regions of each country access the programme
What is the evidence for the example given?	Direct interviews with project beneficiaries, press articles, video testimonies from the Kassiri, Wemtenga (Naaba or traditional chiefs) and Mogho Naaba (the King of the Mossi people)

What has changed?

In Burkina Faso, two Naabas (traditional chiefs and ministers of the king of the Mossi people) were selected as project participants (HRE workers). These two individuals have a history of involvement in the delivery of Amnesty International Burkina Faso Human Rights Education activities. As traditional chiefs with significant influence they are able to act as multipliers. The Mogho Naaba (the Mossi King) has a personal interest in the work of Amnesty International Burkina Faso. The micro-project being implemented by the traditional chiefs aims to eliminate gender-based violence,

including the banishment of old women accused of being witches, and violence against children in selected rural communities. The main targets of this micro-project are 15 other chiefs and traditional leaders and the population of 4 villages in Tanghin Dassouri. So far, project activities have included:

- In Dassouri, a public sensitisation on violence against women was initiated and attended by around 150 people. An outcome of the event was a public perception that *"If the chiefs involve themselves in this kind of topic, this means that things should change"*.
- In Pabré, 123 people attended a public talk and the targeted chiefs commented: *"We will no longer perform FGM in Pabré since it is the will of the land and traditional chiefs, and above all the wish of the Moro Naaba."*
- In Koubri, where girls are married as young as 12, a theatre forum was performed addressing early marriage as a human rights violation, and an address by the Naabas was witnessed by around 300 people. Community chiefs delivered this message: *"Go back and tell the Mooro Naaba that we will no longer send our under aged girls to marriage".*
- In Boussé, the issue of witchcraft has been highlighted in a community where no death is perceived to have a natural cause and where a person is always sought to be held responsible – frequently an old woman as one of the most deprived, isolated and fragile people in the community. A public debate conducted by the Naabas in this community was attended by 150 people. Conducting the debate, the Kassiri Naaba, one of the project participants, challenged other traditional chiefs in the area to expel this traditional practice stating: "*In our traditions and customs, there are some practices not fit in this day and age, we should abandon them. Have you ever heard that a chief's mother is accused of witchcraft? Have you ever heard that a rich man's mother is accused of witchcraft? So, why are we continuing to accuse poor people's mothers of that? We should stop that! This is not good for our community*". The chief's statement was relayed by the national newspaper Sidwaya in its 18 March 2010 issue. Since then the Boussé Chief has acted upon his statement by taking an old woman previously banned from the village into his household.

Who has benefitted?

In total, 723 people from 4 communities have benefitted – 150 people in Boussé, 300 in Koubri, 123 in Pabré and 150 in Dassouri. 56 people among the 723 beneficiaries are traditional leaders.

How the change occurred?

The power of the Naaba (chiefs) and above all the Mogho Naaba is unquestionable among Mossi people. Having the King of the Mossi supporting the project and two of his ministers leading it has led to changes in public opinion on matters of gender-based violence and discriminatory practices. Amongst the Mossi people, the most important authority is the King, even before the official authorities. The King is consulted by all political leaders including the President of the Republic.

Why this change is useful?

The power of the Naabas in the target communities is highly significant as is the direct support from the Mogho Naaba. As multipliers these traditional leaders can ensure a broad and wide reaching increased understanding of human rights issues and the ability to apply the knowledge in their communities

Where has this change occurred?

In 4 communities in the district of Tanghin-Dassouri located 25–30km from the capital Ouagadougou, comprising 28 villages and 60,000 inhabitants.

10. Cross-cutting Issues

A high proportion of micro-projects are targeting gender-related rights abuses such as gender-based violence and women's access to justice. Other prominent thematic areas are political violence, police brutality and discrimination against minorities (including against disabled persons). One project is tackling the environment (extractive industries) although there are a number of others tackling human rights abuses in slum conditions which are indirectly related to the environment. One micro-project (in Uganda) is tackling HIV/AIDS directly, although a number of other micro-projects focus on women's access to health care and respond to various issues including women's access to maternal healthcare and women's ability to prevent and seek treatment for HIV/AIDS.

11. Progress Towards Sustainability

During the reporting period national project coordinators (local staff) and project participants (HRE workers) have been trained in a number of ways including workshops, toolkits, external trainers and mentoring. The result of this has been:
a. a more comprehensive understanding of human rights frameworks and their links to the daily lives of micro-project constituency groups;
b. an increased ability to coordinate, support and measure HRE interventions that meet the needs of a range of specific constituency groups.

Capacity building during the reporting period has particularly focused on the process of developing and designing community level micro-projects that match needs of communities being targeted. Participants have also reported increased abilities in activity planning, HRE delivery, budgeting and monitoring.

The project is working to skill up participants in areas in which they have previously received little or no support or training. Many of the local CBOs we are working with are very small and this is their first experience of partnering with an international NGO. For many even designing a micro-project (and particularly writing a project plan) has been a new experience. Skills gaps became apparent when the partners submitted their initial micro-project proposals to the Project Management Team in December 2009. To address skills gaps additional national level training on project design was delivered in January and February 2010. This resulted in later versions of proposed projects having fewer and more achievable objectives, narrower target groups and clearer indicators of success. By giving project participants the skills to plan projects in a strategic and structured way the AHRE project has greatly built up their confidence and credibility – providing long lasting opportunities. One CBO in Senegal, Tchais, has reported that they have started a partnership with another international NGO which would not have been possible before, therefore strengthening their work and increasing their impact and sustainability.

M&E training has been delivered with the support of Amnesty International's own Learning and Impact Unit - which supports assessing impact across the Amnesty International movement, promotes accountability and provides capacity building around ensuring active participation plus ActionAid M&E specialists and has focused on gathering testimonies and evidence, including through video. This is particularly appropriate to the context as many communities involved in the project have a primarily oral tradition, and tend not to write things down. Video testimonies are an effective way of involving all members of a community whatever their level of education or time available for participation. Partners have a budget for accessing external training as well

as project-based training and the project partners have between them (to date) accessed external training in the areas of M&E, computer literacy, networking, team building, conflict management and project management.

Partnership committees in each country are on the whole working towards the amalgamation of HRE experience, expertise, and complementary planning but in some countries support is needed to ensure that the partners receive maximum benefit in interaction with one another. Partners are working towards increased visibility and many project activities are being reported in local and in some cases national media outlets.

It is hoped that the micro-projects which are delivered by CBOs will continue after the GTF funding comes to an end. In cases where the HRE workers are individual activists who are not attached to a CBO however some concerns about the sustainability of their initiatives have been expressed. The networking element of this project will help to mitigate this and ensure that they remain well connected to other HRE workers and particularly CBOs in their countries who may be able to support their projects in the future.

12. Innovation

Amnesty International has identified a new way of delivering human rights education (HRE) that should be shared with others. Primarily we are developing methodologies to bring about change at the local level. Lack of access to HRE relevant to the needs of specific communities has been reported as a major problem by our partners in all ten project countries. For example community consultations in Sierra Leone revealed that previous HRE interventions have "*lacked operational representation in most of the human rights violation-prone areas*". As such this project seeks to embed a culture of HRE into the communities, regions and countries it serves, via well-resourced local representatives and locally designed participatory projects. The project is also responding to a need for resources and materials that will reconcile disconnects between theory and practice – for example providing user friendly information which will demystify human rights law and enhance the demand side of justice.

With regard to other players in the project countries this initiative differs to common practice in a number of ways. Project participants have reported a previous lack of collaboration between CSOs (including AI entities) delivering human rights education and have told us that most of the time HRE tools and approaches are not revisited or disseminated. For this reason the AHRE project has built network formation into the project outputs (output 5). The aim is to amalgamate the HRE experience and expertise of participants on a national and regional level and to increase their ability to coordinate, support and measure HRE interventions. Bringing together HRE workers at a national level for annual planning and reviewing has enriched the experience of the participants as they learn from each other and build networks amongst themselves. HRE workers have been inviting each other to participate in their various activities delivered in their own communities – building shared knowledge and skills and strengthening overall project participation.

The project seeks to ensure that participants and stakeholders drive the planning and content of the programme at the local level. This has not previously been the experience of many recipients of HRE. For example community consultations carried out by AMNet (Advocacy Movement Network) and DADA (Democracy and Development Associates) in

two chiefdoms in Kambia District, Sierra Leone, found that previous HRE interventions were ad-hoc, were not interlinked, relayed conflicting messages and did not target victims of human rights violations.

The AHRE project represents an innovation in relation to target beneficiaries – a wide range of HRE project participants are tackling human rights issues at the grassroots level rather than focusing on discreet groups, for example journalists. The AHRE project also represents an innovation in relation to geographic scope. Our baseline analysis identified that HRE has previously targeted elite groups and urban areas only. For example in Togo partners report that "*the different training courses that are run to teach about legal instruments and texts are always directed at people who have some academic experience thereby leaving out a broad swathe of the population living in poorer areas where many people are illiterate*". This project seeks to actively redress the lack of awareness of rights and HRE amongst marginalised communities and groups i.e rural women. To date the project has successfully achieved endorsement from tribal chiefs in rural areas where communities are under traditional tribal structures. The permission and buy in from these local leaders, who have huge influence over the attitudes and behaviours of their community, is paramount to gaining access to communities and in developing multipliers who can act to inform and shape public opinion.

The AHRE project also benefits from Amnesty International's global structure and our ability to scale up community-based learning, actions and mobilisation to the national and international scale. Whilst this project will not directly seek to influence national policy[2], its findings will feed into corresponding programmes of research, campaigning and advocacy that we implement via alternative Amnesty International teams and structures.

13. Learning from GTF

Project design: A lot has been learned with regards to the time and resources needed to plan and develop the micro-projects. The process of supporting development, design and re-design took 5 months, significantly longer than anticipated. The capacity of many small CBOs (acting as HRE workers) to develop projects was quite low. As such time needed to be dedicated to coaching the CBOs on how to develop clear objectives with realistic outcomes. The CBOs have reported back to us that the process was demanding but that they are proud of the end results. The outcome of taking extra time to develop well planned micro-projects is the smooth implementation of the projects, and HRE workers who are clear on what they want to achieve and how they are going to do it.

Working with local leaders and multipliers: Whilst it was anticipated that in the majority of cases working with institutional partners (CBOs) would be more effective than working with individual HRE workers, in practice we have found that some of the individual project participants have extremely valuable skills to leverage effective community projects; due to their technical skills, local connections and positions of influence. For example in Senegal, one of the project participants, Yahya Sidibe, who is a film producer and dramatist unconnected to any CBO, is working in Muslim or

---

[2] Amnesty International has a policy of utilising governmental funding sources only for HRE – which we define as *deliberate, participatory practice aimed at empowering individuals, groups and communities through fostering knowledge, skills and attitudes consistent with internationally recognised human rights principles* – and not for policy advocacy.

"madrasa" schools to open up discussions on and awareness of children's rights. Teachers in these schools send pupils to beg on the streets – children known as "talibe". Yahya has produced a short film which he shows to teachers in madrasa schools to initiate a debate about children's rights.

Working with partner organisations: This project empowers small CBOs, many of whom have not previously worked with INGOs, and resources them with funding through micro-grants. These partners need more project implementation support than originally anticipated – for example less than 50% are computer literate. As such micro-project proposal development has required large amounts of in-person support from national coordinators, some of whom must travel great distances to rural areas to meet with and coach CBO staff (acting as HRE workers / project participants). Whilst the level of training and skilling-up needed is high, relationships of trust have developed between national coordinators and HRE workers. To date involvement in the AHRE project has hugely increased the confidence of the various CBOs and individual HRE workers.

Risk management and community expectations: Continual risk reviews are essential as introducing human rights issues into remote communities changes relationships and shakes up status quo and existing power relations to a degree that we do not always have control over. For example in Sierra Leone, one of the micro-projects is tackling early marriage, and one of the project beneficiaries reported to the police the marriage of a 12 year old girl to a much older man. The beneficiary was then threatened with abduction by the man. Without money for legal fees the beneficiary cannot take the man to court. In relation to managing community expectations the project needs to find ways to link benefiting communities to others who can assist them with basic needs such as water provision. One community in Burkina Faso, when approached by a project participant in relation to a needs assessment, asked *"Why talk about human rights issues when we need clean water?"*. Whilst access to water is a human rights issue itself, we must manage expectations relating to community level micro-projects.

