



**Reducing Torture and Ill-Treatment through Strengthening  
Preventive Monitoring Mechanisms in Georgia and Armenia**

**Mid-term Evaluation**



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the  
Netherlands

June 2017

Jane Rice, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Officer, PRI



## Contents

Executive summary .....	5
Acronyms .....	8
1. Introduction .....	9
1.1 Background and context .....	9
1.1 Project description .....	10
2. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology.....	12
2.1 Purpose .....	12
2.2 Methodology.....	13
2.3 Data collection .....	13
3. Analysis of Findings.....	14
3.1 Outcome 1.....	14
3.2 Outcome 2.....	18
3.3 Outcome 3.....	20
3.4 Project Design and Management.....	21
4. Conclusion.....	22
5. Lessons learned and recommendations .....	22
References .....	26
Annexes.....	27
Annex 1: Summary information about Georgian and Armenian monitoring bodies .....	27
Annex 2: Proposed Theory of Change for remainder of project .....	29



## Executive summary

Penal Reform International's South Caucasus office has been implementing a project aimed at reducing torture and ill-treatment through strengthening preventive monitoring mechanisms in Georgia and Armenia since October 2016. The project is planned for 21 months and this evaluation has been conducted at the midpoint.

The project has three planned outcomes:

1. Strengthened legal and normative framework for monitoring places where people are deprived of liberty, including:
  - (i) Re-establishment of civil society monitoring boards in Georgia;
  - (ii) Amended legal provisions regulating the work of the National Preventative Mechanism (NPM) in Armenia;
  - (iii) Strengthened frameworks for monitoring of police detention units
  - (iv) Improved public and government support for torture prevention and independent monitoring
2. Increased capacity of oversight bodies to monitor places of detention effectively, including:
  - (i) Monitoring body members are better able to provide effective oversight of detention facilities and identify systematic problems in detention that lead to increased risk of torture
  - (ii) Enhanced post-monitoring follow-up
3. Improved highlighting of the issue of torture and monitoring as a form of prevention in the media and strengthened visibility of Armenian NPM and its work through public awareness campaigns

There has been progress in strengthening torture prevention mechanisms in both countries prior to this project. However, there are still gaps in each system including in the legal frameworks, level and scope of civil society involvement in monitoring, capacities of monitoring bodies and public and government awareness all of which this project aims to address.

### **Purpose and Methodology**

This mid-term evaluation will check and adapt the programme design for the remainder of the project and allow PRI to respond to stakeholder feedback and changes in the external political, economic and policy context of the project. The evaluation has four objectives:

1. To assess progress of the project against planned outcomes
2. To provide evidence on PRI's contribution to these changes;
3. To identify any necessary changes to the programme plan and monitoring framework for the second year; and
4. To identify lessons learnt and recommendations for the second year of the project.

The evaluation uses process tracing as its main methodology in order to understand whether outcomes were achieved, and to what extent these outcomes can be attributed to this project.

### **Findings**

#### *Outcome 1*

The project has been successful in the achievement of some sub-outcomes under outcome 1. The most successful outcome has been the passing in late 2016 of a new law on the Human Rights Defender in Armenia. This new law regulates the work of the NPM, setting out the duties and obligations of the Human Rights Defender (ombudsman) as NPM and permits representatives of the NPM to visit any state institution where persons are deprived of their liberty. The new law will also allow the NPM to cover the expenses of experts and will protect them from prosecution. The Armenian

partner in this project provided comments on a draft of the law and many of these were included in the law which was passed.

However, on effecting legislative and policy change to the areas of police monitoring in Georgia and permitting civil society monitoring in Georgia, it is unlikely that these will be achieved by the end of the project due to political intransigence. The Ministry of Corrections is satisfied with current levels of civil society involvement in detention monitoring and is not willing to allow more independence. For the remainder of the project, PRI should focus on raising awareness of the importance of civil society monitoring as complementary to the work of the NPM.

In Armenia, the current police monitoring board is structurally weak and its mandate is very narrow. Its internal problems are unlikely to be improved during the timeframe of this project nor is its mandate likely to be extended by the police. This project should continue to engage the police monitoring board to strengthen it and advocate the government for an extended mandate.

### *Outcome 2*

This is likely to be the outcome where the project will make most impact. A needs assessment conducted at the beginning of the project involving the four monitoring bodies identified a need for training on monitoring of psychiatric institutions and updating and drafting a new monitoring tool. This need was also identified in a recent report on Armenia by the Council of Europe's Committee for the Prevention of Torture and echoed in interviews for this evaluation. The project has been able to recruit international experts to conduct training and review the tools, both of which are highly appreciated by stakeholders and will result in quality tools and useful training.

### *Outcome 3*

So far five articles have been published on human rights news outlets. The articles cover draft amendments to the new prison code in Georgia, the most recent report by the Georgian Public Defender's Office and the issue of prison subcultures in Armenia's prisons. Although the articles fared well on the number of views, there is a risk that they are only being seen by readers who are already informed about these issues because they are readers of these rather niche human rights news outlets. Some informants in both countries believed that the public is suffering from information overload when it comes to stories about torture and ill-treatment and that there needs to be more creative and compelling ways of communicating these issues.

## **Conclusions and Main Recommendations**

The project is at the half-way point and in some areas, namely capacity building and updating and developing new monitoring tools, it is likely to make significant impact. The project has been very successful in identifying the gaps in skills and capacities of monitoring bodies and ensuring that the training activities will meet these gaps.

However, the original project proposal was overly optimistic about the likelihood of achieving legislative and policy change given current attitudes in the Georgian government and the Armenian police towards civil society monitoring. Furthermore, there are circumstances of the Armenian police monitoring board that PRI is unlikely to change within the scope of this project (its funding situation, members and scope of mandate).

There have been steps in Georgia towards increasing the involvement of civil society in the NPM and the Ministry of Corrections, and PRI may want to consider how to build on these and promote the benefits of civil society involvement to the government.

Based on the findings of the evaluation the following recommendations are made:

- A Theory of Change should be developed for the remainder of the project so that assumptions are made explicit and the logic of the design can be tested

- PRI should draw on its reputation as an international organisation with expertise in the field of criminal justice reform in the South Caucasus and use this position to advocate for the reforms and changes in the legal frameworks of Georgia and Armenia. PRI could consider establishing and leading a forum comprising national civil society organisations to achieve this
- The current activities planned for strengthening the police monitoring are inadequate due to the current circumstances and mandate of the police monitoring board. PRI should increase advocacy efforts to strengthen the board and adopt a more strategic and comprehensive approach together with the Armenian partner, CSI.
- There is a risk that the human rights-focused media outlets do not have enough reach and that the articles they produce may be read by those already familiar with these issues. More mainstream media outlets and journalists with access to these outlets should be sought out as partners doing media work for public awareness raising to reach as wide an audience as possible
- To properly measure the impact and effectiveness of media activities, PRI should assist its media partners to develop better media monitoring systems to ensure reader numbers, comments and feedback can be recorded
- When developing new proposals, staff members with knowledge of the context where the project will be implemented and, ideally, the staff who will be managing and overseeing the project should take the lead. This would help develop planned outcomes which are realistic and achievable given the political, economic, social and policy environment.

