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## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Civil Society Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOE</td>
<td>Freedom of Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICORN</td>
<td>International Cities of Refuge Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IREX</td>
<td>International Research and Exchanges Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQI</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, Queer and Intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>Livingstone Press Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISA</td>
<td>Media Institute of Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF</td>
<td>PEN Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEN</td>
<td>‘Poets, Essayists and Novelists’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAN</td>
<td>Rapid Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>(for indicators) Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States [of America]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNBC</td>
<td>Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Introduction
This is the final report of an independent evaluation commissioned by PEN International of its work over the last four years (2015-2018) focusing on the Swedish International Development Agency’s (Sida) core grant - approximately £2.7m over four years. Sida’s grant in 2018 covered 55 per cent of PEN International’s total operating budget. The aim is to provide a rigorous analysis of the organisation’s achievements and learning, and to help PEN strategise for the way forward.

Our evaluation lasted roughly seven months (May-Nov 2018) during which we interviewed over 100 stakeholders from across the organisation (Secretariat, Board, former staffers, elected PEN Centre officials and ordinary PEN members) as well as external partners and other human rights organisations; we visited five PEN Centres (Philippines, Argentina, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Uganda); we consulted over 70 documents; we conducted an online survey of 106 PEN members (representing a 25% response rate); and we observed three PEN workshops and attended the PEN annual Congress in India.

We have produced longer, separate reports on our Philippines, Argentina and Africa trips, analysing Centre activities and the Civil Society Programme (CSP) projects there (see summaries in Annexes). We have also made a short video of our evaluation process and our findings.

Main Findings

- Relevance of PEN as an Organisation

1. PEN has a clear niche as an organisation specialising in the rights of writers, the defence and promotion of literature and of minority languages. Furthermore, it seems to have a faultless reputation. There appears to be no overlap with other human rights groups, whilst there is good cooperation with them. However, having gathered perspectives of outsiders and observed the challenges that PEN faces in attracting younger writers, we conclude that PEN has a somewhat old-fashioned public image. This image probably needs updating and PEN needs to respond more vigorously to the challenges from digital technology and a worldwide decline in book/reading culture.

2. While there is probably more unanimity than a few years ago, there is still internal divergence about PEN International’s identity, what it should be concentrating on, what its future strategy should be, and how, given limited resources and staff-time with the Secretariat, it can set priorities that are realistic and achievable. There are some internal divides that characterise the organisation. Whilst it is probably not possible to reconcile most of these divides - and in many ways they are evidence of a healthy, democratic organisation, unafraid to debate amongst itself - the question of whether it is the Board or the Secretariat who leads, is fundamental and needs addressing.

3. There are a plethora of issues that PEN members believe the organisation should be acting on. Especially for the Secretariat, everything seems to be a priority at once – this points to the need for PEN International to cut down on the number of its activities and streamline and clarify its strategy and objectives. Preparation for the upcoming centenary celebrations in 2021 could be a good opportunity for this.
• **Effectiveness of PEN as an Organisation**

4. PEN International has been quite effective in its activities over the last four years and our sense is that it has changed from being inward-looking to having much more of a global voice. Most indicators are on an upward trend, such as the growing number of writers at risk reporting improvements in their situation. PEN International is at or near to having achieved most of its targets for the period 2015-2018 – in some cases it has positively overachieved, for example, over the last four years, at least 20 Centres in developing countries have created youth projects against a target of 10, under the CSP. All these achievements are very much due to wider organisational and efficiency considerations such as finances being in a better state, compared to four years ago. However, it is difficult to pinpoint many specific achievements and attribute them solely to PEN (even when this is desirable) – this is exacerbated by the challenges the organisation still faces in monitoring and documenting examples of its own impact. Furthermore, being a diverse and horizontal organisation of volunteers is a strength but, at the same time, presents PEN with key challenges that it must continually navigate.

5. PEN’s CSP is very relevant and necessary, especially considering that the space for freedom of expression (FOE) seems to be shrinking, worldwide. It receives a large portion of the Sida funding. We highlight specific positive examples from the activities we observed in Argentina, Philippines, Uganda and Zambia. If PEN continues to put resources into the CSP and thinks about refining it and making it more sustainable, this would play to PEN’s strengths.

6. Progress on monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) has been steady but PEN’s ‘Learning Framework’ is relatively new and still in development. We applaud efforts to introduce creative and compelling ways of assessing change (through stories, and in explicitly recognising the role of external actors) but there is still a long way to go. PEN International’s own reports and public-facing outputs do not yet enumerate, quantify and describe achievements in a clear and accessible way. Reporting especially on advocacy work could be improved by more clearly articulating desired end-points at the design stage, setting milestones to be achieved as indicators of incremental changes, and then reporting against those interim milestones. We urge consideration be given to using a theory of change approach for programme and project design.

• **Efficiency of PEN as an Organisation**

7. Overall we found that PEN is much more professional and better organised than when it was last evaluated in 2014. The dedication and hard work of everyone involved is evident; and it is also clear that PEN covers a lot with few resources. We found that PEN International is a transparent organisation and it insists - and achieves - strict financial probity. It is managing its finances in a much more efficient way than four years ago.

8. In terms of governance, we discerned two competing poles of leadership within PEN (the Board and the Secretariat), which makes it unclear where power lies, who is leading on strategy, and where reporting lines are drawn. With better internal communications and attention to improving skills, procedures and key policies, the Board and Secretariat could improve internal governance.

9. In terms of value for money, we believe that PEN presents good value for money overall but could make efficiency savings by holding Congress biannually rather than annually. The organisation could improve how it communicates on money matters internally – i.e. with its membership. Although progress on fundraising and diversifying income sources is being made, this area remains critical, as PEN is still very reliant on Sida for core-funding.

10. We found that the skills and commitment of the Secretariat staff were very good. However, they are seriously overstretched – and we observed an alarmingly high level of staff turnover during the
period of our evaluation. Recruitment of one or two more staff could be considered, but given that finding further funding for more staff is not guaranteed (at least not in the short-term), it looks most sensible to examine priorities dispassionately and cut down on work areas, rather than adding substantially to staff numbers. We acknowledge that this is a process which has already begun with the start of strategic planning for 2019-22.

11. Most PEN Centres around the world feel well-supported by the Secretariat, although communications between Secretariat and Centres could be improved. While time-consuming, servicing the Centres is probably still a priority area. This points to the need for more staff capacity for covering the regions, possibly by expanding the number of consultants who are regionally-based, such as the one currently helping to cover the Americas.

- **Impact/Sustainability/ Replicability of PEN’s Activities**

12. On supporting individual writers at risk, it is impressive that of those writers who reached out to PEN last year, 80 percent of them reported feeling supported by PEN’s solidarity work. There have been many positive stories over the years but PEN could do more to highlight and report more strongly their own achievements in this area, even if PEN has been one actor among several. Rapid Action Network (RAN) calls to action should remain a priority for the Secretariat but it is important to ensure that Centres always have enough time and information to take action.

13. The International Cities of Refuge (ICORN) and PEN Emergency Fund (PEF) programmes are very valuable but PEN should try to keep them at current levels and not be tempted to expand them, bearing in mind the need to keep the Secretariat’s tasks at manageable levels. When it comes to Universal Periodic Review (UPR) reports to the UN, we note they are low on the Secretariat’s list of priorities and, considering how time-consuming they are and how unclear their impact, it is probably time to review them and consider some cuts.

14. PEN’s work on criminal defamation has seen some positive progress and should be pursued and developed, if funding allows. Work on Turkey has been tougher: PEN has built up a great deal of knowledge, experience and partnerships in relation to the FOE situation in Turkey, such that it would be a shame not to build on it. However, at present it may be necessary to concentrate on monitoring trials and aim for individual releases of imprisoned writers rather than aiming for structural change, given the present climate.

15. The Dissident Blog is in principle a good fit with the aims and ethos of PEN International. It could be an innovative literary magazine with a global audience showcasing writers who are exiled or silenced in their own countries but relatively low levels of reach and engagement mean it is not cost-effective and linkages with the wider work of PEN International are limited. Current plans to revamp the Dissident Blog should take a ‘root and branch’ approach to rethinking the purpose, intended audience, language, format and design and its integration with PEN secretariat and Centres.

16. The CSP can be deemed a success so far, even though it has been slower than foreseen, and achieving impact and sustainability is still some way off. Centres should continue to receive support from the Secretariat, but the question is how much support, where it is given, and how to promote long-term change at institutional level. The involvement of young writers is crucial. Facilitation and the delivery of CSP capacity-building activities are being actively devolved to Centres such as Uganda and Philippines which is healthy but decentralising could be even more actively pursued through twinning between Centres and the appointment of more regional representatives like the present consultant on the Americas to extend and decentralise the capacity-building that, at the moment, is being done by the Secretariat. It would also be sensible to put a ceiling on the number of Centres that receive CSP grants at any one time and to consider larger grants to fewer Centres.
17. On gender and diversity issues, our sense is that a lot has been done to ensure they are integrated within PEN’s roles, functions, operations, programmes, outputs, measurement and learning. The Women’s Manifesto now needs to be developed further to ensure that it embraces and mainstreams gender issues and diversity more broadly, and to inspire programming and fundraising. Perhaps, in future, gender issues will be sufficiently mainstreamed within PEN so as not to require a separate document. Similarly, we like the idea of integrating LGBTQI and other minority issues under one committee and renaming the Women Writers Committee the ‘Committee on Women, Diversity and Inclusivity’. The steps taken to integrate gender within the CSP are on the right track and have received considerable attention: however more support to designing gender sensitive and gender transformative projects will be needed. At all levels PEN should review how and what disaggregated data it should collect and present.

**Priority Recommendations** (please see full set of recommendations in Section 7 below)

1. **Sida should continue funding PEN International** at current levels but PEN should redouble its efforts to diversify and increase its funding from other sources.

2. **PEN should stick firmly to its focus on writers’ rights, literature and linguistic rights** and should not be drawn in diverse other directions.

3. **PEN should pay special attention to tackling the challenges of the digital revolution and to attracting young people** to the organisation, to modernise and make it more relevant. These twin themes should be the focus of the new Strategy and the centenary in 2021.

4. **PEN should be much clearer that it is the Board, representing the membership, that provides the high level vision and strategic direction of the organisation** and that the role of the Secretariat is to support this, not to lead.

5. **PEN should ensure its new Strategy document is written by the Secretariat and the Board together** and the whole organisation should own it.

6. **This new PEN Strategy should cut the number of activities and programmes** being undertaken to lighten the load on the Secretariat. Some advocacy activities and central campaigning could be cut.

7. **PEN should hold its Congress every two years**, instead of annually, to save money.

8. **PEN should continue with its Civil Society Programme** but should aim for longer-term policy or institutional impacts and should consider giving fewer but bigger individual grants.

9. **PEN should concentrate on gathering stronger impact evidence** and telling more punchy stories of change in its external communications and its reports to donors.

10. **PEN should encourage more informal Centre to Centre collaboration**: more twinning between PEN Centres, more regional networks, and should consider more regionally-based coordinators in the Global South.
1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

This is the final report of an evaluation commissioned by PEN International of its work over the last four years (2015–2018) focusing on the Swedish International Development Agency’s (Sida) core grant (approximately £2.7m over four years). We are an independent group of evaluators: Mary Myers, Nicola Harford and Soledad Muniz. Our terms of reference (see copy in Annex 8.10) asked us to provide “a rigorous analysis of the organisation’s achievements and learning by an external and independent consultant”. First and foremost, this is intended as a learning exercise, which we hope will be used for planning PEN’s next strategic plan 2019 – 2022, through and beyond PEN’s Centenary in 2021. This evaluation is also intended to provide an update on the previous evaluation for Sida, carried out in 2014 by the organisation INTRAC1.

1.2. Background to PEN International and context

PEN International, established in 1921, is:

“the world's oldest literary and human rights based organisation. A global grassroots community of writers who adhere to the PEN Charter and are united in celebrating literature as well as upholding and pressing for lasting improvements in respect of freedom of expression and other rights. The PEN network spans more than 100 countries, represented through over 147 [now 149] local autonomous centres, with a Secretariat based in London. PEN Centres are engaged in work at the national, regional and international level to advance PEN’s core values of freedom of expression, mutual respect and tolerance across cultures, as well as opportunities for all to participate in, and contribute creatively to, both local and global literary culture.

“PEN International’s governing document is the PEN Charter and its Constitution, PEN International’s members are the PEN Centres which meet once a year at the Assembly of Delegates. The organisation is managed by its board, which consists of the International President, International Secretary, the Treasurer and seven members elected from among PEN’s worldwide membership. International PEN through its [20 person] Secretariat coordinates the activities of PEN Centres across the world in defence of freedom of expression and provides international support, research, policy development and programming to further its aims.” (PEN International Call for Tender Evaluation, n.d.)

PEN’s overall goal (as per its logical framework) is “to promote and defend freedom of expression, literatures, linguistic diversity, and mutual respect and tolerance across borders”.

Sida’s current four year grant covers 2015 to 2018, totalling 31m Swedish Kroner or approximately £2.7million. Sida has recently agreed a year-long cost extension for 2019 at the same level of funding. The Sida grant to PEN International supports its core programme, in line with PEN’s 2015–2018 Strategic Plan. Sida has stipulated that most of the grant must go either directly to PEN’s activities in ODA countries2 or to support to those activities from the Secretariat, but is otherwise flexible. The Secretariat has devised a logical framework, which has been agreed with Sida, but in practice PEN does not report to

2 Overseas Development Aid - i.e. developing countries – see Sida’s website for full list of its focus countries Sida
Sida against its targets and Sida is open as to how PEN chooses to monitor and report on the activities it does under the grant.

The largest shares of Sida’s grant (total per year average £675,000) are allocated to salaries at the Secretariat (approximately £300,000 per year) and to the Civil Society Programme (approximately £200,000 per year). The CSP awards small grants to selected PEN Centres, mostly in developing countries, to deliver a range of projects that promote FOE, literature and linguistic rights. Twenty-one CSP projects are currently operating. Some of Sida’s grant is allowed to be spent on the ‘PEN family’ as a whole: for example a small proportion is spent on PEN’s annual Congress (e.g. travel costs of delegates from developing country Centres), and a small proportion on the President’s travel budget. This external evaluation is a stipulation of the Sida grant, the budget allocated to it was £50,000 and it was contracted by open tender.

1.3. Methodology

This evaluation exercise spanned roughly seven months from May to November 2018, during which we were primarily based in the UK but visited six countries (Philippines, Argentina, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe and India) in which we met and interviewed over 100 stakeholders of the organisation, as well as consulting over 70 documents and conducting an online survey of PEN’s membership. We documented our evaluation process on film and this report is accompanied by a five-minute video.

The chronology and interim outputs of the evaluation were as follows:

- Initial meetings with PEN Secretariat staff in London during a one month inception phase; short inception report submitted and approved by PEN in June 2018
- Document review, interview guides and trip planning (May-June 2018)
- Launch of online survey through Survey Monkey (June-July 2018) in English, French and Spanish, which elicited 106 responses – a high response rate of about 25%
- Mission by Mary Myers to the Philippines (1st - 7th July) to observe PEN’s Civil Society Workshop – 16 interviews were done, and a Philippines trip report produced, with a summary in Annex 8.5
- Short FOE review, during which eight representatives of other groups working on FOE and human rights issues were interviewed (July-August 2018)
- Mission by Soledad Muniz to Argentina (26th - 28th July 2018) to observe PEN’s Meeting of Centres from the Americas and to review the work of PEN Argentina (30th July - 2nd August) – nine interviews and observation of a CSP session were undertaken, two Argentina trip reports were produced, with a summary in Annex 8.6.
- Analysis and compilation of Survey Monkey survey results (August-September 2018) (see Annex 8.11)
- Phone and skype interviews with International Board members and other key stakeholders (August-September 2018)
- Observation by Mary Myers of PEN Secretariat’s first strategic planning day (4th September), included some feedback on the online survey results
- Mission by Nicola Harford to PEN Centres in Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe (over the period 22nd August – 15th September) to assess the CSP projects and other activities in these countries – 33 interviews and focus groups with beneficiaries were done. Summaries of Uganda and Zambia are in Annexes 8.7 and 8.8
- Mission by Mary Myers and Nicola Harford to PEN’s Congress in Pune, India (25th-29th September 2018)
• Data analysis and report-writing (September-November 2018).

Throughout the data-gathering process we ensured that all interviewees and survey respondents could request anonymity if they wished; we obtained signed permission when filming or photographing (except for group shots obtained through PEN International); and we explained that no quotes would be attributed to anyone by name. Our database of transcribed interviews has been stored securely.

The main limitations experienced were:
• Delays and travel difficulties during Nicola Harford’s Africa trip which meant we ran out of time and financial resources to conduct a short piece of research on the impact of PEN’s work in Turkey, as originally planned
• Difficulty obtaining interviews with some key stakeholders (especially during the holiday season in August and/or because of their travel schedules and/or because they were very busy during the Congress in India)
• Only being able to gain limited insight into the impact of some aspects of Outcomes 1 and 2 (advocacy and protection of writers at risk) because of spending more time on the CSP projects (Outcome 3), which were the main a focus of the Philippines and Africa trips
• Having a page-limit for this report, which meant sometimes having to leave out or only give cursory mention to the many different strands of work done by PEN, and to the great many rich interviews we gathered.

An important caveat to mention is that this evaluation necessarily concentrates mainly on the work that PEN International does that is funded by Swedish Sida. Sida’s grant in 2018 covered 55 per cent of PEN International’s total operating budget, and is essentially core funding (though not completely unrestricted). However, a lot of support to writers and other campaigns are done by all the other PEN Centres around the world, both with other funding and voluntarily, depending on their size, capacity and resources. PEN Centres are autonomous organisations and the larger ones – notably American PEN – act somewhat like grant-making NGOs in their own right. This report does not cover their activities or impacts, except in the cases of the Centres we visited, i.e. Philippines, Argentina, Zimbabwe3, Zambia and Uganda (see separate reports).

So, to be clear, in this report we refer to ‘PEN’ and ‘PEN International’ interchangeably when referring to the whole organisation which encompasses all the Centres, its Board and Trustees and its staff. When we refer to ‘the Secretariat’ or ‘London’ we mean PEN International’s office. English PEN also has offices in London but it is separate from the PEN Secretariat; it is not the subject of this report.

---

3 PEN Zimbabwe has been recently revived. Interviews were conducted with members of the original steering committee and current Board, and two external organisations, in the evaluator’s own time, but it was not possible to investigate the small CSP project conducted in 2015-16. A separate memo on the centre will be submitted to PEN International.

4 The organisation uses the terms ‘International PEN’ and ‘PEN International’ interchangeably, but tends mostly to use the latter.
Overall Findings

2. Relevance of PEN International as an Organisation

2.1. Niche and Public Image

PEN International has a clear niche. We found this from speaking to several key informants from the HR world (e.g. Article 19, Freemuse, UNESCO, IREX and others). Our informants unanimously felt that PEN International fulfils a much-needed role as an organisation specialising in the rights of writers, the defence of literature and of minority languages. PEN International is described by other human rights groups and activists as ‘unique’, ‘important’, ‘distinctive’ and having a ‘faultless reputation’.

There was also consensus that PEN is special, adds value, and is not ‘just another human rights pressure group’. Outsiders who know the organisation well described it variously as:

- ‘an eminent writers group’
- ‘at the crossroads between journalism and artistic freedom and freedom of expression’
- ‘defender of creative freedom primarily in literature’
- ‘a network organisation of writers or people closely linked to writers supporting each other in solidarity’
- ‘they could do nothing for 3 years and still have recognition!’
- ‘an important bridge – they bring grassroots communities of writers that no other freedom of expression group brings to the table’.

Probing whether there may be overlap or duplication of effort on some cases of individual writers at risk or on some campaigns, we found that, on the contrary, there is no overlap but, instead, good cooperation between PEN and other human rights groups. As one director of a human rights organisation said, ‘There are a lot of freedom of expression organisations around but we’ve all got a distinct profile and there is always plenty to do on the human rights front’. Others said that ‘PEN is in a space that very few organisations occupy’ and ‘PEN shouldn’t get into the free-press mainstream’.

Taking the cases of journalists imprisoned in Turkey, for example, our informants emphasised how important it is to show strength in numbers, and that the more activists from different groups there are, the more Turkish authorities are likely to take notice. As one representative from another group defending press freedom expressed it:

“We’ve formed the Turkey support group – we’ve sorted out the overlaps. We’ll all be at the same trials – but the numbers at the trials is important – the presence as international observer is crucial. And lots of PEN centres are often there.”

However, while the writerly niche may be clear, PEN appears to have a somewhat old-fashioned image – perhaps not surprising since it was founded almost 100 years ago. Some of the human rights organisations whom we asked about PEN’s image used words like ‘older people’, ‘a bit out of touch’, ‘they could work on their profile’, ‘challenge of visibility’, ‘a bit old fashioned and dusty’, ‘need to redefine in context of new technology’, ‘how will PEN address the challenge of the 21st century?’. So what we find is that while PEN is well-known within the human rights world and has a clear niche i.e. defending the FOE of writers and promoting literature, it is, at the same time, regarded as slightly out of touch with the modern world and behind the curve of new technology. While this is PEN’s public
identity, the following sub-section looks at the identity of PEN, as expressed by its own internal staff, members, and official strategy and goals.

Conclusion: PEN has a clear niche. There appears to be no overlap with other human rights groups and there is good cooperation with them. However, PEN has an old-fashioned public image that probably needs updating and it faces a clear challenge from new technology and a worldwide decline in book/reading culture.

2.2. Clarity of Strategy and Objectives

We found that, overall, there is lack of clarity within the organisation about PEN’s direction, strategy, and how it plans to stay relevant. Having surveyed 106 members (representing 63 Centres) and talked to just over 100 people in all\(^5\), we found that, while there is probably more unanimity than a few years ago, there is still a lot of divergence about PEN International’s identity, what it should be concentrating on, what its future strategy should be, and how, given limited resources and staff-time with the Secretariat, it can set priorities that are realistic and achievable.

Specifically on the question of whether PEN has had a clear strategy over the past four years (2015-18), our survey of members found that the proportion of people who thought so had gone DOWN slightly since the last evaluation in 2014\(^6\).

We discerned a number of fundamental divides within the organisation. Firstly between those who regard PEN as a human rights NGO on the one hand and a membership-based writers’ network on the other; secondly between those who identify primarily as writers on the one hand and activists on the other; thirdly between the International Board of Trustees (‘the Board’) and the Secretariat; and fourthly between the Global North and the South. While these divides may sound negative, it must be said that they are not necessarily destructive – they can in some ways be dynamic. However, it is important to acknowledge and unpack them:

- **Centralised NGO or grassroots members’ network?** Many people we spoke to within PEN felt that PEN International should aim to become more professional, more donor-funded, have more centralised decision-making, and generally be more like other human rights organisations like Article 19 or Index on Censorship; on the other hand, many others were adamant that it should retain the feel of a democratic grassroots, member-led network or movement, and they disliked the idea of being measured against targets or donor requirements to show ‘impact’ or being marshalled under one banner. Yet others felt that the two were not mutually exclusive and that a loose federation of Centres from all over the world can all help to create policy and still be coordinated and supported efficiently and effectively by a central Secretariat.

---

\(^5\) We interviewed 12 staff members, 13 Board and committee members (past and present), 40 ‘rank and file’ Centre members from around the world as well as about 40 other partners, groups of beneficiaries and people external to PEN (numbers are not precise because some interviews were with groups – e.g. school children).

