

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE REDRESS
TRUST PROJECT:
REPARATION FOR TORTURE: GLOBAL
SHARING OF EXPERTISE -
EIDHR/2013/318-874

SUSIE ALEGRE

FINAL 03/01/2017

This report summarises the final evaluation of the project “Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Expertise” carried out by the REDRESS Trust along with four partners in target countries -Independent Medico-Legal Unit (IMLU - Kenya), Lawyers for Justice in Libya (LFJL), Advocacy Forum (AF - Nepal) and the Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos (CNDDH - Peru).

The project was global in scope with a focus on four target countries and the overall objective was “*to give effect to torture survivors’ rights and prevent future instances of torture.*” It sought to achieve that through a combination of casework, capacity building and advocacy activities.

The overall assessment of the project is that it has made a high quality, effective contribution in line with its stated objectives. In summary, the assessment found, according to the following principles:

- **Relevance**

The relevance of the project was assured by building on earlier work and existing networks. This meant the project incorporated lessons learned from earlier projects and allowed project partners to contribute at the design stage to make sure the needs and priorities of target countries were reflected from the outset.

- **Effectiveness**

The project delivered the planned outputs effectively despite the ambitious scope of the project. This is a testament to the ability of REDRESS and its partners to manage complex large scale projects to a high standard.

- **Impact**

It is often difficult to assess impact in human rights projects but the nature of this project and the way it has built on other projects did give signs of positive impact. There was evidence of the significant impact casework can have on the lives of vulnerable torture survivors and their families. Despite the slow progress of policy change, there were also signs of the project’s impact on developments that have the potential for widespread positive impact on the domestic and international landscapes for combating torture.

- **Efficiency**

The project was well run and there were no signs that the activities could have been carried out at less cost. A fast-track procedure in the European Commission for amending the strategy in Libya considering security concerns could have added to the efficient use of time and resources.

- **Sustainability**

The litigation and advocacy aspects of the project appear to be sustainable on the short term while other funding is sought. Rehabilitation aspects of the project are more difficult to sustain pending additional funding.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction.....	4
Background	6
Evaluation	8
Relevance	8
Casework.....	9
Capacity Building.....	10
Advocacy	10
Effectiveness	12
Casework.....	13
Capacity Building.....	14
Advocacy	14
Impact	15
Casework.....	15
Capacity Building.....	16
Advocacy	17
Efficiency	18
Security	18
Flexibility and Risk.....	19
Co-operation and complementarity	20
Sustainability	21
Conclusion	24

INTRODUCTION

This report is a summary of the final evaluation of the project “Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Expertise” EIDHR/2013/318-874, carried out by the REDRESS Trust and funded by the European Commission under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). The three-year project ended in December 2016 and the evaluation was carried out in December 2016.

The overall objective of the project was *“to give effect to torture survivors’ rights and prevent future instances of torture”*. Within that overarching objective, it had the following specific objectives:

1. Increase survivors’ opportunities to seek and obtain justice and reparation in target countries and worldwide
2. Increase survivors’ opportunities to access rehabilitation in target countries
3. Build capacity and increase knowledge sharing among lawyers/experts/organisations working on torture cases
4. Promote compliance with international anti-torture standards by state actors¹.

The project had a global reach but focused on four target countries through work with local partners:

- Kenya – Independent Medico-Legal Unit (IMLU)
- Libya – Lawyers for Justice in Libya (LFJL)
- Nepal – Advocacy Forum (AF)
- Peru – Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos (CNDDH)

As well as the main partners in the target countries, REDRESS cooperated with a range of civil society organisations in the target countries and beyond in the implementation of the project.

The expected results and outputs were:

1. Opportunities for torture victims in target countries to seek redress, reparation and rehabilitation increased
2. Opportunities for victims in non-target countries where torture is endemic to seek redress and reparation increased
3. Capacity of victims’ lawyers and civil society groups in target countries and worldwide to assist victims strengthened
4. Capacity of national actors to respond to torture complaints, assist victims and prevent torture enhanced
5. Steps taken towards the implementation of the Torture Convention and the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines domestically

They also planned to enhance the local management skills of partners and others through the project.

This evaluation was carried out by way of a desk review of relevant project documentation and documents from related earlier projects (provided by REDRESS and listed in Annexe 1) as well as interviews with stakeholders including REDRESS staff, target country project partners, other partner

¹ Project Narrative EIDHR/2013/318-874

organisations and beneficiaries of the project including lawyers and recipients of training. It was not possible to speak to any of the casework clients within the scope of the evaluation. The methodology is included in Annexe 3 and the evaluator's CV is included in Annexe 4.

Because of time constraints and the broad geographical range of the project there was no scope for a field visit as part of this evaluation. Aside from face to face interviews at the REDRESS offices, other interviews were carried out by skype, phone and written questions. In total 19 interviews were carried out. A list of interviewees is provided in Annexe 2 but reference to interviewees is anonymised throughout this report.

The evaluation assessed the project based on the following principles:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Impact
- Efficiency
- Sustainability

It is understood that a proposal for future EIDHR funding has already been submitted so this evaluation will not be able to feed into the first stage of that process but, where appropriate, recommendations have been included in this report which may be taken into account later on.

Despite near universal recognition of the absolute prohibition of torture, it remains a significant problem globally. As well as ongoing chronic problems of torture and ill-treatment in many countries, victims of torture in the past face challenges accessing justice and reparations.

REDRESS is an international NGO with headquarters in the UK and the Netherlands (REDRESS established a new Dutch Stichting in 2016) renowned for its specialist work on torture with a very practical focus. Its most recent annual report, describes its work as follows:

“REDRESS seeks justice and reparation for survivors of torture and related international crimes. It carries out litigation, research-based advocacy and capacity building, designed to strengthen the conditions necessary to end impunity for torture and afford survivors redress.

REDRESS prioritises the interests and perspectives of survivors in all aspects of its work. The highest priority in decisions and interventions is given to promoting survivors’ well-being and the avoidance of further traumatisation.

Collaborating with like-minded organisations is at the centre of REDRESS’ ethos. More can be achieved when forces are joined. Sharing of expertise within and between cultures and continents is a value that REDRESS seeks to promote as a goal in and of itself and as a means to maximise impact.”²

REDRESS’ stated mission is:

“To seek justice for survivors of torture; to combat impunity for governments and individuals who perpetrate it; and to develop and promote compliance with international standards

Casework: We provide direct legal assistance to individuals and communities that have suffered torture and related international crimes in securing their rights. We provide legal advice, litigation support and representation to survivors in all regions of the world.

Advocacy: We seek to positively influence policies, practices, laws and standards to enable justice and reparation for survivors.

Capacity Building: Working in partnership with like-minded organisations, REDRESS provides technical assistance and support to civil society organisations and networks as well as national authorities around the world to combat torture and help survivors.”³

The EIDHR project reflects that and includes activities across the three strands of REDRESS’ mission statement. This project builds on four earlier REDRESS projects funded through the EIDHR. The first, in 2001-2, was the Audit Project: A Survey of the Law and Practice of Reparation for Torture in 30 Countries Worldwide. The second, Improving Torture Survivors Access to Justice and Reparation, ran from 2003 – 2006 with target regions: Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Central and South America, Central and Eastern Europe, and the CIS. The third, Reparation for Torture Survivors, Implementing the Newly

² REDRESS Trust Ltd, Annual Report 2016 p.5

³ REDRESS Trust Ltd, Annual Report 2016 p.5

Adopted Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law, ran from 2006 – 2009, with target countries: Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Russia, and Uganda. And the most recent one, Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Experiences, ran from 2010-2013, with target countries: India, Peru, Sri Lanka, and Sudan. The activities over the past three years cannot be seen in isolation from previous work. This evaluation included a consideration of the external evaluations of predecessor projects⁴ to assess how this project fits in with the development of REDRESS' work funded by the EIDHR over the years and to understand the evolution of the project.

