



**Promoting fair and
effective criminal justice**

PRI Partnership Review

24 May 2016

1. Background

PRI has a range of partnerships with local and international civil society organisations and networks, professional bodies and experts (eg. judges, social workers), government Ministries and probation and prison services, and inter-governmental and UN bodies. PRI works with partners to provide expertise, training, resources, advocacy and pilot model projects in order to develop and implement legislation, policy and international standards. Partnerships range from formal MoUs with partners to deliver specific project outcomes, to one-off activities or ongoing work with organisations, for example, for joint advocacy. In 2015, PRI had 26 formal partnerships with civil society organisations (with whom PRI has a MoU) in 15 countries. Annex I provides some examples of PRI's partnerships and Annex II comprises two case studies.

PRI developed a new [Partnership Strategy in 2014](#). This defined the different types of partnerships that PRI has and our partnership criteria and principles. Management tools were developed to support PRI staff to identify, select, manage and review partnerships. These were piloted with selected partners during 2014-16. PRI's definition of partnership is defined as:

'A collaborative association for a common purpose either for project implementation, advocacy or research purposes which benefits both partners. It is a working relationship based on trust, respect, transparency, participatory processes, with clearly defined and agreed objectives and methods of working.'

There is increasing recognition by PRI, donors and the wider sector of the importance of effective partnerships. There is an increasing number and range of actors in the development and aid sector. These include the private sector, academic institutions, social enterprises and wider civil society and movements, beyond more traditional NGOs. The capacity and scope of actors/organisations in 'beneficiary' countries are also increasing. International / UK-based NGOs, therefore, need to demonstrate their 'added value' and purpose in an increasingly competitive sector. Effective partnerships can also demonstrate value for money (VfM); collaboration and co-ordination maximise partners' expertise, experience, resources, and avoid duplication.

2. Purpose of the Partnership Review

In light of the above, in 2016, PRI decided to undertake a Partnership Review in order to: *Assess and document the effectiveness and value of PRI's current partnership working and identify ways to improve our partnership working. Evidence and recommendations will inform PRI's programming, proposals and reports to donors, and Partnership Strategy.*

The objectives are to identify the following.

- PRI's 'added value' as a partner, with documented examples.
- Current good practice and success factors in PRI's partnerships.
- Lessons learned and ways to improve PRI's partnership working.
- Recommendations for PRI's future partnership working and revisions to Partnership Strategy and tools.

3. Methodology

The review took place between April to May 2016 and drew upon: PRI's Partnership Strategy, tools and database of partners and consultants; evaluations of PRI's projects; PPA reports; nine partnership reviews – surveys and interviews with PRI partners; two partners' final reports; PRI staff survey on use of the strategy and tools (23 staff responded); Value for Money assessment with one partner in Uganda; partnership reviews 2013 and 2014 (partners managed by PRI Head Office); results from PRI's Bond Partner health check 2013; learning and good practice from other agencies in the PPA partner learning group. The scope of the review was limited given PRI's capacity and the timeframe, and that partners were interviewed by PRI staff, which may impact on responses given. The PPA coordinator coordinated the Review, with the participation of other staff in the partner reviews, partner reports and staff survey.

4. Summary findings from Partner Reviews

Nine partner reviews were conducted March-May 2016. Partners and PRI staff responsible for the partnership completed a partner review form and took part in a skype/telephone interview.

As part of the review exercise, partners and PRI were asked to rate a number of questions. A summary of responses is below:

Main objectives: Partners were asked to rate the extent to which the objectives of the partnership (based on the MoUs and/or project objectives) have been met to date. **5 partners said that the objectives had been 'fully met'**. 4 said that the objectives had been either been 'partly' met or that it was 'too early to tell / unsure'.

Added value: Partners and PRI were asked to what extent the partnership had added value to their work overall. **9 partners replied that the partnership had added 'a lot' of value to their work.** PRI said that all 9 partnerships had added 'a lot' of value to PRI's work.

Satisfaction with partnership working: Partners and PRI were asked to what extent they have been satisfied with the partnership relations and working. **All 9 partners said they were satisfied ‘a lot’**. PRI said they were satisfied ‘a lot’ for 8 partnerships and ‘somewhat’ for 1 partnership.

