

DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK FOR THE STRATEGIC GOALS

In July 2014, the International Board agreed the following criteria to guide decisions on what should be included in Amnesty International's Strategic Goals (2106-19). There is a set of criteria for each individual goal (human rights and organizational), followed by a set for assessing the package of goals as a whole.

Criteria for assessing proposed HUMAN RIGHTS goals:

Criterion	Guidance	Rationale
<p>1. Gravity of the problem addressed by the goal</p> <p>Scoring value: 1-4</p>	<p>1-2 points: there is a strong case for prioritising this goal because of the large scale/serious impact of the problem on victims and communities</p> <p>3-4 points: there is an urgent need for this goal to be prioritised because of the large scale/serious impact of the problem on victims and communities and because it would address a structural cause of human rights abuses or a wider deterioration in the human rights situation</p>	<p>Encourages us to invest our energies where the needs are greatest</p>
<p>2. Playing to Amnesty's strengths and ensuring we are 'adding / creating value'</p> <p>Scoring value: 1-5</p>	<p>1 point: Amnesty would add value by bringing our expertise and international reputation to bear by 'shining a light' and because we are able to mobilise people towards realisation of the goal</p> <p>2-3 points: As well as adding value by 'shining a light'/mobilising, Amnesty would bring a strong human rights angle that is otherwise missing from the current framing of the issue/existing efforts</p> <p>4 points: There is a significant gap among organisations working on the issue that Amnesty is uniquely well placed to fill <u>or</u> Amnesty is already the recognised leader in this area and exit/de-prioritisation would create a serious risk of regression</p> <p>5 points: As well as all of the above, rights holders/other relevant actors have made a powerful case for Amnesty to prioritise this</p>	<p>Harnesses our substantive expertise and capacity to mobilise</p> <p>Promotes a strategic division of labour with other organisations working on human rights and wider social justice issues</p> <p>Consistent with the value we place on being 'inventive' including ground-breaking and fresh-thinking (see movement Values)</p> <p>Helps us to be responsive to the needs identified by rights holders/other relevant actors and to avoid jumping on already crowded 'bandwagons'</p>

<p>3. Work across regions and at multiple levels</p> <p>Scoring value: 1-3</p>	<p>1 point: The goal is relevant to a good range of countries (eg in different regions, in both the Global North and South, in small and large countries etc)</p> <p>2 points: As well as being relevant across a good range of countries, there is strong potential for coordination/integration of work across Amnesty entities of different sizes in these regions</p> <p>3 points: The issue would benefit from a significant investment from multiple Amnesty stakeholders from across (and within) regions and we will be able to harness our unique ability to connect from the local to the global from a human rights perspective</p>	<p>Promotes solidarity and global coherence</p> <p>Harnesses our global capabilities and ability to link work at multiple levels</p>
<p>4. High possibility of positive impact</p> <p>Scoring value: 1-5</p>	<p>1 point: some potential to deliver positive impact (possibly towards a long term change) e.g. because we can work directly with rights holders or make the case for accountability even if it is not politically timely for us to prioritise this right now</p> <p>2-3 points: medium potential to deliver positive impact towards a long term change within this specific four year period e.g. because there is good potential to mobilise including among target groups (e.g. youth or local constituencies) even if there is no concrete opportunity to coalesce around</p> <p>4-5 points: strong potential to deliver high impact in this particular four year period because there is strong potential to mobilise key constituencies and a big push by Amnesty would be politically timely e.g. because there is a key 'moment' at the national, regional or international levels to deliver policy change or accountability or a looming crisis we could help avert</p>	<p>We exist in order to deliver positive human rights change in accordance with Amnesty's four dimensions of change (people's lives, activism and mobilisation, policies, accountability) – and we must expect that anything we invest resources in can deliver this, either in the short and/or long term</p> <p>Note that when considering timeliness we must also bear in mind that halting/minimising attacks on rights is also a positive impact</p>
<p>5. Clarity of short term (4 year) outcome</p> <p>Scoring value: 0-3</p>	<p>0-1 points: the proposed 4 year outcome is too vague. It would not give the movement sufficient direction and lack of clarity would make evaluating performance difficult.</p> <p>2-3 points: the specific change we are seeking to bring about in the 4 year period is well defined and performance is clearly measurable.</p>	<p>Reflects calls from the movement for goals that are outcome-oriented and give clear direction to the movement</p>

Criteria for assessing proposed ORGANISATIONAL goals:

