



INGO Accountability Charter Report January – December 2012

PROFILE DISCLOSURES

1 Strategy and Analysis

1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organisation. [GRI NGOSS: p. 25]

ARTICLE 19 defends freedom of expression and the right to information all over the world. Established in 1987, ARTICLE 19 fights for all hostages of censorship, defends dissenting voices, and campaigns against laws and practices that silence.

The organisation takes its name from article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Its mission is *“to promote, protect, develop and fulfill freedom of expression and the free flow of information and ideas in order to strengthen global social justice and empower people to make autonomous choices.”*

Its vision is of a world where ALL people can speak freely, actively participate in public life and enjoy media freedom without fear, censorship or persecution.

With offices in London, Bangladesh, Brazil, Tunisia, Kenya, Mexico and Senegal, and in collaboration with 50 partners across the world, ARTICLE 19 strengthens the protection of Freedom of Expression and Information by providing legal and technical assistance to civil society and governments, developing standards and policies, engaging in advocacy, campaigning, and strategic litigation; and building capacities on a range of issues related to the exercise of Freedom of Expression and Information.

ARTICLE 19’s work is driven by a conviction that freedom of expression and the right to know lie at the heart of human rights and development. Human rights and the fight against poverty are largely dependent on the growth of an informed citizenry demanding that their rights be upheld.

ARTICLE 19 launched a new five-year strategic plan in 2011. Our key strategic priorities for 2011-2015 are grounded in:

- (i) Regional and country-specific assessment of the national and international political and economic environments by ARTICLE 19 program and regional offices,
- (ii) Review of global trends and future projections
- (iii) Institution-wide discussion of trends, possible interventions and global during the ARTICLE 19 Global Gathering 2010, which brought together ARTICLE 19 staff, board members and some partners, and

- (iv) The conclusions of an ARTICLE 19 conference on “transparency, the free flow of information and the MDGs” which brought together some 80 experts from around the world.

Critical concerns identified are:

- The **multi-polar world** is characterised by the emergence of new powers on the global scene, particularly China, Brazil, Russia and India, which are not known for defending human rights and freedom of expression nationally, regionally or internationally. ARTICLE 19 usual stakeholders are losing their influence and moral legitimacy. These transformations are taking place in a context dominated by increasing conflicts over access to resources (e.g. water), played out at intra-state levels but also nationally and pitting communities against one another.
- The democratisation processes resulting from the Arab Spring and similar movements around the world, are complex and challenging, and they have already encountered serious setbacks. In the short run, the democratic revolts have heightened regional and domestic instability, and prompted repressive governments to increase control over their populations to prevent the democratic bug from spreading.
- The environment and space for **civic engagement** and a professional and independent **media** are increasingly restricted through **legal regression** seeking to prevent investigation, reporting and active participation.
- The new **information and communication technology** (ICT) landscape is creating a range of opportunities for freedom of expression but also raising many new challenges, including legal ones.
- **Non-state actors** have further strengthened their attacks against freedom of the press over the last decade and evidence indicates that the trend is likely to continue and worsen. Particularly critical is the role of organised crime and armed groups. To date, crimes against media workers and HRDs remain largely unpunished – a trend which has seen no change for several years in a row.
- Demands for **transparency** are likely to increase in the years to come, triggered by the rise of middle class in newly emerging powers (e.g. India, China and Brazil) and increasing awareness around the world. The key challenge is whether governmental and regional institutions will be able to respond effectively to these demands and protect the free flow of information.

Strategic Plan

Our four strategic goals are designed to challenge these urgent threats to freedom of expression and increase the impact of a growing movement of highly specialised and innovative ‘niche NGOs’ delivering transparency initiatives on the ground.

Strategic Goal One – Protecting Freedom of Expression in a multi-polar world

By 2015, emerging powerful actors, including Brazil, Indonesia and regional instruments, provide leverage in support of ARTICLE 19’s objectives, including by publicly voicing commitments to human

rights protection, and by implementing FoE policies at national and international level. The trend of the last decade of increased authoritarian rule and democratic set back is delegitimized and halted.

Strategic Goal Two – Defending freedom of expression in a networked world

By 2015 ARTICLE 19 will have established, promoted and/or strengthened standards and policies protecting and defending internet rights and media diversity

Strategic Goal Three – Ending Impunity and Protecting Universal value of FoE

By 2015, states and non-state actors are held accountable for abuses of freedom of expression, freedom of the press and the free flow of information. ARTICLE 19 will have established or strengthened standards and policies on the universal value of freedom of expression

Strategic Goal Four – Strengthen FoE in an era of scarcity

By 2015, freedom of the press and the free flow of information are well integrated in key global policy developments, including those related to development and the fight against poverty. Increasing demands for transparency will be better and effectively met by institutions around the world, empowering people living in poverty to access information they need to advocate for better services and thus tackle some of the root causes and consequences of poverty.

Analysis

In early 2013, ARTICLE 19 commissioned an independent consultant to evaluate our progress in achieving our strategic aims as required by key donors. The evaluation looked at our delivery versus planned delivery over 2011-2012. It found that “In almost all cases, the organization has exceeded its commitment by carrying out more activities that initially planned.” Of course, achievement of the aims is often dependent on political decisions taken by others. Strategic advocacy can improve the likelihood of success as can learning from past experience. ARTICLE 19 is investing in this type of learning by building its Global Management Team , which includes Regional Directors as well as Senior Directors from the International Office and holding its first annual global planning session in January 2013. By involving Regional Directors in overall decision-making, ARTICLE 19 is building on one of its strengths, namely the fact that its work is grounded in local knowledge generated from the regional offices, with added value produced by an experienced International Office.

The main aim of **Goal One** was to engage with a range of emerging influential actors. This has been achieved by:

- Curbing Brazil’s efforts to reduce the scope of the Inter-American human rights system. This has allowed ARTICLE 19 now to increase its potential to influence this important emerging power in terms of its domestic and foreign policy decisions as these effect freedom of expression and human rights more broadly.
- Taking a lead on Access to Information at the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights and establishing an opening for civil society to engage for the first time with the East African Community.
- Responding to demands for technical assistance, in the aftermath of the Tunisian revolution, including by members of the institution responsible for the reform of the information sector, and by members of the National Constituent Assembly.

Goal Two aims to influence Internet and Communications Technologies (ICT) policy and practice at national and international levels and to work with international and national coalitions to drive progressive internet policies. ARTICLE 19 achieved this aim in the following ways:

- In Bangladesh, ARTICLE 19 raised issues of restrictive internet policies in the organisation's Universal Periodic Review (UPR) submission and coupled this with advocacy and an offer of technical assistance to the government.
- ARTICLE 19 contributed towards the defeat of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement in the European Parliament through sustained and strategic lobbying on the basis of a strong analysis with the result that one threat to internet freedoms was removed.
- ARTICLE 19 finalised *The Right to Share: Principles on Freedom of Expression and Copyright in the Digital Age (Principles)*, following two expert roundtables and a series of consultations with experts from the Americas, Africa, Europe and Asia.

Goal Three has two primary aims: in the first place, ARTICLE 19 aims to end impunity for crimes against freedom of expression. This was achieved through:

- International standard setting: ARTICLE 19 was the catalyst for a strongly worded joint statement with the Special Rapporteurs from regional and international human rights mechanisms on the protection of journalists and human rights defenders.
- Strategic litigation: ARTICLE 19 provided evidence in cases with the potential for setting precedents. For example, in *Vélez Restrepo et al vs Colombia*, the Inter-American Court ruled that the government was responsible for a climate of impunity in crimes against free expression.

Through these approaches, coupled with ARTICLE 19's protection training and programmes in a growing number of countries, many journalists are better able to practice their profession. Despite challenges, ARTICLE 19 achieved significant successes towards reversing the trend of impunity, for example, the UN Resolution on the Safety of Journalists, and the strategic litigation victory mentioned above. In addition, ARTICLE 19 advocacy in Brazil contributed to the establishment by the Brazilian government of a working group to propose specific measures on the protection of journalists.

The second aim of Goal Three is to strengthen standards and policies on the universal value of freedom of expression and challenge threats with special reference to the areas of sexual rights, women's rights, disability and freedom of religion. Sustained efforts included:

- **Kenya:** ARTICLE 19 playing an important role in setting a balance between controlling hate speech and guaranteeing freedom of expression in the build-up to the country's elections.
- **Globally** the organisation continued to take a lead in the struggle to prevent adoption of a new norm which would criminalise vilification of religion.

