

CONSULTATION SURVEY – DRAFT GLOBAL STRATEGY – JUNE 2020 UPDATE

#NextStrategy: Form 1 - General Feedback, Shared Values and Key Capabilities

This survey is being conducted to gather feedback from each national entity on Amnesty International's draft global strategy. The results will be used to inform the finalization of the strategy which will then be presented to the Global Assembly in July.

Question 1 - What is the likelihood of the draft strategy providing an overall inspiring portfolio of work and vision for our supporters and society at large?

1 (very unlikely) 2 (unlikely) 3 (unsure) 4 (likely) 5 (very likely)

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please provide what you believe are the **top three** opportunities and strengths of this draft strategy

1. The focus on two main areas of work (goal 1 and 2): Freedom of Expression & Civic Space and Inequality & Discrimination – good combination of “old” and “new” topics for Amnesty.
2. The focus on ESC-rights are much appreciated. Amnesty Sweden supports the initiative to work more with a focus on contributing factors to HR-violations. However, the focus on taxation must be decreased. When focusing on contributing factors one must work with a constant analysis, and to say that issues about taxation would be the answer to many HR-violations means jumping to conclusion.
3. Very positive reactions to the focus on people power in the consultation within the Swedish Section, however negative to the idea of a global mobilization platform. Having said this, the Swedish section would see a great value in AIS developing and coordinating common resources and methods for the sections and structures to use for increased mobilization.

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please provide what you believe are the **top three** weaknesses and the specific changes you would recommend strengthening the draft strategy

1. We must decrease the number of topics to work with/focus on in the strategy. The combination of areas within the 7 focus areas are too broad. It means in practice that we will increase our range of work and this will hinder us from being more focused. We will need to narrow down. Goal 2 is too broad-reaching.
2. Human Rights Relief are not mentioned in the draft. It must be. Perhaps under “tactics and approaches” in the end paragraph of page 8 or as a fourth headline under “key capabilities” on p 9.
3. The ambition and level of abstraction varies too much between the different focus areas. The focus areas should either be set at an ambition to strive for or they should be formulated so it is realistic to reach them by 2028. And find a common level in how concrete/abstract they are described.

OUR SHARED VALUES

The shared values committed to in the draft strategy include (see page 3 of First Draft):

- **Equity & Inclusion:** We celebrate the rich diversity of our movement and prioritise creating an inclusive culture.
- **Trust & Integrity:** We come together as a community of human rights activists with a shared purpose and commitment.
- **Boldness & Innovation:** As passionate human rights activists, we always seek to increase our impact.

Question 2 - What is the likelihood of these values inspiring Amnesty members, staff, and volunteers and creating the conditions to maximise our human rights impact?

1 (very unlikely)	2 (unlikely)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please tell us what do these concepts mean in practice for those who are part of our movement and organisation?				
<p>The Swedish section has an ongoing and active work on equality and in our work we have started to analyze how the values should be translated and used in our everyday work. It would be valuable with a toolkit for sections or structures to use, as support to discuss the values and what they mean for our work to ensure that it is an ongoing discussion. There is a risk that values only become words on a piece of paper, rather than being used and integrated in our everyday work.</p> <p>Also, a valuable clarification would be an explanation how come we use “equality” and/or “social justice” in the text about the focus areas, but “equity” in the text about our shared values. And some of the explanations in the explanatory note should be included in the next draft.</p>				

Question 3 - Should Amnesty include an explicit commitment to <i>feminist leadership</i> in its next strategy?				
1 (yes)	2 (no)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above including what you think this would look like in practice?				
<p>A feminist leadership is close to home for Amnesty when it comes to the work we do. But if we sign up for an ambition of the movement building on a feminist leadership we must be sure that there is a structure that supports and develop our leaders to develop skills on how it’s done and what a feminist leadership is for Amnesty in practice. Here is also an area where text from the explanatory note should be included in the next draft. If we do not include what feminist leadership is for Amnesty (and maybe an explanation why we see this type of feminist leadership as the best one for Amnesty) there will be space for misunderstanding which we think can do more harm than good. There are many directions within feminism, so our feminist leadership must be described and motivated in a more in-dept way in the next draft.</p>				