⁴ Conor Foley, Project Evaluation – Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Experiences, Final report for submission to the European Commission, October 2013; Ingrid Massage, Evaluation of the Redress trust project: Reparation for torture survivors, Final report for submission to the European Commission, February 2010; and Jayne Stoyles, Evaluation of Redress, Final report for submission to the European Commission, June 2006

EVALUATION

Overall the project was assessed as being an excellent, effective, and well run project which should make a significant contribution to global efforts to combat torture.

RELEVANCE

In considering the relevance of the project, I have looked at the way it was designed and the degree to which it addresses its specific objectives. I have also considered whether it was relevant to the needs of target groups and beneficiaries.

As this project builds on a substantive body of work to combat torture supported through earlier EIDHR funding, REDRESS has had the opportunity to hone its project design and its methodology to ensure continued relevance. For example, in relation to Peru, the project reported that:

“... Redress’ work holding training sessions in Peru under the 2006-2009 and the 2010-2013 EIDHR Grants has helped us to identify the needs of local lawyers and civil society groups as well as the best format for capacity building exercises. The lawyers and human rights defenders who attended the training sessions in the previous projects have reconnected with REDRESS and our partner in this year’s sessions thus creating further opportunities for collaboration in further case submissions, and in activities initiated by this new action.”⁵

The range of the project is ambitious with a global reach, four target countries and several activity streams designed to meet the objectives. But what stands out with this project, is the way it seems to fit seamlessly into the core of REDRESS’ work. REDRESS is renowned for its expertise in litigation for reparations in torture and the value of that aspect of the work was recognised by several interviewees⁶ as crucial to access to justice and reparations for torture survivors and as the key to changing the landscape to prevent future instances of torture.

The choice of focal countries and partners was based on several factors including the prevalence of torture in the country, the need for the kind of technical support REDRESS could provide and the identification of organisations where there was a “meeting of the minds” that would facilitate a proper reciprocal partnership⁷. All partners were involved in the design of the project from an early stage and had the opportunity to feed back their comments on the proposal. The inclusive approach to the project design meant that partners were satisfied that the project met their needs and objectives in a very practical way as well as the overall objectives identified by REDRESS in the proposal. Several partners and others involved in project activities commented on the fact that REDRESS was extremely good at building real partnerships based on equality between organisations⁸. Some interviewees also pointed out that REDRESS operated in a way that provided mutual support and added value in the anti-torture arena and that it was laudable for its ability to focus on issues rather than engaging in ‘turf wars’ as can sometimes happen where organisations are operating in a field where funding and

⁵ Year 1 Narrative report, p. 32

⁶ E.g. Interview 5/12/16

⁷ Interview 6/12/16

⁸ E.g. Interview 7/12/16

resources are scarce⁹. This approach has allowed the project to maximise its relevance both on a national and on an international level.

The degree of flexibility built into the project design was important to allow it to stay relevant in a changing global environment over the three-year period. Torture is a problem in all four focal countries. Torture by Kenya's security forces¹⁰ and police¹¹ is widespread. Libya's political and security crisis deepened over the course of the project - against a background of conflict, torture, ill-treatment of detainees by government and militias was rife¹². In Nepal, torture and other ill-treatment by police continued while impunity for past abuses during the conflict was challenged¹³. In Peru, torture continues to be a chronic problem while there remain significant challenges to getting reparations for past abuses¹⁴. The four countries face some challenges in common although their national contexts are different. The ability to network between partners was an important part of the design of the project allowing them to learn from each other's experiences of challenging torture at the domestic and international level¹⁵:

*"Collaboration between REDRESS and project partners and among project partners was enhanced through a number of meetings via teleconference, the creation of a virtual space for exchange of information and advice and the establishment of a blog dedicated to the activities realised in the context of the project."*¹⁶

It was clear that the objectives and outputs of the project were relevant to the circumstances of all the focal countries and, in some cases, the experiences of partners were of particular relevance to others¹⁷ so this aspect of the project added to its relevance for some partners.

CASEWORK

Casework is at the heart of the project and of REDRESS' work more generally. Support for litigation is a practical and concrete way of increasing survivors' opportunities to seek and obtain justice and reparations. The flexibility of the programme allowed REDRESS and its partners to make practical and strategic choices on casework to ensure relevance selecting new cases and continuing support on existing cases in target countries and worldwide.

The ability to continue support for cases REDRESS has been working on for many years is particularly relevant given the length of time a case can take to go through domestic or international proceedings. One of the cases supported through this project, the case of Mr Garcia Lucero related to torture arising out of the Pinochet regime in Chile. This was one of the first cases REDRESS took on in the early 1990's and was the first case of its kind to be litigated on the international level paving the way for other

⁹ E.g. Interview 12/12/16

¹⁰ <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/12/09/kenya-establish-commission-inquiry-violations-security-agencies>

¹¹ <https://www.ictj.org/news/kimani-murder-kenya-police-reform>

¹² <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2016/country-chapters/libya>

¹³ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/asia-and-the-pacific/nepal/report-nepal/>

¹⁴ <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2016/country-chapters/peru>

¹⁵ Interview 6/12/16

¹⁶ Year 2 interim narrative report, p. 1

¹⁷ E.g. Sharing of experience of regional litigation between IMLU and LFJL

survivors of torture under the Pinochet regime.¹⁸ This kind of sustained support shows a real commitment to and understanding of the practical implications of helping survivors to obtain justice and reparations.

In Libya, where national casework is effectively impossible at the moment, the ability to progress cases at the regional and international level ensured that, even in the extremely challenging circumstances of a country in conflict, the casework aspect of the project remained relevant. The project provided hope to survivors, their families and to lawyers and civil society activists by demonstrating that genuine practical action was still possible¹⁹.

Strategic litigation in Peru was used to highlight issues of discrimination against LGBTI people nationally and more broadly in the region. This fits with developments in the Inter-American system to address this systemic problem²⁰. This focus is a good example of the relevance of the selection of cases by REDRESS and its partners.

CAPACITY BUILDING

The capacity building activities for lawyers seem to have been welcomed and relevant to the needs of participants. Feedback from the events organised shows participants generally found the trainings to have been useful for their work and a common suggestion on feedback forms was for more training over a longer period²¹ indicating an appetite among beneficiaries for this type of support.

Capacity building for other stakeholders such as police, prosecutors, parliamentarians, and judges is also important for a holistic approach to improving access to justice and reparations as well as improving the policy framework and trying to prevent future incidences of torture. This kind of training helps to raise awareness of international and national standards and frameworks to combat torture with justice sector and law enforcement officials on the ground. Highlighting international standards and the implications of failure to respect those standards is highly relevant to torture prevention, access to justice and reparations. One example, noted in Kenya was that police officers were now much more aware of their personal criminal liability in cases of torture which is helping to change attitudes in the police²².