Raising the issue of Intersex, Trans, Bisexual, Lesbian and Gay (LGBTI) rights in many regions remained a challenge. In Africa, ARTICLE 19 adopted an exploratory approach, monitoring violations faced by the LGBTI community, raising issues within the UPR process and intervening when Ugandan NGOs were threatened with de-registration on suspicion that they were working on this sensitive issue. Further strategies are being developed. Russia's support for 'traditional values' presents another threat to progressive approaches to sexual rights within Russia and across the region. In

Ukraine and Russia, ARTICLE 19 called for a rejection of bills seeking to ban homosexual 'propaganda'.

Goal Four aims to use the power of access to information to tackle the millennium development goals.

ARTICLE 19 stepped up its work on linking access to information to other rights in 2012, especially those affecting development, such as the right to water, the right to health and the right to education. Building on its advocacy at the Rio + 20 summit, ARTICLE 19 also developed expertise on working with communities to exercise their right to information about environmental and other issues relating to sustainable development.

A new opportunity arose with the establishment of the Open Government Partnership (OGP) as ARTICLE 19 Mexico seized on the government's role as a founding member of the Open Government Partnership and its endorsement of the Open Government Declaration to push for application of the provisions. In addition, ARTICLE 19 organised preparatory meetings to enhance civil society involvement ahead of the first OGP official event in Brasilia, which ARTICLE 19 attended. The organisation advocated civil society participation in the preparation of the Plan of Action and in monitoring its application. Three of ARTICLE 19's recommendations for the Plan of Action were adopted.

Worth highlighting are a couple of examples where ARTICLE 19 responded to specific country and or individual needs. The relevance of these interventions enhanced their contribution to achieving the stated aims:

- Tunisia – the 2012 analysis of the draft constitution has been widely praised by stakeholders. This sustained intervention has been particularly relevant after the last 2011 elections interrupted the fast pace of progress noted since the military government fell in January 2011. ARTICLE 19's sustained approach to reforming Tunisia's legal landscape since the revolution makes the organisation's interventions increasingly relevant.
- Protection of journalists is perhaps the clearest example of an activity meeting the needs of beneficiaries. It provides some emergency assistance on a practical level, but equally combines that with raising the awareness of all those involved in both the persecution and protection of journalists with the aim of improving the context in which they work. The success of this approach in Mexico has now been exported and modified to suit other regions where ARTICLE 19 staff and their partners identified a clear need.

These two examples are indicative of ARTICLE 19 playing to its strengths – a strong reputation for legal analysis of the complex issues relating to key aspects of the right to freedom of expression, association and the right to information which is put to excellent use in Tunisia; and a flexibility of approach which enabled ARTICLE 19 to develop a response to journalists at risk in Mexico which is now being to 'exported' to ARTICLE 19 colleagues in other regions and adapted to ensure relevance to the specific circumstances, on demand.

The difference ARTICLE 19 made to our beneficiaries thus far was also highlighted by two examples cited by the independent evaluator:

- ARTICLE 19's analysis and advocacy against Article 73 of Mexico's Constitution eventually brought success after many years. As a result, the Federal Authorities have the power to prosecute crimes committed against freedom of expression. This is an example of ARTICLE

19's sustained commitment to a national issue, based on sound analysis and collaboration with others within civil society.

- ARTICLE 19 issued its policy on 'incitement to hatred' which was endorsed by the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression. The organisation's standing at a global level is well-established and maintained by continued attention to significant issues in the field of freedom of expression.

Feasibility

The aims of the organisation in general are aspirational. ARTICLE 19 is experienced in its legal analysis and advocacy approach and direct support to human rights defenders and journalists whose freedom of expression and association are violated. Within those fields, the organisation is responsive and flexible – it responds to unexpected demands, seizes opportunities provided by political change, and adapts its policies to a wide variety of country situations. In addition, ARTICLE 19 is flexible enough to adopt new approaches requiring a different kind of partner, including its work with grassroots groups in pursuit of application of right to information legislation, which is outside the remit of this grant.

The aims ARTICLE 19 has set itself play to one of the organisation's major strengths. It is well respected for its legal analysis and the role it plays on freedom of expression issues within recognised international processes and mechanisms. However, too often, excellent legislation or strong recommendations are not implemented and respect for these and international legislation requires constant vigilance. ARTICLE 19's response to this is to build alliances with civil society networks whether nationally, regionally or globally, to enhance its own voice. This position enables the organisation to exercise some vigilance in terms of monitoring freedom of expression issues and assisting those whose freedom of expression is under attack. This assistance takes the form of legal representation, practical support, public declarations and training to reduce the risks.

Taking these different types of approach helps towards achieving the ambitious aims. However, the demands are at times overwhelming even in the countries where ARTICLE 19 is well-established, and the organisation is often under pressure to intervene in new countries. The decision as to whether to further specialise or respond to new demands is a constant tension within the organisation.

Looking Ahead

2013 is a transitional year at ARTICLE 19. The organisation will be internally evaluating progress under the strategic plan and initiate the process for the next strategic planning period. In addition, the organisation will have a leadership transition in 2013 with a new Executive Director entering. The new Executive may well bring a different approach that will impact the mid and long term strategic direction of the organisation. However, the Board of Directors affirmed the mission and vision of ARTICLE 19 in December of 2012 as it adopted a new organisational Constitution designed to strengthen the governance ties between the different entities that make up the international organisation.

If nothing else, the recent revelations on internet surveillance combined with an increasingly aggressive governmental response to the prosecution of whistleblowers and the media bring home the continued relevance and urgency of the rights to freedom of expression and information world-wide. ARTICLE 19 will continue to meet the challenge to preserve these fundamental rights.

2. Organisational Profile

2.1 Name of the organisation. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

ARTICLE 19

2.2 Primary activities (e.g., advocacy, social marketing, research, service provision, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, etc.). Indicate how these activities relate to the organisation's mission and primary strategic goals (e.g., on poverty reduction, environment, human rights, etc.). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

ARTICLE 19's objectives are to educate the public and protect freedom of expression, access to information and related rights, throughout the world, particularly as defined in ARTICLE 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in international and regional human rights law. It fights for all hostages of censorship, defends dissenting voices that have been muzzled, and educates against laws and practices that silence.

ARTICLE 19 believes that all people have the right to freedom of expression and access to information, and that the full enjoyment of this right is the most potent force to achieve individual freedoms, strengthen democracy, and pre-empt repression, conflict, war and genocide.

The activities currently carried out for the public benefit by the charity and to make freedom of expression a reality all over the world can be broadly categorised as follows. ARTICLE 19:

- Champions freedom of expression and information, as a fundamental human right that is also central to the protection of other rights. Freedom of Expression (FoE) and Freedom of Information (FoI) allows people to demand the right to health, to a clean environment, to memory and to justice. It makes electoral democracy meaningful and builds public trust in administration. It strengthens mechanisms to hold governments accountable for their promises, obligations and actions. It provides external checks on state accountability, and thus prevents corruption which thrives on secrecy and closed environments.
- Monitors, researches, publishes, campaigns, sets standards and provides information to courts on behalf of freedom of expression wherever it is threatened.
- Provides expertise on international human rights standards that protects the right to speak and right to know in countries emerging from conflict, war and genocide or repression.
- Works to safeguard media pluralism, independence and diversity of views.
- Provides legal and professional training and mentoring to national actors, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs), judges and lawyers, journalists, media owners, public officials and parliamentarians.
- Promotes the right to know of poorer communities to ensure transparency and strengthen citizens' participation.

In setting ARTICLE 19's programme each year, ARTICLE 19 has regard to the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit. The Trustees review the programmes undertaken by ARTICLE 19 to ensure that they fall within ARTICLE 19's charitable objects and aims.

ARTICLE 19 works to achieve its charitable objectives in two ways:

- (1) through direct delivery especially in relation to work in areas where it has its own staff; and
- (2) through financial and capacity support to ARTICLE 19's partner organisations.

Work carried out by partner organisations is especially useful in jurisdictions where ARTICLE 19 has no established infrastructure for managing staff and operations or where partners provide knowledge and skills that complement ARTICLE 19's own international comparative perspective. Partnership also assists in maximising the number of beneficiaries reached. In turn, partnership has both defined and strengthened ARTICLE 19's effectiveness and legitimacy.