## Acronyms

<b>APT</b>	Association for the Prevention of Torture
<b>CoE</b>	Council of Europe
<b>CPT</b>	Council of Europe Committee for the Prevention of Torture
<b>CSI</b>	Civil Society Institute
<b>Dutch MFA</b>	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
<b>HRD</b>	Human Rights Defender - Armenia
<b>MoC</b>	Ministry of Corrections - Georgia
<b>MoJ</b>	Ministry of Justice - Armenia
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>NPM</b>	National Preventive Mechanism
<b>OPCAT</b>	Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture
<b>OSCE</b>	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
<b>PDO</b>	Public Defender's Office - Georgia
<b>PRI</b>	Penal Reform International
<b>RA</b>	Republic of Armenia
<b>SC</b>	South Caucasus
<b>TDI</b>	Temporary detention isolator
<b>ToC</b>	Theory of Change

## 1. Introduction

This report details the findings of a mid-term evaluation of the project “Torture Prevention in Georgia and Armenia” funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands which is being implemented from October 2016 to June 2018 by Penal Reform International’s South Caucasus office. The goal of the project is to *reduce torture and ill-treatment through strengthening preventive monitoring mechanisms in Georgia and Armenia*.

This evaluation has four objectives: 1. To assess progress of the project against planned outcomes 2. To provide evidence on PRI’s contribution to these changes; 3. To identify any necessary changes to the programme plan and monitoring framework for the second year; and 4. To identify lessons learnt and recommendations for the second year of the project.

This mid-term evaluation falls under PRI’s commitment to learning and sharing which is set out in the Learning and Sharing Strategy launched in 2016. The strategy aims to ensure that all of PRI works in synergy, is reflective, and uses and builds internal and external expertise. Learning is embedded at every stage of the project cycle to ensure that projects are evidence-based, which in turn, contribute to the pool of knowledge of effective methodologies for doing criminal justice reform.

Under this strategy, PRI aims to evaluate 90% of its projects and, where possible, the evaluation should be midterm to allow findings to influence the remainder of the project. Evaluation reports are also to be made available on PRI’s website <https://www.penalreform.org/about-us/impact-2/>.

### 1.1 Background and context

Permanent national independent monitoring and oversight bodies are essential for the prevention of torture. Because they are national bodies, they can conduct regular monitoring of closed institutions allowing them to witness trends in conditions, spot early warning signs, establish long-term and trusted relationships with the authorities and make context appropriate recommendations.<sup>1</sup>

Independent national monitoring of places where persons are deprived of their liberty is mandated by the Optional Protocol Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT states in Article 3 that each state party should establish “one or several visiting bodies for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” known as a national preventive mechanism (NPM).<sup>2</sup> Civil society needs to be involved in monitoring both in the establishment of NPMs and as watchdogs as well as monitors of closed institutions, among other roles.<sup>3</sup>

#### Georgia

In 2012 there was a political scandal resulting from the release of videos showing horrific abuse of prisoners by prison officers at Gldani prison. The release led to wide-scale public protests and the Saakashvili government losing the election which took place shortly after. Although international and national observers had been noting cases of torture and ill-treatment prior to 2012,<sup>4</sup> it was not until these videos were released that human rights groups and the public became aware of its extent and violence. The scandal led to the opening of prisons and places of detention to monitoring by civil

---

<sup>1</sup> National Preventive Mechanisms (NPMs) <http://www.apt.ch/en/national-preventive-mechanisms-npms/>

<sup>2</sup> Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/OPCAT.aspx>

<sup>3</sup> Civil Society and National Preventive Mechanisms under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, Association for the Prevention of Torture [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/57291/CivilSocietyNPM\\_En.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/57291/CivilSocietyNPM_En.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Open Society Georgia Foundation (2014) “Crime and Excessive Punishment: The Prevalence and Causes of Human Rights Abuse in Georgia’s Prisons” [https://www.osgf.ge/files/2015/Publication/Final\\_Report\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.osgf.ge/files/2015/Publication/Final_Report_ENG.pdf)

society for a brief time (mainly to placate civil society and the public). However, it was insufficiently regulated, disorganised and did not assist or complement the work of the Public Defender’s Office and so was ended shortly after it began.

Since then there have been small developments in opening prisons to civil society monitoring and extending involvement of civil society in the NPM in response to recommendations by national and international civil society, including by PRI.<sup>5</sup> However, these movements are largely seen by members of Georgian civil society as compromises and do not constitute proper civil society oversight.

## Armenia

The Armenian NPM has existed since 2008 and functions under the Human Rights Defender. In contrast to Georgia, Armenia does allow independent monitoring by civil society in the form of police and prison monitoring boards, which have existed since 2004 and 2006 respectively. These boards are composed of representatives of national human rights organisations with expertise and interest in the rights of prisoners and arrested persons.

The Council of Europe Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) has observed that ill-treatment continues to be prevalent in places of police detention in Armenia, concluding that “the phenomenon of ill-treatment by the police still remains widespread and that the risk of ill-treatment is particularly high vis-à-vis persons who do not immediately confess to an offence of which they are suspected or provide other information sought by the police”<sup>6</sup> and that the conditions for prisoners serving life sentences amount to inhuman or degrading treatment. In its most recent visit in 2015, it noted that, although not eradicated, there had been an improvement in allegations against police ill-treatment and that there had been an improvement in conditions for those serving life sentences.<sup>7</sup>

## 1.1 Project description

The project was devised to respond to a need to improve civil society oversight and build the capacity and standing of National Preventive Mechanisms and civil society monitoring groups in both countries. As noted above, although Georgia and Armenia have established monitoring bodies in various capacities, there are limitations in their composition, statutes and capacities which this project aims to address.

Table 1 provides a summary of the project as per the proposal.

