



Amnesty International UK Brave Evaluation

January 2022



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Brave Campaign, launched by Amnesty International, is a global priority campaign. As a national section, Amnesty International UK adopted the Brave Campaign and sought to contribute to change both in the UK and internationally.

The Brave Campaign UK ran from 2017-2020¹ with the aim of:

More Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, are able to carry out their work more safely and effectively, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them.

Under this overarching aim, Amnesty International UK advanced three outcomes:

1. Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, are better protected, recognised, connected, and equipped to carry out their work.
2. Individual Human Rights Defenders at Risk receive increased support and are better protected from attacks, intimidation, and harassment by state or non-state actors.
3. An increased number of people in the UK are actively engaged in campaigning with, and in support of, Human Rights Defenders in the UK and around the world.

Following the conclusion of the Brave Campaign, Amnesty International UK commissioned an independent evaluation to assess the campaign over a five-month period. The evaluators used a qualitative and quantitative methodology to assess the campaign environment and capture perceptions of campaign stakeholders, addressing the following questions:

- How and to what extent have the aim, outcomes, and objectives of Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign been achieved, and its Theory of Change realised?
- How and to what extent has Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign positively or negatively influenced systems of oppression, inequalities, and drivers that perpetuate human rights violations?
- How and to what extent was Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign designed to include and enable the participation of key stakeholders (Human Rights Defenders, their organisations, partners, and those with lived experiences of campaign issues)?

Expanding upon the aim of the Brave Campaign, the evaluation assessed the achievements of objectives through the following themes: Protection, Recognition, Connection, Equipped.




Protection

How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better protected from threats and reprisals? How and to what extent do project environments better protect Human Rights Defenders from threats and reprisals?


¹ The campaign timeline was extended from 2017-2019 to the end of 2020 with some projects and activities continuing beyond the end of the Brave Campaign.


In the context of the Brave Campaign, 'protected' refers to protection from threats and reprisals. Conceptualising 'protected' suffered from definitional challenges in the campaign and evaluation. Protection is commonly understood as shielding from harm. Where respondents detailed examples of feeling protected, they most commonly referenced the ways in which interventions addressed their needs after threats materialised. In all cases, respondents spoke of protection in relation to their networks and connections as opposed to protection measures that may be in place by state actors or international institutions or conventions.

Key Findings

-  Respondents primarily described protection as the ways in which interventions addressed their needs after threats materialised.
-  In all cases, respondents spoke of protection in relation to their networks and connections as opposed to protection measures that may be in place by state actors or international institutions or conventions.
-  While Human Rights Defenders experienced protection in different ways, Amnesty International UK took steps to influence institutions directly positioned to protect Human Rights Defenders from threats or reprisals. The Brave Campaign's input into the *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines is one of the ways the campaign contributed to protection mechanisms.

Learning

-  Amnesty International UK appears to have more power to protect at sub-national levels and should not underestimate how its reputation can add greater legitimacy and credibility with decision-makers at local levels.

 The assumption that influencing the UK government translates into increased protection for Human Rights Defenders does not hold at this stage. Feelings of protection caused by UK government actions were not articulated by respondents, despite the success of influencing activities and commitments expressed by the UK government in support of Human Rights Defenders. However, this could be because the evaluation did not surface evidence or focus on cause-and-effect relationships. It is likely that early foundational outcomes (e.g. the establishment of guidelines) are now in place, and long-term impact may materialise in the next 3-5 years.

Recognition

How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better recognised by States?
How and to what extent do project environments improve recognition of Human Rights Defenders by States?



In the context of human rights work, recognition by state or non-state actors can be positive or negative. This evaluation explored recognition which resulted in positive improvements and recognition that increased the risk of threats and reprisals for Human Rights Defenders.

Human Rights Defenders reported experiencing an increased or sustained level of risk due to state recognition - though this was felt to be an acceptable risk associated with their human rights work. Some noted an increase in reprisals concerning engagement with the international community.

Key Findings

-  The majority of Human Rights Defenders, living outside the UK, experienced an increased or sustained level of risk due to state recognition in their respective country contexts.
-  The Brave Campaign's exposure-raising activities made direct contributions to increased recognition by the UK government of Human Rights Defenders, resulting in positive developments. Exposure through one or more of the activities (Meetings with Members of Parliament, Action Cards sent on behalf of Human Rights Defenders, appearance on Amnesty International UK social media/website or attendance at events (Human Rights Summit, Pride Inside, Brave Awards) was associated with Human Rights Defenders feeling better recognised by states, including the UK government, with positive developments in their cases.
-  The UK government increased recognition of the importance of Human Rights Defenders and their causes. Sustained pressure and direct engagement with Members of Parliament from Amnesty International UK contributed to commitments from the UK government to support Human Rights Defenders.

Learning




-  Human Rights Defenders reported an increase in reprisals in response to their engagement with international agencies. This was not solely a result of their interaction with Amnesty International UK. However, Amnesty International UK and other actors need to remain attuned to the wider context of their engagement with Human Rights Defenders and how interactions with international agencies, in combination, may influence the risk of threats and reprisals against Human Rights Defenders.
-  Engaging Members of Parliament to lobby the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, combined with public pressure, was an effective campaign strategy. A recommendation from political figures to advance in future campaigns and avoid ministerial dependency is to target ministerial allies alongside sustained public pressure.

Connection

How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better equipped with skills and knowledge? How and to what extent do project environments better connect Human Rights Defenders to other Defenders, decision-makers, or influencers?

'Connected' refers to the goal of being better connected to other Human Rights Defenders, decision-makers, and influencers, including non-governmental organisations. Overall, Human Rights Defenders reported feeling better connected as a result of activities related to the Brave Campaign. Connections to other Human Rights Defenders were reported positively, helping individuals surface and understand strategies effective for other Human Rights Defenders.

Key Findings

-  Human Rights Defenders reported feeling better connected to decision-makers, influencers, and other Human Rights Defenders due to activities related to the Brave Campaign. Connecting to other Human Rights Defenders and UK politicians was especially positive.
-  Connecting Human Rights Defenders to UK politicians can lead to meaningful one-time action, but there is no evidence that it translates into sustained action favouring the Human Rights Defender's cause. Exposure and opportunities to connect Human Rights Defenders may have prioritised those more accessible to the UK context. For youth Human Rights Defenders, there was a concern that they were not taken seriously by decision-makers, such as political figures.
-  Amnesty International UK played a critical convening role but did not always optimise that role, for example, by connecting Human Rights Defenders in Campaign initiatives like Suffragettes Spirit or the Brave Awards.

Learning



While Human Rights Defenders felt prepared for meetings with politicians and other decision-makers, power imbalances were present in meeting formats that may have disadvantaged Human Rights Defenders. Seeking 'neutral ground' or spaces that are most comfortable for Human Rights Defenders is a positive step toward addressing power differentials by focusing on the needs of the Human Rights Defender rather than the needs/convenience of political targets.



Being connected to others can lead to Human Rights Defenders feeling better equipped through shared and reciprocal learning. Proactively creating and fostering connections leads to Human Rights Defenders feeling better equipped, which is also associated with feeling better protected.



Gathering cases and harvesting examples of where youth activists and young Human Rights Defenders' actions has led to change and influenced decision-makers can elevate the legitimacy of their work to decision-makers. Gathering and sharing these examples affirms the importance of youth Human Rights Defender inclusion and recognition of their contributions.



Equipped

How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better equipped with skills and knowledge? How and to what extent do project environments better equip Human Rights Defenders and Youth Activists with skills, knowledge, and capacity?



Within the Brave Campaign's overall aim, it is assumed that for Human Rights Defenders to carry out their work effectively, being equipped with skills and knowledge is an enabling factor. Human Rights Defenders reported requiring a range of skills and knowledge to advance their work, for example, combating digital threats, answering questions while being interrogated, understanding legal frameworks and engaging with international human rights mechanisms.

Human Rights Defenders reported feeling well equipped to advance their human rights work, though this was not consistently in response to initiatives related to the Brave Campaign. The breadth and depth of their skills appear to be associated with the diversity of their networks and the ability of these networks to be drawn on for rapid and reactive upskilling. Amnesty International UK did contribute to connecting some Human Rights Defenders to these networks. For example, by connecting Human Rights Defenders to embassies, national Amnesty International sections, and networks that help to elevate their cause, such as medical associations.

Key Findings

-  How equipped Human Rights Defenders felt was most often associated with their level of connection to other Human Rights Defenders and local and international organisations. Human Rights Defenders who were well-connected and benefited from large networks reported feeling well-equipped.
-  The majority of Human Rights Defenders who reported feeling the best equipped also experienced high levels of exposure facilitated by the Brave Campaign. This finding supports other evidence that suggests Human Rights Defenders with a sufficiently high level of exposure broaden their networks and benefit from opportunities to upskill through these relationships.

Learning

-  To be equipped extends beyond the practical skills to advance human rights work, and Human Rights Defenders require mental health and psychosocial support to undertake their work more effectively. Some Human Rights Defenders reported feeling exhausted by retelling their stories - though they understood the utility. Human Rights Defenders advance their work, in large part, by drawing attention to their cases in the context of human rights violations. Human Rights Defenders can be re-traumatised when telling their stories and experience mental health strains. These challenges were acknowledged by Amnesty International UK, to some extent, throughout the campaign. However, these considerations may not have contextualised the extent to which Human Rights Defenders are telling their stories outside of their interaction with Amnesty International UK. While it is not the sole responsibility of Amnesty International UK to account for the re-traumatisation of Human Rights Defenders when interacting with other agencies, Human Rights Defenders undertake their work within broad networks and tell their stories across a range of national and international fora.
-  Projects designed to better equip Human Rights Defenders did not appear to reflect on the ways intersecting social identities may influence the skills and knowledge needed by individuals. To better equip Human Rights Defenders, a strategic, needs-based approach based on an individual's unique positionality will result in greater learning and upskilling gains for Human Rights Defenders.

Brave Campaign Aim

More Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, are able to carry out their work more safely and effectively, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them.

Overall, the Brave Campaign did achieve its aim. Based on the evidence, more Human Rights Defenders can now carry out their work more effectively. However, the nature of Human Rights work is unsafe, even in the UK. Human Rights Defenders are able to undertake

their work more safely due to enabling factors such as their level of connection and the ways in which they are equipped to advance their human rights work. The Brave Campaign increased awareness of Human Rights Defenders, both across the UK public and within the UK government.

Key Findings



The Brave Campaign was perceived to be most successful in: Increasing the awareness and relevance of Human Rights Defenders among the UK public and UK government, adapting to COVID-19 and maximising opportunities to reach more Human Rights Defenders using online platforms, and convening youth Human Rights Defenders.

Learning



The Brave Campaign consisted of several projects and initiatives. There was an overall lack of clarity on how projects connected to each other as a means of reinforcing and advancing campaign objectives and outcomes.



The unexpected and rapid success of some projects in the absence of integrated, appropriately resourced and prioritised ethical approaches may have had a negative impact on some campaign participants, including the inadvertent de-prioritisation of the needs of campaign stakeholders. Ethical approaches need to be uncompromisable and prioritised at all stages by all staff involved in work with Human Rights Defenders.

Table of Contents	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	9
INTRODUCTION	10
Background	10
METHODOLOGY	11
Ethics	13
Limitations	14
FINDINGS	15
Brave Campaign Approach	15
Equipped	17
Connected	20
Recognised	23
Protected	27
Case Improvement	29
UK Public Engagement	30
Solidarity	32
Media	34
Participation and Inclusion	35
Working with Partners	38
Systems of Oppression	39
RECOMMENDATIONS	42
CONCLUSIONS	50
Challenging Systems of Oppression and Inequalities	53
Working with Human Rights Defenders and partners	54
Brave Campaign Aim	54
Annexe	54
Annexe 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference	55
Annexe 2: Example Participation Information Sheet	61
Annexe 3: Cases, Conditions and Outcomes	65
Annexe 4: Interview Questions	67
Annexe 5: Monitoring Data	75

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our special thanks to the evaluation participants who shared their stories with us. We have aimed to reflect their valuable insights on the Brave campaign, their work with Amnesty International UK, and the broader human rights landscape. We are indebted to the energy that rights holders bring when calling to account International non-governmental organisations through evaluations.

Secondly, we want to thank the Amnesty International UK Project Team, *Ruth Dawson*, *Sara Rydkvist* and *Felix Jakens*. This Project Team lived the ethos of meaningful partnership through collaborative decision-making, inviting and providing critical perspectives, and promoting an environment of self-reflection and growth. We have learned a lot, thank you.

Teia Rogers and Lauren Burrows

INTRODUCTION

Background

This report summarises the key findings of the final evaluation for Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign. The purpose of this evaluation was to provide an independent analysis of Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign's (2017 - 2020) key achievements and challenges and the experiences and perceptions of campaign stakeholders. The evaluation assesses campaign planning and implementation, specifically:

1. The extent to which the aim, outcomes, and objectives of Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign have been achieved and the Theory of Change borne out. The factors that contribute to achievement including Amnesty International UK's role and any unplanned or unintended impacts arising from the campaign, either positive or negative.
2. The ways in which Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign challenged/worked to dismantle or reinforced/perpetuated inequalities and systems of oppression
3. How key individual Human Rights Defenders and partner organisations (including particularly Human Rights Defenders-led organisations) experienced and perceived the campaign and their participation in it, as well as what impact (planned and unplanned, positive and negative) that resulted for them.

The evaluation took place over a five-month period. The Evaluation Team was composed of:

- A White, cisgender woman
- An Asian and Black, cisgender, queer woman

Committed to a rights-based and feminist evaluation approach, the Evaluation Team considered complex power relations between themselves as evaluators, Amnesty International UK, Human Rights Defenders, and other campaign stakeholders.

The evaluation deployed Qualitative Comparative Analysis - a mixed-method, case-based approach to assess the factors which may have influenced the experiences and perceptions of campaign stakeholders and the campaign environment.

Lessons and recommendations support Amnesty International UK as it undertakes the next global priority campaign, including:

- Embedding campaign approaches that actively challenge inequalities and systems of oppression.
- Improving ways of working with Human Rights Defenders and their organisations.

The Campaign

The Brave Campaign, launched by Amnesty International, is a global priority campaign. As a national section, Amnesty International UK adopted the Brave Campaign and sought to contribute to change both in the UK and internationally.

Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign ran from 2017-2020² with the aim:

More Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, can carry out their work more safely and effectively, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them

Under this overarching aim, Amnesty International UK developed three outcomes:

1. Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, are better protected, recognised, connected and equipped to carry out their work.
2. Individual Human Rights Defenders at Risk received increased support and are better protected from attacks, intimidation and harassment by state or non-state actors,
3. An increased number of people in the UK are actively engaged in campaigning with and in support of Human Rights Defenders in the UK and around the world.

METHODOLOGY

Evaluating the operating environment of human rights campaigns required a methodological approach capable of identifying the complex combinations of factors to determine what may have contributed to change in isolation or in combination with other factors. The evaluation utilised Qualitative Comparative Analysis - a novel approach for surfacing complex causal pathways to explore the conditions which may have impacted the achievement of campaign outcomes.

Qualitative Comparative Analysis is a configurational approach that allows for a refined understanding of complex relationships by exploring how different factors, internal and external to the campaign, influenced the outcomes under investigation. This enabled the evaluation to move beyond an emphasis on independent determinants of change to surface multi-causal and complex relationships.

Applying Qualitative Comparative Analysis, the evaluation addressed the following questions:

- How and to what extent has Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign positively or negatively influenced systems of oppression, inequalities, and drivers that perpetuate human rights violations?
- How and to what extent have the aim, outcomes and objectives of Amnesty International UK Brave Campaign been achieved and its Theory of Change realised?
- How and to what extent was Amnesty International UK's Brave Campaign designed to include and enable the participation of key stakeholders (e.g. Human Rights Defenders, their organisations, partners, and those with lived experiences of campaign issues)?

² The campaign timeline was extended from 2017-2019 to the end of 2020 with some projects and activities continuing beyond the end of the Brave Campaign.