Partnership criteria: Partners and PRI were asked to rate the extent to which the partnership had helped them achieve the following criteria (based on the criteria included in the ‘criteria selection tool’):

Partners’ responses

	A lot	Somewhat	Not at all	Not sure / too early to tell
Greater beneficiary, stakeholder, network reach	8	1		
Wider geographical reach	7	2		
Provision of expertise	9			
Greater profile	7	2		
Stronger/wider advocacy voice	5	4		
Sharing learning, gaining skills, knowledge	9			
Increase/more effective use of resources and funding	7	2		
Supported sustainability of work	7	1		1

PRI responses

	A lot	Somewhat	Not at all	Not sure / too early to tell
Greater beneficiary, stakeholder, network reach	8	1		
Wider geographical reach	6	3		
Provision of expertise	6	3		
Greater profile	3	6		
Stronger/wider advocacy voice	3	6		
Sharing learning, gaining skills, knowledge	4	5		
Increase/more effective use of resources and funding	5	3	1	
Supported sustainability of work	7	2		

5. ‘Added Value’ of PRI’s partnerships

The partner reviews, together with a number of partner final reports and evaluations of PRI’s programmes, identified how our partnerships ‘add value’ to both PRI’s and partners’ work. The key areas of ‘added value’ identified correspond closely to PRI’s partnership criteria.

PRI’s local NGO partners are able to deliver services directly to offenders, which supports PRI’s work at legislative and policy level, eg. implementing new probation systems, piloting rehabilitation programmes and enabling guidelines on international standards to be informed by direct experience with offenders. Where PRI does not have a local office, partnerships enable PRI to **reach more beneficiaries, ensure interventions are cost-effective and are locally appropriate**.

In turn, PRI has enabled partners to have their **voices heard by higher-level officials, facilitated local civil society alliances, provided international expertise and exposure to international good practice** and learning. Membership of networks and partnerships with inter-governmental bodies has strengthened international advocacy work, adding 'weight' and outreach. Partnerships **improve the efficiency and quality of our work** eg. through sharing of resources or expertise.

Examples and quotes of the added value areas for PRI and partners

✓ Enabled a wider reach (stakeholders, beneficiaries, geographically)

'PRI was able to organise meetings with both government and NGOs. We were able to use these contacts and continue this engagement.' NGO partner

'We ... have always worked locally within the local region. Partnership with PRI enabled us to extend its reach across the country and also with other countries in the region, to meet and work with others and exchange experience.' *'The partnership enabled us to become a NPM member and this has helped us widen our activities.'* NGO partner

'This partnership enabled PRI to contribute to the criminal justice system in Pakistan – due to security issues, we would not otherwise be able to work in KP Province. They have the expertise and experience of the local context that PRI does not. It is respected and has contacts with the relevant stakeholders, which PRI would not have.' PRI

Partnerships with NGOs in Georgia and in Jordan, and NGOs receiving small grants from PRI in Kazakhstan and Ukraine – who are all able to deliver services (legal aid, health services, social services, vocational training) and deliver pilot schemes directly to offenders in prisons and post-release, enabled PRI to extend its 'reach', enabling policy and international standards to be put into practice and support advocacy work.

✓ Gained knowledge, expertise, learning

'Opportunity to learn from the other two countries in the region, especially as Tajikistan is 'behind' in this area ... continuing to have contact with these NGOs (outside of project activities).' NGO Partner

'PRI's previous training to the Probation department and magistrates (2012-14) provided us with the expertise to train others on CSOs [Community Service Orders].' Government probation department

'PRI was able to bring its regional and international expertise. PRI has a wide global network of experts and contacts it can call on. PRI has provided this expertise even outside of the project.' NGO Partner

'We gained a lot of benefit from PRI expertise especially on juvenile justice, and research training on Bangkok Rules. Expertise was also shared within the country and region. Women prison officers gained knowledge, NGO coalition of children of imprisoned parents also gained knowledge. They have shared with others.' NGO partner

'Their local knowledge and expertise was very useful and appreciated in doing the baseline research.' PRI on NGO partner