*Table 1 Project summary*

<b>Project title</b>	Torture Prevention in Georgia and Armenia
<b>Timeframe</b>	October 2016 – June 2018
<b>Donor</b>	Dutch MFA
<b>Goal</b>	To reduce torture and ill-treatment through strengthening preventive monitoring mechanisms in Georgia and Armenia.
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthened legal and normative framework for monitoring places where people are deprived of liberty, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Re-establishment of civil society monitoring boards in Georgia;</li> <li>(ii) Amended legal provisions regulating the work of the National Preventative Mechanism (NPM) in Armenia;</li> <li>(iii) Strengthened frameworks for monitoring of police detention units</li> <li>(iv) Improved public and government support for torture prevention and independent monitoring</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

<sup>5</sup> Penal Reform International (2013) *National mechanisms for the prevention of torture in South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia* <https://cdn.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/south-caucasus-torture-v10-web.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.cpt.coe.int/documents/arm/2015-08-inf-eng.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://rm.coe.int/16806bf46e>

	<p>2. Increased capacity of oversight bodies to monitor places of detention effectively, including:</p> <p>(i) Monitoring body members are better able to provide effective oversight of detention facilities and identify systematic problems in detention that lead to increased risk of torture</p> <p>(ii) Enhanced post-monitoring follow-up</p> <p>3. Improved highlighting of the issue of torture and monitoring as a form of prevention in the media and strengthened visibility of Armenian NPM and its work through public awareness campaigns</p>
<b>Activities</b>	<p><b>Outcome 1</b></p> <p>1.1 Produce a baseline report on current monitoring of police units</p> <p>1.2 Annual roundtable/workshop events with high level stakeholders, monitoring bodies, civil society groups in each country</p> <p>1.3 Develop factsheets on country-specific policy issues</p> <p>1.4 Advocating legislative change in Parliament / participation in Parliamentary working groups / drafting inputs to legal and normative amendments</p> <p>1.5 Organising and participating at side events at regional and international fora including OSCE, COE and UN.</p> <p>1.6 Regional Conference to discuss work of NPMs, facilitate exchange of good practices and experiences in the region, report, raise awareness, produce recommendations for reform</p> <p><b>Outcome 2</b></p> <p>2.1 Assessment undertaken of training needs of institutional and civil society monitoring bodies. Need for new tools and updated methodologies will be identified in the assessment reports (gap assessment)</p> <p>2.2 Develop new monitoring tools and update existing monitoring methodologies</p> <p>2.3 Develop a monitoring handbook in local languages containing guidelines and tools for monitoring, based on collection of tools analysed and adapted to local contexts and challenges</p> <p>2.4 Delivery of 3-4-day training courses on preventive monitoring based on pilot undertaken in Georgia and Armenia using PRI/APT monitoring assessment toolkit and building knowledge of monitoring to understand and identify systemic problems that greatly increase torture in places of detention.</p> <p>2.5 Development and delivery of specialised training for monitoring bodies with focus on vulnerable groups and effective post-monitoring follow-up including writing monitoring reports</p> <p><b>Outcome 3</b></p> <p>3.1 PRI to facilitate expert input into the development of Armenia's NPM annual reports</p> <p>3.2 Media work, including writing articles and providing radio interviews</p> <p>3.3 Write torture prevention and independent monitoring news articles for PRI newsletter</p> <p>3.4 Social media work including Facebook, twitter</p>
<b>Budget</b>	€211,201
<b>Project partners</b>	Civil Society Institute (CSI), Armenia
<b>Main stakeholders</b>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <p>National Preventive Mechanism  Special Prevention Group  Consultative Council at the Ministry of Corrections Ministry of Corrections  Scientific-consultative Council</p> <p><b>Armenia</b></p> <p>National Preventive Mechanism  Council of Experts  Prison Monitoring Group  Police Monitoring Group  Anti-torture Interagency Coordination Council,  Criminal Justice Interagency Coordination Council,  Ministry of Justice  Penitentiary and Police Working Groups.</p>

## 2. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

### 2.1 Purpose

The primary purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to check and adapt the programme design for the remainder of the project. This will allow PRI to respond to stakeholder feedback and changes in the external political, economic and policy context of the project. Table 2 outlines the key evaluation questions this evaluation examines.

Table 2 Evaluation questions

Key Evaluation Question	Related Evaluation Question	Relevant data sources
<b>Objective 1: Assess progress of the project against planned outcomes</b>		
<b>Has the intervention made a difference?</b>	Were all activities implemented as planned?	Quarterly reports from CSI; reports from PRI SC office; Project application; logframe; project reports
	To what extent are the outcomes of the project on track to being achieved?	
	What causes are necessary or sufficient for the fulfilment of the outcomes?	
	Would these impacts have happened regardless of PRI's intervention?	
<b>Objective 2: Provide evidence on PRI's contribution to the changes</b>		
<b>How has the intervention made a difference?</b>	How and why have the impacts come about?	Project application and logical framework; project reports; project publications; interviews with stakeholders
	What factors resulted in the observed impacts?	
	Has the intervention resulted in any unintended impacts?	
	For whom has the intervention made a difference? (beneficiaries)	
<b>Objective 3: Identify any necessary changes to the programme plan and monitoring framework for the second year of the project</b>		
<b>What can PRI do differently to ensure the project's outcomes are achieved in the second year of the project?</b>	Did PRI implement the right activities in the right way?	Project application; logical framework; theory of change; Interviews with project stakeholders including partners and PRI staff.
	If you were planning the project again what would you do differently? If money, time resources were not limited, what would you do differently?	
	Have any changes to the context (political, changes with partners, with stakeholders, with staff) occurred which may affect the achievement of the outcomes by the end of the project's term?	
	Have MEL tools been used? Who has used these?	
<b>Objective 4: Identify lessons learnt and recommendations for the second year of the project</b>		
<b>Does anything need to be changed in the project design in order to achieve the planned outcomes?</b>	To what extent were the activities effective in reaching the desired outcome?	Interviews with stakeholders.
	To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the donor funding has ended?	

This report is for the project's manager, PRI's South Caucasus Regional Director, as well as other members of PRI's senior management. The recommendations presented should inform the remainder of the project. Other PRI offices and project managers will also be able to use the mid-term evaluation

as evidence for the effectiveness of interventions when planning similar projects on torture prevention and strengthening preventive monitoring mechanisms in other regions.

## 2.2 Methodology

This evaluation report draws on a methodology called process tracing which aims to overcome the challenges of evaluating advocacy projects aiming for policy change. The outcomes of these kinds of projects are not tangible or quantitative, thus an evaluation methodology needs to assess whether a change took place, the quality of that outcome, and who that outcome can be attributed to.

Process tracing involves the following steps:<sup>8</sup>

1. Assessing to what extent the outcomes have been achieved
2. Reconstructing the ToC backwards from the identified outcomes
3. Investigating and ruling out alternative explanations and causes for these achievements

## 2.3 Data collection

Data collection for this evaluation was carried out using the following methods:

1. Semi-structured interviews with PRI project staff, staff from CSI and representatives from the following organisations which comprise the main stakeholders in this project:

*Georgia:*

- Ministry of Corrections of Georgia
- Initiative for the Rehabilitation of Vulnerable Groups
- Liberali
- Human Rights Center (HRIDC)
- Open Society Georgia Foundation
- Department of Prevention and Monitoring, Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia

*Armenia:*

- Department for the Prevention of Torture and Ill-treatment, Human Rights Defender's Office of Armenia (National Preventive Mechanism)
- Organizational-Analytical and International Cooperation Division, Ministry of Justice Republic of Armenia
- Group of Public Monitors Implementing Supervision Over the Criminal-Executive Institutions and Bodies of the Ministry of Justice of RA
- Police Monitoring Board

2. Analysis of project planning documents
  - Project proposal and budget submitted to the Dutch MFA
  - Monitoring plan
  - Contract with Dutch MFA
  - MoU with CSI
  - Two Armenia visit reports
  - Plan of activities - Armenia