Sustainability and scaling up: In the original project proposal, micro-projects were designed to last one year, and new tranches of micro-projects would start in project years three and four (i.e. three x 12-month cycles of micro-projects). It has become clear however that one year is not long enough to build up trust and skills or sustain real results at the community level. Project participants/HRE workers need time to put into practice what they have learned and enable change to bed down and take root in the community. As such it is now expected that all micro-projects need to be two to three years in duration and that instead of starting new projects participants will scale up current projects to neighbouring communities.

Agents for change: It is a little too early to see results on a large scale (change in this project hinges on micro-projects which only became operational in January 2010) but some examples of the creation of local agents for change are already in evidence. For example, in Sierra Leone, project participant Sabi-yu Rights (Know your Rights) are finding that the community in which they are delivering their micro-project is already bringing a large number of cases of human rights violations to them in order to gain advice and support with seeking police intervention. They have taken on a crucial role as human rights experts in the community. In Burkina Faso two tribal chiefs are acting as project participants and are leading awareness raising activities on access to justice for women. Other chiefs are already seeking their advice in relation to tribal laws and how they relate to national statutes on human rights. Getting key people of influence, or

multipliers, on board will ensure lasting behaviour change and this is pivotal to all micro-projects at this stage.

Local access to human rights education = improved governance and transparency at the local level: In terms of local traditional tribal structures, where local conflicts and disputes are resolved through a council of elders and tribal chiefs, human rights education has challenged existing reliance on tribal customary law. Where there is a discord between customary law and national statutes local leaders are being compelled to examine the "fairness" of existing, frequently discriminatory practices. The case study cited in section 9 - Burkina Faso - is an example of this.

To what extent have GTF interventions contributed to an increase in the understanding of human rights and ability to claim and defend rights? In relation to our project we can certainly see an increased understanding of human rights and ability to claim and defend rights. This can be particularly noted via the active involvement of duty bearers in micro projects – for example local police and traditional leaders – who have led and mobilised HRE activities at the local level. Our project takes place in extremely rural communities where the people are very far removed from the state and, as such, acknowledges governance as being in the hands of not just the state but civil servants, customary chiefs and various other actors. The project is forcing tribal and local leaders to examine their own customary law against national and international human rights statues, which they have probably never done before (or they were not aware of any discord between the two). Where there *are* discordances between the two systems local leaders and their constituencies are asking why this discord exists and whether it needs to be addressed. The project acknowledges parallel systems, enables inter-linkages with local and state governance systems and acknowledges that local governance structures exist which are completely autonomous from the state.

To what extent has GTF contributed to improvements in citizen access to justice through the formal and traditional court systems? Our project does not examine access to formal courts in detail. As above however it does seek to enable communities to analyse, question and challenge local access to justice whether it be via customary structures, entrenched belief systems or local police/local authorities.

How have GTF programmes adapted to different interpretations of justice and human rights? See above.

GTF376

Annex 1 – Achievement Rating Scale

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings
3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
5 = not achieved

Please complete this template in summary form to provide a uniform assessment of progress against your stated objectives.

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
Purpose: Civil society will be better informed, resourced, equipped and enabled to plan, develop, deliver and evaluate HRE locally relevant to the human rights issues they face – leading to marginalised constituency groups' greater critical understanding of, and capacity to claim, their human rights	3	**P. OV1**: Evidence of enhanced collaboration and partnership that enables civil society actors to tackle a range of human rights issues affecting marginalised groups (enabled to better plan and implement sustainable and integrated human rights education programmes)	**P. OV1**: Evidence of collaboration and joint working between organisations, replication of projects, best practice standards. - Lack of collaboration between organisations with experience in delivering HRE – projects happen in isolation from one another and there are few contacts made between the few communities accessing HRE – there is desire and will to replicate learning and share good practice	**P. OV1**: Enhanced collaboration has been achieved via the successful creation and implementation of partnerships. Partnerships operational between Amnesty International and 20 local partners and between at least two local human rights organisations in each project country. HRE participants are utilising increased skills in relation to participatory methodologies, baseline assessment and simple M&E systems which are enabling them to design, support and deliver more locally relevant HRE projects.	No changes made. No unintended impact identified
		P. OV2: Human rights	**P. OV2**: Lack of support,	**O2 OV2**: 146 HRE project	

22

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
		issues identified by stakeholders and beneficiaries are tackled and improved through the delivery of well planned, collaborative, locally relevant projects and strategies.	resources and tools to develop HRE which is relevant to marginalised communities - Lack of coherent national strategies to ensure the targeting of marginalised communities and to avoid duplicity	participants have designed and developed 90 micro-projects via participatory consultations held at community level. 63 micro projects are being effectively delivered at grassroots level (27 are in final development stage). Partners and participants have benefited from continued coaching and training on project development over a period of 5 months.	
		P.OV3: Increased access to community level HRE for a wide range of constituency groups – critical understanding of human rights increases and people in specific target groups are mobilised into claiming their rights	**P.OV3** Existence of current HRE projects. Evaluation of previous HRE projects. Lack of access to HRE which is relevant to the needs of specific communities. Key lessons from previous Amnesty International HRE projects in West Africa include: Impact is increased when civil society organisations take ownership and locally identify relevant themes and approaches. There is a need to move from HRE training in workshops to practical support to plan and implement HRE. The need to target marginalised communities. There is a need to translate materials into local		

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
			languages.		
		POV4: Positive changes in relation to human rights behaviour and relationships amongst the specific groups, institutions and organisations with whom the project works	**P. OV4**: Lack of HRE programmes which go beyond awareness of rights to ensure understanding of how human rights can improve lives. Evidence of participation in human rights and governance projects/actions/dialogues/ policy debate and formulation etc		
Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners (2 x 10 countries) to plan, co-ordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE	2	**O1 OV1**: Coherent, coordinated, informed and quality country-level plans enable the delivery of human rights education projects targeting locally relevant human rights issues (through selected agents of change and key target constituencies).	**O1 OV1**: Limited experience of delivery of sustainable HRE programmes on a national basis across the ten project countries. - Lack of project planning, management and evaluation techniques in small NGOs reported	**O1 OV1**: Partners undertook preliminary development of National Human Rights Education Strategies. Strategies updated in December 2009 were used as guiding documents to drive the development of micro-projects in each country. They are being revised to reflect more closely what human rights issues are currently most critical.	
		O1 OV2: Amalgamation of HRE experience and expertise of representatives on a national level (human rights organisations, experts and networks guide HRE	**O1 OV2**: Poor networking and information sharing. Availability of HR and HRE experts in each country who are willing to contribute to and participate in the project	**O1 OV2**: Partnership Committees in each of the countries include an external resource person/expert. National HRE networks have been created, including social media outlets to share info and create links (blogs/	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
		complementary planning in each country)		Facebook). Project participants are attending each other's trainings and events. Various national level review and planning instruments for project participants are in place, e.g. in Togo the partners have created a newsletter.	
		O1 OV3: 20 partners report an increased ability to coordinate, support and measure HRE interventions that meet the needs of a range of specific constituency groups in each country	**O1 OV3**: Limited capacity to monitor and evaluate HRE programmes.	**O1 OV3**: National coordinators report an increased ability to use M&E tools, such as video testimonies, to gather evidence of impact. The importance of having clear M&E systems is well understood.	
		O1 OV4: Increased visibility and profile of partners and human rights themes addressed through the project at national and international level	**O1 OV4**: Low visibility of CSOs undertaking HRE. - Evidence of visibility (or lack of) in media, meetings, participation in dialogue, coalitions, networks, NGO roundtables	**O1 OV4**: With the beginning of the implementation of micro-projects, CBOs visibility has increased at community level and at the national level as micro-project activities are reported in newspapers, journals, and on the internet.	
Output 2 A pool of 150 HRE workers (15 x 10 countries) and CBOs is created and equipped with the	2	**O2 OV1**: 150 HRE workers have increased project management, evaluation and specialised HRE delivery skills	**O2 OV1**: HRE workers and CBOs have poor understanding of human rights laws and instruments, and require project management and evaluation training and support	**O2 OV1**: A pool of 146 HRE workers has been created who are demonstrating an ability to design and deliver locally relevant HRE projects and produce locally relevant	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects		**O2 OV2**: Community HRE projects are developed and delivered by HRE workers that directly respond to the needs of specific constituency groups / that mobilise greater critical understanding of and remedial action against specific human rights violations. (150 projects [5x10x3 years], with 30% of HRE workers reporting that they have utilised the tools and skills gained in the project).	- Lack of resources and training to implement HRE **O2 OV2**: Identification of key human rights issues, targets and key social change agents at the local level - HRE targets elite groups and urban areas. - Lack of awareness amongst marginalised communities. Limited understanding of how HRE is relevant to improving people's lives, even in countries where HRE is widespread	materials at grassroots level **O2 OV2**: 146 HRE project participants have designed and developed 90 micro-projects based on participatory consultations held at community level. 63 micro projects are being effectively delivered at grass roots level (27 are in the final development stage). Partners and participants have benefited from continued coaching and training on project development over a period of 5 months.	
		O2 OV3: Tools and training received by HRE workers augments their ability to mobilise people into action for human rights	**O2 OV3**: Lack of knowledge of how human rights mechanisms and tools can be utilised to improve people's lives amongst HRE workers / CBOs	**O2 OV3**: HRE participants are using new skills which are enabling them to design, support, deliver and monitor locally relevant HRE projects, for example: participatory methodologies, baseline assessments and simple M&E systems. Many of the local CBOs are very small and this is their first	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
				experience of partnering with an international NGO. For many even designing a micro project (and particularly writing a project plan) has been a new experience - by giving them the skills to do project planning in a strategic and structured way the project has greatly built up their confidence and credibility, providing long lasting opportunities (evidenced through them linking into other partnerships).	
Output 3 An increased number of people (22,500 = 150 x 50 people x 3 years) are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives	3	**O3 OV1**: Increased participation in civil society: 22,500 people in marginalised groups report an increased understanding of human rights issues and the ability to apply the knowledge and tools for social [and political] change [promoting and protecting human rights].	**O3 OV1**: HRE targets elite groups and urban areas. - Lack of awareness of rights and HRE amongst marginalised communities. - % of groups and individuals that participate and report increased knowledge. - % of participants reporting change in behaviour	**O3 OV1**: The project will mobilise a greater number of people than expected. Many of the micro-projects are achieving sensitisation far beyond the set objectives: In Burkina Faso for example, the traditional chiefs' micro project has already reached more than 700 people even though it only targeted the local chiefs in the selected 4 communities at first. In Sierra Leone, the DADA-AMNET micro-project targeted 50 direct beneficiaries but a parade against VAW mobilised more	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
				than 100 women and a crowd including the local authorities (local chiefs, paramount chiefs, police representatives etc) who attended a discussion following the parade in a public place. In many projects community members are playing a facilitation role in expressing human rights issues. For example in a school in Burkina Faso where students performed a drama to inform other students about sexual harassment.	
		O3 OV2: A broad range of communities and groups access the programme (and demonstrate enhanced critical understanding / capacity to assert their rights) including at least 11,250 women, 1,000 young people, 10,000 people living in remote communities and 500 people with disabilities. Communities in at least 4 regions of each country access the programme	**O3 OV2**: Limited understanding of how HRE is relevant to improving people's lives, even in countries where HRE is widespread. - Participation in the project - % disaggregated data (age, gender, disability, geography).	**O3 OV2**: The AHRE project is mobilising a wide range of men, women and young people living mostly in the remotest areas of the implementing countries. 50% of the micro projects are related to women issues, 25% are related to child rights issues, 7% to minority rights. The micro-projects are being implemented in more than 4 regions of each country	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
Output 4 People living in at least 50 communities are able to identify local human rights issues, their correspondence to human rights instruments and the relevance of human rights in their communities	2.5	**O4 OV1**: People formulating plans and organising projects of self-help in at least 50 communities / constituency groups. (Developing skills to document human rights abuses and to take action on human rights abuses)	**O4 OV1**: Lack of participation in vertical forms of accountability amongst poor and marginalised communities	**O4 OV1**: Participatory consultations have been conducted in more than 90 communities and micro-project proposals have been designed to respond to the most serious human rights issues in each of the communities. Currently there are 63 micro-projects being implemented as a result of these consultations.	
		O4 OV2: At least 30% of constituents report that they have changed their human rights behaviour (either as perpetrators or victims of human rights abuses - Improved access to human rights and justice in beneficiary communities occurs	**O4 OV2**: Most perpetrators and victims of human rights abuses, especially in poor and marginalised communities, are not aware of human rights	**O4 OV2**: Behavioural change as a result of micro-projects is already in evidence despite projects only being operational for a number of months – see case studies.	
Output 5 Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning, best practice, and a joint	3	**O5 OV1**: All project partners are firmly embedded into human rights education movements in their own countries, linked to a range of NGOs, CBOs and networks. Indicator of functioning	**O5 OV1**: There is little collaboration between organisations delivering HRE. HRE projects take place in isolation and learnings are not replicated	**O5 OV1**: The induction workshop in March 2009 introduced participants to the Africa Human Rights Education Project Network. Since then various collaborations have been formed, for example the national coordinator in Burkina Faso is mentoring the	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
voice.		network for change: Africa HRE Network is an active learning forum with at least 160 members participating and sharing ideas and skills (10 exchange visits, 36 monthly Africa wide email circulars and 360 in country, web page and blog created and utilised and three thematic groups created with web pages, 3 network meetings for project co-ordinators and 1 network meeting with project co-ordinators and HRE worker representatives). Learning is replicated and increased, complimentary activities are developed, duplication is decreased and a culture of HRE becomes embedded on a national basis)

