

ODS GREATER IMPACT

Final evaluation
11.11.11 International Programme
2017 - 2021

Final Global Report | 10 June 2022

Rue Joseph II | 1000 Brussels, Belgium

www.odsupport.eu | info@odsupport.eu

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and background of the International Programme

1.2. Purpose of the evaluation

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation process and Methods

Table 1: Summary of scope of evaluation and number of participants

2.1.4 Limitations of the evaluation

2.1.5 Acknowledgements

2.1.6 Structure of this report

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Effectiveness

3.1.1 Progress markers

I. Contributing to a more autonomous civil society (narrative and financial)

II. Reaching out to and influencing specific target groups, the general population and/or social and political actors, and resonance to get in the media

III. Strengthening links with rights-holders and contributing to victories in the enforcement of specific legal cases to uphold rights

IV. Together with rights-holders, promoting access to policy processes for women and contributing to the recognition of gender equality as a crucial element for change.

3.1.2 Reliability of the Monitoring of the Progress Markers

3.1.3 T11's role in realising change processes and critical success factors that influenced change

3.1.4 Counter Forces that influenced the change processes

3.1.5 Adaptability of interventions

3.1.6 Unintended effects

3.2 Efficiency

3.2.1 Programme management, Budgeting and Reporting Tools

3.2.2 Adjustments of budgets and schedules

3.2.3 Collaboration with other organisations

3.3 Sustainability

3.3.1 Sustainability of social changes

3.3.2 Institutional sustainability

3.3.3 Financial sustainability

[3.3.4 Contribution of the programme to an enabling environment](#)

[3.4 Risk Analysis](#)

[Table 3: Risk analysis and mitigation measures](#)

[4. Conclusions](#)

[Recommendations](#)

[ANNEXES](#)

[Annex 1: List of documents](#)

[Annex 2: Participating organisations](#)

[Andes Region](#)

[Asia Region](#)

[Annex 3: Inception report \(attached\)](#)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AARs	After-Action-Reviews
AEPF	Asia Europe People's Forum
AIDPROF EN	Actions et initiatives de développement pour la protection de la femme et de l'enfant
AMI	Association Modeste et Innocent
CDES	Centro de Derechos Económicos y Sociales
CEDENM	Coordinadora Ecuatoriana de Organizaciones para la Defensa de la Naturaleza y el Medio Ambiente
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DGD	Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
EoT	End of Term
EU	European Union
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
GLR	Great Lakes Region
IBGDH	Initiative pour la bonne gouvernance et les droits humains
IGJ	Indonesia for Global Justice
INREDH	Fundación Regional de Asesoría en Derechos Humanos
LNOB	Leave No One Behind
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
NGO	Non governmental organisation
ODEP	Observatoire de la dépense publique
PM	Progress Marker

REJA	Réseau des organisations de Jeunes en Action pour la paix, la réconciliation et le développement
RH	Right holder
TNI	TransNational Institute
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
T11	Triple 11 - 11.11.11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This evaluation examines the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of the international programme of 11.11.11 (T11) over the period 2017-2021, and assesses its sustainability for the future. It identifies key lessons and proposes recommendations for future actions of the programme. The programme was implemented in the Great Lakes region, the Andes and Asia. This global report reflects on the programme from the perspective of these three regions. In the Great Lakes region, the focus country for this evaluation has been the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC); in the Andes region, it has been Ecuador and in the Asia region, it has been Indonesia. This global report is therefore accompanied by regional reports, which make more in-depth analyses of the different regions, taking a stronger focus on these focal countries.

Methodology

The evaluation was conducted in three main phases (inception, consultations, reporting). The analysis focused on the evaluation areas (effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency). The evaluation participants comprised T11 staff, both in Brussels and in the regions; programme partners; external stakeholders and other CSOs in the different regions; and embassy staff in some regions. Consultations took the form of mostly individual and group interviews, coming to a total of 47 consultations. Regional roundtable discussions were held with partner organisations on the efficiency of the programme, and results of the evaluation were validated with the different regions through validation workshops with the partners. A global validation workshop was also held with T11 staff to validate the global findings of the evaluation. The evaluation was implemented from January 2022 to May 2022.

Main Findings

Overall, the evaluation has found the international programme to be **effective** across the different regions, with Progress Markers (PM) indicating slight variations in the quantitative interpretation of the degree to which progress markers were met. Qualitative data has shown clear similarities across the regions on particular progress markers. Of note is that gender equality has been inconsistent in its integration into the narratives of partners' work. Where integration has been achieved, it does not seem to have moved beyond this level and as such, the evaluation has no evidence of policy wins in this area. At the same time, given the structural focus of the international programme, and the types of issues that are paramount, including indigenous peoples rights, the evaluation suggests that the gender lens may not be the most holistic

