

What is DECI?

- A form of Utilization Focussed Evaluation (UF)
- A decision-making framework for enhancing the utility and actual use of evaluations
- Projects are the drivers of their own evaluation
- DECI 2 included Research Communication mentoring



The PI experience

1. Program readiness

- ✓ February 2013

2. Evaluators' readiness

- ✓ February 2013

3. Primary Intended users:

- Carly
- Emma
- Mike
- Eric
- Gus
- Vicky
- Alex
- Matt

Steps 4 and 5 – Situational analysis and Primary Intended Uses

- DECI process started in early 2013, first meeting with them was in late 2013
- A lot changed from when we signed up to when we first began the work – i.e. Snowden
- First meeting in November 2013 PI was in a lot of flux and growth
- Then SIDA started and things changed again
- Initially wanted to focus on questions of growth, strategy and sustainability
- Then shifted focus to relationship with partners
- Also because of Firetail evaluation

Evolution of our Primary Intended Uses

November 2013

Making Choices - To assist Privacy to develop a policy that will guide its choice of issues to work on.

Learning from Experience - To identify the lessons learned from its contributions to effecting change.

Uniqueness - To identify the uniqueness of the role played by Privacy

Organizational Sustainability - To contribute to the planning of the future organizational structure and resourcing

Short and Long Term Balance - To validate the current balance struck between short term responses and longer term strategic interventions (reactive - proactive balance, e.g. fire-fighting vs long term issues)

Partnership Relations - To assess the value that Privacy brings to its partners.

November 2014

Use 1: To assess the extent to which PI has enabled and/or contributed to enriching the work of the partner organisations.

Use 2: To assess the extent to which Privacy International achieves its organisational mission by working with partners.

Use 3: To assess how effective Privacy International has been in fostering and building a community dedicated to enhancing privacy-related legal protections, building community respect for privacy, conducting policy-directed research, and/or increasing privacy committed stakeholder engagement at the local, national, and regional level in the 'Global South'

Use 4: To assess which type of funding arrangement between the 'Global North' and 'Global South' is the most appealing to donors and most effective at capacity-building.'

Steps 6-7-8 – Designing and focusing the evaluation

- Most onerous task
- Had to ask ourselves
 - What do we want to know about PI?
 - What do we want to know about our partners?
 - What's the best way to phrase questions to get the data we need?
 - Do we want facts or feelings?
- Had to come up with a list of Key Evaluation Questions

Use 1: To assess the extent to which PI has enabled and/or contributed to enriching the work of the partner organisations.

1. Before the organisation engaged with Privacy International, to what extent was privacy a component to the partner organisation's work?
2. What changes have occurred regarding the partner's work on privacy?
3. What are the most pressing privacy needs in the partner country and through what mechanisms and to what extent has Privacy International helped the partner organisation target those needs?

Use 2: To assess the extent to which Privacy International achieves its organisational mission by working with partners.

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages for Privacy International to have partners in the 'Global South?'
2. How if at all, does Privacy International's staff employ the respective organisation's work in their own work?

Use 3: To assess how effective Privacy International has been in fostering and building a community dedicated to enhancing privacy-related legal protections, building community respect for privacy, conducting policy-directed research, and/or increasing privacy committed stakeholder engagement at the local, national, and regional level in the 'Global South.'

1. Do partners/staff feel they are a part of a community and what do they think Privacy International's role is within that community?
2. What are the best ways to communicate across the community and about the community [partners/staff]?

Use 4: To assess which type of funding arrangement between the 'Global North' and 'Global South' is the most appealing to donors and most effective at capacity-building.

1. What funding arrangement do funders and partners prefer?
2. How do partners feel about Privacy International being the 'middle man' as compared to their respective relationship with other partners and funders?



Step 9 - Data collection

- Focus group meeting with PI staff
- Online survey of PI staff
- Funder interviews with OSF, SIDA and IDRC
- Partner interviews with Karisma, ADN (Hisham), Pablo Palazzi, CIS-India (Elonnai), Derechos Digitales (Claudio), KELIN (Allan), Bytes for All (Shahzad)

... and then on to the data analysis...