✓ Supported advocacy and access to high-level officials

'Partnership with PRI provides excellent opportunity to communicate with law enforcement bodies and officials directly. For the most NGOs in Belarus such communication is impossible ... PRI has good image in Belarus due to its long standing work in the country....' NGO partner

'Partnership with PRI 'opens doors to governmental structures and the parliament ... involving national experts to development of legislative amendments.' NGO partner

'We previously only had contact with local officials and stakeholders. PRI, as an international NGO, has access to high-level officials, which we were able to then engage with – this would not have happened without the partnership with PRI. This contact with high-level officials is now ongoing and enabled us to promote changes at higher level. PRI's status as an international NGO helps with these official meetings.' NGO partner

'Contact facilitated by PRI for us to engage with the Head of Probation and Penitentiary Department during the project has continued and enabled us to be able to continue the work.' NGO partner

'We already had a profile on the national platform, but this gave us an opportunity to extend this, especially on women and on children of imprisoned parents. Also at the ACERWC [African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child]. We are now recognised as leading in these areas.' NGO partner

6. How partnerships help to sustain PRI's and partners' work

Another area of added value is that partnerships helped to sustain PRI's and partners' work. For example:

In Uganda, the Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI) formed a coalition of local NGOs to take forward the recommendations in PRI/FHRI's [joint research report on children of imprisoned parents](#).

In Georgia, PRI provided partner NGO Women in Business with knowledge on the UN Bangkok Rules and facilitated their engagement with high-level officials, enabling them to continue initiatives to rehabilitate women prisoners.

Partnerships enabled PRI to reach wider audiences with our resources eg. the Association for the Prevention of Torture (APT) translated the [Detention Monitoring Tool into Spanish](#). PRI provided 'training of trainers' on the UN Bangkok Rules on the treatment of women prisoners and offenders to partners such as the Kenya Probation Service, DOST Welfare Association, Pakistan, and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). This 'multiplier

effect' enables PRI's training and materials to be sustained within the institutions and reach more stakeholders. Follow-up 6 months after the training demonstrated that participants not only passed on the knowledge to their colleagues, but were able to make changes to work practice. Several partners have included PRI's training in their regular training curricular eg. the prison academy in Jordan; the UN Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DKPO) in its pre-deployment training.

Several partners obtained further funding as a result of the partnership.

'Due to this successful cooperation, we won several grant contracts from European Union Delegation' NGO partner.

'The partnership provided the opportunity for us to engage with two funders. enlarging the work and enabling us to continue working on probation after the PRI project ended.' NGO partner.

In East Africa, as a result of our strengthened partnerships with NGOs and the Probation and Prison services, PRI has now established an office in Uganda to sustain and develop our sub-Saharan Africa work.

However, sustainability of work was also raised as a challenge by PRI and partners – see below.

7. Good practice on working of partnership – key success factors

The following elements were identified by PRI and partners as facilitating effective partnership working. These also related to PRI's partnership values and principles.

Regular communication

'Monthly skype calls were good to supplement quarterly reports, because a lot was happening.' NGO partner

'Due to supporting of regular communication between PRI and us, "horizontal" contacts between the partners themselves strengthened what led to active interaction between them not only in the frame of the project implementation but on wider human rights issues.' NGO partner

Open and transparent. Transparency and good governance

'The roles at the partner level were clearly spelt out right from the MoU signed between both parties which facilitated this partnership.' NGO partner

Participatory approaches

'There was maximum involvement of the project partners to the project, events as co-organisers, experts, speakers or just participants.' NGO partner

'When PRI develops any project for Belarus, it always involves us at the project development stage and keeps us updated about perspectives of the project.... During the project implementation working meetings between PRI and us take place to discuss joint strategy and technical issues.' NGO partner

Collaborative approach, trust and respect

'The partnership with PRI is empowering and not controlling.' *'PRI is the donor, but does not behave as a donor, PRI is not "dominant"'*. NGO partner

Any issues are discussed constructively and consensus reached together.' NGO partner

8. Challenges, lessons learnt and how PRI is applying learning identified

Several challenges and lessons (from good practice and challenges) were identified and the lessons are being applied, for example:

An evaluation (2015) of PRI's role in the revision of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of prisoners (now the Nelson Mandela Rules) identified the importance of PRI's partnership approach: *'PRI mobilised key organisations and helped to develop a clear and coherent approach enabling a large group to speak with one voice thereby ensuring greater impact. PRI participated actively in all of the major meetings ensuring visibility of the organisation, the coalition and ensuring that the expert comments were fed into the discussions at the highest levels'*. This successful approach is being used to inform PRI's advocacy strategies.