framework to address the structural nature of gender inequality. Partners for the most part have empowered rights holders through capacity development efforts. The levels of activism among rights holders differ across the regions. Ecuador in particular has a high level of activism and in Indonesia there has been an increase in protests demanding rights or protesting against violations of rights, while the GLR has a clear focus on working with different groups of rights holders to empower them. In its contribution to a more autonomous civil society, the international programme's biggest value has been that of coming into a space that is generally under-funded, contributing to closing that gap through providing institutional funding and most of all, taking an equal partnership approach. The equal partnership approach has been T11's own internal decolonisation process, and has been highly valued by partners, enabling them to keep their institutional fabrics intact; to own their programmes and implementation methods and to establish strong networks, while having T11 as a solid political partner beyond the grants it provides. Such a model is one that is worth advocating for in the space of international development, together with T11's upcoming restructuring efforts to further the direct participation of partners in policy work. At the same time, financial autonomy among partners continues to be a challenge, with persisting dependence on donor funding, even with the equal partnership principles in place. This is a persisting concern for **sustainability**. Several partners in Asia and the Andes region have initiated modest fundraising activities which have sustained over a good part of the programme period, while others have strengthened their internal management systems to become attractive to other donors beyond T11 as in the case of the GLR and Andes. Beyond financial sustainability, the evaluation has found that the focus on systemic change is in itself a route to sustainability. Advocacy efforts and related wins have included entrenching human rights into legal frameworks; raising awareness among the public and integrating rights holders, including at local levels as part of the campaigns. These strategies and their related achievements result in changes that are difficult to undo, even while hostility at the political levels sometimes imposes regression. Finally in terms of **efficiency**, the evaluation has found that the flexibility in the budget systems, the monitoring and evaluation systems and the reporting systems have been expressions of a focus on learning and partnership, rather than control. This has had the effect of strengthening partners' internal systems, and the institutionalisation of T11's systems in a way that has facilitated efficiency within the programme and beyond it. Covid has had an effect both on the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme but these effects have been well mitigated through re-channelling funds, programme flexibility to change activities and providing additional funds for needs that arose.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Effectiveness						
<p>C1- The programme has contributed to an autonomous civil society with limitations on financial autonomy. These have been mitigated by the programme's equal partnership principles. The synergy building has been successful, characterised with networking and network facilitation</p>	<p>C2 - Inter-regional exchanges have facilitated the travelling of concepts and advocacy tactics. More can be done to facilitate more inter-regional exchange, particularly between the Andes and Asia regions. At the same time, partners have faced human and financial resource limitations in engagement at regional and international levels. Furthermore, there is room for more strategic engagement with partners who could facilitate the</p>	<p>C3 - While the south-south synergy building is important to the evaluation, there are opportunities for equal north-south exchange on common advocacy issues, even in spite of different advocacy contexts.</p>	<p>C4 - The gender inequality aspect has been generally inconsistent, ranging from little marked progress to progress that seems to still be somewhat at an awareness raising level. The approach to gender as a stand alone element may not be adequate for a programme focusing on systemic change from a holistic point of view.</p>	<p>C5 - The approach of different types and levels of partners has been useful in bringing in different perspectives while maintaining stability through steady 5 year long funding</p>	<p>C6 - Partners have built up expertise to engage with rights holders using tailored tactics at national levels and local levels where impact is more direct. Capacities of rights holders differ across regions and partners have done well in capacity building, in spite of persisting capacity limitations here and there on the level of engagement with legislative processes on the part of rights holders.</p>	<p>C7 - Progress markers have been a useful way to track progress over time, with complementarity between qualitative reflections and quantitative scores. However, the qualitative element is dominant and thus subjectivity is a strong factor. Further, the monitoring system does not adequately capture information that demonstrates the contribution of the international programme to the outcomes contribution clearly.</p>

	acceleration of alternative narratives, such as youth. However, in most cases, they are not organised or structured, therefore difficult to engage more strategically .					
	R1- Incorporate youth movements as strategic partners	R3-Initiate the trajectory of common issues to exchange as part of north-south sharing	R6- Advance decolonisation work through taking an intersectionality approach to gender equality		R-5 Build capacity of rights holders and simultaneously include them in campaigns through Rights to Information laws	R7- Incorporate mid-reporting check in points for GLR and Asia regions in order to facilitate two way feedback for the latter and to facilitate mid-way reflection for the former.
	R2- Consider having a budget dedicated to facilitating networking and synergy building					R8- Consider an outcome harvesting methodology for the next programme evaluation
	R4- Strengthen internal mechanism for sharing information among regional staff					

Sustainability	
C8- The T11 model as an equal partner facilitates financial sustainability because of the space it	C9- The approach of equal partnership without imposition of narratives and implementation

<p>provides to reflect on sustainability beyond its own funding, the transparency it gives to its partners and the capacity development it offers explicitly but also implicitly through providing budgeting and reporting systems that are easy, can be institutionalised and can strengthen the internal management processes of its partners.</p>	<p>methods, in combination with the requirements on reporting are key in the context of the current reliance on donor funding. They at least limit the negative effects of this reliance, which continue to be limitations in the development sector in general</p>
<p>R9- T11 could act as an advocate for the model it is applying on donor/grantee equal partnership to contribute to the shift in the larger donor community on this global problem. This would also contribute to making the benefits of its own efforts in implementing this model sustainable.</p>	

Efficiency	
<p>C-10 The programme has generally been efficient and aligned with its own view of what efficiency means in its political work. Aforementioned elements related to flexible budgets, light reporting systems and outcome based reporting have contributed to efficiency.</p>	
<p>R10- The budget flexibility approach in T11 is well appreciated by partners and should continue.</p>	

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and background of the International Programme

During the period of 2017-2021, T-11 implemented the International programme in the regions of Asia, Andes and the Great Lakes. The International programme is based on the Theory of Change (ToC), updated for 2022-2026¹ as articulated below:

By 2026, people living in the most vulnerable contexts and most affected by the current global unjust system will see more of their socio-economic, ecological and democratic rights realised. This is because:

- 1) people, as rights-holders, belong to resilient communities that stand up for their rights, and a stronger and more unified civil society will push duty bearers to commit to an agenda of rights, redistribution of power and wealth, respect of the planetary boundaries and solidarity;
- 2) local, national and international authorities (primary duty bearers) better fulfil their obligation to respect, promote and realise rights for people most affected by injustice
- 3) (trans)national private sector actors better respect all rights, including by avoiding contributing to rights abuses through their activities.