\(^6\) The survey asked respondents to score the following statement out of 5, with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree: “PEN International over the past four years has had a clear strategy”. This question was asked in 2014 and 2018. The average score was 4.24 back in 2014 and only 3.95 in 2018.
- *Activists or people who write/promote literature and language?* We encountered this dichotomy constantly as we spoke to people both within and outside PEN. While all adhere to the ideals of FOE, we found that PEN members join the organisation for a variety of reasons and there is a spectrum, from those, at one end, primarily wishing to discuss and publish their literature and promote their mother tongue as part of a friendly club, to those at the other end, wishing primarily to stand up, demonstrate and advocate for the rights of writers. Further, whether they self-identify as activists or writers – or both – PEN members are all volunteers, (apart from the 20 or so paid staff in the Secretariat) and they have limited time to give freely, and are not and should not be obliged by anyone to do anything.

- **Who’s in charge – the Board or the Secretariat?** Observing PEN’s 2018 Congress in Pune, India, it was obvious that there are two poles of leadership within the organisation: one centred around the President and the International Board; and one centred around the London-based Secretariat. Interviewing all key members of both, we found quite a divergence of vision on key issues, such as the upcoming centenary celebrations, the status of strategy documents, fund-raising, the purpose of Congress, how staff should be deployed, and different areas of work that should be given priority. There was also a lack of communication between the Board and the Secretariat (for example on fundraising and staffing issues) at the same time as an overlap/duplication of roles between the Executive Director (the paid head of the Secretariat) and the President (the unpaid head of the whole organisation).

- **Ruled by a Northern elite?** A quick glance at the attendees at PEN’s Congress showed a much higher representation from the Global North than the Global South. For example a handful of Africans were vastly outnumbered by Europeans/Americans/Antipodeans. However, PEN’s Congress is not necessarily a representative picture of the whole organisation. Many of the developing-country PEN Centres cannot afford to send representatives to Congress, which means that the organisation appears Northern-dominated, whereas, in fact, with approximately 150 Centres around the world, it is arguably a much more horizontal and globally representative organisation than it may at first appear. Our survey of Centres worldwide elicited answers from 63 of which about half (30) were from developing or transitional countries (e.g. Zimbabwe, Haiti, Philippines) or from Centres representing marginalised or exiled groups (e.g. Roma PEN based in Berlin, Germany; Vietnamese Writers Abroad). We felt this was an encouraging sign, showing that the ‘Southern voice’ is active and wants to make its presence felt within PEN.

These divides, whilst arguably dynamic and a sign of a healthy organisation, have for long been debated internally, which means that PEN International does not always speak with one voice or always agrees on the same priorities.

**Conclusion:** There is lack of clarity within the organisation about PEN’s direction, strategy, and how it plans to stay relevant in future. There are some internal divides that characterise the organisation. Whilst it is probably not possible to change most of them, the question of whether it is the Board or the Secretariat who leads, is fundamental and needs addressing.
2.3. Competing Priorities

On the question of priorities, there is such a diversity of views among stakeholders within PEN that we gathered a long list (see below and in Annexes ‘Recommendations to PEN by Respondents to Online Survey’). These reflect the plethora of issues that PEN members believe the organisation should be acting on. That is to say nothing of the individual countries on which resolutions were adopted during this year’s Congress (for example on FOE problems in Nicaragua, Hungary, China, Eritrea and Australia). Some of the following themes are already a focus for action, some are suggested future priorities, and many overlap with each other. We collated and grouped them: the most frequently mentioned were as follows (in alphabetical order):

- Building institutional and fundraising capacity of all PEN Centres
- Copyright issues
- Defamation and censorship
- Developing-country Centres as a priority
- Digital age / social media / fake news challenges
- Hate speech and the rise of the far right
- Law, policy and practice in relation to FOE
- LGBTQI issues
- Linguistic rights and indigenous languages / oralities
- Migrants / refugees / writers in exile
- Raising PEN’s public profile internationally
- Safety and protection of writers at risk
- Women’s / gender issues
- Youth focus / combating PEN’s ‘old image’

What we heard a lot about was that the organisation – specifically the Secretariat – does not have the time, funds or staff capacity to do everything and it is pulled in many different directions at once. We make further remarks about the staff within the Secretariat being overstretched, below (see especially Section 4: ‘Efficiency’).

Conclusion: Everything seems to be a priority at once – this points to the need for PEN International to cut down on the number of its activities and streamline and clarify its strategy and objectives. Preparation for the upcoming centenary in 2021 could be a good opportunity for this.
3. Effectiveness of PEN as an Organisation

Overall, we found that PEN International has been quite effective in its activities and our sense is that, over the last four years, it has changed from being inward-looking to having much more of a global voice. Further, there generally appears to be more activity year on year – such as:

- expansion of the Civil Society Programme (see below)
- country missions by the International Board to express solidarity with writers (e.g. this year there were missions to Hungary, Malta, Venezuela, Scotland, Argentina, Geneva and India – the number is up from four in 2014)
- more activism and campaigning by the different Centres worldwide (e.g. this year the Secretariat recorded 44 Centre-led and international campaigns, compared with 27 in 2014)\(^7\)
- more research reports and publications (seven published this year including substantial reports on FOE in Venezuela, Hungary and India)
- Additionally, many writers of world-renown – for example Margaret Atwood, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, Masha Gessen and Kamila Shamsie (to name a few), remain committed to PEN and provide visibility and influence which is invaluable and continues to enhance PEN’s profile.

Most indicators appear to be on an upward trend. For instance, our survey\(^8\) found that the membership overwhelmingly feels that PEN has improved the integration of gender issues in all its work; has stronger and more effective committees\(^9\); has provided more direct support and protection for individual writers at risk; and has a better-organised Secretariat. There are estimated to be more individual members worldwide than in 2014 (although precise numbers is not something that PEN International currently tracks, the rise in members’ dues received from Centres by PEN International is indicative (i.e. from £110,300 in 2014 up to £172,000 in 2018).

PEN’s web presence is good and has been enhanced recently by the appointment of a Digital Manager who, amongst other things, has been promoting PEN’s online presence and has got the organisation better known on social media. For instance, there is increasing traffic to PEN International’s website and Facebook and Twitter:

- PEN website: 70,000 visits so far this year, up from a yearly average of 66,000 visits in 2015
- Facebook page: approximately 14,100 in November this year, up from around 7,000 in December 2014
- Twitter: approximately 31,000 followers in November this year, up from approximately 8,000 in December 2014.

The overall number of PEN Centres worldwide has remained fairly constant over the last four years but there are more now than there were 10 years ago (149 in late 2018, 145 in 2008)\(^10\). Additionally, there appears to be increasing cooperation and shared support between Centres such as strong ‘twinning’ partnerships between Norway/ Afghanistan & Eritrea; Germany/Ghana; Canada/Honduras & Guatemala; and PEN America/ Myanmar.

---

\(^7\) This was not systematically recorded previously, so the figure of 27 Centre-led campaigns in 2014 is an estimate provided to us by the Secretariat, which includes 18 Centres which took action on the Day of the Imprisoned Writer, a key campaign date, plus some other records of Centres taking action in response to RANS and action pieces.

\(^8\) Our survey received 106 individual responses, representing 63 different PEN Centres, plus other individual members, past and present Board members and staff from the Secretariat in London.

\(^9\) PEN’s Committees are: Writers for Peace, Women Writers, Translation and Linguistic Rights and Writers in Prison

\(^10\) There are currently 149 active Centres in 2018 compared to 150 at the end of 2014 – several have opened and several others have closed - see Annex 8.3 for the full list of new centres, closures, and dormancies (2014-2018).
Various PEN Centres around the world seem to have worked together effectively over several key campaigns, for example in relation to individual cases like Oleg Sentsov in Ukraine/Russia and Dareen Tatour (Palestine/Israel) and in relation to activism about the situations in Turkey as a focus country (good coordination over attending and lobbying at trials of imprisoned writers and at the UN and Council of Europe).

The following quote from the General Secretary of Norwegian PEN illustrates how effective she found the Secretariat’s campaign over Oleg Sentsov:

“London’s campaigning packages are good, easy to use. It really works: Sentsov for example – it was a brilliant campaign – pushing all Centres, 100 days since hunger strike, asked everyone to write letters – we all did – he got all the message in prison in Russia – it gives him hope – it doesn’t set him free but it helps.”

Looking at the logical framework (or the ‘Sida logframe’, as the Secretariat staff call it) we found that PEN International is at or near to having achieved most of its targets for the four year period 2015-2018 – in some cases it has positively overachieved - so this is a good overall result. For instance, the number of writers at risk reporting improvements in their situations has grown year on year by an average of 82% which is far better than the 5% year-on-year increase that PEN set itself as a target. Further, the number of targeted, strategic submissions to human rights bodies (such as the UN’s Human Rights Commission in the form of Universal Periodic Reviews) has exceeded the target set in 2014 every year from 2015 to now (i.e. 10 reports submitted in 2015; six in 2016; six in 2017 and seven submitted in 2018, against a target of two-three per year by PEN International and two-three per year Centre-led).

For the CSP, the achievements are good: for instance: 32 Centres implemented projects between 2015 and 2018 against a target of 30; at least 24 Centres in developing countries now have advocacy plans in place, against a baseline of 17 Centres in 2014; at least 20 Centres have created youth projects against a target of 10; and 31 Centres (47 PEN members) have received capacity-building in programme development through workshops over the last two years. (See also box overleaf on the CSP).

All these achievements are very much due to wider organisational and efficiency considerations such as finances being in a better state than four years ago; the case-list of writers persecuted worldwide being rationalised; and the number of staff in London having expanded (from 16 in 2014 to 20 in 2018). (These and other aspects relating to the efficiency of PEN International are detailed in Section 4).

There is a great advantage in having a central entity, i.e. the PEN Secretariat, which can coordinate campaigns on sensitive issues at the international level which national Centres may point to but cannot bring up themselves, without endangering their own Centre or its members. This is because PEN Centres are often severely constrained by their local context from speaking out about an issue locally.

---

11 “…created spaces/opportunities for young people to express themselves creatively and critically” (PEN International Logframe 2015-2018)

12 If one adds the number of Centres to receive capacity building in project management via one-to-one mentoring and support through the application and reporting process, the total number supported comes to 37 Centres.
PEN’s Civil Society Programme

We found PEN’s CSP work to be very relevant and necessary in the countries we visited. We saw how small grants can provide entry-points to advocacy and campaigning around linguistic and human rights in countries where FOE is under threat.

For example:

- In Zambia, PEN’s schools clubs have focused on creative expression in mother tongue languages by celebrating ‘Mother Tongue Language Day’, showcasing school children’s creative work, holding poetry sessions for adults, storytelling inspired by visual representations of Zambian myths and hosting radio debates on ‘Intangible Heritage’. This promotes ethnic inclusivity, free-ranging intellectual debate, and access to information in a country which has seen a steady deterioration in FOE over the past six years.

- In Uganda, the space for FOE has shrunk tangibly under Museveni. Both CSP projects (in schools and prisons) have encouraged participants to write about their personal experiences in a way which exposes structural and socially-embedded human rights abuses.

- In both Uganda and Zambia, PEN Centres have increased their capacity to conduct research and build partnerships and conduct advocacy through the criminal defamation project. CSP grants could potentially be used to build on this work, to get the laws repealed.

- In the Philippines, the CSP is promoting indigenous literature and linguistic rights in schools through teacher training. Discovering their own literature has been a revelation to hundreds of the teachers involved. More than that, promoting linguistic rights of minorities is all part of the resistance to Duterte’s regime which has so far failed to curb security force abuses against tribal minorities and other indigenous groups.

- In Argentina there is an increasingly toxic culture of xenophobia. PEN’s CSP work in the slums, helping children of migrants and refugees to express themselves through writing, helps to combat the hidden xenophobia that, according to PEN Argentina, despises migrants from neighbouring countries.

However, it is difficult to pinpoint many specific achievements and attribute those achievements solely to PEN. This is particularly the case for structural threats to FOE and individual writers at risk (Outcomes 1 and 2), where it is hard and not necessarily useful to single out PEN amongst other human rights advocacy groups’ work – this is partly because PEN prides itself in working in a ‘discrete way, under the radar which often does not stand up to measurement’ (as one former President put it) and because PEN expects to contribute to collaborative efforts with other organisations. Controlling for contextual factors is also a challenge: if, as most PEN members believe, the human rights and FOE situation worldwide has worsened in recent years, then PEN’s task is made more difficult – but does it mean that PEN is less ‘effective’? Not necessarily, but it adds to the measurement problem.

Perhaps more fundamentally, we found that PEN’s effectiveness as a campaigning organisation is necessarily limited by two internal factors:
- Firstly, the organisation is made up essentially of volunteers whose daily lives as novelists, academics, teachers etc. is far from the NGO-world of organised advocacy and strategic policy, and they just do not have the time to devote to this sort of work. Therefore the Secretariat can only suggest and support action on any issue, it cannot push action through, since this is up to its members in the Centres.

- Secondly, PEN is a worldwide network of Centres, each with its national politics and cultural differences, which means that it does not necessarily speak with one voice – it therefore becomes very difficult for PEN International to gain traction on an issue if it is divided on it internally (or is seen to be so). A case in point is the defence and promotion of LGBTQI writers, which several Centres in Africa find difficult to take a public stand on in their own countries, for various cultural and political reasons. Another specific example from Africa is that PEN Uganda has not put out a public statement about Bobi Wine\(^{13}\). He is on the PEN case list and PEN Uganda provided the information for the entry but, as the President of PEN Uganda says:

"A hard statement on Bobi Wine would be the end of PEN Uganda... we are walking on a tightrope like everyone."

Conclusion: PEN International has been quite effective in its activities over the last four years. The evidence for this is that most indicators are on an upward trend. PEN’s Civil Society Programme is very relevant and necessary. Continuing and refining the CSP programme in future would play to PEN’s strengths. However, it is difficult to pinpoint many specific achievements and attribute those achievements solely to PEN. Furthermore being an organisation of volunteers and of diverse Centres presents key challenges that the organisation must continually navigate.

### 3.1. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)

An important point to make here is that pinpointing PEN’s achievements is not only difficult for the reasons given above but because PEN International’s own reports and public-facing outputs (particularly reports to donors, Executive Director’s report to Congress and the website) do not enumerate, quantify and describe achievements in a clear and accessible way.

This is partly because some of the questions one might ask about effects and impacts are actually unknowable (i.e. the question ‘was it because of PEN that x person was released from detention?’ is almost impossible to answer). But it is also because PEN’s MEL system - it’s ‘Learning Framework’ - is relatively new and still in development. The Learning and Accountability Coordinator has only been in post since 2016 and has only recently established reporting systems internally which are designed to tell impact stories. The chosen MEL approach is based on the Most Significant Change methodology, which is appropriate for an organisation of writers, since it concentrates on telling stories of change. These stories are gathered and broken down into four ‘domains of change’ which reflect the global aims of the organisation, and stored in an ‘Impact Log’. These qualitative stories are meant to triangulate with quantitative data that are stored in various instruments, the RAN/take action log, the Sida logical framework, as well as other tables and logs, such as the CSP beneficiary table that totals the number of girls/women and boys/men reached in the various CSP projects around the world.

---

\(^{13}\) Bobi Wine is a Ugandan pop star and opposition MP.
The Learning Framework has recently been introduced to the rest of the organisation (it was developed in 2016) and has so far only been rolled out properly in Outcome 3 – the Civil Society Programme (CSP), and not yet fully for the other outcome areas (i.e. writers-at-risk (Outcome 1) and advocacy work (Outcome 2)). Centres in receipt of CSP grants are being trained and supported to record their impacts and to develop SMART14 aims and appropriate indicators. Centres are then asked by the Secretariat to report against these measurements alongside short ‘stories of change’. These narrative reporting procedures are relatively new but there are clear improvements in this area over four years ago and Centres have submitted them on time.

However, Centres in receipt of CSP grants still find financial reporting a burden and there have been significant delays, requiring much more support from the Secretariat than first expected. Also, the Learning Framework has had to sit - rather awkwardly - side by side with the Sida logical framework which, by its nature, is not suited to telling stories but requires hard facts and figures to be shown in order to demonstrate whether targets have been hit or missed. This has resulted in a somewhat frustrating mix of ‘evidence’ which, at best, tells compelling stories but at worst mixes long case-studies with somewhat convoluted measures15.

As far as we understand it, Sida has left PEN free to decide on its own MEL methods, and has not required detailed reporting against the logical framework targets, so PEN has a degree of flexibility and probably just needs to communicate its results better, with a good balance of statistics about targets reached as well as stories.

Nevertheless, the larger challenge remains, which is that the Learning and Accountability Coordinator is working alone (though receiving useful support from the organisation INTRAC on a contracted out basis) whilst trying to bring organisation-wide learning to bear on the strategic planning process. This is an enormous task given the size and diversity of the organisation. But it is also a vital one, not only for organisational learning but also for fundraising because donors naturally want to see impact.

Conclusion: Progress on monitoring, evaluation and learning has been steady and we endorse and applaud efforts to introduce participatory, creative and compelling ways of assessing change (through stories, and in explicitly recognising the role of external actors) but there is still a long way to go. PEN International’s own reports and public-facing outputs do not yet enumerate, quantify and describe achievements in a clear and accessible way. Reporting especially on advocacy work could be improved by more clearly articulating desired end-points at the design stage, setting milestones to be achieved as indicators of incremental changes, and then reporting against those interim milestones.

We are not convinced that the approach of identifying changes that Centres would expect, like and love to see from CSP projects can produce sufficiently robust measures of impact although this is a step towards developing theories of change for individual projects. We urge consideration be given to using a theory of change approach for programme and project design to open up creative thinking, strengthen and justify choice of strategies, improve effectiveness and provide a framework

---

14 Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
15 For example, in the Pen International’s End of Year Impact Report 2017 we find four page-long case-studies about individual writers, as well as some rather meaningless figures, of which the following is an example: “In 2017 the Civil Society Programme (CSP) increased its impact in relation to changes in spaces in 8 out of 10 projects by between 10 and 40 percent.” Whilst this came from intensive efforts to map impact, by the centres and secretariat staff involved in the CSP, it is debateable whether it actually conveys anything concrete to the external audience.
for monitoring and evaluation. The four domains of change already provide the broad end points: what is needed is a process that traces the causal pathways (a series of interim outcomes) that (based on evidence and experience) could lead to that change, and only then determine the most appropriate strategies or activities to overcome barriers and achieve outcomes. (See our suggestions and example for setting interim indicators in Annexes)

We are also highly aware that the sustainability of capacity generally amongst Centres and for M&E and reporting more specifically is dependent on key Centre officials remaining motivated and available and this alludes to other structural problems symptomatic of a largely volunteer-led membership organisation. Nevertheless PEN could invest more in regional consultants (along the lines of the present Americas consultant post) to help with monitoring and reporting.
4. Efficiency of PEN as an Organisation

Overall we found that PEN is much more professional and better-organised than it was four years ago, when it was last evaluated by INTRAC (for Sida) in 2014. The dedication and hard work of everyone involved (staff, Board-members, ordinary members and volunteers) is evident; and it is also clear that PEN covers a lot with few resources. We found that PEN International is a transparent organisation and it insists on - and achieves - strict financial probity. Furthermore, it is managing its finances in a much more efficient way than four years ago.

The results of our survey show that members feel that PEN International has made clear progress, in the specific areas of financial planning, human resources, IT, communications, funding and MEL. The results showed that scores had increased in all cases compared with 2014, as follows:

“Pen International over the past four years has had…

1. “Robust financial planning, financial management and financial reporting systems”: scored 3.36 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.86 2018)*
2. “The human resources it needs to meet its objectives”: scored 3.14 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.47 2018)*
3. “The IT system it needs”: scored 2.89 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.44 in 2018)*
4. “Strong internal and external communications”: scored 3.74 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.83 in 2018)*
5. “A strong, diversified funding base”: scored 3.49 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.60 in 2018)*
6. “A strong monitoring, evaluation and learning system”: scored 3.36 out of 5 in 2014 *(UP to 3.92 in 2018)*

However, there are still some problems that seem to prevent PEN International from functioning as efficiently as it could.

4.1. Governance and Organisational Structure

To expand on a point already made above: the foremost issue is about who is in charge – is it the Board or the Secretariat? Almost all the staff, management and Board members we spoke to were unhappy (in different ways) with the internal running of PEN International, at present.

There appear to be two poles of leadership within the organisation: one centred around the President and her International Board; and one centred around the Executive Director and his London-based Secretariat. While personal relations between the President and the Executive Director are very harmonious, there is nevertheless a structural disconnect. An illustration of this disconnect is that the process for setting strategic objectives for the next four years appears to be being initiated and led by the Secretariat in London with minimal input from the Board. At the same time, the President and the Board seem largely unaware of the goals in the current strategy document or the targets in the current logical framework. Looking ahead, the President and the Board appear to have different priorities for the organisation and do not see the Secretariat’s strategic planning process as particularly important. For example, the President is prioritising the upcoming centenary (and associated events) and said: “…we might have to cut back on programmes of work in order to address the centennial”, whereas the centenary is currently quite low on the Secretariat’s 15 top priorities - at 11th place, (see below, Section 4.3).
Further examples to illustrate this disconnect are that the President and/or Board members have, in the past, decided to go on high level country-missions and have decided on certain plans for the upcoming centenary, without reference to the staff of the Secretariat or the strategic plan.

Meanwhile, the Secretariat has taken some staffing and funding decisions of which the Board members are not fully aware – for example we found that key members of the Board were not sure whether the current fundraiser (a key role) was paid or voluntary, full or part-time. We also found that the state of the finances and short-term financial forecasts were not fully understood by the Board – and not communicated adequately to the membership at Congress. Even the rules governing how the current grant from Sida is used and allocated have either not been fully communicated to the Board (or the relevant Board members have not fully understood them). Several staff members (and even some Board members) felt that Board members lacked skills and capacity and needed to become more professional. Such examples illustrate that internal communications are not always optimal and the Board and the Secretariat are not speaking with one voice.

Furthermore, there is an overlapping of roles between the Executive Director and the President at present, such that the Executive Director does many of the public-facing functions that would normally be done only by the President and he joins many of the international missions, instead of concentrating on spending more time in the office managing the personnel of the Secretariat and reporting on activities to the Board via the International Secretary.

In terms of ensuring that the Board continues to improve its level of professionalism, we received a number of comments. Whilst it is important that the Board reflects the membership and is made up of writers, who, in many cases have been victims themselves of repression, jail and/or torture, both the Secretariat and Board members themselves acknowledged that they could become more professional, improve their own skills, and streamline and update their procedures. An induction pack for the Board was recommended in the 2014 evaluation but has still not been put-together in its entirety, although various short documents for guidance are available, Charity Commission guidelines have been shared with Board members and several important policies and procedures have been laid out recently, on anti-bribery and whistle-blowing, for instance\(^\text{16}\).

**Conclusion:** There are two overlapping poles of leadership within PEN, which makes the organisation much less efficient and effective than if it were clear where power lies, who is leading on strategy, and where reporting lines are drawn. With better internal communications and attention to improving skills, procedures and key policies, the Board and Secretariat could improve internal governance.

\(^{16}\) We also understand that a sexual harassment policy and a child protection policy are being developed with a view to adoption at the next Board meeting.
4.2. Financial Management, Fundraising and Value for Money

Financial Management: Following the last evaluation in 2014, and at the behest of Sida, PEN International underwent an independent internal control review by Ernst and Young in early 2015, and also appointed a permanent Director of Finance and Administration in London. This Finance Director is now leading and overseeing financial planning, training and management, IT and human resources of the organisation and as a result, the internal control of the organisation is now strengthened. According to the Secretariat’s finance team they have been able to achieve nearly all the financial changes recommended in the Ernst and Young report. Proof of this is that PEN International received a good report from the audit (year ended 2016), acknowledging the huge improvements in the financial processes and internal controls.