O5 OV2: Increased learning is facilitated by at least 3 thematic sub | | national coordinators in Côte d'Ivoire and Benin.

All project participants have accessed Amnesty International's online HRE forum where they retrieve resources and participate in forum discussions. Language is however becoming a major barrier to participation in the forums.

Networks have been set up in each of the 10 project countries. Burkina Faso and Benin have set up networking committees and are developing networking charters and action plans.

05 OV2: At least two national coordinators (Kenya and Uganda) have made | |

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
		groups formed, bringing together HRE Workers across the ten countries		exchange visits to facilitate workshops and share experience.	
Output 6 Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change	3	**O6 OV1**: Increased availability of locally relevant HRE materials and training in local languages that meet the needs of specific constituency groups and enhance the impact, dissemination and sustainability of locally delivered HRE projects (range includes radio scripts, drama scripts, posters, leaflets, curriculum guides etc) - Increased relevance of materials for target communities, including in materials translated into at least 2 languages in each country and a range of formats including non-word based for illiterate audiences (posters, radio, drama etc). **O6 OV2**: HRE (physical and virtual) resource	**O6 OV1**: HRE materials are inaccessible and few are translated into local languages **O6 OV2**: Most perpetrators and victims of human rights abuses,	**06 OV1**: 5 project countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Senegal and Sierra Leone) have produced and distributed HRE materials in French to their constituencies. They are now in the process of translating them into local languages for production and distribution to the grassroots beneficiaries. The other 5 have designed their materials and are currently in the production phase. They will be able to print and distribute their materials by the end of June 2010 **06 OV2**: Each partner is mapping existing HRE	

OBJECTIVE STATEMENT	ACHIEVEMENT RATING FOR YEAR BEING ASSESSED	LOG FRAME INDICATORS	BASELINE FOR INDICATORS	PROGRESS AGAINST THE INDICATORS	COMMENTS ON CHANGES OVER THE LAST YEAR, INCLUDING UNINTENDED IMPACTS
		centres increase access to critical understanding of human rights. - Accessed by at least 22,800 users per year (780 visits x 10 countries x 3 years)	especially in poor and marginalised communities, are not aware of human rights	materials in their country. Some have engaged experts to adapt national materials to make them user-friendly e.g. through drawings and images, and translated into local languages	
		06 OV3: Online resource centre- increased sharing of HRE information between ten project countries and beyond - On-line resource database of at least 200 resources established and accessed at least 1,200 times during the project.	**06 OV3**: Limited learning and sharing of information within and between countries	**06 OV3**: The HRE online resource centre (internal to AI and partners by registration) houses materials that are accessible to all project participants and NCs. A training manual has been developed on how to train trainers in producing materials.	

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Budget heading: **CAPITAL COSTS PARTNERS**	Activity: Buying laptops and equipment for national resource centres *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver*	All capital equipment bought in fiscal year 1 (September 2008 – March 2009)	As per previous report

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
	locally relevant HRE)		
Budget heading: **HUMAN RESOURCES (AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)**	Activity 1.1 AI recruit and induct AI Programme Staff *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*	Two regional Project Coordinators were recruited in fiscal year 1 (September 2008 – March 2009) Permanent Project Manager recruited in October 2009.	All staff in place
Budget heading: **HUMAN RESOURCES (PARTNERS)**	Activity 1.3 Partners recruit 10 national project coordinators *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*	National Coordinators recruited in fiscal year 1 (September 2008 – March 2009)	As per previous report
Budget heading: **ACTIVITY 1 (AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Establishing project infrastructure and capacity building for partners	Activity 1.2: AI formalise existing partnerships and identify new partners	Partnerships with 20 partners were formalised in fiscal year 1 (September 2008 – March 2009). Partnerships with a further 2 partners were formalised in fiscal year 2 (April 2009 – March 2010) – in Togo an original partner dropped out and was replaced; in Uganda the secondary partner did not enter the project until July 2009.	All partners in place
Budget heading: **ACTIVITY 1 (PARTNERS)** Establishing project infrastructure and capacity building for partners	Activity 1.4 Partnership committees (made up of at least 5 representatives from partners and other NGOs/ specialists) formed in 10 countries (Q2, Project Year 1) and meeting at least twice per year throughout the project *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*	Partnership committees are now operational in all 10 countries	Committees guide national implementation of project
Budget heading (Not reflected in Budget)	Activity 1.5: Partners conduct organisational self-assessment using existing AI tools to identify strategic, resource and capacity	This activity took place in Uganda, Ghana and Sierra Leone but was not universally implemented across the ten countries. No budget was being allocated by the project for this activity.	Self assessment is still being encouraged as a formal process. It is happening as an informal process in all countries and is informed by the ongoing capacity building dialogue between the

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)	A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
needs *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*		project management team and the national coordinators in each country.
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 1 (PARTNERS)** Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building	Activity 1.6: Partners develop country plans *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*	National level HRE needs assessment to inform country plans was conducted between April and July 2009. Country strategy papers have been drawn up, detailing how the project will be implemented in each country, articulating strategies for organisational capacity building, tackling most relevant HRE themes and constituencies, training HRE workers and responding to risk and cross cutting issues.	Strategies will be reviewed in next reporting period
Budget Heading: ACTIVITY COSTS 1 **(PARTNERS and AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building	Activity 1.7 – Annual training, review and planning with national coordinators *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE)*	During the reporting period one four-day workshop was conducted in December 2009.	Regional (project-wide) capacity building for National Coordinators has focused to date on project management, project development and monitoring and evaluation
Budget heading (Not reflected in Budget)	Activity 1.8 – Ongoing support and advice for partner organisations (from project management team) *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE*	During the reporting period the Project Management Team has worked to skill up partners in various areas – with a focus on monitoring and evaluation. Capturing success through video, audio and testimony gathering has been emphasised and coordinators have been provided with and trained in the use of a small and user friendly video device. National Coordinators also needed a lot of support with ensuring that project participants in their countries developed quality micro-projects.	In some countries National Coordinators seemed to lack the project design skills necessary to coach and support project participants in developing community level micro-projects. Much more support was needed from the Project Management Team than anticipated
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 1 (AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Establishing Project	Activity 1.9 – Annual monitoring and support visits from project management team *(Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners to plan, coordinate*	Between April 2009 and March 2010 eight visits were made by the Project Management Team to project partners. All countries were visited except Mali and Sierra Leone. Each visit lasted between three and seven days.	The Project Management Team also met with all NCs at the HRE workers induction in July 2009 in Côte d'Ivoire and at the NCs' annual review meeting in Dakar in December 2009.

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Infrastructure and Capacity Building	*and deliver locally relevant HRE*		
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.1: Analysis and identification of 150 HRE workers / project participants *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	In June to July 2009 up to 15 HRE workers were recruited per country. Dynamic individuals were selected but attention was given to choosing individuals affiliated with organisations. The final list includes women's leaders, youth leaders and CBOs rooted within and with access to specific marginalised constituency groups	Whilst it was anticipated that in the majority of cases working with institutional partners (CBOs) would be more effective than working with individual HRE workers, in practice we have found that some of the individual project participants have extremely valuable skills to leverage community level projects – due to their local connections and positions of influence
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.2 Partners design HRE training materials for HRE workers / project participants *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	Various activities towards this output were scheduled for April 2009 to March 2010 and in most countries partners started the process of a) identifying local needs relating to HRE materials and b) meeting that need	Partners have expressed that HRE material production should happen on a rolling basis in line with micro-project implementation and as such many materials-related activities scheduled for April 2009 to March 2010 will now take place later in the project
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS and AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.3: Partners induct HRE workers through a week long pan-Africa planning and training session *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	A week long pan-Africa planning and training session was held for HRE workers and NCs in Côte d'Ivoire in July 2009 with the primary purpose of supporting them to design projects that directly respond to the human rights needs of their communities	Further discussions needed with partners around whether future national level meetings should be replaced with larger regional level / pan Africa meetings
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE	Activity 2.4: HRE workers / project participants consult constituents about HRE project plans and finalise and submit plans to national coordinators to refine with	Between August and October 2009 consultations were undertaken by 77 HRE workers. Participatory consultation comprised focus groups, surveys and interviews and formed the basis of micro-project planning	Whilst rich data has been generated for many project participants, the collection of baseline data was a new concept and they faced various challenges. As such capacity building in data collation, participatory consultation and M&E will

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
workers	partnership committee. Final approval of plans given by AI project manager *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*		be ongoing
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.5: Biannual planning and review meetings held with HRE workers to deliver training, feed learning into programmes, build networks and adapt plans *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	10 national level biannual planning and review meetings for HRE workers were scheduled for April-June 2009 (original proposal) but were replaced by a pan-Africa (whole project) workshop in Côte d'Ivoire in July 2009. Partners folded funds for national level meeting into sending participants and NCs to this regional level meeting 10 national level biannual planning and review meetings for HRE workers were held in January –March 2010	Further discussions needed with partners around whether future national level meetings should be replaced with larger regional level / pan- Africa meetings
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.6: Annual project support and monitoring visits undertaken by National Coordinators (to project participants) *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	Field visits (from NCs to project participants) have been undertaken throughout the reporting period	Micro-project proposal development has required large amounts of in-person support from national coordinators – some of whom must travel great distances to rural areas to meet with and coach HRE workers. Whilst the level of training and skilling-up needed is high, relationships of trust have developed between National Coordinators and HRE workers.