ADVOCACY

The project included elements of advocacy at the domestic, regional, and international level. REDRESS' high level of experience and knowledge in the field of access to justice and reparations for torture allowed it to identify targets and issues of particular relevance. The evaluation report of the previous project noted:

¹⁸ Interview 7/12/16

¹⁹ Interview 12/12/16

²⁰ Interview 7/12/16

²¹ Feedback forms from Training "International Jurisprudence on Torture and Other Ill Treatment 12-13 December 2014 – 5 participants suggested more time or continued training would be beneficial.

²² Interview 7/12/16

“The influence of the case-work and international research and networking built up over several years is also noticeable in the quality of REDRESS’s publications.... REDRESS can credibly claim to be helping to write the international jurisprudence in this area as well simply documenting it.

The relevance of the project is based on this particular combination of activities, which, as an earlier evaluation report has noted have put it ‘at the cutting edge’ of human rights litigation. As an EU monitoring report notes: ‘What renders the project approach unique is the combination of support to torture victims with the preparation of legal reform documents for the introduction of systemic changes in the jurisprudence of the target countries.’ REDRESS has obviously given considerable thought to developing this in a holistic manner, so that the different type of activities complement one another, which has ensured that the project remains highly relevant even as it has evolved in the light of changing circumstances.”²³

This trend has continued in the current project with the choice of publications reflecting REDRESS’ expertise and its very practical approach to the issues. This was evident in its choice of advocacy targets such as work on follow-up procedures at the UN Human Rights Committee and the publication of a handbook for journalists on covering torture²⁴. The choice of thematic publication “*Mass Refugee Influxes, Refoulement and the Prohibition on Torture*” and the timing of the release on the eve of a summit of world leaders meeting at the UN General Assembly to discuss the challenges relating to mass migration reflected a good understanding of the global context the project was operating in.

On the domestic level in target countries, advocacy strands of the project highlighted thematic areas of concern. For example, REDRESS and CNDDHH, produced an advocacy video²⁵ which raises awareness of the use of torture and ill-treatment in the context of social protest by law enforcement officials in Peru. This was done with the organization Witness, that trains and supports people using videos in their fight for human rights. This video was used as part of the advocacy strategy to raise awareness about torture committed during social protests in Peru.²⁶

At the international and regional level, REDRESS’ input seems to have been appreciated for its timeliness and high quality²⁷. REDRESS’ advocacy and support to the African Union Committee for the Prevention of Torture in Africa in the development of its first General Comment on the Right to Redress of Victims of Torture and Ill-Treatment in Africa is a good example of targeted advocacy that is particularly relevant to improving compliance with international standards in the region and fostering access to justice and reparations for victims in Africa. Another example at the international level was the focus on follow-up procedures at the UN Human Rights Committee – an issue that has huge practical implications for victims of torture.

²³ Foley, p. 15

²⁴ Available for download at <http://www.redress.org/home/home> (accessed 14/12/16)

²⁵

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/wbvphhj1v11lew4/Last%20edition%20Tortura%20052016%20720p.mov?oref=e&n=452790177>

²⁶ Year 3 Quarter 2 REDRESS update

²⁷ Interviews 8/12/16 and 9/12/16

EFFECTIVENESS

In assessing the effectiveness of the project, I considered whether it delivered on the intended outputs and results as well as whether or not the methodologies were appropriate.

Overall the project delivered the outputs it planned in a timely way to a high quality. Given the ambitious scope of the project and the unpredictable nature of core activities such as litigation alongside the variable political landscape both globally and in target countries, this should be recognised as a great achievement and a credit to REDRESS' ability to manage a complex and large scale project effectively.

To give a sense of the scale of the project, the Interim Narrative Report for Year 2 of the project summarises the range of activities undertaken in that year:

“During the second year of the Action, progress was made in all areas of the project and activities took place in all target countries, as well as in several other countries. Collaboration between REDRESS and project partners and among project partners was enhanced through a number of meetings via teleconference, the creation of a virtual space for exchange of information and advice and the establishment of a blog dedicated to the activities realised in the context of the project.

The following case submissions were made during the second year of the Action in target countries: Kenya - 1 filing before the Constitutional Division of the Kenyan High Court and 1 before the Chief Magistrates Court (2 submissions total); Libya - 1 communication to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (1 submission total); Nepal - 4 submissions to the UN Human Rights Committee, 1 to domestic court (5 submissions total); Peru - 2 submissions before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, 3 before national Prosecutors and Judges (5 submissions total).

For non-target countries, there have been the following case submissions: 8 communications to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, 1 letter to the UN and African Commission Special Procedure mandate holders, 1 communication to the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, 5 submissions before domestic courts (15 submissions in total).

Capacity building activities took place for all four target countries. REDRESS staff attended training sessions in regards to all of the four target countries.

Kenya: a training session with lawyers from IMLU's network took place from 23-25 June (Nyeri) and 3 workshops were organised with national actors from the Judiciary and Police on 18-21 March (Naivasha); 31 August - 4 September (Embu) and 11-14 November (Embu) respectively. Libya: workshop for Libyan lawyers and activists was co-organised by REDRESS and LFJL in Istanbul on 26-28 May 2015.

Nepal: a training session for lawyers was held on 12-13 December 2015 (Dhulikhel) as well as four regional meetings with stakeholders of the criminal justice system in October/November/December 2015.

Peru: 3 trainings for lawyers and civil society were held on 6-7 May (Lima), 27-28 August (Arequipa) and 29-30 October (Lima), and a workshop for national actors was held on 13-15 August (Huancaayo).

Advocacy activities were realised in all target countries and jointly by all the partners in the context of the Global Campaign against Torture.”²⁸

The only significant change in the planned activities was in relation to Libya where, due to the worsening security situation in the country from 2014, a revised strategy was developed to allow for effective implementation outside the country:

“In light of the increased security concerns in Libya, an adjustment of the activities under the project and, as a consequence, a revision of the original advocacy and litigation strategy had become warranted for the short to medium term. In particular, under the revised strategy which was adopted in October 2014 and reviewed and confirmed in June 2015, the work focuses more on the international aspects of litigation and on awareness raising components. This adjustment has not affected the overall strategy and plan of action in relation to Libya, and the activities still contribute to the achievement of the ultimate objectives of the project.”²⁹

As discussed below in the section on efficiency, aside from the impact of the process for approval of the change in strategy, it seems that the steps taken by REDRESS and LFJL to move activities outside the country and to focus on international litigation allowed the project to be realised effectively.

One of the aspects that several people at REDRESS³⁰ highlighted as particularly effective in the methodology of the project was the communication between partners and the opportunity for developing supportive networks. But while partners appreciated some aspects of this, in particular the final meeting in Nairobi, the feedback on the effectiveness of communication between partners overall was mixed. Some said they would have liked more opportunities to speak to each other³¹ while some felt that the communication between partners was of limited value because of differences in priorities and the pressures of other project work on partners’ time and resources.³² Regular communication is clearly an important part of creating an effective global network but different partners may have different needs and expectations and it can be difficult to tailor communication accordingly.

CASEWORK

The casework managed under the project included cases that REDRESS or partners had begun earlier and new cases in the focal countries and elsewhere. Overall, despite the scale of the task and the variables that make human rights litigation time-consuming and unpredictable, the casework aspect of the project appears to have been effective. There were some delays that were put down to difficulties communicating with lawyers in partner countries³³ but despite these problems, the casework seems to have progressed as well as could be expected.

