



PPA Annual Review Reporting Year: 2012/2013

Note: maximum word length 15,000; 12pt for compulsory sections 1-8

(This includes tables, figures, footnotes etc. This excludes questions, guidance, optional sections 9 and 10 and Annex A and B).

Any text over the maximum word length will be disregarded.

Please submit an electronic copy to:

PPA-applications@dfid.gov.uk by 12:00 1st July

Section 1: Background Information

(Note Sections 1 and 2 will be used by reviewers commenting on individual sections, not the whole report)

1.1 Organisation	Penal Reform International (PRI)	CHASE
-------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------

1.2 Main contact	Alison Hannah, PRI Executive Director
-------------------------	---------------------------------------

1.3 Finance	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Annual Income of Organisation (£)	N/A	3,469,852	3,487,271	3,598,860
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
PPA funding (£)	N/A	1,081,377	1,081,377	1,081,377
As % of total organisational income	N/A	31%	31%	30%
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Other DFID funding (£)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1.4 Summarise your relationship with DFID and other DFID funding? Has this changed since 2011/12?
<p>PRI does not have any other DFID contracts. PRI's regional staff engage with local DFID offices and PRI London staff meet with DFID staff when they are in the regions whenever possible. PRI also increasingly engaged this year with DFID in London, through individual and PPA meetings with CHASE, Civil Society Department and PPA Learning Groups. This has enabled us to promote and share our work with DFID and to ensure that we are able to collaborate/complement wherever possible.</p>

1.5 Approximate % of PPA expenditure allocated by sector or theme for 2012/13

Outcome 1 – Alternatives to imprisonment, good prison practice – 22%
Outcome 2 – Torture prevention and abolition of the death penalty – 12%
Outcome 3 – Restorative Justice, children – 10%
Outcome 4 – Women and Bangkok Rules – 11%
Organisational Effectiveness – 12%
Organisational Systems/Support – 29%
Bridging – 4%

Section 2: Organisational information and progress towards results

2.1 Describe your organisational type using the categories in the guidance and the implications for your work.

i. Tier: Second-tier

ii. Type: Niche sectoral specialist

iii. Implications

Our specialist expertise in promoting and implementing international standards in key areas of penal reform is targeted at international, regional and national levels (policy-makers, criminal justice officials, judiciary, civil society), to promote and implement humane and fair treatment of prisoners, offenders and poor and vulnerable people in conflict with the law (our ultimate beneficiaries).

2.2. What is your theory of change for your PPA funds i.e. that underpinning your logframe?

PRI's PPA Theory of Change¹

Our vision: The majority of prisoners and people in conflict with the law are poor and marginalised and unable to afford a lawyer or access to justice.² We believe that in a criminal justice system that is fit for purpose: offenders are held to account, sentences are proportionate and the primary purpose of prison is rehabilitation not retribution.

We believe this vision is dependent on:

- International human rights standards providing a framework for a fair criminal justice system.
- National legislation and policies aligned with international standards.
- Decision-makers, prison authorities, judiciary and other criminal justice actors having the capacity, political will, motivation to develop and implement laws and systems that reflect international standards and good practices, and, in particular, provide for alternatives to imprisonment and for the needs of women and children.
- Active civil society mechanisms and public opinion that support prisoners' rehabilitation and proportionate sentencing.
- Poor and vulnerable people in contact with the law having access to legal aid, complaints mechanisms, and fair trials.

We work where there is a need for change, a political will to change; and where PRI can be a catalyst for change. We work at international, regional and national levels, through a mix of advocacy, capacity building and practical programmes for reform. We work with governmental and non-governmental partners that aim to improve conditions for poor and vulnerable people caught up in the criminal justice and penal systems. This will lead (in the long-term) to governments adopting a human rights culture in prisons and criminal justice systems, aligning legislation with international standards. There will be a reduction in the use of imprisonment as more proportionate sentencing increases the use of community-based sanctions. Prisoners, including women and children, will have increased access to legal aid and justice, rehabilitation opportunities, better conditions and treatment. They will maintain family ties and re-offending rates will be reduced.

A Theory of Change (ToC) has been developed for each of the PPA outcome areas, mapping the 'middle story' between outputs and outcome.

2.3 What are your key objectives and approach(es) for the ways in which you use your PPA funds?

PRI uses its PPA funds to achieve and further its strategic objectives (identified in PRI's Strategic Plan 2010-15), and specifically, the outcomes defined in our PPA logframe. This includes funding activities to achieve the outcomes and outputs, as well as the resources (staff, travel, infrastructure, communications, materials) needed to support them.

In addition, we are using PPA funds to further our *organisational development*, in particular, investing in improving our monitoring, evaluation and learning, Value for Money (VfM) and partnership approaches. In year 2, PRI started this process, with the appointment of an Effectiveness and Organisational Learning (EOL) Advisor³, and during 2013-14, will prioritise and invest more into this work.⁴

2.4 Brief summary of progress in 2012/13

i. Please include a summary of your progress.

During year 2, PRI made good progress towards achieving the milestones set out in the logframe. However, following our PPA Independent Progress Review and Coffey Mid-Term Assessment report⁵, we acknowledged that more work is needed to improve our efficiency, effectiveness, planning and learning processes. We recruited an EOL Adviser (EOLA) to lead this organisational change process and have taken the first steps in a journey that we expect to continue over the next two years. The EOLA has drawn up a detailed plan with timelines showing how progress will be achieved.

ii. Separately, identify your top three highlights and three biggest challenges (Questions i. and ii. should be no more than 600 words combined)

Highlights:

1. Our work on juvenile justice and in particular violence against children (VAC) in conflict with the law, has been successful at several levels: internationally through inputs into a) the process for revising and finalising the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)⁶ drafted Model Juvenile Justice Law and b) the 2012 report prepared jointly by UNODC, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Violence Against Children (SRSG-VAC)⁷; regionally through the drafting by the African Committee of Experts for the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACERWC) of its first ever General Comment on the issue of protection of children of incarcerated parents⁸; and nationally through advocacy impact following the publication of 8 country reports on VAC⁹ and capacity building initiatives carried out for more than 350 stakeholders in 7 countries.
2. Our achievements in promoting and implementing the *UN Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules)* (BR), demonstrated the importance of our approach through working at different levels, with different stakeholders, with a range of advocacy, training, information materials and tools and research interventions. Our BR Guidance and Index of Implementation was developed through international and national consultations and piloting and has subsequently received wide interest and endorsement. Practical interventions, such as improving the health of women prisoners in Kazakhstan¹⁰, supported our advocacy work. Targeted advocacy at international level placed the issue of women as offenders, not just victims, on the

agenda.

3. Redesigning and improving our online presence (including a new website, launch July 2013 and regular themed e-bulletins), has enabled us to reach more stakeholders, providing information and materials in more accessible, timely, cost efficient, and environmentally-friendly ways. A blog section, new use of twitter, Facebook and PRI's Arabic website, has allowed greater engagement and dialogue with stakeholders and partner networks.¹¹

Challenges

1. Identifying the changes, including culture change, needed to improve our systems and policies in line with the recommendations made in our IPR and by DFID and Coffey. A further challenge is to identify appropriate indicators to monitor and evaluate our work. Gathering beneficiary feedback from prisoners can be difficult to obtain and sometimes carries the risk of reprisal. Furthermore, policy change usually takes place over a number of years and change in public or official attitudes are often difficult to measure.
2. As most of our funding is restricted, there is little continuity of funding for programmes which makes it difficult to ensure sustainable change. Even where a programme is successful in achieving its outcomes, without further funding the change may be short-lived. It is a challenge for PRI to find ways to ensure continuity of its work.
3. Insecurity and political volatility of the environment in which we work. This is particularly true in the Middle East (we face ongoing difficulties in implementing our programmes in Egypt). In Russia, there are ongoing challenges in supporting human rights in a country which is increasingly hostile to NGOs (local, as well as international).

2.5 Logframe

- Has the logframe been updated since the last Annual Review?* N
- How have these changes altered the results that you have reported on in this Annual Review?* N/A

Section 3: Outcome reporting

3.1 Progress to date against PPA Outcome(s)

Outcome 1: International and regional guidelines relating to good prison practice, community based sanctions and measures developed, promoted and implemented

Indicator	Number of measures relating to alternatives to prison and the use of non-custodial sanctions contributed to by PRI		
Baseline	2011: Lack of effective alternatives at pre-trial and sentencing stage due to weak international norms, lack of knowledge of best practices and poor training		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	2 measures developed and promoted with partial implementation in at least 6 countries	2 further measures developed and promoted and implementation agreements reached in 10 countries	2014 = 4
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			

i. Narrative on progress

Important progress was made on the two International Standards that PRI focused on at international level in year 1: UN Legal Aid Principles and Guidelines; and Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (SMRs).

Legal Aid Principles

The UN General Assembly adopted the Principles in December (a key objective and focus for PRI's advocacy). PRI updated its briefing on the Principles¹², disseminated via our website, networks and events on access to justice and poverty. Following our input to the draft Principles, PRI participated in UNODC's expert working group on a draft handbook (publication autumn 2013). This will set out guidance and examples of access to legal aid at the earliest stages of detention and support governments wishing to establish cost effective legal aid.

SMRs

PRI was the key driver for 'targeted' revisions of sections of SMRs to bring them in line with current human rights standards, specifically: access to legal representation; healthcare; Investigation of torture and deaths; disciplinary proceedings; protection of vulnerable groups; inspections and complaints mechanisms. In October, PRI and Essex University convened a meeting of 30 experts to prepare a revised text for the Intergovernmental Expert Group Meeting (IEGM). The proposal was submitted to the UN, commended by many state delegations and referenced in the IEGM's report. PRI's continued lobbying saw results, with the process of targeted revision proceeding, increasingly supported by states cross regionally (Crime Commission resolution April 2013).¹³

Bangkok Rules

The BR for women and girl offenders were promoted internationally, regionally and nationally (see Outcome 4).

National level

PRI continued to promote community service and/or probation in the six countries (Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Pakistan, Russia and Ukraine) focused on in year 1. Agreements on implementing these measures were achieved in many of these countries (representative examples below). Two further measures were promoted: restriction of liberty (including electronic monitoring) as a pre-trial and post-sentencing measure; and reintegration. Additional countries included Algeria, Jordan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda.

Georgia: Following the change in government in October, PRI's long-standing work calling for prison reform and use of alternatives to detention meant it was well-positioned to engage with the new government on reforms. PRI contributed to changes in law and practice by: participating in the Justice Ministry's Probation Working Group and meetings with the new Ministers of Justice and Corrections, Head of Probation Service and Penitentiary Department representatives and making recommendations on parole decision-making¹⁴. Draft legislative amendments and action plans on probation reflected recommendations made by PRI and civil society partners. PRI also submitted recommendations on amendments to criminal legislation, including non-custodial pre-trial measures, assisted with development of a new type of non-custodial sanction 'restriction of liberty', and is a member of the Working Group drafting legislation for rehabilitation systems. By April 2013, prison numbers were half those of April 2012, following the government's policy change and amnesties for prisoners.¹⁵

Kazakhstan: Following PRI's presentation of a paper to the Senate, PRI was asked to organise an expert meeting on the wider use of probation and alternatives. Its experts were subsequently invited to join the Working Group drafting the Criminal Executive Code and PRI was invited onto the Parliamentary Working Group. Recommendations from papers submitted by PRI and partner NGOs were incorporated into the Code, including measures on half way houses, probation and wider use of alternatives. The Government has agreed funding for wider use of alternatives. PRI also promoted reintegration of former prisoners and shared good practice on implementing reintegration and electronic monitoring programmes with government, judiciary and municipal governors at roundtables and the First Prison Forum conference (co-facilitated by PRI). As a result, a group to support reintegration was established, centres opened in several municipalities and the Prime Minister's Office supported several events. Reintegration is now included in Kazakhstan's Prison Strategy 2012-15 and in the penal-executive programme.¹⁶

Kenya: PRI's workshops with magistrates on strengthening community service and probation led to an increase in support by magistrates and judges in making orders for community sanctions.¹⁷

Ukraine: moves to establish probation services stalled for lack of government commitment. However, a reduction in pre-trial detention was seen. In 2011, approximately 2,000 people a month were detained, by December 2012 this reduced to 287. PRI's worked with judges in Kiev to promote bail, and following PRI's roundtable on alternatives, the Acting Director of the Supreme Specialised Court developed guidance for judges on implementing the new Criminal Code, utilising information gained from the roundtable.¹⁸

Jordan: PRI is the only NGO in a high-level committee drafting a strategy on penal system reform. The committee recommended legislation for community service and use of

electronic monitoring. Training has been given to judges, police and social workers on alternative sanctions. A pilot scheme for reintegration was set up in two prisons (one for women, one for men).¹⁹

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards target

Good progress has been made in developing and promoting measures, at national levels, and in obtaining agreements (legislation, policies, plans), for their implementation.

iii. Recommendations on amendments

None

3.2 Discuss i. Key new challenges to the achievement of outcome(s) and ii. Key new factors of progress

Georgia: It is feared that there is a risk of a backlash following the release of so many prisoners without preparation or support. If many re-offend, a more punitive sentencing approach may again be adopted.

The process of SMR Review, labelled by senior staff of OHCHR ‘the most significant standard setting exercise relating to human rights currently’, has also prompted renewed discussion in states regarding their own implementation of international prison standards (‘Renaissance for the SMR’).²⁰ PRI’s collaboration with states, UN and NGOs also strengthened our reputation and facilitated access to key policy-makers.

3.3. Assumptions

Assumptions on political stability/continue to be a factor.

3.1 Progress to date against PPA Outcome(s)

Outcome 2: Measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment established and effectively implemented

Indicator	Numbers of ratifications to OPCAT and 2nd Optional Protocol		
Baseline	2011: OPCAT = 6; 2nd Optional Protocol = 5		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Steady progress towards ratification of OPCAT in 3 countries and the 2nd Optional Protocol in 2 countries	Steady progress towards ratification of OPCAT in 3 countries and the 2nd Optional Protocol in 2 countries	2014: OPCAT = 9; 2nd Optional Protocol = 7
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			

i. Narrative on progress

Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT)

Significant progress was achieved towards ratification of OPCAT and strengthening of preventive monitoring mechanisms in 5 PRI target countries. Progress was also made towards strengthening the preventive capacity of monitoring bodies more widely, in PRI's 4 regions and at international level.

Representative examples:

Kazakhstan: significant progress was made towards the adoption of a National Preventative Mechanism (NPM) law. PRI made key contributions to major amendments on what was initially a problematic draft law. PRI also contributed to a precedent verdict of the Constitutional Council on the important interpretation of the 'moment of arrest'.

Georgia: Following the torture scandal in September, monitoring of prisons by civil society was re-approved, with unlimited access to places of detention granted to 50 civil society representatives, including PRI. PRI had advocated intensively for re-instatement of the public monitoring mechanism (its dissolution and subsequent ill-treatment of prisoners, represented a worrying precedent for OPCAT ratifications in the region). While access of civil society to prisons was again withdrawn in 2013, its temporary re-establishment is an important step in the continued advocacy to expand monitoring capacity. PRI and local partners have since secured the permission of the Ministry of Corrections to undertake independent monitoring.

PRI contributed to a definition of torture incorporated into *Tajikistan's* Criminal Code. While OPCAT ratification has yet to be achieved here, the Ombudsman conducted his first prison visit. In *Ukraine*, PRI contributed to a law designating the Ombudsman's Office as NPM, with a role for civil society. In *Jordan*, PRI played a leading role in the establishment of an Independent Inspection Commission for juvenile detention centres - the first precedent of an external inspection body in the country.