2.3 Operational structure of the organisation, including national offices, sections, branches, field offices, main divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries, and joint ventures. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Corporate entity: ARTICLE 19 is a charitable company limited by guarantee (no. 2097222). It was set up by a Memorandum of Association on 5 February 1987. Its Memorandum and Articles of Association were amended by special resolution on 12 June 2009. ARTICLE 19 was registered as a charity on 7 January 1987 (registered charity number 327421).

Geographical structure:

ARTICLE 19 has its own structure and organisation under active review, seeking to ensure that its institutional arrangements are best suited to the effective achievement of its objectives and performance of its work. The international and regional nature of ARTICLE 19's work means the organisation must carefully evaluate the most appropriate arrangements to put in place to serve the interests and needs of ARTICLE 19, seeking to ensure compliance with local requirements and laws.

Different arrangements are made to facilitate work in different regions and across regions, taking into consideration the different needs, available resources, as well as national laws and requirements.

ARTICLE 19's International Office (based in London) hosts ARTICLE 19 international support programmes (including Law and Policy; Media and Communication; and Operations) as well as regional programmes (Europe, Asia and Middle East), directly manages two local project offices (in Tunisia and Burma) and provides financial, operational and fund raising support to ARTICLE 19 regional offices established in the USA, Mexico, Brazil, Senegal, Bangladesh and Kenya. Due to local law, three of the regional offices are registered as legally independent entities: ARTICULO 19 Campaña Global por la libertad de expression (ARTICLE 19 Mexico), ARTIGO 19 Brasil (ARTICLE 19 Brasil), and ARTICLE 19 Inc (ARTICLE 19 USA).

The structural arrangements are intended to enable the development and delivery of ARTICLE 19 projects, programmes, strategies and vision across the world. ARTICLE 19's culture of openness and dialogue encourages and enables cross-function learning and the exchange of knowledge across all ARTICLE 19 offices.

Governance and Board:

We are governed by an International Board of Trustees (Directors under company law) who meet twice a year and oversee our Executive Director and Senior Management Team.

In 2012, our International Board consisted of 10 members at the start of 2012 and 7 at the end of 2012: Catherine Smadja (Chair); Nigel Saxby-Soffe (Treasurer); Galina Arapova; Charlie Beckett (resigned in Dec 2012); Lydia Cacho; Evan Harris; Liz Kennedy; Lawrence Mute (resigned in July 2012), Malak Poppovic and Heather Rogers (resigned in July 2012).

ARTICLE 19's governance structure aims to ensure that we are effective in working towards achieving our vision, using our resources to maximum effect and upholding our core ethos and values. In December 2012, the International Board adopted an organisational Constitution to more

formally establish the governance relationship between ARTICLE 19 and the various regional entities and offices. One key provision of this is the formal establishment of regional representation on the General Assembly and International Board. At present, representatives of the Board or Steering Committee of ARTICLE 19 Brasil and ARTICLE 19 Mexico are members of the Board of ARTICLE 19, with representatives from ARTICLE 19 Kenya and ARTICLE 19 USA to be added in 2013-14.

Within the ARTICLE 19 Board, there is the Finance and General Purposes Committee (FGPC) which provides more direct financial and operational oversight of the organisation, effectively functioning as the Executive Committee of the Board. The FGPC had three members as of December 2012: Catherine Smadja, Nigel Saxby-Soffe and Liz Kennedy. The Board may set up ad hoc committee from time to time to address specific needs and functions, such as Board recruitment.

The organisation's audited financial accounts and annual report are presented and approved at the Annual General Meeting, generally held in June-July each year.

Selection and appointment of Trustees

New Trustees are first nominated and recommended by existing members of the General Assembly. Their CVs are circulated, and the nominating member meets with the prospective Trustees. Trustees will then vote to appoint a new Trustee. New Trustees are confirmed at the Annual General Meeting of ARTICLE 19.

As of June 2013, the Trustees had issued invitations to four prospective members to join the Board of Trustees.

Induction and training of Trustees

On appointment, UK Trustees meet with the Chair, the Executive Director and staff members as part of an induction programme; they receive key ARTICLE 19 organisational and programmatic documents. For non-UK based Trustees the induction programme is held at the time of the AGM. Trustees are provided with an ARTICLE 19 email address and are added to internal distribution lists, enabling them to be fully aware of, and contribute to, the work done by the organisation as they think fit.

Internal Management: ARTICLE 19 is headed by an Executive Director who reports to and is appointed by the Board of Directors. A Senior Management Team (SMT), comprised of the Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Director of Finance and Operations, Director of Law made key decisions during 2012. The Global Management Team which was set up in 2012 brings together the senior management team in the International Office and the Regional Directors to allow for increased collaboration and oversight of ARTICLE 19's strategic programmatic work.

Organisational restructuring and renewal:

In 2011, ARTICLE 19 initiated a change management approach, the Global Integration Project, to build a more globally connected ARTICLE 19 with the strategic help of a consultant. This included in-depth discussions with managers and staff across the organisation, so as to better capture needs and suggestions. This process was taken further in 2012 as ARTICLE 19 implemented key recommendations that arose from the consultation, such as the creation of Global Management Team that included the regional directors, and the establishments of a mid-level tier of managers across the organisation.

In 2012, ARTICLE 19 opened offices in Tunisia & Myanmar and recruited a Monitoring and Evaluation advisor and cross-programmatic projects manager to our Operations team.

2.4 Location of organisation's headquarters. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Free Word Centre, 60 Farringdon Road, London EC1R 3GA

2.5 Number of countries where the organisation operates. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

ARTICLE 19 operates at the global level, as well as through project partners in a number of countries. At the start of 2012, ARTICLE 19 had projects in 32 countries.

2.6 Nature of ownership and legal form. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

ARTICLE 19 is a private not-for-profit organisation registered in the United States as a 501(c)(3) organisation and in the United Kingdom as a private limited company and a charity. ARTICULO 19 is registered as a civil society organisation (Number 82374 on 06 May 2008) and as ARTIGO 19 in Brazil on 11 June 2008. The Board, SMT and GMT provide oversight of the organisation's strategy, governance and annual budget. Board members serve for 3 year renewable terms.

2.7 Target audience and affected stakeholders. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

ARTICLE 19 works with communities most affected by poverty, human right defenders, lawyers, journalists, civil society organisations, international non-governmental organisations, bloggers, and those most vulnerable to FoE and RTI abuses of human rights such as the disabled, women and marginalised communities.

2.8 Scale of the reporting organisation. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Although ARTICLE 19 has a global reach, it is a small-medium sized organisation:

Total size of workforce (including staff, volunteers, interns, consultants): 22 staff and 36 consultants (start of reporting period, January 2012); 27 staff and 40 consultants (end of reporting period, December 2012).

Total income: £3,075,044. Our audited accounts are available online at <http://www.article19.org/pages/en/finance-accountability.html>

Net revenue: £274,294

Total assets: £2,099,956

Scope and scale of activities:

ARTICLE 19 works directly with communities through our offices in London (International Office, which manages programs in Asia, Europe/Central Asia, Iran and the Middle East and North Africa); Dakar, Senegal; Nairobi, Kenya; Mexico City, Mexico; Sao Paulo and Brasilia, Brasil; Dhaka, Bangladesh; Tunis, Tunisia; and Yangon, Burma. Additionally, we have representatives in Washington, DC and Kazakhstan.

ARTICLE 19 works indirectly with a number of stakeholders, and produces research on issues with an extremely broad scope such as crimes against Freedom of Expression, Right to Information and Health and regulating incitement to hatred which are accessible and free.

2.9 Significant changes during the reporting period regarding size, structure, or ownership. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

In 2011, ARTICLE 19 initiated a change management approach, the Global Integration Project, to build a more globally connected ARTICLE 19 with the strategic help of a consultant and included in-depth discussions with managers and staff across the organisation, so as to better capture needs and suggestions. This process was taken further in 2012 as ARTICLE 19 implemented key recommendations that arose from the consultation, such as the creation of Global Management Team that included the regional directors, and the establishments of a mid-level tier of managers across the organisation.

In 2012, ARTICLE 19 opened offices in Tunisia & Myanmar and recruited a Monitoring and Evaluation advisor and cross-programmatic projects manager to our Operations team.