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.7: Specialised training for project participants *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	To date specialised training has mainly been delivered to project participants via national level biannual planning and review meetings held with HRE workers. M&E training has been delivered with the support of Action Aid M&E specialists and has focused on gathering testimonies and evidence (including through video). External training has also been delivered in the areas of computer literacy, networking, team building, conflict management and project management	Specialised training has particularly focused on the process of developing and designing community level micro-projects that match needs of communities
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 2 (PARTNERS)** Training and support of HRE workers	Activity 2.8: National Coordinators offer on-going communication and support for HRE workers / project participants *(Output 2: A pool of HRE workers / project participants is created and equipped with the necessary human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects)*	Phone and face to face training and skilling-up has been delivered on an ongoing basis by National Coordinators	Relationships of trust have developed between National Coordinators and HRE workers. To date involvement in the AHRE project (and particularly with an international organisation such as Amnesty International) has hugely increased the confidence of the various HRE workers
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 3 (PARTNERS)** Implementation of HRE projects	Activity 3.1: HRE workers / project participants deliver 1 project per year *(Output 3: An increased number of people are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives)*	During the reporting period 63 micro-projects were launched in communities. Each seeks to address 'informal processes' of vertical forms of accountability and to provide access to quality and locally relevant human rights information and tools	Micro-projects were launched in early 2010 rather than in October 2009 as originally anticipated. This was due to a need to build in additional time for project design and approval as outlined above.
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 3 (PARTNERS)** Implementation of HRE projects	Activity 3.2: HRE workers / project participants are supported with resources to deliver HRE projects *(Output 3: An increased number of people are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives)*	The first tranche of micro-grants were released by partners to HRE workers	Micro-grants will be paid in stages rather than in full i.e. will be spread over each project year

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 3 (PARTNERS)** Implementation of HRE projects	Activity 3.4: Ongoing monitoring of HRE projects *(Output 3: An increased number of people are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives)*	HRE workers are being supported to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation of micro-projects	Rather than strictly adhering to three distinct 12 month cycles of micro-project implementation we will encourage a more fluid development to ensure sustainability of micro-projects
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 4 (PARTNERS)** Implementation of HRE projects	Activity 4.1: Community HRE committees are established *(Output 4: People living in at least 50 communities are able to identify local human rights issues, their correspondence to human rights instruments and the relevance of human rights in their communities)*	Activities towards output 4 will take place at a later stage in the AHRE project when micro-projects have been operational for at least a year.	
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 4 (PARTNERS)** Implementation of HRE projects	Activity 4.2: Community HRE plans are developed *(Output 4: People living in at least 50 communities are able to identify local human rights issues, their correspondence to human rights instruments and the relevance of human rights in their communities)*	Activities towards output 4 will take place at a later stage in the AHRE project when micro-projects have been operational for at least a year.	
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 5 (AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Establish national and continent wide networks	Activity 5.1: AI facilitate the creation of an Africa HRE network (*Output 5: Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a Human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning, best practice, and a joint voice)*	The AHRE online network space has gone live and is being used. Thematic sub-groups for the network have been set up. HRE workers are also linked into the existing Amnesty international HRE bulletin. The Project Participants' Induction and Training workshop held at Grand Bassam in Côte d'Ivoire in July 2009 brought together the 10 National Coordinators and 58 of the project participants from the 10 project countries and was an important first step towards the development of the regional network of project participants.	The AHRE online network space currently does not have enough French content (tools and guidance documents are uploaded in French but most of the discussion forums are conducted in English)

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY COSTS 5 (PARTNERS)** Establish national and continent wide networks	Activity 5.2: Partners support and strengthen existing networks or create new country networks (*Output 5: Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a Human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning, best practice, and a joint voice*)	Bringing together HRE workers at a national level for annual planning and reviewing has occurred on numerous occasions throughout the reporting period in each of the 10 project countries	HRE workers have been inviting each other to participate in their various activities delivered in their own communities - building shared knowledge and skills and strengthening overall project participation.
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 5 (PARTNERS and AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL)** Establish national and continent wide networks	Activity 5.3: Network meetings – Africa-wide project coordinators meetings, national level meetings of HRE workers, mid-term network meeting with selected national coordinators and HRE workers (*Output 5: Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a Human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning, best practice, and a joint voice*)	Bringing together HRE workers at the Africa level for annual planning and reviewing happened via a week-long workshop in Côte d'Ivoire in July 2009	
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 6 (PARTNERS)** Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials	Activity 6.1: Partners assess in-country HRE materials and identify and collate existing materials (*Output 6 - Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change*)	All partners have started the process of a) identifying local needs relating to HRE materials and b) meeting that need	Partners requested that HRE material production happens on a rolling basis in line with micro-project implementation - most activities scheduled for April 2009 to March 2010 will now take place later

ACTIVITIES (STATE THE MAIN ACTIVITIES IN RELATION TO EACH BUDGET HEADING AND ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE SHOWN WHICH OUTPUTS THEY RELATE TO)		A JUDGEMENT STATEMENT ON PROGRESS SO FAR WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS	COMMENTS TO EXPLAIN THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KEY CHANGES TO ENSURE BETTER ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 6 (PARTNERS)** Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials	Activity 6.2: Workshop to develop HRE training kits and materials *(Output 6 - Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change)*	Workshops have been delivered in 10 countries	As above
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 6 (PARTNERS)** Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials	Activity 6.3: Print and distribute materials *(Output 6 - Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change)*	The process of printing and distributing materials has started	As above
Budget Heading: **ACTIVITY 6 (PARTNERS)** Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials	Activity 6.4: Resource centres established *(Output 6 - Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change)*	Resource centres have been set up and HRE workers in the urban sites are using them.	Access is more difficult for rural workers but they can contact their National Coordinator directly to ask them to send materials requested

Annex 2 – Programme Log Frame

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
Goal: Improve human rights for the most disadvantaged by empowering communities in ten African countries to promote and defend their human rights	**G.OV1:** 22,500 people across 10 countries in Africa report that as a result of accessing the Human Rights Education projects their awareness of rights, ability to claim and defend their rights and hold governments accountable has increased.	In the highly marginalised communities in which this project operates there are grave disconnects between human rights awareness activities and the resultant impact - rights education has failed to translate to interventions that enable people to hold state and non-state actors accountable. Access to justice is a deep-seated problem in all the ten partner countries - there is limited awareness on the part of the victims of institutions set up to provide redress for human rights violations. Ignorance of legal instruments to protect human rights and the fact that they are not applied is conducive to the abuse by those with power.	**1.1** Statistics on constituents accessing the HRE projects **1.2** Baseline and endline assessment of human rights awareness **1.3** Surveys of and testimonies from constituents accessing the HRE projects (questionnaires, interviews etc)	Freedom of partners and HRE workers / project participants to operate in their countries. On-going support from communities for the project
	G.OV2: 70% of constituents involved in the programme (15,750) report understanding of how human rights can be utilised to improve their lives.	In all project countries partners reported that perpetrators of human rights violations almost always go unpunished. There is a need to reconcile disconnects between theory and practice involving the dispensation of justice in the target communities and enhancing the demand side of justice.	**2.1** Baseline and endline assessment (participatory evaluation carried out with micro-project beneficiaries – relating to up to 100 projects in specific communities across ten countries) **2.2** Biannual monitoring reports from HRE workers / project participants and annual monitoring reports of project coordinators **2.3** Participatory mid-term and	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
			final evaluation (including questionnaires and interviews with constituents)	
	G.OV3: 30% of constituents involved in the programme (6750) report behavioural change that has affected their own lives, applying their new skills and knowledge and participating in civil society.	Fears around reporting abuses and claiming rights are linked to segregation, discrimination and voicelessness. There is evidence of tensions between the administration of customary traditional rights and human rights (as enshrined in international human rights conventions).	**3.1** Needs assessment documentation (participatory consultation with communities as part of micro-project planning and delivery) **3.2** Country and HRE plans **3.3** Biannual and annual reports documenting qualitative feedback **3.4** Training reports and materials developed	
	G.OV4: 20 local partners and 150 HRE workers / project participants/CBOs report and demonstrate that they are enabled and resourced to deliver better quality and locally relevant human rights education projects	HRE programmes lack operational representation in most of the human rights violation-prone areas. CBOS identify priority capacity building needs to design and deliver HRE projects that are effective tools for social change. There is a lack of project planning, management and evaluation techniques in small NGOs. There is a need to be more participatory and consultative in strategy development and planning and a need for increased engagement between NGOs.	**4.1** Needs assessment documentation **4.2** Country and HRE plans **4.3** Biannual and annual reports documenting qualitative feedback **4.4** Training reports and materials developed **4.5** Participatory consultation and evaluation carried out with HRE workers / project participants comprising CBOs and individual community leaders	
Purpose: Civil society will be better informed, resourced,	**P.OV1:** Evidence of enhanced collaboration and partnership that enables civil society actors to tackle a range of human rights	Little evidence of collaboration and joint working between organisations, replication of projects, or best practice standards. Lack of collaboration between organisations	**1.1** Partnership agreements **1.2** Partnership Committee meeting TORs and minutes of meetings	Co-operation of local partners Participation of

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
equipped and enabled to plan, develop, deliver and evaluate HRE locally relevant to the human rights issues they face – leading to marginalised constituency groups' greater critical understanding of, and capacity to claim their human rights	issues affecting marginalised groups (enabled to better plan and implement sustainable and integrated human rights education programs)	with experience in delivering HRE – projects happen in isolation from one another and there are few contacts made between the small number of communities accessing HRE – there is desire and will to replicate learning and share good practice Example from Senegal: Where HRE is conducted in the field, organised replication is almost nonexistent. There is a need to have well-trained local relays to ensure proper monitoring of HRE programmes. Prior to the project collaboration between Amnesty International national entities, project participants (CBOs) and other civil society groups working on education around human rights was weak (and found to be in the early stages of the project set up). Example from Côte d'Ivoire: There is very little collaboration among NGOs and institutions that deliver HRE and most of the time, tools are not revisited. In addition, it is difficult to monitor such training because of a lack of resources.	**1.3** Workshop and training reports **1.4** AI annual records of support and active communications **1.5** Project monitoring visit reports **1.6** Minutes of annual review and planning meetings with qualitative feedback on capacity building support **1.7** Participatory consultation / evaluation carried out with / testimonies from HRE workers / project participants comprising CBOs and individual community leaders	HRE workers / project participants/ CBOs in the project Continued stability and accessibility to targeted regions
	P.OV2: Human rights issues identified by stakeholders and beneficiaries are tackled and improved through the delivery of well planned, collaborative, locally relevant projects and strategies.	Lack of support, resources and tools to develop HRE which is relevant to marginalised communities – lack of coherent national strategies to ensure the targeting of marginalised communities and to avoid duplicity All the project partners in this project operate on very small budgets and are reliant on short term grants and funding, as a result the majority have very few HRE resources and	**2.1** Country plans x 10 (including needs assessment / baseline on access to HRE provision) **2.2** AI approvals / recommendations on country plans **2.3** Annual monitoring visit reports **2.4** National Coordinator and partnership committee reports	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		tools. In Uganda the partners report that the government of Uganda has had very limited outreach in terms of HRE and although the Uganda Human Rights Commission has had some success a gap remains. Various restrictions exist to successful HRE in Uganda (e.g. requirements around reporting to Resident District Commissioners, creating a climate of fear, and restrictive donor conditions). Community consultations carried out by AMNet (Advocacy Movement Network) & DADA (Democracy and Development Associates) in two chiefdoms in Kambia District, Sierra Leone found that HRE is conducted but is not systematic or interlinked and also 'giving conflicting messages' and 'not continuous'. They also found that victims of human rights violations had not been included in previous HRE. In Kenya partners report that there are *"grave disconnects between human rights awareness activities and the resultant impact. Rights education has invariably failed to translate to interventions that enable people to achieve their rights and hold the state and non-state actors accountable for their omissions"*	**2.5** Baseline and endline assessment (participatory evaluation carried out with micro-project beneficiaries – relating to up to 100 projects in specific communities across ten countries) **2.6** Reports from community leaders participating in HRE projects.	
	P.OV3: Increased access to community level HRE for a wide range of constituency groups - critical understanding of human rights increases and people in specific target groups are	Lack of access to HRE which is relevant to the needs of specific communities. Key lessons from previous Amnesty International HRE projects in West Africa include: Impact is increased when civil society organisations take ownership and locally identify relevant themes	**3.1** Baseline and endline assessment (participatory evaluation carried out with micro-project beneficiaries – relating to up to 100 projects in specific communities across ten	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
	mobilised into claiming their rights	and approaches. There is a need to move from HRE training in workshops to practical support to plan and implement HRE. The need to target marginalised communities. There is a need to translate materials into local languages. Community consultations in Sierra Leone revealed that despite some current access to HRE, delivering organisations "lack operational representation in most of the human rights violation-prone areas". Need to move from HRE training in workshops to practical support to plan and implement HRE. For example in Senegal partners identified a need to build HRE into schools curricula because *"in Senegal HRE is virtually non-existent in the curricula of schools and training institutions and is not clearly supported by existing resources and materials".* Need to translate materials into local languages. All the project partners are small NGOs which have low or non-existent budgets for producing or translating materials. In Sierra Leone partners report a need for materials that will reconcile disconnects between theory and practice – for example user friendly information on the Criminal Procedure Act including texts in Mende, Krio and Temne, and drama scripts / radio programmes which will demystify human rights law and enhance the demand side of justice. There is a requirement for the development of HRE programmes which are relevant to the needs of the communities they	countries) **3.2** HRE project plans **3.3** Partnership committee meetings **3.4** Monitoring visit reports **3.5** Biannual reports on activities and outputs **3.6** List of actions planned and scheduled in *Plans de Développement Social, Economique, et Culturel* / Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans (Mali)	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		serve. HRE programmes lack operational representation in most of the human rights violation-prone areas. There is a need for materials and resources that will reconcile disconnects between theory and practice, demystify human rights law and enhance the demand side of justice		
	P.OV4: Positive changes in relation to human rights behaviour and relationships amongst the specific groups, institutions and organisations with whom the project works	Lack of HRE programmes which go beyond awareness of rights to ensure understanding of how human rights can improve lives. Evidence of participation in human rights and governance projects/actions/dialogues/policy debate and formulation etc. Evidence of tensions between the administration of customary traditional rights and human rights (as enshrined in international human rights conventions) During needs assessment conducted prior to and during the first capacity building and networking workshop for project participants (HRE workers and CBOs) (July 2009 Grand Bassam, Côte d'Ivoire) participants reported a priority capacity building need because designing and delivering HRE projects goes beyond awareness, and they can be effective tools for social change. Across all of the project countries participants reported tensions between rights and responsibilities - for example some potential project beneficiaries concluded that the importation of "the white man's concept" is	**4.1** Participatory consultation and feedback / with micro-project beneficiaries **4.2** Participatory evaluation carried out with indirect beneficiaries of micro-projects for example parents, police, other CBOs, neighbouring communities **4.3** Community leaders draw up new policies **4.4** HRE project plans **4.5** Partnership Committee meetings **4.6** Monitoring visit reports **4.7** Biannual reports on activities and outputs **4.8** Local structures monitoring the enrolment and retention of girls in school / women reporting gender-based violence etc in the target communities **4.9** Parent-teacher associations and other community-based	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		responsible for children and women disrespecting their parents and husbands (Sierra Leone) or that *"if a society believes in a culture like Female Genital Mutilation, then it will not be easy to show them that this practice violates women's and girls rights"* (Uganda)	monitoring teams	
Outputs				
Output 1: Strengthened capacity of at least 20 local partners (2 x 10 countries) to plan, co-ordinate and deliver locally relevant HRE	**O1 OV1:** Coherent, coordinated, informed and quality country-level plans enable the delivery of human rights education projects targeting locally relevant human rights issues (through selected of agents of change and key target constituencies)	Limited experience of delivery of sustainable HRE programmes on a national basis across the ten project countries. Lack of project planning, management and evaluation techniques in small NGOs reported. In the partner induction and project planning workshop conducted in March 2009 all partners stressed the need for the AHRE project to deliver partner capacity building in relation to HRE methodologies, HRE materials development, project leadership and management. Further to the training several HRE workers (CBOs/individual community leaders) have requested additional support on project planning for example in Côte d'Ivoire, interviews with HRE workers show that most of them have requested further training on project design as well as on the role of trainers and the tools that they can use to deliver successful human rights education. In Kenya partners have identified that HRE workers (CBOs/individual community leaders) need further support with project formulation and implementation and developing work plans which are SMART.	**1.1.1** Country plans **1.1.2** Needs assessment **1.1.3** Organisational self-assessment **1.1.4** Mid-term and final evaluation	Financial and managerial stability of partner organisations