Internationally: The SMRs revision process in which PRI is playing a key role, is geared towards an updated framework for assessment for monitoring bodies (see Outcome 1). PRI's strong relationship with the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture (SPT), as an authoritative source for national monitoring bodies, also proved a good asset in supporting advocacy (Kazakhstan).

2nd Optional Protocol:

Progress was made internationally and in a number of PRI's target countries.

Belarus demonstrates how PRI's targeted, and long-term advocacy work created a new opportunity for progress. In January, the Chair of the Constitutional Court announced that a moratorium on the death penalty was an open question and should be publicly debated. The Parliamentary Commission on the Death Penalty was re-established and PRI is supporting the new Chair and local NGOs to further this opportunity.

Through the World Coalition Against the Death Penalty (WCADP), PRI contributed to Benin and Madagascar *acceding* to the 2nd Optional Protocol. Although not target countries, further accessions are significant to establish a global trend. The UN General Assembly (UNGA)'s *adoption of a fourth moratorium resolution* on the death penalty also signalled slow, but steady, progress: 111 states voted in favour (2 more than in 2010). PRI's advocacy contributed to Tunisia voting in favour for the first time.

PRI contributed to two landmark reports by the Special Rapporteur on Torture (*SR-T*) and Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (*SR-ESEs*)' to UNGA which concluded that there is an evolving standard whereby States consider the death penalty to be a violation per-se of the prohibition of torture, and to *two UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC)* resolutions relating to the death penalty (briefing, experts' roundtable in Geneva).

Regionally, PRI supported the *African Commission* in its initiative to draft an Optional Protocol to the African Charter on the right to life.

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards target

The target of 3 new OPCAT ratifications by 2014 may not be realised as, although progress is steady and significant, it is slow. Whilst ratification of OPCAT sets an important framework and tool for advocacy, the establishment of effective preventive mechanisms is more important than the 'formal' step of ratification (which can be perceived by States as a 'box-ticking' exercise).

iii. Recommendations on amendments

As referred to above and explained below, recommendation is to focus on establishment of effective preventative monitoring bodies in target countries, rather than simply 3 new OPCAT ratifications.

3.2 Discuss i. Key new challenges to the achievement of outcome(s) and ii. Key new factors of progress

Many monitoring bodies conduct prison visits documenting general conditions and cases, but lacking a preventive effect. PRI therefore increased focus on strengthening monitoring bodies (in particular those that might be designated NPMs following OPCAT ratification); and differentiates the approach in target countries: those where OPCAT ratification is a long-term goal; countries in the process of NPM establishment; and countries with an existing NPM.

3.3. Assumptions

The establishment of NPMs requires a long-term approach. OPCAT ratification constitutes an advocacy tool to achieve preventive monitoring rather than an end in itself. Kazakhstan demonstrates that rather than pushing for speedy adoption of an NPM law, resources need to be invested into advocacy on OPCAT-compliant NPMs with an actual preventive role.

3.1 Progress to date against PPA Outcome(s)

Outcome 3: Restorative justice-based diversion interventions and community based sanctions understood, accepted and implemented

Indicator	a) Instances where incarceration of children is used as a measure of last resort b) Numbers of restorative-justice based measures for children in contact and in conflict with the law
Baseline	2011: Children routinely detained unnecessarily and for long periods due to lack of appropriate law or institutions; children under 12 routinely held criminally

	liable		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Baseline data gathering on numbers of children in detention, especially under-12s	Identification of targets for reform	2014: 10 countries achieving locally-set targets for measurable reductions in juvenile detention, increased use of diversion and setting of 12 or higher as the age of criminal responsibility
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			

i. Narrative on progress

The following targets for reform were identified from year 1 research²¹ (including violence against children (VAC) research reports); and priorities identified by stakeholders during roundtables/consultations:

- Improving juvenile justice legislation
- Reducing VAC
- Increased inspection/complaints mechanisms
- Children of incarcerated parents
- Greater use of diversion
- Higher minimum age of criminal responsibility (MACR)

Specific targets/priorities were set according to national contexts/international agendas. These targets fall in line with PRI's *Ten-point plan for Fair and Effective Justice for Children* (year 1)²² and provided a focus for our juvenile justice work during 2012-13.

Progress on achieving targets: Representative examples:

Internationally:

- UNODC agreed to publish the *Model Juvenile Justice Law* (Impact milestone 2). This will be an added advocacy tool for PRI to promote at national level, and a good practice example. UNODC acknowledged PRI's 'valuable' role in helping finalise the resource.²³
- To promote improved treatment of *children of incarcerated parents*, PRI attended ACERWC meetings and submitted papers on the General Comment of Article 30 on this. PRI was subsequently granted Observer Status with ACERWC. This, and our engagement in East Africa, enabled PRI to raise its profile with juvenile justice stakeholders' in Africa, and expose more stakeholders to good practices and collaborate on advocacy (eg. African NGO PRAWA featured PRI's Observer Status on its website and included our briefings).²⁴ PRI also raised the issue of children of incarcerated parents at the 21st Crime Commission (statement submitted, side-event with Quakers).²⁵

Nationally:

- *Armenia*: The National Plan of Action for the Protection of Children 2013-2016 includes improved measures on *probation, diversion, alternative sanctions* and support to rehabilitation/education centres. PRI's recommendations on the juvenile justice section of the Plan and related legislation were all approved. Through working with local partners and judiciary, the first referral to a Rehabilitation Centre was made by a Court. Instead of issuing a sentencing verdict, the Court gave the local authority supervision of the child, through the services of a PRI-supported Rehabilitation Centre.²⁶
- *Georgia*: imprisoned juveniles reduced from 142 (March 2012) to 90 (April, 2013). New approaches were introduced in a renovated facility including rehabilitation programmes, risk assessments, and complaint mechanisms. The Penitentiary Department presented these at a PRI-supported roundtable (December).²⁷
- *Jordan*: The specialised Juvenile Police Department, which PRI played a key role in establishing (January 2012), has already increased the number of *children diverted from the criminal justice system*. Police data shows that between January–September 2012, 78% of juvenile cases were resolved at police level. An Independent Inspection Commission of Care Centres was launched (February) a significant step to reducing VAC in detention. PRI played a key part through leading the inspection team, developing inspection tools, and submitting recommendations to the new National Strategy. (see Case Study.)²⁸
- *Russia*: A new National Strategy for Children's Protection is a significant step towards improving *social reintegration of juvenile offenders* and includes PRI's submitted recommendations. In Tomsk, *rehabilitation of girl offenders* increased through PRI's initiative. The local administration has now agreed to fund this initiative to 2018. Two new laws on the Rights of the Child will allow the Ombudsman to monitor juvenile detention facilities more effectively; and, following PRI meetings with the Federal Penitentiary Service (FSIN), juvenile colony staff will be trained on treatment of juveniles, both contributing to reducing VAC in detention.²⁹

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards target

Progress to date indicates that PRI is on track to supporting 10 countries to achieve locally-set targets on reductions in juvenile detention, increased diversion and a higher MACR.

iii. Recommendations on amendments

None

3.2 Discuss i. Key new challenges to the achievement of outcome(s) and ii. Key new factors of progress

Political changes in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and *public demands for reform* provided an opportunity for PRI to promote and support juvenile justice reforms. Eg. PRI arranged for Yemen's new Prison Director to visit Jordan to witness juvenile justice developments there. On returning, the Director successfully secured new measures for improved conditions and protection within prisons and juvenile centres: a Juvenile Police Centre has been established and a child-friendly court is being developed with PRI providing technical support eg. developing protection policies, training, good practice models.

However, *political instability* is also a challenge: in Egypt, pace of reform slowed when the Juvenile Police Department was restructured as part of wider police/security changes.

3.3. Assumptions
<i>Political buy-in was challenged:</i> eg. in Russia, the Head of the Council implementing the National Children’s Strategy, an influential individual in the State’s hierarchy, announced that she is, ‘against the introduction of Juvenile Justice in Russia’, which may impact on the possibility of further reform.

3.1 Progress to date against PPA Outcome(s)
--

Outcome 4: Improved treatment of women and girls in the criminal justice and penal systems

Indicator	Status of implementation of the Bangkok Rules		
Baseline	2011: Limited knowledge and awareness of and compliance with, provisions in Bangkok Rules; advocacy limited to small numbers of organisations and networks; very little training available		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Internationally agreed norms widely known	Through training and advocacy, concrete changes made to improve the way women are dealt with	2014: Increased levels of compliance with the Bangkok Rules in 15 countries
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			

i. Narrative on progress

Important progress was made in increasing awareness of the situation of women in conflict with the law, and of the BR, amongst key international institutions and at national level. This led to the BR inclusion in recommendations and standards made by several key international bodies. Advocacy and training in PRI countries also saw legislation/policy change to improve the situation of women offenders.

Significant achievements at *international level*:

- OHCHR Gender Unit acknowledged lack of coverage on the issue, submitted PRI’s BR tools to its field offices, and committed to integrating it in their work.
- The BRs are now included in the list of international standards on the OHCHR website.
- PRI engagement in the SMR review provided opportunities to raise the BR, resulting in their explicit reference in the 2012 Crime Commission resolution.
- PRI contributed to the Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (SR-VAW) forthcoming report on violence in custodial settings to include the BR, and to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) considering inclusion of the topic in their forthcoming General Recommendation on

'access to justice'.

- Recommendation to implement the BR is included in the Human Rights Council and UNGA Resolutions on 'Human rights in the administration of justice'.

Examples of key achievements *nationally*:

- *Kazakhstan*: PRI's capacity building work in two women's prisons to improve the health (HIV/AIDS, TB) of offenders saw significant results and a model of good practice now being shared across the region. A nurse participating in training said it, 'helped me to understand how to work with women prisoners...as a result of the project in 2012 we had no cases of HIV in our previously very problematic women prison'. Training was complemented by research and manual development. PRI's recommendations were included in the new national penal system plan 2012-15.
- *Georgia*: PRI's work to promote the re-socialisation of women in 'Penitentiary Institution 5', contributed to the introduction of vocational training for women, improved nutrition, and more professional staff - psychologists, social workers and lawyers.
- *Ukraine*: PRI contributed to the adoption of legislation on the joint accommodation of women prisoners and their small children including by organising a roundtable and recommendations to the Supreme Council. PRI also contributed to the change of prison regime for women sentenced to life imprisonment from maximum to medium level security within amendments to the Criminal Executive Code.
- *Algeria*: The Government committed to establishing a pilot mother-and-baby unit compliant with international standards, and to replicate it in other prisons.

PRI's BR's guidance tools have been widely disseminated, are already being referenced and endorsed by other stakeholders and used in trainings eg. the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF)'s training manual now includes a special BR section, referencing PRI's documents; UNODC used Guidance Document in training in Japan.

PRI's BR's guidance tools, developed in year 2, have been widely disseminated and are already being referenced and endorsed by other stakeholders and used in training with officials and practitioners eg. DCAF's training manual now includes a special BR section, referencing PRI's documents.

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards target

PRI's work contributed to an increased awareness of key stakeholders and concrete changes to improve the way women offenders are dealt with. As with all new international standards, implementation requires a long-term engagement. Research will increase the chance for change due to increased evidence-base (Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Jordan, Tunisia).

iii. Recommendations on amendments

None.

3.2 Discuss i. Key new challenges to the achievement of outcome(s) and ii. Key new factors of progress

The *extent of lack of awareness* of issues for women offenders has been bigger than anticipated. Focus is also often on ‘violence against women’, ignoring the multi-fold links with women in detention. PRI is continuing to raise these issues with stakeholders at all levels. Research commissioned by PRI on ‘women in prisons’ (due year 3) will help to provide evidence-based data to fill the gap in stakeholders’ knowledge (a gap recognised by the BR).

In some regions it is particularly difficult to push for women’s issues. The economic crises has also exacerbated the sidelining of measures on behalf of women offenders.

Recognition of PRI as a leading expert on BR has increased credibility of advocacy with key stakeholders. The active engagement of international actors, following PRI’s advocacy, (UNODC, SR-VAW), collaborative working (with Association for the Prevention of Torture (APT), Thai Institute of Justice, Quakers) and increasing recognition of PRI as a leading role and expert on the BR, has helped to raise the issue with more stakeholders and build momentum for implementation.

3.3. Assumptions

Assumptions remained the same, but have now been formulated in a detailed narrative ToC.

Section 4: Output Review and Scoring

4.1 Output 1

Key criminal justice stakeholders exposed to best practice in addressing prison overcrowding and alternatives to prison

Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results

Indicator 1.1	Numbers of key stakeholders involved in discussions of evidence-based models of best practice.		
Baseline	2011: Alternatives to pre-trial detention and prison sentences under-developed in law, policy and/or practice with most effective models not properly documented.		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	4 policy papers published; training manual on alternatives developed and tested.	4 further policy papers published and disseminated; training manual finalised and published	2014: 600 key stakeholders reached; 12 round tables/training events held
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		380+ stakeholders reached directly.	

i. Narrative on progress

Policy papers are a key means for PRI to promote/document good practice on alternatives,

informing legislation, policy and practice. As such, the number of papers produced exceeded our target (4).

Significant international papers:

- *The Use and Practice of Imprisonment: current trends and future challenges*: This paper was commissioned in early 2013 to identify the current trends in criminal justice and penal policy, to identify targets for reform both for external policy-makers and to inform PRI's strategic development.³⁰
- '*War on Drugs*': was presented and statement delivered at the International Parliamentary Union Assembly, March, attended by up to 700 delegates. The briefing drew attention to the disproportionately harsh sentences for drug-related offences and current policy as a driver of criminality and high prison populations.³¹

Examples of national papers:

- Kazakhstan: several papers on alternatives and conditions of incarceration including: *Concept of Penal-Executive Code* and *Problems of Reducing Prison Population*, were presented to officials at conferences on legislative reforms. Papers on *probation*, *electronic monitoring* and *humanising the prison system* were produced for 205 participants (government, judiciary, international bodies, civil society) at the 'First Prison Forum', March 2013. The papers were promoted through the Senate's website, conference reports, PRI Central Asia's website, Facebook and twitter. They informed amendments to the Criminal Code and government plans and practice on re-integration.³²
- Russia: PRI commissioned a paper setting out a comprehensive summary of available community-based sentences, with recommendations. It was used to inform discussions with government on reducing the prison population (a government commitment) and to guide implementation (drawing on PRI's programme on supervision of non-custodial sentences in Siberia).³³

Training manual:

Originally, PRI intended to produce a general guide to alternatives. However, feedback from partners indicated it was more useful to have a tailored regional resource. *Making Community Service Work: a resource pack from East Africa*³⁴ was published and includes models of good practice. It was used in 4 trainings in Kenya and Uganda (40 Magistrates and probation officers at each), and presented to all 25 correctional services attending the the African Correctional Services Association (ACSA) Conference.³⁵

PRI was also involved in reviewing and revising the *Commonwealth Secretariat manual on human rights and prison management*. PRI then delivered training in the Solomon Islands (20 delegates from prison services throughout the Pacific region) and for 12 African prison services in Mozambique. Action plans were prepared by the participants to implement lessons learnt on their return to work.³⁶

In India, PRI delivered a '*training of trainers*' programme for 30 prison officials from four states. Follow up with officials, 5 months after, showed that 75% had since used the workshop materials, 83% had shared learning with colleagues, and 71% had since made changes to their prison management and practice.³⁷

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

<p>International advocacy events, wide-dissemination of papers, and training activities indicate good progress.</p> <p>For the examples provided under this output, 380 stakeholders were reached this year.</p> <p>iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator</p> <p>None</p>	
<p>4.2 Discuss i. key new challenges to the achievement of output(s) and ii. key new drivers of progress</p>	
<p><i>Challenge:</i> Stakeholders exposed to good practices, but may face barriers to implementation through lack of political will, public support and resources.</p> <p><i>Drivers:</i> New use of social media (PRI bulletins, Georgian-language Facebook, and partner networks) exposed more stakeholders to good practices (and cut environmental costs).</p>	
<p>4.3 Impact Weighting</p>	
<p><i>i. Current impact weighting in logframe (%):</i> 30%</p> <p><i>ii. Are you making any changes to this weighting:</i> N</p> <p><i>iii. Explanation for changes:</i></p> <p><i>iv. How are you managing changes?</i></p>	
<p>4.4 Output risk</p>	
<p><i>i. Current risk:</i> Medium</p> <p><i>ii. Are you making any changes to the level of risk?</i> N</p> <p><i>iii. Explanation for changes</i></p> <p><i>iv. How are you managing changes?</i></p>	
<p>4.5 Actual achievement of expected results for Output 1</p>	<p>A</p>

<p>4.1 Output 2</p>			
<p>Support for advocacy for the prevention of torture and the abolition of the death penalty</p>			
<p>Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results</p>			
<p>Indicator 2.1</p>	<p>Status of campaign to promote OPCAT</p>		
<p>Baseline</p>	<p>2011: Limited knowledge of OPCAT and its effective implementation in target countries</p>		
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>2011/12</p>	<p>2012/13</p>	<p>2013/14</p>
	<p>Campaign to promote OPCAT and establish NPM launched in 3 regions and 9 countries</p>	<p>Continuing campaign with addition of further 6 countries in 2 regions</p>	<p>2014: 15 countries reached through the campaign</p>
<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Partly</p>	
<p>Variance</p>		<p>Focus on 9 countries (3</p>	

		regions)	
Disaggregated data*		N/A	

* – expand number of rows if needed

i. Narrative on progress

PRI continued to promote OPCAT and NPMs in 9 countries (3 regions) targeted in year 1. PRI’s international advocacy extended the campaign more widely.