Central to the methodology is the identification of cases, conditions, and outcomes. The evaluation focused on two case sets: Human Rights Defenders (including Human Rights Defenders at Risk) and Brave Campaign initiatives:

- Rise Up
- Human Rights Defender policy for the UK government
- Pride Inside
- Suffragettes Spirit
- Still Marching & Wikipedia Edit-a-thon
- The Defenders Comic
- Brave Awards
- Uncategorised Brave Campaign initiatives and activities

Conditions and Outcomes

In Qualitative Comparative Analysis, 'outcomes' refer to the phenomena being analysed - not necessarily interchangeable with the outcomes of the Brave Campaign. 'Conditions' are the factors that may contribute to the outcome. The evaluation explored the enabling environment created by the Brave Campaign projects as well as the perceptions of Human Rights Defenders and conducted an analysis of four different outcomes for each case set corresponding to the aim of the campaign. The evaluation explored the extent to which Human Rights Defenders felt better protected, equipped, connected, and recognised as well as how and in what ways Brave Campaign initiatives were enabling environments that better protected, equipped, connected, and recognised Human Rights Defenders and reinforced or challenged systems of oppression.

Conditions

- Human Rights Defenders
 - Case Improvement
 - UK Solidarity
 - UK Engagement (Actions Taken)
 - Exposure
 - Participation and Inclusion
 - Political Landscape
- Campaign Initiatives
 - Project Strategy
 - Participation and Inclusion
 - Analysing power differentials
 - Interpreting context
 - Intersectional approaches
 - Cultural representation

Outcomes

Human Rights Defenders:

- Human Rights Defenders feeling protected, connected, equipped, and recognised.

Campaign Initiatives:

- Enabling environments that protect, connect, equip, recognise Human Rights Defenders.
- Challenging Systems of Oppression

Data Collection

Through Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and surveys, the evaluation gathered insights from a range of campaign stakeholders. Evaluation participants were identified collaboratively with Amnesty International UK with particular consideration for who may have been excluded from the evaluation. The following criteria were applied to this purposive sampling:

- Level of engagement with the campaign
- Role
- Connection to outcomes and evaluation objectives
- Demographic, geographic and cultural diversity

Additional criteria relevant to Human Rights Defenders as evaluation participants:

- Accessibility
- Risk of participation
- Willingness

Conditions for inclusion remained live and responsive based on contextual shifts that occurred across the evaluation period. Thirty-nine campaign stakeholders participated in the evaluation and included: Amnesty International (Secretariat and UK) staff, Amnesty International activists, student activists, Rise Up project youth, partner organisations, Human Rights Defenders, political figures, and civil servants. This was supported by a comprehensive desk review of over 100 campaign documents and social media posts.

Membership Scores

This evaluation utilised Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis which assessed conditions and outcomes on a 5-point scale. Assigning membership scores is the process of determining where cases (Human Rights Defenders and Campaign Initiatives) fall across the 5-point scale. Data surfacing from the Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, surveys and the desk review were consolidated into a data table and assigned membership scores.

Analysis

The raw data table is converted into a Truth Table which lists all the possible configurations of conditions and the number of cases that fall within each configuration. The Truth Table allows the Evaluation Team to quantify the degree to which cases share a condition or combination of conditions, display an outcome and the degree to which a condition (or combination of conditions) accounts for instances of an outcome.

Ethics

An evaluation of Human Rights Defenders, young people, and individuals with lived experiences of campaign issues require robust ethical and safeguarding considerations. Prior to their engagement with evaluators, Amnesty International UK conducted preliminary risk assessments and consulted with evaluation participants to identify safe platforms to conduct Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions. Potential risks related to participation were collaboratively identified and contextualised with evaluation participants.

Leveraging Amnesty International UK's existing policies on consent, the evaluation applied engaged consent - an enhanced approach to informed consent. The engaged consent process involved asking a series of questions drawn from the Participant Information Sheet (Annexe 2) and preamble to ensure comprehension of the evaluation's purpose, anonymity and safeguarding measures, and the scope of dissemination.

Limitations

The design, analysis and interpretation of the data are subject to the following limitations:

- A number of campaign stakeholders were unavailable, including some project partners and UK activist networks. Information relating to partners and their participation has been drawn from internal evaluations and documentation.
- Interpretation of the findings was viewed through the lens of privilege and the unique positionality of the Evaluation Team.
- Evaluation participants were all English-speakers, though not necessarily native English speakers. Nuance related to individual experience and emotional states may have been lost.
- The evaluation made assumptions of the conditions which may produce the outcomes under investigation. There was a degree of subjectivity in developing these conditions and their relationship to the outcomes. In addition, the assigning of membership scores was based on the subjective interpretation of campaign documents and unstructured interview data.
- The findings present a snapshot of the achievements and challenges that took place during the Brave Campaign within the parameters of the evaluation timeframe, resources and capacity.

FINDINGS

This section presents the main findings of the Brave Campaign evaluation structured around key themes relevant to the campaign.

Brave Campaign Approach

The reviewed projects and campaign activities appear to align strategically with the Brave Campaign's aim, outcomes, and objectives. The majority of projects and activities were designed to:

- Increase awareness and recognition of Human Rights Defenders, with emphasis on LGBTQI+, women, youth, for the UK government and UK public
- Increase solidarity and mobilise support for Human Rights Defenders
- Equip youth Human Rights Defenders.

While there appeared to be strategic alignment between projects and the overall campaign objectives, respondents reported fragmentation and a lack of coherence between projects:

"...they were a bit disparate. I don't think they all necessarily...ladder up.... so sometimes maybe it felt like a series of small projects without necessarily a clear narrative of why those particular things come together".

- Amnesty International UK staff

The Brave Campaign consisted of several projects and initiatives. However, there was an overall lack of clarity on how these projects connected to each other as a means of reinforcing and advancing campaign objectives and outcomes.

Amnesty International UK respondents frequently mentioned Pride Inside, Suffragette's Spirit, the Brave Awards, and Rise Up as successful initiatives. Factors identified as successful included:

- Increasing awareness of Human Rights Defenders
- Increasing awareness of local human rights causes in the UK
- Making Human Rights Defender issues more relevant to UK Audiences
- Adapting to the COVID-19 pandemic
- Convening youth Human Rights Defenders

Suffragette's Spirit and Pride Inside were more successful than expected. However, some respondents suggested that planning for success was not part of the culture and may have hindered ensuring surge capacity was available.

Amnesty International UK has protocols and processes for informed consent and ethics, and at the onset of the campaign had the ambition to *"embed and frame training in informed consent, risk, ethics participation and to build current practises and work with the individuals at risk teams to embed these practises"*³. However, the evaluation identified ethical challenges in the delivery of some projects. While participants in projects such as Suffragette's

³ Internal documentation

Spirit and Brave Awards were subject to an informed consent process, considerations for duty of care, respect for dignity and agency of individuals involved in the campaign does not always appear to have been systematically applied by all staff. Challenges included:

- Although the evaluation found evidence of assigned responsibility to ethics in proposals and Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed (RACI) frameworks, there remained a lack of clarity on what roles embed, integrate, and uphold ethical processes.
- Lack of systematic ethical training for all staff (including refresher training).
- The unanticipated scale of success and misunderstanding about internal project objectives for Suffragettes Spirit meant that ethical processes were not planned or resourced to the same scale ahead of time.
- Lack of clarity on what participants were consenting to within the project (e.g. appearing in media or on the Suffragettes Spirit map).
- The pace of ethical processes did not always match the evolution of project objectives and ideas.
- The role of Human Rights Defenders, partners, and other campaign participants were not always clear - producing a lack of clarity on ethical and risk management.

At the time, the challenges demonstrated a lack of prioritisation and shared vision on how ethical procedures were followed in line with the nuanced needs of, and risks to, campaign participants. Evidence here is from 2018 and reflects a journey for Amnesty International UK in advancing ethical approaches across the organisation.

Key Findings



The Brave Campaign was perceived to be most successful in: Increasing the awareness and relevance of Human Rights Defenders among the UK public and UK government, adapting to COVID-19 and maximising opportunities to reach more Human Rights Defenders using online platforms, and convening youth Human Rights Defenders.

Learning



The Brave Campaign consisted of several projects and initiatives. There was an overall lack of clarity on how projects connected to each other as a means of reinforcing and advancing campaign objectives and outcomes.



The unexpected and rapid success of some projects in the absence of integrated, appropriately resourced and prioritised ethical approaches may have had a negative impact on some campaign participants, including the inadvertent de-prioritisation of the needs of campaign stakeholders. Ethical approaches need to be uncompromisable and prioritised at all stages by all staff involved in work with Human Rights Defenders.

Unintended or Negative Outcomes

- **New Partner Opportunities:** The Defender's Comic project prompted unexpected interest from the Glastonbury Festival. As a result, Amnesty International UK featured Saudi Women Human Rights Defenders cases and action during the festival.
- **Contextual Challenges:** The evaluation found some contextual factors affecting how Human Rights Defenders are viewed and how governments use data. In one case, the concept "Human Rights Defender" is reported to be co-opted and used negatively by government actors.

Further, data and information that Amnesty International gathers to shine a light on state human rights violations campaigns can often be used by oppressive governments to deflect from their own human rights abuse. These contextual factors present the potential for negative outcomes based on what Amnesty International UK is promoting publicly and may warrant further exploration in risk analyses.

- **Backlash:** The evaluation surfaced examples of backlash from campaign supporters. In one case, a Human Rights Defender involved in the Brave campaign was trolled by individuals who thought they were associated with another contentious campaign that Amnesty International UK was running. The Still-Marching event also received a considerable amount of anti-trans backlash. Supporters' beliefs, attitudes and behaviours are situated along a complex spectrum and do not always reflect an unwavering commitment to all human rights work. Therefore, the extent to which campaign participants are subject to backlash by association warrants further investigation.

Equipped

Within the Brave Campaign's overall aim, it is assumed that for Human Rights Defenders to carry out their work effectively, being equipped with skills and knowledge is an enabling factor. Human Rights Defenders reported requiring a range of skills and knowledge to advance their work, for example, combating digital threats, answering questions while being interrogated, understanding legal frameworks and engaging with international human rights mechanisms.

"Everyone took legal training to understand legislation. Filed power of attorneys – the reporting is professional. Take all the possible measures... to protect the office and team".
- Human Rights Defender

How equipped Human Rights Defenders felt was most often associated with their level of connection to other Human Rights Defenders and local and international organisations.

Evidence suggests that connecting and equipping Human Rights Defenders, coupled as twin components of the same initiative, is likely to be mutually reinforcing. When Human Rights Defenders are connected with other Human Rights Defenders and organisations that specialise in a range of expertise, they are then able to develop their capacity and skills, and in some cases, this was seen as supportive of them feeling better protected.

The majority of Human Rights Defenders who reported feeling the most equipped also experienced high levels of exposure facilitated by the Brave Campaign through any combination of the following: Meetings with Members of Parliament, Action Cards sent on their behalf, appearance on Amnesty International UK social media/website, or attendance at events (Human Rights Summit, Pride Inside, Brave Awards). This finding supports other evidence that suggests Human Rights Defenders with a sufficiently high level of exposure broaden their networks and benefit from opportunities to upskill through these relationships.

Amnesty International UK partnered with the University of York Centre for Applied Human Rights, specifically the Human Rights Defender Hub and Fellowship scheme. The objective was to strengthen collaboration to provide training and advocacy opportunities for Human Rights Defenders. Amnesty International UK supported the applications and nominations for visiting fellows, developed training plans, and delivered advocacy and influencing training based on needs assessments and consultation with the Human Rights Defenders at the University of York. Amnesty International UK's role as a third partner trainer did not reach its full potential when the fellowship was paused in 2020 due to COVID-19. The outcomes of this training are unclear at this stage; however, the diversity of partnerships and collaboration with the University of York is viewed favourably by respondents.

Throughout the evaluation, to be equipped was most often associated with the practical skills needed to advance human rights work; however, mental health and psychosocial support became an emerging feature of what Human Rights Defenders need to effectively undertake their work. Some Human Rights Defenders detailed the mental health strains experienced, specifically:

- Anxiety and fear are associated with threats from the government not only for themselves but also for their families and colleagues.
- Coping with the uncertainty of their cases.
- Emotional strain stemming from lived experiences which motivate their human rights work.

Overall, Human Rights Defenders reported feeling well equipped to advance their human rights work, though this was not consistently in response to initiatives associated with the Brave Campaign. The breadth and depth of their skills appear to be related to the strength and diversity of their networks and the ability of these networks to be drawn on for rapid and reactive upskilling.

Key Findings

-  How equipped Human Rights Defenders felt was most often associated with their level of connection to other Human Rights Defenders and local and international organisations.
-  The majority of Human Rights Defenders who reported feeling the best equipped also experienced high levels of exposure facilitated by the Brave Campaign. This finding supports other evidence that suggests Human Rights Defenders with a sufficiently high level of exposure broaden their networks and benefit from opportunities to upskill through these relationships.

Learning



To be equipped extends beyond the practical skills to advance human rights work, and Human Rights Defenders require mental health and psychosocial support to undertake their work more effectively. Some Human Rights Defenders reported feeling exhausted by retelling their stories - though they understood the utility. Human Rights Defenders advance their work, in large part, by drawing attention to their cases in the context of human rights violations. Human Rights Defenders can be re-traumatised when telling their stories and experience mental health strains. These challenges were acknowledged by Amnesty International UK, to some extent, throughout the campaign. However, these considerations may not have contextualised the extent to which Human Rights Defenders are telling their stories outside of their interaction with Amnesty International UK. While it is not the sole responsibility of Amnesty International UK to account for the re-traumatisation of Human Rights Defenders when interacting with other agencies, Human Rights Defenders undertake their work within broad networks and tell their stories across a range of national and international fora.



Projects designed to better equip Human Rights Defenders did not appear to reflect on the ways intersecting social identities may influence the skills and knowledge needed by individuals. To better equip Human Rights Defenders, a strategic, needs-based approach based on an individual's unique positionality will result in greater learning and upskilling gains for Human Rights Defenders.



SPOTLIGHT: RISE UP

At the intersection of 'Equipped' and 'Connected' sits Rise Up, a Brave Campaign project designed to equip youth with skills for activism in their communities. The mid-term review conducted in 2020 revealed key outcomes for youth Human Rights Defenders, including:

- Increased knowledge of types and elements of campaigning
- Developed practical skills, including better time management, planning and critical thinking
- Improved confidence to carry out activism in their local areas
- Connected a diverse group of youth human rights defenders to each other. In the Rise Up final evaluation, a survey participant stated:

"I have been lucky enough to now come in contact with other youth activists who are just as passionate as I am about making change within our local area".

- Rise Up participant

Respondents and survey participants in the Rise Up final evaluation frequently mentioned positive changes in the youth participants as achievements of the project.

"Before Rise Up, I hated public speaking, but now I go to schools and do anti-racist workshops and speak to 1000's of people confidently".

- Rise Up participant

The application of skills and confidence beyond the end of the training is testimony to the social impact of Rise Up. Rise Up is also an example of how Amnesty International UK drew on external expertise to equip youth Human Rights Defenders. For example, 'Glitch', a UK charity focused on ending online abuse, provided Rise Up participants with online protection training. In some cases, Amnesty International UK takes the role of convenor between Human Rights Defenders and other organisations.

Rise Up was born out of a priority focus on young people. The project elevated change for some youth but also put pressure on Amnesty International UK's capacity to manage, scale and maximise gains. Despite this, its success was widely reported and Rise Up has now been incorporated into ongoing plans to implement a youth strategy — a sustainable legacy of the Brave Campaign.

Connected

'Connected' refers to the goal of being better connected to other Human Rights Defenders, decision-makers, and influencers, including non-governmental organisations. Overall, Human Rights Defenders reported feeling better connected to decision-makers, influencers, and other Human Rights Defenders as a result of activities related to the Brave Campaign. Connections to other Human Rights Defenders were viewed positively, helping to surface and understand strategies to deal with their own situations.

"Learning from other Human Rights Defenders, learning their strategies, because we know what is war. For example, one defender I met was living near the airport as a strategy, I never thought of that."