Assumptions linked with desired change are:

Assumption 1: Rights-holders can bring about powerful changes.

Assumption 2: There is a growing global (scientific based) consensus about the need to move towards a more ecological and economically sustainable global system.

Assumption 3: CSOs are playing a very active role in the transition process. They are making use of new ways of public participation in decision-making processes, such as through social media.

Assumption 4: A globalised world has interlinked local and international processes. Changes at the global level in the areas of power relations, balance between economy and environment, and management of global goods are closely linked to local changes.

¹ The choice to base the evaluation on the updated ToC was made together with T11 at the inception phase of the evaluation. This decision was informed by the fact that the evaluation is a forward looking evaluation, aiming to provide insights that will contribute to improvements to the next programme, which is based on the updated ToC. Therefore for the lessons of the evaluation to be applicable, it was necessary for the evaluation to base itself on the same updated ToC. It should be noted however that only a selection of some structuring elements of the ToC are reflected on here. Furthermore, the Progress Markers that the evaluation focuses on are consistent with the previous ToC.

The international programme focuses on three **domains of change**, with different emphases on each region. For instance, the programme in the regions of Asia and Andes have a strong focus on ecological and socio-economic justice, while the programme in the Great Lakes Region takes a stronger focus on democratic justice. For these, the ToC identifies four **strategic priorities** and four **transversal issues and approaches** as shown below. In addition, the international programme’s strategy for partnership has been to engage different partners differently through having a combination of institutional partners; thematic partners and adhoc partners. It has identified strong partners whose work focuses on tackling systemic change rather than taking reformist approaches and has taken a long term view in its partnerships, particularly its institutional partners.

Themes linked with ToC	Strategic priorities	Transversal issues and approaches
<p>Democratic justice: <i>A strong civil society Inclusive, democratic and transparent participation in national and international decision-making processes Enforcement, Protection and Promotion of Human Rights</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Beyond the dual North-South narrative -A dynamic and broad network -Decolonization and actively combating the dominant power relations -Significant political impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Rights Based Approach -Gender -Leave No One Behind (LNOB) -Intersectionality Approach
<p>Ecological justice: <i>Climate Justice and action Expose the link between consumerism and extractivism Promote ecological alternatives</i></p>		
<p>Socio-economic justice: <i>A redistribution of income and a more progressive tax system Just and sustainable trade and investment policies Tackle and decrease the concentration of corporate power at international and national level.</i></p>		

1.2. Purpose of the evaluation

In February 2022, T11 contracted ODS to conduct the End of Term (EoT) evaluation of the International programme 2017-2021. This EoT evaluation builds on the Mid-term evaluation (MTE), which was conducted in 2020, with a strong focus on the relevance of the programme and with a focus on Peru, Burundi and the Philippines. This final evaluation focuses on the **effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability** of the programme with a focus on **Ecuador, DR Congo and Indonesia**.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation process and Methods

The evaluation comprised three non-linear phases, namely an inception phase, a consultation phase, and a reporting phase. At inception, we conducted an *introduction meeting* with key staff to understand the scope and purpose of the evaluation better. This was followed by an *initial desk review* to engage with key documents. We conducted *scoping conversations* with selected partners and T11 staff from different regions to gain an understanding of organisational and regional contextual issues that were important to consider and or focus on in the evaluation. The scoping interviews also drew from some of the recommendations from the previous evaluation to probe on how this evaluation could provide insights on operationalising them. We held seven scoping conversations with selected programme staff and partners from the focus countries and from these and the desk review, drew some preliminary findings which were important to factor in shaping the evaluation. Based on these we finalised the evaluation plan and brought it to an inception meeting with the T-11 Extended Evaluation Steering committee which comprised key staff members. On the basis of their inputs, we finalised the evaluation plan and began the consultation phase of the evaluation.

The consultation phase consisted of interviews with T11 staff members; interviews with partners in the three regions, which were a combination of individual and group interviews; interviews with other relevant stakeholders, including other Civil Society Organisations (CSO) working in the regions, International organisations and embassy staff. Interview discussions focused on evaluating effectiveness and sustainability. We held 4 roundtable discussions (1 per region) which focused on the efficiency element of the programme. Upon this basis, we drafted the report, which was shared with all relevant evaluation participants in advance. We organised regional validation workshops to present the findings of the evaluation to the regional stakeholders (mainly the

partners in each region and the T11 staff in a separate workshop). From the input of these validation workshops, we finalised the evaluation report.

A **more detailed account of the methodology** is provided in the **inception report** of the evaluation which we have **attached as Annex 3**.

Table 1: Summary of scope of evaluation and number of participants

Types of stakeholders consulted	Global	Andes	Asia	Great Lakes	Total number of evaluation participants
T11 Staff	2	4	2	2	
Partners	-	6	9	7	
Other CSO's	-	2	2	2	
Right Holders (RH)	-	-	-	-	
Embassies	-	2	-	3	
Other stakeholders (external)	-	2		2	
Total consultations	2	16	13	16	47

2.1.4 Limitations of the evaluation

The main limitation of the evaluation was the challenge in accessing certain stakeholders, particularly rights holders. This was possibly a result of the remote nature of the consultations. Related to the remote nature of the consultations, we also faced some connectivity issues during consultations, such that the participation of a few stakeholders, particularly in roundtable discussions and group interviews was limited. In some regions, external stakeholders, such as embassy staff, notably in Indonesia and partners in some regions were occupied and could only be available in mid-end of May, after the consultation phase of the evaluation had passed. While for the most part evaluation findings show commonalities among regions, there are regional disparities which cannot be generalised to the global picture of the programme. This is of course addressed by the fact that the evaluation provides regional reports which are specific to the regions. Finally, while the progress markers (PM) are key to the evaluation of effectiveness, the

nature of the programme, which is political, and aims for structural change, is such that these outcomes cannot be assessed with certainty in the short term. Further, progress is non-linear, consisting of moments of significant progression and moments of regress, albeit moving forward still towards political and societal change, which is not always measurable but is perceived, felt, experienced and in some cases, possible to prove.