Steps 10 & 11 – Data analysis and meta evaluation

Staff survey

Communication

- 80% staff interact with partners at least once a week
- How do you communicate with partners
 1. Email, skype and jabber
 2. Twitter and at conferences
 3. Via Community (only 1 respondent)
- Preference is for face to face meetings

Staff survey cont'd

Interaction with partners' work

- Every member of staff said that they cite partners' work and experiences relatively often
- Most visible of our partners to staff are: Bytes for All, ADN/Hisham, Zimbabwe, Morocco, DRF Pakistan, and India
- Quite a lot more contact than just those projects with specific partner engagement (i.e. GSMA)

Staff survey cont'd

Suggestions for improvement

- “Some partners are awesome and some just... aren't. I wish they felt they should be a little more accountable. Some partners perceive us **simply as a source of funding** and they think that as long as a report is produced at the end of the year they can get away with not engaging at all throughout the year.”
- “I think there are two issues: 1. Finding a suitable technological means for interacting with them and 2. A **requirement for staff to engage** in discussions using that medium”
- “PI staff **masterclasses should be streamed** across to partners and have their input and questions asked during the sessions.”
- “More integrated communications. **Better processes to highlight** their work and bring it to the PI audience.”
- “Perhaps allowing them to **work from PI's offices** in London for a fortnight.”

Staff survey cont'd

Suggestions for improvement

- “**Integrate the work** across our organisation so that all teams liaise with partners.”
- “Communicate more regularly -- periodic catch-ups that aren't administrative. **Better communications platforms**. More physical meetings. A more **social and relaxed relationship** that isn't just 'privacy' and 'funding' related -- learn more about their work across domains.”
- “Develop **common** research and advocacy to work more in partnerships with partners with same objectives, etc.”
- “I think a lot of it depends on **partner motivations** for doing this work with us -- are we basically a source of funding for them, and they wouldn't look at surveillance unless we asked them to, or are they really interested in looking into surveillance?”
- “Establish closer relationships, **work more collaboratively** with partners to design research and advocacy initiatives that both respond to their interests and those of PI.”

Use 1: To assess the extent to which PI has enabled and/or contributed to enriching the work of the partner organisations.

Partners generally fall into one of three camps:

- organisations in Asia with which PI began working in the **first IDRC project**, none of which had worked on privacy prior to contact with PI;
- organisations, generally in Latin America but also in Africa, which have been working on **free expression, digital or mainstream human rights organisations** and which had previously done some work on privacy, tangentially, for whom working with PI has been the catalyst to making institutional dedication of resources/focus to privacy issues
- **academics** in the field of privacy/data protection whose work runs parallel to PI's but who are not dependent on PI as the catalyst for working on privacy

The particular value that PI brings to partners is

- the provision of financial resources
- the provision of expertise and support on substantive matters
- membership of the community
- international prestige

Use 2: To assess the extent to which Privacy International achieves its organisational mission by working with partners.

- All staff value the idea of having partners
- All staff refer to partners in advocacy situations, bring in partners' work in where possible, and use their stories where relevant and useful.
- However, staff do not have a clear sense of how having partners, or the partners themselves, contribute to PI's organisational mission.
- Therefore, it is clear that we need to encourage greater engagement throughout PI with the partners and their work

Use 3: To assess how effective PI has been in fostering and building a community dedicated to enhancing privacy-related legal protections, building community respect for privacy, conducting policy-directed research, and/or increasing privacy committed stakeholder engagement at the local, national, and regional level in the 'Global South.'

- All partners feel like they are part of a community, and are positive about the benefits this brings to them. These include:
 - global partner meetings - everyone speaks very highly of these
 - "emotional" support, not feeling alone
 - ability to get access to expertise and other funding opportunities
- However, PI needs to do a better job on "up keep" of the community.
- Feedback from partners includes that we should try the following to nourish the community:
 - curate discussion on the Community platform
 - make people more knowledgeable about who is in the community, profile members
 - consider coordinating joint litigation/action

Use 4: To assess which type of funding arrangement between the 'Global North' and 'Global South' is the most appealing to donors and most effective at capacity-building.

- Partners, on the whole, feel positively about PI as the middle man.
- This is with the exception of those partners in Latin America who have aspirations to expand and would like to be cultivating the relationships with the international funders themselves.
- Funders feel positively about PI's role, although they differ on why PI plays a valuable role.
 - IDRC focuses more on the importance of research, PI providing a sounding board for researchers, providing expertise where necessary
 - OSF/SIDA believes PI should be working with partners to collaboratively set agendas, more integrated strategising etc



**WE NEED
YOU**

What do you think?

- One of the most important things PI brings to the partners is the provision of expertise and support on substantive matters – so how can we do this more consistently?
- Staff value partners but don't necessarily connect them to PI achieving our organisational mission. How can we rectify the lack of identification of PI staff with partners and their work?
- The “privacy community” that PI fosters is hugely important to partners. How can we nourish it more?