- Human Rights Defender

"Good to meet with other Human Rights Defenders from other countries because [it] makes you feel that you are not alone".

- Human Rights Defender

Human Rights Defenders reflected the benefits of shared understanding and camaraderie based on the similarities in the experiences and challenges associated with defending human rights. The Brave Campaign's role in connecting Human Rights Defenders to decision-makers was also reported positively by those who had the opportunity to connect with politicians. Political figures reinforced this:

"Bringing the reality of what Human Rights Defenders face is quite powerful. In Westminster, we work in a bubble. We sent out guidance but having Human Rights Defenders in-person talk to us is an important reminder of the direct practical realities".

- Political figure

Though the benefit of connecting Human Rights Defenders to decision-makers was a positive initiative, political figures reported not hearing any information regarding the Human Rights Defender after visits. While connecting political figures and decision-makers to Human Rights Defenders can lead to meaningful one-time action (e.g. asking backbenchers to raise an issue in Parliament), there is no evidence that it led to sustained action favouring the Human Rights Defenders' cause. In addition, the exposure and opportunities to connect Human Rights Defenders involved in the Brave Campaign were disproportionate, with some benefitting from extensive exposure and connection to decision-makers and influencers.

Some approaches were impromptu and may have favoured Human Rights Defenders more accessible to the UK context or those better able to advance the campaign's goals.

"Some of the defenders we worked with were ad hoc. One of the Women Human Rights Defenders tours that we organised... was just people we had met basically. Syrian Women Human Rights Defenders who someone else knew and someone we met at the Paris Summit who was a good speaker, speaks powerfully, who can influence parliamentarians. From an advocacy perspective, this was sound thinking. But what did it mean for them? To ensure the time they spent was meaningful for them as well".

- Amnesty International UK staff

Where Human Rights Defenders were connected to politicians and decision-makers, they reported feeling well-prepared by Amnesty International UK for meetings:

"We developed a strategy for how the conversation will flow....what they will ask, how we can be useful for each other....what we can create together. It was very to the point and I enjoyed it a lot"

- Human Rights Defender

However, consideration for the power imbalances between Human Rights Defenders and political figures could be expanded. For example:

"The format of meetings can be short and crowded, maximum one hour with a bunch of Human Rights Defenders together, and though they may be experts in their own right, with their own targets....the foreign office squeezes them into a format that doesn't really work for them"

- Amnesty International UK staff

While Human Rights Defenders felt prepared for meetings with politicians and other decision-makers, power imbalances were still present in meeting formats that may have disadvantaged Human Rights Defenders.

Amnesty International UK played the role of convener when youth Human Rights Defenders were connected to Members of Parliament through a youth conference held in parliament. There was some concern that youth were not taken as seriously by decision-makers:

"I think it was valuable but my concern is that youth activists are not taken as seriously as they should be so the message might have not gone across".




- Survey respondent

Amnesty International UK may want to gather cases and harvest examples of where youth Human Rights Defenders' actions and the elevation of their voices has led to change and influenced decision-makers. Through this, reaffirm the importance of youth Human Rights Defender leadership and recognition of their contributions.




Partners and Human Rights Defenders reported wanting Amnesty to take a more proactive approach in connecting them to others. Amnesty International UK did not necessarily optimise connecting people in projects such as Suffragettes Spirit or the Brave Awards,

particularly after the project was finished.

Key Findings

-  Human Rights Defenders reported feeling better connected to decision-makers, influencers, and other Human Rights Defenders due to activities related to the Brave Campaign. Connecting to other Human Rights Defenders and UK politicians were viewed especially positively.
-  Connecting Human Rights Defenders to UK politicians can lead to meaningful one-time action, but there is no evidence that it translates into sustained action favouring the Human Rights Defender's cause. Exposure and opportunities to connect Human Rights Defenders may have prioritised those more accessible to the UK context. For youth Human Rights Defenders, there was a concern that they were not taken seriously by decision-makers, such as political figures.
-  Amnesty International UK played a critical convening role but did not always optimise that role, for example, by connecting Human Rights Defenders in Campaign initiatives like Suffragettes Spirit or the Brave Awards.

Learning

-  While Human Rights Defenders felt prepared for meetings with politicians and other decision-makers, power imbalances were present in meeting formats that may have disadvantaged Human Rights Defenders. Seeking 'neutral ground' or spaces that are most comfortable for Human Rights Defenders is a positive step toward addressing power differentials by focusing on the needs of the Human Rights Defender rather than the needs/convenience of political targets.
-  Being connected to others can lead to Human Rights Defenders feeling better equipped through shared and reciprocal learning. Proactively creating and fostering connections leads to Human Rights Defenders feeling better equipped, which is also associated with feeling better protected.
-  Gathering cases and harvesting examples of where youth activists and young Human Rights Defenders' actions has led to change and influenced decision-makers can elevate the legitimacy of their work to decision-makers. Gathering and sharing these examples affirms the importance of youth Human Rights Defender inclusion and recognition of their contributions.



SPOTLIGHT: BRAVE AWARDS

In some cases, association with the Brave Campaign was the catalyst for Human Rights Defenders to feel better connected as a result of increased social media coverage and recognition of their human rights cause. Brave Awards winners were connected to other organisations after receiving the Brave Award.

“More organisations reached out after the award. Now I am on a committee with five other disability organisations coming together....and I am now one of the few people who contribute to the Northern Ireland disability strategy for the government”.

- Brave Award winner

Another Brave Award winner reported:

“Now I add Brave Awards to my CV, and people are 'wow'. I turned up at the local elections for councillor, and they also put Brave awards on my leaflet, so many people can see this”.

- Brave Award winner

These contacts then opened additional spaces for the winners to move forward with their human rights work. The Brave Awards was also a project that focused on Human Rights Defenders in the UK and brought awareness to local human rights challenges. One Human Rights Defender reported that sometimes local human rights issues can get lost or are assumed not to exist. Amnesty International UK may want to ensure that local and global Human Rights Defenders are provided with the same levels of exposure and attention.

Recognised

In the context of human rights work, recognition by state or non-state actors can be positive or negative. This evaluation explored recognition which resulted in positive improvements for Human Rights Defenders or recognition that increased the risk of threats and reprisals for Human Rights Defenders.

Human Rights Defenders reported experiencing an increased or sustained level of risk due to state recognition - though this was felt to be an acceptable risk associated with their human rights work. Some noted an increase in reprisals concerning engagement with the international community.

“Reprisals in relation to engagement with the international community came after engaging more actively. My speaking out and my engagement with international mechanisms and the reprisals that came with it, the government would do it anyway. With the level of the brazenness of the government, these are expected. They will do it anyway if you don't engage. If I don't do that, I'm remiss in doing my work – they can also silence me just like that and succeed in silencing me. I'm considering international engagement..as part of my set of rights. I'm willing to face the consequences of the exercise of those rights... I will still continue to assert this kind of engagement. I know the dangers and the levels of threats”.

- Human Rights Defender

The Brave Campaign's exposure-raising activities made direct contributions to increased recognition of Human Rights Defenders which resulted in positive developments. Exposure through one or more of the activities (Meetings with Members of Parliament, Action Cards sent on behalf of Human Rights Defenders, appearance on Amnesty International UK social media/website or attendance at events (Human Rights Summit, Pride Inside, Brave Awards) was associated with Human Rights Defenders feeling better recognised by states with positive changes.

Most notably, the UK government increased recognition of the importance of Human Rights Defenders internationally and their causes. Across the life-span of the campaign, key actions

from the UK government and Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office demonstrate increased recognition and commitments:

- **February 2018:** Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office's annual Human Rights Report
- **December 2018:** Amnesty International UK contributed to Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office's toolkits on Human Rights Defenders
- **April 2019:** The Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office invited Amnesty International UK, partners and civil society to comment on the first draft of the *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines
- **July 2019:** Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office guidelines *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* are made public
- **September 2019:** A enquiry into broader Human Rights Defender issues is secured
- **November 2019:** 15 Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office staff receive training from Amnesty International UK
- **December 2019:** The Foreign Affairs Committee makes a recommendation that the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office should prioritise Human Rights Defenders in South America
- **December 2020:** Ministers and Foreign affairs spokespeople from three opposing parties post on social media recognising Human Rights Defenders
- **March 2021:** Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office / Department for International Development merger results in human rights and open society directorate
- **April 2021:** UK government integrated review includes a commitment to work with Human Rights Defenders and focus on civic space *"To defend universal human rights, including by working with local civil society and human rights defenders"*.
- **July 2021:** The British Embassy in Manila released a call for proposals to *"support the right of Human Rights Defenders to carry out their work and voice their opinion freely and safely"*.

Across this timeline, Amnesty International UK carried out several activities, including:

- Conducting panel events at party conferences
- Engaging the public in asking for Members of Parliament action
- Lobbying Members of Parliament directly
- Contributing verbal and written feedback to *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines, enquiries, and reviews
- Connecting Human Rights Defenders with politicians
- Consulting with over 80 Human Rights Defenders and partners to create and inform a strategy for the UK government as part of the *On the Human Rights Front Line* report

The timeline, combined with interview testimonies, suggest that sustained pressure and direct engagement with Members of Parliament contributed to commitments from the UK government on Human Rights Defenders. A political figure interviewed confirmed this:

"We were very conscious to reach out to posts [embassies] because of the pressure from Amnesty, to seek good examples and high-profile cases. Made us want to know much more as to whether they were using the guidelines".

- Political Figure

Another added:

"I know we have this issue pending and it's got to find a way into that strategy (on Human Rights and Open Societies); I think [Amnesty have done] enough to ensure we capture Human Rights Defenders as part of that strategy".




- Political Figure

With consideration for Brexit, COVID-19, and changing government ministers, the Brave Campaign has achieved commendable breakthroughs and laid the foundations for Human Rights Defenders to be a priority to the UK government in the future.

Amnesty International UK reported that Amnesty International sections (Sri Lanka, Mexico, Israel, Afghanistan) contacted the UK embassies in their respective countries and secured commitments to apply the *UK Support to Human Rights Defenders* guidelines and support Human Rights Defenders. Uptake from embassies may be uneven. Some Human Rights Defenders interviewed reported not knowing about the *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines or having any support from Amnesty sections. However, one Human Rights Defender was aware of the guidelines as a result of Amnesty International UK and used its existence to challenge the embassy and hold them to account.

The extent to which these guidelines have impacted Human Rights Defenders cases is unclear at this stage. UK government lobbying work is ongoing and extends beyond the lifetime of the Brave campaign.

Key Findings

-  The majority of Human Rights Defenders, living outside the UK, experienced an increased or sustained level of risk due to state recognition in their respective country contexts.
-  The Brave Campaign's exposure-raising activities made direct contributions to increased recognition by the UK government of Human Rights Defenders, resulting in positive developments. Exposure through one or more of the activities (Meetings with Members of Parliament, Action Cards sent on behalf of Human Rights Defenders, appearance on Amnesty International UK social media/website or attendance at events (Human Rights Summit, Pride Inside, Brave Awards) was associated with Human Rights Defenders feeling better recognised by states, including the UK government, with positive developments in their cases.
-  The UK government increased recognition of the importance of Human Rights Defenders and their causes. Sustained pressure and direct engagement with Members of Parliament from Amnesty International UK contributed to commitments from the UK government to support Human Rights Defenders.

Learning

Human Rights Defenders reported an increase in reprisals in response to their engagement with international agencies. This was not solely a result of their interaction with Amnesty International UK. However, Amnesty International UK and



other actors need to remain attuned to the wider context of their engagement with Human Rights Defenders and how interactions with international agencies, in combination, may influence the risk of threats and reprisals against Human Rights Defenders.



Engaging Members of Parliament to lobby the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, combined with public pressure, was an effective campaign strategy. A recommendation from political figures to advance in future campaigns and avoid ministerial dependency is to target ministerial allies alongside sustained public pressure.



SPOTLIGHT: What's in a label?

Under International law, a Human Rights Defender is defined as... "individuals or groups who act to promote, protect or strive for the protection and realisation of human rights and fundamental freedoms through peaceful means"⁴. This creates a framework under which Amnesty International uses the term and advocates for the protection of Human Rights Defenders.

The evaluation revealed mixed associations and interpretations of what it means to be a Human Rights Defender. Respondents reported not knowing they were Human Rights Defenders before engaging with the Brave Campaign. Labelling individuals as 'Human Rights Defenders' had a positive effect in most cases but to what extent their agency was enabled in that choice is unclear.

There was some consideration for whether the label 'Human Rights Defender' was "putting individuals into a box" as one respondent reported:

"...in reality, there are so many ways that people can contribute to the Defence of Human Rights that I think using the expression 'right to defend human rights is much more inclusive".

- Partner representative

This also echoed with some Human Rights Defenders who said,

"I don't talk about my suffering as a Defender. I talk about myself as a woman, a mother. I'm not a criminal. I wanted to change my community. They saw this. Maybe this touched something human as they know me as a human".

- Human Rights Defender

Some Human Rights Defenders also perceived the label as an association with achievements rather than reflecting their local realities,

⁴ [United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner](#)

“After international links then I was defined as a Human Rights Defender..., because of all these connections I achieved...then I became a Human Rights Defender in the eyes of others” .

- Human Rights Defender

“‘Human rights defender’ connotes many things. First is a kind of distortion that the administration has done around the term ‘human rights’ which practically denigrates it. At the same time, the term ‘human rights defender’ sounds messianic. To some, it may sound like that. And I consider myself as knowing full well what those terms may be”.

- Human Rights Defender

The use of the label *Human Rights Defender* was key to increasing recognition across the campaign; however, there may have been too much focus on getting the UK public and decision-makers on board before determining how ‘Human Rights Defenders’ identify and interpret the term itself within their relative contexts. Quotes from respondents above suggest that the term Human Rights Defender may indeed be limiting in complex local realities and that ‘Defending human rights’ matches a focus on the cause instead of the individual.

Protected

In the context of the Brave Campaign, ‘protected’ refers to protection from threats and reprisals. Conceptualising ‘protected’ suffered from definitional challenges. Protection is commonly understood as shielding from harm. Where respondents detailed examples of where they felt protected, they most commonly referenced the ways in which interventions addressed their needs after threats materialised. In all cases, respondents spoke of protection in relation to their networks and connections as opposed to protection measures that may be in place by state actors or international institutions or conventions.

Preemptive steps to protect Human Rights Defenders include Amnesty International UK’s risk assessment guidance that considers how Human Rights Defenders may be subject to threats and reprisals due to their interaction with the Brave Campaign.

As a reactive measure, in response to actions taken against Human Rights Defenders, Amnesty International UK issued appeals for the release of Human Rights Defenders, which featured online, as leaflets, and Petition/Action Cards. For example, for the case of Tep Vanny, a petition was handed in at the Cambodian embassy with over 20,000 signatures. To elevate the message of defending land rights, the digger delivered the petition and called on the embassy to reach out to the government in Phnom Penh. It is challenging to determine the extent to which these appeals impacted individual cases or whether it was in combination with other international organisations and local action.

In some cases, Human Rights Defenders felt better protected due to international solidarity:

“After I returned....I was detained again. Immediately the United Nations Human Rights Commission and Amnesty International, Frontline Defenders, and 20 European MPs tweeted about me, within one hour... [the tweets] were printed in front of that persecutor. I was released because of this. International support gives us power, affects our lives directly and physically. I am out because of this, I know it”.

- Human Rights Defender

Another Human Rights Defender reported a different experience of protection:

"[I] don't feel protected. Things don't work this way. ...lots of connections with global entities but [that] doesn't afford any protection. Maybe they get released but the risks are still high and the personal costs are high. No one is protected really. The level of connections means that there would be a fuss...but there are people stuck in pretrial who have been rotting there. I don't feel protected...I feel lucky".




- Human Rights Defender

International collective pressure and solidarity can translate into action and increased protection for some Human Rights Defenders, especially in situ. It is likely that the collective pressure from international agencies and social media strategies wielded greater local influence, as evidenced in the first quote above. However, other Human Rights Defenders expressed that this solidarity is a reactive measure that doesn't necessarily influence whether Human Rights Defenders experience threats and reprisals. In all cases, the level of protection afforded by international solidarity is highly context dependent.