Our interview with the Sida representative confirmed that there have been tangible improvements but he also pointed to room for more, he said:

“We would probably have to have another control systems review if we approve another round of funding. We have seen some improvement and some weaknesses at the same time. Things have improved a lot since [the appointment of the Finance Manager at the Secretariat]. But the budget format agreed back in 2014 would not be approved now. We want to see a budget linked to the strategic objectives – or the logframe.”

We found that PEN International has good financial controls and insists on the same from Centres, specifically when sub-grants are given by the Secretariat to Centres as part of the CSP. Although we are not auditors, there appear to us to be robust policies in place on zero-tolerance of bribery and other risk assessment/risk management procedures. For instance, during the CSP workshop we observed in the Philippines in July 2018, PEN’s Deputy Executive Director very strongly emphasised PEN’s governance rules to the assembled Asian Centres, including the need for financial and procurement controls, the need for sound accounting standards and audits, the declaration of conflicts of interests, and she also explained that Centres participating in the Civil Society Programme are contractually obliged to comply with PEN International policies including Anti-Bribery, Procurement, Whistle-blowing and to organise an audit of their Sida funded project(s). We note, also, that Centres (whether participating in the CSP or not) can be and are expelled from the organisation if found in breach of these rules.

One negative thing we found, however, was during the Congress meeting in India, where the presentation of the finances to the Assembly of Delegates was not clear, there was no forecast for 2019, no actuals for spending so far in 2018 against budget, and graphics and text were not readable. This points to the need for the Board – specifically the International Treasurer - to work more closely with the finance team in the Secretariat to ensure that present and future financial situation is thoroughly understood at all levels within the organisation and properly communicated to the membership.

Fundraising has progressed significantly over the last four years and donations are now coming from a more diverse set of sources. Although Sida is still the biggest funder (£905,032 in 2018), other large donors include an anonymous legacy from someone in Mexico of approx. $1million secured this year for reserves and towards the centenary, as well as significant support from ICORN (£88,000), the
Neverthelesss almost everyone we spoke to within PEN acknowledged the urgent need to step up the fundraising effort to both increase and diversify the funding base. One of the most frequently cited needs was for more funding for the Secretariat to expand their staff numbers – if only slightly – to address the fact they are overstretched. We explored a little with other human rights organisations how they saw the funding landscape and found that, on the whole, there is optimism that ‘there is money out there’. One high profile UK-based organisation, campaigning on FOE, revealed that it had ‘quadrupled in size budget-wise over the last five years’. It appears that there are foundations and donors, particularly in the US and Northern Europe that could be approached, given the right fundraising strategy. The centenary in 2021 was mentioned by the President and several others as an opportune fundraising event on the horizon.

This year’s appointment by the Secretariat of a part-time fundraising consultant in London was universally welcomed. So there is a sense of optimism about finding more funds whilst, at the same time, the necessity for diversified and unrestricted funding is clear: as the Executive Director told us, “We’ve started a push for unrestricted funding [and] … donor care will be better developed in future. We want another partner at the same level as Sida – we’re exploring Dutch and Finnish foreign affairs possibilities. This encouragement by Sida on diversifying other funding is good – keep it up! It’s made us more coherent and has dynamised the board around fundraising.”

At the Centre level, we found a growing consciousness that fundraising is needed among the Centre presidents and officials we spoke to in the Philippines, Uganda, Zambia and Argentina. Lack of funds is of huge concern to the Africa Centres but has not received much practical attention or effort, to date. The problem, at Centre level, is of course the lack of paid staff to actually undertake fundraising. Despite that, we also gathered several requests for more support from the Secretariat for in-country fundraising by Centres; for instance, we heard requests for training in writing funding proposals and the guidance from the Secretariat for identifying donors.

The collection of dues by Centres remains an administrative challenge for some, while centrally, the Secretariat has, for the past two years, witnessed a consecutive increase in the payment of membership dues, thanks to an invoicing system put in place which has allowed them to communicate but also to re-establish contact with Centres that were previously ‘under the radar’ as far as the Secretariat was aware.

Value for Money: Here we expand on a point mentioned above – we found that PEN International covers a large amount of ground for relatively little money and its staff and volunteers all work incredibly hard. In our view, the very fact that so much of the effort that is made is at the grassroots in 149 Centres around the world – and that this is largely unpaid - is enough to score PEN highly in terms of value for money. Furthermore, we observed that PEN is very careful with money: there is very little wastage and no extravagant spending. We found, talking to the Finance Director that procedures for expenditure and procurement are sensible and rigorous. Salaries in London are within the range for other small London-based NGOs. Rent and other services are relatively high in London, compared to other cities in the world, but the advantages of being located in London, with all the connections that that offers, is thought to be worth the cost.

17 It is interesting to note that dues from American PEN constituted about one third of all the membership dues last year. American PEN is the largest PEN Centre globally and has a total budget of approx. $9 million USD (approx. £6.8m) yearly, which dwarfs that of International PEN (approx. £1.6 million GBP).
18 Figures in this paragraph are derived from the Treasurer’s report to Congress, September 2018.
Holding an annual Congress was the only area that did not present good value for money, in the view of many people. Many insiders we spoke to thought that it was unnecessary, expensive and time-consuming to hold a big international Congress every year (which cost about £55,000 in 2018), despite the fact that there is always a generous contribution in terms of volunteer time and in-kind contributions from the host Centre. Some also pointed out it is difficult to fund, and holding Congress yearly would probably not be possible without the core grant from Sida. Despite the fact that we spoke to some other people who did not want to change Congress in any way, we make a recommendation about holding Congress only every two years (see below).

Other possible efficiencies that were raised were those related to the CSP and making the staff-time of the Secretariat more efficient, including saving time spent reporting. These are dealt with below.

Conclusion: Financial management has improved over the period. PEN International has good financial controls and insists on the same from Centres. However, the organisation could improve how it communicates on money-matters internally. Fundraising and diversifying income-sources remains a priority but progress is being made. We believe that PEN presents good value for money overall but could make efficiency savings by holding Congress biannually rather than annually.

4.3. Secretariat: Capacity, Workload and Structure

We found that the skills and capacity of the individuals on the staff were high quality. We gathered a lot of praise for their personal dedication, knowledge and abilities. Both insiders (Board members, Centre members and other FOE organisations) and outsiders described PEN staff in the following terms:
- “the staff are very good, very positive” – Board member
- “they sometimes have the expertise I don’t have” – Committee chair
- “the researchers are excellent - at the top of their game.” – Committee chair
- “they’re experts, very thorough...there’s a special energy and I feel very supported” – Committee chair (elect)
- “they inspire us, skill us, help us network, provide funds... I would give them 10 out of 10!” – African Centre president
- “Pen secretariat staff are always supportive and helpful” – CSP Coordinator in African Centre

However, one of the strongest messages we received from our interviews was about the high workload of the Secretariat and how its staff in London are seriously overstretched. As one staff member expressed it:

“I’m always tired! There are lots of competing demands. We need a redefinition of job-descriptions – what everyone’s being asked to do is herculean – I’m not sure it’s sustainable.”

The majority of other staff members expressed similar sentiments and other members of PEN (Board, office-holders from other Centres etc.) expressed concern too. We observed that staff do not feel appreciated. There is genuine burn-out and a high level of staff turnover at the moment – we note with dismay that three key staff members are in the process of leaving PEN as this report is being written!
We also attended one of the staff’s strategic planning days on 4th September this year and found their list of tasks very long – as did they. Their (self-compiled) list of 38 outputs is as follows, with those ranked as a priority by staff in bold:

1. RANS (Rapid Action Network statements)
2. ICORN assessments
3. Pen Emergency Fund requests
4. Website
5. Support to individuals
6. Support to Centres
7. M&E data and reports
8. Funding applications
9. Budgets
10. Audit
11. Centenary
12. Statements
13. Reports
14. Civil Society Programme
15. Congress
16. Missions
17. Trial monitoring
18. Translations of literature
19. Surveys
20. Committee meetings
21. Infographics, memes
22. Centres resources
23. Admin
24. Archive material
25. Annual report
26. Press releases
27. Advocacy meetings
28. Case List
29. UPRs
30. Workshops (including training)
31. Oxfam Novib award
32. Public/ open letters
33. Management reports
34. Resolutions
35. Network meetings
36. Panel events
37. Campaigns
38. Media quotes

The General Secretary of Norwegian PEN reiterated this problem as follows:

“At the Secretariat there are too few people to too many tasks. I see how hard they work – on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas even – they reply to messages! ... Their annual report to Sida/Norway etc. shows how much they do – I was flabbergasted by everything they do because I didn’t know about it all.”

Some see the solution as adding more staff while others believe that reducing the number of work-areas would go a long way to ease the strain. For example, reducing the number of special days for action has been mooted (e.g. World Refugee Day, Day of the Dead, Day of the Imprisoned Writer etc.). Improving small things like the internet connection and the IT system in the London office was also raised, and are clearly necessary.

There is also an ongoing debate within the Secretariat about how the teams are structured and organised. There was a re-structuring a couple of years ago into two main teams: 1. International programmes and 2. Advocacy and communications. Some believe the organigram needs to be re-organised again, whereas others cannot face another re-structuring – meanwhile almost no one we talked to in the Secretariat felt the present structure is working well.

The consensus is that once priorities are clearly defined and activities are whittled down, then the staff structure will be easier to resolve. The high number and variety of focus areas and tasks seems to be the root of the problem. Staff members are very thinly spread at the moment. This ‘overload’ situation seems to have built up gradually.

As we see it, this is mainly because of the disconnect between the Secretariat and Board/membership, whereby both have been very reactive and open to taking on many different strands of work, and there has been inadequate communication between Secretariat and the Board about how
best to deploy staff, and how to operationalise everything everyone wants to do. It is also a consequence of the Secretariat receiving the Sida grant, which it negotiated and feels it therefore owns and controls which has made the Secretariat act more autonomously in recent years. With its centralised campaigns, such as the ‘Make Space’ campaign on refugees and migrants, the Secretariat is starting to act almost like an independent campaigning and grant-making NGO and, arguably, this has exacerbated the disconnect between itself and the Board though we acknowledge that PEN Centres were consulted in its formulation. Meanwhile, the Board (and the membership/Centres) has assumed that the Secretariat, because it is paid and is mandated to do its work, is obliged to take on almost everything.

Conclusion: PEN sees almost everything as a priority, is tempted to go in many different directions, and in consequence is in danger of losing sight of its strategic vision. Recruitment of one or two more staff could be considered, but given that finding further funding for more staff is not guaranteed (at least not in the short-term), it looks most sensible to examine priorities dispassionately and cut down on work areas, rather than adding substantially to staff numbers. We acknowledge that this is a process which has already begun with the start of strategic planning for 2019-22.

4.4. Secretariat: Relationship with Centres

The Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the activities of PEN Centres around the world but does not involve itself in the same way with every Centre. Some, notably the 23 Centres who are the current/recent beneficiaries of the CSP programme, receive grants and intensive support from London while others, particularly in the Global North, have no need for financial support but they still rely in the Secretariat to provide guidance, research, campaigning materials for RANs, information and so on.

While most Centres we spoke to (or surveyed) felt well-supported by the Secretariat in London, a minority had various criticisms to make about the support received from PEN International. For example, lack of communications between the Secretariat and Centres was mentioned by Centre officials responding to the survey, and in our interviews. Specifically we received several requests for an internal newsletter to connect the Secretariat with Centres worldwide, promote Centre-to-Centre networking and give news from all over the organisation. Overleaf are the results to two survey questions we asked about the quality of PEN International’s support to individual PEN Centres and about the success of the Civil Society Programme (n=100).

---

19 We hear such a newsletter (or email update) used to exist, but whether this newsletter is no longer regular or has been cut or replaced by something else (perhaps on the web-site) is unclear.
The graph above (left) shows that while the majority (53%) agreed (or ‘strongly agreed’) that PEN International’s support to their Centre has been excellent over the last four years, there were a number who were neutral and more negative: 12% either ‘disagreed’ or ‘strongly disagreed’. (The graph on the right shows a generally positive assessment of the CSP – see Section 5.3 below for a fuller discussion).

Other remarks from Centres were that the Secretariat staff ‘didn’t have enough time’ for them or their queries, and/or that their Centres was being neglected in favour of other Centres elsewhere in the world. Interestingly, very few Centres requested financial support. In the recommendations given by survey respondents, mainly it was requests for information, help with creating connections and exchanges between Centres, help to create new Centres, supporting more regional meetings between Centres and providing training (e.g. project planning, management, resource mobilisation and centre administration were specifically mentioned). Strikingly, we noted that no Centre representatives we spoke to mentioned the ‘Make Space’ campaign about refugees and migrants, which, according to the Secretariat, is meant to be a campaign that builds on work Centres already do and is meant to act as a public communication tool and a brand for them to use. In light of this, we make a recommendation to the Secretariat about considering cutting the Make Space campaign, to help rationalise the number of work-areas the Secretariat is engaged in.

From the point of the view of the Secretariat, we sensed a feeling of responsibility among staff towards supporting Centres yet, at the same time, a sense of being overwhelmed by their sheer numbers and the multiplicity of their desires and demands. There are only four regional coordinators on the staff covering the world, one of whom covers the whole of Central/Latin America, Asia and the Pacific, while the others cover scores of countries in the MENA region, Africa and in Europe/Eurasia. The appointment of a consultant based in the region to assist the regional coordinator to support North, Central and South America Centres has helped. But, again, we see here the problem of overstretch in the Secretariat writ large.

Conclusion: Most PEN Centres around the world feel well-supported by the Secretariat, although communications between Secretariat and Centres could be improved. While time-consuming, servicing the Centres is probably still a priority area. This points to the need for more staff capacity for covering the regions, possibly by expanding the number of consultants who are regionally-based, such as the one currently helping to cover the Americas.
5. Impact / Sustainability / Replicability of PEN’s Activities

In this section we look at the three main activity areas of PEN, which correspond with the ‘outcome’ areas in its logical framework, as well as gender and diversity as cross-cutting issues. We outline their impacts to date and their sustainability and/or replicability.

1. Supporting Writers at Risk
2. Challenging Structural Barriers to Freedom of Expression
3. Supporting Spaces for Freedom of Expression in Civil Society
4. Gender and Diversity

Before exploring these programmes, it is important to note that coming to conclusions about the impact of PEN’s work is a challenge overall. As already mentioned (see Effectiveness, Section 3), this is for three main reasons:

– because PEN works alongside human rights organisations and other civil society and international actors – it is very difficult to attribute and trace outcomes specifically and only to PEN
– because human rights impacts are always difficult to quantify in an ever-changing context (e.g. just because fewer writers get imprisoned in country x in year y, it does not necessarily mean that this is due to PEN’s work, it could be a multiplicity of other factors influencing the situation at that time)
– because PEN’s own monitoring, evaluation and learning systems are still being developed and its external reports tend not to enumerate, quantify or describe achievements in a clear and accessible way.

5.1. Impacts under Outcome 1. Supporting Writers at Risk

Over the last four years PEN International’s activities in this area have concentrated on monitoring and reporting on individual cases; campaigning and advocacy and assisting persecuted writers to leave their situation (exile and refuge as last resort). The following are the most important activities under this outcome area:

– Work on PEN’s Case List and calls to action through PEN’s Rapid Action network (RANs)
– Processing applications to ICORN to assess writers seeking temporary shelter in ICORN’s member cities
– Providing relief under PEN’s Emergency Fund

1. Individual writers at risk and RANs

When an imprisoned writer is released from jail it makes headlines and it is a clear win for human rights. This is impact. It is impressive that of those writers who reached out to PEN last year, 80 percent of them reported feeling supported by PEN’s solidarity work. As well as statistics, there are stories of brave individuals, many of which are incredibly heart-warming. The good work of PEN’s Writers in Prison Committee, working in tandem with the Secretariat, is particularly noteworthy.

We will not repeat the individual stories printed in PEN’s own reports or those showcased on the website, but here we add one we gathered from a representative of another human rights organisation working in Turkey:
“If it weren’t for PEN - IP and CU would not be out of prison in Turkey. They are two journalists under 25 years of age, working for Evrensel newspaper – they’d covered a Kurdish rally – just arrested as terrorists. The Kurdish one was in prison for 3-4 months. Also the defence lawyer was arrested/questioned during the trial. There was help from Progressive Union of lawyers, NUJ, Morning Star and PEN International as well as the head of Turkish Labour Party and editors of 3 major newspapers, and head of Turkish union of journalists and Kurdish free press association. So it was a real show of strength but crucially PEN was cited in the defence case – to help prove that these men were journalists. Both were released straightaway. This was November 2017.”

So it is clear that PEN’s campaigns on behalf of individuals can be impactful not just because each individual matters but because with every victory publicised, there is the possibility of wider systemic change.

But it is important to know where to focus and to keep the list of those in need manageable – so it is good that PEN has recently reduced the numbers in its Case List from 1,000 names down to around 200. Issuing RANs is, and should probably remain, a priority area of work. But it was interesting to hear from staff in the Secretariat that they have had fewer measurable results as a result of issuing RANS and statements in 2017 than in previous years: they thought it might be the lack of a focused strategy that is clear whose audience is for these actions – one staff member said:

“In terms of our statements and RANs – who are we speaking to? Is it media, government or Centres? What is the purpose of the communication – to inform, to influence change, or both?... It’s difficult to know how effective our campaigns are at bringing about wider systemic or policy change.”

This points to a gap in PEN’s articulation of its purpose and strategy: the need for an explicit theory of change or possibly, several theories of change, which identifies intended goals/impacts relating to the main outcome areas (or sub-areas) and explicates the expected pathways to change. Despite the learning framework’s existence there seems to be a tendency for both PEN International and PEN Centres to focus on strategies at the level of activities and outputs and then try and work out what change might/could result from them, rather than defining the end-changes it wants to effect and working backwards to design the most appropriate strategies. This process would also help to surface the interim milestones to be achieved en route to the ultimate goals and potentially shape the indicators to be used for monitoring and evaluation (See also MEL section 3.1 above).

Clearly the RANs issued by the Secretariat have better impact if they are taken up by Centres, so, again it is good that this is being measured and it appears the proportion of Centres acting on RANs is going up: e.g. in 2015 only 12 Centres took action out of 30 RANs issued, whereas in 2018 the proportion was much higher even though the overall numbers were lower, i.e. Centres took action in 11 out of 15 RANs issued20.

**Conclusion:** RANs and calls to action are a priority, nevertheless it is important that they are not done for the sake of appearing to respond to every single case or crisis. It is important that they are always actionable by Centres and are clear and timely, to ensure that Centres have enough time and information to take action. This points to the need to review the procedures for issuing RANs.

---

20 Centres can take action on a RAN etc. but may not always report back to the Secretariat that they have done this, so the numbers of Centres taking action is probably higher than is reported.
2. International Cities of Refuge (ICORN) and PEN Emergency Fund (PEF)

PEN International aims for a five percent increase year on year of cases processed for ICORN by the protection team. PEN is contractually committed to deliver 100 assessments per year for ICORN. But they receive more than that - in fact the yearly numbers of ICORN applications and those processed has risen markedly since the baseline of 50 processed per year was set in 2014. Total numbers of ICORN applications processed yearly between 2015 and 2018 hover around the 100 mark and last year PEN received the highest ever number of applications for assessment (106) – the overwhelming majority from the MENA region.

While this ICORN work is unique and valuable and should probably remain a priority, there is a risk of ICORN work expanding beyond the ability of staff to cope with it – i.e. beyond sustainable levels. There are also challenges in relation to supporting writers at risk in the long term. Impact can be enhanced if protection ‘asks’ are built into advocacy work, such as integrating individual cases into UPR submissions. We are unclear whether that always happens in every case but staff told us that they try to do so.

PEN’s Emergency Fund made 29 emergency grants to writers in immediate risk in 2017. While clearly important for the individuals concerned and an activity which is a core priority for PEN, there are challenges around not letting the PEF work get out of hand – it is therefore good that the ‘target’ in the logical framework is to maintain the levels as at 2014, which was 31 writers receiving emergency relief.

Conclusion: ICORN and PEF programmes are very valuable but PEN should try to keep them at current levels and not be tempted to expand them, bearing in mind the need to keep the Secretariat’s tasks at manageable levels.

3. Reporting and Showcasing PEN’s Protection work

A final point to make about all this protection work is that sometimes PEN’s reporting about it is too vague and lacks punch. For instance, the following line appears in the latest annual report to donors (2017): “Campaigns led to positive improvements for a number of writers across the globe in 2017”. This lacks precision and does not inspire confidence in the reader – even if PEN does not know the precise figure, at least some kind of ball park figure could be given such as ‘scores’ or ‘hundreds’, just so we can gain a sense of the size. Furthermore, reports which start with lists of missions done by the Board or internal procedural matters are boring and off-putting (e.g. the second point in last year’s report ‘2017 at a Glance’ was a long sentence about who was re-elected and elected to the Board of PEN at the 83rd Congress). Stronger and bolder claims and publicity of victories for individuals could help e.g. so and so released, or so and so received sackfuls of letters etc. Where is the list of cases that PEN led on this year (or the like)? Unlike other human rights organisations, PEN’s reports appear very modest, probably so as not to brag and falsely attribute successes to itself – and in some cases to safeguard identities. But modesty can backfire and sometimes look like lack of impact.

---

21 PEN International Trustees Report and Audited Accounts 31st December 2017: p. 4
Conclusion: At present much of PEN’s reporting is vague and lacks punch. Reports could be improved by showing the biggest impacts first, emphasising writers released from detention and other clear campaign wins, especially in cases where PEN has led or has been key. Multimedia can also add value to reporting.

5.2. Impacts under Outcome 2. Challenging Structural Barriers to Freedom of Expression

PEN International’s activities in this area have concentrated recently on criminal defamation in Africa and advocacy efforts in Turkey. The organisation has also continued to target international human rights bodies, such as the UN, through research and submission of UPRs and other submissions to international or regional bodies.

1. Criminal Defamation

The area that has probably seen greatest impact is the work to decriminalise defamation in Africa. PEN has been working on this for many years and has had impact, for example the repeal of key laws in Ghana back in 2001. Several other states have pledged to repeal criminal defamation laws which carry severe penalties and are used by politicians and public officials to silence their critics. The Konaté decision22 at the African Court of Human Rights has led to positive moves in Burkina Faso, South Africa, Kenya, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Niger. Although PEN usually works within coalitions of other human rights and civil society organisations, not many other organisations are working on these issues, so the PEN Centres in Zambia and Uganda, in particular, have been at the heart of this work and a degree of success at least in terms of sensitising media professionals and writers, and other stakeholders concerned with FOE, can be directly attributed to PEN. This Criminal Defamation work is a good example of the Secretariat supporting a number of Centres in developing countries with research and advocacy, both at the local and international level, whilst at the same time supporting the development of those Centres.

Between 2015 and 2018, activities have included:

- workshops for journalists to sensitise them about Criminal Defamation run by national Centres;
- campaigns in Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia to repeal Criminal Defamation laws;
- lobbying at the international level (Human Rights Council) by PEN Zambia and a workshop on defamation for the Committee on Human Rights and Justice led by African PEN presidents;
- public education about Criminal Defamation through radio programmes in Zambia;
- sensitisation with university students in Uganda;
- publication and country launches of a report entitled Stifling Dissent, Impeding Accountability – Criminal Defamation Laws in Africa which includes case studies from the participating countries;
- Amicus briefing on Criminal Defamation in Uganda.