Using PRI's partnership selection criteria and reports, PRI was able to raise concerns with a partner concerning delivery of agreed outputs. This emphasised to PRI the importance of having clear policies and criteria.

A mid-term evaluation of a regional programme identified the need to engage partners in setting realistic targets and planning of exit strategies. This is now being incorporated into the second half of the project.

In some cases, where partners managed the projects or activities as separate or in addition to their core work, this had an impact on the partnership relations eg. with PRI being seen as a donor, or with the partner staff managing the project finding it difficult to get buy-in from colleagues. It also impacts on sustainability of the initiatives if the work is not integrated into the partners' ongoing programmes or if no funding is available to continue to initiatives. PRI considered this when deciding whether to continue partnerships, using the PRI selection criteria.

'It makes a difference when there is a committed and dedicated Programme Manager ... who is able to manage the project, has a good understanding of the issues and context, and has good initiative.' PRI on NGO partner.

Following several initiatives where partners' capacities to manage the project had been weak, PRI ensured that this is assessed as part of the selection criteria.

9. Staff survey – key findings

PRI staff in all 5 regional offices and in London were asked to complete an optional survey on how useful they have found PRI's Partnership Strategy and tools since they were developed in 2014. 23 staff responded, at least one from each office (out of a total of 40 staff, a response rate of 57.5%).

Key findings:

- 47% of staff found said they found the **Partnership Strategy**, defining who and how we work with organisations 'very useful' and 43% found it 'somewhat useful'.

'Usually in our activity with partners we base on the office' experience and people's personal experience... The strategy is useful because everything is collected in one place.'

'With some partners there is no real option, eg. working with government departments. The exercise becomes more about establishing transparency and underlining the need for due diligence, yet does little to actually select the partner.'

'It helps us to take a more informed approach to partnerships by identifying issues we need to be looking at when deciding to partner with an organisation, or while in partnership to assess how it is working, and what value are we both giving and drawing from it.'

- Staff had **used (or adapted) most tools** with civil society partners that PRI has an MoU with, but they also used them with government partners, partners that PRI does not have an MoU with, and with consultants. With civil society partners that PRI has a MoU with, six tools relevant for civil society partners had been used by 30-40% of staff. The partner report template and cashbook template had been used the most. The least used tools were the partner review tool, partner selection criteria and partner MoU template. 67% of respondents said that the reason they had 'never used' one or more of the tools was that it was 'not relevant' and 17% said that they were 'not aware' of the tools.

'We started using it for regional project partners, who we don't see or work on daily basis.'

'They were adapted by translation and changing some text according to context and legal obligations in each country.'

It 'was useful to use the MOU to make sure we cover everything but we found a bit too PRI dominant in that it seemed to be more like a contract (with a client) rather than a partnership relationship'.

- When asked how **useful the tools had been in selecting or develop partnerships**, the main reasons given were: it 'made the partnership objectives and expectations of both PRI and the partner clearer'; 'the questions provided a useful prompt and process for constructive discussion and feedback', 'ensure the partnership was transparent and partners were accountable', and helped with 'monitoring and reviewing the partnership work'. (Note that respondents were only able to tick one reply and so most gave their answers as 'other' and added a comment.)

'Ensured the partnership was transparent and partners were accountable (eg. reporting, due diligence).' *'When the donor questioned the due diligence of our partners, the fact that we had completed the selection criteria was valuable.'*

'Made partnership objectives/expectations of PRI and partner clear!'