A number of activities were undertaken to further the campaign in target countries, including:

A *synthesis report* was produced distilling the research in 9 Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries, on common challenges and lessons to be learned from countries in the region that have established an NPM.³⁸ The report proved an important advocacy tool to further progress nationally/regionally including at PRI’s *cross-regional conference* (100 participants, 9 countries).³⁹ For Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, the timing was significant due to legislative reform taking place.

An *assessment tool* is being developed with the APT to strengthen monitoring bodies’ ability to address causes and risk factors contributing to torture. A first part of this tool was published in March: *Guide to Gender-Sensitive Monitoring* and disseminated (OPCAT-network, APT-network, European NPM-newsletter, PRI’s Together Against Torture e-bulletin.)⁴⁰

Examples of progress following national campaign activities:

- *Kazakhstan*: PRI played a leading role in advising the Parliamentary Working Group on the NPM draft law, seeking and passing on advice from the SPT to prevent misinterpretation of OPCAT. PRI was invited, as one of only two NGOs, to join the Public Council under the General Prosecutor’s Office, allowing PRI to raise further problems on the draft law, including a problematic public tender model and an incomprehensive mandate (juvenile facilities); both were subsequently addressed in the draft law.⁴¹
- *Russia*: PRI presented amendments to the Code of Ethics for Public Oversight Commissions and contributed to an alternative report to UN Convention Against Torture (UNCAT).⁴² A number of publications were produced on independent oversight in places of detention, for officials and NGOs, setting out international standards and monitoring methodology.⁴³

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Progress towards ratification and NPMs through the campaign remains steady, if slow.

PRI focused on 9 CIS countries, where momentum has been built over years 1-2, and there was potential for change, rather than extending to a further 6 countries (2 regions) given the need for longer-term/in-depth engagement to prompt change. However, our wider international advocacy campaign, will contribute to reaching the target of 15 countries.

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

None

4.1 Output 2

Support for advocacy for the prevention of torture and the abolition of the death penalty

Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results

Indicator 2.2	Numbers of publications on DP and alternatives		
Baseline	2011: Limited knowledge of alternatives to the DP		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Information Pack on Death Penalty and Alternatives published and disseminated	PRI advocacy in minimum 15 countries	2014: 2 reports and related country / regional factsheets (minimum of 10)
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		N/A	

i. Narrative on progress

Following recommendations in an evaluation of PRI's death penalty project⁴⁴, PRI focused on more in-depth/targeted advocacy in 10 countries that have potential for progress (rather than at least 15). These are: Belarus, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Russia, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Uganda, Tunisia. PRI worked through its regional offices and with partners to advocate for progressive abolition, through moratoria and reduction of death penalty offences. However, PRI's *regional/international work* (Human Rights Council, SR-T, African Commission, WCADP) and dissemination of papers/materials, extended its advocacy support to other countries.

Representative examples:

Internationally: Hosting side-events at the UNGA and Human Rights Council⁴⁵; PRI presented on the death row phenomenon, generating positive stakeholder dialogue and follow-up with the SR-T.⁴⁶ PRI's briefings/reports were used to support advocacy eg. PRI's briefing *Life After Death: what replaces the death penalty?* at the 21st Crime Commission Session. PRI also informed the UN Secretary General (UNSG)'s reports on the Death Penalty through submissions.⁴⁷

Regionally, East Africa: PRI worked with partner Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI) and Ugandan MPs on a draft Bill to remove references to mandatory death sentences in the Penal Code⁴⁸; reduce the number of death penalty applicable offences; and trained prison officials on treatment of death row prisoners. An East African Coalition meeting was held, where a joint advocacy strategy covering Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania was agreed, with participants guided by PRI's manual on Death Penalty Advocacy.⁴⁹ This work complements PRI's support to the African Commission to develop a Protocol to mirror the 2nd Optional Protocol (eg. submission of joint PRI-FHRI statement, *Death Penalty in Africa*, to the Commission)⁵⁰.

Nationally:

- *Kazakhstan:* The General Prosecutor's Office has stated that the number of applicable offences should be reduced. PRI had advocated for this, including at a Parliamentary roundtable, focused on preventing an increase in death penalty applicable offences

from 18 to 25 crimes.⁵¹

- *Belarus*: with the Parliamentary Commission on the Death Penalty re-established, PRI met its Chair to discuss support; facilitated development of a joint NGO national campaign; held a 'Right to Life' roundtable; and stimulated public debate (journalist competition, TV interviews).⁵²
- *Tunisia*: PRI trained prison officials on standards for death row inmates and held a session⁵³ on 'Death Penalty and Sharia Law' at the World Social Forum in Tunisia. Tunisia later voted in favour of the UN-Moratorium for the first time. To address the argument that Sharia Law does not allow for abolition of the death penalty, PRI commissioned research on this (report publication late-2013).⁵⁴

ii) Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Feedback on PRI's reports, factsheets/briefings, and advocacy in years 1-2 suggests good progress. Further briefings have been commissioned to tackle common arguments preventing progressive abolition.

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

See above regarding countries of focus.

4.1 Output 2			
Support for advocacy for the prevention of torture and the abolition of the death penalty			
Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results			
Indicator 2.3	Number of capacity building events for CSOs working to prevent torture		
Baseline	2011: Civil society capacity not well developed through lack of access, training or political barriers		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Network established; briefing paper on torture prevention mechanisms published; workshops in 3 countries	Minimum of 9 roundtables and training events hosted in 3 regions and 6 different countries	2014: Torture prevention network of CSOs established; 12 events implemented
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		738 participants	
*– expand number of rows if needed			
i. Narrative on progress			
26 roundtables and training events, for over 738 civil society and government stakeholders, took place in 8 countries, 3 regions, linking capacity-building with advocacy goals. They brought together civil society and government authorities to develop a shared			

understanding/trust, learn from good practices and implement international norms.⁵⁵

Network development was strengthened through: PRI's 'Together Against Torture' website (28% increase in visits) and e-bulletins (English, Russian); dissemination of PRI's materials/events through partner networks and collaboration with local and international partners (APT, WCADP).⁵⁶

ii) Assessment of overall progress towards indicator
 Good progress

iii) Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator
 None

4.2 Discuss i. key new challenges to the achievement of output(s) and ii. key new drivers of progress

Unexpected events adversely changed public opinion and political agendas, eg. in Kazakhstan, reduction of death penalty applicable offences came under renewed pressure with regard to terrorist offences.

Developments at international level increased debate of abolition of the death penalty, and set important frameworks for national bodies. PRI used these opportunities to support advocacy at a national level and further debate (on children of parents on death row).

4.3 Impact Weighting

- i. Current impact weighting in logframe (%):** 30%
- ii. Are you making any changes to this weighting:** N
- iii. Explanation for changes:**
- iv. How are you managing changes?**

4.4 Output risk

- i. Current risk:** High
- ii. Are you making any changes to the level of risk?** N – *If yes, state new level*
- iii. Explanation for changes**
- iv. How are you managing changes?**

4.5 Actual achievement of expected results for Output 2 B

4.1 Output 3

Restorative justice based measures for children in contact and in conflict with the law promoted

Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results

Indicator 3.1	Number of key stakeholders reached with evidence-based models of diversion good practice		
Baseline	2011: CRC Concluding observations indicate weak systems of juvenile justice in 25 target countries		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	3 factsheets published; 3 consultative round tables hosted	3 further round tables hosted with all key stakeholders (minimum 20 per event); further 3 factsheets prepared and disseminated	2014: PRI Good Practice in JJ Factsheets (minimum of 6) published and disseminated; 6 round tables with total of 120 stakeholders;
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		300+ stakeholders	

*– expand number of rows if needed

i. Narrative on progress

International and national stakeholders working on juvenile justice were informed of evidence-based diversion models and good practice through roundtables, factsheets and advocacy.

3 factsheets: Children with Parents in Conflict with the Law; Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility; Review of law and policy to prevent and remedy violence against children in policy and pre-trial detention in eight countries: overview report (available English/ Russian) were disseminated via: PRI e-bulletins, websites, social media; during roundtables/side-events, trainings, advocacy meetings; partners, networks⁵⁷ (eg Interagency Panel on Juvenile Justice (IPJJ), International Juvenile Justice Observatory (IJJO) newsletters/websites⁵⁸).

PRI hosted *6 roundtables* reaching over 300 stakeholders in 5 countries (Armenia, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan (2), Russia). Participants included Ministers, Parliamentarians, Criminal Justice officials, judiciary, NGOs and professionals working with children in conflict with the law. Good practices were presented and implications/actions for implementation discussed.⁵⁹

Roundtables included meetings with officials/parliamentarians to influence legislation. In *Kazakhstan*, 20 representatives from Parliament, Prosecutor-General Office, diplomats, discussed improvements in legislation and, with professionals on implementation⁶⁰. *Russia*: 100 professionals discussed restorative approaches, including creating a network of reconciliation services (December).⁶¹

PRI also participated in national roundtables to inform/influence stakeholders: eg. presenting our work in Armenia⁶², Egypt⁶³, Russia⁶⁴ for experts, NGOs and government representatives (over 50 stakeholders).

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Strong progress

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

None

Indicator 3.2	Number of training materials developed and events delivered		
Baseline	2011: Limited numbers of training materials and lack of systematic training for key stakeholders		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Programme of training established; publication of training manual; training delivered in at least 5 countries	Continuation of training programmes (minimum 5 additional countries) with development of training materials for onward transmission	2014:Justice for children Training Manual developed and published; 10 training workshops delivered with minimum 100 key stakeholders reached
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		350+ participants	

*– expand number of rows if needed

i. Narrative on progress

PRI conducted *training* on the targeted juvenile justice reform areas for over 350 stakeholders in 7 countries. 5 of these are additional countries from year 1.

- Prison and government officials (Yemen)⁶⁵
- Juvenile professionals and stakeholders (Armenia)⁶⁶
- NGO and UNICEF staff (India)⁶⁷
- NGOs and Ombudsman monitoring juvenile detention centres (Kyrgyzstan)⁶⁸
- Juvenile professionals (training of trainers) (Uzbekistan)⁶⁹
- Alternatives to detention for prison/parole officers (Pakistan)⁷⁰
- Criminal justice professionals (Egypt)⁷¹
- Study visit to the Netherlands: Senior officials from Egypt, Jordan and Yemen⁷²

Training materials were developed for specific contexts, as well as for wider use:

- The *Juvenile Justice Manual* was delayed in order to coordinate with UNICEF’s work. Content revision is now complete (publication due September 2013).⁷³
- Additional training material included: *Armenia*: CDs containing relevant international standards (English, Armenian)⁷⁴; *Uzbekistan*: 3 manuals - for

criminal court judges; civil court judges; and frontline professionals.⁷⁵

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Strong progress

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

No revision required

Indicator 3.3	Status of campaign to address issue of violence against children (VAC) in police custody and pre-trial detention		
Baseline	2011: Addressed in UN Secretary General's report on violence against children, 2006		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Partners identified in 10 countries; 2 reports prepared and disseminated; 3 seminars	2 further studies published; partners identified in further 15 countries; seminars organised in 3 regions	2014: 4 reports, 25 partners, 6 seminars
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		Seminars: 250+ stakeholders; Partners: 100+	

* – expand number of rows if needed

i. Narrative on progress

PRI raised VAC issues with authorities and civil society in over 16 countries through reports, seminars and advocacy; working with them to address VAC (providing technical support on police procedural guidelines⁷⁶, training monitoring bodies to inspect detention centres⁷⁷, revising national plans to include protection measures⁷⁸). PRI's advocacy at international level and disseminating good practices through national/international networks (eg. IPJJ, Uganda Children's Coalition) supported this.

PRI published 8 country reports, 'A review of law and policy to prevent and address violence against children in police and pre-trial detention', for Bangladesh, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tanzania, Uganda in multiple languages.⁷⁹

These reviewed policy and legislative measures in place to prevent violence, assist victims, and make perpetrators accountable; highlighted gaps in provision; and recommended improvements. Findings provided an important baseline and evidence-based resource for advocacy (eg. PRI Kazakhstan's report informed new legislation). Recommendations enabled stakeholders to plan follow-up actions. Feedback from the Ombudsman and UNICEF in Georgia is an example: 'We are pleasantly surprised with the ... professional insight provided in the report,

and...competent assessment of the child's rights, this is a luxury for Georgia. This is the only report of its kind.⁸⁰

Other reports published 2012-13 include: Armenia: *Gaps in Juvenile Legislation*; Jordan: *Procedural Guide for Police Working with Children*; Pakistan: *DOST's work with vulnerable groups*.

PRI organised 4 seminars, reaching over 250 stakeholders in 4 regions⁸¹, including an International Conference.

PRI has a network of over 100 partners in 25 countries⁸². PRI engaged with additional partners in 2012-13, including:

- Co-hosting International Conference with HAQ Centre for Child Rights (March 2013).⁸³
- Developing an East Africa 'Juvenile Justice e-network' with FHRI.
- Enhancing local partners' work through facilitating coordination meetings, Armenia.⁸⁴
- Supporting Yemen's Coordination Committee on Children's Rights to strengthen their inspection role.⁸⁵

PRI has begun to focus on improving relationships with a more targeted group of local partners, whilst maintaining its wider international network, in order to develop a bigger and lasting impact.

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Strong progress.

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

None.