---

<sup>8</sup> Adapted from *Influencing policy change in Uganda: An impact evaluation of the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group's work* Stefano D'Errico, Barbara Befani, Francesca Booker and Alessandra Guiliani U-PCLG <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G04157.pdf>

- Monthly reports sent by CSI to PRI's SC office as well as monthly reports sent to PRI's executive director
3. Analysis of documents produced as part of the project's activities:
    - Needs assessment report covering both countries
  4. Analysis of external documents
    - CPT report Armenia
    - CPT report Georgia
    - Special Rapporteur's 2015 report on visit to Georgia
- (see references for full details of all public resources used)

### 3. Analysis of Findings

Based on analysis of monthly reports from PRI SC office and CSI, most outputs have been achieved according to schedule. However, the achievement of outcomes needs to be explored through interviews and further examination of the evidence. Bearing in mind that this is a mid-term evaluation and achievement of outcomes take longer, this report aims to examine the extent to which outcomes are on track and are likely to be achieved based on the project design, progress so far and political and social factors.

#### 3.1 Outcome 1

**Strengthened legal and normative framework for monitoring places where people are deprived of liberty, including:**

- (i) **Re-establishment of civil society monitoring boards in Georgia**
- (ii) **Amended legal provisions regulating the work of the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) Armenia**
- (iii) **Strengthened frameworks for monitoring police detention units**
- (iv) **Improved public and government support for torture prevention and independent monitoring**

##### (i) Re-establishment of civil society monitoring boards in Georgia

###### **Context**

The only current involvement of civil society in detention monitoring is in the form of two bodies: a Special Prevention Group and an advisory group, both of which are part of the NPM and a consultative board attached to the Ministry of Corrections.

The Special Prevention Group was created in 2015 and comprises experts such as doctors, psychologists, social workers and minority rights advocates. There are currently 36 members of this group. An advisory council was also created in 2015 made up of representatives of NGOs (PRI's SC Regional Director is a member), academics, mental health professionals, and lawyers. There are currently six members. The Special Prevention Group was set up so the Ombudsman would function in the style of an 'Ombudsman-plus' model,<sup>9</sup> however neither group is independent of the NPM and can only visit places of detention with permission or at the invitation of the NPM. In addition, the Special Prevention Group does not issue its own reports but instead reports to the Public Defender.

---

<sup>9</sup> The 'Ombudsman plus' model is one in which the Ombudsman is nominated as the NPM and is supported by NGOs.

The MoC Consultative Board was also created in 2015 by order of the Minister. It comprises 42 representatives from national and international NGOs and multilateral organisations who are mandated to meet every three months (although, in reality, meetings have been much less frequent than this). PRI's Regional Director in the South Caucasus is also a member of this board. The board was established as a mechanism through which to communicate successful reforms to the penitentiary system. According to informants the current minister, unlike the previous administration, is communicative with external stakeholders such as civil society and is keen to demonstrate this. However, the penitentiary department remains fairly closed. The board does not have a monitoring purpose, it only holds meetings. The ministry must plan and coordinate any visits to prisons in advance. The meetings do however provide an opportunity for civil society to raise issues directly with the Minister and other senior officials and decision makers.

Civil society stakeholders perceive both these groups as compromises to proper independent civil monitoring of places of detention and believe the current Georgian government distrusts civil society and its motivations for monitoring prisons. Some stated that ministers are afraid of NGOs having contact with criminal gangs in prisons. During an interview with a representative from the Ministry of Corrections it was made clear that a more independent model of civil society involvement was not on the agenda and, in fact the informant stated that there had been no recommendation in this regard.

#### **Activities under this outcome**

So far, there has not been much substantive work done towards the achievement of this outcome. The baseline report on current monitoring of police units has not yet been completed. The roundtable organised with Bristol University (see below for further details) appeared to be targeted at monitoring bodies rather than advocacy with the government to re-establish civil society monitoring boards in Georgia.

PRI, along with the Georgian Young Lawyers Association, was invited to provide comments on amendments to the prison code but this law is about prison conditions rather than public or civil society-led monitoring. However, commenting as a civil society organisation on prison law is related to monitoring and may have contributed to increasing awareness about the importance of civil society involvement in the criminal justice system.

#### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

Considering the informant from the Ministry of Corrections was not aware of any need or demand to increase the involvement and independence of civil society this suggests there is more to be done on raising awareness of the need for independent civil society monitoring boards.

Most informants, including PRI staff, agreed that it was highly unlikely that the project would achieve this outcome within the timeframe due to the current government's lack of political will and intransigence on the issue. One informant stated that it was unlikely that the government would accept an idea from an NGO about setting up another monitoring group. Many informants stated it was unrealistic and naïve to have included it as an outcome from the outset and agreed that this is not an outcome that can be achieved by PRI alone and that advocacy on this issue requires extensive engagement with a broad coalition of national and international actors. Informants recommended that PRI should lead this coalition, using its standing as an international NGO which is more respected and listened to than national NGOs.

#### **(ii) Amended legal provisions regulating the work of the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) Armenia**

##### **Context**

The new law on the Human Rights Defender was adopted in December 2016 and came into force on 1 March 2017. There are several articles which prescribe the statutory duties and obligations of the

HRD as NPM and the HRD as ombudsman separately. The constitutional law defines places of deprivation of liberty and the permissions of NPM representatives (that they can enter every single building, interview any person including staff and prisoners and look at any document they feel necessary). The new law allows the HRD to contract NPM experts and pay their expenses and it offers experts protections under the law, namely that they cannot be prosecuted for the information they gather without the written permission of the HRD.

#### **Activities under this outcome**

The project partner, CSI, provided comments on the amendments regarding selection of members to the NPM and these were adopted.

#### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

This outcome has been achieved, the comments provided by CSI were adopted into the law.

However, informants from CSI said they would have provided comments regardless of this project as one of their main activities is reviewing and commenting on draft legislation (where they have capacity and resources). PRI's SC office was not involved in the commenting process.

### **(iii) Strengthened frameworks for monitoring police detention units**

#### **Context**

There has been a police monitoring board in Armenia since 2006, formed by order No. A1-N of the Chief of Police of the Republic of Armenia in 2005 and regulated by the Head of Police of Armenia under Article 47 of the RA Law on Custody of Detainees and Arrested Persons adopted in 2002.<sup>10</sup> This law allows for a police monitoring board; however, it only permits the board to monitor police temporary detention isolators, not places of interrogation or other parts of the police station where arrested persons may be held. Many informants stated most suspected cases of torture and ill-treatment do not take place in detention isolators and questioned the effectiveness of the police board in being able to combat torture.

The board has been functioning in this capacity since 2006. Last year its main donor, the Open Society Foundation, ended its funding and this has had a significant impact on the board's capacity and ability to carry out monitoring visits. The board is supposed to carry out at least two visits to each temporary detention isolator every year, however last year they only carried out 10 planned and 9 unplanned monitoring visits to the 40 TDIs in Armenia.