---

22 In December 2014 the African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights in the case of Konaté v Burkina Faso ruled that imprisonment for defamation violates the right to freedom of expression and that criminal defamation laws should only be used in restricted circumstances – this was hailed as a landmark ruling (see PEN article [here](#)).
Our missions to Zambia and Uganda found that the campaign was done well and achieved good entry points for PEN Centres and PEN more widely in Africa. Our assessment is that it is really solid work and the sensitisation done is sorely needed and based on good local partnerships. For example, there between PEN Centres and the Human Rights Network of Journalists in Uganda and the Livingstone Press Club in Zambia. (For more detail see our Africa reports).

However, the actual repeal of Criminal Defamation laws will not be easy. We spoke to some officials and partners in both Zambia and Uganda who indicated, unfortunately, that this is still a long way off and part of the reason given is that media houses and individual journalists continue to behave (or are perceived to behave) irresponsibly and offer little recourse to those they defame.

Nevertheless, despite initial fears that this work might be too legally technical and too funding-driven (the main funding has come from UNDEF), in our view, this Criminal Defamation work has seen some positive progress. Even though it is clearly long-term work and may not see spectacular policy changes quickly, it seems sensible to try to replicate it in Latin America, so it is good to see PEN plans interventions in December 2018 at the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on Criminal Defamation.

Conclusion: The Criminal Defamation work has seen some positive progress and should be pursued and developed, if funding allows.

2. Turkey

PEN’s advocacy efforts at the Council of Europe have contributed to the Parliamentary Assembly’s vote to restore monitoring for Turkey in April 2017 and PEN has maintained the pressure on the UN Human Rights Council and the Council of Europe to act on Turkey by, for instance, facilitating meetings and participation of victims’ family members. PEN may be able to continue this international advocacy by focusing on key states within the European Union and to continue to monitor trials and continue to take part in advocacy initiatives with other human rights organisations, where PEN seems to be strongly appreciated. For instance in their interview with us IREX said “PEN’s work in Turkey is stellar and smart” and a respondent from Article 19 told us:

“PEN is collaborative and especially strong on Turkey – they are very productive, very helpful. We’d all be poorer without them”.

However, there has been less high level structural impact in the Turkey work on FOE than PEN had hoped, even though there have been several victories with the release of individual writers. As PEN’s 2017 report says:

“the climate for advocacy and protection in Turkey is extraordinarily difficult, in light of ... a government with whom PEN International... has no access or leverage... and PEN Turkey feel themselves to be too at risk to collaborate with PEN [International]”

Conclusion: Our sense is that PEN has built up a great deal of knowledge, experience and partnerships in relation to the FOE situation in Turkey, such that it would be a shame not to build on
it. However, at present it may be necessary to concentrate on monitoring trials and aim for individual releases of imprisoned writers rather than aiming for structural change, given the present climate.

3. Universal Periodic Reviews (UPRs)

Another area where there has been a lot of work but perhaps less than optimal results is the UPR process\(^{23}\). This process involves PEN Secretariat staff researching, writing and submitting pages of evidence and briefings to the UPR process at the UN and it requires a lot of staff time. It is not clear to us what has been gained by some of the UPR process submissions made in recent years. A Committee Chair we spoke to said:

“We take lot of time and do a lot of lobbying at UN – UPR and all that – x [member of staff] does a great job but it’s not well understood by the membership. UPRs are not great because not much happens... but [it does] lead people to think seriously about these issues.”

Whilst PEN International has submitted an average of 6.25 UPRs per year over the last four years (2015-2018), few of these have been Centre-led, and, arguably very few have gained traction or achieved any real change. Speaking to staff, committee chairs and reading reports, our sense is that the UPR process on Myanmar has been one of the few with genuine Centre engagement, where the PEN Myanmar took the UPR back and worked on it as part of its efforts to keep up the pressure the repeal of repressive laws governing free speech in Myanmar.

Conclusion: We note that UPRs are low on the Secretariat’s list of priorities and, considering how time-consuming they are and how unclear their impact, it is probably time to review them and consider some cuts.

5.3. Impacts under Outcome 3. Supporting Spaces for Freedom of Expression In Civil Society

The main activity under this outcome-area is PEN’s Civil Society Programme (CSP) which has been run by the Secretariat since 2012 and currently allocates around £200,000 per year to selected PEN Centres, mostly in developing countries, to deliver a range of projects that promote FOE, literature and linguistic rights. There are 21 CSP projects currently running. These are mostly educational in nature, and include projects run in schools, universities, rural communities and prisons to encourage reading, creative writing, knowledge of minority language and literature, and critical thinking. Grants are small at up to £10,000 over two years each and are meant to be seed-money so as to encourage Centres to find their own local funding if they want to expand.

---

\(^{23}\) Between 2015 and 2018 PEN International has submitted UPR reports on: Turkey, Kyrgyzstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Myanmar, Honduras, USA, Tajikistan, Hungary, Brazil, India, South Africa, Guatemala, Ghana, Zambia, Russia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Mexico, China/Hong Kong, Saudi Arabia, Malta, Eritrea and Ethiopia.
We found from our survey of the PEN membership that the CSP is generally regarded to have been a success so far: 59% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that “over the past four years overall, PEN International’s CSP has been a success” (see graph in section 4.4 above). As part of the survey we received 19 comments from Centres implementing CSP projects about their successes – these included the following positive self-assessments by Centres:

“It’s our best project and I think we have achieved beyond our dreams. The anthology [of prison writing] is the first of its kind. And we hope that it will travel beyond our scope” – Ugandan PEN

“Success of [our] literature-teaching workshops can be gauged by the continuous requests from teachers and education planners for PEN to hold them in the various regions” – Philippine PEN

“The success of our civil society programmes has increased our visibility over the years. This in turn enable us to be recognized by the government and both local and international partners” – PEN Sierra Leone

We registered a handful of requests to the Secretariat for further funding in future, bigger grants overall and desires to expanding pilot projects to other regions and countries – for example, PEN Canada linked with PEN Guatemala under the CSP to give security training to community journalists and has requested this pilot project to be extended to other parts of Central and South America, if possible.

We also asked survey respondents about the degree of success of their individual projects, in their opinion. As seen below, the majority (62%) felt that their main project had achieved most or all of its objectives.

So, it is clear that, from the perspective of those participating in the CSP, it has so far been a positive experience. In our view too, the CSP has been a success by many measures and deserves to continue. We present, below, our headline assessments about the impacts of the CSP projects we visited in person.

---

24 We cannot enter into great detail here but we have written three separate reports which give much more detailed assessments of what we saw of the CSP work in Philippines, Argentina, Zambia and Uganda (see report summaries in Annexes)
1. **Philippines ‘For the Love of the Word’** – The PEN Centre in the Philippines is an established participant in the CSP, having started its project in 2011. Called ‘For the Love of the Word’, the project involves strengthening the capacity of teachers to teach and promote Filipino local-language literature. Philippines PEN has received £12,000 for its CSP programme from 2015 to date, and has submitted a request for a further phase worth £10,000 covering 2018-20. Philippine PEN has shown that the teacher-training workshops they have conceived and run to date have been good quality, enormously popular and have raised awareness in the educational establishment about the importance and richness of local literature. They have kick-started the process of promoting local literature in schools all across the Philippines. An important concrete result has been that school libraries are now obliged to hold a certain number of local literature titles in their collections. Furthermore, curricular changes have been implemented by both the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education. Now the Philippine Centre plans to work with the Ministry of Education to get local literature truly embedded into the education system throughout the country.

2. **Argentina - Micro narratives in the slums** - This project by PEN Argentina under the Civil Society Programme started in 2016. They have received ten thousand pounds from PEN International over the first two years of the project, and for 2018 they have received fifty thousand Argentinian pesos (the equivalent to £1250) from a national arts fund. Its focus includes education, social inclusion and FOE through the use of the genre ‘micro narratives’ for children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds (living in slums or in youth prisons) to learn how to write creatively, express themselves, as well as to grow in self-esteem. The aims were to stimulate critical thinking in the young people as well as the value of their own identity. In total they reached 200 children and youth over two years. As the first year was deemed a success, in the second year they replicated the process in more primary schools near slums and in youth prisons across the City of Buenos Aires and are planning to publish a book of the micro narratives created by the youths. The impact on participants, as expressed by Luisa Valenzuela, President of PEN Argentina “...is not only the fact that they have created something artistic, but also that they could connect themselves with their stories and learn how to read what is said behind words”.

3. **Uganda – ‘Harnessing Rare Voices’** – PEN Uganda implemented a creative writing project for prisoners in Luzira maximum security prisons (male and female) entitled ‘Harnessing Rare Voices’ between 2015-17 with a budget of £10,000. PEN Uganda has produced an anthology of prison writing but, more importantly, has demonstrated the power of creative writing to help inmates develop personally and gain a skill, and to open a channel for inmates to speak to the outside world and show their humanity beyond their crime. In terms of something more sustainable, the President of PEN Uganda said “What we tried to sell to the prison authorities is this is something they can run after the project finishes. Prisoners gained skills and [this kind of workshop] could be done in perpetuity by others, support rehabilitation and prevent recidivism – [it keeps inmates’] minds on more productive things and [helps them] reflect on their situation.” PEN Uganda has also implemented a schools project, under the CSP, for children to gain a voice to tell stories of human rights violations and to work with teachers to mainstream the issue of human rights in the education system.

Obviously initial grants of two years (on average) are too short and small to achieve lasting change; they are just seed money to establish pilot approaches. This is understood clearly by the Secretariat staff who are managing the CSP centrally. But it is a slow and intensive process for the Secretariat.
staff to build capacity and encourage Centres to really ponder the ‘so what?’ question about how their pilots can be scaled up or made sustainable. Some of them are asking for help with local fundraising and PEN Argentina, for example, has been able to get a new grant from a national arts fund. But in most cases, if they have completed an initial project, Centres simply want to do more of the same – e.g. run more workshops in other regions (Philippines) or introduce more prisons to creative writing (Uganda). The outcomes that have been achieved – positive though they are - are therefore interim, not long-term impacts.

However, there is a clear desire to build a sustainability dimension into the design of the projects and, crucially to bring in young writers – who are, after all the future of PEN. The above examples from Philippines, Argentina and Uganda all show the beginnings of sustainability planning. Ideally, though, all CSP projects should, we believe, have strategic longer term goals, which, when pilots are successful can be adapted and leveraged in a second phase with further funding to change and embed new practice and policy in enduring partner institutions (e.g. Ministries of Education, Prison Services, partner NGOs etc.).

At the Secretariat, staff emphasised to us how time-consuming the CSP is and that it has gone more slowly than first expected. For example, one manager at the Secretariat said:

“We have learned that Centres need considerable support from the Secretariat to conceive of and implement CSP projects over the four years plus that we’ve been administering it”

For us there are questions about the size of grant and whether or not it is wise, cost-effective and efficient to spread the CSP budget thinly over many countries and many small grants. Secretariat staff talked about ‘spreading the love’ and there is certainly an argument to be made for targeting more Centres with smaller grants. But unless the Secretariat and the donor(s) are prepared to accept that some of these grants might not be properly accounted-for, or reported-on, and/or that some might just be one-off projects that do not lead to anything long-term, then PEN needs to consider carefully how many CSP projects the Secretariat can support at any one time – because they do need a lot of capacity-building and support.

Conclusion: The CSP can be deemed a success so far, even though it has been slower than foreseen, and achieving impact and sustainability is still some way off. Centres should continue to receive support from the Secretariat, but the question is how much support, where it is given, and how to promote long-term change at institutional level. The involvement of young writers is crucial for the long-term. Key learnings and impacts achieved through the CSP by individual Centres are already being documented (e.g. by PEN Argentina) but these kinds of initiatives could be further encouraged, published and shared between all CSP implementers. Facilitation and the delivery of CSP capacity-building activities are being actively devolved to Centres such as Uganda and Philippines which is healthy but decentralisation could be even more actively pursued through twinning between Centres and the appointment of more regional representatives like the present consultant on the Americas to extend and decentralise the capacity-building that, at the moment, is being done by the Secretariat. It would also be sensible to put a ceiling on the number of Centres that receive CSP grants at any one time and to consider larger grants to fewer Centres.
The Dissident Blog

Of 84 responses to the online survey question on the Dissident Blog just under half ‘agreed’ it was a crucial platform for writers who would otherwise be silenced and the remainder were divided between ‘strongly agree’ and ‘neutral’. This appears to be reasonably positive but then this audience is predisposed to agree. One interviewee on the staff was particularly enthusiastic: “When I go to the Dissident Blog I know I’ll have issues highlighted on freedom of expression, but also I’m going to enjoy literature.” However few other people had much to say about it in interviews, with some Centre officials not being aware of its existence (and we note that 19 people surveyed did not answer at all).

In terms of audience figures, Google analytics show a disappointingly low if fairly stable reach and engagement over the past four years: approximately 20,000 users (mostly new) annually; page views went down from 45,000 in 2015 to 36,000 in 2018 whilst pages viewed per session were 1.64 in 2015 and stable at about 1.55 for the other years. Bounce rate (the percentage of visitors to a particular website who navigate away from the site after viewing only one page) is very high at around 80% given that this is not a conventional blog or news site when one would expect short reads, but a series of substantial pieces. This is borne out by the time spent on the site at only 1.24 mins in 2015 decreasing to 1.09 mins in 2018. If a cost per reader analysis is done then even in 2015 when four editions were published, at a cost of $40,000 per edition, it works out at roughly $8 per user. We understand that costs are relatively fixed and translation is a major component.

Language: This is an output of Swedish PEN, which is proud to host - virtually - writers who cannot be published in their own country. As half the funding is now raised in Sweden we accept that this is a non-negotiable factor. While the language analytics are slightly misleading the Swedish language audience appears substantial, though lower than the English language audience, but it should be borne in mind that increased readership is likely to come from an international audience reading the English version and also the original language version. It could be translated into Spanish for wider readership.

Marketing to increase reach and engagement: The Dissident Blog’s lack of visibility and reach seems to be a key problem but this is recognized and is relatively easy to address. It needs better positioning on the PEN International website and links from PEN Centre websites; new editions should be publicised more widely and via other social media platforms. Old editions should be titled/labelled to attract viewers to click on the icon for back editions. If possible all issues should be available for download. Calling it a blog is something of a misnomer as it is not interactive apart from readers being able to share it on Facebook. Making it more interactive is perhaps a step to take in the future if/when audience numbers are up.

Content, format and design: It needs more integration with the wider work of PEN International and individual Centres. We suggest embedding a short survey in the blog to find out what readers think of the Dissident Blog in terms of content, format and design and their ideas for what it should cover.

---

25 We note that the Dissident Blog is about to undergo a revamp and rethink so we anticipate that our observations will chime with existing plans. Some of our recommendations have already been shared with the editor. We would urge that any further strategising takes a ‘root and branch’ approach to rethinking the purpose, intended audience, language, format and design of the Dissident Blog, and its links with work of PEN secretariat and centres.

26 Information provided verbally by PEN Secretariat, May 2018.
6. Gender and Diversity Issues

6.1. Policy: charters, declarations

At the policy level within PEN a greater integration of gender has emanated from greater leadership and support to several highly visible policy initiatives, notably the change in wording to the PEN Charter and the formulation and adoption of the Women’s Manifesto. In 2017 the PEN Charter was modified so that the former limitation of the classes of ‘hatreds’, which members must oppose (race, class and nations – all identities of key importance in the 1920s), became ‘all hatreds’ and the word ‘equality’ was added.

The Women’s Manifesto, published in 2017, and promoted in a number of high level fora this year has attracted endorsement from prominent individuals (such as Nicola Sturgeon, First Minister of Scotland) and institutions (UN). It draws attention to the restrictions placed on women’s ability to participate fully in the world of literature: “For women to have free speech, the right to read, the right to write, they need to have the right to roam physically, socially and intellectually. There are few social systems that do not regard with hostility a woman who walks by herself”. Through the Women’s Manifesto PEN International explicitly endorses the principles of non-violence, safety, education, equality, access and parity for women. The leadership of Jennifer Clement, the first female President of PEN International, and the role of the Women Writers Committee taking this initiative is clearly recognised by the PEN family.

However it was not clear to us that Global South PEN Centres are fully aware of the Women’s Manifesto and its relevance to their work (it was not mentioned in any of the African countries visited), and more needs to be done to unpack how it could be used to promote PEN and for programming and fundraising. For example a paper copy was distributed to all attendees at the CSP development workshop in the Philippines in July 2018, but there was no specific presentation about it, although a video was made at the Malawi capacity development workshop featuring participants who read out and talked about the manifesto. PEN’s Executive Director said:

"We did the gender review and the new women’s manifesto --this new perspective is coming from the leadership of PEN International. Next step will be for PEN Centres to carry this vision, maybe creating women’s committees at the local level and rooting there PEN’s women’s struggles."

The introduction of the VIDA count\(^\text{27}\) at this year’s Congress was received with considerable enthusiasm, as a tool that can be applied globally, with country specific modifications, to generate a visible output/index by which PEN could draw attention to disparities between men and women (and possibly other minority/marginalised groups) in terms of number of books published and reviewed. Although we were not able to gather much feedback from individual Congress participants on the relevance or utility of the VIDA count to their Centres, many of the Global South countries especially in Africa lack literary review publications, and it is not clear that it would work as an advocacy tool when literary endeavour as a whole is highly marginalised and fragile. It is also not yet clear whether the Secretariat will be required to support Centres to collect the data required and

---

\(^{27}\) The VIDA count is an initiative by a US organisation called Women in Literary Arts which highlights imbalances in publishing by collecting data across genre, book reviews and journalistic by-lines, offering a gender-based assessment of the publishing world.
what implications the VIDA count has for the Secretariat’s workload and how this fits with the ongoing strategic planning process.

6.2. Organisational strategy and programme design

1. Addressing gender and diversity dimensions within structural barriers to freedom of expression

An example of where these dimensions are integrated into FOE work is in PEN’s concerted and long running campaign for justice for Daphne Caruana Galizia and the protection of journalists and rights activists fighting for justice in her case: in campaigning against the associated reprisals against investigative journalists and human rights defenders in Malta, PEN noted the presence of misogynistic abuse against Martina Urso, a civil society activist from the anti-corruption group Il-Kennesia.

PEN’s Freedom of Expression report ‘India: pursuing truth in the face of intolerance’ launched at the Pune Congress, illustrates the varied ways in which critical voices are targeted and silenced: from the use of overbroad laws; directed attacks online and offline; the systematic stifling of academic research and freedom; and the continued marginalisation of and hostility towards women’s voices. The congress featured cases of Indian women who have been silenced especially Gauri Lankesh, and honoured both Mahatma Gandhi and his wife Kasturba.

2. Addressing gender and diversity issues as experienced by writers at risk

A key plank of PEN’s support to writers at risk is the compilation of the annual Case List of writers who have been attacked, persecuted and imprisoned. The methodology section of the 2017 edition noted: “...the full extent of censorship of women must be seen within the wider context of gender-based violence, and lack of access to education, civil, political and cultural rights.” The concern is further highlighted in the introduction: “And the Internet...has seen...ceaseless trolling and bullying as a weapon, particularly targeted at women and women writers, often threatening them with sexual violence. (p1).

We note that although the 218 cases are broken down by region and by profession, they are not disaggregated by sex/gender identity, but understand this could be potentially misleading as to the relative safety of women writers due to the methodology used to select cases for listing.

In other work under this strategic outcome there has been an explicit attempt to disaggregate statistics: for example case studies highlight issues facing writers due to their gender roles, e.g. Choty Ahmed from Bangladesh who faced particular difficulties trying to support her family as a single mother.

In some cases it is controversial and risky for a PEN Centre to integrate gender and diversity into protection and solidarity work. For example, the President of PEN Uganda told us:

“As a centre we want to reach out to LGBTQI community – wanted to do it with Stella Nyanzi [blogger who was arrested for her writing] but members are cautious ... We are negotiating a way through turbulent waters."
3. Incorporating gender analysis into design of projects under the CSP

PEN has started developing resources to assist Centres in designing their projects to be gender aware. Two tools are available on the website: a Gender sensitivity criteria handout which provides a scale and accompanying explanation and examples of four levels of gender sensitivity – gender blind, gender neutral, gender sensitive and gender transformative. It was implied in the Philippines CSP workshop that, at a minimum, projects should aim to be gender sensitive – recognising actors can be men and women and they are constrained in different ways. A 15-slide presentation deck entitled ‘Understanding need - who are our beneficiaries?’ addresses gender in the context of researching needs and being cognisant of stereotypes, power structures and inequalities. However apart from providing the gender sensitivity criteria it does not further explicate tools to support diversity analysis and the inclusion of minorities in assessing needs.

In its CSP development and capacity strengthening workshops PEN International appears to have successfully incorporated specific sessions dedicated to gender, when designing CSP projects – e.g. in the Philippines, Malawi and Sierra Leone. In the Philippines several other sessions incorporated gender issues tangentially, for example, there was a short discussion about how Uganda PEN needed to approach working in men’s and women’s prisons differently. But we felt that at the Americas meeting there was an absence of mainstreaming of gender and diversity beyond a public discussion on female writers’ rights, and the short presentation by PEN Argentina about their brand new LGBTQI Committee.

Some CSP projects focus on women or have high rates of participation of women as well as addressing human rights including gender-based violence and discrimination. For example PEN Malawi reported reaching out to new communities, through women’s groups, and successfully enrolling women in reading clubs. In Uganda and Zambia we found that women and girls were generally thought to be more active than their male counterparts in prisons and schools projects.

There was not, however, any precise disaggregated gender data/statistics from previous CSP projects, although the Philippines CSP estimated that women participants were 70% compared to 30% men in their literature training workshops and women participants were prioritised. In Zambia a PEN board member explained that there was conscious inclusion of girls’ and rural schools in the CSP programme to enhance diversity.

4. Addressing barriers to women and minorities’ participation in literary activities

Some interesting work has explicitly sought to expand access to literature by marginalised groups. PEN Malawi’s CSP project reached out to rural women and girls to support their access to reading and writing; PEN Afrikaans’ project provided opportunities for writers of diverse backgrounds; PEN Argentina has worked with young people in informal settlements and reformatory centres, and both it and PEN Uganda plan to develop initiatives to take reading and writing activities to homeless and slum children. PEN Lebanon ran theatre workshops and open readings to bring refugee Syrian and Palestinian writers into contact with the local Lebanese community especially young people.

In Argentina the newly constituted LGBTQI committee has plans to translate the articles that are available in PEN OutWrite into Spanish to be available for Latin America. Other projects are directly supporting marginalised groups rather than traditional minorities, for example a Welfare Officer we spoke to in the Ugandan Prison Service said: “PEN [Uganda] is unique in that it has recognised the worth of marginalised people [prisoners].”
In Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe there was a general feeling that access by most people to literature is limited, and that obstacles exist in terms of availability – literature is not commercially viable, and affordability - printing costs high and duty payable on non-text books in e.g. Zimbabwe, and a general lack of a reading culture. This is exacerbated by government educational policies which prioritise scientific, business and technical subjects over the humanities, and a dire lack of funding for cultural activities with literary endeavour tending to come last.