4.2 Discuss i. key new challenges to the achievement of output(s) and ii. key new drivers of progress

i. Challenges: The gang-rape case in India, with a 17 year-old suspect (December), raised the issue of MACR at international and national levels. Punitive public opinion in India intensified with proposals to lower the age of a child in criminal law to 16 years.⁸⁶

ii. Drivers: Progress at international/regional level supporting national-level progress: eg. The SRSG-VAC work adds momentum to PRI's campaign⁸⁷; UNICEF's VAC advocacy with governments in the CIS region enhanced PRI's work⁸⁸. Engagement with ACERWC on children of incarcerated parents widened interest in this regionally.⁸⁹

4.3 Impact Weighting

i. Current impact weighting in logframe (%): 20%

ii. Are you making any changes to this weighting: Y/N

iii. Explanation for changes:

iv. How are you managing changes?

4.4 Output risk
<p><i>i. Current risk:</i> Low</p> <p><i>ii. Are you making any changes to the level of risk? N – If yes, state new level</i></p> <p><i>iii. Explanation for changes</i></p> <p><i>iv. How are you managing changes?</i></p>
4.5 Actual achievement of expected results for Output 3 A+

4.1 Output 4			
Tools and capacity relating to special characteristics and needs of girls and women in the criminal justice system developed			
Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results			
Indicator 4.1	Number of guidance notes / reports published		
Baseline	2011 Bangkok Rules formally adopted by UN GA in December 2010; limited dissemination; tools to measure compliance lacking		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Publication and dissemination of practical guidance on implementation of Bangkok Rules; research methodology for assessment of compliance with the Bangkok Rules finalised and piloted in 3 regions	Continued dissemination of key elements of the rules plus further research on compliance in 3 regions together with publication of an international report highlighting key compliance issues	2014 Guidance document on Bangkok Rules and Index on compliance developed, discussed and published
Achieved	Yes	Partly	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		N/A	
* – expand number of rows if needed			
i. Narrative on progress			
Guidance on the BR, practical tools for implementation and tailored briefings on specific elements/topics of the Rules, were developed by PRI and widely disseminated, supporting advocacy and capacity-building with a range of stakeholders.			
These included: PRI's 'BR toolbox': <i>BR Guidance and Index of Implementation</i> ⁹⁰ drafted and working documents published and widely disseminated for feedback. Methodology of the Index was tested in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan and Russia, forming a baseline for compliance. ⁹¹ The Thai Institute of Justice agreed to formally endorse the tools ⁹² (launch at the UN-GA, October 2013).			

Tailored briefings were produced: eg. for *parliamentarians* at 3 Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) sessions, (4 languages);⁹³ on women's *access to justice* for CEDAW.⁹⁴ Given monitoring bodies are uniquely positioned to support implementation of the Rules, PRI (with APT) produced a *Guide to gender-sensitive monitoring* to help these bodies incorporate a gender focus in their work (English, Russian, Georgian).

These materials were disseminated via PRI's BR e-bulletin, website, other organisations' and partner networks (APT, Council of Europe-NPM) and at events.⁹⁵

Key elements of the BR were also promoted and tools developed at national level to support advocacy and practical initiatives. Examples include:

- *Kazakhstan*: Manuals for prison staff and women prisoners on BR-compliance and good practices relating to healthcare of women prisoners.⁹⁶
- *Kyrgyzstan*: Quarterly meetings of the Public Monitoring Boards together with relevant Ministries and NGOs.⁹⁷
- *Russia*: focus on women with babies in prison, including establishment of an informal working group of NGOs and FSIN to pilot initiatives for improving the situation of women prisoners who are pregnant or have babies.⁹⁸

International report: Given the lack of data, PRI has commissioned research on characteristics of women offenders to improve the evidence-base; a key component for successful advocacy. Research started (Armenia, Georgia), completed in year 3 including Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Jordan, Tunisia.⁹⁹

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Good progress in disseminating key BR elements, in particular using the international level as a multiplier and development of 'BR tools'. Publication of the international report was delayed due to the complexity of developing the research methodology and need to co-ordinate with other actors.

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

None.

4.1 Output 4			
Tools and capacity relating to special characteristics and needs of girls and women in the criminal justice system developed			
Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results			
Indicator 4.2	Number of CSOs engaged in international network		
Baseline	2011 = 5		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	1 international and 3 regional roundtables hosted; 2 e-bulletins; 6	1 international and 3 regional roundtables; 2 e-bulletins in 3 languages;	2014 = 35

	roundtables hosted with relevant organisations (minimum 5 at each roundtable) to discuss plans to advocate for Bangkok rules	networks established in 6 regions	
Achieved	Yes	Yes	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		Roundtables: 200+ participants e-bulletins: 162 subscribers	

*– expand number of rows if needed

i. Narrative on progress

PRI engaged an increasing number of civil society organisations, experts and academics, at international and national levels to promote the BR and their implementation. This was achieved through roundtables, participation in international fora, local partnerships, networks and information dissemination.

2 PRI BR e-bulletins were distributed in 2012-13, with updates and resources about women in the criminal justice system and the BR (English, Arabic, Russian). PRI's monthly e-bulletins and 'Together Against Torture' e-bulletin also featured the BR.¹⁰⁰

PRI hosted 2 international roundtables:

- *Women and healthcare*: 11 medical experts, including (International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Amnesty International, physicians), to discuss BR healthcare-related provisions.¹⁰¹
- *VAW in custodial settings*: side-event at the UN Commission on the Status of Women (UN-CSW) to discuss relevant BR provisions (about 40 participants).¹⁰²

PRI hosted 2 regional roundtables:

- *Europe and Central Asia*: 'Human rights of women prisoners', side-event at Organisation for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM), 30 participants. PRI presented legal analysis and work on improving healthcare for women prisoners in Kazakhstan.¹⁰³
- *Russia, Ukraine, Belarus*: 120 participants discussed BR implementation in Ukraine, with recommendations for the Ukrainian Prison Service.¹⁰⁴
- PRI also attended the *East Asia-Pacific* meeting, (hosted by UNODC and Thai Institute). Participants from 12 countries presented reports on various aspects of the Rules, highlighting examples of good practice.¹⁰⁵

PRI fostered and expanded 1 international and 5 regional networks, alongside increasing contacts in other regions: to share experience, information and co-operation on the BR.

Examples:

- International civil society: CRIN; Quakers; APT; ICRC; ACLU; GREAT initiative.¹⁰⁶

- Eastern Europe: in Ukraine network of women and human rights NGOs from 12 countries established.¹⁰⁷
- PRI-FHRI 'East Africa criminal justice civil society network' with BR as one of 3 priority themes.¹⁰⁸

PRI engaged a wider network of individuals and organisations beyond its target countries. Eg, Women in Prisons (UK)¹⁰⁹; Raoul Wallenberg Institute¹¹⁰, Dui Hua Foundation (China), and in the Americas¹¹¹.

ii. **Assessment of overall progress towards indicator**

Good progress: activities have built momentum, with more stakeholders engaged, leading to requests for further support, materials and training, and collaborative working.

iii. **Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator**

None

4.1 Output 4

Tools and capacity relating to special characteristics and needs of girls and women in the criminal justice system developed

Assessment of performance of output and progress against expected results

Indicator 4.3	Numbers of workshops delivered; numbers of key stakeholders trained;		
Baseline	2011: Specialised training courses = 0; numbers of key stakeholders with specialised knowledge = very small		
Milestone	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
	Curriculum developed based on Bangkok Rules and tested in 6 countries in 2 regions involving 120 key stakeholders	Training material translated into 2 languages, and training rolled out in a further 12 countries in 4 regions involving 240 key stakeholders	2014: Training curriculum and Manual developed; minimum 12 workshops; training delivered to 360 key stakeholders
Achieved	Yes	Partly	
Variance			
Disaggregated data*		700+ stakeholders	

*– expand number of rows if needed

i. **Narrative on progress**

Examples of training material developed and training delivered:

BR e-course: 3 modules of the course were piloted by six stakeholders (including UNODC and other international NGOs), with feed-back incorporated. To be launched at the UN-GA, October 2013, in English, Russian, Arabic. The e-course has already attracted interest (UNODC, Council of Europe (CoE), and nationally: Kenya Probation Service; India Prison Academy).¹¹²

Other materials include: PRI contributed to DCAF's *Gender and Security Sector Reform Toolkit* (4 languages)¹¹³; *A Guide to Gender-Sensitive Monitoring* (PRI-APT) (3 languages)¹¹⁴; PRI MENA *Manual on Vulnerable Groups in Detention*; updated to include the BR.¹¹⁵

*PRI delivered training in over 8 countries in 4 regions. Examples: Kazakhstan: to prison staff on women's healthcare; India: to senior prison officials as part of good prison management training (the prison academy subsequently requested further training specifically on BR); Jordan: BR included in teaching curriculum for police.*¹¹⁶

ii. Assessment of overall progress towards indicator

Good progress: Tools and training raised awareness and capacity in the BR with an increased number of stakeholders. PRI delivered training in only 8 countries this year (rather than 12). However, other stakeholders have been supported by PRI to deliver training eg. UNODC used PRI tools in lectures with UN Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, UNAFEI officials in Japan. Work on e-course modules has progressed particularly well, and this will facilitate training in many more countries during year 3.

iii. Recommendations on amendments to output or indicator

None.

4.2 Discuss i. key new challenges to the achievement of output(s) and ii. key new drivers of progress

Stakeholders reluctant to commit their staff to trainings exclusively on BR; therefore incorporation of special sessions in trainings with broader scope.

Newly established Thailand Institute for Justice as new actor, supportive of PRI's activities.

4.5 Impact Weighting

- i. Current impact weighting in logframe (%): 20%*
- ii. Are you making any changes to this weighting: N*
- iii. Explanation for changes:*
- iv. How are you managing changes?*

4.6 Output risk

- i. Current risk: Low*
- ii. Are you making any changes to the level of risk? N – If yes, state new level*
- iii. Explanation for changes*
- iv. How are you managing changes?*

4.7 Actual achievement of expected results for Output 4 B

The new project scoring system measures **actual achievement of expected** results rather than the *likelihood of achievement* in the future.

Ratings to be applied:

- A++ = Outputs substantially exceeded expectation
- A+ = Outputs moderately exceeded expectation
- A = Outputs met expectation
- B = Outputs moderately did not meet expectation
- C = Outputs substantially did not meet expectation

Repeat for further outputs and output indicators.

Section 5: Organisational effectiveness (This may be read as a stand-alone section)

5.1 Organisational effectiveness, definition and impact of PPA funds

i. How do you define organisational effectiveness within the context of your PPA funding?

PRI defined organisational effectiveness as its ability to deliver PPA outcomes and targets. Following the Coffey evaluation, we are reviewing and revising this definition to align it with DFID's.

ii. What difference has PPA funds made to organisational effectiveness in 2012/13. What effect has this had, if any, on the delivery of your activities and your reported results? How will this be developed in 2013/14?

PPA funds enabled PRI to recruit a number of specialist staff, to improve our effectiveness.¹¹⁷ An Evaluation and Organisational Learning Adviser started in March 2013 and an 'Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan' (EOL-Plan) has been developed, with a supporting ToC and logframe for implementation.¹¹⁸ The plan aims to improve Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEL) systems to integrate them into planning processes. Training will be delivered to all PRI staff, pilot evaluations carried out with mentoring support for evaluations introduced, and an organisational learning and communications strategy will be developed.

PRI has improved tools for beneficiary and stakeholder feedback and is using this information to inform programming.¹¹⁹ (see Section 6).

PPA funds enabled us to improve our website, use new media to disseminate and monitor information, and define our key messages more clearly.¹²⁰ This extends our reach and dissemination of resources to a wider audience – with less reliance on printed materials (also reducing carbon-footprint).

iii. What have PPA funds enabled your organisation to do in 2012/13 that you would not have otherwise been able to do, and why?

Without PPA funds in 2012-13, we would not have been able to¹²¹:

- *Invest in improving our organisational effectiveness.*
- *Work with partners in East Africa and South Asia:* PPA funds allowed us to re-engage in these regions, prisoners, offenders and suspects are particularly vulnerable in inefficient and poorly resourced penal and criminal justice systems, and with little access to justice to ensure fair trials.
- *Achieve results from advocacy:* Our international advocacy and profile have benefited enormously. PPA funds allowed us to travel, organise and speak at events, and produce policy papers to a much greater degree. Experience has shown persistent, long-term advocacy is key to being effective (raising awareness, developing relations, reaching key stakeholders and ensuring recommendations are incorporated).
- *Enhance our strategic and programme work:* Clear additionality is shown in work to promote the Bangkok Rules, where PRI has taken a lead role and is regarded as expert. Promotion of the Rules requires research, advocacy, piloting of tools – work

that is difficult to secure 'project' funding for, especially given the lack of awareness around women offenders. It has also enable PRI to continue work with partners on programmes for which restricted funding has ended, thereby strengthening sustainability and impact.

- *Extend our expertise* by contracting experts as consultants to assist with policy papers, reports/guidelines, research, training, and learning from international experience, allowing PRI to reach milestones more efficiently and effectively.
- *Improve our IT and communications and media functions.*
- *Participate in the development and promotion of the new UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems.*

iv. What are you doing less of as a result of PPA funding, and why?

Please include examples

PPA funding meant we did not pursue income-generating opportunities that would not further our strategic goals.

We are disseminating information less in hard copy and more through USBs and online media.

5.2 Anti-corruption and Transparency

i. Are you IATI compliant? – If not, please explain why not.

Yes. By April, all PPA information was published on IATI.¹²²

ii. Do you go beyond IATI minimum compliance? Y/N – If yes, please explain

PRI will publish non-PPA data by December 2013.

iii. How are you taking anti-corruption measures forward?

PRI's anti-corruption policy is included in partner and consultant contracts and adhered to in programmes. All spending is linked to specific budget lines. Regional Offices' cashbooks are entered in London. Programme and organisational budgets and expenditure are reviewed monthly by Regional Directors and London; any significant variances are queried. Partner quarterly financial reporting has been introduced. Procurement and audits comply with PRI and donor regulations.¹²³

iv. Paragraph 16 of the PPA MoU states that we must be notified of any misappropriation of funds or potential fraud. Have we been notified of any such situations? Y/N

No.

5.3 What key issues or challenges, identified by your organisation in the Annual Report 2011/12, were to be addressed during 2012/13? How has this work progressed?

Insecurity and political volatility in the Middle East and North Africa region

The impact of this was that we had to suspend operations in Egypt, and decided not to launch new activities in Sudan, South Sudan and Yemen. Instead, we carried out some

activities in Tunisia, which seemed interested in moving towards abolition of the death penalty.

Political instability remains a concern in the region. We resumed activities in Egypt, but have not been able to make steady progress because of continuing tension and lack of government commitment to human rights and criminal justice/penal reform. In Yemen we resumed working - due to our good relationship with a local NGO partner. We have no current plans to work in Sudan or South Sudan – while there is great need in those countries, it seems unlikely that any intervention we make will have a lasting impact due to the volatility of the political context.

Political stalemate

Political power struggles in Ukraine were threatening to undermine progress. However, we remained engaged and were able to achieve our milestones for the PPA over the past year (as set out in our report on results).

Access

It was difficult for us to work on abolition of the death penalty in Belarus following the government's stand, including their execution of two men in 2012. However, by adopting a less confrontational approach than other NGOs working in this field, we have been able to make progress and recently received a grant from the EU to work there on death penalty abolition.

5.4 What key issues or challenges were identified in your feedback letter in 2011/12 for resolution by 2012/13? How has this work progressed?

The main challenges related to PRI's need to improve MEL systems and measurement of impact, so that the changes from our interventions can be demonstrated. It takes time for penal policies and practices to change and make a difference to prisoners' and offenders' lives. To better assess and demonstrate change in the short term, we improved several monitoring tools (eg. 6-month follow-up surveys to assess post-training impact¹²⁴) and are developing a ToC for each programme to demonstrate linkages and intermediate indicators between high-level advocacy and change.