A central assumption in the Brave Campaign is that influencing the UK government translates into increased protection for Human Rights Defenders. Influencing activities have been successful as demonstrated by commitments expressed by the UK government to support Human Rights Defenders and further evidenced by political figures interviewed for this evaluation. However, there is limited evidence available to determine if commitments from the UK government translate to localised actions to protect Human Rights Defenders at Risk in other contexts. Feelings of protection caused by UK government actions were not articulated by Human Rights Defenders in this evaluation

While Human Rights Defenders experienced protection in different ways, Amnesty International UK took steps to influence institutions directly positioned to protect Human Rights Defenders from threats or reprisals. The Brave Campaign's input into the *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines is one of the ways the campaign contributed to protection mechanisms.

Key Findings

-  Respondents primarily described protection as the ways in which interventions addressed their needs after threats materialised.
-  In all cases, respondents spoke of protection in relation to their networks and connections as opposed to protection measures that may be in place by state actors or international institutions or conventions.
-  While Human Rights Defenders experienced protection in different ways, Amnesty International UK took steps to influence institutions directly positioned to protect Human Rights Defenders from threats or reprisals. The Brave Campaign's input into the *UK Support for Human Rights Defenders* guidelines is one of the ways the campaign contributed to protection mechanisms.

Learning



Amnesty International UK appears to have more power to protect Human Rights Defenders at sub-national levels and should not underestimate how its reputation can add greater legitimacy and credibility with decision-makers at local levels.



The assumption that influencing the UK government translates into increased protection for Human Rights Defenders does not hold at this stage. Feelings of protection caused by UK government actions were not articulated by respondents, despite the success of influencing activities and commitments expressed by the UK government in support of Human Rights Defenders. However, this could be because the evaluation did not surface evidence or focus on cause-and-effect relationships. It is likely that nascent outcomes (e.g. the establishment of guidelines) are now in place and long term outcomes may materialise in the next 3-5 years.

Case Improvement

Case improvement refers to a positive development in the cases of Human Rights Defenders at Risk. Five Human Rights Defender cases were prioritised at the start of the Brave Campaign. These cases were chosen based on:

- Representing the campaign's sentiment
- A tactical or partnership building opportunity arose
- A previous relationship existed,
- Amnesty International expertise already existed in that area
- Tangible impact appeared likely

Of the five cases, Amnesty International UK reported improvements in four, with one case ongoing:

- Dr Mudawi Ibrahim Adam is a human rights defender exposing human rights abuses in Sudan. He faced harassment from authorities, six trumped-up charges and potentially the death penalty. He was released in August 2018, and all charges dropped.
- Sakris Kupila is a transgender rights defender who faced harassment, intimidation, threats of violence and open hostility and was denied rights to gender recognition. Sakris is no longer considered at risk⁵ through increased positive recognition and visibility of their work.
- Rodrigo Mundaca is a water rights defender in Chile who faced threats, attacks and criminal charges. Rodrigo, and his organisation, were provided with protection after the Chilean government opened investigations into threats.
- Tep Vanny is a housing rights defender in Cambodia who faced harassment, beatings, short-term arbitrary arrests and imprisonment. She was released and received a royal pardon in August 2018, a few days after an event and petition handed in at the Cambodia Embassy in London by Amnesty International UK.

⁵ A decision made in consultation with the Amnesty International Secretariat, Amnesty Finland and Sakris Kupila.

- Azza Soliman is a women's Human Rights defender in Egypt who has faced several arrests, harassment, targeting by security forces, pro-government media and smear campaigns and continued surveillance. Azza's case is ongoing.

Other significant case improvements under the Brave Campaign include:

- Marielle Franco was a Women Human Rights Defender murdered in 2018 fighting for the rights of LGBTQI+ and young people in the favelas of Brazil. Amnesty International UK coordinated letters to the UK ambassador of Brazil, issued press releases and online calls to action. In 2019 two former police officers were arrested for Marielle's murder.
- Several Women Human Rights Defenders from Saudi Arabia who campaigned for the right to drive were detained in May 2018, facing sexual harassment, torture and other forms of ill-treatment. The UK government finally called for their release, and three of the Saudi women Human Rights Defenders were released in March 2019; Iman al-Nafjan, Aziza al-Yousef and Ruqayyaa al-Mhareb. In 2021, a fourth Women Human Rights Defender - Loujain al-Hathloul, was also released.

Amnesty International UK's contribution to these cases included:

- Trial monitoring
- Connecting in-country expertise
- High-level advocacy
- Social media campaigning and petitions
- Catalysing international pressure on decision-makers and embassies
- Engaging the media

Overall, it is difficult to determine the cause-and-effect relationship between campaign activities and case improvements, as Amnesty International UK is one of many Amnesty sections and other human rights actors (e.g. Front line Defenders) who also worked on these cases. However, Amnesty International UK's contributions certainly added depth to broader connections and, in some instances, catalysed other actors (e.g. the UK government) to pay attention to these cases.

Key Findings



Significant positive impact on the lives of over five Human Rights Defenders through case improvement strategies. Amnesty International UK contributed through a depth of experience, adding broader connections and catalysing decision-makers to pay attention (UK government).

UK Public Engagement

The campaign aimed to increase the number of people in the UK actively engaged in the campaign in support of Human Rights Defenders in the UK and worldwide. This was enabled through the objective:

“By the end of 2020, 350,000 members of the UK public, existing supporters and newly engaged individuals will have acted in support of Human Rights Defenders”⁶.

Amnesty International UK reported 850,309 total actions taken, of which 531,278 were unique actions. Of the total actions taken, 213,576 were actions taken by new supporters and 636,733 actions taken by retained or reactivated supporters. Actions taken from new supporters were significantly higher for Nasrin Sotoudeh, Monireh, Yasaman and Mojgan Iranian Human Rights Defenders. Factors that enabled or inhibited actions taken were:

Enabling factors

- Availability of strong assets (e.g. video).
- Keeping supporters updated via email.
- Long-running case strategies.
- Individuals at Risk in prison resonated with traditional Amnesty audiences.
- Engaging audiences at the end of other activities, e.g. a women's rights quiz.
- Connection to other campaigns, e.g. Write for Rights.
- Increasing relatability by connecting the Human Rights Defender to a family.

Challenges

- Low engagement on calls for Members of Parliament actions (e.g. for Members of Parliament to prioritise Human Rights Defenders)
- The Defenders Comic received little action-taking by the UK public.
- Technical or complicated campaign asks for mass audiences. (e.g. ask your MP to ask the Foreign Secretary to focus on Human Rights Defenders).
- Difficulty finding captivating images, for example, in the On the Human Rights Frontline Report.
- Human Rights Defender as a term is less accessible.

The overall ask for the campaign was not as clear or consistent across projects and significant fundraising appeals. Messaging around Human Rights Defenders vacillated between human rights heroes to ordinary people defending human rights. The mixed messaging may have been a factor in lesser engagement from UK audiences.

UK public calls to action for Members of Parliament did not appear to be successful due to the low actions taken. The UK public took 12,890 unique actions in calls for Members of Parliament to act in favour of Human Rights Defender causes. This is 2% of the total recorded number of unique actions taken by the UK public across all calls to action. Some respondents reported that the complex messaging may have been a factor in low numbers; for example, the campaign asked members of the UK public to *“Write a letter to your MP and raise following key points using the information in attached briefing”*. Where the UK public did write to or ask Members of Parliament to act, it is not yet clear to what extent this caused Members of Parliament to take action. A nfpSynergy Parliamentary Monitoring Report from 2019 finds that while 66% of 137 Members of Parliament surveyed were aware of Amnesty International UK's campaign, 16% (21) Members of Parliament acted by writing to a Minister, and 7% (9) tweeted or used social media in support of the campaign. This is despite 54% (74) Members of Parliament also stating that they support the campaign for Human Rights Defenders. Pressure from the UK public seems to increase awareness of the campaign but does not always cause Members of Parliament to act. The evaluation found that recognition and

⁶ An action could be signing a petition or writing to Members of Parliament.

actions taken from the UK government was primarily from direct engagement by Amnesty International UK.

Projects and fundraising appeals did raise awareness or spark interest among political targets and the UK public in short time periods, but awareness did not always translate into action, nor is it clear how this will translate into sustained solidarity with Human Rights Defenders.

Key Findings



850,309 total actions were taken by the UK public in support and solidarity with Human Rights Defenders and their causes across the lifespan of the Brave campaign.

Learning



Factors that increased UK engagement included strong assets, updating supporters via email, long-running cases, increasing relatability (e.g. through family connections, engaging audiences in a quiz or other creative initiatives, connecting to other Amnesty International campaigns).



UK government engagement in the campaign was primarily through direct engagement and less to do with actions taken by the UK public.

Solidarity

The Brave Campaign's third outcome aimed to ensure individual Human Rights Defenders and civil society organisations benefit from UK solidarity action:

An increased number of people in the UK are actively engaged in campaigning with and in support of Human Rights Defenders in the UK and around the world.

Several 'solidarity actions' were carried out across the campaign period:

- Solidarity action cards
- Messages of solidarity from Amnesty International, partners and the UK public
- Signature petitions and events (for example, outside the embassies of Finland and Cambodia)

Solidarity can be understood as an expression of support by campaign audiences as well as how Human Rights Defenders experience and perceive acts of solidarity. Where Human Rights Defenders and their cases have benefited from exposure to UK Audiences and UK Public Engagement, Human Rights Defenders felt a strong sense of solidarity.

"...something broke inside. They succeeded in breaking something in us. But when people ask me why I continue and why I have hope: I have support. I am not alone in this life. I'm a

fighter. But sometimes, I'm broken. I can't continue without people. Without Amnesty, without receiving thousands of letters from around the world. I'm still fighting".

- Human Rights Defender

Feelings of solidarity were also expressed through the Pride Inside project. Pride Inside was a project that had the lens of solidarity for LGBTQI+ activists and Human Rights Defenders during a difficult time where COVID-19 had cancelled Pride events across the UK. Along with Stonewall, UK Black Pride, Parapride and Gendered Intelligence, the project showcased solidarity across more than 30 events and a diverse range of speakers and topics. The live-streamed event with two Human Rights Defenders received the highest number of views, 133,000. At one point, 1,300 people were watching the Facebook Livestream. According to Amnesty International UK, this was the highest Livestream figure recorded. Both Human Rights Defenders spoke about the feeling of increased solidarity and support from the event.

Outside of the UK context, Human Rights Defenders experienced solidarity differently. For example, in one case, a Human Rights Defender was concerned about how misinterpretation of the situation and assumed stereotypes might hinder solidarity:

"Some journalists came to the city for one day [of] solidarity, then they returned, and I watched them on the TV. They were telling it is unbelievable that one half of the city is under bombardment and the other half is drinking coffee. War is our life and now you are coming for one day and judging us. Yes, we are still drinking coffee because still we are here, and we are still struggling, and still we are not leaving our country".

- Human Rights Defender

This is not associated with an Amnesty International UK initiative but shows how stereotypes and a lack of contextualisation about what Human Rights Defenders and people experiencing violent conflict should be experiencing and the life they lead, may limit solidarity in this case. An area for further investigation is the role of national solidarity and the role Amnesty International sections play in transforming national landscapes.

Key Findings



Some Human Rights Defenders expressed feelings of solidarity as a result of activities under the Brave Campaign.

Learning



Feelings of solidarity from people within Human Rights Defenders differing country contexts may be out of Amnesty International UK's influence but should be further explored in relation to documenting cases where Human Rights Defenders do feel national solidarity (i.e. what changed) and how other Amnesty sections, or partnering with other civil society organisations can facilitate this.

Media

Media engagement with the Brave Campaign varied and tended to spike in relation to a fundraising appeal or project launch. For example, the Brave Campaign had the fourth-highest reach across Amnesty International UK's campaigns in 2018, fuelled by the Suffragettes Spirit campaign. This project was an unexpected success in terms of engagement from regional and local news and is the most successful media campaign in Amnesty International UK's history and went on to be replicated by other Amnesty national sections around the world.

Across the campaign, components such as favorability, reach of messages and estimated number of people reached by campaign coverage were monitored. This includes monitoring how the campaign reached different target audiences, for example, young optimists or sceptical moderates⁷. Especially audiences who may not have previously heard of or interacted with concepts such as 'Human Rights Defenders'. Key elements of media coverage include:

- 2020 Brave Campaign media coverage was dominated by Pride Inside and LGBTQI+ rights. For example, this key message, "*COVID won't stop us celebrating LGBTQI rights this year*", appeared in almost half of media articles.
- 2019 Brave Campaign media coverage was dominated by Human Rights Defender cases such as the Stansted 15⁸ and detained women Human Rights Defenders in Saudi Arabia. Key messages included "*It's time for the UK government to show the world that supporting Human Rights Defenders is a priority*", which appeared 31 times in articles with a potential reach of 12.8 million people.
- In 2020 and 2019, audiences were reported to be 100% favourable towards the Brave campaign.
- The "Comfortably Convinced"⁹ audiences were the highest reached across the campaign overall.
- In 2018, Suffragette's Spirit coverage dominated with a reported reach of 5,291,056 people.

For more media related metrics, please refer to the table at Annexe 5¹⁰.

The Brave Campaign also monitored the media for increased use of the term 'Human Rights Defender: a possible proxy for determining increased awareness. In 2019, the term was

⁷ Sceptical Moderates 45+ are a target group for campaigns. A less internationalist group. Well-educated, politically engaged and interested in domestic issues. Tends to put family and community first. Believe that rights are a privilege that should be lost by those who infringe the rights of others. Very trusting of the INGO sector, but distrusting of governments of developing nations. This group is more likely to engage with some cases than others. Ones that are relatable to them (e.g. that have a family/community angle), and where the human rights abuses involved are extreme and unequivocal, are likely to resonate most. We hope the UK-specific element of the campaign may pique their interest.

⁸ The Stansted 15 are a group of 15 UK Human Rights Defenders who took action against a deportation flight at Stansted Airport in 2017. They were arrested and sent to trial. Their case was overturned in January 2021. You can learn more about Stansted 15 [here](#).

⁹ Comfortably convinced are considered: A target group who have a strong sense of social justice. Likely to support causes that are framed in terms of equality and social justice (e.g. victims of discrimination, refugees, women and girls, or people with disabilities).

¹⁰ The Brave Campaign was not the focus in all media monitoring reports and in addition changes in measurement approaches impacted the ability to identify overall trends.

reported to appear 112 times in stories connected with Amnesty International UK. Further monitoring data showed Human Rights Defender appearing:

- Q1 2020 - 23 times
- Q4 2020 - 179 times
- Q1 2021 - 105 times

In early 2020, COVID-19 dominated all media outlets, and thus the reduced number is likely representative of these external factors. Higher numbers in late 2020/2021 are promising, but it is difficult to make any significant interpretations from the data available without a deeper understanding of how the figures were collected or without a pre-campaign baseline to determine what effect the campaign had on usage.

Overall, media engagement set a useful foundation for raising awareness particularly amongst audiences who are sceptical about human rights work. Sustained media engagement with Amnesty International UK ensured the Brave campaign and Human Rights Defenders reached high audience numbers annually in 2018 and 2020, 500,000,000 people and above. However, the extent to which media engagement translated increased awareness into increased support for Human Rights Defenders was not measured and may be a useful future consideration for understanding cause-and-effect.

Monitoring the use of 'Human Rights Defender', while interesting, may be more useful if undertaken in conjunction with actions to adopt and adapt new strategies for awareness or to be more targeted about partnerships with news outlets. It is also less clear how media, communications and fundraising teams operated collectively to maximise outcomes under the Brave Campaign.

Key Findings



Suffragette's Spirit was the most successful media campaign in Amnesty International UK's history and has since been replicated by other Amnesty national sections around the world.

Learning



Media monitoring of the term 'Human Rights Defender' was not used to its full potential and with more consistent monthly monitoring and a baseline could provide useful data to determine future campaign contribution to increased awareness.