In December 2012, the International Board adopted an organisational Constitution to more formally establish the governance relationship between ARTICLE 19 and the various regional entities and offices. One key provision of this is the formal establishment of regional representation on the General Assembly and International Board. In 2012, representatives of the Board or Steering Committee of ARTICLE 19 Brasil, ARTICLE 19 Kenya and ARTICLE 19 Mexico were members of the Board of ARTICLE 19, with representatives from ARTICLE 19 USA to be added in 2013-14.

2.10 Awards received in the reporting period. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None

3. Report Parameters

Report Profile

3.1 Reporting period (e.g., fiscal/calendar year) for information provided. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

January to December 2012 unless otherwise stated

3.2 Date of most recent previous report (if any). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

This is our first report

3.3 Reporting cycle (annual, biennial, etc.). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Annual. This report links the annual Accountability Charter report to the annual financial year used by ARTICLE 19 (January – December).

3.4 Contact point for questions regarding the report or its contents. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

Inger Wong
Senior Compliance Officer

Inger@article19.org
020 7324 2500

Free Word Centre
60 Farringdon Road
London
EC1R 3GA

Report Scope and Boundary

3.5 Process for defining report content. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

In determining the materiality of the information and topics prioritised in this report, ARTICLE 19 adopted the standard recommended indicators adopted for the NGO sector by the NGO Working Group. The indicators selected should speak closely to the information which ARTICLE 19 believes is of interest and relevance to its stakeholders. This content results in a Level C Report, including NGO specific indicators, which it is hoped will be qualitatively richer than other GRI templates. We aim to be able to report on more indicators in our next report.

3.6 Boundary of the report (e.g., countries, divisions, subsidiaries, leased facilities, joint ventures, suppliers). See GRI Boundary Protocol for further guidance. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

This report covers the activities and performance of the legally registered organisation ARTICLE 19 (registered England and Wales). This does not include the activities of our partner organisations who are not directly managed by ARTICLE 19, or ARTICLE 19 Mexico, which operates as a legally independent entity although abiding by ARTICLE 19's Constitution.

3.7 State any specific limitations on the scope or boundary of the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

There are no specific limitations on any boundary of the report, as far as is possible to ascertain. However, it should be noted that ARTICLE 19 is a relatively small organisation. The allocation of proportionally limited resources to monitoring, evaluation and information gathering means that ARTICLE 19 does not currently have all the raw information that it would need in order to be able to report fully and comprehensively on each and every of the chosen indicators contained within this report.

3.8 Basis for reporting on joint ventures, subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other entities that can significantly affect comparability from period to period and/or between organisations. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

Any joint activities with partners or ARTICLE 19 Mexico only feature in this report to the extent that ARTICLE 19 was engaged. This practice will be maintained in future reports.

3.9 Data measurement techniques and the bases of calculations, including assumptions and techniques underlying estimations applied to the compilation of the Indicators and other information in the report.

Data for this report is collected from appropriate units, departments and data-holders within the organisation, and is compiled by Inger Wong. The data is as accurate as possible and correct to the

best of our knowledge, given ARTICLE 19's information management, which of course may contain occasional inaccuracies.

3.10 Explanation of the effect of any re-statements of information provided in earlier reports, and the reasons for such re-statement (e.g., mergers/acquisitions, change of base years/periods, nature of business, measurement methods). [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

This is our first report

3.11 Significant changes from previous reporting periods in the scope, boundary, or measurement methods applied in the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

This is our first report

GRI Content Index

3.12 Table identifying the location of the Standard Disclosures in the report. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

Strategy and Profile Disclosures	Page
Strategy and Analysis	1
1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organization	6
Organisational Profile	
2.1 Name of the organisation	7
2.2 Primary activities (e.g., advocacy, social marketing, research, service provision, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, etc.). Indicate how these activities relate to the organisation's mission and primary strategic goals (e.g., on poverty reduction, environment, human rights, etc.).	8
2.3 Operational structure of the organisation, including national offices, sections, branches, field offices, main divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries, and joint ventures.	10
2.4 Location of organisation's headquarters.	10
2.5 Number of countries where the organisation operates	10
2.6 Nature of ownership and legal form.	10
2.7 Target audience and affected stakeholders.	10
2.8 Scale of the reporting organisation.	11
2.9 Significant changes during the reporting period regarding size, structure, or ownership.	11
2.10 Awards received in the reporting period.	11
Report Parameters	
Report Profile	
3.1 Reporting period (e.g., fiscal/calendar year) for information provided.	11
3.2 Date of most recent previous report (if any).	11
3.3 Reporting cycle (annual, biennial, etc.).	11
3.4 Contact point for questions regarding the report or its contents.	11
Report Scope and Boundary	
3.5 Process for defining report content.	12
3.6 Boundary of the report (e.g., countries, divisions, subsidiaries, leased facilities, joint ventures, suppliers). See GRI Boundary Protocol for further guidance.	12
3.7 State any specific limitations on the scope or boundary of the report.	12
3.8 Basis for reporting on joint ventures, subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other entities that can significantly affect comparability from period to period and/or between organizations.	12
3.9 Data measurement techniques and the bases of calculations, including assumptions and techniques underlying estimations applied to the compilation of the indicators and other information in the report	12

3.10 Explanation of the effect of any re-statements of information provided in earlier reports, and the reasons for such re-statement (e.g., mergers/acquisitions, change of base years/periods, nature of business, measurement methods).	13
3.11 Significant changes from previous reporting periods in the scope, boundary, or measurement methods applied in the report.	13
GRI Content Index	
3.12 Table identifying the location of the Standard Disclosures in the report.	13
Governance, Commitments, and Engagement Governance	
4.1 Governance structure of the organisation, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organisational oversight	15
4.2 Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer (and, if so, their function within the organization's management and the reasons for this arrangement). Describe the division of responsibility between the highest governance body and the management and/or executives.	15
4.3 For organisations that have a unitary board structure, state the number of members of the highest governance body that are independent and/or non-executive members.	16
4.4 Mechanisms for internal stakeholders (e.g., members), shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body.	16
Stakeholder Engagement	
4.14 List of stakeholder groups engaged by the organisation.	16
4.15 Basis for identification and selection of stakeholders with whom to engage.	20
GRI Performance Indicators	
Indicator 1: NGO1 Involvement of affected stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs.	20
Indicator 2: NGO2 Mechanisms for feedback and complaints in relation to programmes and policies and for determining actions to take in response to breaches of policies.	21
Indicator 3: NGO3 System for programme monitoring, evaluation and learning, (including measuring programme effectiveness and impact), resulting changes to programmes, and how they are communicated.	21
Indicator 4: NGO4 Measures to integrate gender and diversity into programme design, implementation, and the monitoring, evaluation, and learning cycle.	23
Indicator 5: NGO6 Processes to take into account and coordinate with the activities of other actors. How do you ensure that your organisation is not duplicating efforts?	24
Indicator 6: NGO7 Resource allocation	24
Indicator 7: NGO8 Sources of funding by category and five largest donors and monetary value of their contribution.	25
Indicator 8: EC7 Procedures for local hiring and proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation. Do you have a policy or practice for local hiring? If so, report on the proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation.	25
Indicator 9: EN16 Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight. As a minimum, report on indirect greenhouse gas emissions related to buying gas, electricity or steam. You may also report on business travel related greenhouse gas emissions.	25
Indicator 10: EN18 Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved. What are you doing to reduce and how much have you reduced?	26
Indicator 11: LA1 Total workforce, including volunteers, by type, contract, and region.	26
Indicator 12: LA10 Average hours of training per year per employee by employee category. If you can't report on average hours of training, report on training programmes in place.	26
Indicator 13: LA12 Percentage of employees receiving regular performance and career development reviews.	27
Indicator 14: LA13 Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity.	27
Indicator 15: SO3 Percentage of employees trained in organisation's anti-corruption policies and procedures.	27

Indicator 16: PR6 Programmes for adherence to laws, standards, and voluntary codes related to ethical fundraising and marketing communications, including advertising, promotion, and sponsorship.	28
--	----

4. Governance, Commitments, and Engagement Governance

4.1 Governance structure of the organisation, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organisational oversight. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

ARTICLE 19 is governed by an International Board of Directors. This Board is made up of Individual Members and Affiliate Members representing ARTICLE 19 locally registered Legal Entities (at present, Brazil and Mexico).