These limitations, the statute and the funding, have had serious ramifications on its membership. The board only has seven members out of a potential for 21, as per the order and there are no leading or high-profile NGOs on the board. Many national NGOs see it as ineffective and lacking in reputation and do not want to join. This has the effect of creating a vicious circle: leading NGOs do not want to become members of the board because it is ineffective. But the board cannot become more effective unless it has competent and strong members from NGOs with political standing who can advocate and campaign for an extended mandate to monitor other parts of police interrogation and gain funding.

#### **Activities under this outcome**

So far, no activities have taken place to directly involve the police monitoring board and advocate for an extended mandate. As stated above, the baseline report on current monitoring of police units for Armenia had not been finalised at the time of the evaluation. The original proposal includes advocacy activities including advocating for legislative change in the parliament and drafting inputs to legal and normative amendments. However there is a lack of detail on what the specific objectives should be

---

<sup>10</sup> University of Minnesota Human Rights Library  
[http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/armenia/public\\_observers\\_police.html](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/armenia/public_observers_police.html)

under this and so far, there has not been a coordinated approach from PRI, CSI and other organisations.

Because of their current circumstances, the police monitoring board has not been very engaged in this project so far. One informant from CSI expressed doubts over whether this project should be providing training to the members of this board under this project at all and recommended the board be radically reformed and the members changed first.

### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

This outcome has not been achieved. A lack of activities in the project design aimed at achieving it as well as a recognition among PRI and CSI staff that the outcome was unrealistic from the beginning due to the current composition of the board and the lack of political will and interest in the current government and police to extend their mandate have impeded it. PRI staff did not dismiss efforts to work with the police board entirely and stated they are still keen to work towards improving it within this project, and acknowledged that it would be a huge achievement if they succeeded.

There needs to be a more comprehensive approach to achieve this which, as with the creation of civil society monitoring boards in Georgia, should include a broad coalition including international actors and donors advocating to the police for an extended mandate for the police monitoring board.

## **(iv) Improved public and government support for torture prevention and independent monitoring**

### **Context**

Georgia: as mentioned in the introduction, due to the torture scandal in 2012, the Georgian public are aware of torture and the need for proper oversight of places of detention. However, the government is inflexible on this matter (see outcome 1 (i) above). The informant from the MoC interviewed for this evaluation was unaware of the need for civil society monitoring and the project manager said that those further up the ministry hierarchy had refused to entertain the proposal. The ministry is satisfied with the current involvement of civil society through the consultative board and special prevention group at the NPM and consider this to be enough.

Amendments to prison code earlier this year. The amendments had three readings in parliament and then most were adopted (the most notable exception was the amendment to increase the living space for each prisoner to four square metres).

Armenia: Armenia already has independent monitoring boards but there is no support from the police for extending the mandate of the police monitoring board and allowing it access to other parts of police facilities.

According to informants, there is public awareness of torture and a need for proper oversight, however there is also a possibility that the public is becoming de-sensitised to this (see outcome 3 below which covers public awareness more thoroughly).

### **Activities under this outcome**

There are three activities for this outcome: production of a factsheet each for Georgia and Armenia on country-specific policy issues; organising and participating in side events at regional and international fora including OSCE, COE and UN; and a regional conference to discuss the work of NPMs, facilitate exchange of good practices and experiences in the region, raise awareness and produce recommendations for reform. None of these activities has taken place yet. The factsheets are in production, a workshop with CAT with involvement of the Georgian NPM on how Georgia has managed its prison overcrowding problem is planned for August 2017 and the regional conference will take place towards the end of the project.

### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

So far none of the planned activities have taken place under this outcome. It is the view of the evaluator that this should be the focus for the remainder of the project as sub-outcomes (i) and (iii) cannot be achieved until there is government support for independent civil society monitoring of detention facilities. PRI should lead a broad coalition of civil society organisations to advocate for reforms to monitoring and oversight of prisons.

### 3.2 Outcome 2

Increased capacity of oversight bodies to monitor places of detention effectively, including:

- (i) Monitoring body members are better able to provide effective oversight of detention facilities and identify systematic problems in detention that lead to increased risk of torture
- (ii) Enhanced post-monitoring follow-up

#### Context

NPMs have existed in Georgia and Armenia since 2009 and 2008 respectively. Although the Georgian NPM has the capacity and skills to carry out monitoring in line with its mandate, it lacks expertise and experience in monitoring the conditions of prisoners with mental health needs and other vulnerable groups. A 2013 report by PRI recommended that Armenia improve follow up of monitoring groups' reports and provide clear regulation of the NPM working methods and allow institutionalised cooperation with the monitoring groups.<sup>11</sup>

#### Activities under this outcome

So far in the project only one activity has been completed under this outcome, a workshop organised with Bristol University (although in the project design it comes under outcome 1, the evaluator noted from informants that it seemed to have a more capacity building element than advocacy or awareness raising with government stakeholders). The main activities, a training workshop and new and revised monitoring tools for NPMs and monitoring boards have yet to take place.

The workshop organised with Bristol University was held in February 2017. The aim was to review a new monitoring tool on conditions of detention for elderly prisoners, LGBTI prisoners, foreign nationals and prisoners with disabilities. Representatives from Georgian and Armenian NPMs and the Armenia prison monitoring group participated. Although heads of each NPM did not attend this workshop, they mentioned their staff were very positive about it and how useful it was for updating their own monitoring instruments for vulnerable prisoners and those from minority groups.

The focus of the training on monitoring psychiatric institutions and prisoners with mental health problems was not specified in the original proposal but the needs assessment conducted at the start of the project revealed the main skills gap to be in this area. During the evaluation, all informants from monitoring bodies were asked about their current skills and knowledge gaps and all echoed those outlined in the needs assessment conducted in January 2017. Fortunately, the project design is flexible enough to accommodate this adjustment and address these gaps.

Although the monitoring of psychiatric institutions does not strictly fit under PRI's mandate, there are prisoners with psychiatric disorders and specific mental health needs held in psychiatric institutions.

---

<sup>11</sup> Penal Reform International (2013) *National mechanisms for the prevention of torture in the South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia* <https://cdn.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/south-caucasus-torture-v10-web.pdf>

The training will include a module on prisoners and detainees with mental health needs who are held in regular prisons.

The first training workshop is planned for late July 2017 and will be for staff of the Georgian and Armenian NPMs. The workshop will be five to six days and will include theory as well as a visit to a psychiatric unit and time for updating the monitoring tool. A psychiatrist and former member of CPT who is familiar with the South Caucasus context will conduct the workshop. The participants will include eight persons from the staff and Special Prevention Group of the Georgian NPM, five members of staff from the Armenian NPM (this is the entire department) and two from the Armenian prison monitoring board and police monitoring board respectively.