Participation and Inclusion

In the context of this evaluation, participation and inclusion is analysed through the lens of Amnesty International's definition of '*Active Participation*', *an empowering and enabling process through which rights holders, Human Rights Defenders, partners and activists participate in and influence the processes and decisions which affect their lives and or Amnesty International's Brave Campaign.*

The majority of Human Rights Defenders felt that they were informed of decisions though information only flowed in one direction. Participation extended beyond this when a Human Rights Defender and Rise Up participants were invited to take over Amnesty International UK's social media account. For Pride Inside, partners, to some extent, made decisions about events, however this may still have been directed by the Brave Campaign.

"Operationally, we planned a lot of our work based on the communications given, but these turned out to be quite different as time went by".

- Pride Inside partner

Overall, there was little evidence that the Brave Campaign advanced beyond informing and consulting campaign stakeholders into more active forms of participation such as joint decision-making or rights-holder leadership and shared responsibility.

Where participation can advance to joint decision making and shared responsibility, it is important also to remain aware of time, capacity and risk for Human Rights Defenders. In one instance, a Human Rights Defender reported being overwhelmed by consultations across Amnesty International sections. This may also relate to the level of exposure that certain Human Rights Defenders receive at Amnesty International over others. Data suggests that working with Human Rights Defenders requires an uneasy balance of meaningful participation with the reality that engagement with Amnesty International UK is an additional commitment for Human Rights Defenders.

Most Human Rights Defenders interviewed had strong connections to international organisations and individuals. Amnesty International UK should look to involve lesser-known Human Rights Defenders in future campaigns. One Human Rights Defender stated:

"The others are already powerful when they are in education. Educated professionals in Human Rights Defender activism are professional vs totally human rights activism. Locally, they don't have these advantages. They don't know foreign languages and they don't have relations".

- Human Rights Defender

Levels of participation and perceptions of inclusion across the projects varied. Significant findings include:

- Relevant thematic networks were often consulted, e.g. The Rainbow network for Pride Inside or youth networks for Rise Up.
- Some projects were perceived as less sensitive to participation and inclusion, e.g. The Brave Awards and the Wikipedia Brave Edit-a-thon. Both projects did not necessarily involve Human Rights Defenders in the design or development of the project. In future campaigns, Women Human Rights Defenders could be invited to validate wiki pages or participate in an Awards judging panel as demonstrations of advancing meaningful participation.
- The Rise Up project successfully promoted intentional recruitment with a focus on diversity.
- Pride Inside, as an online platform, is likely to have increased opportunities to participate for partners, LGBTQI+ organisations and individuals who may not have previously had access to events.

Students, partners, and Human Rights Defenders reported not knowing what happened after Brave Campaign activities concluded:

“There was some interest from our local MPs however I did not feel like there was any news around this later. I did not receive any updates on what happened after the event which I attended”

- Survey Respondent

Feedback mechanisms, participation and connection beyond the end of projects and the campaign are of high value to stakeholders in the Brave Campaign. Some components will continue beyond the end of the campaign, for example, continued lobbying of the UK government and embassies to increase support for Human Rights Defenders. However, this does not appear to extend to the ability for campaign participants and rights holders to provide feedback and remain connected to the campaign cause.

For future campaigns, one Human Rights Defender requested greater access to opportunities:

“What I appreciate and what they should do in the future, too, was to propose different things that I could help them with, or where they could involve me. Because of course, I don't know where they might have opportunities”.

- Human Rights Defender

Key Findings



The majority of Human Rights Defenders felt that they were informed of decisions though information only flowed in one direction during the Brave campaign.

Learning



Data suggests that working with Human Rights Defenders requires an uneasy balance of meaningful participation with the reality that engagement with Amnesty International UK is an additional commitment for Human Rights Defenders.



Human Rights Defenders who do not have connections to international organisations, powerful individuals and spaces are less visible in the campaign and across the Human Rights sector. The sector may be reinforcing its own systems of oppression by all working with Human Rights Defenders that are already connected to other international organisations and decision-makers.

Participation and inclusion of Human Rights Defenders needs to be systematic across all projects and campaign initiatives to advance to meaningful



participation and invite Human Rights Defenders to contribute to campaign initiatives.

Feedback mechanisms, participation, and connection beyond the end of projects and the campaign are of high value to stakeholders in the Brave Campaign.



Piloting models of shared leadership, decision-making, and responsibility would be a significant transformative development. Whilst there are challenges associated with remuneration, logistics, inclusion, safety and security and ethical engagement, partner- or participant-led approaches present opportunities to de-centre Amnesty International UK's decision making and re-centre the knowledge and influence of rights-holders.



SPOTLIGHT: ON THE HUMAN FRONT LINE REPORT

Amnesty International UK staff reported that participation and inclusion of Human Rights Defenders in the *On the Human Rights Front Line* report was a new way of working:

Prior we were making recommendations on priorities without knowing whether this would actually make a difference....we did some work at the beginning of the campaign but didn't consult with Human Rights Defenders. We recognised that it was something we needed to do. The report was an outcome of that realisation. Was a progressive move on the side of the organisation and gave the report more legitimacy.

- Amnesty International UK staff

In collaboration with the University of York, the inclusion of over 80 Human Rights Defenders and partners put rights holders' needs at the centre of policy recommendations to the UK government. This is likely to have added greater legitimacy and leverage to the cases of the Human Rights Defenders as UK government officials and the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office requested more information on the recommendations.

Notable areas for improvement were highlighted during the evaluation process:

- The research methods considered ethics, consent and risk, but the overall process had less management of secondary trauma for participants and researchers.
- English remained the dominant language and may have been an exclusionary factor for participation.
- Some partners reported wanting to be more involved from the beginning, specifically in the interview and survey design.
- Respondents generally reported positively about the collective of organisations working together behind the report.

Working with Partners

Overall, partners reported positively about working with Amnesty International UK on the

Brave Campaign and the careful consideration for partners' added value. However, in some cases, partners wanted to *make greater contributions* and felt project design had already advanced beyond the point of meaningful input. Advancing partner relationships may look like leading with partner ideas at the inception phase instead of bringing partners in once ideas have been generated.



Pride Inside partners were also complimentary about relationships with Amnesty International UK and reported benefits such as Increased reach, increased solidarity, inspirational artists and panellists and increased exposure as small organisations. However, one respondent reported that:

“...the needs of people in Pride Inside were brushed away in favour of internal demands”.
- Amnesty International UK staff

It is clear from the evidence presented that Amnesty International UK is undertaking a learning journey to balance the role of lead convener with freeing space to allow other organisations and individuals to actively participate - including ensuring internal constraints do not compromise relationships with partners.

Partners involved in the *On the Human Rights Frontline* report agreed that Amnesty International is the only organisation that can facilitate and guide collective action between civil society organisations on Human Rights Defenders. Factors behind this perception included: brand awareness and association, size and capacity, ability to respond quickly, resonance with the UK government and UK public.

Key Findings

-  Partners reported positively about working with Amnesty International on the Brave Campaign, and careful considerations for partners' added value. Partners also reported benefits such as increased reach due to this partnership.
-  In some cases, partners wanted to *make greater contributions* and felt project design had already advanced beyond the point of meaningful input. Advancing partner relationships may look like leading with partner ideas at the inception phase instead of bringing partners in once ideas have been generated.

Systems of Oppression

Respondents were asked: “To what extent do you feel the Brave Campaign or Amnesty International UK challenges oppression within social, economic, and political systems?” The majority of respondents felt that some areas of the campaign indirectly challenged systems of oppression primarily through their engagement with Human Rights Defenders who themselves are challenging social, economic, or political oppression. Through an extensive review of campaign materials and an assessment of ways of working, the evaluation surfaced examples of the Brave Campaign's role in challenging or reinforcing systems of oppression and inequalities:

- Primacy of the English Language may have been an exclusionary factor to participation and inclusion in the campaign. All projects operated in English, and ways

to engage with the campaign were in English and on digital platforms. Respondents also noted that engagement with political figures was determined in some part by the Human Rights Defenders ability to communicate effectively and impactfully.

- Addressing structural oppression requires unpacking inequalities through a contextual lens. Absent from project documents were reflections on the historical, locational, and sociocultural contexts interacting with the campaign or campaign stakeholders. The Brave Campaign missed opportunities to reflect on history, for example in *Pride Inside*, where a defining moment in the Pride Movement, the Stonewall Riots, was led by Black and Brown transgender women. Additionally, the Suffragettes Movement in Britain fought for voting rights for all women, though Black and Brown women have largely been written out of the narrative around voting rights. There was an absence of a reflection on this history of exclusion when commemorating the Suffragette Movement through *Suffragette's Spirit*. While both projects were inclusive in many respects, acknowledging and referencing history, location, and culture, are important components of addressing systematic oppression.
- The Brave Campaign had a particular emphasis on Women and LGBTQI+ Human Rights Defenders. While there was a recognition within the Brave Campaign of the unique and individual barriers faced by these Human Rights Defenders, there was no evidence that gender and power differentials within the campaign environment were analysed.
- There didn't appear to be equal levels of exposure for Brave Award winners and nominees - a product of competition and award systems that produce winners and 'non-winners'. This finding could be further explored regarding those individuals who may have elected not to be featured on Amnesty International UK's platforms as part of their informed consent process. This would necessarily impact the level of exposure for those who opted out. Additionally, the selection of Brave Award winners may be reinforcing inequality by setting up a hierarchy that is judged by Amnesty International UK staff, journalists, and activists. It also may privilege individuals who can access platforms for nomination, but that is online and in English.
- Some Human Rights Defenders interviewed were clear about the barriers that being a woman presented in their respective contexts. Particularly the cultural sensitivities that limited their active participation in their contexts. Amnesty International UK may need to take a deeper analysis into the cultural, social and gender norms that prevent Women Human Rights Defenders from actively participating not only in campaigns but in civic space in their national contexts.

"I see it across many areas, but there was no conversation about the implication of the intersectionality of being a person of colour and human rights defender, and how that might impact your life/your treatment".

- Survey respondent

Key Findings



Given the value of exposure for Human Rights Defenders through recognition related to the receipt of an award, disproportionately featuring nominees and

winners may disenfranchise non-winners.



Absent from project documents were reflections on the historical, locational, and sociocultural contexts interacting with the campaign.

Learning



Exploring the ways campaigns may reinforce or dismantle inequality socio-economic and political systems is an ambitious area for exploration. Constructing models to measure systems of oppression is a relatively unexplored subject within campaigns and across social sciences more generally. Amnesty International UK is well-positioned to take these investigations forward in their journey to becoming a feminist and anti-racist organisation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines recommendations for Amnesty International to take forward in future campaigns:

1. Ways of Working			
No.	Pg.	Finding	Recommendation
1.1	15	Projects were successful in isolation but how they jointly advanced outcomes were less clear.	<p>Future campaigns will benefit from a comprehensive and regularly reviewed Theory of Change to understand progress towards individual outcomes and how they reinforce each other.</p> <p>Develop a Theory of Change to tie together and unify how change happens in future campaigns. Embed testing assumptions in the Monitoring and Evaluation system.</p>
1.2	-	The Brave Campaign Steering Group struggled with clarity around its role and responsibilities. Expectations from Steering Group members were not well delineated or clear.	<p>Create a role for the Steering Group to monitor for strategic coherence by regularly reflecting on the Theory of Change.</p> <p>Collaboratively developed Terms of Reference for Steering Groups and Project Teams, comprehensively articulating roles and expectations for individuals as well as for the group. Portfolio Management approaches offer useful models for structuring groups and individuals around related projects and initiatives.</p>
1.3	21	Though the benefit of connecting Human Rights Defenders to decision-makers was a positive initiative; political figures interviewed reported not hearing any	Explore safe and ethical platforms or approaches to directly update political figures on the cases of Human Rights Defenders.

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation

...

		information regarding the Human Rights Defender after visits.	Maintain momentum with advocacy and influence the UK government for Human Rights Defenders protection frameworks in the next campaign.
1.4	29	The assumption that influencing the UK government translates into increased protection for Human Rights Defenders does not hold at this stage. Feelings of protection caused by UK government actions were not visible in interviews with Human Rights Defenders in this evaluation despite the success of influencing activities and commitments expressed by the UK government in support of Human Rights Defenders.	Conduct a joint analysis with partners and civil society to deepen understanding of how the <i>UK Support to Human Rights Defenders</i> guidelines and utility at embassy level impacts Human Rights Defenders.
1.5	19	The exposure and opportunities to connect Human Rights Defenders involved in the Brave Campaign were disproportionate, with some benefitting from extensive exposure and connection to decision-makers and influencers. Some approaches were impromptu and may have favoured Human Rights Defenders more accessible to the UK context or those better able to advance the campaign's goals. The majority of Human Rights Defenders who reported feeling the best equipped experienced high levels of exposure.	Assess the balance of exposure between Human Rights Defenders engaged in future campaigns. Particularly opportunities for exposure with decision-makers and through social media. Assess who gets access to these opportunities and who does not. Document these decisions and build an in-depth picture of barriers to participation and increased exposure.
1.6	35	Feedback mechanisms, participation and connection beyond the end of projects and the campaign are of high value to stakeholders in the Brave Campaign. Some components will continue beyond the end of the campaign, for example, continued lobbying of the UK government and embassies to increase support for Human Rights Defenders. However, this does not appear to extend to the ability for campaign participants and rights holders	Create feedback and support mechanisms for campaign stakeholders beyond the life of projects.

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation

...

		to provide feedback and remain connected to the campaign cause.	
1.7	18	Connections to other Human Rights Defenders were viewed positively, helping to surface and understand strategies to deal with their own situations. Human Rights Defenders reflected the benefits of shared understanding and camaraderie based on the similarities in the experiences and challenges associated with defending human rights.	Leverage and increase opportunities available for Human Rights Defenders to connect with and learn from each other.
1.8	20	This recommendation is taken from the Rise Up mid-term evaluation and is repeated here to reinforce its usefulness and Amnesty's role as a connector through the final evaluation.	<i>"Create or utilise an existing online platform for past, current and future participants to continue to connect with each other, share experiences, resources and ideas and communicate with staff and other speakers. Use the platform to connect Rise Up participants with other training opportunities"</i> .
1.9	17	How equipped Human Rights Defenders felt was most often associated with their level of connection to other Human Rights Defenders and local and international organisations.	Projects should advance activities that seek to better connect AND equip Human Rights Defenders.
1.10	26	In all cases, respondents spoke of protection in relation to their networks and connections instead of protection measures that may be in place by state actors or international institutions or conventions.	Projects should advance activities that seek to better protect AND increase positive recognition for Human Rights Defenders.
1.11		Throughout the evaluation, to be equipped was most often associated with the practical skills needed to advance human rights work; however, mental health and psychosocial support became an emerging feature of what Human Rights Defenders need to effectively undertake their work.	Future campaigns should extend 'equipped' beyond skills and knowledge to include emotional and psychological readiness. This could come from new partners who are experienced in offering psychosocial support.