²⁸ Year 2 Interim Narrative Report, p. 1

²⁹ Amended Strategy – Libya, Review February 2016

³⁰ E.g. Interviews 6/12/2016

³¹ E.g. Interviews 9/12/2016

³² E.g. Interview 12/12/16

³³ Interview 6/12/16

In terms of effectiveness, there was some concern that the requirement to hire external lawyers in Nepal instead of using AF's own internal lawyers had made litigation more difficult and time consuming in practice.³⁴ It may be helpful in the future to clarify early on the modalities for carrying out representation in litigation.

It was also noted by one partner that, while rehabilitation was an important part of the project, this is not an area where REDRESS has particular expertise and that it might have been useful to have additional support in that area.³⁵ If this is going to be a component in future projects, it may be helpful to consider working with additional international partner organisations with expertise in this area to provide further support to national partners.

CAPACITY BUILDING

The evaluation revealed stakeholders were happy that the capacity building activities were effective and of a high quality. The report on Year 2 is indicative of effective implementation:

“With regard to capacity building, during the reporting period an increased ability of local lawyers and national actors to deal with torture cases was reported. In particular, in Nepal positive feedback was received in the context of the regional trainings organised by AF and REDRESS in December 2015, and commitment to preventing torture expressed by range of stakeholders including police, prosecutors and judges. Positive judicial decisions at domestic level suggest improved understanding of issues involved in torture cases by judges. In Peru and Kenya, local lawyers have demonstrated to be using international standards in their domestic litigation, which will ultimately induce the national Judiciary to get familiar with and adjudicate claims made under international law. In Libya, where security concerns and political instability rendered the engagement with local courts impossible, local lawyers have acquired in-depth knowledge of international standards and have started to resort to international and regional human rights mechanisms (as attested by the individual communication made by LFJL and REDRESS in cooperation with Benghazi based lawyers to the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights). Finally, the Libyan Permanent Mission’s interest in training sessions in human rights report drafting is significant of an increased interest in engaging with the UN Bodies and engage in international scrutiny.”³⁶

This positive impression was borne out in later reporting and through feedback in interviews conducted as part of the evaluation.

ADVOCACY

The advocacy element of the project was supported by an effective and diverse communications strategy that maximised the reach of advocacy tools and the global campaign against torture. As an example of this, the following was reported in Year 2:

“All target countries – Global Campaign against Torture:

³⁴ Interview 9/12/16

³⁵ Interview 7/12/16

³⁶ Year 2 interim narrative report pp 20-21

In regards to our 26 June activities, our 13 infographics were seen by more than 26,000 people on Twitter, while our live webinar with former Special Rapporteur on Torture Nigel Rodley was watched by 360 people on YouTube. The video featuring clips from survivors, released as part of the “Working Together for a Torture Free World” has been seen by more than 200 people on YouTube. The 26 June Press Release was sent via mailing list by REDRESS and partners, reaching out more than 6,700 subscribers. The press release was also widely distributed via Facebook and Twitter (the organisations have more than 31,000 followers on Twitter and 41,000 on Facebook).³⁷

REDRESS is clearly very practical in the way it approaches effective implementation of its activities. One point that was raised in relation to outreach and advocacy was the importance of translation to make materials truly accessible for practitioners. To that end, the handbook for journalists covering torture is available translated into English, French, Arabic, Spanish and Nepali.

IMPACT

In assessing the impact of the project, I considered how far the activities had contributed to the change REDRESS is seeking. The assessment included evidence of impact built up over time from work feeding into the project and the potential for results beyond the project period.

It is often difficult to assess impact in human rights projects as impact is usually only apparent over the long term and there are many variables that can affect the immediate impact of a project that are outside the control of the implementers. This point was raised in previous evaluations of earlier REDRESS EIDHR funded projects³⁸. Human rights casework is at the heart of this project and of REDRESS’ work in general and there are no quick fixes through litigation on either the national or the international level. It can take many years or even decades for human rights litigation and advocacy for policy change to bear fruit so it is often not particularly useful to evaluate the impact of a human rights project within the strict boundaries of the three-year project cycle.

Having said that, throughout the course of the evaluation, it became clear that this project has produced some good examples of impact in several areas which reinforce the importance of sustained support for this type of work. The project builds on earlier projects with global reach and at least two of the partners (CNDDHH and AF³⁹) were involved in earlier EIDHR funded projects with REDRESS. This has meant that there are some clear signs of the direct impact of work of REDRESS and its partners funded through the EIDHR and continued under this project both at the national and the international level.

CASEWORK

In a very concrete way, there is evidence of the personal impact the project has had on victims of torture and their families who have been supported by REDRESS and partners through litigation and

³⁷ Year 2 evaluation pp 15-16

³⁸ Foley and Massag xxx

³⁹ AF as the lead partner in a separate project.

rehabilitation. One lawyer involved in litigation gave a moving account of the impact the project has had on his clients:

“Some of these people feel intimidated or feel they are too minor, or too poor and can’t stand up to the system. This gives them dignity and courage, tells them they are still human beings and deserve some basics. Otherwise, for most of them – with some of these incidents and offences committed against them- their life is cut short prematurely.”⁴⁰

In Peru, one case stands out for its impact during the project period both domestically and regionally but also highlights the fact that casework takes time and is unlikely to bear fruit within a single project funding cycle. The case of Luis Alberto Rojas Marin⁴¹, led to the first hearing⁴² before the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights where discrimination and torture were argued before the Inter-American system. It was argued he was arrested and arbitrarily detained and that torture happened because of his sexual orientation and in a context of discrimination because of sexual orientation. The initial petition in this case was filed on 15 April 2009 by REDRESS, CNDDHH and PROMSEX, under the EC-funded project DDH/2006/118-141 (2006-2009) and the litigation on this case continued under the subsequent EC-funded project EIDHR/2010/222-733 (2010-2013). At first the case was difficult to move forward but as the Organization of American States recognised systemic problems of discrimination based on sexual orientation in the region, a dedicated Unit was set up in 2011 which led to a Rapporteur on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex persons (LGBTI) being established in 2014⁴³ in the Commission. This meant it was keen to take the case forward as a precedent. Although there is not yet a report on the merits from the Commission (this is expected in mid-2017⁴⁴), the case has the potential to establish important jurisprudence and there is evidence that this case has already helped to put the issue on the political agenda both domestically in Peru and regionally in Latin America.⁴⁵ As well as national and regional interest, REDRESS’ communications strategy has succeeded in giving the case international media coverage highlighting the importance of the issues⁴⁶.