The feedback letter contained a request for evidence of the link between prisoners and poverty. There is a wide range of research, a few examples of which are listed below², from both developed and developing countries that demonstrates that prisoners everywhere in the world are among the poorest and most vulnerable groups in society. The research confirms a number of common characteristics: low educational achievement, little employment experience, a background of dysfunctional families; often dependent on drugs or alcohol and with poor physical and/or mental health. The Open Society Justice Initiative's 2010 publication on *The Socioeconomic Impact of Pre-trial Detention* sets out the position clearly and in depth for both sentenced and pre-trial prisoners.

It is not only prisoners themselves whose poverty is exacerbated by their detention. There is a growing body of evidence of the damaging impact of detention on prisoners' families. The OSJI publication highlights this, giving the example of Afghanistan where families of prisoners 'are commonly reduced to begging because no other options for earning income are available'. Families may lose the main income from the detention of a breadwinner, financial problems follow which lead to debt problems and potential loss of a home. The

impact on children can be damaging and long term.² In addition to the reduction in income, prisoners' families face additional costs – transport to prison for visits, phone calls, food parcels, clothing etc. In some countries, the family must provide the prisoners' daily needs for food, clothing and medicine. Even in the UK, families have to provide money for toiletries, writing materials and phone cards. At the same time as the family income is reduced, expenditure increases to pay the additional costs caused by detention of a family member. Even after release, a prisoner faces social stigma, difficulty in finding a job and re-establishing his or her relationship with the family. Imprisonment is not a temporary setback but a disadvantage for life.²

Progress on other issues raised are provided elsewhere in the report.

Section 6: Evidence and Evaluation (This may be read as a stand-alone section)

6.1 Outline your monitoring and evaluation approach with respect to PPA-funded activities.

PRI is undertaking a significant change in its monitoring and evaluation systems, detailed in our EOL-Plan¹²⁵, and more resources will be invested to implement this new approach.

The Plan will enable PRI to integrate its planning, monitoring, evaluation, learning and finance processes. For each PPA outcome, we are developing a results framework, linked to a ToC, to clarify what will be monitored, what data is required and intermediate outcomes to be evaluated. Information from this will feed into PPA and wider PRI planning. The activities outlined in the plan include designing a monitoring system, developing a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan; carrying out pilot evaluations, training staff in M&E, how to use the ToC approach for planning and monitoring, and developing a learning and communications strategy. All staff will be trained and able to use the ToC methodology and understand and implement monitoring and evaluation against agreed indicators. An evaluation plan for our torture prevention work has already been developed

PRI's current monitoring system measures progress against PPA outcome and output milestones and checks if activities are implemented to plan and budget. Regional Directors send monthly reports to London. Activity documentation (event reports, advocacy meeting notes) are sent to the PPA-Coordinator who regularly discusses progress with relevant staff in London/Regions. Quarterly reporting forms, monthly calls and occasional visits have been introduced for more participative monitoring and learning with South Asia and East Africa partners.¹²⁶ Feedback forms are used more systematically in trainings/roundtables. A tool to track dissemination and use of our publications has been developed. Website and e-bulletin usage is tracked and 'ad-hoc' evidence, such as emails, collected.¹²⁷

6.2 Demonstrate how your organisation has used evidence from your M&E systems to improve PPA-design and delivery activities, increase impact and create better value for money.

Indicative examples:

- *Pakistan*: Evidence from DOST's reports, meetings, Probation Officers' feedback,

indicated that although activities were delivered, there has not been the extent of change anticipated. Probation Officers cited political and institutional barriers to applying their learning or implementing recommendations from the Probation Report. We are reviewing year 3 interventions to identify what/how/whom we focus to achieve more sustainable, effective results.¹²⁸

- *Death Penalty:* An external evaluation of our death penalty programme identified the need for more focused/in-depth advocacy in targeted countries to realise change.¹²⁹ We have therefore identified 10 countries (rather than at least 15) which have the potential for change and where we have already built momentum, to invest our efforts and resources. PRI commissioned research on Sharia law and the death penalty to meet the arguments raised against abolition of the death penalty in Islamic countries.
- *Materials:* PRI seeks opinions of experts and monitors feedback from beneficiaries to improve its resources (eg. BR Index of Implementation methodology). Data such as downloads from our e-bulletins and website, have helped us assess what formats and tools beneficiaries find most useful, and have adapted our information media accordingly.¹³⁰
- *Kenya:* Follow up monitoring with Magistrates indicated that while training and materials on community service were useful, there are structural barriers for effective community sentences. PRI has subsequently planned a pilot 'models of excellence' initiative with the Probation Department for 2013 to address this.¹³¹

6.3 How have you collected beneficiary feedback and used it to improve your work? Include a discussion of your methodology, sampling and verification activities.

DFID approved PRI's request to be exempt from reporting on ultimate beneficiaries this year.

Our EOL-Plan details how PRI intends to improve beneficiary feedback mechanisms during 2013-14. Development of our ToC will explicitly demonstrate the causal pathways from interventions with our proximate beneficiaries to changes for prisoners and their families. Participation in the PPA beneficiary Learning Group will also help inform this work. Current methodology includes:

Proximate beneficiaries: (representatives from criminal justice agencies, judiciary, government, international bodies, and civil society organisations.)

- Feedback forms and surveymonkey: to collect, collate and analyse feedback at trainings/seminars, and 3-6 months later. Questions include beneficiaries' knowledge of law/practice before/after the event; how they are intending to apply their learning and, (after 6 months), whether they achieved this, and reasons why/why not. This informs our future activities. To supplement the forms we may conduct telephone or skype interviews. We verify feedback where possible: eg. using court records to verify numbers of community orders¹³² issued or reports from other independent organisations on treatment of prisoners.
- Partner reports: Feedback from our (contracted) NGO partners is collected through quarterly reports, ongoing communication and meetings. We implement our activities in many countries with partners who are also beneficiaries, and their feedback on progress, as well as on substantive issues is key.¹³³ (In MENA, feedback on the current political situation and how this is affecting activities informs our planning.)
- Piloting/consultations: We collect feedback from stakeholders on draft papers and tools to ensure they are relevant and accurate eg. wide consultation on SMR paper; piloting

of BR e-course.

- PRI recognises that some of the feedback is 'off-the-record', especially that received verbally or via email following advocacy meetings, and can be sensitive. We are careful in how we report and use this.

Ultimate beneficiaries (prisoners and offenders)

Obtaining feedback from these beneficiaries is more challenging given that PRI does not usually have direct access to them. Even where we or our local partners do have access (prison visits, rehabilitation centres), there is a risk of reprisals for prisoners or a climate of fear that prevents beneficiaries from giving honest feedback. Reliable data to verify feedback can be difficult to obtain (prisoners' records missing/incomplete). Despite this, examples of ways that PRI has collected feedback are:

- BR Index of Implementation piloting: includes interviews with women offenders. The consultant undertaking the research has designed a tool to collate beneficiary data.
- PRI Georgia is part of a civil society initiative interviewing prisoners about their experience of torture in prisons. Our training of monitors of detention centres helps to obtain and verify prisoner feedback.
- In Tanzania, PRI worked with local agencies to design a multi-agency IT tool to capture, collate and analyse data and beneficiary feedback collected during monitoring visits to places of juvenile detention.¹³⁴
- Several of our partners provide direct services to offenders and their families enabling them to gather feedback (DOST provide health services in prisons; Armenian partners run rehabilitation centres).

Section 7: Partnership Working and Value for Money (This may be read as a stand-alone section)

7.1 Please provide evidence to show how PPA funding allows you to take risks and innovate (if at all).

PA funding allowed PRI to take risks and innovate by:

- *Developing new partnerships and ways of working* with partners in South Asia and East Africa. The PPA funded travel to meet, and personnel time to support, partners, in addition to implementing a programme of activities.
- *Research*: The PPA is funding research on Sharia law and the death penalty. This fills an important information gap and could have an important impact on how PRI works in Islamic countries on this topic.
- *Social media approaches* were adopted to build networks and disseminate resources eg. East Africa e-network, PRI Central Asia Facebook, e-learning.

The unrestricted nature of PPA funding allows PRI to invest resources/time in these activities, and international advocacy, which other donors and restricted grants are less willing/able to do.

7.2 What effect has PPA supported risk-taking and innovation had on the effectiveness, impact and value for money of your activities and reported results?

- *Advocacy*: Significant results can be demonstrated from international advocacy. One-off attendance at events may have limited results. However, the ability to regularly attend has a cumulative effect. It has raised PRI's profile and credibility to influence many more institutions at an international level (eg. demonstrated by increased requests for PRI's input/materials by UN bodies; ACERWC Observer Status granted¹³⁵).
- *Partnerships and regions*: Our partnership working has increased PRI's organisational reach. Our partnership with DOST in Peshawar, enabled PRI to carry out activities there that would not otherwise have been possible because of the risk to personal safety. DOST have access to officials that PRI would not otherwise be able to engage with.
- *Bangkok Rules e-course*: if this proves an effective mode of delivery, it will provide VfM; reducing costs (and carbon footprint) associated with face-to-face training.

7.3 What additional financial and material resources have been levered from partners as a direct result of PPA funding, enabling you to more effectively deliver your results? How has this been achieved?

Examples of how PPA funding has enabled PRI to access additional funding and resources:

- Partners have translated materials without charge: This has enhanced local ownership and allowed more people to access them. Eg. IPJJ translated PRI's 10-Point Plan for Criminal Justice for Children into French and Spanish¹³⁶; APT is translating the Gender-Sensitive monitoring briefing into Spanish; the BR e-course will be translated into Thai by the Thai Institute of Justice.
- Through PPA-funded advocacy, PRI levied in-kind and financial contributions. Eg. PRI hosted a side event at the UNHRC 22nd Session with the Swiss Mission.
- Additional financial grants secured include: PPA funding being used as co-financing for EC grants on the Death Penalty, which PRI would not otherwise have been able to commit to. PPA violence against children work allowed PRI to obtain funds from the British bi-lateral programme in Kyrgyzstan.¹³⁷ Developing the Justice for Children Manual contributed to PRI securing a training consultancy contract with UNICEF Uzbekistan, generating additional funding.¹³⁸

7.4 Partnership working is considered to be one of the key 'added value' aspects of CSOs, and contributes to effectiveness. Outline your approach to partnership working with respect to PPA funding and how it enables your organisation to deliver and achieve results.

Partnership approach

PRI works with different partners in different ways, depending on the context and area of work. PRI currently has working relationships with over 100 organisations in 25 countries.¹³⁹ In addition PRI has access to/is a member of a large number of international and regional agencies/networks (indicative examples include observer status with UN and regional bodies and membership of networks such as IPJJ and WCADP).

During 2013, PRI began articulating a Partnership Strategy in order to strengthen our PPA programme and partnership working. A working group of PRI staff has been established and partners will be involved through consultation and piloting new approaches. The Strategy will include: PRI's definition of partnership, criteria, responsibilities and management.

PRI's Strategic Plan 2010–2015, includes capacity building of local partners as a cross-cutting theme. Current partner criteria include common objectives and local/specialist expertise. Partnerships are developed following discussions and are formalised with signed agreements.

Examples of partnership working:

Governmental and institutional partners: We provide technical assistance, acting as expert advisers to the governments in the countries where we have regional offices, for example in drafting legislation, advising on international standards and how they can be implemented. We also provide training for personnel in the prison and probation services and training and facilitate discussion between government and NGOs.

Professional bodies: We provide training for judges, prosecutors, probation officers, lawyers and journalists (among others). The training is usually on the application of international standards to their area of practice. Training is often interdisciplinary so that each actor in the criminal justice process can understand better the role of the others, and can discuss how best to work together.

Civil society: We provide training, resources and advocacy to NGOs, media, academics. We facilitate / contribute to networks and coalitions or joint papers for stronger advocacy. This may be through joint activities (e.g. lobbying), through training (e.g. on international standards, or public monitoring of prisons) or through a small grants programme (e.g. assistance to NGOs delivering services directly to prisoners). These activities are usually, though not exclusively, carried out by PRI's regional offices.

Funding local partners to deliver services or organise events on our behalf or jointly: If funding is concerned, we have a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the civil society partner to set out each party's obligations, the specific activities to be carried out and financial and reporting requirements.

Collaborating with other organisations for joint advocacy and policy initiatives at a national, regional and international level: on a thematic basis we join with the Quakers, Amnesty International, APT and other international NGOs to promote and lobby for a particular policy initiative. We share an agreement as to objectives, activities, and have a shared history of collaboration.

7.5 Value for Money (VfM)

i. What are the main cost drivers for your organisation in delivering interventions?

As part of PRI's EOL-Plan and organisational development process, PRI is discussing how to incorporate VfM into its programme and project planning process and its wider organisational systems. PRI's VfM working group has developed a background paper to inform the discussion.¹⁴⁰

A number of cost drivers have been identified so far, including strategy development; partnerships; people; country delivery structure; fundraising; governance; information and communications; exchange rates; travel; political context of the countries where we work – for example, during 2012-13, instability in MENA increased the travel and security costs of our interventions.

ii. Describe how competition and effective commercial practice is used to drive improved value for money

PRI's Financial Policies and donor conditions direct our supplier/procurement practices, including¹⁴¹:

- Obtaining a range of quotes
- Regular reviews of suppliers
- Open tenders, recruitment/procurement processes
- Contracts with timelines, break clauses, deliverables
- Regular review of market costs (eg. benchmarking salaries)

As well as cost, decisions are based on quality of services, environmental considerations, and strategic factors eg. services procured locally increasing stakeholders' buy-in.

Contracts with consultants contain detailed timelines with deliverable outputs linked to incentivised payment schedules.¹⁴² Partnership contracts oblige partners to adhere to PRI's financial procedures and regular reviews of expenditure are undertaken.

iii. Do you track any specific value for money measures in any of your programmes (e.g. unit costs, cost effectiveness measures etc.)? If so, review performance on these measures.

PRI's future plans to pilot VfM tracking will be set out in our *Organisational VfM Plan 2013-14*. Preliminary efforts during 2012–13 included an analysis of unit costs in design and dissemination of 5 regional research reports. Analysis informed our decisions on publication and dissemination options across countries, regions and languages.¹⁴³

iv. Explain and evidence how the use of measures or management practices enables you to achieve results that represent better value for money.

A preliminary VfM analysis was undertaken of our project on Abolition of the Death Penalty and Alternatives (2010- 2012). This showed it was more effective to use local media than an international media partner, a result used in designing the next phase of the project.¹⁴⁴

When planning events, we seek to maximise value, minimise cost and environmental impact by organising them back to back to reduce air/road travel (eg. Board meetings are immediately followed by meetings with Regional Directors who attend the Board meetings) and arranging multiple meetings during one trip.

v. Have you had experienced any significant VfM achievements in the last reporting year? If so, please describe.

Conducted a successful open recruitment process to procure a consultancy contract for a publication within a specialised field (Sharia Law and the Death Penalty).¹⁴⁵

Offering research methodology, developed for the BR research, to other stakeholders interested in conducting a comparable project.¹⁴⁶

During 2012 - 2013 PRI's Board began the process of revising its Constitution. The revised draft Constitution now contains a provision enabling Board meetings to be held

virtually (which will save costs and environmental impact through reducing air flights). The staff have produced a cost estimate for investing in video-conferencing, which has been agreed and investment in this will reduce the need for so many face to face meetings.

7.6 Organisational risks – Have you been able to achieve better value for money in delivering your results because of the risk mitigation actions that you have taken. If so, how and why? If not, why not?

PRI decided not to intervene in Sudan or South Sudan, given the volatile political context and risks to personal security. Substantial costs would have been required to undertake activities there, which at this current time, were considered unlikely to result in sustained changes.