Informants from Georgian and Armenian NPMs expressed interest in other methods of capacity building such as study visits to countries which have experienced similar challenges with their prison populations (for example in dealing with prison subcultures). As study visits can be costly both in human and financial resources, it is worth considering other innovative methods for delivering capacity building such as peer-to-peer learning and conferences where experiences can be shared between countries. As PRI has extensive experience on building the capacities of NPMs and civil society monitoring boards in countries across the world, it could also share its own lessons learned.

The other main activity under this outcome is the development of new monitoring tools and updating existing monitoring methodologies which will be compiled into a handbook in Georgian and Armenian. A police monitoring tool is to be updated by Mr Michael Kellett, a former police officer and a board member of APT. He will revise several questionnaires and statistical surveys used by the Georgian NPM, add missing components and create a single document. This may then be translated and adapted for use by the Armenian NPM. The monitoring tool for psychiatric institutions will be updated by Dr Vladimir Ortakov, a psychiatrist and former CPT expert and will be carried out in the framework of the training on monitoring psychiatric institutions. The original tool was created two years ago for Georgia but now requires updating and the addition of checklists.

### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

When asked about the potential impact of the training, nearly all informants from monitoring bodies stated it was the most necessary part of the project for them and would likely have the biggest impact as it would meet their most pressing capacity needs.

The revision of existing tools and development of new ones was also seen as a key need by project stakeholders especially in the areas of psychiatric institution monitoring and monitoring of police detention facilities in Armenia and would be of great benefit once they are produced and distributed.

One of the indicators for this outcome is the number of monitoring visits disaggregated by monitoring body type, country and type of facility. However, according to informants and the project manager all monitoring bodies, except the police monitoring board, are carrying out a sufficient number of visits (see Annex 1 for details of the number of visits each board conducted in 2016). Moreover, there are other factors which contribute to the number of visits a monitoring body can do, which are outwith the scope of this project.

Another of the indicators is number of recommendations from monitoring bodies that are actioned, disaggregated by monitoring body type; target country; type of detention. This is not an accurate measure of the increased capacity of oversight bodies to monitor places of detention effectively. There may be a high number of recommendations because the human rights situation has been poor or because the current government is more receptive to recommendations for improvement or because the monitoring bodies' recommendations are easy to adopt. Instead the indicator should look at the quality of the recommendations or the speed at which recommendations are made by monitoring bodies to the authorities after a visit.

### 3.3 Outcome 3

Improved highlighting of the issue of torture and monitoring as a form of prevention in the media and strengthened visibility of Armenian NPM and its work through public awareness campaigns

#### Context

Due to the torture scandal in 2012 in Georgia, according to some informants, public awareness about torture and ill-treatment in Georgian prisons is high. In Armenia, awareness is also high due to some well-publicised cases in recent years on ill-treatment of arrested protesters by the police.

#### Activities under this outcome

Five articles have been published on websites so far – four in Georgian media and one in Armenian media. The articles were published by Liberali and humanrights.ge in Georgia and by CSI in Armenia. Liberali is a human rights and justice focused media outlet with a monthly print magazine and a regularly updated website. Humanrights.ge is a Georgian human rights NGO which was founded 20 years ago. One article has been published so far by CSI in Armenia under this project, however it has been republished on two more websites thereby increasing the potential number of readers.

Table 3 Articles published under the project with total page views

Date	Title <sup>12</sup>	Link	No. of views
<b>Georgia</b>			
24 April 2017	What changes in the revised Code provides for imprisonment by Natia Gogolashvili	<a href="http://humanrights.ge/index.php?a=main&amp;pid=19187&amp;lang=geo">http://humanrights.ge/index.php?a=main&amp;pid=19187&amp;lang=geo</a>	558 <sup>13</sup>
1 May 2017	What Changes for Prisoners, Zurab Vardiashvili	<a href="http://liberali.ge/articles/view/29043/ra-itsvleba-patimrebistvis">http://liberali.ge/articles/view/29043/ra-itsvleba-patimrebistvis</a>	987
29 May 2017	MIA isolators – what describes the Ombudsman, Zurab Vardiashvili	<a href="http://liberali.ge/articles/view/29555/shsss-izolatorebi---ras-aghtsers-ombudsmeni">http://liberali.ge/articles/view/29555/shsss-izolatorebi---ras-aghtsers-ombudsmeni</a>	1,282
2 June 2017	Reintegration, ill-treatment, health care - What are the challenges facing the prison system? Natia Gogolashvili	<a href="http://humanrights.ge/index.php?a=main&amp;pid=19231&amp;lang=geo">http://humanrights.ge/index.php?a=main&amp;pid=19231&amp;lang=geo</a>	407
<b>Armenia</b>			
31 January 2017	Criminal subculture in prisons leads to violence, discrimination and ill-treatment	<a href="http://www.hra.am/hy/point-of-view/2017/01/31/torture">http://www.hra.am/hy/point-of-view/2017/01/31/torture</a> and reposted here: <a href="http://www.aravot.am/2017/01/31/851073">http://www.aravot.am/2017/01/31/851073</a> and referred to here: <a href="http://www.panarmenian.net/arm/news/231401">http://www.panarmenian.net/arm/news/231401</a>	395

<sup>12</sup> Translated from the original language with Google Translate

<sup>13</sup> Figures for this article and the other humanrights.ge article are page views to the website for the 2 days after the article was published

The topics were selected by the project's manager in collaboration with the journalists and drafts were reviewed by the project manager before being published. Journalists were also requested to put the name of the project and Penal Reform International at the end of each article.

The first two articles published in Georgia cover draft amendments to the Imprisonment Code and comments provided by NGOs. The second articles by both publications cover the recent report by the Georgian PDO which was released in April. The article published by CSI on their Human Rights in Armenia webpage is about the criminal subcultures in Armenia's prisons and the problems these create for prisoners. It mentions cases and problems raised by the prison monitoring group and CPT. Articles were also posted on PRI SC's Facebook page which has 733 followers.

All journalists stated they were interested in the issue of torture prevention and public monitoring and have been writing on these issues for a while, however the project gave them the opportunity to prioritise these issues.

The second activity under this outcome is to facilitate expert input into the development of Armenia's NPM annual reports. PRI approached the Armenian NPM at the end of 2016 with a proposal to involve an expert in the development of their report; however, the report was already being drafted. Instead PRI instead proposed that the expert review and provide comments on the published report. The NPM agreed, if the review would not be made public. The expert selected was Mr Walter Suntinger, a human rights consultant, trainer and university lecturer and an APT board member. This activity will also take place again in the second year of the project. Feedback from the head of the NPM was very positive on this activity "he gave us lots of comments based on other countries' experiences and was very familiar with the Armenia NPM and Armenian penitentiary system. His report was very targeted on the points and issues we raised as NPM."

### **Progress towards the planned outcome**

All articles attracted a fair number of views. However, some informants at the media partners stated that, although they are leading organisations in the field of human rights, their articles are likely to be read by persons already interested in these issues as they read these news outlets and follow them on social media. Furthermore, the articles published in Georgia were not reposted on any other website.