CAPACITY BUILDING

In some focal countries, there was also evidence of the positive impact on other stakeholders who have benefited from the capacity building and advocacy strands of the project although it was recognised that changes at the policy level will take a long time⁴⁷. For example, one interviewee noted that in Kenya:

“in interaction with law enforcement officers, we now see a change in most of them compared to the attitude they had before - they realise that if you commit acts that are illegal, you may be held personally liable. Before, they were completely protected by the system. Now even the AG is coming in and saying

⁴⁰ Interview 8/12/16

⁴¹ Interviews 9/12/16 and 7/12/16

⁴² Link to hearing: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_cfx0tE0ZI

⁴³ <http://www.oas.org/en/iachr/lgtbi/default.asp>

⁴⁴ Interview 7/12/16

⁴⁵ Interviews 9/12/16 and 7/12/16

⁴⁶ <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-peru-lgbt-idUSKBN13Q5WD>

⁴⁷ Interview 8/12/16

officers need to personally take liability for it. Officers are more receptive and more alive to the legal mechanisms in existence currently. Before, where it was an attitude of ‘what are you going to do about it?’”⁴⁸

The situation in Libya has made it very difficult to assess impact on the ground and the way the project was originally planned had to be changed significantly⁴⁹. But in a situation where action on human rights and combating torture is extremely difficult and dangerous, there was evidence that the training and capacity building provided by this project gave hope to lawyers and others working on these issues in Libya. One interviewee⁵⁰ noted that the workshops for lawyers were very emotionally charged and that, for many of the attendees, this was the first time they had heard about practical strategies for bringing cases at the international level. In a context where human rights defenders put themselves and their families at significant risk to pursue their work, it was pointed out that this kind of action gave them concrete hope and a reason to carry on with their important work. Without this kind of support and encouragement, there is a real risk that when opportunities open up for transitional justice in Libya, there would be no-one left to work on these issues in Libya. Impact in this challenging context could be considered through the number of lawyers and others working on combating torture who continue to work in this field although the full impact of their work will only be measurable in years to come.

ADVOCACY

It is often difficult to ascribe impact to individual advocacy activities in the human rights field. Policy change is often slow and may come about through a variety of push factors and influences. But there are signs that the advocacy component of this project has influenced change which could have a significant impact in both target countries and more broadly on the international level.

In the target countries, there have been developments which, if they come to fruition, are likely to have a wide impact.

For example, the Year 2 Interim Report highlights developments in Kenya:

“In March 2015, the Attorney General (AG)’s office informed IMLU that the office prepared a memorandum on the Anti-Torture Bill to be submitted to cabinet by end of March 2015. This came as a result of IMLU and REDRESS submitting, in January 2015, comments on the draft anti-torture bill and a memorandum on the need for such a bill to the AG for presentation to cabinet.

On 26 June the Attorney General publicly announced Anti-Torture Bill is pending before Cabinet for approval and made positive statement about possibility of the Bill being approved by the end of 2015.”⁵¹

And there were notable advocacy successes in Peru and Nepal:

“the establishment in Peru of a National Mechanism for the Prevention of Torture. This is the result of prolonged efforts which started under the previous projects and were particularly stressed during the

⁴⁸ Interview 8/12/16

⁴⁹ REPARATION FOR TORTURE: Global Sharing of Expertise, Amended Strategy – Libya, October 2014 reviewed June 2015 and February 2016

⁵⁰ Interview 12/12/16

⁵¹ Year 2 Interim Narrative Report, p. 19

first and the second year of this Action. Advocacy will continue around the need to provide adequate resources to the Office of the Ombudsman to carry out the additional roles of the Mechanism. With regard to Nepal, the fact that the Torture Bill was forwarded to the Nepalese Parliament for discussion constitutes progress towards the promotion of compliance with anti-torture international standards by state actors and it is hoped that the Bill will be finally approved during the course of the last year of the Action.”⁵²

In relation to Libya, although activity was restricted to the international arena because of the conflict in the country, successes were also noted:

“A number of recommendations put forward by LFJL, DIGNITY and REDRESS in their Stakeholder Report to the UNHRC Universal Periodic Review (03.10.14 – Year 1 activity) was reflected in the Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Libya (A/HRC/30/16) published on 22 July 2015. Among the most relevant recommendations is the need to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, the need to prohibit the practice of torture, ensure accountability for perpetrators and ensure that victims obtain redress in accordance with Libya’s international obligations under the Convention against Torture.”⁵³

REDRESS has been a driving force behind the development of the General Comment on the Right to Redress of Victims of Torture and Ill-Treatment in Africa. One interviewee said that the General Comment, expected to be finalised in 2017, would not have got so far without the support provided by REDRESS. It was noted that

“...we work with REDRESS more than any other organisation as they are a most reliable partner – we have a very good relationship with them. Whatever we work with, you can be certain you receive a timely response, good quality of work and one of our most reliable partners to work with.”⁵⁴

Advocacy work carried out under this project has clearly influenced policy developments at the national level in target countries and at the international level though the full potential impact is impossible to quantify at this stage.

EFFICIENCY

The assessment of efficiency considered the allocation of financial and human resources and the cost effectiveness of the project.

There has not been scope to carry out a full assessment of the value for money provided by the project as part of this evaluation, but the evidence indicates a well-run and financially prudent project and there is no suggestion that the project activities could have been carried out at a lower cost. A couple of areas do, however, merit some consideration for their potential impact on efficiency.

SECURITY

⁵² Ibid, p. 21

⁵³ Ibid, p. 18

⁵⁴ Interview 8/12/16

Previous evaluations have stressed the need for security strategies to be costed into project planning to address the very real risks that human rights defenders including lawyers and their clients run in pursuing litigation of this kind:

“The type of litigation that REDRESS has long pursued is, in itself, often a dangerous activity as lawyers are targeted for such work in many countries. REDRESS’s chosen project partners also have experience of working in such situations and know the risks involved. However, the decision to pursue this strategy in ‘post-conflict’ or ‘transitional’ countries, such as Sri Lanka and Sudan, carries with it additional risks that may require taking some hard decisions in the future. At the very least the physical costs of security should be explicitly factored into discussions about which cases to take, which partners to work with and which countries to work in during future strategic discussions. Humanitarian organizations with long experience of working in conflict and post-conflict zones have been increasingly forced to address physical security issues because of the number of their staff that have been killed, injured, kidnapped or otherwise traumatised in recent years. Systems and structures have been developed such as counselling services, security de-briefings and threat assessments that are now mainstreamed into their working practices, but all of which have cost-implications for the organizations concerned.”⁵⁵

That evaluation was done after the project proposal for this project was designed so there was no opportunity to incorporate recommendations into the project design⁵⁶. But that report highlighted several steps REDRESS had already taken to address security concerns and a recent security audit was mentioned in the project narrative for this project as a mitigation strategy for security risks. Despite recent events highlighting the very serious risks to victims and lawyers working on this kind of litigation in target countries such as Kenya⁵⁷ those interviewed at REDRESS, in partners and other stakeholders in target countries were satisfied that the security arrangements under the project were adequate for their needs.

FLEXIBILITY AND RISK

While most of the project went ahead as planned, as mentioned above, the worsening political and security situation in Libya meant a revised strategy was required for Libya. The operating principles set out in the EIDHR Multi-Annual Indicative Programme 2014-2017 (MIP) include reference to both flexibility and risk:

“The EIDHR is flexible, reactive and tailor-made. While limited in financial scope, its flexible tools are essential. These include direct support to human rights defenders at risk, ad-hoc grants in most difficult situations, re-granting, eligibility for non-registered CSOs and natural persons.

⁵⁵ Foley, p.20

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-36682639>

...The EIDHR entails risks. The targeted difficult environments in which the instrument operates create physical and political constraints. These introduce serious challenges in implementing and monitoring projects, which are often managed by beneficiaries under pressure who lack resources.”⁵⁸

Although ultimately the European Commission accepted the new strategic plan, there were mixed views⁵⁹ about the flexibility of the Commission in the face of difficult external circumstances.