5. Disaggregating/measuring gender, equity and diversity dimensions of activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts

CSP Beneficiary Table 2015-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of workshop participants</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>110 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>59 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>48 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>120 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>375 375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>10 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>802 597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>900 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>301 302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish PEN</td>
<td>65 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>500 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>978 901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>130 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>199 236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>75 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td>324 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>242 416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>48 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4500 4500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>45 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>125 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>134 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>50 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10140</strong></td>
<td><strong>9785</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19925</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have already noted some of the ways in which data collection is being disaggregated, as well as where it is not. PEN collects some data for CSP project participation by sex and to a much more limited extent, age. We understand reporting has improved in recent years. However the information available for 2015-17 does not appear to be wholly reliable, with suspiciously round numbers and exactly equivalent male/female numbers in some cases (see table). Presumably PEN Centres are returning guesstimates of numbers reached and, for indirect beneficiaries, estimation and disaggregation is even more of a challenge. Better disaggregation should fall out of improvements in project design and implementation to be at least gender sensitive and inclusive, but will need support in monitoring and evaluation.
6.3. Support to leadership, membership and participation in PEN Centres

Clearly PEN International is modelling good practice in terms of female leadership: of the current Board six are women, two of three on the Executive, and two of the four Committee chairs are female, as is the head of the Search Committee. In terms of greater participation by women in PEN International, one Board member noted that the Board was “previously very patriarchal, a male-dominated hierarchical talking shop, top down…. And is now a much more horizontal structure.”

Our impression is that most regions Centres have good representation of women on the boards, but in Africa men tend to dominate in the key roles. PEN’s efforts to explicitly support women’s participation, including in committees and within Centre leadership has been recognised in some quarters, for example, as one staff member from the Secretariat said:

“...there’s a concerted effort in many of our events and panels to make sure there are women. We try to never have male-only panels – unless it’s absolutely necessary.”

This was borne out by the good gender balance achieved in general participation, sessions and panels at the Congress (September 2018), as well as at the Americas strategy meeting in Argentina (July 2018), and the Philippines CSP development workshop (July 2018) although we noted that only one of the attendees from outside the Philippines was female. That workshop also successfully acknowledged and accommodated varying levels of understanding and competence in English (language of the workshop) by participants and the behaviour and language of participants displayed great inter-cultural understanding and gender awareness. Attracting younger participants is perhaps more problematic, and this was a lament among many within the PEN family in terms of membership, participation (except when children are the target group) and leadership. For example in the meeting of the Americas we observed in Argentina, young people were an extreme minority and the issue of how to engage young people better was not covered.

For other dimensions of diversity it is encouraging that Argentina has set up an Indigenous Committee as well as LBGBTQI and Women’s Committees. And progress may be more advanced than first appears – as an executive member of PEN Delhi said:

“Gender sensitivity training is redundant because if you’re a 21st century writer you can’t be gender insensitive!”

Conclusion: Our sense is that a lot has been done to ensure gender and diversity issues are integrated within PEN’s roles, functions, operations, programmes, outputs, measurement and learning. The Women’s Manifesto now needs to be developed further to ensure that it embraces and mainstreams gender issues and diversity more broadly, and to inspire programming and fundraising. Perhaps, in future, gender issues will be sufficiently mainstreamed within PEN so as not to require a separate document. Similarly, we like the idea of integrating LBGBTQI and other minority issues under one committee and renaming the Women Writers Committee the ‘Committee on Women, Diversity and Inclusivity’. The steps taken to integrate gender within the CSP are on the right track and have received considerable attention: however more support to designing gender sensitive and gender transformative projects will be needed. At all levels PEN should review how and what disaggregated data it should collect and present.
7. Recommendations

7.1. Recommendation to Sida

1. Sida should continue funding PEN International at current levels but should consider making its grant slightly more restrictive and selective (for example, consider whether expenses related to Congress and centenary events should be limited or excluded).

7.2. Recommendations to PEN international

A: Focus/Mission

1. Stick to the core focus of defence and protection of writers and promotion of literature and linguistic rights – do not stretch the definition of ‘writers’ too much but do include e.g. musicians whose lyrics come under attack. Adhere more strictly to the criteria for the case list.

2. Use the Centenary and run up to it to do a Strategic Review which should include a ‘scan of the landscape’ to identify the big-picture contextual challenges to PEN’s relevance – specifically, grasp the twin challenges of the digital revolution and the need to attract youth and the next generation, and brush off PEN’s dusty image. This Strategic Review should be initiated by the Board, and the process should be for the Board and Secretariat to do TOGETHER and ultimately owned by the whole organisation: the Board, the Secretariat and the membership. (We acknowledge and welcome that this process has already started with a day retreat for the Board and Secretariat staff planned for March 2019)

3. In the context of the Strategic Review, reflect on how CUTO can be made to the number of activities and programmes being undertaken to lighten the load on the Secretariat and address the current problem of staff overstretch in London.

4. Review the organisation’s advocacy priorities and ensure better planning of campaigning and advocacy activities when done by the Secretariat. Consider cutting or reducing some of the current activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 (‘situation of writers a risk’ and ‘structural threats to FOE’) if not strictly in line with strategic priorities or if not done to support initiatives taken by Centres.

5. Align all policies, manifestos, charters, strategy documents (ensure same wording in each and clarity throughout about what are goals vs. outcomes vs. domains of change vs. principles) and, if possible, have only one charter and only one strategy document.

6. Keep the four goal-areas/domains of change but define what’s done under each of those more narrowly. For example, resist calls from membership to cover all issues. Consider using a theory of change approach to guide thinking around impacts, interim changes and selection of strategies and activities, and the monitoring and evaluation framework which ideally combines the existing learning framework with selected logframe-style quantitative indicators of success.
7. **Review the procedures for issuing RANs** (Rapid Action Network briefings) / Calls to Action, to ensure they are always actionable by Centres, timely, succinct and clear. Consider reducing the number of RANs issued every year.

8. **Review the strategy behind the number of UPRs (Universal Periodic Reviews) written and submitted** to international human rights bodies. Consider reducing the number of UPRs (or similar) submitted every year.

9. **Review the number of campaigning dates** on which the organisation (specifically the Secretariat) is expected to take action and reduce the number of these special days, prioritising those where PEN has strategic added value.

10. **PEN should review its advocacy work on Turkey**, in the light of competing strategic priorities, and the enormous challenges the situation represents, but bear in mind the need not to waste the expertise and partnerships already built.

11. **The Civil Society Programme should build a sustainability dimension into the design of projects.** This means that as well as aiming to achieve short term outcomes they should have strategic longer term goals related to institutional and policy impacts. (See also recommendation below about limiting the number of Centres receiving CSP grants).

12. Develop clearer links between work of the Committees and strategic outcomes:

   - **Writers in Prison – Protection work** – this is operationalised as part of the existing core business of the secretariat so appears to be relatively well streamlined and coordinated but there may be room to improve
   - **Women Writers** – this committee should/could expand its remit to include Diversity and Inclusion, and mainstream these concerns across the work of PEN
   - **Translation and Linguistic Rights** – this committee is actively pursuing issues of minority languages, linguistic rights and translation which few other organisations or initiatives address
   - **Writers for Peace** – no obvious connection with programmes. It is not clear this has relevance any longer.

13. **Limit the number of resolutions tabled at Congress** and ensure that they are restricted to issues over which PEN can actually have an influence (e.g. there seems very little point in spending time over resolutions about chemical or nuclear weapons).  

**B: Structure and governance**

1. **Be much clearer that it is the Board, representing the membership, that provides the high level vision** and strategic direction of the organisation and that the role of the Secretariat is to help define and flesh out the strategy and to implement it, not to lead on it. Both the Board and the Secretariat should own and be familiar with organisational strategy.

---

28 In fact PEN’s Constitution already states that the Secretariat shall “be responsible for ensuring as far as possible that Resolutions which are relatively similar are merged and that those which are clearly outside the competence of International PEN are deleted from the agenda.” (Constitution p.15)
2. **Ensure that the remit of the Secretariat is clear and resist ‘mission creep’**. Its remit should be to service Centres; support and administer the CSP; build capacity among PEN Centres; conduct research; do protection work at the international level; support the Board; support advocacy and campaigning by the Centres; provide visibility for the organisation and fundraise. The role of the Secretariat should NOT be to lead on strategy or to devise or lead on central campaigns (e.g. consider abandoning/winding down the ‘Make Space’ campaign).

3. **Ensure Board members all have clear job descriptions and reporting lines and responsibilities are clear.** Board members should be given introductory packs/inducted at start of tenure. Continue the practice of co-opting non-voting members to add to the skill set.

4. **Make Committee Chairs board members whilst keeping the total number on the Board constant** (i.e. add committee chairs and take away same number of other members so the Board doesn’t get too big). This would forge closer links between the different parts of the PEN family and enhance accountability.

5. **Ensure there is no overlap between President and Executive Director’s role**: the President (supported by the rest of the Board) should do the missions, Centre diplomacy, public-facing role; Executive Director reports to the Board and should not duplicate the public-facing or Centre-diplomacy role of the President. The Executive Director is the link between Board and Secretariat and should primarily be a management role: implementing strategy, fundraising, providing oversight of staff and operations.

6. **Review Secretariat staff and management roles and job descriptions** to reflect reality of the work done (in parallel with defining strategy). Currently the structure is not functioning well. The regional coordinator structure in particular is overloaded. Support to Centres for capacity building and CSP design and monitoring and evaluation should be handled separately from research and protection work.

7. **Congress: Committee, and other sessions e.g. on CSP, Centre development, should aim to develop a plan of work with clear goals and responsibilities attached.** General assembly should provide opportunities for Centres to showcase their work and again, focus on achievements and learnings, not just listing activities undertaken.

8. **Presentation of finances to general assembly**: this should be a more transparent process and information needs to be clearer. Members should be able to understand how much has been spent on what, how fundraising is going, and see the budget forecast for the coming year. Board and secretariat should work closely to prepare accounts and forecasts.

9. **Improve, extend and mainstream safeguarding and protection policies throughout the organisation**. A number of PEN CSP projects are aimed at addressing human rights issues through creative writing and involve children and other especially vulnerable people. In the process of expressing their experiences and feelings it is very likely that participants will expose and potentially relive traumatic events. Measures to ensure confidentiality, to anticipate and deal with negative psychosocial effects and to address abuse, should be anticipated and embedded in the design process of any project or programme implemented by Centres and their partners, and across the whole organisation. A draft safeguarding policy is being considered by the Board and the Staff Union at the Secretariat and is due to

---

29 It may be useful to refer to this booklet for NGOs and non-profits: Ruth Lesirge and Rosalind Oakley, 2015, *A Question of Balance: A Guide to the Chair and Chief Executive Relationship*, Association of Chairs: London
be adopted at the next Board meeting but we recommend more resources for awareness and training to operationalise this policy – this could start with a programme of safeguarding training for all Centres involved in the CSP.

**C: Fundraising/Efficiency**

1. **Strategy-led fundraising. Work out what you want to do and then look for funding, whether restricted or not, to achieve those goals.** The Centenary can be the focus for fundraising over the next two years and should be used strategically to define focus for the future but fundraising is urgent and should not be left until 2021.

2. **A full time fundraiser is needed** to work closely with the Board and the Executive Director on fundraising efforts and to diversity funding sources. Consider having the President working on philanthropic institutions and high net worth individuals and the Executive Director/secretariat focused more on bilateral aid donors.

3. **Fundraising at local level (Global South):** with more dedicated secretariat support to Centres/the CSP, this should become more of a priority in future – ideally strengthening capacity of local Centres to develop proposals themselves.

4. **Twinning Centres:** expand twinning programme and make matching of Centres more systematic - with Secretariat playing a linking role.

5. **Regional programmes:** At this stage we suggest that informal inter-Centre collaboration is more fruitful than attempts to formalise regional networks. Consider having other regionally based consultants like the current consultant on the Americas.

**Value for Money**

6. **We strongly recommend that Congress is held every two years to save money** and its purpose and structure should be rethought so that it is more efficient, more productive and more representative.

7. **Make supporting the CSP more efficient:** PEN should consider capping the number of Centres that receive CSP grants and support at any one time and should aim for less spread and more depth whilst increasing the value of each individual grant – i.e. give fewer but bigger grants. Centres receiving follow-on grants need to have demonstrated they can handle the administrative responsibility without intensive support from the Secretariat.

8. **Be more efficient about exploiting external and internal outputs** and not have duplication of effort around reporting, e.g. there should be common elements and some merging of the Trustees Report, the Annual Report to Sida, the Executive Director’s report to Congress, and the bi-annual report. They should be outcome-focused and should give priority to the most significant changes and achievements.

9. **We endorse the plans that Swedish PEN is making to rethink The Dissident Blog and improve its readership and impact.** It is not currently delivering value for money at a cost of US$40,000 per edition (50% funding provided by Sida via PEN International) given its low reach and engagement.
D: Communications

1. Internal: within the secretariat:
   - Clearer lines of communication needed especially downwards to foster greater sharing and accountability.
   - Recommend hiring at least a part time Knowledge Management/IT person. The IT system, especially internet connection and conference call facilities need urgent improvement.

2. Within the PEN family:
   - Review external communications of PEN Centres – support them to activate at least one platform – website or FB page and link to main PEN International website. Encourage Centres to send in information and stories of change.
   - Consider whether it is time to expand the number of official languages – especially Arabic, maybe Chinese, to reflect urgent needs in the Middle East and changing global power dynamics, and demonstrate that PEN is a forward-looking organisation.
   - More proactive communications between Secretariat and PEN Centres: PEN members are not routinely checking the website – the Secretariat needs to proactively inform the wider membership e.g. via a newsletter for PEN Centres which shares experiences and showcases achievements. Secretariat could also send out short video stories for social media sharing.
   - Better e-mail communication; more email messages from the President of PEN International – tell membership what they are achieving, invite interaction.

3. External:
   - A communications strategy should be developed for every output and report of campaigns and projects, and Centres should do this as well. Leverage report launches for fundraising and visibility purposes. This should include stronger marketing and communications around the Dissident Blog, which would benefit from being more integrated with the work of PEN International and PEN Centres.
   - Reporting should highlight pithy stories of change and show impact using more video/photos/graphics – e.g. a five minute wrap up film to showcase achievements to screen at Congress and to funders and on website and to send to Centres. These should emanate from a reviewed MEL strategy which focuses on gathering impact stories and evidence systematically (i.e. impact logs for policy-influencing should be kept both at Secretariat level and by every Centre implementing a CSP project) and generating understandable stories of change. At the same time, lessons from both good practice and failures should be being captured and the Secretariat’s impact grid system (for the CSP) and logical framework should be simplified and made more user-friendly.
   - Reports to donors and to the public should show the biggest global impacts first, such as clear campaign wins and other victories such as lists of ‘writers released this year’. Public-facing reports should avoid vague figures and should not give priority to news of internal procedures (elections to the Board etc.).
8. Annexes
## 8.1. List of Interviewees

### PEN International staff and management (Secretariat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carles Torner</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romana Cacchioli</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Director / Director of International Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Strauss</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Accountability Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebony Riddell-Bamber</td>
<td>Director of Advocacy &amp; Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Muthee</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Halmshaw</td>
<td>Digital Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nael Georges</td>
<td>MENA Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Wadsworth-Jones</td>
<td>Asia, Americas &amp; Pacific Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy McCann</td>
<td>Manager Protection Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Regional Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Quinones</td>
<td>Americas Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahar Halamzai</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Dondo</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board and Committee Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Clement</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarkko Tontti</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katlin Kaldmaa</td>
<td>International Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Orford</td>
<td>Board member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Rodriguez</td>
<td>Chair elect Women Writers Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjan Strojan</td>
<td>Chair Peace Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simona Skrabec</td>
<td>Chair Translation and Linguistic Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salil Tripathi</td>
<td>Chair Writers in Prison Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Hiester</td>
<td>coopted Board member (lawyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEN Centre officials / duty bearers / CSP coordinators / consultants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Ralston Saul</strong></td>
<td>President Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caroline Stockford</strong></td>
<td>Chair elect Search Committee, Welsh PEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dru Menaker</strong></td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer American PEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elnaz Baghlanian</strong></td>
<td>Editor Dissident Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anna Livion Ingvarsson</strong></td>
<td>Secretary General Swedish PEN / Dissident Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene Schoulgin</strong></td>
<td>Former International Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hege Newth</strong></td>
<td>General Secretary Norwegian PEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sara Whyatt</strong></td>
<td>Former staffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucina Kathmann</strong></td>
<td>International Vice President Emerita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antonia Byatt</strong></td>
<td>Director English PEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lai-Ming Ho, Tammy</strong></td>
<td>Vice President, PEN Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poudel, Mitra Bandhu</strong></td>
<td>Executive member, PEN Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaw, Han</strong></td>
<td>Programme Manager PEN Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young, Youn</strong></td>
<td>Secretary PEN Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argentina</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tania Ortega</strong></td>
<td>PEN Nicaragua CSP Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexandra Jamieson</strong></td>
<td>LGBTQI Committee PEN Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maria Heguiz &amp; Gustavo Bedrussian</strong></td>
<td>Resource people PEN Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jorge Miralda</strong></td>
<td>Centre Official, PEN Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gabriel Seisdedos</strong></td>
<td>Vice-president Pen Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Francisco Morales</strong></td>
<td>Committee of Indig Langs, PEN Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jose Antonio Albertini</strong></td>
<td>Vice-president, PEN Centre of Cubans in Exile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luisa Valenzuela</strong></td>
<td>President, PEN Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danson Kahyana</strong></td>
<td>President PEN Uganda/CSP Project Coordinator &amp; resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob Kisikii</strong></td>
<td>Vice-president PEN UGanda &amp; CSP resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beatrice Lamwaka</strong></td>
<td>CSP Project Coordinator PEN Uganda and resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roger Stringer</strong></td>
<td>Former Steering Committee member PEN Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elisha July</strong></td>
<td>President PEN Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daphne Jena</strong></td>
<td>Secretary PEN Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Samuel Makore</strong></td>
<td>Treasurer PEN Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tsitsi Dangarembga</strong></td>
<td>Former Steering Committee &amp; Board member PEN Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel Sikazwe</strong></td>
<td>General Secretary PEN Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicholas Kawinga</strong></td>
<td>President PEN Zambia &amp; CSP resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marita Banda</strong></td>
<td>Board member &amp; CSP Project Coordinator PEN Zambia &amp; resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordinary PEN Members and CSP resource people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrillo, Pamela Del Rosario</td>
<td>workshop participant and resource person from PEN Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jha, Apoorvanand</td>
<td>workshop participant, PEN New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lua, Shirley</td>
<td>workshop participant, Philippine PEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas, Glenn</td>
<td>playwright and resource person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Wider beneficiaries of CSP (young people, teachers etc.)** |
| **Philippines** |
| Talle, Onah Pierre | participant in Illogon workshop |
| Tolentino, Glenn Ford | participant in Baguio workshop |
| Vincent, Jaycel | participant in Cebu workshop |

| **Africa** |
| Barbara Odetta | Teacher at CSP participating school, Kira Secondary School, Uganda |
| Beatrice Akite | Teacher at CSP participating school, St Kizito Secondary School, Uganda |
| Emmanuel Watsui | Student at CSP participating school, St Kizito Secondary School, Uganda |
| Angela Sinzala & Mercy Chongwe | Teachers, Chongwe Secondary School, Zambia |
| Students | Chongwe Secondary School, Zambia |

<p>| <strong>Africa - PARTNERS</strong> |
| Ronaldo Nahabwe Kalangi | Journalist - Criminal defamation victim, Uganda |
| Kenneth Ntende | Human rights lawyer - Resource person for Criminal Defamation project, Uganda |
| Hilda Twongyeirwe | Executive Director - Femrite - women writers |
| Elizabeth Namfuka | Commissioner of Rehabilitation &amp; Welfare, Prison Service, Uganda |
| Christine Naigaga | Welfare Officer, Uganda Prison Service |
| George Ngobi | PEN Board member &amp; Broadcaster, Uganda |
| Madinah Nalwanga | Journalist - Criminal defamation victim, Uganda |
| Prof Benon Tugume | Professor of Literature, Kyambogo University, Uganda |
| Gankhanani Moffat Moyo | PEN member, poet, academic, University of Zambia (UNZA), Zambia |
| Justin Nshimbi | Acting Controller/Programme Manager, ZNBC, Radio 2, Zambia |
| Julie Girard | Director, Alliance Francaise, Lusaka, Zambia |
| Adrian Chipindi | Director, National Arts Council, Zambia |
| Felix Kunda | Justice for Women and Orphans, Lusaka, Zambia |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Nawa</td>
<td>PEN member, Publisher Butali Press, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Phiri</td>
<td>Director, Lusaka National Museum, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hatyoka, Chanda Himbala, Kelvin Mudenda</td>
<td>Livingstone Press Club, Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other collaborators/partners/funders/stakeholders**

- Rod McLeod: INTRAC 2014 evaluator
- Anne Garbutt: INTRAC MEL adviser to PEN
- Peeter Kaaman: SIDA Programme Specialist i/c PEN grant

**Externals to PEN / FOE organisations / govt/ others**

- Annie Game: IFEX Executive Director
- Bill Orme: Former Director CPJ
- Caroline Giraud: Specialist on EU project: Media and Freedom of Expression in EU Democracy Support
- Guy Berger: UNESCO Director for FOE and Media Development
- Mira Milosovic: GFMD Executive Director
- Sophie Leferink: HIVOS Programme Development Manager
- Thomas Hughes: Article 19 Executive Director
- Srirak Plipat: Freemuse Executive Director

**Philippines**

- Palabay, Cristina ‘Tinay’: Secretary General, Karapatan (Human rights group)
- Villaneze, Rosalina: Chief Education Programme Specialist, Department of Education

**Argentina**

- Santiago Kovadloff: writer

**Africa**

- Tabani Moyo: National Director, MISA Zimbabwe
- Murray McCartney & Irene Staunton: Weaver Press, Publishers, Zimbabwe
- Jane Chirwa: Programmes Officer, MISA Zambia
- Austin Kayanda: National Director, MISA Zambia
8.2. Interim Indicators – an example

Advocacy campaign to repeal criminal defamation laws

Suggested examples of interim indicators/milestones to assess outcomes and impact:

Activities:

1. Research briefings and position papers drawing on experiences of media professionals and writers affected by the laws
2. Meetings with parliamentarians, media owners and editors, bodies that represent those affected by the laws (e.g. journalist associations, unions etc.), members of the judiciary, lawyers, police and others involved in criminal defamation cases
3. Public meetings/briefings to which wider media invited (presenting stories of those affected and legal context); production and dissemination of social media content on issue
4. Meetings with potential coalition members (human rights and FOE organizations, media associations) including international organisations, donors

Interim outcomes – changes in public opinion, political will, media attention

1. Increased focus of issue on policy agenda: indicators could include: policy documents highlighting effects of criminal defamation, number and types of parliamentary questions and debates, PEN involved in select committee consultations
2. Fostering of champions within key stakeholder groups (parliamentarians both in government and opposition, judiciary, media sector) – indicators could include: increased understanding by both those affected and decision-makers; public or private expressions of support for repeal of criminal defamation; public commitments to act; judiciary use their powers to limit effects of criminal defamation (whilst still in existence); media houses provide support to those affected
3. Media debate generated on the effects of laws, incompatibility with constitution and need for their repeal – indicators could include: number of articles and programmes arguing for repeal of criminal defamation; social media amplification/discussion; media houses provide support to those affected; media houses acknowledge need for training in ethics and self-regulation mechanisms for investigating and appropriately rectifying complaints
4. Active coalition of civil society organizations advocating on repeal of criminal defamation laws – indicators could include: MOUs signed between organizations and meetings held; activities organized by coalition – petitions, letters to MPs, attendance at hearings; funding received from supporters/donors; Coalition invited to meet policy makers; Alignment of policy maker messages with coalition policy position