All informants believed that publishing news articles was an effective way of doing quick advocacy and awareness raising about an issue. However, they also mentioned the problem of information overload and that the public was becoming fatigued by stories about torture and ill-treatment and that they need more creative and compelling methods of attracting the public's attention and support.

Although the media outlets have been recording the number of readers of each article (or website hits to the website after posting articles as in the case of [humanrights.ge](http://humanrights.ge)), there has not been much monitoring of feedback or comments which limits examination of the impact of these articles.

The comments from the international expert on the Armenian NPM's annual report were very well received and will, in subsequent years, contribute to improved reports by the NPM. There is some doubt however about whether this activity will lead to strengthened visibility of the Armenian NPM and its work, as stated in the outcome, unless it is also combined with publicity.

## **3.4 Project Design and Management**

The project is being well managed by a competent and experienced project coordinator in PRI's SC office and a very committed and capable partner organisation in Armenia.

The project proposal was primarily put together by PRI staff in London with information provided by PRI's SC office and CSI (although they did not formally become a partner in the project until the contract with the Dutch MFA had been signed). Furthermore, the project manager was only hired after

the project started. Therefore, there was no substantive input or say from those working on the project and who have knowledge and expertise on the current situation and what might be feasible and achievable in a project. This can be seen in several unrealistic outcomes being included and insufficient activities planned to achieve these in the timeframe of the project.

Although the project has a monitoring plan, it has not been updated since the project was designed and is lacking in baseline and target figures for the indicators. Some of the original indicators are unrealistic or are insufficient measures of outcomes, as noted above in the discussion of outcome 1. Project staff should not be afraid to adapt and refine the monitoring plan at the start of the project to ensure that indicators are achievable (is the data easily collectable?) and relevant and reliable (do they actually measure what you need to measure?).

Most informants mentioned how much they appreciated the work of PRI and said it was very supportive of their organisation.

## 4. Conclusion

The goal of this project is *to reduce torture and ill-treatment through strengthening preventive monitoring mechanisms in Georgia and Armenia*. At mid-way through the project several activities have taken place and the project is likely to make significant impact in areas around capacity building and development of new tools. Nearly all those interviewed mentioned that this was the most needed and where most impact would be seen.

The original design of the project did not take the current political will of the governments of Georgia and Armenia sufficiently into account and therefore it is unlikely that several of the outcomes, especially the sub-outcomes under outcome 1, will be achieved by the project's conclusion. In recent years there have been steps towards increasing the involvement of civil society in the NPM and the Ministry of Corrections, these are viewed as insufficient and more steps need to be taken. However, there is no appetite in the current Georgian government to allow independent civil society monitoring boards. In Armenia, although there have been civil society monitoring boards for over ten years, the composition and mandate of the police monitoring board is very weak. The board can only enter and monitor TDIs but this is not where most incidents of torture and ill-treatment by the police occur. The board only has seven members, none from leading human rights NGOs and it has no funding sources. All of this has resulted in a weak board which has little standing or influence and cannot affect much change.

The project, as well as the work of PRI in general, is very much appreciated by all stakeholders. PRI is clearly well respected and highly valued in the region. With adjustments to the project for the second year, this project will be able to deliver significant impact.

## 5. Lessons learned and recommendations

### For the remainder of the project

**Lesson learned** The original project design included outcomes which are unlikely to be achieved during the lifetime of this project and by PRI alone. There was insufficient recognition of the assumptions and conditions required to make these changes come about.

**Recommendation** A ToC should be developed for the remainder of the project so that assumptions are made explicit and the logic of the design can be tested. The ToC should be

reviewed and revised regularly as the political and social context and assumptions change.

---

**Lesson learned** The PRI SC office has been implementing the Georgia parts of the project while most of the Armenia components are being managed by the partner CSI. While this in an effective way of dividing the project and it is important to use the knowledge and expertise of a local partner, stakeholders in Armenia would also benefit from PRI's expertise as an international organisation.

**Recommendation** PRI should engage more directly with the stakeholders in Armenia. Stakeholders in Armenia were very keen to learn from PRI's vast experience of strengthening public monitoring for torture prevention elsewhere.

---

**Lesson learned** Some stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation sometimes confused projects and wrongly attributed activities from other projects under this project leading potentially to wrong expectations and incoherence about what was to be achieved.

**Recommendation** Although some mix-up is to be expected when implementing multiple projects with the same stakeholders, project staff could make more effort to communicate and publicise the project and its objectives to stakeholders throughout implementation.

#### For outcome 1

**Lesson learned** Projects involving the authorities to reform laws on oversight require substantial and coordinated advocacy from a range of stakeholders including international and national NGOs and donors. International NGOs such as PRI are listened to by the governments of Georgia and Armenia and, according to representatives from national NGOs, international NGOs' voices carry more weight than theirs.

**Recommendation** PRI should use its standing as an international NGO with experience from many countries to take the lead and facilitate a renewed discussion between national civil society and the governments of Georgia and Armenia on the creation of public monitoring bodies in Georgia and expanding the mandate of the Armenia police monitoring board. PRI could consider establishing and leading civil society fora in each country to achieve this.

---

**Lesson learned** The police monitoring board in Armenia is weak in terms of members, mandate, and funding and has been unable to fulfil its duties in monitoring police TDIs. In the context of this, the objectives of this project which involve the police monitoring board are unrealistic and the activities planned are unlikely to improve the capacity of the board, raise its status or expand its mandate. However, the board should not be written off completely as their work is essential, furthermore there is still a keenness from the project implementers to work with them.

**Recommendation** PRI should increase their advocacy efforts on strengthening the police monitoring board and adopt a more strategic and comprehensive approach together with CSI

#### For outcome 2

**Lesson learned** All informants were very happy with the upcoming training on monitoring psychiatric institutions and the involvement of international experts as trainees.

However, the monitoring bodies, especially the NPMs, participate in numerous training workshops like these.

**Recommendation** PRI could explore more innovative methods for delivering capacity building, for example through study visits to other countries (and not just to post-soviet countries), peer-to-peer learning, online learning or conferences.

---

**Lesson learned** The training and monitoring tools update will likely be the most significant outcome of the project. It is therefore essential that these activities are properly monitored to measure the effectiveness and impact of this outcome.

**Recommendation** Monitoring should include pre- and post-tests to check what knowledge has been acquired by training participants and follow up questionnaires around six months after the training to check whether the skills and monitoring tools are being used. Analysis should also be done to check whether the improved skills and tools are having an impact on the quality of monitoring reports to psychiatric institutions and reports about the conditions of prisoners with mental health problems.

### For Outcome 3

**Lesson learned** According to CSI, the public and government in Armenia has grown complacent when it comes to hearing about human rights abuses. The government dismisses monitoring bodies' recommendations and the public are also losing interest in cases of torture and ill-treatment.

**Recommendation** PRI should consider more creative ways to build the communication capacities of monitoring groups so that they can conduct advocacy and communication with the government and public in more interesting and compelling ways which may bring about change and spark interest and engagement from the public.