REFLECTING ON THE IMPACTS OF COVID-19

Question 4 - What trends do you think will either accelerate or emerge as a result of Covid-19 and that are most relevant for Amnesty’s work?
(up to 200 words)
<p>Digitalisation</p> <p>Increased inequalities, which becomes very clear in the human rights relief program.</p> <p>Digital surveillance and threats to the right to privacy/integrity, and the states responsibility and accountability in this matter.</p> <p>Domestic violence and men’s violence against women</p>

Question 5 - What human rights issues should Amnesty prioritise in light of the pandemic and its long-term impacts?
Drop down menu (select up to three areas from the issues in the draft strategy – including watching brief)
Focus 1: Strengthening freedom of expression and association

Focus 3: Reducing inequalities and promoting gender justice
Protecting refugees and migrants

Open-ended follow-up question (up to 200 words): *Please specify how you would further focus and refine these areas of work as a result.*

Focus 3 need to be broader than promoting gender justice. To work from an intersectional perspective means making a power analysis to understand how different power structures overlap and this needs to be clarified in this goal. This is also connected to our strong focus on intersectionality in the rest of the draft. A general/overall comment is that the draft has a strong focus on intersectionality in some areas but not in all. This must be mainstreamed in Amnesty's entire work for us to be more consistent. Equal access to health care should also be a prioritized topic.

KEY CAPABILITIES

Research, Human Rights Education, and State & Corporate Advocacy

Question 4 - What is the likelihood that investment in these capabilities would make Amnesty more effective in achieving human rights impact – especially in the two global priorities identified?

1 (very unlikely)	2 (unlikely)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
-------------------	--------------	------------	------------	-----------------

Open-ended box (up to 400 words): Please explain your response above and suggest any adjustments you would make.

What is the process behind identifying these methods as key capabilities? Human rights relief should be here as well. What are we not investing in when investing in these areas? And it is a bit problematic to set a specific price tag, since this must be related to income levels etc.

The purpose of HRE should always primarily be education, learning and training. The draft seems to present a shift towards making HRE a method for mobilization.

Growing our movement, resources and people-power

Question 5 - What is the likelihood that the proposed outcomes on growth in *supporter base, activism* and *organising* gives Amnesty an ambitious vision of what our movement should look like and of our movement's capacity to take more effective action by 2028?

1 (very unlikely)	2 (unlikely)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
-------------------	--------------	------------	------------	-----------------

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above and suggest what adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area.

The Swedish section are working on a similar model as the pyramid, and it is a good model that we support. We do not believe in investing in a digital mobilization platform. It will need too much resources to monitor and administrate, and our section would like to work closer to our activists on a more local and personal basis. We support the overall perspective on growth in supporter base and activism since it is a focus that we also have. But we are skeptical to the chosen method, ie a digital mobilization platform.

Question 5B – How important are these outcomes for your section?

1 (Not important at all)	2 (Minor importance)	3 (Neutral)	4 (Important)	5 (Top priority)
--------------------------	----------------------	-------------	---------------	------------------

Question 5C - Do you agree that Amnesty should create a digital platform where we own our relationship with our supporters and which helps grow their number? The platform would allow our supporters to connect with others worldwide, get the latest news, express solidarity, and take action for human rights.

1 (strongly disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (strongly agree)
------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above

We do not support such an initiative, since we do not believe that this is how activism is strengthened and we would prefer that the movement's common resources being used in a more effective way. It would demand to much effort from local, national and global level, and we would risk missing out on commitment and interest because of lack of sync and resources. Research about voluntary commitment and people organizing shows that people prefer to work from a local starting point, which is the opposite to a global digital platform.

Strengthening our work with partners and other people-power movements

Question 6 - What is the likelihood of the suggested outcomes helping Amnesty become a more desirable partner and one that can add value to the work of other human rights partners and people-power movements?

1 (very unlikely)	2 (unlikely)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------------------

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest what adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area.