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
	O1 OV2: Amalgamation of HRE experience and expertise of representatives on a national level (human rights organisations, experts and networks guide HRE complementary planning in each country)	As P1 plus Poor networking and information sharing. Availability of HR and HRE experts in each country who are willing to contribute to and participate in the project. In Sierra Leone an internal organisational assessment of capacity building needs conducted by the coordinating partner found that "there is a need to be more participatory and consultative in strategy development and planning (and) a need for increased engagement with other NGOs". Poor coordination among implementers, inadequate or non-existent follow-up activities, lack of references, and limited evaluation and impact assessment were reported as major barriers to the effective and efficient delivery of HRE. In Kenya the project partners have identified that partnerships with faith-based organisations are crucial to tackling human rights violations, as is working with paralegal organisations	**1.2.1** Partnership Committee TORs and minutes of meetings **1.2.2** Network membership lists and activity reports in annual Project Coordinator reports **1.2.3** Statistics relating to HRE workers / project participants recruited and trained **1.2.4** Reports of all workshops / consultations with HRE workers / project participants and other stakeholders	
	O1 OV3: 20 partners report an increased ability to coordinate, support and measure HRE interventions that meet the needs of a range of specific constituency groups in each country	There is limited capacity to monitor and evaluate HRE programmes. Project partners have identified a particular need for the HRE workers / project participants to receive extra support on monitoring and evaluation	**1.3.1** Country plans containing strategies and tools (and organisational baseline) **1.3.2** AI project team minutes with approvals and amendments of country plans **1.3.3** Quarterly national project coordinator reports **1.3.4** Annual AI monitoring and evaluation visits **1.3.5** Documentation of project	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
			coordinator and HRE worker training **1.3.6** Documentation of biannual review and planning meetings with HRE workers / project participants **1.3.7** Project budgets **1.3.8** Organisational self-assessment at beginning and end of project **1.3.9** Mid-term and final evaluation **1.3.10** Documentation of information sharing, support and advice given by AI	
	O1 OV4: Increased visibility and profile of partners and human rights themes addressed through the project at national and international level	Low visibility of CSOs undertaking HRE. Evidence of visibility (or lack of) in media, meetings, participation in dialogue, coalitions, networks, NGO roundtables. No baseline data was reported on the existing participation in civil society/human rights projects/governance issues and changes in behaviour; this will be collected at the level of the project participants prior to the commencement of the micro-projects	**1.4.1** Press articles **1.4.2** Minutes and records of public meetings **1.4.3** Commentary on project from other civil society actors	
Output 2: A pool of 150 HRE workers / project participants (15 x 10 countries) and CBOs is created and equipped with the necessary	**O2 OV1:** 150 HRE workers / project participants have increased project management, evaluation and specialised HRE delivery skills	See above in O1 OV1. HRE workers and CBOs have poor understanding of human rights laws and instruments, and require project management and evaluation training and support. Lack of resources and training to implement HRE. In the partner induction and project planning workshop conducted in March 2009 all	**2.1.1** Training workshop reports **2.1.2** Completed HRE worker training evaluation reports **2.1.2** Resources approval forms from project managers **2.1.3** Baseline and endline of project planning, management and reporting skills	Freedom of HRE workers / project participants to operate Continued interest in

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
human rights knowledge, skills and tools to design, support, deliver and monitor HRE projects		partners stressed the need for the Africa Human Rights Education project to deliver partner capacity building in relation to HRE methodologies plus human rights conventions laws etc. To date the project has attracted more HRE workers (CBOs & individual community leaders) and micro-project submissions than anticipated, reflecting the need and desire for a micro grant scheme to deliver HRE.		participating in the project
	O2 OV2: Community HRE projects are developed and delivered by HRE workers / project participants that directly respond to the needs of specific constituency groups / that mobilise greater critical understanding of and remedial action against specific human rights violations. (150 projects [5x10x3 years], with 30% of HRE workers / project participants reporting that they have utilised the tools and skills gained in the project).	Identification of key human rights issues, targets and key social change agents at the local level HRE targets elite groups and urban areas. Lack of awareness amongst marginalised communities. Limited understanding of how HRE is relevant to improving people's lives, even in countries where HRE is widespread. In all ten project countries project partners find limited understanding of how HRE is relevant to improving people's lives - especially in relation to violence against women. Access to justice is a deep-seated problem in all the ten partner countries. For example the partners in Ghana find that *"even though (there are) Laws, a Constitution, & conventions which frown upon human rights abuses and which set grave punitive measures for those who violate the rights of women and children, there is limited awareness on the part of the victims on the existence of these laws that protect their rights, the state institutions set up to provide*	**2.2.1** HRE project plans (approved by partnership committee in each country) **2.2.2** HRE biannual monitoring reports; Project Coordinator monitoring reports of HRE projects **2.2.3** Photographic evidence, statistics of attendees, other forms of documentation identified at country level **2.2.4** Criteria of identification of project themes and approaches in country plan **2.2.5** Participatory consultation reports **2.2.6** Mid-term and final evaluations **2.2.7** Biannual review and planning meetings documenting variety of approaches and accessibility for various target groups	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		redress and even what rights they hold as human beings". In Mali partners reported that *"inadequate command of communication tools by NGO actors...and ignorance of legal and instruments to protect human rights and the fact they are not applied is conducive to the abuse of those with power and the violation of human rights".*		
	O2 OV3: Tools and training received by HRE workers / project participants augments their ability to mobilise people into action for human rights	As O2 OV1 Lack of knowledge of how human rights mechanisms and tools can be utilised to improve people's lives amongst HRE workers / CBOs	**2.3.1** Baseline and endline assessments of HRE worker ability to deliver locally relevant HRE **2.3.2** Minutes of biannual review and planning workshops **2.3.3** Biannual reports completed by HRE workers / project participants	
Output 3: An increased number of people (22,500 = 150 x 50 people x 3 years) are aware of their human rights and are empowered with information and understanding of how they relate to their lives	**O3 OV1:** Increased participation in civil society: 22,500 people in marginalised groups report an increased understanding of human rights issues and the ability to apply the knowledge and tools for social [and political] change [promoting and protecting human rights].	HRE targets elite groups and urban areas. Lack of awareness of rights and HRE amongst marginalised communities. For example in Togo *"the different training courses that are run to teach about legal instruments and texts are always directed at people who have some academic experience thereby leaving out a broad swathe of the population living in poorer areas where many people are illiterate".* In Mali *"inadequate command of communication tools by NGO actors undermines the fight against the practice of excision"* and ignorance of legal and instruments to protect human rights and the fact they are not applied is conducive to the	**3.1.1** Qualitative documentation of projects generated, including video recordings, photos, drama scripts, radio transmissions. Statistics on project attendees **3.1.2** Baseline and endline assessment of awareness **3.1.3** Project monitoring visits **3.1.4** Biannual monitoring reports and minutes of biannual meetings **3.1.5** Baseline and end line assessments (questionnaires and interviews with constituents) **3.1.6** Mid term and final evaluation	Communities willing to participate in HRE training