2.1.5 Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to acknowledge and thank all the evaluation participants for their thoughtful input to the evaluation and their dedicated commitment to the work on alternatives. We extend particular thanks to the T11 partners for their enthusiasm and the thoughtful insights they provided to the evaluation, from which we too learned a lot; the Extended Steering Committee who helped to frame the evaluation and the evaluation coordinator of T11 who provided continuous guidance and steady communication throughout the evaluation.

2.1.6 Structure of this report

In this main report, we present the findings of the evaluation per investigation area, i.e. Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability and per Evaluation Question in order to respond to the questions in the Terms of Reference (ToR). We then capture the risks and mitigation strategies of the programme before Concluding and providing Recommendations.

Accompanying this main report are the regional reports which take a closer look at the programme in the Great Lakes region, the Andes region and the Asia region. Within those reports, the focus countries, namely Ecuador (Andes); Indonesia (Asia) and DR Congo (Great Lakes) are discussed as case studies within the reports.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Effectiveness

To what extent has the international programme of 11.11.11 achieved its specific objectives (outcomes) in terms of both quality and coverage?

3.1.1 Progress markers

The monitoring and evaluation of the programme in the different regions is conducted through outcome journals, in which the different partners reflect on their progress towards the identified outcome progress markers. These progress markers are the following:

1. Contribute to a more autonomous civil society (narrative and financial).
2. Together with OCM's, manage to reach out to and influence specific target groups, the general population and/or social and political actors, and resonance to get in the media.
3. Strengthen their link with rights-holders and contribute to victories in the enforcement of specific legal cases to uphold the rights of rights-holders. The latter play an active role.
4. Together with rights-holders, promote access to policy processes for women and contribute to the recognition of gender equality as a crucial element for change.

I. Contributing to a more autonomous civil society (narrative and financial)

A shared challenge among the different regions is the difficult political contexts in which they are operating. Within these political contexts, the T11 programme foci are common between the Asia and Andes regions, where the topics of focus are stronger towards climate justice; rights and the protection of human rights defenders. In the Great Lakes Region (GLR), a stronger focus is on democracy and creating space for CSOs and human rights. The contribution of a more autonomous civil society therefore is reflected within the context of these regional focus areas.

In terms of financial autonomy, civil societies across all the regions face the persistent challenge of overreliance on donor funding. The risks posed by this overreliance are often a limitation of CSO independence in terms of their narratives, political positions; programme types and implementation methods, to mention a few. In the Asia region, efforts have been made by T11 partners to fundraise independently through modest projects whose goal is also to provide

alternatives to communities in times of crisis. In the Great Lakes region, while diversification of funds has been limited, the T11 funds had the effect of making partners more attractive to other funders such that it facilitated access to funds beyond T11. Partners in the Andes region also improved their internal management structures, thanks to the flexibility of the T11 grant, thus becoming more effective in reaching out to other donors.

Within the scope of its own funding, the T11 grant is characterised by flexibility and equal partnership, which has directly granted financial autonomy to its partners. Partners are able to determine their own priorities and report in a light way that is more concerned with reflecting on the outcomes of their work rather than financial control. In this way, the international programme has set itself apart from the control level of traditional donor approaches of limiting the agency of grant recipients, and has thus managed to form genuine partnerships which transcend the donor-grantee power imbalance. This has of course also been strengthened by the fact that the partnerships of the international programme are not only limited to providing grants, but are designed in the first place to be partnerships that provide support, facilitate synergies and explore alternatives as partners in solidarity.

Part of the expression of this solidarity is the lack of imposition of political narratives on partners. This is also partly thanks to the Belgian Government as a funder of T11, who provide breathing room in this regard. The position of pursuing systemic change is in itself a political position on the part of T11. Within this space, partners implement different political tactics and where they face limitations, for instance the limitations that Covid imposed on mobilisation at the grassroots level, the international programme availed dedicated funds to facilitate this. This has kept the narratives of CSOs visible, which for campaign initiatives, is crucial. The synergy building role of the international programme also facilitates networking. On the one hand this involves plugging partners into other T11 networks and on the other, supporting them to plug into other networks that T11 is not a part of. In this role, T11 also provides financial support to partners to participate in international conferences even where they may not have been foreseen in the original grant. In itself, this has contributed to strengthening the narratives of CSOs, capacitating them to speak with a united voice and keeping them visible.

II. Reaching out to and influencing specific target groups, the general population and/or social and political actors, and resonance to get in the media

Partners in the different regions have strategic expertise in reaching interest groups. Across the regions, there are strategies that are cross-cutting, and within regions, there are also differences in strategies which have been adapted to contextual realities.

Of note is that in the Great Lakes region, the partners in the DRC have a markedly different strategy to those in Rwanda and Burundi. The latter two target local communities and local governments to work on social and economic rights, whereas in the DRC, partners can also work at the level of central government on sensitive issues such as civil and political rights. Both strategies yielded significant results in terms of influencing government policies on corruption, elections and raised attention at different levels of government. During the covid pandemic, the focus on working with the media increased, with the purpose to continue targeting the government as an audience.