The primary organ of the International Board is the Finance and General Purposes Committee. Other committees may be established from time to time on an as-needed basis.

1.1 The primary functions of the International Board are:

- (a) to focus on strategy and approve ARTICLE 19's Integrated Strategic Plan including its financial strategy;
- (b) to approve the annual audited accounts and annual report
- (c) to monitor compliance of all Affiliate Members, Regional Offices and the International Office in London with ARTICLE 19 organizational principles;
- (d) to evaluate ARTICLE 19's performance against its agreed strategies and plans;
- (e) to hold Affiliate Members, Regional Offices and the International Office and other bodies accountable;
- (f) to approve the opening of ARTICLE 19 Regional Offices; and
- (g) to appoint the Executive Director.

Financial and General Purposes Committee (FGPC)

1.2 The FGPC, established by the International Board, is responsible for overseeing ARTICLE 19's financial, Human Resources and Administrative operations.

1.3 The FGPC may be made up of four members, including the Chair and the treasurer of the International Board.

4.2 Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer (and, if so, their function within the organisation's management and the reasons for this arrangement). Describe the division of responsibility between the highest governance body and the management and/or executives. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

No, the Chair is not an executive officer. According to ARTICLE 19's Memorandum and Articles of Association:

- 1.4 The International Board shall appoint an Executive Director who shall be responsible under its direction for the conduct of the affairs of ARTICLE 19 for the implementation of the decisions of the International Board.
- 1.5 The Executive Director may appoint senior executive staff, and may appoint all other staff as are necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of ARTICLE 19 and ARTICLE 19 International.
- 1.6 The Executive Director will chair the global management team which shall be comprised of senior directors of the International Office and directors of the Regional Offices, and shall support the Executive Director in her/his responsibilities for the global and integrated management of ARTICLE 19 International.
- 1.7 The Executive Director and such members of the International Office as may appear appropriate to the Chairperson of the International Board shall be invited to whole or part of meetings of the International Board and may speak thereat but shall not be entitled to vote.

4.3 For organisations that have a unitary board structure, state the number of members of the and/or non-executive members highest governance body that are independent and/or non-executive members. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]

All Board members are non-executive members.

4.4 Mechanisms for internal stakeholders (e.g., members), shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body. [GRI NGOSS27]

The Senior Management Team of ARTICLE 19 are tasked by the Board to attend all Board meetings and make reports and recommendations on the status and strategy of the organisation. The full Global Management Team attends the Annual General Meeting for the same purpose.

Staff and other stakeholders submit recommendations and reports to the Board through the appropriate member of the GMT. Should staff feel concerns have not been appropriately addressed by the senior management, a process is in place that ultimately allows for petition to the Chair of the Board for consideration.

Stakeholder Engagement

4.14 List of stakeholder groups engaged by the organisation. [GRI NGOSS: p. 29]

FIRST TIER PARTNERS IN WEST AFRICA

- Media Institute of Southern Africa
- Institut PANOS Afrique de l'Ouest
- Media Foundation for West Africa
- Media Rights Agenda
- West African Journalists Association (WAJA)
- International Federation of Journalists Africa Office
- The African Editors Forum
- Open Democracy Advice
- Africa Freedom of Information Center
- Center for Media Studies and Peace Building
- Forum Civil

- Synpics

FIRST TIER PARTNERS IN SOUTH EAST ASIA

- Cambodia: Advocacy and Policies Institute (API)
- Cambodia – Cambodian Center for Human Rights (CCHR)
- Cambodia – Housing Rights Task Force
- Cambodia – Cambodian Center for Independent Media (CCIM)
- Cambodia – Natural Resource Protection Group
- Cambodia – Cambodian League for the Promotion and Defense of Human Rights (LICADHO)
- Cambodia – Community Legal Education Center (CLEC)
- China: Center for Legal Assistance to Pollution Victims (CLAPV) at China University of Political Science and Law
- Indonesia: Tifa Foundation
- Indonesia: PATTIRO –Centre for Study and Regional Learning
- Indonesia: Aliansi Jurnalis Independen (AJI)
- Indonesia: ICT Watch
- Indonesia: ID-CONFIG (Network of ICT NGOs created in Nov 2012)
- Malaysia: Suaram
- Malaysia: Zunar, political cartoonist
- Malaysia: Radio Free Sarawak
- Philippines: Center for Media Freedom and Responsibility (CMFR)
- Thailand: Free Somyot Campaign
- Thailand: Prachatai online news
- Vietnam: Viet Tan
- Regional: Asia Forum for Human Rights and Development (FORUM-ASIA)
- Regional: Southeast Asia Press Alliance (SEAPA)
- Regional: Media Defence – Southeast Asia (MD-SEA)

FIRST TIER PARTNERS IN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

- Adil Soz - Kazakhstan
- The Media Defence Institute - Ukraine
- The Mass Media Defence Center (MMDC) – Russia
- Bulgarian Helsinki Committee
- Balkan Investigative Reporter’s Network – Kosovo
- Media Development Centre – Macedonia
- Center for Independent Journalism – Romania
- Media Law Institute – Ukraine
- Centre for Development and Democratisation of Institutions - Albania

FIRST TIER PARTNERS IN LATIN AMERICA

- Acao Educativa
- ANDI
- Barao de Itarare www.baraodeitarare.org.br/
- Intervozes
- Centro Sabia www.centrosabia.org.br/
- Vitae Civilis www.vitaecivilis.org.br/

- Criola www.criola.org.br/
- Alianza Regional www.alianzaregional.net/
- GPOPAI www.gpopai.usp.br/wiki/index.php/Página_principal
- Open Knowledge Foundation Brasil <http://br.okfn.org/>
- AMARRIBO
- Grupo de Información en Reproducción Elegida (Mexico)
- Fundar Centro de Análisis e Investigación (Mexico)
- Centro de Estudios de Derecho Ambiental (Mexico)
- Cultura Ecológica (Mexico)
- DECA Equipo Pueblo (Mexico)
- Alianza Cívica (Mexico)
- Periodistas de a Pie (Mexico)
- Fundación Manuel Buendía (México)
- Insyde (Mexico)
- Sala de Prensa (Guatemala)
- Instituto Demos (Guatemala)
- CINCO (Nicaragua)
- Centro Nacional Nicaraguense de Derechos Humanos (Nicaragua)
- Fundación Violeta Barrios de Chamorro (Nicaragua)
- Asociación de Periodistas de El Salvador (El Salvador)
- Universidad Centroamericana (El Salvador)
- C-Libre (Honduras)
- Centro de Derechos Humanos de la Montaña Tlachinollan (Mexico)
- Red de Periodistas de Ciudad Juárez (Mexico)
- Red Nacional de Organismos Civiles de "Todos los Derechos para Todos y Todas" (Mexico)
- Red Mesa de Mujeres de Ciudad Juárez (Mexico)

FIRST TIER PARTNERS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

- IFEX – Tunisia
- UNDP Iraq
- UNESCO Iraq
- Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (CIHRS) – Egypt
- Egyptian Initiative for Human Rights (EIHR) - Egypt
- Iraqi Journalists Union (IJU) – Iraq
- MAHARAT – Lebanon
- Bahrain Centre for Human Rights
- The Gulf Centre for Human Rights

GLOBAL AND LEGAL PARTNERS

- Our main global partners include:
- UNESCO
- UNDP
- Amnesty International
- Columbia University
- Index on Censorship
- English Pen
- Freedom House
- Human Rights First
- International Media Support (IMS)
- International Publishers' Association

- International Federation of Journalists
- Media Diversity Institute (MDI)
- Media Legal Defence Initiative (MLDI)
- Exiled Writers Ink
- Pen International
- Reporters Sans Frontieres
- World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC)
- World Association of Publishers (WAN)
- African Union of Journalists
- Bolo Bhi Pakistan
- Berkman Center, Harvard University
- Bytes for All
- Community of Democracies
- Center for Internet and Society, India
- CIVICUS
- International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL)
- EDRI (European Digital Initiative for Human Rights)
- Global Partners
- Open Rights Group (ORG)
- Access Now
- La Quadrature du Net
- OSCE and Office of the Special Representative of the OSCE for Media Freedoms
- UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Opinion
- UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Assembly and Association
- OAS Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression
- African Union Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression

ARTICLE 19 has consultative or observer status with:

- **ECOSOC,**
- The **Council of Europe** and
- The **African Commission on Human and People's Rights.**

We work with and through:

- The UN Human Rights Committee,
- The Inter-American Commission and Court of Human Rights
- The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR)
- The European Court of Human Rights
- ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission for Human Rights (AICHR)

ARTICLE 19 has a long practice of close cooperation with all four special mandates on FoE, including:

- ACHPR Special Rapporteur for FoE (Africa)
- OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media (Europe)
- OAS Special Rapporteur on FoE (Americas)
- UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression (global)

ARTICLE 19 will invest in a new and better knowledge and contact management system in 2013.