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		abuse of those with power and the violation of human rights. According to CBO Centre Afrika Obota *"On consulting beneficiaries, we found that only 2 out of every 10 people had some idea about legal instruments and 9 out of 10 had no experience of HRE"*. No baseline data was reported on the existing participation in civil society/human rights projects/governance issues and changes in behaviour; this will be collected at the project participants' level prior to the commencement of the micro-projects.	**3.1.7** HRE worker qualitative biannual reports with feedback from constituents	
	O3 OV2: A broad range of communities and groups access the programme (and demonstrate enhanced critical understanding / capacity to assert their rights) including at least 11,250 women, 1,000 young people, 10,000 people living in remote communities & 500 people with disabilities. Communities in at least 4 regions of each country access the programme	As O2 OV2 plus Limited understanding of how HRE is relevant to improving people's lives, even in countries where HRE is widespread. In Uganda the constituencies with the least access to HRE and human rights knowledge were found by partners to be women from minority groups and women refugees. For example project participant African International Christian Ministry (AICM) reports that the Batwa, Bakiga and Bafumbira tribes possess very limited information about human rights and particularly women's rights. In Burkina Faso vulnerable groups are cited as older people accused of sorcery, pregnant girls and teenage mothers, and people with disabilities. In Sierra Leone partners have emphasised that women have extremely limited control over their situation in society due to social, cultural	**3.2.1** Statistics on constituents benefiting from the HRE programmes, according to gender, age, region, disability etc **3.2.2** Biannual review and planning meetings documenting accessibility for various target groups **3.2.3** Strategy to ensure accessibility documented in Country Plan **3.2.3** Baseline and end line assessments (questionnaires and interviews with constituents) **3.2.4** Mid term and final evaluation **3.2.5** HRE Worker qualitative biannual reports with feedback from constituents	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		and structural issues. Project participant Sabi Yu Rights (SYRAG) undertook consultations with 50 people in four of the villages forming the Grafton Community in rural Sierra Leone and *"according to respondents access to justice is considered a major problem with causing factors stated as poverty and lack of knowledge on how to seek redress…causing perpetrators to walk away free".*		
Output 4: People living in at least 50 communities are able to identify local human rights issues, their correspondence to human rights instruments and the relevance of human rights in their communities	**O4 OV1:** People formulating plans and organising projects of self-help in at least 50 communities / constituency groups. (Developing skills to document human rights abuses and to take action on human rights abuses)	Lack of participation in vertical forms of accountability amongst poor and marginalised communities. Baseline data has identified many barriers to participation including discrimination, HRE projects that do not translate to action or are inaccessible, and a lack of skills and knowledge to tackle issues of customary traditions. Consultations undertaken in three chiefdoms in Moyamba district, Sierra Leone – Kongbora, Kaiyamba and Fakunya - found that "*there is much awareness of human rights (55%) but the (HR) situation is not adequately improved due to the lack of an adequate human rights education culture and traditional belief, lack of proper monitoring and reporting and (the fact that) perpetrators almost always go unpunished".* Partners in Uganda highlight how abuse victims are not accessing justice because of fears around reporting which they describe as linked to segregation and discrimination against minority groups, for example the	**4.1.1** Community HRE plans **4.1.2** HRE worker biannual reports **4.1.3** Project coordinator visits	Interest in human rights approaches from targeted communities

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		Batwa, by local councils and courts. Project participants Human Rights Defenders Solidarity Network (HRDSN) emphasise violence against women refugees… *"starting with their husbands, camp officials, employers, refugee agency employees and other people in the community who use these women's vulnerability and ignorance to abuse them sexually"* and the resultant impact on participation and accountability initiatives. In Sierra Leone partners have reported a need to reconcile disconnects between theory and practice involving the dispensation of justice in target communities. For example disseminating user friendly information on the Criminal Procedure Act to help target beneficiaries to create, and live in local rights - based communities of their own design. In Burkina Faso partners highlight the need for the transition from customary to modern law (via the adoption of the Code des Personnes et de la Famille – CPF in 1994) to be known and owned by communities. For example in relation to inheritance rights, partners call upon a need *"to confront the pressures families now governed by the CPF find themselves under… (and) carry out awareness-raising concerning the inheritance rights of married couples and children in the context of modern law".* In Burkina Faso: "*Generally speaking (there is a need to) raise awareness of notables and customary dignitaries about the need to combat the types of violence that are linked to*		

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		the socio-cultural practices that are still in use in our societies". In Côte d'Ivoire, partners report racketeering in hospital maternity units and operating suites and delivery kits being sold to labouring women who are also charged for the services of midwives. In Mali, partners cite human rights violations around discrimination and exclusion relating to certain peoples and groups lacking identify documents: *"At school, some children face (access) problems relating to birth certificates".* In Burkina Faso, project participants report very low levels of understanding of human rights mechanisms that might improve people's lives. For example project participants 'Association Song Taaba des Femmes Unies et Développement (ASFUD)' report that practical steps taken by the Ministry for Human Rights Promotion to raise human rights awareness have had very little impact on beneficiaries at the grassroots level.		
	O4 OV2: At least 30% of constituents report that they have changed their human rights behaviour (either as perpetrators or victims of human rights abuses - Improved access to human rights and justice in beneficiary communities occurs	Most perpetrators and victims of human rights abuses, especially in poor and marginalised communities, are not aware of human rights. In each of the ten project countries women are cited as lacking information about Human Rights and suffering human rights violations because they are ignorant of their right to seek redress. Specific findings related to widows. In Ghana community consultations in Zanlerigu in the Talensi/Nabdam District of the Upper	**4.2.1** Qualitative biannual and end of grant reports on programme outcomes with participatory feedback from communities **4.2.2** Baseline and endline assessments **4.2.3** Mid term and final evaluation	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
		East Region of Ghana found that there is widespread and continuous violence against widows which goes unchallenged and unreported. During the course of community consultations they found *that "a major constraint to human rights in most communities is inadequate awareness"* and that *"very few of these rural poor have information or access to education related to their basic human rights including sexual reproductive health".* Impunity is also reported in schools - in Burkina Faso project participant consultations revealed numerous abuses of human rights in the school context ranging from corporal punishment to sexual harassment. In Côte d'Ivoire partners report that *"the school environment is largely characterised by numerous ongoing acts of violence".* Partners in Togo cited human rights violations in the context of customary succession (not recognising the right of women to inherit and women being virtually absent from CVD [Village Development Committees]).		
Output 5: Strong, embedded and sustainable human rights culture for change enabled through a human rights education network that facilitates mutual learning,	**O5 OV.1:** All project partners are firmly embedded into human rights education movements in their own countries, linked to a range of NGOs, CBOs and networks. Indicator of functioning network for change: Africa HRE Network is an active learning forum with at least 160 members	P. OV1 plus: There is little collaboration between organisations delivering HRE; HRE projects take place in isolation and learnings are not replicated. Community consultations carried out by AMNet (Advocacy Movement Network) & DADA (Democracy and Development Associates) in two chiefdoms in KAMBIA DISTRICT, Sierra Leone, found that HRE is being conducted but	**5.1.1** Network - Copies of guiding principals **5.1.2** Network - Member sign up lists **5.1.3** Online network resources **5.1.4** Record access to network site **5.1.5** Annual review and planning meeting reports record qualitative relevance and	Inter-regional and international travel between countries is possible for participants

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
best practice, and a joint voice	participating and sharing ideas and skills (10 exchange visits, 36 monthly Africa wide email circulars and 360 in country, web page and blog created and utilised and three thematic groups created with web pages, 3 network meetings for Project Co-ordinators and 1 network meeting with project co-ordinators and HRE worker representatives). Learning is replicated and increased, complimentary activities are developed, duplication is decreased and a culture of HRE becomes embedded on a national basis.	is not systematic or interlinked – in five of the six communities being targeted HRE is being delivered already. Communities gave criticism of the existing interventions and responses as follows (in the respective five communities): 'not emphasising the responsibilities of women and children'; 'lacking solutions to the welfare of children', 'giving conflicting messages and lacking a responsibility-based approach to HR', 'not continuous or sustainable due to lack of resources'.	quantitative accessibility of network **5.1.6** Planning and reports documentation of exchange visits (including video recording/ photographs where relevant) **5.1.7** Network models recorded in annual country plans, **5.1.8** Minutes of networking meetings at biannual review and planning meetings **5.1.9** Record of shared information through email circulars and informal meetings in annual reports **5.1.10** Relevance and usage of the network through mid-term and final evaluation	
	O5 OV2: Increased learning is facilitated by at least 3 thematic sub groups formed bringing together HRE workers / project participants across the ten countries	As P. OV1 Limited learning and sharing of thematic / methodological information around HRE delivery and learnings within and between countries	**5.2.1** Joint HRE project plans **5.2.2** Joint HRE project reports **5.2.3** Blogs and emails generated through cross country thematic groups **5.2.4** Log of information sharing and blog discussions on thematic issues **5.2.5** Qualitative feedback of use and relevance of thematic groups in feedback to project co-ordinators in biannual review and planning meetings and biannual reports	
Output 6:	**O6 OV1:** Increased availability of	As P.OV3	**6.1.1** Training reports and	Quality printing,

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
Sustainable critical human rights consciousness is increased as CSOs and communities are empowered with better quality, more relevant, accessible human rights education and resources as a key tool for change	locally relevant HRE materials and training in local languages that meet the needs of specific constituency groups and enhance the impact, dissemination and sustainability of locally delivered HRE projects (range includes radio scripts, drama scripts, posters, leaflets, curriculum guides etc) - Increased relevance of materials for target communities, including in materials translated into at least 2 languages in each country, and a range of formats including non-word based for illiterate audiences (posters, radio, drama etc).	HRE materials are inaccessible and few are translated into local languages	training materials **6.1.2** Questionnaires with feedback from HRE workers / project participants **6.1.3** Baseline and endline assessment of understanding and capacity of HRE and human rights **6.1.4** Database and hard copy list of HRE materials produced or collated **6.1.5** Project Coordinator annual report on range and suitability of materials **6.1.6** Printing and distribution lists **6.1.7** List and copies of materials produced and developed **6.1.8** Printing and distribution lists **6.1.9** Baseline and endline survey with HRE workers / project participants to assess relevance of materials **6.1.10** Mid-term and final evaluation with constituents to assess relevance of materials	translation and transportation possible within countries
	O6 OV2: HRE (physical and virtual) resource centres increase access to critical understanding of human rights. Accessed by at least 22,800 users per year (780 visits x 10	**As P.OV3**	**6.2.1** Resource centres visitors and loaning book **6.2.2** List of documents in resource centre maintained and updated **6.2.2** Itinerary of resource centre	

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
	countries x 3 years)		equipment	
	06 OV3: Online resource centre-increased sharing of HRE information between ten project countries and beyond on-line resource database of at least 200 resources established and accessed at least 1,200 times during the project.	**As P.OV3**	**6.3.1** List of resources on the database **6.3.2** List of recorded usage through AI team **6.3.3** Documented feedback from HRE workers / project participants and Project Co-ordinators on usage of the database through reporting and reviewing mechanisms	

Activities
1: Creation and Management of Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners
1.1 AI recruit and induct AI Programme Staff (Q2 – Quarter 4, Project Year 1)
1.2 AI formalise existing partnerships and identify at new partners through a thorough assessment process and against a set criteria. Partnership agreements established (Q2, Project Year 1)
1.3 Partners recruit 10 national Project Co-ordinators who are approved, inducted and trained by AI (Q2, Project Year 1)
1.4 Partnership Committees (made up of at least 5 representatives from partners and other NGOs/ specialists) formed in 10 countries (Q2, Project Year 1) and meeting at least twice per year throughout the project
1.5 Partners conduct organisational self assessment, using existing AI tools (OSSA), to identify partners' strategic, resources and capacity needs and participatory project needs assessment to develop the Country Plan (Q3 and 4, Project Year 1)
1.6 Partners develop Country Plans (including risk assessment, needs assessment of human rights themes and constituencies, selection and training of HRE workers / project participants, M&E strategy, cross cutting issues etc) approved by AI (Q3, Project Year 1)
1.7 Annual training, review and planning with Project Co-ordinators by AI (Q3, Project Year 1 – changed to quarter 2, Quarter 4 Project 2, 3 & 4)
1.8. On-going support and advice for partner organisations from Africa Programme Coordinators/ Programme Manager (bi-monthly contact, Y1 - 4). Will include support and advice on planning and development for each stage of the project and practical exercises in assessment, mapping, designing and delivering activities/ materials.
1.9 Annual monitoring and support visits from AI Programme Co-ordinators/ Programme Manager (Q3, Project Y 2, 3 and 4).
2: Training and support of HRE workers / project participants and development of HRE Projects
2.1 Further analysis and identification of 150 HRE workers / project participants/ CBOs (women, young people, journalists, teachers, community leaders) in collaboration with partners (Q3, project Y1)
2.2 Partners design HRE training materials with support of Project Coordinators. Including HRE training kits for 150 HRE workers / project participants (from