The review in February 2016 found that:

“The 2014 Amended Strategy has proven to be an appropriate response to the persistent and ongoing political crisis and the ongoing security situation in Libya which has made it more difficult for partners to work on all facets of the project in-country, and thus has required creativity to progress work in the most sensible way.”⁶⁰

The deteriorating security situation in Libya was well documented in mainstream international media⁶¹ making it practically impossible to carry out activities safely in the country. Even the EU Delegation to Libya was relocated to Tunis because of conflict in the country in 2014 and has not yet been able to move back⁶². Considering this clear change of circumstances outside the implementers’ control, a fast-track procedure for approval of the necessary amendments could have allowed the project activities to move forward more quickly and might have saved on the time and human resources required to get approval for a change of strategy. LFJL is a good example of a small beneficiary working in a difficult environment under pressure with restricted resources - the type of organisation the EIDHR is designed to support. An overly heavy procedure for explaining necessary changes in strategy and resource allocation can put a serious strain on the resources of an organisation like this. A simplified procedure for dealing with these circumstances at the Commission level would improve the efficient use of time and human resources by beneficiaries operating in challenging circumstances.

CO-OPERATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY

Several interviewees highlighted the complementarity of REDRESS’ work both in supporting partners and in engaging on the international level in advocacy and policy work. REDRESS is a specialised organisation and has an excellent reputation for the quality of its work⁶³. The ability of its staff to produce high quality outputs with limited resources has been commented on in earlier evaluations of its projects⁶⁴. What is clear from the responses of stakeholders is that the approach REDRESS takes to deploying its expertise is efficient and targeted with time and effort spent assisting partners in important capacity building activities and engaging with others to avoid duplication of efforts.

An example of the way REDRESS used its resources efficiently to maximise the potential impact of the project is the technical support provided to AF on financial management where needs were identified.

⁵⁸ http://www.eeas.europa.eu/human_rights/docs/eidhr-mip-2014-2017_en.pdf

⁵⁹ Interviews 6/12/16, 12/12/16 and 13/12/16

⁶⁰ Amended Strategy – Libya, Review February 2016

⁶¹ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13755445>

⁶² https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/libya/1447/libya-and-eu_en

⁶³ Ref Message and Foley XXXX

⁶⁴ Ref Message and Foley XXXX

The REDRESS Finance Director visited Nepal in the first year of the project to provide support to AF and to engage with staff there to help facilitate the heightened reporting requirements that would be needed throughout the project.⁶⁵ This intervention helped to foster relationships between REDRESS and AF to avoid difficulties later on in the project. Despite the high level of reporting required, it seems this approach paid off and there were no difficulties reported in the first two years' audit reports⁶⁶.

In a difficult climate for human rights NGOs with limited resources spread thin, it is particularly admirable that REDRESS seems to be very much focused on practical results for beneficiaries and sustainability rather than being driven by a narrow project narrative.

SUSTAINABILITY

In assessing sustainability, I have considered whether or not the activities under the project will be sustained after the project cycle. I have also considered whether or not results may be achieved without REDRESS' continued support.

This project is the latest in a series of EIDHR funded projects implemented by REDRESS. Over time, the way REDRESS has designed its proposals for funding has developed from an initial approach that focused on research to an approach that puts casework at the heart of the project. The final evaluation for the previous project pointed out that:

"Sustainability is also often a particularly problematic criterion by which to assess human rights litigation projects because of the length of time, high cost and few direct beneficiaries that are often associated with such cases. This can sometimes lead to project proposals underestimating the costs associated with litigation or emphasizing other activities, such as training, networking or awareness-raising, which are cheaper and quicker to organize and easier to evaluate using standard evaluation criteria. In the case of this particular project, however, one reason for sanguinity about its sustainability is because the project appears to have grown organically through REDRESS's international case-work and contacts. There is every reason to believe that the main elements of this project could continue even without funding under the EIDHR or support from REDRESS."⁶⁷

This optimism about sustainability was largely borne out by the interviews conducted under this evaluation with some caveats.

The EIDHR has been a key source of funding for REDRESS over the past decade and funding for this project made up around one third of REDRESS' overall budget⁶⁸. It has clearly been an important factor in REDRESS' ability to continue to do the important work it does on the scale it has. REDRESS has applied for funding under the new EIDHR call, if their application is successful, this will clearly be a major boost for the sustainability of the work they have undertaken within this project. As EU funding has been so important to REDRESS and its growth as an organisation in recent years, its continued ability to apply for and secure EU funding in the future is a significant issue for the organisation. Following the UK referendum in June 2016, there is a large degree of insecurity for UK

⁶⁵ Interview 13/12/16

⁶⁶ Audit Reports XXXX

⁶⁷ Foley, p. 30

⁶⁸ Interview 6/12/16

based NGOs, both in terms of their ability to retain staff from EU countries and their eligibility for EU funding and involvement in EU networks and projects. It is a sign of REDRESS' commitment to sustainability that it has established a new independent Stichting in the Hague as well as its existing office in London to ensure its continued viability.

CASEWORK

Litigation is a core part of REDRESS' work and that of its partners there is a clear commitment to continue to support existing cases with or without additional funding. It was noted that REDRESS has funds for litigation which would be enough to tide it over although clearly it would need to find new sources of funding on the long term to sustain its work.⁶⁹ On the short term the casework will also be sustained through the personal commitment of lawyers working for REDRESS and the partner organisations, several of whom have indicated they would be willing to work on a *pro bono* basis to ensure continuity of support for existing cases. While this is a laudable sign of the professional and personal dedication to the objectives of the project, there are limits to the sustainability and effectiveness of *pro bono* legal support for cases that require significant input in terms of time and expertise over many years.

The one area where several interviewees did raise serious concerns about sustainability was the provision of medical and psychological support for rehabilitation.⁷⁰ This is clearly a sensitive issue and one that does not fit easily within a three-year project cycle. Finding the funds to maintain this kind of support after the project will be an important challenge.

CAPACITY BUILDING

The capacity building side of the project supports the overall sustainability in that it has helped to develop the skills of a network of lawyers and other professionals expanding the numbers of people available and able to carry out effective work to combat torture in the target countries. For example, an interviewee in Kenya explained that:

“Trainings will be taken forward as new lawyers trained are now part of a national network of lawyers against torture. Judiciary, police and prisons remain key to our activities going forward – we have changed some of them into champions against torture. Our work on building a movement against torture including professionals who work on a pro bono basis now provides service to victims wherever they are across the country.”⁷¹

⁶⁹ Interview 6/12/16

⁷⁰ Interviews 7/12/16, 8/12/16, 9/12/16

⁷¹ Interview 7/12/16

The publications produced within the project, including the handbook for journalists covering torture *“Reporting on Torture”*⁷² and the manuals for practitioners litigating torture in East Africa and in the Middle East and North Africa⁷³ provide a resource for others to take forward the objectives of the project whether in partnership with REDRESS or not. Similarly, the development of websites, webinars and accessible databases⁷⁴ over the project will continue to be of use to practitioners globally beyond the scope of the project.