4.15 Basis for identification and selection of stakeholders with whom to engage. [GRI NGOSS: p. 29]

ARTICLE 19 believes that one of the most effective and principled ways to promote and implement institutional, cultural and legal change is to work in partnership with local groups. This approach enables it to facilitate relationships amongst civil society actors on a national and international level and promote best-practice models from around the world. Its projects build the capacity of local organisations to ensure they are able to continue working in the future with decreasing international involvement and support.

ARTICLE 19 has developed an extensive partnership network across the world. At present, ARTICLE 19 works with about 50 domestic implementing partners, typically local civil society organizations, as well as media and human rights institutions, active in areas such as human rights, FoI, the media, women, health and the environment. In addition, the implementation of ARTICLE 19's projects involves nearly 100 grass-roots organisations which participate in training sessions, workshops, strategy meetings and evaluations.

ARTICLE 19 works closely with 5 regional and international inter-governmental instruments, and has consultative status with the United Nations' economic and social council (ECOSOC), the Council of Europe and the Organization of African Unity. It is a member of 11 active coalitions, as well as of the Global Transparency Initiative, a network of civil society organisations promoting openness among international financial institutions. The organisation was also instrumental in establishing the International Freedom of Expression Exchange ("IFEX").

Program effectiveness

Disclosure on Management Approach

Programme Effectiveness Performance Indicators

Indicator 1: NGO1 Processes for involvement of affected stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes.

ARTICLE 19 has involved stakeholder representatives through our ongoing project cycle management process in which information from target and beneficiary groups is used to monitor project and refine and redirect activities and strategies where this is necessary. A number of projects have been designed in partnership with a variety of organisations and many of our programmes have been implemented alongside partners including other INGOs, national NGOs, local grass roots community groups, government departments, and international bodies. For example, we designed a project on FOE for LGBT groups in collaboration with Gay and Lesbian Cultural Research and Solidarity Association (KAOS), we developed a project on ICT freedoms working alongside Bytes for All in Pakistan and the Vietnam Action Network. Furthermore, we have begun to implement a project on increasing public access to information in Cambodia alongside the Advocacy and Policy Institute (API) and we are monitoring the progress of this project against its stated aims.

We are using a host of results-based, qualitative and quantitative M&E tools, including: Project Work Plans; Periodic Progress Reports; Annual Project Report; Field Visits; Evaluations (projects and programmes, internal and external). We have found that, with a few exceptions, impact results from a confluence of events, meaning no single organisation can realistically claim full credit. Indeed, given the centrality of partnership as one of ARTICLE 19's core values, we have been keen to ensure that all M&E methodology recognises and integrates partners. The vast majority are designed and

implemented with them (e.g. joint partnership in Azerbaijan). Customers' surveys and focus group discussions are included in the majority of our activities, both as an M&E and programmatic tool. Evaluations include a focus on how well the partnership functioned, what it brought, and what could be done better in the future.

Indicator 2: NGO2 Mechanisms for feedback and complaints in relation to programmes and policies and for determining actions to take in response to breaches of policies.

External complaints regarding an ARTICLE 19 project, project management or staff behaviour have always been fully investigated, including with board members when required. Redress and remedies have been allocated, alongside identifying institutional learning. No external complaints were received in 2012.

ARTICLE 19 of the UK staff Terms and Conditions covers the formal process within ARTICLE 19 to bring a grievance against another member of staff or the organisation. This is also reiterated and an informal procedure established under our Bullying and Harassment policy which cover all staff, interns and Board Members no matter where they work.

ARTICLE 19 also has in place a Whistleblower Protection under its Code of Conduct which is made accessible to every staff member on arrival. It enables a channel for internal complaints to be raised and, if necessary, elevated to the Board Chair's attention.

Indicator 3: NGO3 System for programme monitoring, evaluation and learning, (including measuring program effectiveness and impact), resulting changes to programs, and how they are communicated.

ARTICLE 19 has a well-developed system in place for planning, both at strategic and operational level, and reporting. The development of ARTICLE 19's 5 year plan was initiated in February 2010 and finalised towards the end of the year. It involved a range of stakeholders globally, experts and meetings to share, exchange and balance competing ideas or priorities. Our plan is based on an extensive analysis of the global, regional and country environment, whether political, technological, economic or social; and a review of the organisation's strengths and weaknesses. In 2010, ARTICLE 19 was also able to rely on the support of professional facilitators to strengthen the determination of the priorities and what has been termed the "power of destination". In addition to the 5 year strategic plan, ARTICLE 19 priorities and work are set up through a yearly operational plan and individual staff member work and personal development plans. We organize an organizational week every year, where we review and discuss our strategic priorities, projects and activities, and agree on an operational plan for the organization as a whole, which include specific programmatic objectives.

- i. *Result Based management:* Plans and specific projects have been developed and approved since 2008 using the RBM approach (logic flows begin with long term and medium term results and end with activities). Organisational strategic priorities trickle down to regional and programmes operational plans and individual work plans. In 2008, we identified **global indicators** of success for our key strategic priorities, which were revised in 2010, as part of the operational planning. They both complement and reflect project-specific and country-specific indicators. In addition to a traditional annual report, ARTICLE 19 has produced a **Result-based implementation report** for each of our strategic priorities, providing specific feedback on each indicator, highlighting the new learning and identifying new indicators. These reports have been thoroughly reviewed and discussed with SIDA in 2009 and 2010, and have constituted a great basis for institutional learning. A number of 2010 projects have included **base line studies** to allow us to monitor progress over the next years. They include base line data on:

transparency of parliaments in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda; access to health information in Kenya, Senegal and Nigeria; and the implementation of transparency law in Timor.

- ii. *Monitoring and Evaluation:* We are using a host of results-based, qualitative and quantitative M&E tools, including: Project Work Plans; Periodic Progress Reports; Annual Project Report; Focus Group Meetings; Field Visits; Client Surveys; Evaluations (projects and programmes, internal and external). **Customers' surveys** and **focus groups** are included in the majority of our activities, both as an M&E and programmatic tool. External evaluations include a focus on how well the partnership functioned, what it brought, and what could be done better in the future (e.g. in 2010 in Brazil and Bangladesh). For two years, ARTICLE 19 has also been testing "**ranking surveys**" in Mexico, Azerbaijan, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania (where we have surveyed the transparency of specific institutions) which we have used to both evaluate our impact and advocate for greater change. We intend to extend the use of this tool to all our countries of intervention, along with establishing a global ranking for transparency laws. We will recruit a Head of Impact and Effectiveness who will continue to strengthen our Monitoring and Evaluation systems throughout the organisation.

ARTICLE 19 adopted a **Result Based Management** (RBM) system in 2008, in response to an organisation-wide evaluation from SIDA which recommended that ARTICLE 19 improved its capacity for results oriented monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Since then, ARTICLE 19 has implemented an ambitious RBM programme assessed every year by SIDA. ARTICLE 19 staff has been trained in RBM methodology for the last three years, an RBM coach was made available to all staff in 2010 and a set of **RBM templates and guidelines** have been developed, tested and revised.

Plans and specific projects have been developed and approved since 2008 using the RBM approach (logic flows begin with long term and medium term results and end with activities). Organisational strategic priorities trickle down to regional and programmes operational plans and individual work plans. In 2008, we identified **global indicators** of success for our key strategic priorities, which were revised in 2010, as part of the operational planning. They both complement and reflect project-specific and country-specific indicators. In addition to a traditional annual report, ARTICLE 19 has produced a **Result-based implementation report** for each of our strategic priorities, providing specific feedback on each indicator, highlighting the new learning and identifying new indicators. These reports have been thoroughly reviewed and discussed with SIDA in 2009 and 2010, and have constituted a great basis for institutional learning. A number of 2010 projects have included **base line studies** to allow us to monitor progress over the next years. They include base line data on: transparency of parliaments in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda; access to health information in Kenya, Senegal and Nigeria; and the implementation of transparency law in Timor. In 2010, we have piloted and evaluated a **thematic matrix management project**. We are now establishing thematic matrix groups to ensure integrated and cross regional policy development and advocacy, including on access to water, aid transparency and the preparation of Rio 2012.