Section 8 Lessons Learned (This may be read as a stand-alone section)

What lessons are being learned and shared with respect to PPA funding?

i. Briefly describe your organisation's approach to PPA learning.

Our PPA learning objectives are focused on: a) Organisational development; b) Penal reform issues for each PPA outcome.

a) Organisational Development

PRI has prioritised: MEL, ToC; Effectiveness, VfM, partnership learning:

- As a response to our IPR and Coffey evaluation¹⁴⁷. The PPA provided a catalyst/opportunity to focus learning on these.
- To inform PRI's Strategic Plan 2015 and future programming and funding (better quality of proposals/reports to secure sustainable funding) PRI commissioned research on current trends in imprisonment and penal policy to inform future work¹⁴⁸.
- Partnerships are key to achieve our PPA work. It is important we learn from our new approach in two regions and other partnerships, to inform decisions on how/where/who we work with.¹⁴⁹

Our institutional arrangements for taking these forward:

- Appointment of our EOLA and EOL-Plan.¹⁵⁰
- London and regional staff will be involved through consultation, training and piloting new approaches (eg. on beneficiary feedback; learning informing project proposals).
- Workshops to develop ToC (this has been done for PPA Outcomes and has begun for PRI's wider goals); implementing the EOL-Plan fully.

b) Penal reform issues for each PPA Outcome

Examples of priority learning for each PPA Outcome and plans to take these forward:

- *Alternatives*: A number of countries are developing probation services and PRI will monitor data to see how effective these are in terms of number of orders made and re-offending statistics.
- *Juvenile Justice*: PRI's research on violence against children in 8 countries, contributed to our learning; enabling us to identify targets for reform and focus our interventions.

- *Women, Bangkok Rules*: PRI is undertaking international research on women in prisons to fill gaps in knowledge (a need identified in the Bangkok Rules) and using expert learning to develop tools to support implementation of the Rules.

ii. Where possible, describe the impact of your learning.

Organisational:

- New monitoring tools enabled us to learn from beneficiary feedback on change from trainings/roundtables, informing further activities (eg. Pakistan on alternatives.)
- Learning from initial reviews of partnerships in East Africa and South Asia confirmed the importance of investing time/resources into developing partnerships through regular communications to ensure better delivery of results. Learning from other PPA Partner Strategies and BOND, PRI is developing a draft partnership strategy.
- Learning from participation in VfM workshops and papers eg Saferworld Advocacy-VfM paper, DFID VfM approach, informed PRI's draft VfM strategy.

PPA Outcomes:

Please see above examples of our how learning so far has informed policy, tools and approaches.

Focused organisational learning work began 2012-13, following IPR and Coffey feedback and the appointment of our EOLA, so it is too early to see the impact. However, implementation of our EOL-Plan will take place during 2013-15 as set out above.

iii. Describe how you learn from and/or contribute to the sector's learning.

During 2012-13 PRI has engaged with PPA Learning Groups (E&A; Beneficiary Feedback; VfM; Advocacy; CHASE). As one of the relatively few CHASE 2nd tier PPAs, PRI can contribute different perspectives/learning. We shared learning with several PPA organisations eg. partnership strategies (VSO, CAFOD); alternatives in East Africa (Avocats Sans Frontieres (ASF)).

Learning with the wider sector includes sharing/promoting:

- Tools: sharing Tanzania multi-agency juvenile monitoring tool in roundtables/training. The e-course on the BR is being piloted and feedback welcomed.
- Research: sharing methodology on women in prisons with the Vance Centre of the New York Bar Association for research in Latin America, with the Dui Hua Foundation and Dignity (NGO).
- Good practices: documenting and presenting good practice on community-service via East Africa manual.
- PRI's website/ e-bulletins disseminate PRI and other organisations' resources.
- Facilitating roundtables enabled NGOs to share learning eg. International Juvenile Justice Conference, Delhi, March 2013.
- PRI is a member of many formal and informal networks through which information is shared.

PLEASE NOTE:

THIS IS THE END OF THE COMPULSORY SECTION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT

Note 1: The following two sections present optional opportunities to discuss aspects of your work that you have not been able to represent in the main sections.

Note 2: The evidence table is a compulsory appendix to the Annual Report and is located after sections 9 and 10.

Section 9: Changing Lives Case Study (This may be read as a stand-alone section).

Note:

- a. The case study is optional.
- b. The case study should be **no more than 600 words**.
- c. The case study should be linked to the logframe.

Changing Lives Case Study:

Specialised police units for children in the Middle East and North Africa – Piloting, expanding and publicising a model of good practice

What was the theory of change?

PRI believes that a child-friendly justice system must include separate units within police stations which are staffed by qualified, specially trained personnel. Specialised police with the power to divert children away from the formal system can reduce rates of reoffending, avoid stigmatising children, encourage reparation to communities, and is often much cheaper than court procedures and detention. Specialised police units and diversion will also reduce incidences of violence and ill-treatment against children. This is in line with the Beijing Rules which state, 'In order to best fulfil their functions, police officers who frequently or exclusively deal with juveniles or who are primarily engaged in the prevention of juvenile crime shall be specially instructed and trained. In large cities, special police units should be established for that purpose.'

What did you do? What changed?

In 2012, PRI's MENA office played a key role in the establishment of the specialised Juvenile Police Department in Jordan, which it continues to support. Since its establishment, there has been an increase in the number of juvenile offenders diverted from the criminal justice system, and therefore fewer imprisoned. Police data showed that between January–September 2012, 78% of cases involving juveniles were resolved at the police level. PRI worked closely with the Juvenile Police Department to develop a 'Procedural Guide for Police working with Children'. 500 copies were published and disseminated and its working procedures were adopted by the Police.

Following the success in Jordan, PRI worked with authorities to replicate this model in Yemen by establishing the first Juvenile Police Centre in Sana'a in January 2013. PRI provided technical support, developed codes of ethics, procedural guidelines, and protection policies, all of which were accepted by the police department. PRI also delivered training, shared international good practice and its experience in Jordan.

How did you adapt based on lessons learned in practice?

Aspects of this model were also replicated in Egypt where PRI helped develop a Code of Ethics for police; however, political instability has slowed progress and work has recently been obstructed by the restructuring of the Juvenile Police Department as part of wider police reforms.

PRI shared this experience at a wider level with NGOs, stakeholders, policymakers and professionals through participation at international and regional conferences and other fora. For example, the model was presented to 60 participants at the International Colloquium on Juvenile Justice in Delhi, March 2013.

What was distinctive about your involvement that made these changes happen that could not have been achieved by other actors?

PRI's previous work and credibility on juvenile justice reform in Jordan enabled it to advocate for and assist the government. PRI's international reach meant that the original model of good practice, together with the learning from developing such units in Jordan, could be shared widely.

Section 10: Further Information (This may be read as a stand-alone section)

Note:

- a. This is optional and helps us develop DFID policy work. This section does not form any part of your annual assessment.
- b. This should be **no more** than 1000 words.

Organisations are invited to discuss aspects of their work, not included or highlighted in the main report and particularly undertaken with excluded groups – for example work on faith, disability, gender, youth etc.

Annex A: Acronyms

ACERWC	African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ACSA	African Correctional Services Association
APCA	Academy of Prisons and Correctional Administration, India
APT	Association for the Prevention of Torture
BLAST	Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust
BR	UN Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules)
CEDAW	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CoE	Council of Europe
CRIN	Child Rights International Network
CRC	UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO	Community Service Order
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DCAF	Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces
DP	Death Penalty
DOST	The DOST Foundation, Pakistan
EOLA	Evaluation and Organisational Learning Advisor
EOL-Plan	Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan
EC	European Commission
FHRI	Foundation for Human Rights Initiative
FSIN	Federal Penitentiary Service, Russia
GREAT	Gender Rights and Equality Action Trust Initiative
HAQ	HAQ Centre for Human Rights, India ('Haq' in Urdu means 'rights')
HDIM	Human Dimension Implementation Meeting
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IEGM	Intergovernmental Expert Group Meeting
IPJJ	Interagency Panel on Juvenile Justice
IJJO	International Juvenile Justice Observatory
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
IPR	Independent Progress Review
JJ	Juvenile Justice
MACR	Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MP	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NPM	National Preventative Mechanism
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture
OSCE	Organisation for Security Cooperation in Europe
PRI	Penal Reform International
SMRs	UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners
SPT	Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture
SR-ESE	Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

SRSB-VAC	Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence Against Children
SR-VAW	Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women
SR-T	Special Rapporteur on Torture
ToC	Theory of Change
UN	United Nations
UN AFEI	UN Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders
UN GA	UN General Assembly
UN SG	UN Secretary General
UN CAT	UN Convention Against Torture
UN CSW	UN Commission on the Status of Women
UN HRC	UN Human Rights Council
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UN ODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VAC	Violence Against Children
VAW	Violence Against Women
VfM	Value for Money
WCADP	World Coalition Against the Death Penalty

Annex B: Evidence Table

Reference Number	Page No.	Reference	Further information
1	3	PRI PPA Theory of Change PPA Logframe PRI <i>Strategic Plan 2010-2015</i>	
2	3, 33, 34	<i>Prison Conditions in Africa</i> , PRI, 1993 <i>Exploration towards accessible and equitable justice in the South Asian region</i> , Dr Rani Shankardass, 2001 <i>UNODC Afghanistan: Female Prisoners and their Social Reintegration</i> , Tomris Atabay, 2007 <i>Unjust Deserts: A thematic Review by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons of the Treatment and conditions for Unsented Prisoners in England and Wales</i> , 2000 <i>The Socioeconomic Impact of Pre-trial Detention</i> , OSJI, 2010 <i>Poverty and disadvantage among prisoners' families</i> , Rose Smith, Roger Grimshaw, Renee Romeo and Martin Knapp (Joseph Rowntree Foundation), 2007	
3	4	EOLA contract and job description, March 2013	
4	4	Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan (2013-4) (EOL-Plan)	Internal document, April, 2013.
5	4	<i>Independent Progress Review of the PPA</i> , October 2012, Annabel Jackson Associates. <i>PPA Mid-Term Performance Assessment</i> , Coffey, November 2012.	
6	4	PRI-UNODC email correspondence, March 2013	To PRI Programme Development Director from Alexandra Martins, UNODC Justice Sector
7	4	Email correspondence and invitation to experts meeting, January 2012	To PRI Programme Development Director
8	4	PRI submission to ACERWC, 22 October 2012 Email from ACERWC, 6 March 2013 on drafting of the General Comment	
9	4	<i>A review of law and policy to prevent and remedy violence against children in police and pre-trial detention</i> , Country Reports for Bangladesh, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tanzania and Uganda, PRI, December 2012 – March 2013	6 reports translated into local languages.
10	4	Report on Evaluation of the Project <i>A Model Programme Against the Spread of HIV/AIDS and TB in Women's Prisons</i> , December 2012	Independent evaluation
11	5	Information and Communications Officer job description and signed contract PRI websites PRI Facebook pages PRI Twitter Account @PenalReformInt and PRI Twitter Guidelines	www.facebook.com/pages/Penal-Reform-International-in-Central-Asia (155 'likes') www.facebook.com/pages/Penal-Reform-International-South-Caucasus-Regional-Office (121 'likes') www.penalreform.org : PRI website: average of 4,500 visits per month.

		PRI MailChimp account PRI Blogging Guidelines	www.primena.org (launched in Oct 2012. Between October 2012-January 2013, 241,249 hits) Twitter: PRI Head Office, 194 followers; Central Asia, 14 followers e-bulletins: Main PRI e-newsletter: 2,705 subscribers (+25 increase each month) Together against Torture e-newsletter – 799 subscribers (English) and 304 for Russian version Bangkok Rules e-bulletin – 234 subscribers
12	6	<i>Briefing on the UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid</i> , PRI	www.penalreform.org/publications/briefing-principles-and-guidelines-access-legal-aid-criminal Finalised April 2013.
13	6	<i>Expert Meeting At The University of Essex on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners Review Summary, 20 November 2012</i> , paper submitted to IEGM PRI Policy Director reports following meetings eg. IEGM (December 2012), Geneva (March 2013); meeting documentation Emails from IEGM participants to Policy Director Letter from Director of Human Rights Centre, Essex University, 11 June 2013.	Eduardo Vetere, a criminal justice expert and former head of UNODC, stated that the “ <i>SMR Review process will benefit millions of men and women in prison</i> ”, during the side event on the SMRs at the UN Crime Commission Session April 2013. PRI Policy Director reports are internal, and include notes from informal meetings and discussions. Email example from a representative of a mission to the UN in Vienna ‘I found meeting with you to be useful, and I learned several things of which I was unaware. I’ve circulated the documents to my colleagues in Ottawa as well.’ Received April 2013, following meeting in March. Email example from UNODC official ‘PRI played a leading role in promoting and coordinating the NGOs’ contribution to the ongoing revision of the SMRs
14	7	PRI South Caucasus monthly Report, March 2013	Internal monitoring report
15	7	Georgia Prison Department Data	Comparison of data April 2012 and April 2013
16	7	PRI Central Asia monthly reports and Board reports Interim and final reports of ‘ <i>Strengthening criminal justice system of Kazakhstan through establishing criminal legislative system with respect to human rights</i> ’ project, PRI, December 2012, May 2013 Minutes of working group (in Russian).	Kazakhstan reports submitted to Netherlands Embassy. Includes data, activities, stakeholder numbers, outcome changes etc.
17	7	Training reports and feedback forms from Magistrates (July, September, December 2012) Trip reports from PRI expert, Rob Allen, October, December 2012 PRI email correspondence with Kenya Probation Department (regular) Uganda Community Service Department 6 month report and their internal monitoring reports of community orders issued (from court records December 2012-April 2013; 1 May 2012-30 April 2013), broken down by districts where Magistrates had received training.	Approx 40 participants (mostly Magistrates) at 4 trainings. Feedback forms distributed at workshops (2 Kenya, 2 Uganda) and follow up surveys and interviews conducted Kenya (December 2012); Uganda (March 2013). Uganda: Of 15 participants that completed follow up survey, 12 said they now imposed more community service orders as a result of the training. Community Service Department reports used to verify survey results. Kenya: of 33 respondents to follow up

			survey, 91% said they have issued more CSOs as a result since the workshop and 97% said they attributed this to the workshop. 81% had shared their learning with colleagues. (Data not yet verified)
18	7	Supreme Court information letters on use of Code, April 2013 PRI Russia Regional Office roundtable documentation and monthly reports Ukraine Ministry data.	
19	8	Annual report to SIDA on PRI's ' <i>Promoting Human Rights-based Approach towards Vulnerable Groups in Detention in the Middle East and North Africa Region</i> ' project, PRI MENA, November 2012	Report prepared by PRI MENA so risk of bias. Contains detail on activities in each country and outcomes achieved
20	8	PRI Policy Director reporting, March, April 2013 List of submissions by states ahead of IEGM in Buenos Aires: 38 states reporting, inter alia, on good practice of implementation of the SMR in their countries:	Quote from Mona Rishmawi, OHCHR, Head of OHCHR's Rule of Law and Democracy Unit, at SMR Review conference, Geneva, April 2013 www.unodc.org/unodc/en/justice-and-prison-reform/expert-group-meetings5.html
21	11	<i>A review of law and policy to prevent and remedy violence against children in police and pre-trial detention</i> , Country Reports for Bangladesh, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tanzania and Uganda, PRI, December 2012 – March 2013	6 reports translated into local languages.
22	11	<i>10 point plan for Fair and Effective Justice for Children</i> , PRI, 2012	www.penalreform.org/publications/ten-point-plan-fair-and-effective-criminal-justice-children Arabic, English, French, Russian, Spanish 500 copies printed in PRI London. Dissemination also includes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – VAC Conference: disseminated in English and Russian to all participants (120) – IPJJ Event 16th May 2013 (50 participants) – Delhi UNICEF Child Protection Conference (Nov 2012), 165 participants – HAQ conference (March 2013), – 60 participants, disseminated to all on memory stick – IJJO conference Nov 2012 – 200 copies – ACERWC Addis Ababa – Nov 2012
23	11	PRI-UNODC email correspondence, March 2013	To PRI Programme Development Director from Alexandra Martins, UNODC Justice Sector
24	11	Letter from ACERWC 20 November 2012 granting Observer Status. PRI Submission to ACERWC 22 October 2012 Email from ACERWC 6 March 2013 on drafting General Comment; PRI news piece, 19 November 2012	www.penalreform.org/news/pri%E2%80%99s-supports-work-first-general-comment-article-30-african-charter-rights-and-welfare-child www.prawa.org/penal-reform-international-granted-observer-status-to-the-african-committee-on-the-rights-and-welfare-of-