⁷² <http://www.redress.org/home/home> downloadable from here - site accessed 14/12/16

⁷³ <http://www.redress.org/reports/reports> Both downloadable from here – site accessed 14/12/16

⁷⁴ E.g. database of HRC decisions relevant to Nepal in English and Nepali: www.realrightsnow.org

CONCLUSION

The project Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Expertise has built on previous projects effectively and delivered high quality activities efficiently. The strong casework component is an important part of the project but one that doesn't fit easily into short project cycles and the results of which are often difficult to measure quantitatively. Casework is often subject to delays in procedures that are outside the control of REDRESS and its partners but this kind of work has real impact for individual survivors of torture as well as creating genuine change in terms of torture prevention and a shift of attitudes in states. During this project cycle, the efforts from earlier work have begun to bear fruit clearly demonstrating that this is crucial and valuable work and absolutely the kind of work that the EIDHR should support.

The capacity building elements of the project have helped to foster networks of professionals to support respect for and implementation of international frameworks for torture prevention. The broad network of trusted partners that REDRESS has built up over previous projects and the connections developed under this project are invaluable to the sustainability of the work.

Policy changes do not happen overnight and it is difficult to identify the impact of a particular advocacy strategy on policy developments. But the expertise and experience of REDRESS and its partners in this project is clearly recognised and valued by national and international stakeholders. This gives the advocacy aspects of the project added weight to influence policy makers and there are signs that this project has helped to move policy in the right direction in some of the target countries and on the international level.

Susie Alegre

DRAFT 15/12/16

List of Documents Received

PROJECT PLANNING

EIDHR/2013/318-874:

Annexe I - Project Narrative

Annexe II - General Conditions

Annexe III - Budget

Year 1 and Year 2 Narrative Reports and Year 3 Quarterly Reports

Strategy documents for the four target countries (and amended strategy and reviews for Libya)

Logframes for Year 1, 2 and 3 which report on activities, outputs and outcomes of the project and have been used as tools to monitor the project's implementation and impact

Year 1 and Year 2 Audit Reports

Year 3 Kick Off Meeting Notes

Feedback forms related to capacity building activities including the Sensitization of the National Council on the Administration of Justice – Technical Committee, on issues of torture on 18th-21st March 2015, organised by IMLU and REDRESS in Kenya.

CASEWORK RELATED

The judgment (in Spanish) delivered on 13 April 2015 by the Sala Penal Nacional of Lima in the case of Victor Collazos Galarza

The decision on the admissibility of the case of Luis Alberto Rojas Marín delivered by the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights on 6 November 2014.

PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

Conor Foley, Redress Evaluation, Reparation for Torture: Global Sharing of Experiences, 2013.

Thordis Ingadottir, Redress Evaluation, Strengthening victims' participation in the international criminal court, 18 August 2009

Ingrid Massage, Evaluation of the Redress trust project: Reparation for torture survivors, Final report for submission to the European Commission, February 2010

Jayne Stoyles, Evaluation of Redress, Final report for submission to the European Commission, June 2006

PUBLICATIONS FUNDED UNDER THE PROJECT

Mass Refugee Influxes, Refoulement and the Prohibition Against Torture (September 2016)

Reporting on Torture: A Handbook for Journalists covering Torture (

http://www.redress.org/downloads/publications/Reporting_on_Torture_English.pdf

Litigating Torture and Ill-Treatment in the Middle East and North Africa – A Manual for Practitioners (November 2016)

Litigating Torture and Ill-Treatment in East Africa – A Manual for Practitioners (November 2016)

OTHER REDRESS DOCUMENTS

REDRESS Trust: 2016 Annual Report

List of Interviewees

Name	Organisation	Role
Carla Ferstmann	REDRESS	Director
Beini Ye	REDRESS	Post Conflict Legal Adviser
Juergen Schurr	REDRESS	Head of Law and Policy
Gaia Pergolo	REDRESS	Project Coordinator
Eva Sanchis	REDRESS	Communications Officer
Clara Sandoval	REDRESS	Consultant
Michelle Willis	REDRESS	Head of Finance
Partners		
Peter Kiama	IMLU	Director
Kamal Pathak	AF	Former Legal Officer
Om Prakesh	AF	Director
Victor Alvarez	CNDDHH	Director
Thomas Ebbs	LFJL	Director
Others		
Mossaad	ACJPS	Director
Anne Lardy	APT	
Albab Tesfaye	African Commission CPTA	
Yasmine Hadjoudj	UN Human Rights Committee	Legal Officer
Patrick Mutzenberg	CCPR	Director
Joseph Ngigi	Kenyan Bar	Lawyer
Dan Gichuru	Kenyan Bar	Lawyer

REDRESS Final Evaluation Suggested Methodology

This suggested methodology is based on the terms of reference for the final evaluation and discussions with the Director of REDRESS. It takes account of the tight deadlines for the project and the understanding that there will be a separate financial evaluation that will go into more detail in relation to efficiency.

Outputs:

- Suggested methodology
- Draft evaluation report for comments (estimated 10-20 pages plus annexes by 13/12/16)
- Final evaluation report (estimated by 16/12/16 subject to timing and extent of comments from REDRESS)

Research

The evaluation will be carried out by way of:

- desk review of relevant project documents including EIDHR documentation, annual reviews, publications, workshop feedbacks and evaluations and evaluations of previous related projects (documents to be provided by REDRESS)
- interviews with project stakeholders including REDRESS staff, project partners and beneficiaries of projects where possible. Because of time constraints and the broad geographical scope of the project, interviews will be conducted in person where possible in London, otherwise by skype, telephone or through written questions by email.

Selected questions to consider:

A – Relevance

- What were the drivers behind the design of the project?
- Why were target countries selected?
- Did the project address partners' priorities?
- How did the project meet priorities for REDRESS and EIDHR?
- How far were stakeholders involved in the design of the project?
- Did the project take account of recommendations from earlier projects?
- Was the project able to adapt to changing context?
- Were the resources and timelines appropriate to achieve the purpose of the project?

B – Effectiveness

- How far were expected outputs and outcomes achieved?
- Were the outputs of high quality?
- Was the design appropriate to achieve the objectives?
- Were there any impediments or changes to the planned project?
- Were there any unexpected external events that had a positive or negative impact on the project?
- Were there any elements of the project that were included in response to lessons learned from earlier projects? (e.g. security of REDRESS staff, partners, and beneficiaries)

C – Impact

- What evidence is there that the project supported REDRESS' work on gaining reparations for torture survivors?

- Is there evidence of policy improvements in target countries or on an international level? (including evidence arising out of earlier related EIDHR projects)
- Did target groups benefit as expected and were there differences in target countries?
- Were there external factors that limited impact on a national or international level?
- How is REDRESS seeking to measure impact?
- Can the impact of this project be clearly separated from the wider impact of REDRESS' work?

D – Efficiency

- Were resources sufficient?
- Were there any changes to resource allocation during the project?
- Were resources well managed and transparent?
- Were there any changes of plan that affected resources?
- How effective were plans for monitoring and reporting of project activities?
- How efficient were communications strategies on publications and other outputs?

E – Sustainability

- Was financial sustainability factored into the project design?
- How far will project activities in the target countries be sustainable at the end of the funding cycle?
- How will continued support for project activities be funded?
- How will networks developed under the project be sustained on the long run?
- Was capacity development a factor in the project design and has this been implemented?
- What are the challenges for sustainability of the project globally and in target countries?