- 42% of respondents said that **partners had found using the tools** 'somewhat useful but needed guidance to use them'. 21% of partners had found them 'useful and easy to use'.
- Other comments and suggestions:

'It is always useful to have the working tools within the organisation, which in most of the cases simplify our work. I think needs survey could be conducted and common strategy for using these tools should be developed. Many thanks for the existing tools :).'

'Capacity building directly with partner staff who complete the forms would be advisable.'

'Partner criteria checklist needs to be reviewed. Completed forms need to be backed up by evidence.'

'It would be good to have the updated tools in Russian.'

'Rather than informal and formal partners we could view partnerships as a continuum. Christian Aid recognise that they engage in different types of relationships: transactional-transformational.'

10. Summary, recommendations, and next steps

- Clear areas of added value were identified for both PRI and partners. These closely relate to PRI's partnership criteria, indicating that the criteria are useful to maintain for identifying future partnerships.

- Factors identified for successful partnerships correspond to, and confirm, PRI's partnership values and principles.
- A number of challenges to successful partnerships were identified. These need to be considered when reviewing PRI's partnership tools and procedures, so that challenging factors / risks can be assessed better when selecting partners and managing partnerships.
- PRI's new organisational learning strategy to include learning from and with partners.
- Establish a 'PRI partnership working/learning group' to exchange good practice, continue to monitor PRI's Partnership Strategy and support staff with any partnership issues.

Annex I: Examples of PRI's different types of partnerships

- **Kazakhstan:** PRI supported five NGOs to deliver pilot projects for 107 juveniles and an information service to 78 former prisoners.
- **Georgia:** PRI facilitated a coalition with four NGOs to conduct prison monitoring visits and reports. PRI mobilised a civil society campaign for early release of prisoners on health grounds, achieving results not otherwise possible for one NGO.
- In **Armenia**, PRI coordinated meetings between two partner NGO Rehabilitation Centres for juveniles and the police, schools and local authorities.
- **Jordan:** PRI and a women's NGO delivered a pilot model after-care programme for women offenders.
- **Morocco:** PRI and the Adaleh Centre for Human Rights organised joint meetings to advocate for juvenile justice reforms. Leading the debate, the Adaleh Centre facilitated dialogue with the Prime Minister's office and senior officials.
- In **Yemen** and **Egypt**, PRI's local partners were able to continue work when political and security instability prevented PRI from working there.
- **Ukraine:** PRI's partner, 'Kyiv is the Native Home', provided services to women offenders to support their rehabilitation and facilitated relevant agencies to collaborate for more effective, interlinked psychological, social and legal support for women offenders.
- **Uganda:** The partnership with FHRI enabled PRI to work more effectively in East Africa where we had no regional base. With PRI's support, FHRI was able to advocate with parliamentarians on a death penalty bill and new juvenile justice legislation, undertake research on women prisoners and engage the judiciary on sentencing women offenders. *See case study in Annex II.*
- PRI's partner, BLAST, in **Bangladesh**, negotiated with officials and provided training/resources in Bangla, making use of their local reputation.
- In **Pakistan**, the Dost Welfare Association's long-established reputation means it is the only NGO able to access the prisons and it has good relations with high-level government and prison officials in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, a region that PRI would not be able to work in otherwise due to security. *See case study in Annex II.*
- **Governments:** PRI's partnerships with Probation departments in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda to promote effective use of community service orders, via training, expertise and exchange of learning between probation services in Africa. In **Jordan**, PRI's MoU with the Ministry enabled the introduction of new inspection teams and police juvenile justice units.
- **International NGOs and networks:** PRI partnered with the Association for the Prevention of Torture (APT) to develop a Detention Monitoring Tool for monitoring bodies and contributed to APT's multi-country research on torture prevention mechanisms. PRI worked with Defence for Children International to promote a global study on children deprived of their liberty and held joint side-events at international conferences. As a member of the World Coalition against the Death Penalty steering committee, PRI worked with other organisations globally to strengthen the struggle against the death penalty. As members of the Civil Society Task Force for the UN General Assembly Special Session on the World Drug Problem (UNGASS) in April

2016, PRI facilitated NGO consultations, submissions and joint side-events at UNGASS and other UN forums on the impact of the 'war on drugs'.