In the Andes region, innovative conversations have been going on for 20+ years and partners have built up expertise in reaching different interest groups. This has been done among other ways through the innovative coining of concepts such as the 'rights of nature' which have been on the agenda for more than 20 years. The rights of nature concept in particular has travelled beyond the Andes region, with partners in Asia exploring how it applies to their own context, comparing it with the idea of 'no go zones' in parts of their own region and thinking of how these can be advocated for in ways that are more entrenched in the legal framework (as it is entrenched in the constitutional framework in the Andes) in order to counter the current loose practical application of environmental policies. This demonstrates the role of synergy building and exchange in facilitating not only the travelling of concepts from one region to another, but also the travelling of advocacy and targeting targets that partners use to advocate for their implementation. Here while the benefits are clear, the evaluation has found that there is significant room for even more inter-regional exchange. Of course this is also limited by human and financial resources, and we engage with this point in the regional reports as well as later in this report.

Between Andes and Asia partners and some in the GLR, a shared strategy is that of targeting the local government level. CSOs are realistic about the difficulty of accessing national government level in hostile contexts and have adapted to it by working to make changes at the local government level. In the case of the Philippines, partners have a political strategy of supporting

credible actors of systemic change to gain power at the local government level, based on their understanding that power is necessary to implement change. This strategy is also used in Indonesia, where in general the growth of the international programme from 3-5 partners has facilitated more synergies in campaigning and coordinating. While it is still difficult for media to pick up on the work of CSOs, certain elements have been helpful, namely the increase of social media visibility thanks to the new generation of leaders, ties with CSO leaders who were recruited into Government (even though this benefit has dwindled over time due to tensions between government and CSOs). A major setback has been the approval of the Omnibus bill which in spite of protests was approved in 2020.

The international programme's approach of having institutional partners, thematic partners and adhoc partners acts as an agent that strengthens the effectiveness of the different advocacy strategies, while also contributing to their breadth of reach and depth of narrative. Specifically, partners that may come into the programme as thematic or ad hoc partners add perspective. For example, Ecofeminism organisations in Asia bring in the perspective of indigenous women's groups to the narrative on the extractive industry, strengthening the overall narrative in terms of its gender perspective and intersectionality lens. At the same time, this brings in other interest groups, particularly ones that tend to be overlooked.

In terms of interest groups, the ToCs of the different countries clearly identify interest groups and how they are engaged. However it also seems that there is secondary engagement of some interest groups, including youth, who may be at this moment key to the narratives on alternatives because of their connectedness beyond the north-south divide, technological savviness, and the language they use to discuss global challenges, which is not the language of development or SDGs but rather the language of justice and sustainability. Yet their social positioning at this moment makes them a target group from which the international programme can benefit not only from having them as a 'target group', but rather a more strategic partner who can advance certain campaigns and narratives of the programme significantly.

III. Strengthening links with rights-holders and contributing to victories in the enforcement of specific legal cases to uphold rights

In all regions, the foundations for strong links with rights holders are present given the reach that partners have to the communities in which rights are violated. In the Andes, partners work directly with rights holders on legal cases, and there are tangible results to show, for example, achieving amnesty for [268 people in Ecuador](#) who had been charged with protests. The same applies in the Asia region, although there it is clear, particularly in Indonesia, that partners have

different capacities to work on legal issues and different views on specific legal cases. They are nevertheless bound by public interest and manage based on this common interest to collaborate. Across the regions, while there have been notable increases in the number of protests to push back on for instance, mining in certain villages as is experienced in Asia, broadly speaking, rights holders have limited capacity to organise sufficiently and engage to put pressure on legal cases that are necessary to protect their rights. While the actual limitations of rights holders are unclear as the evaluation did not manage to get their perspective, it is common that rights holders may not feel comfortable engaging with the legal processes because of several reasons that may include the perceived distance between what happens on the ground and the legal frameworks. In addition, as has been experienced in the Andes region, rights holders often need legal processes to be able to support the enforcement of their rights, meaning that they need support from experts such as lawyers. In the case of the former, capacity building efforts can focus on closing this gap through facilitating engagement between rights holders and accessible legal processes, for example, engagement with Right to Information laws, while at the same time using the same processes to put pressure on specific cases. Examples of this have been noted in the Asia region, and we discuss this further in the recommendations section.

In the GLR, particularly in the DRC, partners worked a lot with community movements and it is clear that the international programme contributed significantly to supporting awareness raising among rights holders. In the cases of Andes and Asia, a common factor regarding victories in the enforcement of specific legal cases to uphold rights is that while cases can be won in court, implementation of the decision is more complicated due to political instability. In terms of advocacy in fact, winning cases is a solid beginning, but still, just the beginning to a long journey of advocacy towards implementation. This is a common challenge in advocacy, also present in for instance the European region and therefore there are advocacy lessons that can be shared in this regard that are not only linked to 'south-south' cooperation but also on the basis of 'north-south' commonalities. On this the MTE recommended that the same progress markers be used for the 'north' and 'south' partners of T11, aligning them to the identification of joint learning trajectories. To build on this, we suggest in this evaluation that the advocacy follow up tactics towards implementation of adopted legislation is a solid common learning point between the Belgian T11 members and the international partners.