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
Q3, project Y1 – partners have requested that this an ongoing activity to be extended throughout quarters 1 & 2 of the second project year)				
2.3 Partners induct HRE workers / project participants through 1 week long pan-Africa training and planning session (Q4, project Y1) and support them to develop their HRE Project Plans				
2.4 HRE workers / project participants consult constituents about HRE Project Plans and finalise and submit plans to Project Co-ordinators to refine with Partnership Committee. Final approval given by AI Project Manager (Changed from Q4, project Y1 to quarter 1, project Y2).				
2.5 Biannual Review and Planning Workshops held with HRE workers / project participants, to deliver training identified through annual self assessments, feed learning into programmes and adapt HRE plans accordingly (Q2 & Q4, Y2, 3 and 4)				
2.6 Annual project Support and Monitoring Visits undertaken by Project Co-ordinators with each HRE project (Project Y2, 3 & 4)				
2.7 Specialised human rights/ HRE training for 150 HRE workers / project participants (one week training in Y2 and Y3)				
2.8 Project Co-ordinators offer on-going communication and support for HRE workers / project participants (bi-monthly communication)				
3: Implementation of HRE Projects (access & critical awareness)				
3.1. 150 HRE workers / project participants deliver 1 project per year (project Y2, 3 and 4) to 22,500 target constituents (7,500 x 3 years). Projects could include: use of theatre, radio and media, HRE in schools etc				
3.2. HRE workers / project participants are supported with resources to deliver the HRE projects (average of £1000 per year, per project) in project Y2, 3 and 4.				
3.3 Ongoing monitoring of HRE projects by HRE workers / project participants				
4: Implementation of HRE projects (mobilisation, action, behaviour change)				
4.1 Community HRE committees established				
4.2 Community HRE plans are developed				
5: Better coordination, networking and skill sharing				
5.1 AI facilitate the creation of an Africa HRE network (Q2, project Y1), which is developed and accessed by Project Co-ordinators and HRE workers / project participants (project Y2, 3 & 4)				
5.2 Partners support and strengthen existing networks or create new country networks through resources promoting links to the Africa HRE network (both online and in person: meetings, database of resources, notice board, resource centres, opportunities to share experiences) (on-going)				
5.3 Network meetings: Africa wide Project Co-ordinators (Y 1,2,3 and 4 of the grant), country biannual meetings of HRE workers / project participants and one mid-term network meeting with Project Co-ordinators and HRE workers / project participants.				
5.4 Thematic networking facilitated through grouping of in-country HRE workers / project participants at the national level and online communications and 10 country exchange visits (one per country) at the Africa wide level				
6: More relevant training and awareness-raising materials and tools				
6.1 Partners assess in-country HRE materials and identify, collate existing materials for the HRE projects - from Q3, project Y1 – partners have requested that this an ongoing activity to be extended throughout quarters 1 & 2 of the second project year)				
6.1 Workshop to adapt or develop HRE training kits for HRE workers / project participants and HRE projects - from Q3, project Y1 – partners have requested				

	Measurable indicators Evidence (qualitative and quantitative) which will be used to measure/ judge the achievement of the goal.	Baseline Data (and specific examples of country level baseline values)	Means of verification Sources of information / data which will be used to assess the indicators)	Important assumptions
that this an ongoing activity to be extended throughout quarters 1 & 2 of the second project year)				
6.2 Print and distribute materials - from Q3, project Y1 – partners have requested that this an ongoing activity to be extended throughout quarters 1 & 2 of the second project year)				
6.3 Resource centres established and utilised by Project Co-ordinators, HRE workers / project participants and others (Q4, project Y1 and on-going)				
7. Monitoring and Evaluation				
7.1. Country M&E plans developed by partners				
7.2. Ongoing monitoring of HRE projects by HRE workers / project participants (consultative feedback)				
7.3. Biannual HRE Review and Planning meetings and submission of HRE worker monitoring reports				
7.4. Project Coordinators monitor each HRE project, each year of the grant and complete standard participatory monitoring forms				
7.5. Project Coordinators develop biannual country monitoring reports which are submitted to the AI Project Manager and shared and discussed at annual review and planning meetings				
7.6. AI Programme team undertake monitoring visit to each country in year 2, 3 & 4 completing standardised monitoring forms				
7.7. External mid-term and final participatory evaluation of the programme				
7.8 Baseline and endline assessment of HRE, human rights understanding and application in citizen's lives in which indicators of success are adapted and refined at the country level				

GTF376

Annex 3 – Annual Financial Report

A3.1 Programme Identification

1. GTF Reference No.	GTF-376
2. Organisation Name	Amnesty International

A3.2 – Reporting Period

1. Start of Period	01April 2009
2. End of Period	31 March 2010

A3.3 – Funds received from DFID during Reporting Period

Payment No.	Date Received	Amount
Payment 1	16/06/2010	£436,803.56
Payment 2	04/12/2009	£237,802.12
Payment 3	19/4/2010	£151,920.46
Payment 4	26/06/2010	£56,600.60
Total received during Period		**£826.525.14**

A3.4 – Expenditure during Reporting Period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010

Agreed Budget Lines	Agreed Budget for Period	Actual Expend' for Period	Variance	Variance %
Capital Costs partners: Lap tops for project co-ordinators	£0	£0	£0	0%
Capital Costs partners: Resource centre equipment	£300	£409	£-109	-36%
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS PARTNERS	**£300**	£409	£-109	**-36%**
Human Resources Partners: Project Co-ordinators	£110,894	£100,971	£9,923	9%
Human Resources Partners: Recruitment costs for Project Co-ordinators	£0	£0	£0	0%
Human Resources Partners: Support for Director/programme staff in partner organisations	£15,338	£15,427	£-89	-1%
TOTAL HUMAN RESOURCES PARTNERS	**£126,232**	**£116,398**	**£9,834**	**8%**
Human Resources Amnesty International: Programme Manager Dakar	£43,906	£27,184	£16,722	38%
Human Resources Amnesty International: Africa Project Co-ordinators Dakar	£73,575	£91,582	£-18,007	-24%
Human Resources Amnesty International: Programme Director support London	£537	£0	£537	100%
Human Resources Amnesty International: Project Administrative Assistant	£0	£0	£0	0%
Human Resources Amnesty International: Recruitment costs	£0	£0	£0	0%
TOTAL HUMAN RESOURCES AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£118,018**	**£118,766**	**£-748**	**-1%**

Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners: Mapping and consultation to identify secondary partners	£500	£500	£0	0%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners: Partnership Committee meetings	£3,825	£3,975	£-150	-4%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners: Specialised training for partners identified through self-assessments	£7,125	£9,069	£-1,944	-27%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners: Annual Project Co-ordinators review, planning, networking and training workshop (Dakar)	£0	£8,312	£-8,312	100%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building for Partners: Needs assessment and baseline assessment to develop country plan	£16,037	£15,548	£489	3%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 1 PARTNERS	**£27,487**	**£37,404**	**£-9,917**	**-36%**
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building Amnesty International: Formalise partnership agreements	£0	£0	£0	0%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building Amnesty International: Annual Project Co-ordinators review, planning, networking and training workshop (Dakar)	£0	£0	£0	0%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building Amnesty International: Annual monitoring and support visits to partners	£10,300	£7,147	£3,153	31%
Activity Costs 1- Establishing Project Infrastructure and Capacity Building Amnesty International: On-going advice, information and support from AI	0	0	£0	0%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 1 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£10,300**	**£7,147**	**£3,153**	**31%**
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: Partners identify 15 HRE Workers	£5,000	£3,544	£1,456	29%
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: HRE Workers identify constituencies and plan HRE projects	£11,250	£10,855	£395	4%
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: Training, planning, review and network meetings for HRE Workers (HRE worker induction in Dakar, quarter 1 year 2)	£116,571	£99,853	£16,718	14%
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: Project Coordinators carry out monitoring and support visits for HRE Workers	£56,215	£18,374	£37,841	67%
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: HRE Workers receive specialised training	£27,000	£22,503	£4,497	17%
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: Partners provide on-	£13,500	£11,437	£2,063	15%

going advice, information and support for HRE Projects			
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Partners: On-going advice, information and support from AI	£13,500	£11,104	£2,396	18%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 2 PARTNERS	**£243,036**	**£177,670**	**£65,366**	**27%**
Activity Costs 2 - Training and Support of HRE Workers – Amnesty International: Training, planning, review and network meetings for HRE Workers (HRE worker induction in Dakar, quarter 1 year 2)	£22,286	£22,286	£0	0%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 2 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£22,286**	**£22,286**	**£0**	**0%**
Activity Costs 3 - Implementation of HRE Projects – Partners: HRE Projects	£166,000	£58,309	£107,691	65%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 3 PARTNERS	**£166,000**	**£58,309**	**£107,691**	**65%**
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Collation of existing HRE Materials	£3,000	£1,923	£1,077	36%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Workshop to adapt or develop HRE Materials	£37,000	£26,332	£10,668	29%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Translation costs into local languages	£7,500	£3,899	£3,601	48%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Print and distribute HRE training materials for HRE workers	£7,500	£13,318	£-5,818	-78%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Print and distribute HRE materials for HRE projects	£75,000	£26,814	£48,186	64%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Resource centres equipped with files, books, materials and other materials	£3,000	£2,303	£696	23%
Activity Costs 4 - Increase access and quality of locally relevant HRE materials - Partners: Resources database accessed by local partners, project co-ordinators and HRE Workers	£0	£0	£0	0%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 4 PARTNERS	**£133,000**	**£74,590**	**£58,410**	**44%**
Activity Costs 5. Establish and facilitate relevant and accessible national and continent wide networks – Partners: Consultations to establish national network models	£0	£0	£0	0%
Activity Costs 5. Establish and facilitate relevant and accessible national and continent wide networks – Partners: Country networks established and operating	£25,500	£17,092	£8,408	33%
Activity Costs 5. Establish and facilitate relevant and accessible national and continent wide networks – Partners: Biannual network meetings	£0	£0	£0	0%
Activity Costs 5. Establish and facilitate relevant and accessible national and continent wide networks – Partners: Network meeting of project co-ordinators, partners representative	£0	£0	£0	0%

and selected HRE workers (55 participants)				
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 5 PARTNERS	**£25,500**	**£17,092**	**£8,408**	**33%**
Continent wide network is established and operating	£1,000	£1,000	£0	0%
Annual network meetings of programme coordinators	£0	£0	£0	0%
Dissemination of programme results	£0	£0	£0	0%
Network meeting of project coordinators, partners and selected HRE workers	£0	£0	£0	0%
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS 5 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£1.000**	**£1,000**	**£0**	**0%**
Monitoring and Evaluation- Partners: Establish in-country M&E plans	£0	£0	£0	0%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Partners: Biannual project review and planning meetings	£0	£0	£0	0%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Partners: Annual project support and monitoring visits	£0	£0	£0	0%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Partners: Project coordinators and HRE Workers conduct end of project impact assessment with participants/beneficiaries	£0	£0	£0	0%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Partners: Monitoring costs for HRE Workers	£0	£0	£0	0%
TOTAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION - PARTNERS	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**0%**
Monitoring and Evaluation- Amnesty International: Annual monitoring and support visits	£10,660	£8,139	£2,521	24%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Amnesty International: Annual review and planning meetings	0	0	£0	0%
Monitoring and Evaluation- Amnesty International: Mid-term and final participatory evaluation (Programme Coordinators lead participatory evaluation with Partners and Project Coordinators)	0	0	£0	0%
TOTAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION – AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£10,660**	**£8,139**	**2,521**	**24%**
Project Management – Partners: Contribution towards office overheads, management, administration, transportation, stationary, utilities	£54,756	£44,468	£10,288	19%
TOTAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT PARTNERS	**£54,756**	**£44,468**	**£10,288**	**19%**
Project Management – Amnesty International: Overheads	£11,890	£11,888	£-2	0%
Project Management – Amnesty International: AI Dakar office: rent, electricity, security, telephone etc	£0	£0	£0	0%
TOTAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	**£11,890**	**£11,888**	**£-2**	**0%**
Total for Period	**£950,465**	**£693,221**	**£257,244**	**27%**

Annex 4 – Materials produced during the reporting period

Item	Date	Title or description of material	Access web site (if any)
1.	April 2009	Project Handbook for project partners	Internal document only.
2.	April 2009	Report on first induction workshop	Internal document only
3.	July 2009	AHRE project online network site	Internal network site
4.	December 2009	A short guide on how to gather testimonies to build up a portfolio of evidence of impact and change experienced by individual beneficiaries at community level as a result of the micro-projects.	Internal document shared with partners
5.	January to March 2010	Several international and national laws, conventions, declarations, video and audio features have been produced for use by the project participants and CBOs in their HRE trainings at community level.	Internal documents
6.	March 2010	Short film on the project and video testimonies of constituencies, participants, national coordinators and partners	Not yet available on line.