Aim	Guidance	Rationale
Equipping Amnesty to deliver our mission and our human rights goals Scoring value: 1-5	1 point: Delivery of the goal would tackle an area of serious and persistent organisational weakness identified via our learning, accountability and impact evaluation work, staff engagement exercises, or by our governance, management or advisory structures 2-3 points: Delivery of the goal is also an important step towards transforming Amnesty’s effectiveness in one or two key areas prioritised in our human rights goals 4-5 points: Delivery of the goal is critical for further progressing changes we have already embarked on that are aimed at greatly strengthening Amnesty as a whole by revitalising and ensuring the long-term sustainability, integration and impact of our movement in a changing world	Ensures we focus on and invest in major changes needed to be “fit-for-purpose”
Clarity of short term (4 year) outcome	0 points: the proposed 4 year outcome is too vague. It would not give the movement sufficient direction and this lack of clarity would make evaluating performance very difficult. 2-3 points: the specific change we are seeking to bring about in the 4 year period is well defined and performance is clearly measurable.	Reflects calls from the movement for goals that are outcome-oriented and give clear direction to the movement

Other considerations:

Bearing in mind that calculated risk-taking is an important element of developing as a movement and increasing Amnesty’s impact, any serious risks – either in taking on or not taking on an issue – should be assessed at an early stage and mitigation options explored:

- high risk to Amnesty if we fail to prioritise this area e.g. risk of irrelevance/falling on the wrong side of history/brand damage
- high risk to Amnesty (that would be difficult to mitigate) if we do prioritise this e.g. undermining our core values such as risk to perception of our independence of impartiality; or brand damage

Each Strategic Goal should also be drafted using simple, clear and inspiring language. There should be a clear rationale for choices made and each goal should indicate the long-term aim as well as the outcome expected during the four-year period.

Criteria for assessing the PACKAGE of GOALS as a whole:

Criteria	Questions to ask	Rationale
1.Growth potential	<i>Will the goals as a whole help us make the most of opportunities for growth in paying members/activism identified via solid evidence e.g. market research etc?</i>	Growth in paying members/activism was identified as high priority in phase 1 of the ‘conversation’ – although this cannot mean that we avoid difficult/unpopular issues

2. Equipping Amnesty for longer term challenges (the 'big picture')	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Will this package of Strategic Goals strengthen our ability to protect the human rights agenda in the face of 'big picture' challenges including arising from shifting power relations between the individual and the state, the global power transition, globalization, (uneven) development, the information revolution, and climate change?</i> 	The Strategic Goals only cover a 4 year period but they need to be developed with an eye on 'meta' trends and other developments that will shape our operating environment in the longer term
3. Balance between 'signature' and 'cutting edge' issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Has the right balance been struck between 'signature' issues and issues at the cutting edge of human rights protection?</i> ➤ <i>Are we allowing for flexibility and the need to respond to emerging needs?</i> 	Maintain key strengths while also being responsive to emerging needs
4. Inter-dependent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Do the goals support (or at least not undermine) each other?</i> ➤ <i>In particular will organisational development efforts in the goals appropriately enable success in the human rights efforts</i> 	Ensuring coherence and mutual support across the breadth of human rights efforts, and with organisational development
5. Demonstrate indivisibility of civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Have we struck the right balance between civil and political, and economic, social and cultural rights across the goals?</i> ➤ <i>Are there ways to integrate analysis/action on different types of rights within specific goals?</i> 	Amnesty's mandate has long included the full spectrum of rights but there is a general view that economic, social and cultural rights are not yet part of our 'DNA' and are too often worked on in a silo
6. Gender perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Are gender perspectives evident within and across the Strategic Goals?</i> ➤ <i>Will work in the proposed areas enable us to better embed gender considerations in our work and organisation?</i> 	INGO Accountability Charter reporting, among others, have identified this as an area Amnesty needs to strengthen
7. Strong campaigning opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Can clear campaigning objectives (global, regional and/or national levels) be identified within the human rights goals, including clear calls on duty-bearers and opportunities for work on behalf of named individuals?</i> ➤ <i>Do these include strategic opportunities for mobilisation of members?</i> 	Our global campaigns will come from the Strategic Goals rather than being selected through a separate process – we will need to narrow selection of possible global campaigns during 2014
8. Movement passion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Do the goals reflect areas for which there is clear passion across the movement?</i> ➤ <i>Will all parts of the movement be engaged in multiple goals?</i> 	Our theory of change is premised on people's engagement and for a movement-wide strategy to be successful, it needs to be developed from the "bottom up" and "owned" by the movement.
9. Fundability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Is the overall package of goals realistic within our human/financial resource constraints?</i> ➤ <i>Have resource implications (such as developing capability in new areas, costs of exiting such as loss of existing grants and/or making the most of investments to date) been properly assessed?</i> 	Resources constraints were not adequately considered during the process to develop our current ISP - this was criticised in the process evaluation

	➤ <i>Will we be able to raise new funds for delivery of this strategy?</i>	
--	--	--