In terms of outreach, Covid added strain to already politically hostile environments by leading to a situation where gatherings were banned, thus reducing the outreach impact of traditional campaigning. In response, partners had to reinforce their presence at the community levels. This was the case in the GL region. Similarly in the Asia region, a response to covid restrictions was in

some cases, having to channel funds directly to communities. This had the positive effect of bringing for instance communities affected by mining activities closer to the campaign by involving them more directly. In all regions, the covid situation demonstrated the necessity of strong communication strategies and social media presence in reinforcing outreach to rights holders. At the same time, the existing inequalities which translate to a digital divide and unequal access to internet services and devices also demonstrated that physical gatherings cannot actually be replaced without leaving many behind. As such, in all regions, as covid started to come under control and restrictions on movement and gatherings were lifted, physical meetings and traditional elements of campaigning were taken up again.

IV. Together with rights-holders, promoting access to policy processes for women and contributing to the recognition of gender equality as a crucial element for change.

The translation of the gender equality aspect to policy processes has remained relatively inconsistent across the international programme. On the one hand, it has remained at an awareness raising level. On the other, it has been difficult for partners working on specific themes, e.g. those working on free trade agreements between the EU and their countries (Andes region), to integrate gender equality into their narratives. Therefore, while partners who already work on gender equality manage to articulate gender equality in their work and indeed bring that perspective to the programme, it has been difficult to streamline it across the different themes. Streamlining perhaps is not necessary, in the sense that the strategy to have ad hoc partners in the programme can bring together partners with a strong gender focus and those without, such that those with a strong gender focus provide the perspectives to integrate it into the narratives. This is the case for instance with the ecofeminism partners in Asia (WAMA and the Sisters), who bring in the perspective of indigenous women in mining. To this extent, the partnership composition that makes this combination can be seen as a strategy that needs to be pursued more intentionally in order to bring in the perspective of gender equality as a crucial element for change and translate it to the policy level

At the same time there is a more fundamental reflection to be made on how gender equality is seen in the international programme, particularly given the programme's focus on systemic change and decolonisation. Reflecting also the findings of the mid-term evaluation, whose reflection touches upon intersectionality, albeit without elaboration, it is our assessment that a more suitable framework for the international programme to strengthen the gender equality

aspect in a way that addresses the roots of inequality, is that of intersectionality. Such an approach would, rather than separating gender as a stand-alone component, look at systems that generate unequal power structures as a whole. At the level of rights-holders, this would be a necessary moving away from the tendency of splitting elements from each other that are in reality embodied in a single person, as often those whose rights are violated on the basis of gender also embody other elements that position them on the margins because power structures make it so. Practically therefore, an intersectionality approach of the programme would take the view that a woman suffering from gender inequality can simultaneously be indigenous; be racialized, be disabled; be unemployed, be a youth, for example. Therefore while gender inequality is a crucial element, it is exacerbated by other systems of inequality which exist simultaneously. The programme would benefit from applying this intersectionality approach more broadly to strengthen its holism. We will make suggestions in the recommendations section on how this can be operationalised.

3.1.2 Reliability of the Monitoring of the Progress Markers

The system elaborated by T11 to monitor progress is overall appreciated by the partners in the region. The focus on outcomes has been important in shifting the way partners think about their own work, moving away from traditional reporting systems that are focused on quantitative formats, to thinking more qualitatively and focusing on learning. Partners report that they have internalised this system for their own planning, reflection and learning.

The quantitative element of tracking progress complements the qualitative reflections of the progress markers well. However, the qualitative element continues to be dominant, such that the monitoring has a strong element of subjectivity. Further on the quantitative side, while the guidelines for the scoring system are clear, it remains unclear how the scores are decided. Nevertheless it is worth noting that for this evaluation, we have found a good level of consistency between the scores in the outcome journals and the qualitative reflections accompanying them.

In terms of contribution, the monitoring system does not adequately capture information that makes it clear what the actual contribution of T11 to the achievement of the outcomes is. For example, in some instances, partners were already part of networks, initiating projects, working closely with rights holders, as their ways of working, prior and in spite of T11's involvement. While T11's contributions are highlighted in several instances, it remains that the monitoring system does not allow us to do this consistently.

3.1.3 T11's role in realising change processes and critical success factors that influenced change

Quite apart from the actual facilitation and initiation role played by the programme in influencing change which we will reflect on shortly is the theory of change of the programme. To begin with, the international programme's ToC is refreshingly placed outside of the development institutional frameworks and theories of change that underpin the language of development, SDGs, and so on. This is a good thing, because the latter have proven to be quite disconnected from everyday experiences at the local level, failing to capture the worldviews of the younger generation, aspirations of the so-called global south, or connect the realities of interconnected locals with their common underlying needs and aspirations beyond the North/South narrative. It is therefore necessary to reflect on T-11's role in realising change and the critical success factors that have influenced, or at least contributed to foundations for change, against the main elements of the ToC of the programme. Below we provide an analysis of the alignment between the programme's strategic priorities, transversal approaches and our findings.

Strategic priorities	Transversal issues and approaches	Evaluation of critical success factors influencing change
Beyond the dual North-South narrative	Rights Based Approach Gender Leave No One Behind (LNOB) Intersectionality Approach	While the aim for south-south synergy building is important, there are also common challenges faced between North-South in movement building and advocacy. ² The evaluation finds that the pathway of North-South exchange on areas of mutual concern has been underutilised thus far and is a solid issue for mutual learning.
A dynamic and broad network		The strategy to have different types of partners, including ad hoc partners and the encouragement of partners to build networks beyond that of T11 as well as T11's own broad network into which partners are plugged have been critical factors in creating a dynamic and broad network.