- **Inter-governmental and UN bodies:** PRI worked with the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACERWC) (with whom PRI has observer status) to develop and promote General Comment 1 on children of imprisoned parents. PRI partnered with the Office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime to hold side-events and expert panels at UN forums to promote the revised UN Standard Minimum Rules on the treatment of prisoners, the UN Bangkok Rules on women prisoners and offenders, and other international standards.

Annex II: Case studies

Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI), Uganda

In Uganda, as in many countries, women and children are often more vulnerable to detention in the first place, to ill-treatment in detention and subject to a system that does not account for their specific needs. Joint research conducted by PRI and FHRI in 2015 showed that women prisoners are mostly poor (76 per cent of those surveyed), are mothers (92 per cent), and are survivors of domestic violence (74 per cent).

In early 2013, PRI and FHRI established a partnership with objectives in three areas: child-friendly justice; the treatment of women prisoners; and sharing of good practice on criminal justice reform within the East Africa region.

FHRI highlighted the following achievements, as a result of partnership working:

- Civil society, professionals and government are now increasingly mobilised around the need for juvenile justice reform in Uganda. FHRI brought NGOs together, sharing good practice and standards and facilitated new joint pilot initiatives that successfully promoted mediation and diverted juveniles from the formal justice system. FHRI was also able to inform the Children Amendment Bill (2015), resulting in new legal provisions which give greater priority to the use of restorative justice for children.
- FHRI was able to take up the issue of children of prisoners and conducted unique research on this topic. This issue is a priority for the African Committee on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (ACERWC) and the research was welcomed, when presented at an ACERWC Conference, as ‘ground-breaking’. A new coalition has now been formed in Uganda to take forward the report’s recommendations.
- FHRI has become a leading advocate on the needs of women offenders in Uganda. Research was conducted on women prisoners, providing information and stimulating dialogue that led to the judiciary and the Uganda Prison Service requesting further guidance. This led to the first ever training for women prison officers in the region on the UN Bangkok Rules and a workshop for magistrates on sentencing guidelines.
- There is now an active regional network of criminal justice organisations. Under this network, NGO exchange visits were organised and contributed to the sharing of good practice across the region.

FHRI says: ‘The partnership with PRI is empowering. FHRI was able to deepen its work on juvenile justice and the work on the Bangkok Rules was ground-breaking. It has built the capacity of our staff particularly in the area of research, writing, international advocacy and public speaking.’

PRI says: ‘FHRI’s local experience, established networks and access to prisons in Uganda enabled PRI to extend its work and knowledge on women and children in detention, and contributed to regional and international advocacy. The success of our East Africa work has now led to the establishment of a new PRI Africa Office.’

DOST Welfare Association, Pakistan

In 2014, PRI and DOST established a partnership to increase awareness of, and implement good policy and practice in line with the UN Bangkok Rules for the treatment of women prisoners.

In 2014, approximately 120 women were detained in the five prisons in which DOST work, the majority pre-trial, and 52 children were living with them. Most are detained for drug smuggling, trafficking, murder and prostitution, often driven by poverty, domestic conflict, and lack of education, awareness, and discrimination.

DOST carried out advocacy with parliamentarians, provincial government departments, prison authorities, and mobilised local civil society and universities; promoted the issue in the media; and trained personnel across the justice system.

In the 2016 review, DOST highlighted the following achievements:

- High-level stakeholders, including the Inspector General of Prisons and the Provincial Ministry of Home and Tribal Affairs, have publicly committed to supporting the implementation of the UN Bangkok Rules.
- DOST and the Prisons Department are working together to pave the way for implementation of the Bangkok Rules into the Pakistan Prison Rules (PPR) at provincial level.
- There have been practical changes in prisons where women are held. For example, beds have been provided and there are also now daily visits by female medical staff and psychologists. DOST was able to provide technical expertise to the prison administration on, for example, search procedures and on admissions.

DOST says: *'We need PRI because they are international experts. We have learned about ways we can approach and advocate to parliament and other stakeholders.'*

PRI says: *'DOST's local expertise and presence enabled PRI to contribute to reform of the criminal justice system in the KP Province, which we would otherwise not have been able to do.'*