Impact – changes in policy and institutional practice:

1. Pre and in-service training institutions incorporate ethics of reporting in curricula
2. Media institutions establish voluntary code of conduct and set up mechanisms for self-regulation and recourse
3. Drafting of bill to repeal criminal defamation
4. Presentation of bill to repeal criminal defamation to parliament
5. Criminal defamation laws removed from statute book.
### 8.3. PEN Centres – new, dormant and closed (2014 -2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEN CENTRE</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>South India</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberian</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrean Writers in Exile</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea - Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DORMANCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek writers in exile – London</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Writers Abroad</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers-in-exile London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4. Documents Consulted

General
2. Freedom of Expression and Human Rights Organisations working with PEN International, 2018
3. Impact Log 2017
4. Information for Board Candidates, 2008
6. Memorandum and Articles of International PEN, 2006
7. New & dormant and closed Centres 2014 -2018
9. PEN Charter n.d.
10. PEN International End of Year Report 2017
11. PEN Strategic Plan 2015-2018
12. Results framework 2015 - 2018
13. Women’s Manifesto 2018
14. Strategy for the Americas

Civil Society Programme
15. Analysis - Comparing Impact grids - Civil Society Programme, 2017
16. Civil Society Database 2015-2018
17. Civil Society Programme WORKING BUDGET 2018
18. CSP Beneficiary Table 2015 – 2017
19. CSP Impact & Learning Report 2017
20. Domains of Change - Summary document for PEN Centres
21. Grant management and sub granting, Internal procedures and guidelines, 2017
22. PEN Malawi - Final CSP report w SoC, n.d.
23. Philippine Centre CSP FINAL End of Project Reporting form + Story of Change, n.d.
25. Uganda Using Literature to Promote Human Rights Education in Ugandan Secondary Application
26. ‘As I Stood Dead Before the World’ – anthology of writing from Luzira prison, 2018
27. Zambia Civil Society Programmes 2015-2017 Full Application Form
28. Zambia CSP FINAL End of Project PEN Centre Reporting form + Story of Change 2017
29. Argentina PEN: Application and reports under the CSP grant
30. Mexico PEN: Application and reports under the CSP grant
31. Nicaragua PEN: Application and reports under the CSP grant
32. Honduras PEN: Application and reports under the CSP grant
33. PEN Canada: Report on work in Guatemala

Financial
34. Copy of Sida budget 2015 -2018 adjusted draft
35. International PEN Audited Accounts for the financial year ending 31st December 2017
36. Pen auditors mgt letter 2017
37. PEN International Budget Vs Actual Report for the period 1st January to 31st December 2017
38. Signed accounts 2017
ICORN
39. Final Evaluation report 27 March 2012-2016, 2018
40. ICORN Jan-June 2017 –FINAL
41. ICORN July-December 2016
42. ICORN July-December 2017 FINAL

Teams’ Self-Reviews (2017 and 2018)
43. Finance and Admin Team Self Review
44. Freedom to Write Team
45. International Programmes Team
46. Monitoring and Evaluation – Finance Team
47. Team Self Review SMT

INTRAC Evaluation 2014
49. SMT response to INTRAC evaluation, 2015

Congress, Pune, India 2018
50. Delegates’ Pack, 2018
51. Draft Agenda Meeting Assembly of Delegates, 84th PEN Congress, 2018
52. Draft Committee Meetings Schedule, 2018
53. Executive Director Report, 2018
54. Final Schedule of Events, 2018
55. Minutes of the Assembly of Delegates Lviv 2017
56. PEN Centenary Digital Archive brochure, 2018
57. PEN International 2018 Budget summary, 2018
58. Women Writers’ Committee Newsletter, n.d.

Criminal Defamation programme
60. UNDEF application UDF-RAF-14-584 PD signed 14 Dec 2015
61. Uganda final UNDEF project reporting form April 2018

Trustees’ Reports and Audited Accounts 2013 to 2017

Plus many documents related to Philippines, Argentina, Africa and India visits as well as other web-based materials.
8.5. Summary Trip Report: Philippines

Mary Myers

1. Manila Civil Society Programme Workshop

PEN International organised a five day Civil Society Programme development workshop (1st-7th July 2018) with support from PEN Philippines. The aims of the workshop were:

- To provide training in project management
- Strengthen and develop civil society projects
- Knowledge-sharing between PEN Centres who have developed and are running projects and those at the genesis stage of new civil society projects.

The workshop, which was held at De La Salle University, Manila, brought together 16 representatives from PEN Centres across Asia and was aided by a facilitator from Uganda PEN. Participating PEN Centres were: Bangladesh; Cambodia; Hong Kong; Myanmar; Nepal; New Delhi; Philippines; and South India.

The PEN Centre in the Philippines is an established participant in the CSP, having started its project in 2011. Called ‘For the Love of the Word’, the project involves strengthening the capacity of teachers to teach and promote Filipino local-language literature. Philippines PEN has received £12,000 for its CSP programme from 2015 to date, and has submitted a request for a further phase worth £10,000 covering 2018-20. (See below for more observations about Philippines’ CSP project).

Ugandan PEN is also considered by PEN International to have been a strong participant in the CSP having implemented a writing-project for prisoners entitled ‘Harnessing Rare Voices’ between 2015-17 with a budget of £10,000. For this reason both Ugandan PEN and Philippine PEN CSP coordinators (Danson Kahyana and Shirley Lua) played a prominent role in this workshop as trainers and facilitators, alongside Secretariat staff.

By contrast, other PEN Centres in Asia have not been so active with their CSP projects or are just beginning work, so the aim of the workshop was to build their capacity to plan, implement, report on, monitor and evaluate their CSP projects in future.

PEN International has previously organised two similar CSP development workshops – in UK and Malawi in 2017. Ultimately, the aim behind these CSP workshops, from the Secretariat’s perspective, is to share learning, expand and enhance the CSP work, enable those Centres in receipt of CSP funding to be more accountable, and build capacity for Centres to access and leverage other grants and funding.
2. Philippine PEN

Philippine PEN appears to be a middle-sized Centre (about 70 members currently), long-established (since 1957) and situated in a good physical space, above the Solidaridad bookshop in central Manila.

One member of the board of directors I interviewed said about Philippine PEN:

“It’s not just the pleasure of reading and discussing but it’s the fact of rubbing elbows with literary lions, and being with peers. It’s a wonderful company of literary people.”

By talking to several participants of the workshop who are on the board of Philippine PEN I detected a little internal dissent within Philippine PEN, particularly concerning ideas for taking forward the civil society work. Some members feel the Centre is not engaging sufficiently with the evils of the Duterte regime (e.g. that it could do more work with those affected by extra-judicial killings) and some feel that there is insufficient follow-through with participants in the current workshop series (i.e. teachers). This shows that the Centre is not entirely cohesive. However, this is not unusual and must be the case with almost every PEN Centre, given all the disparate – and often strong - personalities involved.

Feedback obtained from another human rights group in the Philippines, Karapatan\(^{30}\), was positive overall – the two informants from the organisation I spoke to described Philippine PEN as ‘very distinct’, ‘prestigious’, and ‘it’s got a strong position among the artist community and the upper strata of society’. However the respondents from Karapatan voiced a little concern that Philippines PEN, from their point of view, was insufficiently politically engaged and “a bit old fashioned - not that happy in the digital space” and “did not have much presence on social media.”

---

\(^{30}\) [www.karapatan.org](http://www.karapatan.org)
3. Philippine PEN’s Civil Society Programme

Philippine PEN’s CSP project has been delivering a series of workshops on teaching Philippine literature, in different regions of the country, which showcase Filipino literature and writers, impart teaching techniques, ideas, lesson-plans and materials to teachers, and generally inspire more and better teaching of local-language literature. Since 2011, Philippine PEN has conducted 14 workshops-fora across the country under the Sida-funded CSP. The latest phase covered five different regions of the Philippines:

- two workshops in the Visayas region (Cebu, 11-12 April 2016; Samar, 3-4 April 2017)
- two in Mindanao (Davao, 22-23 Aug 2016; Iligan, 4-5 Sept 2017),
- one in Luzon (Baguio, 16-17 Oct 2017).

The Philippine literature workshops were carried out by eminent and qualified people, were well-attended and received enthusiastic plaudits from participants. In total, about 1,100 teachers were trained during the 2016/17 phase.

All the participants and resource-people I spoke to, without exception, were very enthusiastic about these workshops. Participants interviewed used adjectives such as ‘inspiring’, ‘reviving’, ‘revelatory’, ‘free of charge’ ‘accessible’. On outcomes, participants mentioned that the workshop ‘gave us good tools, like lesson plans’, ‘helpful hints on how to teach playwriting’ and ‘a realisation that our literature is really rich’. Participants shared ways they intended to apply the knowledge learned from the workshop, for example: “I will focus more on teaching dramas and plays; I will study further and enhance my knowledge on this track of literature/creative writing.” “[I will] make an anthology of the students’ works.”

The Department of Education were also enthusiastic about Philippine PEN’s workshops:

“PEN Philippines has been doing training for teachers. This is a big help to the teachers and to the Department. The trainings are free of charge. We don’t have sufficient trainers ourselves to do this.”

Tangible outputs of the Philippine PEN CSP workshops

Support materials have been produced with Sida funding. In the first phase (pre-2014), these were:

- A Manual for Teaching Philippine Literature – 1000 copies produced and
- An anthology called Peace Mindanao featuring writers from different communities from the conflict affected island.

The tangible outputs of the 2015-17 workshops/activities were:

- ‘Selfie photos’ and ‘selfie essays’ produced by the workshop participants which are “feedback approaches to use to show stories of change”
- Teaching manual produced by members of Philippine PEN “After 1-2 years we will follow up and see if these manuals are being applied”

Wider impact of the Philippine PEN CSP workshops

As a result of the Mindanao workshop in September 2017 a new association was formed by and for teachers of local literature, called the Mindanao Literature Teachers Association. An anthology of current Mindanao literature was proposed and a call for submissions was made to local writers and academics. A special session during Philippine PEN’s 60th National Congress in Manila in November 2017 was devoted to writers from Marawi City – a conflict-affected city in Mindanao – as a result of

31 Both quotes from Shirley Lua, CSP Coordinator, Philippine PEN
one of the workshops. **Institutional/policy change:** Philippine PEN members successfully lobbied the Department of Education to **increase the provision of Filipino books in libraries** of all higher education institutions from 10% to 20% of holdings.

Future plans for the next phase of the CSP work in the Philippines are in development. A submission has been made to the Secretariat for 2018-20 entitled *The Healing PEN 3: Workshops and Learning Resources Toward Social Empowerment and Relevance* for a budget of £10,000 and discussions between London and Manila are ongoing. The plan is to return to the same regions as before and conduct more intensive follow-up training from the previous workshops. PEN Philippines is not just dependent on PEN International for CSP funding but has managed to leverage some in-kind contributions from the universities hosting the various workshops in the regions and has also secured some match funding from the National Commission for Culture and Arts. However, advice and support on fundraising would be welcomed by Philippine PEN.

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS on Manila Civil Society Programme Development Workshop

Overall I felt the workshop was successful. It was well-planned, creative, paced appropriately and well-organised. Content was delivered professionally, in an accessible style. The final session revealed that all participants were satisfied and had been inspired and energised by the week.

Friendly contacts were evidently made across Asian Centres, learning took place, commitments to developing civil society work were made, creative spirits were (re-)energised and a sense of solidarity with oppressed, imprisoned and censored writers was renewed.

However, time will tell whether the concepts/tools learned and the ideas that were generated during the workshop will actually be applied.

**Relevance:** The workshop was relevant to the needs of the participants and was timely. Participants were, on the whole, carefully selected and well-prepared before-hand. It was appropriate to hold it in the Philippines, as an Asian hub, also considering Philippine PEN’s CSP project is already well-developed and served as a good example. Involving PEN Uganda struck a chord with all participants. One suggestion:

- The workshop could have been made even more relevant to each participating PEN Centre if there had been a pair of attendees from each PEN Centre, rather than just one.

**Effectiveness:** The content of the workshop was generally well-planned and delivered.

---

The project plans are, in summary: “Firstly: The Philippine Center will continue to organize a series of workshops for literature teachers in the secondary and tertiary levels. The name For Love of the Word: Workshops on Teaching Philippine Literature in High School and College will be retained. From July 2018 to December 2019, the Center proposes to organize four (4) workshops in Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao regions. This time, the workshop will run for three days to allot sufficient time for training tasks (or for two days if funds are not enough). Secondly: a Summit on 21st Century Literature Canon: The Philippine Center will assist the Commission on Higher Education Technical Committee on Literature to hold and implement the Program on the Formation of the 21st Century Literature Selections. This program includes a summit, i.e., a three-day gathering of experts who will study and investigate a range of 21st century writings and decide on the significant literary texts to be included in the two core courses of the Senior High Humanities track—21st Century Philippine Literature from the Regions and 21st Century World Literature.” (Philippine Pen Civil Society Project Application 2018)
A few suggestions for future CS workshops:

- Workshop facilitators could provide *more examples and evidence of change* and impact from previous successful (and unsuccessful) PEN CSP projects.
- Provide participants with *more specific examples* when explaining tools such as ‘SMART’ indicators, how to fill in an impact grid, and so on;
- More time in workshop plenary could be allocated for the person/people from each participating PEN Centre to present the history, activities, plans and challenges of their particular Centre;
- Facilitators could be more explicit about the *actual process through which a CS funding proposal must pass* before PEN International approves it;
- More concrete suggestions and perhaps practical exercises could be given on *fundraising and proposal-writing techniques*;
- Participants could have been encouraged to gather *gender, equity and diversity statistics* in their planned activities and be shown how to do this;
- The session on digital/social media communications could have benefited from *more examples*, showing other PEN Centres’ successful communications platforms (e.g. Facebook pages) and could have been *more culturally universal*.

**Efficiency:** The workshop was well-organised and all the travel, food, accommodation and other arrangements were extremely good and appeared cost-efficient.

**Impact / Sustainability:** Only time will tell whether the ideas and tools from the workshop will be internalised and applied by participants in the near future.

- PEN International staff will have to follow-up on their promises to monitor and help develop each participant’s plans for their respective CS projects.
- More emphasis could be given in such workshops to PEN International’s/Sida’s funding being *seed-money* with which Centres can do pilot projects and to help them fundraise locally themselves to scale-up or do other spin-off projects.

Due to the workload for London issue, PEN International should re-visit the idea of *limiting or even reducing the number of PEN Centres receiving CS grants* world-wide.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS** on Philippine PEN CSP Project

**Relevance:** The local literature workshops for teachers have no doubt been relevant to participants and much needed, due to the government being challenged by a lack of trained teachers and resources.

- Ensure that the ‘master trainers’ and working closely with the Philippines Department for Education are key features of the next CSP phase in the Philippines.

There are also some different ideas for CS projects coming from other PEN members, that were mentioned to me:

- These may have merit and deserve more open discussion and consideration within Philippine PEN.

**Effectiveness:** As detailed above, the workshops have been very popular, well-received, professionally delivered, and the advocacy work has been effective.

**Efficiency:** The workshops appear to have been cost-efficient and they certainly were well-organised, according to the participants I spoke to.
Impact / Sustainability: There have been some clear institutional and policy impacts, as detailed above (curriculum changes, library quotas); there have also been many hundreds of teachers trained, and resources distributed; good advocacy work has happened which has influenced the government. It is difficult to say whether or not teachers have been able to apply the training PEN has given them because there has not been any systematic follow-up of teachers by Philippine PEN after each regional workshop. However, to do so would probably not be a good use of PEN/Sida money. However,

- More could be done by PEN Philippines to explore partnering more closely with the Department of Education’s regional staff who could possibly follow-up and see if trainees have applied what they’ve learned.
8.6. Summary Trip Report: Argentina

Soledad Muñiz

PEN Argentina

This summary provides a description of some of the key activities that PEN Argentina carries out, as well as analysis of its strengths and weaknesses, Centre development, decentralisation and relevance as well as conclusions and recommendations.

Civil Society Programme: Micro narratives in the slums
PEN Argentina’s Civil Society Programme started in 2016. They received £10,000 (2016-18) from PEN International and £1250 (2018) from a national arts fund. Its focus is education, social inclusion and FOE through the use of ‘micro narratives’ for children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds (living in slums or in youth prisons). The aim is to stimulate critical thinking in the young people as well as the value of their own identity.

As part of the project initially PEN Argentina provided open training about micro narratives to its younger members. The senior writers in the country specialised in the genre gave master classes to the younger writers. The coordination team then selected a team of young writers to deliver workshops in primary schools near slums and in youth prisons. In total they reached 200 children and youth over two years. As the first year was a success, in the second year they replicated the process in more primary schools near slums and in youth prisons across the City of Buenos Aires. "We all have something to tell", said Maria Heguiz who is a member of PEN Argentina and the founder of the non-governmental organisation Argentina Narrada. She and Gustavo Bedrossian, another member of PEN Argentina, are now in charge of the third year of the project. Alongside the coordination team at PEN Argentina they have decided to focus on schools for adults, training not only the students but also the teachers to make it sustainable.

In each session - lasting one and a half hours - the students initially listen to narrators read some selected texts, to then use metaphors to write ideas in small pieces of paper. During that time, the use of imagination aims to build confidence in the students to trust that "their word can be said and heard", affirms Maria.

Left: Micro narrative written during a class I observed on Wednesday 1/08/2018. "Live without fear, as we were born to die". Right: Class undergoing. Groups were discussing narrations and writing their own texts.

33 Article about the third year of the project published in a national newspaper in Argentina:
Luisa Valenzuela, President of PEN Argentina, said “It’s a fun, humorous and light genre with language consciousness, where each word has strength...Many of the children living in slums are first generation born in the country from migrants from neighbouring countries. There is a hidden xenophobia that despises migrants. I wanted them to feel pride about their cultural heritage.” She is proud that they are planning to publish a book of the micro narratives created by youth over the last two years. Furthermore, they are now working with two universities in Argentina (FLACSO and Sarmiento) to systematise the methodology and write it up. They are also in conversations with the department of adult education (Dirección del Adulto in Spanish) from the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires to give them support to incorporate the activities as part of the official curriculum for adult literacy in adult schools.

Committees
PEN Argentina has a Women’s committee as well as the brand new Indigenous Languages committee and a LGBTQI committee. The Women’s committee organised a Marathon of reading with texts linked to each point of PEN’s Women’s Manifesto during International Women’s Day. Thirty-five writers participated and 21 focused on issues linked to violence. On 25th November 2018 another event will focus on the elimination of violence against women. The committee has also committed to start counting publications and awards to women writers.

The Indigenous Languages committee represents seven indigenous languages. Most of the indigenous representatives are oral narrators. Francisco Morales, a committee member, also manages a small publishing house that supports other indigenous writers to publish books both in Spanish and indigenous languages. The reasons for setting up the Committee were to preserve indigenous knowledge that lies beneath the languages as well as to preserve ethno literature as well as to help integrate indigenous writers into the PEN membership.

Five PEN Argentina members form the brand new LGBTQI committee. Alexandra Jamieson, PEN member in charge of communications, shared some of their initial ideas: “[We] will translate the articles that are available in the website PEN OutWrite into Spanish... There is going to be also a section in our website dedicated to this type of literature.” She said a lot of literature in Argentina is excluded because the authors don’t have access to journalists or certain platforms. She also shared their intentions to work closely with other Centres from the Americas, specifically PEN Puerto Rico in the first instance.

Campaigns
PEN Argentina took part in Dia de Muertos (Day of the Dead) campaign last year. With the support received by PEN International, they had a vigil remembering journalists killed in Brazil, in particular the case of Mario Randolfo Marques Lopes, editor in chief from the news site Vassouras na Net, who was killed on 8th February 2012 in Rio de Janeiro.

PEN Argentina had the support of National University of San Martin and the Institute of Masks and there was a high level of participation by members and the public.

Protection
PEN Argentina has had mixed experiences on this front. On the one hand, they have supported PEN International’s calls for solidarity for cases through social media in particular, as well as in the choice made for the campaign Dia de Muertos. They have also been actively supporting journalists who have been fired recently from TELAM, the Argentinian public news agency, and they pronounce themselves publicly whenever it's required.

________________________________________
34 http://www.pen-outwrite.org/about-penoutwrite/
On the other hand, they had a negative experience with hosting a writer sent by PEN Honduras. Unfortunately it was a fake case that had slipped through the research net at PEN Honduras, and PEN Argentina found themselves highly disappointed and troubled by the experience.

**Centre Development**

PEN Argentina is a great example of how a dormant or almost extinct Centre can be renewed quickly (in just 4 years) and its revival can bring energy not only to that country but further to the region. PEN Argentina has quickly grown to 80 members engaging in literary activities for young and adult writers. Many are active today in the committees. They have a mailing list of 1100 and use newsletters and social media to inform both members and "friends" about the activities, and they send personalised emails to members in relation to exclusive benefits as well as for the collection of dues.

Another of their strengths is that they have been able to create partnerships to achieve their vision e.g. with the NGO Argentina Narrada in the context of their CSP; as well as with Carlos Sarasola, a well-respected local anthropologist, who has been crucial to establishing the Indigenous Languages Committee.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Relevance:** The influence of literature is shifting towards a smaller percentage of the population that read books. The majority of the population uses television and other media to form their views. PEN needs to address this challenge and it points to a strategy re-think. The civil society programme in this context seems crucial and therefore deserves more resources. Also advocacy and working in partnership is also crucial. In this sense, PEN Centres should partner more with audiovisual media and other institutions to reach a wider audience. Protection is the area of PEN International’s work most recognised and its impartiality is crucial. For this the core work on research about cases should remain centralised in London using multiple sources from each country.

**Effectiveness:** The Civil Society programme and the campaign Dia de Muertos have achieved their aims and have been fruitful for PEN Argentina also for Centre development. In the future both PEN Argentina and PEN International should consider better connecting both and using for example outputs from the Civil Society projects in the creative campaigns. In relation to Protection, some solidarity actions have been effective. The observatory of FOE, cases list and research on cases, as well as decision-making on the approach to take in each case should remain an impartial process. That is hard for a Centre to do without the appropriate resources. In my view this is the DNA of PEN and should remain centralised in London. Centres can continue solidarity actions and propose cases as they do today, but PEN International should also triangulate information with other key players in FOE in each country and region. PEN International should consider increasing resources in the communications area to be able to support Centres in the process of (re)establishing themselves. Further, it is important to recognise, also, that the realities of countries like Venezuela, Colombia and Mexico are really different to Chile, Argentina and Uruguay, for example. So it may be more effective to have a strategy from Mexico to Venezuela and Colombia, and another one for the rest of South America.

**Efficiency:** The strategy that PEN International has in relation to the micro grants through the Civil Society programme and campaigns like PEN Protesta and Dia de Muertos in the region have proved
efficient in the case of PEN Argentina. It not only created actions to raise issues linked to FOE, but also provided opportunities for Centre development. PEN Argentina was also able to get a small local fund for 2018 (half of what they received per year in 2016-2017 from PEN International).

**Impact:** The Civil Society project has been a success. It is starting its third year and has received new funding from a national arts fund. PEN International should consider documenting the methodology and sharing this with other countries interested in replication. (PEN Canada mentioned an interest in that line).

**Sustainability:** In relation to the Civil Society project, if PEN Argentina is able to advocate with the department of adult education at the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires for formally including the methodology in the curriculum that could establish sustainability in terms of financial support as well as expansion to all adult schools in the city. PEN Argentina may need further financial support from PEN International to expand outside Buenos Aires. Some of the key more general aspects to create sustainability at Centres will be bringing in young writers, having a strong communications strategy in place as well as finding the key issues in the country linked to FOE where Pen can position itself with a comparative advantage. In Argentina, both indigenous language rights and the civil society project can provide that comparative advantage.