Throughout 2010, we have reviewed the implementation of RBM, with the assistance of a coach. The exercise highlighted real progress over the last 3 years along with some remaining difficulties. Our **RBM progress plan** for the next 3 years seeks to strengthen **institutional learning** and **sector-wide sharing** through: (i) continued RBM coaching, new monitoring tools and guidelines; (ii) greater use of base line studies, so that we can better assess our impact throughout the project cycle; (iii) strengthening monitoring feedback loops into project implementation to improve the effectiveness of our interventions and policy making; (iv) recording and analysing case studies, interventions and evidence of impact to **consolidate the case** for transparency and FoE, and strengthen our community of practices; (v) better time management and planning, including at design stage, to ensure that sufficient time is allocated to record, analyse and share learning.

We are recruiting for a Head of Impact and Effectiveness who will be responsible for developing and implementing monitoring and evaluation systems for projects, programmes and regional offices.

Indicator 4: NGO4 Measures to integrate gender and diversity into programme design, implementation, and the monitoring, evaluation, and learning cycle.

ARTICLE 19 policy and capacity-building work is grounded on our gender sensitive policy, which seeks to ensure that the organisation captures the main elements pertinent to women, and addressing some of them in the implementation of projects. It includes both a specific focus on women as beneficiaries and the integration of a gender-sensitive methodology, and on ARTICLE 19 “multi-level approach” which cascades feedback and results between the international, national and grass-root levels, thereby driving a virtuous cycle of change.

Our projects on the impact of access to information on sexual and reproductive health rights in Peru served as a model for similar projects in Mexico with young women and men and currently in Kenya. We sought to defend the right of women and girls to have access to relevant information regarding reproductive and sexual health, including as a leverage towards the fulfilment of their rights to health. In general, we actively promote gender equality through, for example, training, capacity building and networks to support women’s involvement in community broadcasting and through achieving as great a gender-balance as possible in activities (participants, trainees, issues discussed).

In particular, when designing a project, ARTICLE 19 researches into the differentiated needs and capacities of both men and women, including within and across specific communities (racial, religious, ethnic, etc.) so as to ensure that the projects outcomes will be relevant all, including women. ARTICLE 19 activities will impact men and women differently, and prescriptive gender roles in a given social environment may determine to what extent women in particular are able to participate in planned activities; as such it is important to incorporate gender analysis into the early planning stage.

In many countries, organisations concerned with women will be addressing and monitoring issues that do not appear to be directly related to “traditional” FoE work, such as community-based work around health or education projects, access to resources, cooperatives, etc. Many women’s NGOs are working on “development” questions and may not be knowledgeable or, indeed, aware of international human rights principles and standards, such as those related to FoE and access to information. Experience has also shown that many human rights organisations (international and national) are not aware of the interrelationships between development and human rights work.

ARTICLE 19’s experience has demonstrated the huge potential in working together with organisations that do not necessarily use international FoE standards. Indeed, we have identified this kind of partnership as essential to a true social change process – without the involvement of grass root organizations representing a broad range of communities and interests, many laws, particularly those related to RTI, remain dead letter and are never used. Bringing together partners which had never worked together before, such as a feminist and a media law organisation (as in our project in Peru), may present a number of challenges. But the change and transformative process inherent to the partnership for all actors involved, including ARTICLE 19, is of benefit to everyone and to the defense of FoE.

All ARTICLE 19 contracts with partners include the following clause, “ARTICLE 19 makes grants on the condition that all grant recipients incorporate a non-discriminatory and gender perspective into all their activities and outputs, and that project reporting includes a description of how this has been achieved.”

ARTICLE 19 seeks to influence and affect how those who make or change policies (policy-makers, legislators, judges, and administrators, etc.) think about FoE. It is also based upon assisting contacts in learning new skills, consciousness-raising, gaining access to national and international forums, bringing their cases or issues to world-wide attention.

It should be emphasised that gender is only one of many characteristics that shape the course of our missions: age, nationality, race, ethnicity influence as well the nature of the relationships between the ARTICLE 19 delegate and the contacts.

In countries where ARTICLE 19 has seldom worked or never interacted with women's groups or women, a first exploratory mission may be disappointing. Contacts may be limited and untrustworthy. In countries where women's access to education is very limited, research may require even more time and effort to overcome lack of communication due to cultural and language differences, and contrasting modes of reporting information.

Indicator 5: NGO6 Processes to take into account and coordinate with the activities of other actors. How do you ensure that your organisation is not duplicating efforts?

ARTICLE 19 is a small organisation – therefore the size and scale of our projects means that we are still able to oversee all projects to avoid duplication.

As an organisation, the success of ARTICLE 19 depends upon being aware of and part of ongoing FoE, transparency, and general human rights debates. This includes maintaining a strong link with the external environment, including coordinating work with other organisations and international bodies working on similar issues. We have several mechanisms for achieving this. First, ARTICLE 19 has six regional offices and representatives in strategic parts of the world who all maintain regular contact with each other and the International Office as well as through the Global Management Team meetings and annual general meetings. Second, our International Board includes geographical representation of senior representatives from key organisations, and offers the senior management a pool of expertise and experience in the field of Human rights. Finally, organisational and programme annual planning meetings includes a mapping of ARTICLE 19's position in relation to other actors.

Economic

Indicator 6: NGO7 Resource allocation

During the reporting period, ARTICLE 19 received funds either as project-specific funds for particular activities, or as unrestricted funding to be allocated more flexibly across the organisation.

In 2012, we allocated our funding according to the following strategic goals:

Goal One: Protecting Freedom of Expression in a multi-polar world – 22.17%

Goal Two: Defending Freedom of Expression in a networked world – 11.22%

Goal Three: Ending Impunity for Crimes against Freedom of Expression – 24.97%

Goal Four: Strengthen Freedom of Expression and transparency in an era of scarcity – 35.62%

Goal Five: A Global Integrated Organisation (Organisational effectiveness) – 6.02%

ARTICLE 19 retains oversight mechanisms to ensure that resources are allocated correctly. Independent auditors carry out an annual audit of ARTICLE 19's finances in London, Brazil and Kenya.

ARTICLE 19's International Board and its Finance and General Purposes Committee retains an oversight function on all issues of financial management and resource allocation.

Indicator 7: NGO8 Sources of funding by category and five largest donors and monetary value of their contribution.

ARTICLE 19's financial year is from January to December every year. Financial information available covers the reporting period Jan-Dec 2012. The audited 2012 financials and ARTICLE 19's annual report are available online at www.article19.org

In the year 2012, our gross income was approximately £3,075,044, consisting of:

- Unrestricted: £1,187,508
- Restricted: £1,887,536

Five largest donors in 2012:

- UK Department For International Development (DFID): £542,687
- Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO): £418,341
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA): £306,547
- International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL): £312,954
- European Commission (EC): £173,713

Indicator 8: EC7 Procedures for local hiring and proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation. Do you have a policy or practice for local hiring? If so, report on the proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation.

ARTICLE 19's policy and general recruitment procedure is to hire locally or regionally based experts for regional roles. All staff at present in our regional or program offices were recruited from the local/regional community. ARTICLE 19 Recruitment Policy reflects these concerns.

100% of senior management for our 5 regional offices were hired from the local community.

For the International Office in London, the senior roles require less location-specific expertise as the majority of the roles are operational or supportive in nature. The International office abides by all regulations and policies promulgated by the UK Border Agency and Home Office with regards to the recruitment of EU nationals and international recruitments.

Indicator 9: EN16 Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight. As a minimum, report on indirect greenhouse gas emissions related to buying gas, electricity or steam. You may also report on business travel related greenhouse gas emissions.

ARTICLE 19's total greenhouse gas emissions from 2012 were approximately 252 metric tonnes which comprises of 39.9 metric tonnes of indirect greenhouse gas emissions from our energy, water and sewage use and 221.1 tonnes from our business related travel.