We support and appreciate the ambition to amplify voices and support other movements and groups in their human rights struggle. It is smart, humble and the way to go. We need to organize ourselves within civil society, not only within our movement. Amnesty is a strong voice and a well known brand and we could lend it to others, with other/more knowledge and experience than us. Especially when it comes to thematic areas that are somewhat new to Amnesty, areas where we can learn from others. Human rights relief team is a potential partner for smaller and unestablish groups that can benefit from the relief program for capacity building and support.

Question 6B – How important are these outcome for your section?

1 (Not important at all)	2 (Minor importance)	3 (Neutral)	4 (important)	5 (Top priority)
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-------------------------

#NextStrategy: Form 2 - Human Rights Goals

Question 1 – The draft strategy proposes a series of goals and outcomes to be achieved by 2028 and 2024 – breaking down the suggested priorities on *Freedom of Expression & Civic Space* and *Inequality & Discrimination*. In order to refine these outcomes and turn them into ambitious yet realistic targets, please share with us your assessment of the seven focus areas identified and how you would measure them.

Focus 1 - Strengthening freedom of expression and association

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

Freedom of expression is one of the most important human rights issues globally. It is a topic where Amnesty has knowledge and network and it must continue to be a prioritized issue.

What should be the balance between focusing on states vs tech giants/corporates? We must not forget to work on states accountability as well.

From a Swedish perspective it would be valuable to highlight the relation between freedom of expression and democracy even more, and discuss the development of shrinking space, political involvement in culture, freedom of information/the principle of public access to official documents in relation to people power etc.

Focus 2 – Securing the right to peaceful assembly for all

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. dis	Dis	neith	agre	Str agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

As important as Focus 1. In 2.1 we should change “regulating the use of less-lethal weapons” to “banning of weapons and other harmful tools to repress meetings”.

“A legal framework of civil disobedience” seems to be a contradiction.

What is the difference/border between 2.2 and HR abuses in Watching brief?

Focus 3 – Reducing inequalities and promoting gender justice

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. dis	dis	neith	agre	Str agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

We need to ensure that we are working with inequalities because they lead to HR violations, and that the relation between the inequality and HR violation is highlighted and clarified. We need to motivate, in a more explicit way that today, that our reason to work with inequalities is because they lead to HR-violations.

In the document different words are being used – equality, equity, justice, fair allocation and we need to be clear what we mean by these concepts.

In this goal we would like to see a stronger focus on intersectionality, and not only gender justice. We need to be more consistent when it comes to prioritizing intersectionality in all our work and not just in some areas.

It is a too broad focus area, we need to narrow it down to make it relevant.

Focus 4 – Reducing corporate power and its negative impact on equality

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. dis	dis	neith	agre	Str agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

This area is important but once again we need to clarify and highlight the relation to HR violation. For Amnesty corporate power is not the main problem/a problem on its own, but the problem is its negative impact on HR and equality. There should be no space for misunderstandings. The draft does not describe the relation to HR violations properly.

Our work should aim to strengthen the policy framework and regulations in relation to corporate power.

4.1 must be processed more. It is vague and there is no clear connection expressed between fossil fuel and HR.

Focus 5 – Ending the climate crisis by securing a safer and more equal future for all

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

Once again – we need to clarify that we are working with the climate crisis, ie because it leads to HR-violations.

It is a high set goal compare to the other goals. And unrealistic if we look at the situation today.

This is an area where Amnesty should support others, rather than aiming for developing our own expertise.

Eco-activists are relevant under focus 1 and 2 as well.

Focus 6 – Protecting and empowering individuals and communities at risk

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

Important to prioritize this area. But it is tricky to have this as a separate focus area since it can be a part of focus 1-5. It is rather way of working with the areas within focus 1-4, that its own focus?

Focus 7 – Creating knowledge, attitudes and narratives for a human rights embracing future

1 This area is a prominent human rights issue in this country					2 The section has capacity, expertise, ongoing work and partnerships on this issue					3 Members and supporters are interested and engaged to mobilize on this issue					4 This area of work will attract different and new audiences to Amnesty (i.e. media, fundraising, diverse members)				
Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree	Str. disagree	dis	neither	agree	Str. agree

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your answers and suggest any adjustments you would make to strengthen this focus area (please be as specific as possible)

This is also more of a “how”, than a “what”-area. It needs to more explicit in what we mean and want to achieve. This area met a lot of critique, but also a little bit of support, in our rounds of consultation. The critique focused on that the goal was to unclear and undefined and therefore hard to understand what we want to achieve.