**Gender and Diversity:** PEN Argentina has begun to take positive steps to integrate gender and diversity into their work through the three committees they have set up: Women, Indigenous languages and LGBTQI. Now this should be mainstreamed across all areas of work (civil society programme, advocacy and protection).

---

**Meeting of PEN Centres from the Americas organised by PEN International in Buenos Aires, 26-28 July 2018**

**Background:** The purpose of the event was to bring together all the Centres from the Americas to review their strategy for the continent, decide what to focus on in the future and to also build capacity and relationships.

**Presentations from each Centre about their work and challenges they faced** (in alphabetical order)

**PEN Argentina:** Founded in April 1930, formed by an elite of writers up to 1936 when the international congress was hosted in Argentina. There was a space of inaction up to 1960-1980 and total extinction until 2014. In April 2014 the current President, Luisa Valenzuela, and Vice-president, Gabriel Seisdedos, renewed it. Its activities include meetings about Poetry and Literature, establishing the Committee for Indigenous languages, and for the last two years a Civil Society Programme project using micro narratives with vulnerable groups.

**PEN Bolivia:** Founded in La Paz in 1931, inactive until 1991. It has four active regions in the country with chapters that are part of the Centre. A grant from the PEN Civil Society Programme supports literary contests, book donations, panel discussions and nominations for the national award for print
media. PEN Bolivia also carries out reading projects with children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods with texts from Bolivian authors. It has set up literary exhibitions and published a magazine of the Women's Committee. Every 21st March activities are organised to recognise World Poetry Day.

**PEN Brazil:** founded in 1936. It has always been more a club of friends and resembles an academy: it has not been very action-oriented. Also PEN Brazil faces difficulty in trying to be a truly national Centre, and not just of Rio de Janeiro. It has 100 members and is in the process of setting up committees. Some members have supported the creation of CABRA (Refuge House in Brazil). Other activities and outputs include a website, an annual literary award to writers and an annual general meeting, as well as a magazine that was recently re-launched.

**PEN Chile:** PEN Chile was founded in 1935. After the inaction during the dictatorship, it was revived 10 years ago and now has 50 members (from 15 five years ago). PEN International went on a mission to reopen it (the same was done for PEN Argentina). It has recently set up a website, established agreements with universities and foundations and organised a Poetry Day for migrants alongside University of Santiago.

**PEN Colombia:** After 50 years of war, PEN Colombia has struggled. Registered officially in 1983, has been subject to internal conflicts between members. As a first step to revive it, 50-60 writers (poets, essayists and narrators) were brought together to publish an anthology of writing. PEN Colombia was decentralised with chapters in Bogota and El Caribe – the latter currently strongest. The Centre has recently organised a Book Fair, a “new voices” contest and a second anthology of young writers. There is a project to set up a Centre of ‘Afro descendants: so far 15 writers are involved.

**PEN Cuba:** Initially founded in 1945. Dormant until revival in 2015 by 20 writers. Its vision is: Freedom of thinking, cultural activities, inclusion and respect. Initial steps included the drafting of statutes and establishment of the administrative structure, and a public opening event (in September 2018).

**PEN Centre of Cuban writers in Exile:** Miami hosts the Centre but it includes writers based all over the world. It has been active for 59 years. It opposes the opening of the new PEN Cuba Centre because it will have to obey the regime to be able to operate. PEN’s Executive Director explained that this issue was debated in Congress and it was decided to give space to PEN Cuba’s formation to see how it can evolve linked to the opening up of the regime.

**PEN Guadalajara:** Founded in 1994, one of three Centres in Mexico, alongside PEN Mexico and PEN San Miguel de Allende. "We have publications, books, magazines and projects." For example, a contest for stories about violence, focusing on kidappings, murders linked to drug trafficking. "We also created an anthology about people disappeared. We are now looking at putting together an anthology for the three Centres in Mexico. We also have literary workshops for new writers." There are 40 members.

**PEN Guatemala:** It was approved in 2003 at the PEN Annual Congress and was constituted in February 2005. It is the only writers’ organisation with legal status in the country. Main mission: defence of FOE. It appears to exemplify mutual tolerance and understanding with diverse ideological and political views among the key elected officials. Its slogan is: "To serve and not to serve ourselves". The campaign on Dia de Muertos was really successful. They also launched the magazine of the Centre with great effort.

**PEN Honduras:** Founded in 1994. The current situation is that members have been harassed by the government and face legal actions and psychological pressure. The government took photos of the
creative writing workshops organised by PEN Honduras under the civil society programme. A member experienced an attempted kidnap. Since 2009 the situation is really hard - they hope in the next Congress there will be a resolution about the two colleagues that worry the Centre a great deal.

**PEN Mexico**: It was founded in 1924 and worked till 1951. Then it had a dormant period till 1960. They have the Excellence Awards, not only to honour a writer but also for journalists that have died or have been killed. Impunity is a huge problem given the number of journalists killed in Mexico. They are doing research on all the journalists who have died. Blog PEN Piensa has tripled the number of followers on social media (the only platform in the country for writers to discuss FOE issues).

**PEN Haiti**: Set up in 2008 after the visit of PEN International to writers in the country. They have a writers' refuge house with six people who lead the work. They receive young writers. They have support from PEN Quebec. They have plans for decentralisation and they do a festival to "free the word". There is violence against journalists but censorship is a bigger issue in the country.

**PEN Nicaragua**: Founded in 2000. They set up spaces for public debate about FOE as well as forums about books and to debate issues. They provide trainings to independent media on literature and FOE. They have members from all generations that they see as crucial. Forums on books are organised once a month. They also provide training on digital writing. They use social media as a space for independent journalists to be able to denounce issues.

**PEN Paraguay**: Founded in 1943. They publish a magazine twice a year. They have a relationship with American PEN linked to an award from the USA to Paraguayan writers, to publish in translation. They were part of the campaign Dia de Muertos, organising an event linked to the concept of the Empty Chair.

**PEN Puerto Rico**: Founded in 1965. The Vicepresident has been 35 years part of PEN. They give awards. They were part of the campaign PEN Protesta (with funds from PEN International). They organised a congress for writers focusing on panels about LGBTQI, Women and black women. They organised gender campaigns.

**PEN Uruguay**: It is 68 years old and has been mostly inactive; they are in a transition period. Linking back to the mission of PEN: "we have to go back to the source of PEN, literature and freedom of the word". They have an issue with age in membership. They asked for a visit of PEN International to revive the Centre and re-order priorities.

**PEN Venezuela**: Using photographs from a private archive the President has been writing about the reality of Venezuela. "There is not one freedom, but many freedoms. If you lose one, you lose them all. The word founds, creates, frees. The reality that is happening in Venezuela can't be spoken." A few statistics she mentioned: 91% poverty, 55% critical poverty, 90% scarcity of food. The country has the worst malnutrition in the continent. “Abolition of memory was the first step of the dictator”, she said, however, she adds "Twitter has made me strong".

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Relevance**: the event was clearly and directly linked to the areas of work of PEN international and...
the wider PEN family.

**Effectiveness:** the event fulfilled the aims of creating space for Centres to review their realities, assess the situation of FOE in the region and initiate conversations on the issues to focus on in the future. For future meetings, it would be good to include more participatory learning and action exercises to create more space for dialogue. There was limited space to discuss the great work of the Civil Society Programme in the region so perhaps in the near future a gathering could be coordinated (online?) between the four countries that received grants recently to share lessons. Those lessons could then be disseminated to all the Centres in the region to enhance exchange and learning across Centres.

**Efficiency:** The event was extremely well organised and all logistics were in place. All participants seem happy with arrangements (except for lunch). For future meetings, PEN International could consider organising them per sub-region (for e.g. a) South America, b) Central America and Mexico) to focus more on the different realities in each of them and create working plans for joint actions. The role of PEN’s Americas consultant (Alicia Quinones) is crucial to achieve decentralisation. Her coordination of the region can lead to more cost effective capacity building and strengthening the links between PEN Centres. It’s a successful model that PEN International should consider implementing in other regions.

**Impact:** Overall the meeting had visible impact in strengthening relationships between the Centres and with PEN International. It remains to be seen what impact it will have in developing a strategy to work on the issues identified as a region in the future and it will be important to track the influence of the meeting in steering the Centres into action. Also perhaps if not done yet, it would be helpful to send a short survey to participants to assess their view about the event and its impact. The public events were extremely rich in content but it’s unclear if they had as much impact they could have. PEN International alongside PEN Argentina should cultivate and monitor media coverage, as well as expand its social media presence. PEN International should incorporate in future events a press conference linked to the launch of a report (in this case the report on Venezuela). There was press coverage on the launch of the meeting (see this for an example) but it should be assessed to see if the issues discussed (e.g. the situation in Venezuela, Nicaragua and Honduras; linguistic rights in the region, etc.) have resulted in further press and social media coverage.

**Sustainability:** The results of the meeting should be further used in communications by PEN International to showcase: 1) the critical situations in Venezuela, Nicaragua and Honduras and what PEN is doing about it, 2) the situation of linguistic rights in the region and what PEN is doing about it. Also PEN International should consider: 3) supporting the Centres to implement their ideas linked to creative campaigns, 4) deciding on key countries that need to be visited in the region to be revived (e.g. Uruguay made a request and Brazil and Colombia mentioned multiple times their limitations and need for support). 5) Document all the good practice shared by some Centres linked to gender mainstreaming issues (for e.g. work of Women Committees and work on LGBTQI issues) 6) Key formats that are successful and Centres feel comfortable on how to utilise should be documented and provide guidelines across Centres in Spanish that they can share internally (e.g. the excellent use made of the ‘Empty Chair’, PEN Pregunta, Dia de Muertos annual campaign, etc.)

[35](https://www.lanacion.com.ar/2156470-en-defensa-de-la-palabra-verdadera-se-reunen-los-centros-pen-de-america-latina-en-buenos-aires)
Gender and Diversity: The meeting had a good gender balance among participants and speakers in panels. Adults and the older generations were majority with only a few participants representing young writers from the Centres. Beyond the great discussions on female writers' rights on Tuesday's public session, and the short presentation by PEN Argentina about their brand new LGBTQI Committee, there was no other mention across the event about gender and diversity. For achieving gender and diversity mainstreaming, PEN International should start incorporating in events gender analysis in all sessions and issues. This includes protection of writers at risk, advocacy, Civil Society Programme, Centre development, Translation and Linguistic Rights.
8.7. Summary Trip Report: Uganda

Nicola Harford

Uganda
The space for FOE in Uganda is shrinking - as President Museveni holds onto power after 32 years in office - in the face of repressive laws, including Criminal Defamation, and a culture of impunity surrounding those with money and connections.

Ugandan PEN Centre
Ugandan PEN was started in 2001 and has always been based at Makerere University where the three successive presidents are faculty members. The Centre currently has about 20 paid up members who regularly participate in activities but only the six board members are actively committed.

Future development of the Centre, despite its achievements to date and the outward appearance of energy and enthusiasm, is limited by the lack of resources to fund people’s time. PEN in Uganda is small and relatively unknown. Public events when organised are successful but few people are able to put in the work to make them happen. Currently Danson Kahyana (President), Bob Kiski (Vice President) and Beatrice Lamwaka (Secretary) manage activities on a voluntary basis, fitting in with their other commitments.

Freedom to write and writers at risk
PEN Uganda has been somewhat reluctant to directly publicise writers at risk cases locally, and address LGBTI issues openly, because of concerns about the potential backlash especially as several board members work for the government. In addition its Civil Society Programme partners include the Prison Service and individual schools, which relies on government approval.

PEN Uganda did not issue a public statement about Bobi Wine, the musician turned politician whose arrest and torture sparked protests which were violently put down in August 2018. Danson said he provided background information to international media and others but that “a hard statement on Bobi Wine would be the end of PEN Uganda... we are walking on a tightrope like everyone.”

However in recent days (November 2018) PEN Uganda has issued a joint statement with PEN International to protest the re-arrest of Stella Nyanzi, an academic and writer on LGBTI issues and an outspoken critic of Museveni who is highly active on social media.

Communications
A £2,000 grant was awarded to Ugandan PEN to improve its profile and visibility. It now has a functioning website and Facebook page and plans to increase its presence on social media.

Fundraising
It has been hard for Ugandan PEN to market itself although other cultural and FOE organisations raise money in country. This is largely due to lack of time, but also a limited number of suitable donors exist (Miles Morland Foundation is one possible avenue).

Relationship with PEN International and other Centres

36 used interchangeably with PEN Uganda
Ugandan PEN is deeply appreciative of the support it receives from PEN International although it feels that the secretariat isn’t always aware of how difficult it is for writers to set up and maintain Centres without resources. PEN Uganda officials have participated in CSP capacity development workshops in Oxford, Malawi and the Philippines (Danson as facilitator), in meetings of the Writers in Prison and Women Writers Committees, ICORN meeting in Amsterdam, the Pan African network meeting in Johannesburg and at Annual Congresses. It has connections with PEN Centres in Zambia, Malawi and Sierra Leone amongst others: and has had discussions with PEN USA and Scottish PEN in the hopes of developing joint activities.

**CSP project 1: Harnessing Rare Voices**

Led by Danson Kahyana, the ‘Harnessing Rare Voices’ creative writing project took place over three years 2015-18 in Luzira maximum security prison – both male and female wings. PEN facilitators conducted multiple workshops on poetry, drama and short story forms with male (approx. 120) and female (approx. 20) inmates. Femrite (the Ugandan women’s writers association) and other donors provided reading materials. The project is widely thought to be a success.

The project faced a number of challenges relating to prison security protocols, caution on the part of both the authorities and the participants, which sometimes led to delays and cancelled sessions. As a result the budget had to be stretched over a longer time period than planned. Also, facilitators had to fit the work into their other commitments, adjust to the often low educational attainment of inmates and manage expectations.

**Tangible outputs**

The most tangible achievement of this work has been a newsletter containing inmates writing and in June 2018 the publication ‘As I stood dead before the world’ - an anthology of prisoners’ writing. Despite the gender disparity in inmates participating in the project the selection process resulted in roughly equal numbers of men and women’s pieces being published. An initial run of 50 copies was printed: the prison authorities then asked that the cover be changed to use a different picture of the prison. Copies will be distributed to the participating inmates, government officials, Ugandan Human Rights Council, and the remaining 50% of the 500 print run will be sold. Until it has been formally launched PEN has refrained from publicising it widely.
**Wider outcomes**
The deeply moving poems, stories and playlets were an opportunity for prisoners to express themselves, resulting in greater confidence and self-esteem according to Christine Naigaga, Welfare Officer at Luzira women’s prison. She went onto say: “... for women who committed crimes ... like murdering her husband you think they must be a terrible person but when you get to know the circumstances surrounding the case [ you realise you] shouldn’t have judged her.” This understanding helps her in her work with prisoners.

Some women are continuing to meet without PEN facilitators. In addition two released prisoners have been in touch with PEN and asked to join, and one was hired by the African Prison Project. Elizabeth Namfuka, Commissioner for Social Welfare, Integration and Rehabilitation in Prisons, who is third in the Prison hierarchy and wrote the afterword to the anthology, was very positive about the project: “Helps us with rehabilitation – get outside world in. Shows the inmates that someone trusts and cares about them – treating them like human beings.”

PEN has clearly shown the Prison authorities the value of this work, but this has not yet led to the hoped-for commitment to put resources into continuing and scaling up creative writing in prisons.

**CSP project 2: Schools and human rights**
A grant of £14,000 was awarded for this project, which was implemented over two years between 2016-18, and led by Beatrice Lamwaka. PEN seeks to use creative writing as a vehicle for teaching and sensitising about human rights and for children to gain a voice to tell stories of human rights violations and work with teachers to address human rights in schools/teaching and mainstream the issue within the education system.

PEN Uganda worked with teachers in five schools to run creative writing workshops for students: numbers appear to have been between 20 and 40 per school with girls predominating. The activity including facilitation from published writers was well received by both teachers and students. Barbara Oketta, teacher at Kira Secondary School said: “Generally students enjoyed the project – we loved such activities”

Whilst schools do have some safeguarding procedures for the children in their care, with nominated counsellors (both peers and teachers) and procedures for reporting and dealing with abuse, it was not clear that much thought had been given to the possible negative impact of the project on the participants. It is also not clear that the structural and systemic issues raised by the writings are being used to spark debate and action, or link within subjects and lessons within schools.

**Tangible outputs**
At the schools themselves students showcased their work in assembly and posted their work on the school noticeboard or produce newsletters. Beatrice Lamwaka is editing an anthology of children’s writing and material from a workshop on teaching human rights. This is behind schedule but anticipated to be complete by the end of 2018.

**Wider outcomes**
Benefits include exposure to writers, mindset changes, widening of perceptions and how to voice issues, and the potential/ability to be published writers and gain status.

It is doubtful whether the schools project, hinging on the commitment of individual teachers, is the right intervention for a wider policy change around curricula or whether the community dialogue activity can actually link directly with participating schools given that children at secondary schools
often come from a wide catchment area. PEN Uganda plans to develop a reading and writing project with slum children in collaboration with Save the Children and the City administration.

The long-term outcome of integrating literature and human rights within school curricula will need a strategic and concerted push, and given the antipathy towards literature and the humanities expressed at highest political levels, it is an ambitious and possibly unrealistic goal. That said, Ugandan literature is now included in the school curricula alongside western classics. This also begs the question of whether written literature is the most appropriate form of expression to be cultivating in schools: performance poetry – a freer more contemporary approach - is gaining a following in Uganda.

Criminal Defamation project (Uganda)
Since 2016 PEN International and PEN Centres in Africa have carried out a focused regional campaign funded by the UN Democracy Fund (UNDEF) to repeal criminal defamation and insult laws in Africa, which are a serious barrier to FOE across the continent. The project sought to build the capacity of writers through training and mentoring to advocate for the repeal of such laws. Advocacy at the national and regional levels, including at the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and the Pan African Parliament, was underpinned by research in four countries - Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia - to demonstrate the impact of these laws on writers seeking to report on land-grabbing and other corrupt practices by business people and those with political connections.

Tangible outputs
Ugandan PEN identified and interviewed a number of journalists who had been charged with Criminal Defamation: resulting in the project report “Stifling Dissent, Impeding Accountability: Criminal Defamation Laws in Africa.” Ronald Nahabwe, reporter, who was charged in 2015 and only acquitted two years later said: “the Criminal Defamation report is really appreciated...organisations like PEN Uganda uplift us with a sense of solidarity.”

PEN held a launch event, attended by Salil Tripathi, Chair of the PEN Writers in Prison Committee, and meetings with stakeholders including writers and writers organisations, media houses, human rights organisations, academics and students at Makerere and Kyambogo universities in Uganda.

Wider outcomes
Kenneth Ntende, a human rights lawyer who presented at these events said: “the contribution of PEN.... is in sensitisation...writers have got to point where [they] understand they can fight Criminal Defamation charges.” But for sustained change he and Ronald suggested that the work needs to expand to areas outside Kampala and be integrated in training and education curricula for journalists and writers.

PEN Uganda is frank in admitting that they do not have evidence that they have progressed the repeal of laws in Uganda: meetings with the Police Media Crimes Unit made it clear that the authorities believe (or use) the fact of unethical media practices to justify the laws, and indeed there is a recognised need to professionalise the media and strengthen adherence to ethical standards. So far the planned meeting with the key politician in relation to Criminal Defamation, the Chairperson of the Parliamentary Forum on the Media, has not happened. However in identifying, reaching out to and engaging multiple stakeholders, the aim of building a coalition to further the campaign has been started.
## Conclusions and Recommendations

**Relevance:** Both CSP projects seem relevant and meet real needs.
- New project design processes should be based on needs assessments, which include prospective partners from the outset to ensure better buy in and a closer fit with the realities on the ground.
- Reading culture is limited in Uganda: creative writing projects should give equal weight to reading and discussion, as well as writing, and also consider incorporating other forms of literary expression.
- Safeguarding and protection: measures to ensure confidentiality, to anticipate and deal with negative psychosocial effects and to address abuse should be anticipated and embedded in the design process of any project or programme implemented by Centres and their partners, especially when working with children.

**Effectiveness:** The projects (CSP and CD) have been well-received, and professionally delivered, and the personal commitment of PEN Uganda officials and facilitators enormously appreciated.
- It is essential the schools anthology is published soon, and that the second print run of ‘As I stood dead..’ is pushed through.
- Develop a communication strategy around both to leverage publicity, increase PEN’s visibility, and promote longer term policy and advocacy aims.

**Efficiency:** The projects appear to have used their budgets well, although there were inefficiencies resulting from delayed and cancelled visits to prisons and schools. Partners were happy with PEN’s organisation for the most part.

**Impact / Sustainability:**
Incremental steps towards policy change around Criminal Defamation have been made, with sensitisation and education of a large number of stakeholders, moves to build a coalition, and initial discussions with policy makers.
- It would be a pity if the momentum created was lost so it would be good to see some additional resources to take this forward.
- Activities and outputs of CSP projects could be leveraged to achieve more impact by and within the host institutions (e.g. debates and discussions within school by students and staff about addressing abuse; prison authorities using the anthology to push for greater integration of educational and welfare interventions).
8.8. Summary Trip Report: Zambia

Nicola Harford

Zambia

Freedom of expression has seen a steady deterioration in Zambia over the past six years now ranking 113 out of 180 countries compared to 72 in 2013. Numerous examples of repression and media violations were provided by interlocutors and have been documented in the Zambian section of PEN’s report on Criminal Defamation in Africa (see below). The situation is exacerbated by related issues such as inefficient media regulation and the lack of an access to information act. On the literary front the government does not prioritise the arts and culture for their own sake but has recategorised them as an economic sector in tandem with tourism under one Ministry. Zambia seems in search of an authentic literary voice: few writers get published and the publishing industry mostly produces textbooks (as in Zimbabwe and Uganda). PEN’s work across its three strategic outcomes is therefore highly relevant and much needed. This view is endorsed by partners and external organisations in Zambia.

PEN Zambia

Pen Zambia was established in 2004: it currently has around 20 active members who pay a nominal ZMK100 (US$10) per annum. Like PEN Uganda it gives the appearance of being active and energetic, but most activities are initiated and implemented by a small number of committed members. It is quite well known in Lusaka, having run schools’ writing clubs, and hosted monthly ‘Writers’ Circle’ meetings for many years. It is becoming better known outside the capital with the more recent introduction of a weekly literary review radio programme of the same name on Radio 2 of the national broadcaster Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation (ZNBC), anchored by Daniel Sikazwe (PEN Zambia Secretary) and featuring writers, poets, performers and broadcasters.

“Writers Circle has contributed not only to highlighting literature but in creating a voice for the Zambian literary form.” (Gankhanani Moffat Moyo, Poet and lecturer).

In this endeavour and others PEN Zambia is supported by a number of partnership arrangements. For example, since its inception PEN Zambia has collaborated with the Alliance Francaise in Lusaka. The Alliance Francaise is the main external organisation supporting the arts in Zambia, and provides space free of charge to PEN Zambia for holding its writers’ circle meetings, as well as for book launches and other events. The present Alliance Francaise Director, Julie Girard, says PEN is the ‘go to’ organisation for literary issues. This arrangement is seen as beneficial for both parties giving PEN Zambia access to meeting space, organisational support and advertising/publicity (which would otherwise be very expensive). It helps the Alliance Francaise to fulfil its mandate to support the host country culture, and PEN Zambia plans to present a funding proposal for promoting mother tongue literature amongst young people, consolidating what it has been doing previously.