		PRAWA website, 7 December 2012	the-child/
25	11	PRI <i>Statement on Children of Incarcerated Parents</i> at 21st Crime Commission, April 2013	
26	12	PRI South Caucasus Monthly Report, February 2013; Interim Narrative Report to the EU on project ' <i>Promotion of Modern Concepts in the Administration of Juvenile Justice in Armenia</i> ', PRI	
27	12	PRI South Caucasus Monthly Report, December 2012	
28	12	Annual report to SIDA on PRI's ' <i>Promoting Human Rights-based Approach towards Vulnerable Groups in Detention in the Middle East and North Africa Region</i> ' project	Report prepared by PRI MENA so risk of bias. Contains detail on activities in each country and outcomes achieved
29	12	Russian National Strategy for Children's Protection PRI Russia Regional Report to the Board, December 2012 PRI Russia Regional monthly report, November 2012	
30	16	Contract with Rob Allen (commissioned expert), May 2012, May 2013 <i>The Use and Practice of Imprisonment: Current Trends and Future Challenges</i> , PRI, April 2013.	The Discussion paper was presented at the 22nd Session of UN Crime Commission, April 2013. The Paper and interventions by delegates will serve as a basis for continuing research conducted by Rob Allen and a full paper that PRI intends to publish for the Crime Congress in Qatar in 2015.
31	16	Paper submitted and blog from IPU IPU meeting documentation	www.penalreform.org/news/pri-ipu-re-thinking-drugs-policies-lively-debate-among-parliamentarians-quito www.ipu.org/conf-e/128agnd.htm
32	16	PRI Central Asia monthly and Board reports Interim and final reports of ' <i>Strengthening criminal justice system of Kazakhstan through establishing criminal legislative system with respect to human rights</i> ' project, December 2012, May 2013 Senate website PRI blog report on Conference PRI Central Asia Facebook	www.parlam.kz/en
33	16	Documentation for researcher PRI Russia reports	
34	16	<i>Making Community Service Work: a resource pack for East Africa</i> , PRI, 2012	www.penalreform.org/publications/making-community-service-work-resource-pack-east-africa
35	16	Training reports and feedback forms from Magistrates (July, September, December 2012) Trip reports from PRI expert, Rob Allen, October, December 2012 PRI email correspondence with Kenya Probation Department (regular) Uganda Community Service Department 6 month report and their internal monitoring	Approx 40 participants (mostly Magistrates) at 4 trainings. Feedback forms distributed at workshops (2 Kenya, 2 Uganda) and follow up surveys and interviews conducted Kenya (December 2012); Uganda (March 2013). Uganda: Of 15 participants that completed follow up survey, 12 said they now imposed more community service orders

		reports of community orders issued (from court records December 2012-April 2013; 1 May 2012-30 April 2013), broken down by districts where Magistrates had received training.	as a result of the training. Community Service Department reports used to verify survey results. Kenya: of 33 respondents to follow up survey, 91% said they have issued more CSOs as a result since the workshop and 97% said they attributed this to the workshop. 81% had shared their learning with colleagues. (Data not yet verified)
36	16	Evaluation reports of Solomon and Mozambique trainings <i>Manual on Human Rights Training for Prison Officials in the Commonwealth</i>	Manual is finalised and waiting for approval from Commonwealth Secretariat
37	16	<i>Prison Management and Human Rights, Training of Trainers Workshop, Vellore, India, 7– 11 January 2013</i> ; training report, 27 January 2013, from PRI Experts that delivered training Feedback forms (at workshop) and follow up survey report (May-June 2013)	Follow up survey 5-6 months after: 63% of the 30 prison officers trained completed the surveys. 71.4% said that they had made changes to their management and practice since the training. 85.7% said the training had increased their capacity to share methods and content with other staff and 83.3% have since shared the training with other staff. The surveys were sent out by surveymonkey, but many completed hard copies which were returned to APCA – this may have biased results. Verification data needed.
38	18	<i>Mechanisms for the Prevention of Torture in 9 CIS States</i> , PRI, 2012	www.penalreform.org/publications/mechanisms-prevention-torture-nine-cis-states-synthesis-report
39	18	Report on <i>Cross-Regional Conference: Development of Mechanisms of Torture Prevention in Post-Soviet Countries</i> , PRI	Conference was held 25-26 June 2012, Tbilisi, Georgia. Over 80 participants.
40	18	<i>Women in Detention: A Guide to Gender Sensitive Monitoring</i> , PRI, APT, March 2013 PRI e-bulletin, 8 March 2013 APT email to its network, 19 March 2013 European NPM newsletter March-April 2013 email from ICRC, 15 March 2013 email from OHCHR, 11 March 2013.	www.penalreform.org/publications/women-detention-guide-gender-sensitive-monitoring www.coe.int/t/democracy/migration/default_en.asp
41	18	20 Parliamentary sessions discussing draft law between 8 May 2012 –18 March 2013 PRI Central Asia Report to Board, December 2012. PRI Central Asia correspondence with Public Council. PRI Central Asia monthly report February 2013.	
42	18	Report to the UN Committee Against Torture <i>Joint Report under coordination of the Public Verdict Foundation</i> , presented during session on 8 November 2012 on Russia's 5th Periodic Report	www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/cats49.htm
43	18	PRI Russia papers: ' <i>OPCAT and the practice of independent oversight in places of detention in the CIS region</i> '; ' <i>Using the ECtHR cases and international standards in the work of the monitoring commissions</i> '; ' <i>Methodology of</i>	

		<i>monitoring of the closed institutions'</i>	
44	19	<i>Progressive abolition of the death penalty and alternatives that respect international human rights standards: Final Evaluation</i> , PRI, September 2012	Submitted to EC. External evaluator.
45	19	Examples: 1) Side event at 67 th Session of the UN General Assembly, <i>The Death Penalty and Human Rights: The Way Forward</i> , 24 October 2012 2) Side event at 22 nd Session of the UN Human Rights Council, <i>The Human Rights Implications of Solitary Confinement, Extreme Sentencing and the Death Penalty</i> , 5 March 2013.	
46	19	PRI Policy Director reports following side-events and report to PRI Board eg. November 2012. Email correspondence eg from SR-T to PRI Policy Director, 7 January 2013 email from SP-T, 13 March 2013, to PRI Policy Director	Email feedback from SPT-T, 13 March 2013, 'The SP-T could not want for a more constructive relationship than that which it enjoys with PRI, which have been a longstanding source of encouragement, support and insightful advice – a true 'critical friend'
47	19	PRI submitted briefings, June 2012 on the death penalty in PRI's 10 target countries for the UNSG's report on implementation of a moratorium on the death penalty for the UN General Assembly 67th session (September 2012). PRI provided oral and written statements at the UNHRC 21st Session, 10-28 September 2012, on the Question of the Death Penalty	www.penalreform.org/publications/pri-submission-un-secretary-general-status-death-penalty www.penalreform.org/news/un-secretary-general%E2%80%99s-report-moratorium-use-death-penalty-consultation-process
48	19	<i>The Law Revision (Penalties in Criminal Matters) Miscellaneous Amendments Bill, 2013</i> (Revised draft)	
49	19	FHRI reports to PRI and project documentation FHRI report on roundtable with 50 MPs <i>East African Strategy Planning meeting 11-13 February 2013</i> report, FHRI	Internal reports
50	19	PRI and FHRI submission to the UN Secretary General, 27 March 2013 (email acknowledgement from OHCHR, 2 April 2013).	www.penalreform.org/news/pri-and-fhri-submission-un-secretary-general-death-penalty
51	20	PRI South Caucasus monthly reports and activity documentation	
52	20	PRI Russia Regional monthly reports and project documentation, February 2013. <i>Right to Life</i> roundtable: 26 February 2013 (28 participants). Meeting with the 'Human Rights Activists against the Death Penalty' Coalition. Media: eg. TV show 'Duelling' on Russia-1 (20 September 2012), Distribution of PRI's information packs at the State Museum of Political History of Russia during an exhibition on the 'Death Penalty'.	http://poedinoktv.net/30985/ http://en.polithistory.ru/vistavka/618-exhibition-death-penalty-pros-and-cons
53	20	PRI MENA monthly report, February 2013	
54	20	Sharia Law Consultant Job Description and Advert	www.penalreform.org/news/pri-currently-recruiting-consultant-research-and-draft-

		Sharia Law consultant signed contract	publication-sharia-law-and-death-penalty
55	21	Summary document of all 'Torture Prevention' related roundtables and trainings PRI regional offices' roundtable and training documentation (agendas, participant lists, reports, training materials)	PRI internal document, with details of topics, participants, dates, venues.
56	21	Interim report to EC on ' <i>Strengthening institutions and building civil society capacity to combat torture in 9 CIS countries</i> ', PRI, September 2012 mailchimp data (e-bulletin) and website data.	
57	22	Justice for Children Publications Dissemination Table PRI MENA website PRI Central Asia Facebook page PRI South Caucasus Facebook page	Dissemination table includes numbers printed, distribution means and numbers.
58	22	Eg. <i>10 Point Plan for Fair and Effective Justice for Children</i> . PRI, IPJJ, 2012, featured in: IPJJ November 2012 newsletter, and; OIJJ newsletter, March 2013	www.ipjj.org/news/newsletter/ www.oijj.org/sites/default/files/boletines/bolletin_197408.pdf
59	22	Roundtables: 1) PRI South Caucasus Monthly Report, November 2012 2) India: PRI News Report; upcoming event report. 3) Jordan: MENA monthly report, February 2013 4) PRI Central Asia Monthly Report, December 2012 5) PRI Central Asia Monthly Report, March 2013 6) PRI Russia Region Monthly Report, December 2012	India: External news example: www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-newdelhi/because-age-matters/article4531880.ece
60	22	PRI Central Asia monthly report, December 2012	
61	22	PRI Russia region Monthly Report, December 2012	
62	22	PRI South Caucasus Monthly Report, March 2013	
63	22	PRI MENA Monthly Report, April 2012	
64	22	PRI Russia region Monthly Report, March 2013	
65	23	PRI MENA Monthly Report, February 2013	
66	23	PRI South Caucasus Monthly Report, December 2012	
67	23	PRI News Report, ' <i>Report from last month's Learning Initiative on Juvenile Justice hosted by UNICEF India</i> ', 16 April 2013 <i>Learning Initiative on Juvenile Justice: Identifying Priorities and Framework of Action</i> , UNICEF, April 2013.	http://penalreform.org/news/report-last-months-learning-initiative-juvenile-justice-hosted-unicef-india
68	23	PRI Central Asia monthly report, December 2012 Training Report <i>Monitoring of the closed facilities: identification and prevention of ill-</i>	Internal monitoring report Internal monitoring report by trainer Natalya Utesheva; only available in

		<i>treatment concerning children. PRI</i>	Russian
69	23	PRI News Report 22 November 2012; UNICEF Uzbekistan Newsletter No.8, November-December 2012; PRI News Report 13 February 2013	
70	23	DOST Training Report (Punjab) December 2012 DOST Training Report (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) October 2012	Internal monitoring reports from local partner
71	23	MENA monthly reports January, February 2013	Internal monitoring reports
72	23	Annual report to SIDA on PRI's ' <i>Promoting Human Rights-based Approach towards Vulnerable Groups in Detention in the Middle East and North Africa Region</i> ' project	Report prepared by PRI MENA so risk of bias. Contains detail on activities in each country and outcomes achieved
73	23	PRI ' <i>Protecting Children in Criminal Justice Systems: A training manual and reference point for professionals and policymakers</i> ', April 2013, draft; Email correspondence between UNICEF New York and PRI 12 February 2013	Awaiting finalisation To PRI Executive Director and PRI Programme Development Director from Kerry Neal, UNICEF Child Protection Department
74	23	CD ' <i>International Standards for Juvenile Justice</i> ', PRI, Armenian/English PRI South Caucasus monthly report, January 2013	Internal monitoring report
75	24	<i>The Rights of Children in Civil Proceedings: Training Handbook and Manual</i> <i>Training Manual and Handbook: Enhancing the skills of frontline professional working with children</i> <i>Justice for Children: Training Manual and Handbook</i>	Internal UNICEF documents produced by PRI, finalised May 2013; available on request.
76	24	For example, <i>Yemeni Procedural Guide for Police working with Children</i>	Only available in Arabic.
77	24	PRI Central Asia monthly report, December 2012 Training Report <i>Monitoring of the closed facilities: identification and prevention of ill-treatment concerning children. PRI</i>	Internal monitoring report Internal monitoring report by trainer Natalya Utesheva; only available in Russian
78	24	For example, <i>Armenian National Plan of Action for the Protection of Children 2013-2016</i>	
79	24	<i>A review of law and policy to prevent and remedy violence against children in police and pre-trial detention</i> , Country Reports for Bangladesh, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tanzania and Uganda, PRI, December 2012 – March 2013	6 reports translated into local languages.
80	25	PRI South Caucasus monthly report, February 2013	Internal monitoring report
81	25	1) PRI ' <i>Violence against Children in Juvenile Justice Systems: International Conference Report</i> ', October 2013; 2) PRI MENA monthly report, February 2013 3) PRI News Report, ' <i>PRI MENA celebrates World Day for the Prevention of Child Abuse at the Rehabilitation Centre for Juveniles in</i>	Internal monitoring report http://www.penalreform.org/news/pri-mena-celebrates-world-day-prevention-child-abuse-rehabilitation-centre-juveniles-