Question 2 - What is the likelihood that the proposed balance between the priorities and watching brief will bring adequate FOCUS to our work, yet allowing for FLEXIBILITY?

1 (very unlikely)	2 (unlikely)	3 (unsure)	4 (likely)	5 (very likely)
-------------------	--------------	------------	------------	-----------------

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above, suggest any adjustments you would make, and include what steps your section would need to take to transition to a 70/30 split

It is a smart idea to have an explicit balance. But since there are so many areas covered by the focus areas we fear that a section/structure could do basically anything in what way they wanted and still be able to motivate it within the 80/20 rule.

OTHER

Question 3 - This questionnaire seeks and welcomes feedback on key areas of the strategy proposal. If there is any feedback on other parts of the proposal not explicitly mentioned please share here:

(open-ended – up to 400 words):

Amnesty should prioritize work in refugees, asylum seekers and migrants considering the development we see in the world.

Amnesty's focus when working with individuals should be HRDs and not individuals in general. The focus on HRDs must increase in the next draft. This is an area where Amnesty has a strong voice, carries a lot of knowledge and experience, and it has gained increased attention in society. Human rights relief program is an appreciated tool for supporting HRDs.

Amnesty needs to develop a more long term goal/purpose. We suggest "By 2040 we want to create a world where people are able to stand up for the protection of human rights and create more equal, inclusive and rights-respecting societies."

The work with leading from the ground should be more visible in the strategy to ensure a continued decentralization of responsibility and participation.

In the document different words are being used – equality, equity, justice, fair allocation and we need to be clear what we mean by these concepts.

Focus 6 and 7 are more of a "how" approach, whilst Focus 1-4 has a "what" approach. We need some help to understand how we should work with these focus areas. When it comes to monitoring, evaluating and reporting one project will include both "what" and "how", so in the next draft we would like to see an explanatory note on how these should be planned and monitored.

#NextStrategy: Form 3 - Financial Sustainability

Fundraising Investment Fund

Question 1a – Amnesty has a strategy to grow and diversify its income base. To achieve this Amnesty will:

Diversify in markets so that more entities raise substantial funds

Diversify in income channels to reach the opportunities for growth in legacies, major donors and trusts and foundations.

From the perspective of your entity where do you see the most growth potential regardless of cost?

	1 (shrinking)	2 (weak growth)	3 (strongly growth)
Individual Giving			X
Major Donors			X
Legacies			X
Trust & Foundations		X	

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above

We do not have a major donor program today, since we are missing out on important preconditions regarding skills, infrastructure etc. However, there is a great potential in this market even though the philanthropy culture in Sweden is not as strong as in for example North America. It would be a long term investment.

Northern Europe has good conditions for working with legacies because of its pension programs etc, so this market has potential and we are working with it today with a high ROI.

Regarding individuals giving – we would need to make some further investments, but this gives us faster results.

Fundraising Investment Fund

Question 1b – From the perspective of your entity where do you see the most *cost-efficient* growth potential?

	1 (shrinking)	2 (weak growth)	3 (strongly growth)
Individual Giving		X	
Major Donors			X
Legacies			X
Trust & Foundations		X	

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above

A major donor program would be cost-efficient in the long run (5-10 yrs), but it demands investments.

Legacies is also a good long term investment (10 yrs) and cost-efficient in the Nordic markets.

The nature of individual giving programs is that constant investments are necessary.

The competition of trusts and foundations are increasing in Sweden, but Amnesty has not reached it full potential there yet. It rather a constant development, neither increasing or shrinking.