²Challenges related to advocacy include trying to influence proposals for adapting or adopting legislation;; trying to influence adoption of new law proposals and ensuring implementation.

		<p>Across the globe, there is a strengthening of indigenous movements, feminist movements and youth movements. Youth movements in particular are a strong force in going beyond the North-South narratives, often articulating their messages in similar language of sustainability and justice. The programme however does not seem to ride adequately on this wave. Particularly the innovation and connection potential of youth movements has not been explored to its full potential. There has been involvement of youth and exchanges of youth from the Philippines and Belgium for instance. However, the evaluation notes that the programme would benefit more from strategic partnerships with youth movements that go beyond 'involving them' to engaging them as strategic partners designing and strategising with them. It remains a challenge of course that in most contexts there are few to no structured or organised youth movements. Nevertheless, where these can be found, this should be strongly considered.</p>
<p>Decolonization and actively combating the dominant power relations</p>		<p>Much of T11's decolonisation focus has been on itself being an equal partner to its donors. This has been successful on many fronts including equal and open communication; usefulness and replicability of reporting formats which focus on reflection and learning rather than control; a partnership in solidarity and with a long term view, which goes beyond granting. All these have been critical factors in combating dominant power relations in its position as a donor.</p> <p>Within the international department, T11 is restructuring in order to facilitate more input to policy to ensure that partners can represent themselves on policy work rather than be spoken for. This is a strong move towards decolonisation.</p> <p>There is still room to bring decolonisation into the lenses that the programme uses to look at issues. A colonial legacy is the tendency towards binaries and the separation and categorisation of elements that in fact are interconnected. The move towards intersectionality is important for this. This needs to be operationalised concretely, for instance, when it comes to the way in which gender is positioned in the programme. For this to happen concretely, the preliminary stage of capacity building on</p>

		<p>intersectionality will be crucial to the programme and should ideally be done at the beginning of the programme. An intersectionality lens will also be crucial to operationalising the Leave none behind approach through its connection of different structures that together reinforce exclusion on the basis of several factors which coexist simultaneously with gender. We make suggestions for this in the recommendations section.</p>
<p>Significant political impact</p>		<p>The programme in itself, by taking an open stand on the need for alternatives, is political. Such an open position in itself has an impact, as it brings the case for Alternatives from the periphery to the centre of mainstream discussions and the government fiscal envelope.</p> <p>The institutional funding provided to partners, the choice to work in difficult political contexts and the long-term view that T11 takes, which keeps it around as a funder beyond annual or periodic performance indicators strengthen the political impact that partners can achieve given that political impact takes time and is a non-linear process which is vulnerable to political changes in contexts.</p> <p>At the same time, the support of campaign work and initiatives that raise awareness builds strong foundations for political impact given that once awareness is raised, it cannot be 'un-raised' and thus societies remain changed in a way, with those whose perspectives were previously left out (e.g. indigenous groups, featuring more), as well as partners' work in entrenching the rights based approaches into legal frameworks (Rights of nature in the constitution-Andes; human and environmental rights focus in Free Trade Agreements (FTA)- Andes and Asia)</p>

In terms of its role as facilitator, initiator, catalyst, it can be said that T11 has played different roles in different situations in this regard. The way that these have manifested in the programme have been through creating synergies. T-11 is seen by its partners mostly as a facilitator of change processes. From inception, the programme has selected strong partners, with a strong background of activism in political environments that can be difficult. Many of these

organisations (e.g. in Asia) recognise T-11 from years before they were partners to the international programme. They therefore view the organisation not only as a donor, but as a partner in solidarity to their own cause for social, economic and ecological justice.

T-11 has been a very active facilitator in certain initiatives, such as the coordination of actions on FTAs with the EU. T11 (and the network in which they actively participate) facilitated the presentation of a Peruvian CSO complaint against the Peruvian government. T11 also facilitates coordination between CSOs in Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and the EU. In the GLR and Asia, the role of facilitator has been very pronounced. For instance the Bonne puissance programme in the GLR, targeted at shifting mindsets and internalising democratisation, anti-corruption, gender sensitivity, etc., which was implemented in DRC and will be implemented in Rwanda and Burundi as well, was significantly facilitated by the international programme.

In the GLR, the role of T11 as a convener is more pronounced, even though the national and regional dynamics make this role more difficult- i.e. the size of DRC and the distances between regions.

Beyond the role that T11 plays with its partners in this regard, it is important for it to look at its role as facilitator, accelerator and even a convener from the perspective of its internal communication and collaboration. From the perspective of partners, there is room for T11 to strengthen its role as convener, bringing together partners to discuss different approaches to ensure that for instance climate justice problems are not shifted from one sector (e.g. Clean energy through solar energy/panels) to another (e.g. The mining sector through increased mining for nickel to make collar panels). Beyond bringing partners together, it is important for T11 to strengthen its internal mechanism for sharing information between staff working in different regions. This could support the holism of the programme, transferring tactics and insights from one region to another at an institutional level. Given the pathway that T11 is taking on linking the international programme more with its policy work, internal coordination will be necessary to ensure that policy contributions are coherent and avoid possible contradictions of inputs from different regions.

Further, in its facilitation and convening role, T 11 should consider that there is a strong role that can be played by engagement and involvement of research institutions. The evaluation has no clear view of the extent to which this happens. We suggest that research institutions could be strong partners in the mutual sharing of knowledge as well as the provision of input on alternatives that can feed into the advocacy work of partners. As mentioned above, the risk of

shifting of problems from one sector to another is a global risk and reality. Yet, in terms of alternatives, research could shed light into such factors and inform advocacy positions, so that partners may not have to reinvent the wheel if research on this has been done and can be referred to.