Susie Alegre

24/11/2016

Barrister and International Consultant – Human Rights and Rule of Law

Consultancy Experience includes:

- ROLE UK Review and Learning Exercise
- Drafting of Training Manual on Child Rights for Nigerian Judiciary (BHRC and UNICEF)
- Consultant for the Policy Practice (UK based consultancy) on human rights and the rule of law in Rwanda, in particular on draft legislation on genocide ideology.
- Consultant for International Criminal Law Services, the Hague. Assisting in a needs assessment mission to Rwanda for a project on judicial training.
- Consultant for International Legal Assistance Consortium, Stockholm. Rapporteur on a needs assessment mission to Rwanda organised in cooperation with the Government of Rwanda and the ICTR on the criminal justice sector and human rights in Rwanda.
- Report writer for the Euromed Human Rights Network, Copenhagen (June-October 2008). Drafting report on the impact of counter-terrorism policies on freedom of association in the Euromed region and advising on future strategy for the justice component of their work.
- Consultant for the AIRE Centre on a project assessing the development of cooperation in criminal law in the European Union.
- Human Rights Consultant for the legal directorate at the Equality and Human Rights Commission, 3 More London, London. Advising on the legal strategy in relation to human rights and enforcement, also advising on potential interventions and judicial reviews on human rights.
- Research and report writing for Human Rights Watch on accountability for British Army abuses in Iraq.
- Report writer for Human Rights Watch Global Report 2009. Drafting EU chapter.
- Consultant for the EU DG Justice and Home Affairs – implementation of EU criminal legislation.
- Consultant on human rights in Europe for Zennstrom Philanthropies, London. Advising on the development of a funding strategy to support human rights in Europe.
- Consultant researcher for Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), Brussels. Various projects including analysis of the human rights implications of EU cooperation with third countries on counter-terrorism and criminal justice, advice to the European Parliament on terrorism and penal reform and rule of law in Bulgaria and Romania.
- Consultant for UN Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna. Drafting a background tool on the international legal framework for counter-terrorism including international human rights, humanitarian and criminal law, drafting a tool on 'Bringing Terrorists to Justice'.
- Consultant for the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, drafting a tool on human rights and terrorist listing mechanisms.
- Consultant for JUSTICE, London. Advising on developments in EU criminal justice and on the human rights implications of the reform treaty as well as potential funding streams.

Training – Development and Delivery of Courses:

- Equality and Access to Financial Services (FOS)
- Human Rights in Practice (ICPS)
- Preventing torture in the context of counter-terrorism (including Istanbul Protocol) for Egyptian National Council for Human Rights (IRCT)
- International Cooperation and Counter-Terrorism for Rwandan prosecutors and judges (UNODC)
- Comparative law – differences between common and civil law systems in the context of counter-terrorism (UNODC)
- Human Rights and Counter-Terrorism for UK Foreign Office Officials (International Bar Association)

- Turkish General Staff prosecutors and judges on human rights in a military context (British Embassy Ankara)
- Training of trainers on human rights and counter-terrorism (OSCE ODIHR)
- UK diplomats on European systems for protection and promotion of human rights (UCL)
- Training course on human rights for police authorities (BIHR)
- Lecturing on international criminal law for the Essex University LLM in International Human Rights

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2014-Present – **Interception of Communications Commissioner for the Isle of Man**

2013-July 2015 – **Ombudsman (G2) – Financial Ombudsman Service, London, UK**

2010-2013 **Attaché – Accountability and Governance, EU Delegation Kampala, Uganda**

2007-2010 **International Consultant – Human Rights and Rule of Law**

2005 – 2007 **Anti-terrorism Adviser, Human Rights Department, OSCE ODIHR, Warsaw, Poland**

2003 – 2005 **Executive Officer on Legal Issues and Human Rights in the EU, Amnesty International, Brussels, Belgium**

2001 – 2003 **Senior Legal Adviser on EU Criminal Justice – JUSTICE, London, UK**

1999 – 2000 **Barrister, criminal and extradition law – 3 Raymond Buildings, London, UK**

PUBLICATIONS

- Chapter on the impact of counter-terrorism policies in the region in Euromed Human Rights Network Report on Freedom of Association 2008 (published Dec 2008)
- Chapter on EU countries in Human Rights Watch Global Report 2009 (publication Jan 2009)
- Assessment of the human rights implications of EU cooperation on criminal justice with third countries (including Canada) for Centre for European Policy Studies (published Sep 2008)
- Justice in Rwanda: An Assessment, ILAC report, 2007.
- The EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy and Human Rights in Central Asia: Do as I Say Not as I Do? Chapter in 'Security v Justice: Police and Judicial Cooperation in the EU', ed. Elspeth Guild and Florian Geyer, Ashgate (2008)
- Introduction to the international law framework of counter-terrorism prepared for UNODC 2008
- Human Rights and the Future of the EU, JUSTICE Futures Papers, 2008
- Human Rights Concerns Relevant to Legislating on Incitement to Terrorism and Related Offences, European Parliament Briefing Note, March 2008
- Unpaid Compulsory Labour as an Alternative to Imprisonment in the EU, European Parliament Briefing Note, June 2008
- Analysis of Rwandan draft legislation on genocide ideology, Policy Practice, June 2008
- "The European Arrest Warrant and the Grounds for Non-execution" and "European Integration and UK Criminal Law." Chapters in 'L'intégration pénale indirecte', ed. Geneviève Giudicelli-Delage and Stefano Manacorda, Société de Législation Comparée, 2005.
- "Mutual Trust – Lifting the Mask." Chapter in 'Mutual Trust in the European Criminal Areas', ed. Gilles de Kerchove and Anne Weyembergh, Editions de L'Université de Bruxelles, 2005.
- "The shifting face of extradition." New Law Journal, Vol 154, No 7135, 2 July 2004.
- "EU fair trial rights – added value or no value?" New Law Journal, Vol 154, No 7129, 21 May 2004.

- “Mutual Recognition in European Judicial Cooperation: A step too far too soon? Case study – The European arrest warrant.” *European Law Journal*, Vol 10, No. 2 March 2004, pp 200-217 (with Marisa Leaf).
- “European arrest warrants – A lapse in justice.” *International Herald Tribune*, 2/2/2004
- “Human rights and the future of extradition in the European Union: Implications of recent case law in the United Kingdom, France and Spain” -*ERA Forum* 2003/4
- “Euowarrant: A Solution Ahead of it’s Time”, *JUSTICE Book*, November 2003 (with Marisa Leaf)
- “Criminal Law and Fundamental Rights in the European Union: Moving Towards Closer Co-operation”, *EHRLR Issue* 3 2003 (with Marisa Leaf).
- “The European arrest warrant – improving the rights of suspects and defendants”, *Challenge Europe*, December 2002.
- “The myth and the reality of a modern judicial space”, *New Law Journal*, June 28 2002
- “The European Arrest Warrant: part of a move towards an area of freedom, security and justice in the EU”, *The Law Society Criminal Practitioners Newsletter*, April 2002
- “Defamation in French Law”, *New Law Journal*, Spring 2001
- Council of Europe Note on Human Rights and the European Convention on Extradition, 1998

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1996-1997	Bar Vocational Course, Inns of Court School of Law, London, UK
1995-1996	Common Professional Exam in Law, University of North London, UK (Equivalent honours degree in law) – Commendation
1989-1993	MA Honours in French and Philosophy, University of Edinburgh, UK 2(1) with Distinction in spoken French

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

From 2009	Associate of The Policy Practice Ltd
From 2007	Associate Tenant, Doughty Street Chambers