Annex 5 – Web Update for Programme

Amnesty International is working with local partners in 10 African countries to deliver a human rights education (HRE) programme to address locally relevant human rights issues at the community level. Capacity building and support is being provided to local partners to aid them to develop, implement and monitor strategic HRE.

We are working amongst rural, poor and marginalised communities in ten project countries; Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Uganda.

Our approach is to empower small community-based organisations (HRE participants) to address local issues through HRE through equipping them with training, skills, tools and resources necessary to raise critical awareness of human rights and mobilise agents of change (targeting both perpetrators and victims of human rights abuses).

Since our project started in September 2008 95 HRE participants have been supported to design and deliver a range of innovative human rights education micro-projects utilising theatre, radio and existing local governance structures. So far 63 micro-projects are being effectively implemented. Community members are being supported to identify the human rights issues that are most crucial to them and to identify how they might take action against the violations they directly experience.

For example in Senegal, one of the HRE participants Yahya Sidibe, who is a film producer and dramatist, is implementing human rights education in Muslim or "madrasa" schools, to open up discussion and awareness of children's rights amongst teachers. Teachers in these schools commonly send pupils to beg on the streets, the begging children are known as "talibe".

In some countries we are already witnessing behavioural change at the grass roots level. For example, in Burkina Faso two tribal chiefs are acting as HRE participants and are leading awareness raising activities on access to justice for women (particularly tackling accusations of witchcraft targeted at elderly women). Other local leaders are responding by seeking out advice in relation to tribal laws and how they relate to national statutes on human rights. This is hugely significant as many local conflicts and disputes are resolved by tribal chiefs and harnessing their buy-in has a great influence on community justice in Burkina Faso. This will ensure lasting change in human rights practices.

This is just the start. Through the duration of this project we aim to reach 22,500 people to equip them with critical understanding of their human rights and how to apply and claim them in their communities.

Annex 6 – Annual Workplan

For the Period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010

GTF Number: 376
Organisation: Amnesty International

ACTIVITIES	April 2009 to March 2010											
	Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 1			Quarter 2		
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Conduct Self Assessment (OSSA) to identify capacity building needs and to undertake participatory project needs assessment to develop the country plan												
Partners develop first draft of national HRE strategies (including risk assessment, needs assessment of human rights themes and constituencies, selection & training of HRE participants, M&E strategy, cross cutting issues etc). To be approved by AI												
Analysis, identification and recruitment of up to 15 (we recommend 5-10) HRE Participants/CBOs per country (in collaboration with secondary partners and with support from IS project managers)												
Partners design HRE training materials and kits with support of IS project managers – including HRE training kits for 150 HRE participants												
HRE Participants are inducted via training and planning workshop –comprising support with development of HRE project plans												
HRE Participants consult constituents about HRE project plans and finalise and submit plans to refine with the partnership committee												
Final approval on HRE plans given by IS project manager												

ACTIVITIES	April 2009 to March 2010											
	Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 1			Quarter 2		
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
National project coordinators offer ongoing communication and support for HRE Participants (bi-monthly communication) – throughout project – from quarter 4, year 1												
HRE Participants are provided with 1st instalment of resources to undertake their projects (average of £1,000 per project per year) – micro grants distributed in quarter 4 of years 1, 2, and 3. – HRE projects delivered in years 2, 3 and 4												
Partners assess in-country HRE materials, identify and collate existing materials for their HRE projects.												
Resource database (managed by AI), including materials collated and developed through the project and global HRE materials –is promoted and accessed by project coordinators and HRE participants throughout the project												
Assist IS project managers in the creation of an Africa HRE network												
Partners support and strengthen existing networks or create new country networks through resources promoting links to the Africa HRE network (both online and in person: meetings, database of resources, notice board, resource centres, opportunities to share experiences) – Ongoing activity												
Thematic networking facilitated through grouping of in-country HRE participants at the national level and online communications												
Country M&E plans are developed by partners												
Partners conduct baseline assessment of HRE, human rights understanding and application in citizen's lives in which indicators of success are adapted and refined at the country level												

ACTIVITIES	April 2009 to March 2010											
	Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 1			Quarter 2		
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Africa Project Management Team provide on-going support and advice to partners to include support and advice on planning and development	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪							
Workshop to adapt or develop HRE training kits for HRE participants and HRE projects								▪	▪			
Resource centres established and utilised by project coordinators, HRE participants and others						▪	▪					
Africa programme management team delivers annual monitoring and support visit to each partner								▪	▪			
HRE projects approved by national partnership committees and AI							▪	▪				
HRE Participants are provided with resources to undertake their projects									▪			
Plan and deliver annual training, review and planning workshop for National Project Co-ordinators – to deliver training identified through annual self assessments, feed learning into programmes and adapt HRE plans accordingly. To include refinement, monitoring and evaluation of National HRE Country Plans										▪		
Support partners to develop HRE training materials/kits										▪	▪	
AI manage resource database, including materials collated and developed through the project and global HRE materials and this is utilised by Project Co-ordinators and HRE Participants (on-going)										▪	▪	▪
AI maintain Africa HRE network which is accessed by Project Coordinators and HRE participants										▪	▪	▪
Facilitate and support in-country network meetings (Biannual review and planning meeting for HRE participants)									▪	▪	▪	
Project Co-ordinators offer on-going communication and support for HRE Participants (bi-monthly communication)										▪	▪	▪

GTF376

ACTIVITIES	April 2009 to March 2010											
	Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 1			Quarter 2		
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
Specialised human rights/ HRE training is delivered for 146 HRE Participants – as identified through self assessment (one week training in Y2 and Y3) – throughout the year												
5 – 10 (maximum of 15) HRE participants deliver one project per year – *years 2, 3 and 4* – to 2,250 target constituents (750 x 3 years). Projects could include use of theatre, radio and media, HRE in schools etc												
On-going monitoring of HRE projects by HRE participants (photos, consultative feedback, records of participants / attendance and outcomes) – *throughout project*												
Project coordinators monitor each HRE project each year of the grant and complete standard participatory monitoring forms – each quarter throughout project												
A range of HRE Materials are collected and developed and disseminated throughout the year												
Thematic networking facilitated through grouping of HRE participants at the national level and online communications												
Submit narrative and expenditure report for the quarter to IS project manager												
	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March

GTF376

Annex 7 – Partners

GTF No	Organisation	Project Name	Continent (from DFID Country Profiles)	Country	Partner	Address	Current (since)	Intend to but never worked with	Worked in the past but dropped off (state the end-date)	To be (in year)
376	Amnesty International	Africa Human Rights Education Programme	Africa	Benin	**Women in Law and Development in Africa - Benin**	[Women in Law and Development in Africa - Benin] Carré 1066 K Vodjè Kpota, CotonouTél / fax 229 21 30 60 92	Dec-08			
				Benin	**Amnesty International Benin**	01BP3536 Cotonou Bénin, Tel +229 21 32 36 90	Dec-08			
				Burkina Faso	**Amnesty International Burkina Faso**	Amnesty International-Burkina Faso #27, Pissy Boumiougou Ouagadougou – Burkina Faso	Dec-08			
				Burkina Faso	**Groupe d'Etudes et de Recherches sur la Democratie et le Developpement Economique et Social (GERDES Burkina)**	Groupe d'Etudes et de Recherches sur la Democratie et le Developpement Economique et Social 02 BP 5301, Ouagadougou 02, Burkina Faso,	Mar-09			

						Burkina Faso	**Mouvement Burkinabe des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (MBDHP)**		Not current		Left the project in March 2009 on request of Amnesty International Burkina Faso as failed to provide various accountability documents including audited accounts	
								MBDHP, BP 2055, Ouagadougou 01, BURKINA FASO, Tel: (226) 50 31 31 50, Fax : (226) 50 31 32 28. Email: mbdhp@cenatrin.bf				
						Cote d'Ivoire	**Amnesty International Cote D'Ivoire**	Amnesty International Section Ivoirienne Las Palmas, Immeuble F, Porte 80, Cocodi 2, Palataux, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire	Dec-08			
						Cote d'Ivoire	**Association des Femmes Juristes de Cote d'Ivoire (AFJCI)**	01. BP 1758 Abidjan 01, Côte d'Ivoire, Tél: 21 32 28 24, Fax : 20 21 44 54, email: afjci@aviso.ci,	Dec-08			
						Ghana	**Maata-N-Tudu Association**	Maata-N-Tudu Association 15&17 Rice Close Vitim Estates. Box 1015 Tamale, Northern Region Tel:233 71 22 916	Dec-08			

					Ghana	**Amnesty International Ghana**	Amnesty Int'l – Ghana PMB, Accra-North Ghana, Tel: +233 12 220 814, Email: info@amnestyghana.org	Dec-08			
					Kenya	**Legal Resources Foundation**	[Legal Resources Foundation] PO Box 34720, Nairobi 00100 GP, Kenya	Dec-08			
					Kenya	**Centre for Rights Education and Awareness**	Centre for Rights Education and Awareness Convent Drive, Lavington off Isaac Gathanju Rd, P.O. Box 11964-00100 GPO Nairobi, Kenya, Email: info@creaw.org	Dec-08			
					Kenya	**Amnesty International Kenya**	AACC Hqs, Waiyaki Way,P.O.Box 1527,00606,Sarit Centre,Nairobi,KENYA, Email: amnestykenya@sections.amnesty.org	Dec-08			
					Mali	**Amnesty International Mali**	Amnesty International Mali Kalabancoura, Route de l'Aeroport, Rue 24, Immeuble Soya Bathily	Dec-08			
					Mali	**Association pour le Progrès et la Defense des Droits des Femmes (APDF)**	Immeuble Djiré ACI-2000, Avenue Cheick Zayed route de Lafiabougou, Bamako, Tél/fax : 223 20 29 10 28, Email :APDF@datatech.toolnet.org	Dec-08			
					Senegal	**Amnesty International Senegal**	303, Immeuble Arame Siga, Secre Cœur II, BP 35269, Dakar	Dec-08			

					Senegal	Groupe Agora pour l'Education aux Droits de l'Enfant et a la Paix (GRA-REDEP)	Groupe Agora pour l'Education aux Droits de l'Enfant et à la Paix Appartement AG3, BP 26440 Liberté VI, Dakar, Sénégal Tel:+221 33 8271213, Email: gra-redep2@orange.sn	Dec-08				
					Sierra Leone	Amnesty International Sierra Leone	Amnesty International – Sierra Leone] 16 Pademba Road, PMB 1021, Freetown, Sierra Leone	Dec-08				
					Sierra Leone	Centre for Democracy and Human Rights (CDHR)	Centre for Democracy and Human Rights 48 Station Road, Makeni, Northern Province	Dec-08				
					Togo	Amnesty International Togo	Amnesty International-Togo] Boulevard. de RPT, Casablanca, BP 20013, Lome, Togo	Dec-08				
					Togo	Groupe de Réflexion et d'Action Femme Démocratie et Développement (GF2D)	Boulevard du Haho, en face du séminaire catholique Jean Paul 2, Hédzranawoé – Assiyéyé, BP 14455 Lomé, Togo, Tél. : 228 261 49 25, Fax :228 261 49 26, E-mail: gf2dcriff@ yahoo.fr	Apr-09				

376					Togo	**Association Togolaise pour la Defense et la Protection des Droits de l'Homme (ATDPDH)**	20 rue Nabin3, Tokoin solidarité, BP 80378, Tel. / fax (228 220-20-98, Email: freedom_tg@yahoo.fr / atdpdh@ifrance.com	Not current		Left the project in March 2009 at the request of Amnesty International Togo due to reputational risk (an internal conflict within their organisation unrelated to the AHRE project took them before the courts of Togo)	
376					Uganda	**East & Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (EHAHRDP)**	Sub regional coordination office, Human Rights House, Plot 1853, Lulume Rd., Nsambya, P.O. Box 70356 Kampala, program@defenddefenders.org	Dec-08			
376					Uganda	**Agency for Co-operation and Research in Development (ACORD)**	Plot 1272 Block 15 Nsambya P. O. Box 280, Kampala, Uganda Tel: +256 414 287 667 / 266 596, acorduganda@acord.or.ug	Jul-09			