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



1.12	16	<p>The evaluation uncovered some ethical challenges in the delivery of projects. Amnesty International UK does have protocols and processes for informed consent. At the onset of the campaign, there was the ambition to “<i>embed and frame training in informed consent, risk, ethics participation and to build current practises and work with the individuals at risk teams to embed these practices</i>”¹¹.</p>	<p>Across all teams, systematically embed training on empowering and ethical engagement with and representation of Human Rights Defenders. Build on Amnesty International’s Active Participation approach within an ethical framework.</p> <p>Plan for and embed empowering and ethical mandates within campaign design and delivery.</p> <p>When developing and establishing training and mandates on empowering and ethical engagement, prioritise the knowledge and experiences of rights-holders and ensure this is reflected in the overall approach.</p>
1.13	32	<p>Projects and fundraising appeals did raise awareness or spark interest among political targets and the UK public in short time periods, but awareness did not always translate into action, nor is it clear how this will translate into sustained solidarity with Human Rights Defenders.</p>	<p>Where UK engagement with Human Rights Defenders increases (e.g. through an appeal or project like Suffragettes Spirit) , optimise the opportunity and invite UK audiences to engage further rather than a one-time targeted engagement.</p>
1.14	27, 32	<p>There was some consideration for whether the label ‘Human Rights Defender’ was “<i>putting individuals into a box</i>.”</p> <p>The overall ask for the campaign was not as clear or consistent across projects and significant fundraising appeals. Messaging around Human Rights Defenders vacillated between human rights heroes to ordinary people defending human rights. The mixed messaging may have been a factor in lesser engagement from UK audiences.</p>	<p>Where the focus on Human Rights Defenders remains for future campaigns consider focusing on the action “<i>Defend Human Rights</i>”, which may be a simpler ask for the UK public and more inclusive of activists overall.</p>

¹¹ Internal documentation

1.15	34	The extent to which media engagement translated increased awareness into increased support for Human Rights Defenders was not measured and may be a useful future consideration for understanding cause and effect.	Enhance media monitoring capability, including annual trends, to better be able to correlate campaign activities with media engagement.
1.16	26	In terms of tactics, one political figure reported that engaging Members of Parliament to lobby the Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office, combined with public pressure, was also a good campaign strategy.	A recommendation from political figures to advance in future campaigns and avoid ministerial dependency is to think about who are the friends or allies of ministers and target these people alongside sustained public pressure.
1.17	54	Evidence suggests that more pressure was put on UK governments in cases that exceeded 50,000 unique actions. But the benefit only materialised in the presence of long-running campaigns generating enough actions that create a sufficiently high level of pressure on the UK government.	When setting targets for actions taken, set goals for individuals as opposed to across an entire campaign. For example, 50,000 unique actions taken per case.
2. Working in Partnership			
2.1	19	Human Rights Defenders can be re-traumatised when telling their stories and experience from mental health strains that were considered to some extent when interacting with the campaign, Amnesty International UK, or their participation in the evaluation.	Offer Human Rights Defenders other mechanisms for personalised storytelling, e.g. Testimony Therapy.
2.2	18	The operating environments for Human Rights Defenders required a range of skills and capabilities, not all of which could reasonably be provided by Amnesty International UK. Human Rights Defenders reported requirements to upskill specifically around combating digital threats and censorship, legal training, and counter-interrogation.	Amnesty International UK's reach can help Human Rights Defenders upskill by connecting them to partners and organisations that prioritise diverse thematic areas. Future campaigns should prioritise monitoring what skills Human Rights

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



			Defenders need to continually upskill in complex contexts ¹² .
2.3	40	Projects designed to better equip Human Rights Defenders did not appear to capture the experiences of people with multiple intersecting marginalised positionalities.	<p>To better equip Human Rights Defenders, a strategic, needs-based approach may result in greater gains for Human Rights Defenders.</p> <p>Adopt an intersectional approach to 'equipping' Human Rights Defenders by acknowledging and addressing the intersectional needs, e.g. skills needed as a woman, parent or Queer Human Rights Defender.</p>
2.4	28	Overall, it is difficult to come to a conclusion on the cause-and-effect relationship between campaign activities and case improvements, however, Amnesty International UK's contributions certainly added depth, broader connections and, in some cases, catalysed other actors (e.g. the UK government) to pay attention to these cases alongside other human rights actors.	Remain realistic about to what extent case improvements can catalyse systems change in target contexts. Assess what other activities or collaborations might be needed to advance to catalysing change in contexts outside the UK.
2.5	41	The exposure and opportunities to connect Human Rights Defenders involved in the Brave Campaign were disproportionate, with some benefitting from extensive exposure and connection to decision-makers and influencers. Some approaches were impromptu and may have favoured Human Rights Defenders more accessible to the UK context or those better able to advance the campaign's goals.	Strategise how to reach lesser-known Human Rights Defenders or those less connected to international agencies.

¹² One respondent reported that the International Services for Human Rights [Academy](#) is reported to have global recognition and credibility, especially in complex contexts.

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



2.6	38	Sometimes, Human Rights Defenders are simply not aware of ways they could get involved.	Make Human Rights Defenders more aware of opportunities you have for their participation and decision-making.
2.7	22	Youth Human Rights Defenders were also connected to Members of Parliament through a youth conference held in parliament. Amnesty International UK played the role of convener. There was some concern that youth Human Rights Defenders were not taken as seriously by decision-makers.	Harvest impact stories and examples of where youth Human Rights Defender action and elevation of their voices has led to change in decision-makers and share widely.
2.8	36	The majority of Human Rights Defenders felt that they were informed of decisions though information only flowed in one direction. In one example, participation extended beyond this when Rise Up, and a Human Rights Defender were invited to take over Amnesty International UK's social media account.	Outline what co-designing looks like and when Amnesty is the supportive or guiding partner rather than the central voice
2.9	37	The majority of Human Rights Defenders interviewed had strong connections to international organisations and individuals. Amnesty International UK should look to involve lesser-known Human Rights Defenders in future campaigns.	Invite organisations or academic institutions from contexts closer to the Human Rights Defenders at risk to meaningfully participate in partnerships, leverage their knowledge and draw attention to lesser-known Human Rights Defenders. Promote local leadership through these new partnerships.
3. Systems of Oppression			
3.1	40	Primacy of the English Language may have been an exclusionary factor to participation and inclusion in the campaign. All projects operated in English and ways to engage with the campaign were in English and on digital platforms.	Create a campaign environment that accommodates speakers of other languages by planning for translation and interpretation that strengthens cultural competencies.
3.2	40	Addressing structural oppression requires unpacking	Document the examination of where history, culture, location

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



		inequalities through a contextual lens. Absent from project documents were reflections on the historical, locational, and sociocultural contexts interacting with the campaign or campaign stakeholders.	interact with the campaign and develop strategies to integrate that information.
3.3	40	There didn't seem to be equal levels of exposure for Brave winners and nominees - a product of competition and award systems that produce winners and 'non-winners'. Given the value of exposure for Human Rights Defenders, disproportionately featuring nominees and winners may disenfranchise non-winners.	Give equal opportunities for social media exposure to nominees and winners. Transparency in the metrics used to decide the winners. Consider rotating and publicising the panel.
3.4	40	On the whole, campaign projects seem to involve either unilateral decision-making or some level of informing Human Rights Defenders. This was supported by the level of participation reported by Human Rights Defenders. There was some level of consultation, but this was more about how Amnesty was taking and using information.	Pilot more transformative models with shared leadership, decision-making and responsibility.

CONCLUSIONS

Progress against Campaign Aims and Objectives

Campaign objectives evolved over time but shared consistent features and themes. This section consolidates the objectives into themes and shares final reflections.

Improvements in Selected Countries and the Lives of Individuals

The Brave Campaign made improvements in the lives of Human Rights Defenders. The approaches adopted by the campaign to increase the exposure of Human Rights Defenders were associated with improving their connection to other Human Rights Defenders, decision-makers, and influencers. Facilitating the broadening of networks for Human Rights Defenders was associated with feeling better connected, equipped, and in some instances, protected.

The majority of Human Rights Defenders featured in the campaign saw some improvement in their cases throughout the campaign, and some level of improvement was enabled by their increased exposure. Some Human Rights Defenders reported feeling better equipped due to their engagement with Amnesty International UK and the University of York.

The extent to which the campaign made improvements in key countries is harder to determine. The political landscapes in the countries under investigation largely remained unchanged, or conditions for Human Rights Defenders deteriorated. While there is little evidence to suggest the campaign was able to make improvements in key countries, there is ample evidence to suggest that the lives of Human Rights Defenders were improved by their association and engagement with the campaign.

Improvements to the UK government's Ways of Working with Human Rights Defenders

While there may have been other civil society initiatives involved, evidence suggests a high likelihood that the Brave Campaign influenced an improvement in the UK government's ways of working around Human Rights Defenders, primarily for Human Rights Defenders in other countries. The UK government demonstrated an increased awareness and recognition of Human Rights Defenders. While there are some areas of the UK government translating this increased awareness into action, a comprehensive strategy has not yet been developed. What can be achieved by the UK governments through their connections with Human Rights Defenders has limitations as their remit remains fixed within the boundaries of soft power influence. The UK government Integrated Review does go some way to demonstrate a commitment to Human Rights Defenders. Though a strategy on Human Rights Defenders has not yet materialised, the foundations of a strategy have been established. Some Human Rights Defenders reported being aware of the *UK Support to Human Rights Defenders* guidelines which articulated a pledge by the UK government to Human Rights Defenders along with context pieces and guidance for working with Human Rights Defenders.

Increase in the capabilities of Human Rights Defenders and their strategic relationships

Overall, Human Rights Defenders were better equipped as a result of their engagement with the Brave Campaign. Evidence suggests that the exposure raising initiatives advanced by the Brave Campaign did increase the capabilities of Human Rights Defenders and is associated with Human Rights Defenders feeling better connected. However, Defenders also reported a range of sources that contributed to feeling better equipped to advance their human rights work. Brave campaign initiatives - Rise Up and Pride Inside, and campaign interactions with the Protective Fellowships for Human Rights Defenders at the Centre for Applied Human Rights at the University of York, are notable examples that better equipped Human Rights Defenders.

The operating environments for Human Rights Defenders required a range of skills and capabilities, not all of which could reasonably be provided by Amnesty International UK. Human Rights Defenders reported requirements to upskill specifically around combating digital threats and censorship, legal training, and counter-interrogation. While the existence of the Amnesty Academy app may go some way to building the skills of Human Rights Defenders, none of the evaluation respondents referenced this resource. Relatedly, the concepts covered in the app may not be suitable for some of the more advanced skills required by Human Rights Defenders.

Case Improvement for Human Rights Defenders At Risk

While the majority of Human Rights Defenders at Risk saw improvements in their cases, it is challenging to determine the extent to which these improvements were a direct result of Amnesty International UK's efforts. It is likely that the contributions enabled through the Brave Campaign (Trial monitoring, lobbying and advocacy, social media campaigning, and media engagement), in combination with other factors, played a role in case improvement for Human Rights Defenders. It is evident that Amnesty International UK's contributions catalysed the UK government, which brought increased attention to these cases.

One case deteriorated over the course of the campaign. Azza Soliman, an Egyptian lawyer who has faced several arrests, harassment, targeting by security forces, and smear campaigns, is the subject of continued surveillance. There is no evidence that the deterioration in Azza's case is a result of engagement with Amnesty International UK, who continue to campaign for administrative barriers in Azza's case to be lifted.

Responding to Regional and Global calls to act on new threats against Human Rights Defenders At Risk

Amnesty International UK responded to emerging threats against Human Rights Defenders at risk. Consideration was taken to ensure Human Rights Defenders were not put at further risk by these actions. Reactive responses principally sat with the Individuals At Risk Team, and capacity was added to the Brave campaign at times to respond, for example, campaigning for the Saudi Women Human Rights Defenders who were imprisoned for campaigning for their right to drive was a response to new threats. This approach allowed Amnesty International UK to pivot and apply resources against the greatest need. Some Human Rights

Defenders involved in the On the Human Rights Front Line Report also faced new threats leading Amnesty International UK to react:

- The killing of Zara Alvarez, paralegal at Karapatan - the Alliance for the Advancement of People's Rights
- The arrest of Mohamed Basheer, Karim Ennarah, and Gasser Abdel-Razek, senior staff at the Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights (EIPR)

Whether and how Amnesty International UK acted on new threats was subject to a criteria:

- Link to key themes of the Brave Campaign
- Scale of the issue
- UK opportunity to influence
- UK relevance

In the context of limited resources, establishing a criteria to focus capacity on particular cases is logical, however, this approach may work against its ability to respond to the cases with the greatest need.

UK Public act in support of Human Rights Defenders and Civil Society Organisations who benefit from UK solidarity

Amnesty International UK reported 850,309 total actions taken, of which 531,278 were unique actions. Of the total actions taken, 213,576 were actions taken by new supporters and 636,733 actions taken by retained or reactivated supporters. Actions taken by new supporters were significantly higher for Nasrin Sotoudeh, Monireh, Yasaman and Mojgan Iranian Human Rights Defenders.

Among the Human Rights Defenders included in this evaluation, actions taken by the UK public made no discernible impact on their case improvement. UK public calls to action for Members of Parliament did not appear to be successful due to the low actions taken. Some respondents reported that complex messaging may have been a factor in low engagement. An nfpSynergy Parliamentary Monitoring Report from 2019 found that awareness of the Brave campaign was high amongst Members of Parliament (66% out of 137) and that 22% went on to write a letter to a Minister or express support through social media. Pressure from the UK public seems to increase awareness of the campaign but does not always cause Members of Parliament to act. The evaluation found that recognition and actions taken from the UK government, particularly more sustainable actions (e.g. guidelines or funding opportunities), were primarily from direct engagement by Amnesty International UK.

The evaluation analysed Brave Campaign communications data on actions taken by the UK public in relation to the pressure these actions may have put on the UK government. One Human Rights Defender, Nasrin Sotoudeh, appeared to benefit from actions taken by the UK public which may have resulted in increased pressure on the UK government. Between June and November 2021, two Members of Parliament publicly raised questions with the Secretary of State for Foreign Commonwealth and Development Affairs on the actions taken by the UK government on behalf of Nasrin. In response:

“The UK government has repeatedly raised Nasrin Sotoudeh's ongoing detention with the Iranian authorities. On 25 September, the UK joined 46 other countries in calling for her release at the Human Rights Council. We have designated Iran as a Human Rights Priority Country, and press Iran to improve its poor human rights at every appropriate opportunity, including by taking action with the international community to press Iran to improve its poor human rights record. Human Rights Defenders worldwide must be able to carry out their work safely and without fear”.

- James Cleverly, Joint Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department for International Development¹³

Questions regarding the cases of Azza Soliman and another Human Rights Defender were also raised by Members of Parliament. However, it is reported that in the case of the latter Human Rights Defender, they presented their case directly to political figures. This, in the presence of minimal actions taken, suggests it was direct engagement with Members of Parliament that influenced their action. In the case of Azza, Members of Parliament referenced an Amnesty International event as the point in which Azza's case was brought to their attention.

A review of the communications data in parallel with the cases of Human Rights Defenders in the Brave Campaign suggests that more pressure was put on the UK government in cases that exceeded 50,000 new action takers, taking approximately 1.3 new actions each. However, to create a sufficiently high level of pressure on the UK government, actions taken have the biggest influence in long-running campaigns.

Challenging Systems of Oppression and Inequalities

Some campaign areas reinforced inequality and inadvertently created barriers to equitable access for Human Rights Defenders, particularly lesser-known Defenders. Though there was some evidence of the intersectional experiences of individuals taken into consideration in project design and delivery, a reflection on history, context, and culture and an analysis of power and gender would have been a substantive step toward understanding and challenging systemic inequality.

The Brave Campaign did appear to go through an evolution in how Human Rights Defenders were represented in some social media posts. Images of Human Rights Defenders had primarily been single-subject portraits; more recent images on social media feature Human Rights Defenders as complex individuals by depicting them beyond the narrative of the campaign, for example, as women, mothers, lawyers, etc. This transition to describing Human Rights Defenders in their diversity respects the uniqueness of each Human Rights Defender, not just in their cases, but in their experiences. This may also contribute to increasing the relatability of Human Rights Defenders.

¹³In response to [questions](#) on Nasrin Sotoudeh's situation in November 2021, the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

Overall, while not deliberately designed to challenge systems of oppression, the Brave Campaign was perceived to have indirectly challenged inequality in social, economic, and political systems through its work with Human Rights Defenders.

Working with Human Rights Defenders and partners

The Brave Campaign did not appear to advance the majority of its engagement with Human Rights Defenders beyond one-way information flows and consultations. Evidence on project design and perceptions of Human Rights Defenders was consistent with lower levels of participation. However, while noting that engagement and responsibility-sharing could have improved, Human Rights Defenders and partners consistently reported positive working relationships with Amnesty International UK.

Advancements in ethical approaches across the Brave campaign from 2017 to 2020 were observed, including considerations for less extractive, opportunistic, and responsive ways of working with Human Rights Defenders and partners to a re-assessment of what works for Human Rights Defenders and partners nuanced experiences, time, and resources.