		<p><i>Amman</i>, 23 October 2012;</p> <p>Email Correspondence MENA Regional Director to Executive Director, 25 November 2012;</p> <p>4) PRI News Report, '<i>PRI's partner in Pakistan, the DOST Foundation, to host conference on alternatives to imprisonment next week</i>', 22 February 2013;</p> <p>Participant Conference Feedback Forms;</p> <p>Margala Declaration;</p> <p>Conference Participants' List</p>	<p>amman</p> <p>http://www.penalreform.org/news/pris-partner-pakistan-dost-foundation-host-conference-alternatives-imprisonment-next-week</p> <p>see PRI SurveyMonkey account and accompanying report</p>
82	25	<p>Overview of PRI Partnership Strategy (Working draft)</p> <p>PRI Partner quarterly narrative reports</p> <p>Partner PRI financial reports</p>	<p>Internal document</p> <p>Internal monitoring documents</p>
83	25	<p>PRI-HAQ Email Correspondence, January-March 2013;</p> <p>Agenda/Concept Note 'International Colloquium on Juvenile Justice'</p>	
84	25	<p>PRI South Caucasus monthly report, March 2013</p>	<p>Internal monitoring report</p>
85	25	<p>PRI MENA Annual report to SIDA on '<i>Promoting Human Rights-based Approach towards Vulnerable Groups</i>', November 2012,</p>	<p>Internal donor report</p>
86	25	<p>See example external news report, '<i>Young and Dangerous: Delhi gangrape sparks a nationwide debate on the juvenile justice system as crimes by minors show an alarming rise. Is reform better than retribution?</i>', India Today, 12 January 2013</p>	<p>http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/delhi-gangrape-minor-acused-trial-review-juvenile-justice-system/1/242004.html</p>
87	25	<p>Website of the UNSR-SG on VAC</p>	<p>http://srsg.violenceagainstchildren.org/</p>
88	25	<p>Website of the UNICEF CEE/CIS Office, Child Protection Section</p>	<p>http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/protection_24084.html</p>
89	25	<p>Email from ACERWC on drafting General Comment, 6 March 2013</p> <p>ACERWC Report on 19th Session, March 2013</p>	<p>http://www.acerwc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/English-ACERWC-Session-19-Report4.pdf</p>
90	26	<p>PRI '<i>Bangkok Rules Guidance Document</i>' (English, Russian) and '<i>Index of Compliance</i>' (Arabic, English, Russian)</p>	<p>http://www.penalreform.org/publications/bangkok-rules-guidance-document-and-index-compliance</p>
91	26	<p>Consultant ToRs, final reports</p>	<p>Internal documents; eg:</p> <p>Kazakhstan (consultant Sergey Gulyayev) Report and Index completed, October 2012;</p> <p>Russia, 'Report on methodology of piloting Index of Compliance', January 2013;</p> <p>Jordan, Index Report received from consultant May 2013;</p> <p>South Caucasus pilots were conducted by PRI and independent experts, January-March 2013, including three visits to Georgia's #5 women's prison, interviewing 25 prisoners and 10 prison staff (PRI and consultant reports).</p>
92	26	<p>Report following PRI meeting at ASEAN Conference, 19-21 March 2013 with Vongthep (Thailand Institute of Justice 'agreement that TIJ</p>	

		will endorse / jointly publish the Guidance Document and Index of Implementation’.	
93	27	PRI, <i>‘What can Parliamentarians do to work on penal reform?’</i> , 2013 (English, Russian, Spanish) Distributed at 1) IPU Kampala, April 2012; 2) IPU Quebec, October 2012; 3) IPU Quito, March 2013	http://www.penalreform.org/publications/what-can-parliamentarians-do-work-penal-reform
94	27	67 th Session of the CEDAW, <i>‘Half-day general discussion on access to justice: Written Submission’</i> , PRI, 18 February 2013	http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/Discussion2013/PenalReformInternational.pdf
95	27	Eg PRI <i>Guide to Gender Sensitive Monitoring</i> , March 2013 PRI e-bulletin, 8 March 2013 APT email to network, 19 March 2013 European NPM newsletter, March-April 2013	http://www.penalreform.org/publications/women-detention-guide-gender-sensitive-monitoring ;
96	27	Report on Evaluation of the Project <i>A Model Programme Against the Spread of HIV/AIDS and TB in Women’s Prisons</i> , December 2012	Independent evaluation
97	27	Eg. Report from meeting of ONS (Public monitoring boards), 22 March 2013, 15 representatives of civil society took part.	
98	27	For example, Letter to Children’s Ombudsman; Written announcement of roundtable on ‘Maternity and Childhood in Prison Settings’, December 2012; PRI, <i>‘Babies behind bars’</i> (Russian)	published online: Human Rights Online http://hro.org/node/15482 https://disk.yandex.com/public/?hash=olgrWBp3fv5kJ/E4QMnawslUDcwP92yftx4ug8gNIKo%3D
99	27	PRI Consultant Contract, Tomris Atabay, for Research on Women in Prison, 6 February 2013 Research on women in prison methodology and concept paper.	
100	28	¹ Bangkok Rules e-newsletter: September 2012; January 2012 (Arabic, English, Russian) PRI Monthly e-bulletins Torture Prevention e-bulletins	See PRI MailChimp account http://tortureprevention.penalreform.org/content/torture-prevention-newsletters
101	28	<i>Women and Healthcare Roundtable: 26-27 November 2011</i> . List of participants, agenda, minutes and report	Internal documents
102	28	<i>Custodial Violence against Women, side event at the 57th session of the Commission on the Status of Women, New York, 13 March 2013</i>	www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw57/side-events.htm
103	28	OSCE HDIM Side Event ‘The Human Rights of Female Prisoners: Bangkok Rules’, 28 September, 2012, Warsaw (PRI flyer)	
104	28	PRI Russia roundtable March 2013, meeting documentation, participant list, reports.	Internal documents
105	28	UNODC / Thai Institute of Justice, ‘East Asia-Pacific Meeting Report’; PRI News Report, ‘Challenges and promising initiatives for improving conditions for women offenders in the East Asia-Pacific Region’, 15	www.penalreform.org/news/challenges-and-promising-initiatives-improving-conditions-women-offenders-east-asia-pacific-reg

		April 2013	
106	28	PRI Policy Director meeting reports and email correspondence	For example, with GREAT initiative (January 2013); APT (Guide to Gender-Sensitive Monitoring); ICRC (posted PRI's video interview on health and women in detention on their website on International Women's Day); ACLU (with a large network of civil liberties organisations in particular in Latin America)
107	29	PRI Russia office list of partners in region and project documentation/ correspondence with partners.	Eg. Chernigov Women Human Rights Centre (Ukraine); The Women Information Consultative Centre (Ukraine)
108	29	Being developed and facilitated by PRI partner FHRI in Uganda: See: PRI-FHRI signed MoU, January 2013 FHRI quarterly report, May 2013	Internal monitoring report
109	29	Email correspondence between PRI Policy Director and Women in Prison, January 2013 PRI BR Guidance document referenced in Women in Prison 'State of the Estate Report'	www.womeninprison.org.uk/userfiles/file/StateoftheEstateReport.pdf
110	29	Email correspondence from UNODC, 5 February 2013	From UNODC asking PRI whether they could share the concept note of the e-course with the Raoul Wallenberg Institute, with whom UNODC is likely to team up for their training modules.
111	29	Email correspondence from Dui Hua Foundation, Dui Hau Foundation Conference Announcement	3 December 2012, re conference organisation 13 March 2013, feedback email: 'thanks for sending through the new PRI publications – they will be valuable resources for us at FFT as we support women survivors who were tortured in prisons and detention centres. I'll forward the documents to my colleagues.' http://duihua.org/wp/?page_id=134 .
112	29	E-course presented at the ASEAN-UNODC expert meeting on BR training materials in Bangkok, 19-21 March 2013. Meeting notes: UNODC confirmed they will reference PRI's e-course in two of their training tools. Various correspondence eg. APCA India Prison Academy emails, March 2013.	E-course piloted by: UNODC (Panama field office) Raoul Wallenberg Institute (Sweden) Association for the Prevention of Torture (Switzerland) Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (Argentina) PRI's regional offices Internal documents
113	30	<i>Penal Reform and Gender: Update on the Bangkok Rules</i> , DCAF, 2012	http://dcaf.ch/Publications/Penal-Reform-and-Gender-Update-on-the-Bangkok-Rules
114	30	<i>Women in Detention: A Guide to Gender Sensitive Monitoring</i> , PRI, APT, March 2013	www.penalreform.org/publications/women-detention-guide-gender-sensitive-monitoring
115	30	PRI <i>Manual on Vulnerable Groups in Detention</i> ; PRI MENA Annual report to SIDA, November 2012, on 'Promoting Human Rights-based Approach towards Vulnerable Groups.	Only available in Arabic Internal donor report
116	30	Training reports and documentation: Bangladesh: organised by PRI partner BLAST,	Internal monitoring documentation and event reports

		<p>May 2012, 60 participants</p> <p>India: <i>Training of Trainers Workshop: Prison Management and Human Rights</i>, January 2013 for senior prison officials</p> <p>Jordan, January 2013, 23 prison officials trained</p> <p>BR included in '<i>teaching curriculum for police</i>' in Jordan and Algeria</p> <p>Algeria, Morocco, Yemen: BR included within a number of trainings as part of prison management for vulnerable groups project</p> <p>PRI Kazakhstan organised 15 capacity building events for 607 officials in two pilot districts, patients' schools in women's prisons and a study visit to address HIV/AIDS and TB issues for women prisoners in compliance with the BR</p> <p>Georgia, June 2012 for women prisoners</p>	
117	31	Job description; external advertisements; and signed contracts for: Information and Communications Officer, Executive Assistant and Evaluation and Organisational Learning Advisor	Internal documents
118	31	Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan (2013-4) (EOL-Plan)	Internal document, April, 2013.
119	31	For example, end of training feedback questionnaires; 6 month follow up training questionnaires; PRI's SurveyMonkey account	
120	31	<p>ToR and signed contract for website consultants <i>Forster</i></p> <p>PRI Central Asia Facebook page</p> <p>PRI South Caucasus Facebook page</p> <p>PRI Twitter Account @PenalReformInt and PRI Twitter Guidelines</p> <p>PRI SurveyMonkey Account; PRI MailChimp account</p> <p>PRI Blogging Guidelines</p>	
121	31	PPA Budget 2012-2013	
122	32	<p>PRI IATI Implementation Plan</p> <p>PRI IATI Implementation Schedule</p>	www.iatiregistry.org/publisher/pri
123	32	<p>PRI Anti-Corruption Policy</p> <p>PRI Financial Procedures and International Staff Handbook</p> <p>PRI Regional Office Financial Reports</p> <p>BLAST, DOST, FHRI financial reports.</p>	<p>Internal documents</p> <p>Internal monitoring documents</p>
124	33	<p>Training reports and feedback forms from Magistrates (July, September, December 2012)</p> <p>Trip reports from PRI expert, Rob Allen, October, December 2012</p> <p>PRI email correspondence with Kenya Probation Department (regular)</p> <p>Uganda Community Service Department 6 month report and their internal monitoring reports of community orders issued (from court records December 2012-April 2013; 1 May 2012-30 April 2013), broken down by districts</p>	<p>Approx 40 participants (mostly Magistrates) at 4 trainings.</p> <p>Feedback forms distributed at workshops (2 Kenya, 2 Uganda) and follow up surveys and interviews conducted Kenya (December 2012); Uganda (March 2013).</p> <p>Uganda: Of 15 participants that completed follow up survey, 12 said they now imposed more community service orders as a result of the training. Community Service Department reports used to verify</p>

		where Magistrates had received training.	survey results. Kenya: of 33 respondents to follow up survey, 91% said they have issued more CSOs as a result since the workshop and 97% said they attributed this to the workshop. 81% had shared their learning with colleagues. (Data not yet verified)
125	34	Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan (2013-4)	Internal document, April 2013
126	34	BLAST, FHRI, DOST MoUs and reports	
127	34	PRI SurveyMonkey Account; PRI MailChimp account	
128		<p>Probation & Parole Training 2012 - DOST Follow up survey, May 2013</p> <p>Training Report, <i>Reforms in Probation and Parole System in Pakistan – Developing and implementing use of alternatives</i>, Punjab, DOST, December 2012</p> <p>Training Report, <i>Reforms in Probation and Parole System in Pakistan – Developing and implementing use of alternatives</i>, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, DOST, October 2012</p> <p>National Conference Report, 'Criminal Justice Reform in Pakistan- Developing Alternatives to Prison', DOST, February 2013</p> <p><i>Criminal Justice Reform in Pakistan: Developing Alternatives to Prison Conference Feedback Results</i>, DOST, February 2013</p>	Internal monitoring documents
129	35	<i>'Progressive abolition of the death penalty and alternatives that respect international human rights standards: Final Evaluation'</i>	External independent evaluation
130	35	PRI Communication Officer reports; PRI MailChimp account	
131	35	<p>Training reports and feedback forms from Magistrates (July, September, December 2012)</p> <p>Trip reports from PRI expert, Rob Allen, October, December 2012</p> <p>PRI email correspondence with Kenya Probation Department (regular)</p> <p>Uganda Community Service Department 6 month report and their internal monitoring reports of community orders issued (from court records December 2012-April 2013; 1 May 2012-30 April 2013), broken down by districts where Magistrates had received training.</p>	<p>Approx 40 participants (mostly Magistrates) at 4 trainings.</p> <p>Feedback forms distributed at workshops (2 Kenya, 2 Uganda) and follow up surveys and interviews conducted Kenya (December 2012); Uganda (March 2013).</p> <p>Uganda: Of 15 participants that completed follow up survey, 12 said they now imposed more community service orders as a result of the training. Community Service Department reports used to verify survey results.</p> <p>Kenya: of 33 respondents to follow up survey, 91% said they have issued more CSOs as a result since the workshop and 97% said they attributed this to the workshop. 81% had shared their learning with colleagues. (Data not yet verified)</p>
132	35	See 131 above	
133	35	BLAST, FHRI, DOST MoUs	
134	36	PRI <i>'Toolkit for Multi-Agency Monitoring of Places of Detention of Children in Tanzania'</i> , January 2013	
135	37	Letter from ACERWC 20 November 2012	www.penalreform.org/news/pri%E2%80%99s-supports-work-first-general-comment-

		granting Observer Status. PRI news piece, 19 November 2012 PRAWA website, 7 December 2012	article-30-african-charter-rights-and-welfare-child www.prawa.org/penal-reform-international-granted-observer-status-to-the-african-committee-on-the-rights-and-welfare-of-the-child/
136	37	Email correspondence with IPJJ, September 2012	
137	37	Application and budget to FCO Bilateral Programme for project 'Reducing violence against children in the juvenile justice system in Kyrgyzstan', May 2012	
138	37	Technical and price proposal to UNICEF Uzbekistan for providing institutional technical assistance for 'Development of Knowledge and Capacity of front line professionals to deliver Justice for Children in Uzbekistan in line with International Norms and Standards', May 2012	
139	37	Overview of PRI Partnership Strategy (Working draft)	Internal document
140	39	Background paper for the development of PRI's Approach to Value for Money (working draft)	Internal working document
141	39	PRI Financial Procedures and International Staff Handbook	
142	39	PRI Consultant Contract, eg Tomris Atabay Consultant Contract, 6 February 2013	
143	39	Background paper for the development of PRI's Approach to Value for Money (working draft)	Internal working document
144	39	<i>Progressive abolition of the death penalty and alternatives that respect international human rights standards: Final Evaluation</i> Background paper for the development of PRI's Approach to Value for Money (working draft)	External independent evaluation Internal draft document
145	39	Sharia Law Consultant Job Description and Advert Sharia Law consultant signed contract	www.penalreform.org/news/pri-currently-recruiting-consultant-research-and-draft-publication-sharia-law-and-death-penalty
146	39	Including Raoul Wallenberg Institute	
147	40	<i>Independent Progress Review of the PPA</i> , October 2012, Annabel Jackson Associates. <i>PPA Mid-Term Performance Assessment</i> , Coffey, November 2012.	
148	40	Contract with Rob Allen (commissioned expert), May 2012, May 2013 <i>The Use and Practice of Imprisonment: Current Trends and Future Challenges</i> , PRI, April 2013.	The Discussion paper was presented at the 22nd Session of UN Crime Commission, April 2013. The Paper and interventions by delegates will serve as a basis for continuing research conducted by Rob Allen and a full paper that PRI intends to publish for the Crime Congress in Qatar in 2015.
149	40	Overview of PRI Partnership Strategy (Working draft)	Internal document
150	40	EOLA contract and job description, March 2013 Evaluation and Organisational Learning Plan (2013-4) (EOL-Plan)	