ARTICLE 19's indirect greenhouse gas emissions from our energy, water and sewage use is approximately 39.9 metric tonnes. This is an estimate based on calculations for the period 01 April 2012 to 31 March 2013 for the Free Word Centre where ARTICLE 19 has offices. The total amount of greenhouse emissions for the building was 138.9 metric tonnes and the Free Word Centre has 80 desks and ARTICLE 19 occupied 23 desks in 2012.

ARTICLE 19's business travel related greenhouse gas emissions from 2012 were approximately 212 metric tonnes. This is an estimate based on staff travel calculations for the year, which is the biggest source of emissions for an international organisation like ARTICLE 19. A total of 1,844,544 km was travelled in 2012 and based on 0.115 kg per km, this works out at 212.1 tonnes.

Although the figure is an estimate it is important to establish a base-line of ARTICLE 19's carbon emissions. ARTICLE 19 is committed to calculating and monitoring our greenhouse gas emissions and we will track progress and to improve performance next year.

Indicator 10: EN18 Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved. What are you doing to reduce and how much have you reduced?

ARTICLE 19 committed in 2011 to beginning to monitor and track trends for its greenhouse gas emissions. The argument for deliberately reducing staff travel – the main source of emissions by ARTICLE 19 – needs to be counter-balanced with the recognised need for the staff to interact with stakeholders and to adequately represent the organisation in key forums. In our environmental policy we state that we identify which destinations are easily reachable by train (*e.g.* less than 5 hours) and pledge that we will no longer fly to these places, unless the savings from flying exceed a certain factor for example, flights will be preferred if the ticket cost is at least 35% lower. We do not have exact numbers but the majority of flights taken to France and Belgium in 2012 were taken by train instead of flights.

Nevertheless, it is widely acknowledged that there are other ways of reducing emissions, whether at the office (increased insulation) or in carbon offsetting, and ARTICLE 19 hopes in the coming months to develop an approach for reducing its emissions as well as monitoring them.

Labour

Indicator 11: LA1 Total workforce, including volunteers, by type, contract, and region.

Within the reporting period (2012) ARTICLE 19 maintained its workforce of between 65 and 75 employees, interns, volunteers and consultants.

Total workforce (staff, volunteers, interns, consultants): a total of 132 individuals worked for ARTICLE 19 within the reporting period of January to December 2012.

ARTICLE 19 does have a breakdown available for this period of the concentration of the workforce based in the different regions. At the end of the reporting period the breakdown was:

- Unpaid interns = 4 (2 in UK; 1 in Kenya; 1 in Bangladesh)
- Staff = 27 (19 in UK; 7 in Kenya and 1 in Senegal)
- Consultants = 40 (3 in UK; 1 in USA; 3 in Bangladesh; 1 in Kazakhstan; 2 in Tunisia; 16 in Mexico; 8 in Brazil; 5 in Senegal and 1 in Kenya)

Indicator 12: LA10 Average hours of training per year per employee by employee category. If you can't report on average hours of training, report on training programmes in place.

Training is provided "in-house" where possible and usually on the job. To facilitate this ARTICLE 19 employs a number of specialists whose role includes passing on specialist knowledge and training to others (*e.g.* Monitoring & Evaluation Officer). UK based staff are also required to compile a personal development plan which identifies skills/knowledge shortfalls and how they may be addressed as

part of the performance management policy. During the reporting period (2012) one external half day “dignity at work” workshop was attended by all UK based staff. 28 number of staff also received week long training on project management in both London and Nairobi, and an additional 8 received supplementary training on monitoring and evaluation.

Indicator 13: LA12 Percentage of employees receiving regular performance and career development reviews.

During the reporting period, ARTICLE 19 applied a formal performance management policy. The fundamental principal of this is that an annual work and personal developmental plan should be formulated against which performance can be measured on a regular basis throughout the year, culminating in an annual appraisal which includes the use of 360 degree feedback. 53% of eligible staff completed this process throughout the year while others were in progress dependant on their date of joining anniversary date. In addition, all new entrants are contractually required to complete a probationary period during which performance is more regularly assessed.

Indicator 14: LA13 Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity.

Board:

40% (4) male vs. 60% (6) female at the start of the reporting year

28.5% (2) male vs. 71.5% (5) female at the end of the reporting year (3 vacancies)

Senior Management Team: 100% (3) female at the end of the reporting period

Excluding unpaid interns, at the end of the reporting period ARTICLE 19 had 67 employees, 59% of whom were engaged on a consultancy basis and based outside the UK.

60% of staff members fell within the 30-40 age group, 30% above 40 and 10% were within the 20-29 age group.

Throughout the reporting period the organisation had a higher number of females than males, and a lower number of staff from the global South than the North.

Although ARTICLE 19 gathers some data on gender, age and local vs external hire as a small organisation it does not currently gather full data for all staff.

Society

Indicator 15: SO3 Percentage of employees trained in organisation's anti-corruption policies and procedures.

ARTICLE 19 adopted a new anti-fraud and bribery policy in 2012 in line with the new UK law on fraud and bribery. To date, 14% of employees have received external training on the policy, representing the finance and compliance function in our London office. While internal training has not yet been held in 2012 for the remainder of staff, the policy was circulated to all staff at the time of adoption.

However, ARTICLE 19 additionally has a finance manual that all finance and senior staff have received training on. This manual includes provisions on fraud and bribery prevention.

Product Responsibility

Indicator 16: PR6 Programs for adherence to laws, standards, and voluntary codes related to ethical fundraising and marketing communications, including advertising, promotion, and sponsorship.

ARTICLE 19 does not formally adhere to any standards or voluntary codes related to advertising, marketing communication or promotions activities. Promotional activities are undertaken in line with ARTICLE 19 values identified in our Code of Conduct: Integrity, Collaboration, Diversity, Transparency, Accountability. These values are reflected in our Brand Guidelines, adopted in 2011. Internal procedures, including approval process with senior management, project leaders and managers are in place to ensure accuracy and truthfulness in promotional pieces. During 2012, ARTICLE 19 did not undertake any paid advertising.

In 2012, all materials produced by ARTICLE 19 were freely available via its website. The email distribution system for newsletters and updates allows subscribers to manage their subscription personally and ensure automatic unsubscribes.

ARTICLE 19's law program does provide consultancy services that provide legal and policy analysis upon request. All work done under the consultancy arrangements are reviewed and signed off by the Senior Director for Law and Policy prior to completion to ensure quality control and adherence to our brand guidelines and code of conduct.

ARTICLE 19 does not have a formal policy on ethical fundraising, but have in practice adhered to the Ethical Fundraising Guidelines and the Accountability Charter. As part of our commitment to transparency and accountability, ARTICLE 19 began reporting to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard in 2012.

ARTICLE 19 did not receive any complaints in 2012 for breaches of fundraising or marketing communications standards in relation either to affected stakeholders, or to the rights of donors.

Indicator 5: NGO5 Processes to formulate, communicate, implement, and change advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns. Identify how the organisation ensures consistency, fairness and accuracy.

ARTICLE 19 prides itself on its rigorously researched approach to advocacy, particularly advocacy around legal issues. Our advocacy positions are always developed after carrying out thorough desk research which includes analysis of international and national legal precedents, solicitation of opinions by legal experts, civil society and media reports as well as positions articulated on the issue by governments and inter-governmental bodies. In the case of policy development, which underpins our advocacy at international bodies, the draft policy is then circulated to civil society groups/ experts engaged on the issue for their feedback/ comments. Internally, the unit that develops the position or policy then submits it to the five-member Senior Management Team for sign off before it is circulated publicly.

In 2012, the ARTICLE 19 International Board of Trustees reviewed ARTICLE 19 policies- past and under development- and also discussed the formal process through which we shape advocacy positions. It was decided to increase the role of Board engagement on a select number of policies under development in the future.

Indicator 16: SO1 Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any programmes and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities, including entering, operating, and exiting. This indicator was designed to talk about the positive/negative side effects of what you do, not about your main purpose.

It is important to note that the vast majority of ARTICLE 19 work does not work directly with community members and does not interact with beneficiaries in the same way that a development organisation might. Instead, ARTICLE 19 works with CSOs, often at the national and international level, and often works indirectly through partners.

ARTICLE 19 is implementing a broad Monitoring and Evaluation strategy that looks to document the impact of our work on beneficiaries and our overall mission, as well as achievement of specific program objectives. In 2013 we are looking to implement a component of that strategy that would see ARTICLE 19 establish after-action monitoring protocols to determine long-term impact. This had not yet been done in 2012.