The Lusaka National Museum is another partner offering a venue for events and publicity through its own networks and acting as educational resource people for PEN Zambia’s activities. They have collaborated to host Mother Tongue Day events and adult poetry reading sessions with support from UNESCO. Victoria Phiri, Director says: “The special thing about PEN is they carry an audience and they take advantage of our audience... it’s a powerful space.”
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PEN Zambia is also partnering with a small local civil society organisation, Justice for Women and Orphans Association (JWOA), which provides it with dedicated office space, utilities, access to internet and use of a 4x4 vehicle, in return for support to JWOA's communications: PEN Zambia helped to make a TV documentary, radio programme and print articles and conducted sensitisation of journalists on the issues JWOA works on. The Director, Felix Kunda, visited Chongwe School, where PEN implements its mother tongue language project, to talk about issues such as women's land rights.

All these partner organisations were very complimentary about PEN Zambia, its activities and dedication recognising that the relationships are symbiotic and add value to their own work.

**Relationship with PEN International and other Centres**

PEN Zambia feels it has a good relationship with the secretariat and over the years Centre officials have participated in a number of international and regional meetings, including CSP workshops, the June 2018 meeting of the Translation and Linguistic Rights Committee in Biel and the Pan African Network meeting held in Johannesburg in 2016. PEN Zambia does feel however that expectations of Centres in the Global South are set too high considering tight financial resources and reliance on volunteers.

Daniel Sikazwe, Secretary, believes that “PEN has done a lot ... trying to help them [centres] to be sustainable but they don’t have strong foundations to build on.” Nicholas Kavinga (President) thinks that PEN International could do more to twin affluent Centres with others – providing resources including expertise.

**CSP project: Promoting indigenous languages in schools**

PEN Zambia has for some years run a programme for schools clubs, most recently funded (2015-17) by a £10,000 Sida grant. The project was coordinated by Marita Banda (PEN Zambia), a published writer and teacher, and supported by other PEN Zambia officials and resource people. The main aims include exposing young Zambians to a variety of written and oral materials to appreciate the beauty and value of indigenous Zambian languages and promote their creative written and oral expression in these indigenous languages. In the most recent iteration, activities took place in five schools including private, government, boarding and peri-urban schools. PEN Zambia provided orientation to ‘matrons’ and ‘patrons’ – selected teachers of literature, who often run in-school Pen and Press Clubs anyway. PEN Zambia facilitators ran creative workshops to introduce different forms of expression to the students and encourage them to use local languages, and PEN provided materials, transport to events etc.

The best work was selected for presentation at an annual ceremony where students perform and read their pieces and prizes are awarded. While many positive changes were recorded in learner attitudes the project faced a major setback when widespread plagiarism was detected in much of the work submitted (the awarding of certificates and prizes to schools and individual learners may have created a perverse incentive to cheat). PEN Zambia tackled this issue head on, involving multiple stakeholders such as the Zambia Police Intellectual Property Unit and Copyright Department of Ministry of Trade and Commerce and the Lusaka National Museum, as well as teachers and parents.

**Tangible outputs**

The most obvious outputs are the written and oral pieces dealing with contemporary issues that affect children themselves, showcased at schools and in public events. PEN has discussed producing an anthology with the National Arts Council. Some schools are able to produce magazines and newsletters finances are a challenge.
Angela Sinzala says that as a result of the project, “students are very creative and self-motivated, but that students need to read a lot to be creative – short stories, novellas, novels to be shared with students. Not easy to publish a book in Zambia – rare to have books in homes – people only buy text books.”

The learners themselves appear to recognise the value of what they have experienced: One boy at Chongwe School said: “He [PEN facilitator] taught us something about preserving our local languages and the importance of keeping them.” Another asserted: “When I use the mother language I tried to make the skill ... if I write in Nyanja people can understand and will buy my story...”

Our observation is that children are very keen to perform and perhaps more interested in oral forms of expression than written ones – we witnessed lively performances of songs, comedy skits, poems, rapping, monologues and dialogues. A few were in English, and from these we gained an impression that some of the themes could be better developed and further explored in debates and discussions.

PEN Zambia conducted surveys before and after the project to assess outcomes and has shared these with PEN international and the National Arts Council.

Wider outcomes
Sustainability of PEN Zambia’s work as it stands depends in large part on the motivation of individual teachers and the level of support they receive from their school administration. However Pen and Press Clubs are well-established in the school system, and could continue to provide a channel for initiatives around mother tongue literature, and providing a stepping stone for students who wish to pursue careers in journalism and literature and arts.

The project has helped raise PEN Zambia’s profile in the education sector especially through the publicity around tackling plagiarism (reflecting a wider problem of malpractice in the Zambian educational system) and brought it into contact with a wider range of stakeholders than hitherto. It has increased platforms for wider presentation and discussion of linguistic issues in Zambia through literary events, and radio and TV coverage.

A barrier to the successful integration of mother tongue languages is that there are over 70 ethnic languages and not all children are comfortable in the regional language that is used at the school they attend (there are eight official languages of education in Zambia). In addition qualifications tend to emphasise proficiency in English. There is a general lack of materials especially in regional languages and teachers have not until recently received much training or support in this area.
Criminal Defamation project (Zambia - See Uganda summary for details)
Essentially, PEN Zambia followed the same process as in Uganda, collating material from interviews conducted with writers and journalists affected by Criminal Defamation laws, and supplying information for the synthesis ‘Stifling Dissent’ report. It held conferences and meetings to launch the report and discuss the implications of the laws in Zambia. PEN Zambia identified and worked with partners to conduct sensitisation and sought to start the process of building a coalition to advocate for reform of these and other legal obstacles to FOE and access to information.

Tangible outputs
The Stifling Dissent report was well-received although it is not clear that the momentum created by PEN Zambia’s activities has been maintained. Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) Zambia attended a Criminal Defamation conference but has not entered into a formal partnership with PEN to take further steps although it is active in publicising and protesting defamation cases.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed with the Livingstone Press Club (LPC), an association of media institutions and individuals in Zambia’s southernmost city, to collaborate on campaigns around Criminal Defamation laws and lobby for an Access to Information bill. Activities included training for LPC members, some of whom had been charged with Criminal Defamation and all of whom feel the chilling effects on their profession, to kickstart a campaign.

Kelvin Mudenda (Secretary General, LPC) said: “The training was useful – hope to have closer collaboration because the information was rich. Yardstick that it set was promising.”

Wider outcomes
The barriers to progress on repealing Criminal Defamation laws in Zambia are considerable as successive governments and presidents have brought the weight of the state to bear against independent voices in the media and arts sectors. Unity within the media is not strong and no national body exists to represent their interests. The LPC has lobbied the Minister for Information to establish this entity and feels PEN Zambia could be an important partner.

Jane Chirwa of MISA Zambia and the LPC pointed out the power of literature in conveying messages to a wide audience in a different way from journalistic reporting, and PEN Zambia’s unique position in this respect.

PEN Zambia has found that members who are directly affected – especially journalists - become passionate and tend to get closely involved in the issue. Those who are literary writers are less likely to pick up on FOE issues. Most PEN members are interested in professional improvement rather than activities that try to overcome obstacles that government places in their way. Even journalists are not always aware of these limitations. Nicholas believes as writers we “need to create awareness amongst ourselves before addressing government.”

Brian Hatyoka suggests that a way forward would be to convene number of stakeholder groups including Civil society, MPS/Ministers, interest groups, affected journalists, police, judiciary, legal system and have PEN/LPC make a presentation to them.

Daniel feels more could be done to highlight the landmark case that African Union is using to decriminalise Criminal Defamation (Konote v. Burkina Faso) and to raise the profile of this issue especially for countries where it is still a criminal offence. For example by organising public rallies and a summit to bring judges together to sensitise them to the lack of constitutionality and threat to FOE that these laws pose.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Relevance:
We conclude that PEN Zambia’s overall relevance is indisputable, with few other organisations competing or coexisting in the same space around literature and FOE. However it does not appear, apart from the Criminal Defamation project, to have been addressing structural barriers to writing and taking up specific cases of writers at risk, though we acknowledge that most of the latter are journalists.\(^{38}\)

The lack of reading culture was mentioned by several people, as was the changing consumption habits of young people especially with the social media

- PEN Zambia could engage more with other forms of literary expression – poetry and oral literature in particular – and digital formats for literary output such as blogs and e-book production

PEN Zambia has gained a lot of experience in promoting and training around mother tongue languages, particularly in schools. This could be built on in various ways:

- For example, the LPC recommended that PEN work with journalists to encourage the use of local languages – not just regional ones but other minority languages – most news is in English which excludes a lot of people.

Effectiveness:
Partnerships, and the embeddedness of key PEN Zambia officials and members in the arts, literary, educational and media scenes in Zambia contribute to its profile and effectiveness. The radio programme ‘Writers Circle’ provides an excellent opportunity to showcase literary and related issues and could be more innovative:

- Work with ZNBC and other partners such as Lusaka Museum to host occasional outside broadcasts or record shows with live audiences, storytelling and discussion.

Efficiency:
Partnerships are a key factor in enabling PEN Zambia to be cost-effective and achieve much with the limited funds at their disposal. It also helps that key PEN officials and members are able to fit PEN related activities in and around their paid work.

Impact / Sustainability:
As in Uganda it seems that the defamation work has given PEN Zambia credibility, has had some traction with stakeholders and sparked interest and engagement which deserves to be built on.

- PEN secretariat consider seeking further funding to support a wider programme of sensitisation and advocacy on Criminal Defamation, with pathways to the ultimate goal of repeal laid out, partner organisations identified and clear interim milestones detailed.

With the schools project we feel that PEN’s experience could be leveraged more strategically, using outputs, impacts and partnerships already developed as the entrypoint:

- Recommend strongly that PEN Zambia pursues an approach that institutionalises improved teaching of mother tongue literature and creative writing by aiming to work primarily with teachers or teacher-trainers in partnership with the Ministry of Education, and in consultation with other partners such as the Lusaka Museum, National Arts Council, Alliance Francaise. Invest more time in conducting needs assessment and building sustainability into project design.

- It could be worth considering using the Writers Circle programme as a distance learning opportunity for teachers and students in mother tongue literature and language studies, or developing a separate programme with ZNBC.

---

\(^{38}\)Fumba CHAMA (known as Pilato), a singer-songwriter, is the only Zambian in the PEN 2018 Case list
8.9. Recommendations to PEN by respondents to Online Survey

The following are all recommendations that respondents made from among the 106 total (anonymised, uncorrected and grouped by us under our own headings). Respondents were all from within PEN: either PEN Board members, staff or PEN Centre members/officials.

The question was:

Q. 22: Looking forward, what recommendations do you have for developing PEN International’s activities over the next four years (up to 2022)? Please give up to three suggestions (optional)

(For graphs showing all other responses, see attached pdf document.)

Recommendation analysis/categorisation

1. PROGRAMME APPROACHES
   General
   Freedom of Expression
   Writers at Risk
   Supporting spaces for freedom of expression in civil society

2. SECRETARIAT
   General
   Role of PEN
   Communications
   Fundraising and management

3. PEN CENTRES
   Development and support
   CSP projects

4. GENDER, EQUITY & DIVERSITY

PROGRAMME APPROACHES

General
- PEN International has ventured all the more into regional programmes and projects in the past years and this can be strengthened and continued.
- Define priority axes of cross-cutting programs / activities (for Latin America, for example).

Outcome 1: Challenging structural barriers to freedom of expression

- The situation of human rights and freedom of expression is worsening worldwide: we need a clearer strategy on how to help writers and the civilian population cope with the risks and problems they face.
- Work on online freedoms and responsibility
- Work on fake news
- Work on threats from non-state actors
- The worldwide assault on the integrity, efficacy and viability of the fourth estate has profound implications for democratic freedom of expression. Ownership and control of media is part of
this; too often various channels are simply propaganda outlets. Social media means now everyone is a broadcaster / commentator if they want to be. Are we developing projects and policies to protect free expression while educating people on the realities of defamation and corrosion of hate speech? Can we work with others to create alternatives to the social media behemoths, offering quality journalism through newsfeeds and guarantees of no governmental or corporate surveillance? These are massive questions but will only become more pressing as technological advances and deterioration of democratic leadership grow apace. As a global organisation with strong roots in over 100 countries we should be thinking big and, as writers, thinking creatively. PEN is well placed to adopt a leading role. I hope we will.

- Freedom of expression, writer at risk
- Enhance our communications and be more strategic in advocacy & campaigning - do less & more depth
- To support freedom of expression in Colombia.
- Defending freedom of expression.

**Outcome 2: Supporting Writers at Risk**

- The situation of human rights and freedom of expression is worsening worldwide: we need a clearer strategy on how to help writers and the civilian population cope with the risks and problems they face.
- Expand ICORN network’s host cities to other countries with grants from network
- Support refugees writers and writers at risk
- Include authors from outside Europe informing Europe on difficulties writers elsewhere are facing, making diplomatic moves towards countries where writers are most at risk - Turkey, China, Russia... Reach out towards writers from countries at war or countries which have gained independence only recently
- Continued direct support and protection for writers at risk
- Continue support political prisoners.
- Exploring more options to give better protection to writers in exile
- Develop strategy for direct support to writers at risk in region where located
- The message does not always come across. Our impression is that young readers find it overstated, and too dramatic. Readers are intelligent enough to sense the seriousness of writers at risk and in prison.
- Enhancing Make Space program that offers many possibilities for wider approach to those in need as refugees, displaced and persecuted in the world.
- Better communication and action through forming small international teams that could operate on short notice beyond the committees adjusted frames when emergency arises and later be dispersed.
- Make visible the actions that made writers free
  - Highlight the positive aspect of a government that frees a writer.
- More pressure on governments that imprison writers.
- Defense of writers at risk
- Solidarity and protection of writers at risk.

**Outcome 3: Supporting spaces for freedom of expression in civil society**

- Promotion of literature and freedom of expression
- Further strengthen CSP programme, Digital Media Freedom Strategy and Digital Media Toolkit Development
- Use linguistic rights and translation of literature as tools to approach sustainable peace in both
global and regional context

- Do free the words festival in every continent once a year to have more exposure to our members to each other’s and also to the general public. Make this festival as well known brand not just as literature festival but also as Freedom of Expression festival
- Develop a clearer approach to the institutional aim of "promotion of literature"
- Continue its promotion of literature and linguistic rights.
- Support the development of mother tongue-based materials in developing countries, especially indigenous and Islamized languages, for example in the Philippines
- Emphasis on the promotion of regional literature as a vital part of Philippine Literature
- Prioritizing campaigning for linguistic rights in an updated way
- Concentrate more on grassroots projects – transfer skills to journalists/writers whenever possible (e.g. security training)
- Ask writers to become more engaged with their Centres (we ask our members to attend immigration hearings for asylum seeking writers, and do more to engage with foreign Centres)
- More literary activities to mobilize writers globally
- Increase support for the displaced writers’ rehabilitation and refugee children’s education
- Increase advocacy for the linguistic rights of ethnic minorities
- Encourage the creation of a network of exchange of digital books. (Sp. Original)
- More proactive education of the general populace and campaigning for writers in prison and at risk
- Programs to protect immigrant children’s educational rights
- More proactive programs for education and literary rights for girls and women
- PEN International to seek country literary situational overview and involve PEN Centres in the designing of projects ideas
- Take human rights work (approach?) to help citizens understand their roles, rights and responsibilities in societies.
- Influence attitudes of people to development through books.
- Have more interaction to grow ideas for small range development adjusted to specific regions, including the wider publishing scope.
- Support and encourage more literature denominated secondary, but have their relevance, such as fantasy literature (science fiction, fantasy fiction and others), children and youth literature, indigenous and minority literature and others.
- Promote so that indigenous and minority literatures are recognized and awarded in a context of equality with traditional literatures.
- Greater exchange of works of the members of the PEN with group or regional publications.
- Promotion of literature and influence on public policies.

PEN International secretariat - organisational development & internal capacity

General/continuity

- Continue the good work that so far has been done, concentrate on trouble areas, continue to inform about activities
- I am looking forward to and hoping for steady continuity!
- PEN Int’l has developed a lot in the last four years, and is now on the right track:-
- Communication: with centers, has improved. Internally? To the world, has improved | IT: has improved on all levels | Activities and programs: has improved
- These three issues should still be developed.
- Less bureaucracy and less favour of ideological order (Google translate)
Role of PEN/uniqueness

- Improve on its strategy to gain more visibility globally as a human rights and freedom of expression organisation to reflect the great work it’s doing in these areas
- Emphasize differences among PEN International and other organisations
- Ensure PEN International clearly differentiates itself from human rights and freedom of expression organisations and develops strategies and programmes all of which are underpinned by all kinds of writing internationally relevant to ALL PEN Centres
- Improve visibility on international and national press as well as on the web
- Writers need to get together more and act. Its the role of PEN to persuade the writing community to act effectively.
- Addition of Chinese and Arabic as official languages of PEN - the number of FOE cases and writers from this language groups is significant - they do not necessarily speak the European languages English, Spanish or French.

Communications

- Improved external communication
- Better e-mail communication of the four Committees with PEN centers in the world; more email messages from the president of PEN International
- Saw Pen spokesperson on Al Jazeera this week. In addition to emails would be good to have short video content for social media sharing. Would be good to tell good news stories too, and get more general media pick up for branding for the organisation and its activities
- Integrate literature in its communications better
- More PUBLICITY is needed. And work with more media contacts. And live, across-the-world reportage on literary developments. Newslettered to all PEN members.
- Improve internal and external communication (newsletter, social networks, press, etc.)
- Enhance our comms & be more strategic in advocacy & campaigning - do less & more depth
- More attention for countries we hear not so much about, e.g. African countries.
- Strengthen the presence in social networks
- Communications about the work of PEN International are scarce (compared to other times) and the report of the work of the presidency and secretariat is null.
- Have a solid virtual platform with significant programs (magazine, opinions of writers, etc.) and links, forming a network with the virtual sites of the PEN Centers
- Permanently update the information about the Centers (managers, programs and activities, etc.)

Funding & management

- Step up fundraising
- Consolidate financial and management structure of PEN International to ensure sound base of operation beyond the next 4 years;
- Avoid reliance on small number of external funders
- Fundraise to expand the Secretariat, especially the programmes team in order to meet the needs of the Centres and Writers at Risk
- Diversify its funding sources, through the appointment of a fundraiser
- More diverse funding base
- Better fiscal information.
- Increase funding base and invest in capacity at secretariat .... currently all hugely overworked
• (VFM) Change the choice of venues for conventions in exotic and overpriced destinations
• that international congresses be held in other regions or cities to make them more accessible.
• take care of the training of its managers
• Needs to become more of a professionalized NGO with staffing, communications and fundraising operations.

PEN Centres

Development and support

• Help develop new Centres
• Create more PEN Centres in Africa and South America
• Help to activate and establish PEN Centers in Asia.
• Support the opening of PEN Centers in countries vulnerable to authoritarian regimes in Latin America.
• Support and monitor work of national PEN Centres
• Follow-up to centers and their work to be more effective.
• Strengthen support to PEN Centres in Asia, Africa and South America to pursue PEN goals
• Take Central America much more seriously
• Greater support to the Central American countries, because they are in social discontent because of corruption at all levels, and because PEN centers in these regions are in the middle of this chaos defending freedom of expression and human rights.
• It must turn its gaze to Latin America, it is very concentrated in the Middle East, Asia and in Africa
• Greater concentration on the Asia Pacific - yes, where I am from, but it has profound Freedom of Expression problems including terrible rates of imprisoned authors.
• PEN International should open more to Francophone countries in the future (the structure being more Anglo-centric)
• More closely take into account specific character of Russia. *(may mean in relation to FOE)*
• Promote further the dynamics of regional and continental integration, especially in the sub-Saharan space
• Support PEN regional bodies. While the challenges of such regional bodies are understood, when well managed they would work to assist PEN International achieve its objectives
• Revisit PEN African network
• Conduct regional congresses
• More meetings at the continent level can generate spaces to consolidate the work
• Promote even more regional meetings with similar cultures
• Technical assistance and training for members of PEN centers in developing countries
• Strengthen relations with local centers
• Communication with centers
• More frequent communication with PEN chapters.
• Rigorous supervision regarding the creation of International PEN Centers.
• Have a clear policy on engaging with former PEN chapter members or office bearers who are in disgrace with their chapters
• Let the Centres be independent and do their own thing. Let’s have a lot fewer attacks on Centres. Please.
• Centres need to be made aware of what’s going on at the international office, so they can work on their projects from a point of knowledge.
• Develop video conference capability to maximize inter-Centre connection and minimize cost.
• Improvement of the level of communication and exchanges.
• Seven days a week monitoring of email to the head office.
• Improve the coordination with PEN Centres in order to get better impact on campaigns / Be more dynamic and creative when designing the campaigns
• Help connect individual Centres to donor communities, so that Centres broaden their financial base.
• Provide information for the financing of the PEN Centers
• Train Centres more and more in areas like project planning and management, resource mobilization, and Centre administration. This is already happening, but more of it should be encouraged.
• Generally, being someone from the region outside Manila, I would like to see more activities that touch-base in the regions.
• Projects collaboration among PEN Centers for example in South East Asia.
• More bilateral work with existing PEN centers
• More responsiveness to other PEN members than simply the local secretariat which controls all communications with the International Center
• More financial support to centers
• Increase interest in events in national centers.
• Visualize how the associated writers, in a practical way, benefit from belonging to a PEN Center
• Support relations between the PEN Centers and the Ministries of Culture and Education

CSP / other programmes

• Should have someone assign to make sure grant are working according the project design, because some grantee Pen centers need support in implementing project according to the design.
• Expand on activities of Centres that have successfully implemented the civil society programme to help them grow
• (This seems to refer to CSP projects). The better part of their budget should be more focused on financing the actual activities on their plan rather than on the processes of putting the plan into work. A re-strategizing on this aspect will be more effective, for example instead of spending much resources bringing people together to discuss on particular subject, discussions could be facilitated through other means other than bringing people together. From this approach it means resources can be channeled for the actual implementation of the plan.
• Increase the amount of money given for projects. 10,000 Dollars for a two-year project is little. 20,000 USD would suffice.
• Strengthen support to Centres participating in CSP ..training m&e, gender, for public events & communications
• Support the PEN with less resources to develop their projects.
• Support economically specific writers training projects
• Design training programs to be taught in the most vulnerable countries

Gender, equity & diversity Issues

• Please, let’s have a lot less one-sided and divisive politics and more literature. Let’s accept other opinions that don’t necessarily chime with theirs. Let’s listen to people who may think somewhat differently
• Support women writers
• Support expression of minority opinion
• Work on LGBTI issues
- Deepen the gender work
- Work to ensure tolerance
- Support for Gender issues.
- More programs for the LGBT community
- Prioritize campaigning for linguistic rights in an updated way
- Strengthen strategies and projects around the defense of the rights of women, LGBTI communities and indigenous communities.
  Encourage the creation of networks of women writers
- More proactive education of the general populace and campaigning for writers in prison and at risk
- Programs to protect immigrant children’s educational rights
- More proactive programs for education and literary rights for girls and women
- Strengthen participation in the movement of Centres/writers from global south & middle east particularly writers from minority languages
- The work on LGBTI rights issues is null. We need an LGTBI Rights Committee.
- Support for young writers.
- Promote so that indigenous and minority literatures are recognized and awarded in a context of equality with traditional literatures.
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