“We did follow up on their situation specifically but looking back (when we did ethics training that an Amnesty International UK staff member led on), that was one of the things I reflect on. If I had had that training before, would we have done things the same way?”

–Amnesty International UK staff member

However, as the evaluation found, these considerations tended to sit in pockets and were not applied systematically by all involved within the Brave campaign.

Brave Campaign Aim

More Human Rights Defenders, particularly women and young people, are able to carry out their work more safely and effectively, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them

Overall, the Brave Campaign achieved its aim. Based on the evidence, more Human Rights Defenders are now able to carry out their work more effectively. While the nature of Human Rights work is unsafe, even in the UK, Human Rights Defenders are able to undertake their work more safely due to enabling factors such as their level of connection and the ways in which they are equipped to advance their human rights work. Through the strength of campaign assets, increased relatability, and improved engagement with supporters and the UK government, the Brave Campaign increased awareness and recognition of Human Rights Defenders and their causes.

Annexe 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

Amnesty International UK – Evaluation of AIUK Priority (Global) Campaign Terms of Reference for Evaluation Consultant(s)*

**We encourage tenders from a wide variety of organisations and individuals, from well-established consultants to those pitching for work for the first time, potentially including consultants based anywhere in the world.*

Amnesty International is a global human rights movement of over 7 million people. The Amnesty International UK (AIUK) Section is one of over 50 national Sections in countries across the world.

AIUK is continually working to improve its evaluation and learning processes to better understand the impact of its work and its contribution to human rights change. The Section recognises that impact can be both positive and negative, intended and unintended, and believes it is important to seek to understand and learn from the effects of its work in all these respects, including as part of the journey to becoming an anti-racist organisation.

The movement's current 'Global Campaigns' model is that Amnesty Sections around the world campaign together over the medium term on one/ two high profile and strategically important issues. One such global campaign, *Brave*, ran 2017-2021, with a focus on creating change with and for Human Rights Defenders [*Human Rights Defenders are people who champion and fight for human rights for us all. They can face all kinds of risks – from campaigns of intimidation and misinformation, to fabricated criminal charges, forced disappearance, imprisonment, torture and murder – in reprisal for the work that they do*].

AIUK is now seeking someone to help us by conducting an independent evaluation of the Section's *Brave* campaign. The findings and recommendations from the evaluation will be used to understand and communicate the impacts of the campaign, and how and why these were achieved (or not), as well as to inform our approach to continuing to work with Human Rights Defenders, and to future AIUK priority global campaigns, which will be developed in the context of the organisation's next strategic plan (2022 – 2030). We are particularly keen to learn how to build on our approach to participation, increasing and improving the way that we work together with people with lived experience of the campaign issue, as well as how to embed an approach which actively challenges inequalities and systems of oppression.

Evaluation of Amnesty International UK *Brave* Campaign

1. *Background to the Campaign*

The overarching goal of Amnesty International's global *Brave* campaign was *for Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) to be more empowered in a safe and enabled environment, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them*.

As a national section of Amnesty International, AIUK aimed to contribute to the global campaign in the most strategic way, seeking to contribute to change both in the UK and internationally. AIUK developed its own strategy under the umbrella of the *Brave* global campaign as a major priority campaign for the UK Section.

Launched in May 2017, AIUK's campaign sought to contribute to the overarching global aim, setting a related aim of: *More HRDs, particularly women and young people, are able to carry out their work more safely and effectively, alongside thousands who are inspired to act against injustice with them*. The AIUK strategy identified three outcomes:

- HRDs, particularly women and young people, are better protected, recognised, connected and equipped to carry out their work;
- individual Human Rights Defenders at risk feel increased support and are better protected from attacks, intimidation and harassment by state or non-state actors; and

- an increased number of people in the UK are actively engaged in campaigning with and in support of Human Rights Defenders in the UK and around the world.

2. *Rationale and scope of the evaluation*

Whilst certain elements of both the global and AIUK *Brave* campaigns are continuing in 2021, both campaigns in the full priority form drew to a close at the end of 2020, and so this can be considered a summative evaluation. The evaluation for AIUK will have both a **learning and an accountability purpose, with the emphasis being on learning**. As such, the evaluation findings and recommendations will be proactively shared with **both internal and external stakeholder groups** (including all participants in the evaluation), as well as being made available more widely. An evaluation of the global campaign is also being conducted separately. The evaluation of the AIUK *Brave* campaign will provide **independent analysis of the campaign's key achievements and challenges; as well as an assessment of people's participation and experience of the campaign**.

The evaluation will have an **external focus, concentrating primarily on the impacts that the campaign had, and how different stakeholder groups (predominantly HRDs and their organisations, as well as partner organisations) experienced it, with lessons to be drawn from this**. The evaluation will cover the period from planning (considering participation in strategy development) through to implementation and exit.

The evaluation has been requested by AIUK's Head of Campaigns, who will be the lead stakeholder in the evaluation process. However, as the work under evaluation is part of the Amnesty International global campaigning model and the approach to the UK campaign has been one of collaboration and partnership, other parts of the Amnesty movement, including the International Secretariat, as well as other partner organisations in the UK and rights holders (both in the UK and internationally), will also be participants in the evaluation.

Objectives for the evaluation:

The evaluation consultant(s) will provide AIUK with independent analysis of:

- the extent to which the aim, outcomes and objectives of Amnesty International UK's *Brave* campaign have been achieved and the theory of change borne out, and the reasons (including AIUK's role/ contribution) for this (as far as can be identified), as well as any additional (unplanned/ unintended) impacts arising from the campaign (whether positive or negative);
- the ways in which Amnesty International UK's *Brave* campaign challenged/ worked to dismantle, or reinforced/ perpetuated inequalities and systems of oppression;
- how key individual HRDs and partner organisations (including particularly HRD-led organisations) experienced and perceived the campaign and their participation in it, as well as what impact (planned and unplanned, positive and negative) resulted for them;

and will also identify clear lessons learned and actionable recommendations for building on successful approaches and overcoming challenges, to support AIUK to make further improvements in relation to:

- developing and delivering global priority campaigns, with a particular focus on the participation of people with lived experience of the campaign issues;
- embedding an approach which actively challenges inequalities and systems of oppression into the development and delivery of our campaigning work; and
- working with Human Rights Defenders and their organisations.

3. *Approach and methodology*

It is expected that the evaluation will use qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and that – in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic - all stakeholder engagement will take place remotely. The evaluation will have the opportunity to review the campaign strategy and background documents, and other relevant materials, including internal evaluations of some of the *Brave* campaign projects. Internal and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation will be agreed by the AIUK Head of Campaigns and the *Brave* Campaign

Manager, in consultation with the evaluator, and with advice from the evaluation manager. As to more specific methodology, we are open to the evaluator making recommendations as to the most appropriate approach which will deliver on the core purpose of this evaluation, to **enable us to understand what happened as a result of the campaign, and how we can improve in future.**

Depending on the methodology proposed and list of stakeholders agreed, it is highly likely that specific considerations regarding research ethics, ethical responsibilities to rights holders (including duty of care and informed consent), security of communications, data protection and safeguarding will need to be addressed, as well as measures put in place to enable participation of stakeholders, including through interpretation. **Members of the AIUK evaluation Steering Group will work with the evaluator to clarify specific requirements and provide support as appropriate.**

4. *Key deliverables*

Key deliverables expected from the evaluator are:

- A detailed evaluation plan, including enquiry framework and detailed evaluation methodology (with rationale for this: **what would you need to do in order to achieve each of the evaluation objectives**)
- A draft evaluation report
- Final evaluation report of not more than 30 pages with clear actionable recommendations, including an Executive Summary of not more than 4 pages, including key findings, lessons learned and actionable recommendations
- Presentation of findings workshops or other creative method of sharing final evaluation findings and recommendations

5. *Timeline*

The evaluation is expected to begin in late August 2021 and should be completed by December 2021, with the exception of dissemination activities to take place into early 2022. See below for an estimated timeline for the main evaluation activities. Exact dates will be decided by the Head of Campaigns, *Brave* Campaign Manager, and evaluation manager, in consultation with the evaluator:

- Call for proposals for evaluator(s) – **open from 24 June**
- Deadline for requests for additional information/ clarification prior to tender – **8th July**
- Deadline for proposal submission – **15th July**
- Shortlisted candidates notified – **by 12th August**
- Interviews with shortlisted candidates (conducted virtually) – **w/c 16th August**
- Selection of evaluator(s) and contracting – **mid-late August**
- Inception meetings and agreement of final evaluation questions, and timeframe – **late August/ early September**
- Data collection and analysis – **September - November**
- Final report – **early December**
- Dissemination workshops – **December/January 2022**

6. *Budget*

The budget for this evaluation is £15,000 inclusive of VAT and all expenses. Consultants are requested to provide a breakdown of budget and to outline in their submissions how their proposal constitutes good value for money. AIUK will be able to work with the selected evaluator(s) to establish how we can support you to deliver most effectively against the objectives of the evaluation within budget and other parameters – for example, through lending use of mechanisms for reaching our audiences – so please do think creatively about how you might go about meeting those objectives.

7. How to apply

Amnesty International UK Section invites bids from individual evaluators or organisations, both well-established consultants and those pitching for work for the first time. As all engagement will take place remotely, there is no overriding need for evaluators to be based in the UK; some availability during UK office hours will be required. As such we will consider applications from individuals or firms based anywhere in the world, but do get in touch if you are considering pitching for the work from outside of the UK as there are data protection and taxation considerations we may need to consider.

Applicants should demonstrate the following:

- Knowledge and experience of working in human rights or a closely related field; specific experience of working with Human Rights Defenders would be particularly relevant
- Experience of evaluating social change campaigns, and evidence of previous experience of similar evaluations
- Understanding of the ethical considerations which may arise in conducting and disseminating such an evaluation, and experience of having effectively managed such considerations
- Experience of working on issues of identity-based discrimination, such as sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ageism, racism, or ableism
- Experience of gathering input/ interviewing a range of stakeholders, including people affected by the issue
- Consideration of how the evaluation will be guided by AIUK's evaluation principles [see Appendix 1]
- [Desirable] Ability to communicate in Spanish and/or Arabic

Selection criteria will additionally include:

- Capacity to deliver to required timescales
- Suitability of methodology proposed
- Value for money
- Practicality of consultant's location from taxation and data protection POV if not based in the UK.

Please provide a written proposal of no more than 8 pages, no smaller than 12-point font, which includes the following:

- Brief outline of proposed approach to evaluation, including initial enquiry framework, methodology, and evaluation timeline (including reporting and dissemination), demonstrating an understanding of the evaluation brief and how the evaluator/evaluation team meet the selection criteria
- Budget outline to demonstrate value for money

Please ensure that your proposal does not include any personal identifying information, but instead do also complete the separate 'Personal info, Reference and Monitoring form' *[If your tender is on behalf of an evaluation team, rather than an individual, please complete this monitoring form for the person who will be the lead contact or delivering the majority of the work; if the work will be more evenly split between your team, each individual should complete a copy of this form. Thank you].*

Both documents should be submitted to recruitment@amnesty.org.uk no later than 15th July 2021. Please include "Brave evaluation tender" in the subject line. We will notify shortlisted applicants by 12th August, and arrange to meet (virtually) in the week commencing 16th August before making a decision.

Please note, the successful tender will be required to enter a contractual arrangement for a supply of services. This will not constitute employment for tax purposes, and the consultant or freelancer will not be entitled to our colleagues' terms and conditions.

If you have any questions prior to submitting your tender, please contact ruth.dawson@amnesty.org.uk by 8th July 2021. To support anonymous recruitment practice, please do not use this email address for submission of your proposal. Thank you.

APPENDIX 1

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL UK EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

Amnesty International UK aspires to ensure that the following principles guide our evaluation practice

1. ACTION-LED

Our evaluations will be action-led. Evaluations will be designed with actions and decisions in mind. We will know who and how evaluations will be used before the evaluation begins so that we can collect useful and usable information.

2. LEARNING

Our evaluations are fundamentally about learning. We will use the results of our evaluations to actively learn about the outcomes of our work and to adapt and improve the way we work. We will use these results to evidence and question assumptions that underpin our approach to achieving human rights change.

3. ACCESSIBLE

Our evaluations will be shared with appropriate audiences. We will consider and identify different audiences for the evaluation findings. We will communicate the findings and learning from our evaluations so that others can learn about our successes and areas to improve. We will make sure that our evaluations are clear, concise and engaging so that different audiences can understand and learn from them.

4. REFLECTIVE

We will take time to reflect on the findings of our evaluations and to understand their implications for AIUK policy or practice and make the required adaptations. We will seek further understanding from the evaluation findings by combining the results with insight from our own experiences.

5. PARTICIPATORY AND INCLUSIVE

Our evaluations will actively seek to enable different voices and perspectives on the effectiveness of our work to be heard. We will ensure that we understand how our work and its impact has been experienced by different stakeholders by including intersectional analysis in evaluations of our work.

6. ACCOUNTABLE

Our evaluations will be used to ensure that AIUK is accountable for the impact of its work to its stakeholders, including affected rights holders (primary stakeholders), partners, members, donors and staff. Not only will evaluation results be communicated clearly and openly, actions to improve policy and practice that result from the evaluation will be owned, monitored and reported to ensure that they are delivered.

7. TRANSPARENT

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



Our evaluations will be transparent. We will be open about the data sources and methods used, including any problems and limitations. We will communicate clearly and openly the results of our evaluations, our failures as well as our successes. However, we will ensure that we maintain confidentiality for contributors.

Why have I been chosen? This evaluation includes interviews and focus group discussions with Human Rights Defenders, Amnesty International UK and Secretariat Staff, youth, local groups, networks, and partners. You have been selected because you meet one or more of the following criteria:

Role – Play a key role in the campaign e.g., strategic, operational, advocacy, partner etc. Diversity in roles within the sample is considered.

Level of engagement – Connected to a particular project within the campaign for a significant period of time.

Outcome – Connected to a particular outcome within the campaign.

Evaluation Objective – Can surface findings relating to an evaluation objective.

Do I have to take part? No. Taking part in the project is voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time.

Risks and Benefits of participation Amnesty International UK has conducted a preliminary risk assessment prior to contacting you and agreed with you what platform is safest for us to use for our conversation. Any other potential risks, for example in connection to how what you tell us in the interview will be used, must be collaboratively identified and understood within the unique context of each evaluation participant. If you decide to take part, you can discuss any concerns specific to your context with the consultant without committing to taking part in the evaluation, and we can explore together what the options could be for how what you tell us will be represented (see below). Additionally, if you have specific questions regarding your safety, please reach out to:

Sara Rydkvist [Sara.Rydkvist@amnesty.org.uk]

Or

Karla McLaren [Karla.Mclaren@amnesty.org.uk]

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation

...

What if something goes wrong?

If you have a complaint arising from your interaction with this evaluation or if something serious occurs following your participation, please get in touch with staff at Amnesty International UK using the details above.

How will you look after my data?

We will look after your data in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and have agreements in place as part of our contract with Amnesty International UK to ensure this.

If you would like more information about your rights under the GDPR and Amnesty International UK's approach to data protection, please see <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/privacy-notice> or you can request additional information from the consultant named above.

Your personal data will be processed only for the purposes outlined in this Information Sheet.

What will happen to the results of this evaluation?

Amnesty International UK intends for the final evaluation report to be made publicly available in print and online. The report being published online means that the full reports and its contents will be available on the Amnesty International UK website.

Findings and recommendations might also be featured and shared on social media posts by the organisation. This means that after the evaluation is published (February 2022) it will be accessible online in the UK and in most places around the world and can be read and shared by anyone.



Will I be kept anonymous?

There are two broad categories for contribution to the evaluation: Identified and Anonymous.

If you prefer to make an identified contribution, quotes will be attributed to you in the report and your information may be used in other Amnesty International UK products presenting the findings such as the membership magazine.