---

**Lesson learned** Although the media partners selected have expertise and reputation in the human rights fields in Georgia and Armenia, they have limited reach to a wider and more mainstream audience. Although the articles written were good and covered important and pressing issues, there is a risk that they are "preaching to the converted" i.e. they are only being read by those already interested.

Furthermore, two informants in Georgia were not aware of the importance of civil monitoring boards, despite one of the objectives of the project being to establish these. This indicates that not enough is being done by PRI to raise awareness.

**Recommendation** More mainstream media outlets and journalists with access to these outlets should be sought out as partners doing media work for public awareness raising to reach as wide an audience as possible.

---

**Lesson learned** Each media outlet operates a different system for monitoring its output making it hard to measure the effectiveness of the articles written under this project. Furthermore, there no impact measurements for this outcome.

**Recommendation** To properly measure the effectiveness and impact of media activities, it is essential to have proper monitoring systems which can count reader numbers and record feedback.

### For future proposal development and implementation

**Lesson learned** Unrealistic or badly written outcomes which are not based on the current political and social context of the country hinder a project from being able to deliver reasonable impact.

**Recommendation** Project proposals including the project logic and desired goal and outcomes should be designed and drafted primarily by PRI's regional offices and, where possible, by the member of staff who will manage the project, rather than by staff in the London office.

Project managers should not be afraid of adjusting outcomes (where possible with the permission of the donor) once the project has started.

## References

Association for the Prevention of Torture (June 2008) "Civil Society and National Preventive Mechanisms under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture" [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/57291/CivilSocietyNPM\\_En.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/57291/CivilSocietyNPM_En.pdf)

CPT (2016) "Report to the Armenian Government on the visit to Armenia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 5 to 15 October 2015" <https://rm.coe.int/16806bf46f>

CPT (2015) "Report to the Georgian Government on the visit to Georgia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 1 to 11 December 2014" <https://rm.coe.int/16806961f8>

D'Errico, S., Befani B., Booker, F. and Alessandra Guiliani (2017) "Influencing policy change in Uganda: An impact evaluation of the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group's work" U-PCLG <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G04157.pdf>

Penal Reform International (2013) "National Mechanisms for the prevention of torture in the South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia" <https://cdn.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/south-caucasus-torture-v10-web.pdf>

OHCHR December 2015 "Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment on his mission to Georgia"

Open Society Georgia Foundation (2014) "Crime and Excessive Punishment: The Prevalence and Causes of Human Rights Abuse in Georgia's Prisons" [https://www.osgf.ge/files/2015/Publication/Final\\_Report\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.osgf.ge/files/2015/Publication/Final_Report_ENG.pdf)

Open Society Foundation Summary Of the 2011 Annual Report on the General Activities of the Group of Public Observers Monitoring the Places for Holding Arrested Persons in the Police of the Republic of Armenia <http://policemonitoring.org/DownloadFile/328eng-2011-zekuyc.pdf>

University of Minnesota Human Rights Library [http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/armenia/public\\_observers\\_police.html](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/armenia/public_observers_police.html)

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Summary information about Georgian and Armenian monitoring bodies

National Preventive Mechanism Georgia	
<b>Year Established</b>	2009
<b>Legal framework/charter</b>	OPCAT (ratified by Georgia in 2006); Office of the Public Defender of Georgia (PDO) created in line with Paris Principles by Organic Law No. 230 of 16 May 1996.
<b>Access</b>	All places of detention and where people are deprived of their liberty including penitentiary institutions, police detention isolators, children's homes, homes for the elderly, psychiatric institutions and places of detention prior to deportation.
<b>Members</b>	Advisory Council of the NPM, Special Prevention Group comprising 36 members including lawyers, doctors, mental health professionals, social workers and minorities' rights experts
<b>No. of visits conducted in 2016</b>	35 across ten penitentiary institutions (out of a total of 15 penitentiary institutions in Georgia), 58 visits to police stations and 27 visits to TDIs.
<b>Reports</b>	Annual, ad hoc emergency and general issue based reports which are non-urgent

National Preventive Mechanism Armenia	
<b>Year Established</b>	2008; involvement of civil society from 2010 in the form of a council of experts
<b>Legal framework/charter</b>	Article 6(1), Amendment to the Law on the Human Rights Defender's Office, (8 April 2008) recognises the Human Rights Defender as NPM  Resolution of the National Assembly ratifying the OPCAT  Article 83.1 of the Constitution established the Human Rights Defender
<b>Access</b>	All closed and semi-closed institutions in Armenia (prisons, police departments, military units, psychiatric hospitals, orphanages, special schools and state care homes) <sup>14</sup>
<b>Members</b>	NPM plus model – council of experts
<b>No. of visits conducted in 2016</b>	253 visits to a variety of closed institutions. Members of the Expert Council carried out 78 visits to prisons and police detention facilities.
<b>Reports</b>	Annual

<sup>14</sup> <https://cdn.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/south-caucasus-torture-v10-web.pdf>

**Group of Public Monitors Implementing Supervision Over the Criminal-Executive Institutions and Bodies of the Ministry of Justice of RA (Prison Monitoring Group)**

<b>Year Established</b>	2004
<b>Legal framework/charter</b>	Decree KH-66-N from November 18, 2005 by the RA Minister of Justice approves the charter of the group.
<b>Access</b>	Members can visit all prisons in Armenia and conduct meetings with detainees and staff. The board receives complaints about specific issues and investigates these and conducts monitoring of general prison conditions, healthcare facilities and disciplinary cells, cases of death and facility records. <sup>15</sup>
<b>Members</b>	10 out of a maximum of 21
<b>No. of visits conducted in 2016</b>	140 to all 11 penitentiary institutions
<b>Report</b>	Annual reports, ad-hoc urgent and current reports
<b>Government response</b>	Three days to respond to urgent reports

**Group of Public Observers Monitoring the Places for Holding Arrested Persons in The Police System of the Republic of Armenia (Police Monitoring Group)**

<b>Year Established</b>	2006
<b>Legal framework/charter</b>	2005 Order of the Head of Police No. 1-N. Article 47 of the Law of Republic of Armenia “On Custody of Detainees and Prisoners”
<b>Access</b>	Members of the board can visit Temporary Detention Isolators where arrested persons are held. Can meet with detainees and review their personal files.
<b>Members</b>	7 out of a maximum of 21
<b>No. of visits conducted in 2016</b>	19 (10 planned and 9 unplanned)
<b>Reports</b>	Annual and urgent reports

<sup>15</sup> <https://cdn.penalreform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/south-caucasus-torture-v10-web.pdf>

## Annex 2: Proposed Theory of Change for remainder of project

Figure 1 shows a suggested theory of change (ToC) for this project developed by the evaluator in collaboration with PRI SC's director and the project manager. The ToC takes account of changes to the project design which have occurred since the project and is a better reflection of the current planned outcomes than those stated in the original proposal. The ToC should be used, tested and adapted during the remainder of the project.