Fundraising Investment Fund

Question 2 – In 2019 79% of Amnesty International’s total income was generated by a small number of mature sections. Growth in many of these markets, specifically for individual giving, is becoming increasingly difficult. For example, promotional costs are increasing and competition is intense. Emerging market countries receiving Fundraising Investment Fund (FIF) support are often demonstrating stronger returns than more established markets. However, the way the FIF is currently operated means investment in these emerging markets is constrained.

How strongly do you agree that Amnesty needs to investigate evolving the Fundraising Investment Fund and include mechanisms that incentivize and encourage mature sections to invest in revenue generation activities providing attractive returns being conducted by other sections in emerging markets?

1 (strongly disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (strongly agree)
Sections should only invest in revenue			X	Sections should be encouraged and

generation activities in their country of operation				incentivized to invest in effective revenue generation activities in other countries
---	--	--	--	--

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above and suggest what adjustments you would like to see. What would you be concerned about if adjustments were made?

The set up must come with a low risk, which means that as a funding/investing section we must be able to receive some kind of guarantee that we will see at least the same ROI as if we would see if we made the investments in our own country. One of the things we would be missing out on when investing in other markets that the Swedish, would be the branding.

To invest in emerging markets creates a risk that we undermine established markets in the long run, it is important that the models being develop take into consideration that long term investments must be made parallel with a faster growth rate.

Assessment System

Question 3 – The Amnesty movement is raising 19% more in income in 2019 than in 2015. Over the same period, global gross fundraising costs have increased by 50%. The global fundraising return on investment was 3.49 in 2015 and has dropped to 2.78 in 2019. The assessment contribution as a proportion of global gross income has remained static at 23% between 2015 and 2019. All fundraising costs are deducted as part of the assessable income calculation regardless of how well the investment performed.

In the light of this situation how strongly do you agree or disagree that the current method of calculating assessment payments should be reviewed?

1 (strongly disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (strongly agree)
The current assessment calculation is completely fit for purpose			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The current assessment calculation is completely unfit for purpose

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above and suggest what adjustments could be made to the Assessment System. What are your concerns about this?

Set a limit for fundraising costs in relation to income. However it must be possible to make exceptions for temporary investment projects. Deductions should be valued from ROI. Perhaps looking at a system where there are more diversification in deductions, where for example branding could be deductible by 50 %.

The model must be based on income/growth incl and excl restricted funding.

Distribution and Resource Allocation Mechanism

Question 4 – In 2016 25% of global income was distributed by the Distribution Mechanism – this has dropped to 23% in 2019. Between 2015-19, Resource Allocation Mechanism funds (RAM) have grown by 12% for National Offices and 21% for sections and structures. In 2019 total RAM funds were €11.5m – 3.6% of gross global income. In 2015 RAM was 3.7% of global gross income. It appears that Amnesty’s available financial resources are not being distributed in the most effective and equitable way to grow and deliver on its mission to protect human rights around the world.

How strongly do you agree that the Distribution Mechanism and RAM needs to be reviewed and better integrated to help develop a more equitable distribution of financial resources across the Movement?

1 (strongly disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (strongly agree)
The current RAM and Distribution Mechanism is completely fit for purpose		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The current RAM and Distribution Mechanism is completely unfit for purpose

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please explain your response above and suggest what adjustments could be made to the Resource Allocation Mechanism. What would you be concerned about if adjustments were made?

We would like to avoid a too strong centralization of the income levels and priorities. It is important to make sure that funded sections are able to make their own priorities in the same way as the funded to avoid increase power imbalances within the movement.

Global Fundraising Approach

Question 5 – When it comes to strategic fundraising investments, Amnesty appears to be missing potential growth opportunities by not investing efficiently and effectively when these opportunities present themselves.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement?

1 (strongly disagree)	2 (somewhat disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (somewhat agree)	5 (strongly agree)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Open-ended box (up to 200 words): Please can you explain your response and what should be done (if anything) to address the situation

We would like to avoid a too strong centralization of the income flows and priorities. Each section knows its market and must be able to adapt the fundraising from local condition. At the same time it is interesting to further investigate synergies and how we can level up as one movement.
ROI is a tricky concept to make comparisons from, since there are a lot of different variables to consider – time perspective, endurance, level of investment, alternative costs etc.