If you prefer to make an anonymous contribution, the consultant named on this Information Sheet will anonymise your data during the interview. There are several ways in which you may make an anonymous contribution to the evaluation, for example the report may include a direct quote but only name you as "Interviewee". Due to the wide range of options for anonymous contributions, specific arrangements regarding your interview will be discussed and agreed upon during the consent discussion of the interview.

What will happen to me if I decide to take part?

The interview will last no more than 60 minutes. Before the interview, the consultant named on this Information Sheet will provide a brief introduction to themselves and the evaluation. You will confirm how you want to contribute to the evaluation. You will then be asked a few questions to confirm your understanding of this Information Sheet. Then the interview will begin.



Annexe 3: Cases, Conditions and Outcomes

CASES: HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS	
OUTCOMES	
Protected	How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better protected from threats and reprisals?
Equipped	How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better equipped with skills and knowledge?
Connected	How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better connected to other defenders and to decision-makers and influencers?
Recognised	How and to what extent do Human Rights Defenders feel better recognised by States?
CONDITIONS	
Case Improvement	Where and to what extent have Human Rights Defenders at risk seen positive developments in their cases?
National Solidarity (Non-UK)	How and in what ways has national support for Human Rights Defenders increased?
UK Solidarity	How and in what ways has UK support for Human Rights Defenders increased?
Exposure	How and to what extent have Human Rights Defenders increased their exposure to the UK government and public?
Awareness	How and in what ways have UK audiences become more aware of Human Rights Defenders?
Participation & Inclusion in Brave Campaign	How and to what extent are Human Rights Defenders, Women Human Rights Defenders, youth, their organisations, partners active participants in processes and decisions which affect their lives?

CASES: PROJECTS	
OUTCOMES	
Protected (Enabling)	How and to what extent do project environments better protect Human Rights Defenders from threats and reprisals?
Equipped (Enabling)	How and to what extent do project environments better equip Human Rights Defenders with skills and knowledge?
Connected (Enabling)	How and to what extent do project environments better connect Human Rights Defenders to other defenders and to decision-makers and influencers?

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



Recognised (Enabling)	How and to what extent do project environments improve recognition for Human Rights Defenders by States?
CONDITIONS	
Media	How and to what extent has the media increased their use of human rights terminology? How are and to what extent has the media reported on human rights related activism?
Political Landscape	How and to what extent have there been changes in the political landscape?
Network Expansion	How and to what extent have networks expanded?
Project Strategy	How and to what extent do projects articulate strategic and coherent aims, objectives, and outcomes? How and to what extent are projects sufficiently resourced to achieve aims, objectives, and outcomes?
Participation & Inclusion	How and to what extent are Human Rights Defenders, Women Human Rights Defenders, youth, their organisations, partners active participants in processes and decisions which affect their lives?

CASES: PROJECTS	
OUTCOME	
Challenging Systems of Oppression	How and to what extent do individuals associated with the Brave campaign feel it challenges oppression within social, economic, and political systems?
CONDITIONS	
Analysing Power Differentials	How and to what extent do projects/initiatives surface and analyse ideological, political, institutional, and economic systems of power and privilege? How and to what extent do projects/initiatives examine power differentials inherent to the lived experiences of people facing multiple forms of marginalisation?
Interprets Context	How and to what extent do projects develop their understanding of historical, locational, and sociocultural context? How and to what extent are projects/initiatives situated within a nuanced understanding of history, location, politics, and socio-cultural factors?
Intersectionality	How and to what extent do projects capture the experiences of people with multiple intersecting marginalised positionalities? How and to what extent do projects/initiatives mobilise intersectionality as a strategy to address how individuals are differently impacted by systems of oppression?
Rights, Equality and Treatment	How and to what extent does equality in rights, opportunity, and treatment appear within projects/initiatives? How and to what extent do projects/initiatives actively confront systems of inequality?
Cultural Representation	How and to what extent do campaign products challenge negative stereotypes, images, frames, and narratives?



Annexe 4: Interview Questions

Theme/Framing	Interview Questions
Context	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does it mean to be a [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defender in [country]? • Can you tell me more about your situation / case in [country]? • How did you first become involved in the Brave Campaign? Which parts of the campaign were you involved in? <p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you first become involved in the [project or Brave Campaign]? Which parts of the campaign were you involved in? • How did your work within the campaign interact with [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? <p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tell me about how your role interacts with human rights? • How did you first become aware of the [project or Brave Campaign]? Which parts of the campaign were you aware of? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Country Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does it mean to be a country coordinator at Amnesty International? • How did you interact with the Brave Campaign? Which campaign approaches or projects did you work on? • How did you interact with [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders as part of the Brave Campaign? • How do you track and keep up to date with human rights work in your country / region? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does it mean to be an activist working on human rights in the UK? • What campaign activities did you conduct? <p>Amnesty International Secretariat</p> <p>Tell me about your role at the Amnesty International Secretariat? How did that interact with the Brave Campaign?</p>



<p>Case Improvement: There has been a positive development in the case of a human rights defender at risk</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What positive or negative changes have you experienced with your situation or case since [period of time]? • What do you think contributed to these positive and negative changes?
<p>Protected: Better protected from threats and reprisals</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you feel protected? If yes, in what ways? If no, what could have made you feel more protected? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Country Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you seen a change in the way Human Rights Defenders are treated in the region you work on? What does this change look like for Women, Young and LGBTIQ+ Human Rights Defenders? • What factors or actors do you think have affected this change? How did the Brave interact with this change, if at all?
<p>Connected: Better connected to other defenders and to decision-makers and influencers</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you feel connected to others? If yes, in what ways and who did you feel connected to? If no, what could have helped you to connect to others? <p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways did your work connect [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders to decision makers or influencers? • How has this changed across your involvement in the campaign? What do you think caused that to change? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Country Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways did your work connect [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders to decision makers or influencers? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did your campaign activities support [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did your campaign activities support [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? <p>Amnesty International UK Project Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What tactics or approaches did you put in place to make sure [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders were connected to other HRDs, influencers and decision makers? How did this work? What worked? What didn't work? <p>Amnesty International UK Steering Group</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What role did the Steering group play in maximising opportunities to connect [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders to other HRDs, influencers and decision makers? How did this work? What worked? What didn't work?
<p>Equipped: Equipped with skills and knowledge</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you feel equipped to deal with some of these positive and/or negative changes? If yes, in what ways did you feel equipped to deal with these changes? If no, what could have helped you feel more equipped? <p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways did your work equip [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders with skills and knowledge? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What skills and knowledge did you learn from working on this campaign? What else will you take away from your work on this campaign?
<p>Recognised: Recognised by states and non-state actors</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does your state (government) recognise you as a [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defender? If yes, how has this changed and in a positive or negative way? What do you think influenced this? <p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways do you feel recognition of Human Rights Defenders has changed in the UK? What do you think caused that to change? <p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From your perspective, do you think that [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders are better recognised in the UK? If yes, in what ways? • What do you think lead to increased or reduced recognition? • From your perspective, do you think that [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders are better recognised by the UK wherever they are in the world? If yes, in what ways? • What do you think lead to increased or reduced recognition? <p>Amnesty International UK Project Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What tactics or approaches did you put in place to make sure [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders were recognised by the FCO / UK government? How did this work? What worked? What didn't work? <p>Amnesty International UK Steering Group</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What role did the Steering group play in maximising opportunities to increase recognition of [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders and their work with the FCO / UK government? How did this work? What worked? What didn't work?
<p>Participation and Inclusion: Active Participation is an empowering and enabling process through which rights holders, human rights defenders, partners and activists participate in and influence the processes and decisions which affect their lives and/or AI's campaigning. (AIUK definition)</p>	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways and when were you consulted? How did your input affect the campaign and/or influence decision making? • What was your experience of working with Amnesty UK? How did it make you feel? • What did / didn't you like about Amnesty UK's approach to this campaign? • On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your collaboration with Amnesty UK? <p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was your experience of working with Amnesty UK? How did it make you feel? • What did / didn't you like about Amnesty UK's approach to this campaign? • On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate your collaboration with Amnesty UK? • If you were to work with Amnesty UK in the future, what would you change about the Brave Campaign [or project] and specifically your collaboration? • How did your involvement with XXX affect your human rights work and work with defenders? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Country Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did / didn't you like about Amnesty UK's approach to this campaign? • If you were to work with Amnesty UK in the future, what would you change about the Brave Campaign and specifically your collaboration? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you get involved with the Brave Campaign at Amnesty International UK? Which parts of the campaign were you involved in? • What did / didn't you like about Amnesty UK's approach to this campaign? • If you were to work with Amnesty UK in the future, what would you change about the Brave Campaign and specifically your collaboration? <p>Amnesty International UK Project Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At what stages of the campaign or projects were [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders consulted? What factors affected this? How did you use their recommendations / what influence did their inclusion and participation have on decision making? • At what stages of the campaign or projects were partners consulted? What factors affected this? <p>Amnesty International Secretariat</p>

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you tell us more about how you worked with AIUK on relationship holding with key HRDs? <p>Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did you gain from your partnership with Amnesty International UK on Pride Inside? [Please explain your answer with consideration for how this was unique to Amnesty International UK] • Can you provide an example of one or two of the benefits mentioned above? • What type of negative risks did you experience from your partnership with Amnesty International UK? • Can you provide an example of one or two of the risks mentioned above? • How supportive was your partnership with Amnesty International UK? • How extractive was your partnership with Amnesty International UK?
Outcomes	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did your involvement with the Brave Campaign and AIUK's work affect your human rights work? If yes, in what ways? • Do you feel your involvement in the campaign [or with Amnesty International UK] had mostly positive or negative affects on your work? Please describe your answer.
Systems of Oppression	<p>All Evaluation Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did Amnesty UK represent you as a [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defender? How did you feel about this representation? • To what extent do you feel the Brave Campaign challenges oppression within social, economic, and political systems? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The campaign doesn't challenge systems of oppression ○ Some areas of the campaign indirectly challenge systems of oppression. ○ Some areas of the campaign slightly challenge systems of oppression ○ Many areas of the campaign directly challenge systems of oppression ○ All areas of the campaign challenge systems of oppression • Based on your response, can you tell me more about where you are or aren't seeing the campaign challenge systems of oppression? <p>Amnesty International UK Steering Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "How were [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders represented across the Brave Campaign projects? • What (if anything) affected this representation?" <p>Amnesty International Secretariat</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "How were [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders represented across the Brave Campaign projects?" • What (if anything) affected this representation?"
Learning	<p>Human Rights Defenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you were to work with Amnesty UK in the future, what would you change about the Brave Campaign and specifically your collaboration? <p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defender work will be a priority in the future? If yes, how? If no, why not? <p>Amnesty International UK Project Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons will you take forward into designing the next campaign? <p>Amnesty International UK Steering Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons will you take forward into designing the strategy for the next campaign?
Political Landscape: Developments or changes (e.g. change in government or new law) within the political landscape in the UK and/or country where the Human Rights Defender operates	<p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does it mean to work on human rights in the UK? • How did your involvement with the Brave Campaign affect your human rights work and work with defenders? If yes, in what ways? <p>Amnesty International UK Project Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus group participants will be invited to reconstruct a time-line of significant campaign events (2017-2021) • The focus group participants will be invited to add significant outcomes / areas of change on the time-line (2017-2021) • The focus group participants will then be invited to add significant political, social or economic events/changes that intersected with the campaign (2016-2020) • Why was this event particularly significant? What happened? How did it intersect with your work and the campaign?
UK Solidarity: Increased UK support (through messaging, signatures, donations, events) by the public, partners, civil society, networks,	<p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways did your work build UK solidarity for [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? • How has this changed across your involvement in the campaign? What do you think caused that to change?



<p>Amnesty supporters and the UK government</p>	<p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the UK government currently support [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? • Do you know of any commitments the UK government has made in support of [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders over the past five years? • Do you think the support has increased or reduced over the past five years? • How is this different for Women, LGBTI+ or young Human Rights Defenders? • What do you think has affected the increase or reduction? • How do you think the UK government could support [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders better? <p>Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a scale of 1 - 5, how do you feel Pride Inside contributed to increasing UK solidarity for Human Rights Defenders? [Please explain your answer]
<p>National Solidarity: Increased national support for Human Rights Defenders</p>	<p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Country Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does National Solidarity look like for the [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders you work with? • How did the Brave Campaign support national solidarity for [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? • Do you think campaign activities played a role in supporting national solidarity for [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders? If yes, in what ways?
<p>Project Strategy</p>	<p>Partners/Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were some of the key successes of the [Project or part of the campaign] you were involved in? What factors do you think made it a success? • What were some of the challenges of the [Project or part of the campaign] you were involved in? What factors do you think made it challenging? <p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did any of the parts you just mentioned influence your human rights work? Were there any components in particular that you felt were more or less influential? In what ways? <p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were some of the key successes of your campaign activities? What factors do you think made it a success? • What were some of the challenges of your campaign activities? What factors do you think made it

a challenge?

Amnesty International UK Project Group

- Tell me about how the Brave Campaign and projects were designed? How did the projects fit together? What factors in the design worked / didn't work?
- How were [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human rights Defender cases selected? How did this change when [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders were considered no longer at risk?
- How were project areas selected? What did adaptations look like? What factors or actors were considered when a project was adapted?
- How were partners selected? What was the inclusion or exclusion criteria?
- What were some of the key successes of the campaign? What factors do you think made it a success?
- What were some of the challenges of the campaign? What factors do you think made it a challenge or failure?
- Tell us about working with UK audiences specifically, what was successful? What was challenging?
- Are you aware of any unexpected, unplanned or negative outcomes? If yes, can you tell me about them...? How did you become aware of these?

Amnesty International UK Steering Group

- Tell me about how the Brave Campaign strategy was designed? How did the projects and objectives fit together? Who was involved in the strategy design? What factors in the design worked / didn't work?
- How was the aim and objectives selected? How were these adapted across the campaign? What factors were considered when the strategy or objectives were adapted?
- What were some of the key successes of the campaign? What factors do you think made it a success?
- What were some of the challenges of the campaign? What factors do you think make it a challenge or failure?
- Are you aware of any unexpected, unplanned or negative outcomes? If yes, can you tell me about them...? How did you become aware of these?

Amnesty International Secretariat

- How was the Global Brave Campaign designed? Who was involved in the design?
- What was your initial vision in terms of how the Global Brave Campaign and AIUK Brave Campaign complement and interact with each other?
- What were the specific areas of collaboration between IS and AIUK?

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What influence did the Global campaign have over AIUK Brave Campaign decision making? • From your perspective, what were some of the successes of the AIUK campaign? Were these similar or different to successes at the Global campaign level? • From your perspective, what were some of the challenges of the AIUK campaign? Were these similar or different to the challenges and failures at the Global campaign level? • What do you think was the added value of the AIUK campaign? • How will you change your support to national campaigns in the future?
Exposure: Human Rights Defenders and their cases have increased exposure to the UK government through visits and the UK public through media partnerships / articles / social media	<p>Political Figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you engage with or support [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders in your role? If yes, in what ways? Were any of these engagements facilitated by Amnesty International UK? • If yes, what did you take away from your engagement with the [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders?
Awareness: UK audiences are more aware of human rights	<p>Amnesty International UK Activists - Youth Groups/Local Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think people in your school and/or local area are more or less aware of [Woman, LGBTIQ, Youth] Human Rights Defenders now? Why do you think that?

Annexe 5: Monitoring Data

	2018	Q1/Q2 2020	2020	Q1 2021
--	------	------------	------	---------

Amnesty International UK
Brave Evaluation

...

Volume of articles			338	112
Media mentions	775	109		
Potential audience	533,771,139	114,397,832	584,000,000	28,800,534
Comfortably Convinced	96.6% '+8.5%	65.7% +12.1%	76%	67%
Sceptical Moderates	95.5% '+7.4%	62.6% +9.0%	74%	67%
Stretched Believers	88.9% '+0.8%	46.5% -7.0%	67%	59%
Young Optimists	82.9% '-5.2%	53.6% 0%	75%	63%
BME			37%	36%
LGBTQI			51%	55%