3.1.4 Counter Forces that influenced the change processes

Counterforces to change are common across regions. The difficult political contexts are characterised by several specifics, for instance polarisation in Bolivia, the newly elected president of the Philippines, who is the son of the former dictator signalling a going back to the 'old ways'.

Economic liberalisation has seen government legislation loosening to make space for big companies and other private interests, hampering efforts to preserve protected areas in Indonesia notably, accelerating mining activities which destroy communities and their environment. Fighting against big investment projects is a challenge, as big companies have a lot of political weight, resources and power.

Harsh punishments and legal persecution for human rights defenders are a common thread, and many partners are part of the global campaign working on the legally binding instrument on human rights to hold business accountable.

Geopolitical interests of some countries in the region, e.g., China's interests in Asia counter the pressure that partners will have managed to advocate for policy-wise from others (e.g., pressuring EU countries to support the withdrawal of the mining activities of European companies in their countries). While they may manage to make progress on certain issues, this can be countered quickly by other actors with geopolitical interests and relations with governments who provide pathways that ease pressure to incorporate human rights issues.

Finally, limited funds will continue to be a challenge in the foreseeable future for partners.

3.1.5 Adaptability of interventions

T11's flexibility has generally enabled partners to adapt to crises even before covid. Recently during covid, partners were supported in changing from their usual activities to meeting livelihood needs, setting up online structures, providing additional funding to respond to covid needs.

Beyond covid, flexible funding has been provided for the security of human rights defenders in the GLR. There were also adaptations made on the visibility policy between T11 in Belgium and the partner countries. In Belgium, the purpose of visibility of the programme is advocacy at government level and at the European level the purpose is accountability to the population on what is going on at partner level. This visibility however endangered partners in Burundi, as it made partners targets for government hostility. To manage this, T11 agreed to reduce the visibility of Burundi and Rwanda programmes on their website and to adapt its own policy strategy with regard to the region.

At a more general level and certainly in the case of Asia, T11 has supported the synergy building and networking of its partners by providing additional funds to attend relevant international conferences that would advance their cause, even in cases where these are not part of the planned programme activities.

3.1.6 Unintended effects

Unintended effects have been both positive and negative. In the Andes region, Alianza para derechos humanos en Ecuador is a platform that was spontaneously created after November protests following the pandemic. This now brings together different organisations, including INREDH, CDES and CEDENMA. They work on different topics, including oil spills, mecheros and national strike and amnesty for leaders who have been criminalised- they managed to get amnesty for the 268 people in Ecuador as has been mentioned earlier..

In all regions, the move into the digital space as a result of covid was unexpected, having negative effects of exclusion of some people due to the pre-existing digital divide. In some instances this had positive outcomes, e.g. in the Andes region, 1 partner working at the capital city level expanded to other regions as a result of digitalisation.

Finally, the decolonisation element was not included in the conceptualisation of the first part of the programme. This was brought up in the mid-term evaluation. Yet, the programme had some in-built decolonisation elements, such as its approach of equal partnership, its core purpose which focuses on alternatives to the current system, whose extractivism and inequalities and harm to the environment are outcomes of colonialism³.

³ https://report.ipcc.ch/ar6wg2/pdf/IPCC_AR6_WGII_SummaryForPolicymakers.pdf

Further, on decolonisation, T11 is taking steps to address this through its restructuring of the international department and linking to policy work. This effort is welcome by partners. It will be important for T11 to approach this from the perspective of coloniality- looking at the epistemological level of ways of knowing and seeing the world, where Western epistemologies have been universalised. This is what the evaluation has tried to point to through the suggestion of taking intersectionality as a lens to look at gender more holistically.

3.2 Efficiency

To what extent have the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time etc) been used in an efficient manner?

3.2.1 Programme management, Budgeting and Reporting Tools

Efficiency is traditionally discussed as the proportionality of the resources spent and what was done in programmes. The way that T11 views the efficiency of the international programme, which aims to achieve political change, is that the interpretation of efficiency needs to be aligned with what it takes to achieve political change. As such, there needs to be more institutional funding to allow possibilities to work on content rather than on administration, such that accountability is on the basis of political change rather than of a cumbersome administrative process for reporting. Further, reporting should be a way of strategising, rather than a form of control.

In many ways the programme has achieved this. Partners report that T11 is the most horizontal partner they have. Reporting requirements are light and useful. Partners have institutionalised the T11 budgeting and reporting formats as part of their own internal planning, budgeting and learning. The outcomes journal approach has shifted mindsets from reporting on quantities to qualitative reflection about their work.

The long-term financial support lasting 5 years at a time allows for stable planning on the part of the partners, saving the time and effort it takes to continuously be going into new funding cycles. The flexibility of the budgets have also had the same result and efficiency gain, to focus on the content rather than cumbersome justifications on why budgets need to shift.

The way of engagement, e.g. the co-planning of the activity budget and the open communication to discuss risks is seen as a solid means of support.

A point for improvement is that partners express that they would appreciate feedback moments from T11 on their reports. This is expressed particularly in the GLR and Asia albeit for different reasons. In the context of GLR, it is the T11 staff who propose that midway check in points are important. When it comes to monitoring, a challenge lies in creating the reflex or habit to use and update the monitoring tools on a permanent basis, and not only consult or complete them at the moment a monitoring deadline comes up. There are notable, well appreciated mechanisms in place to ensure the monitoring in between. However, the written synthesis of the main interim findings or conclusions is not always captured in time or adequately in the intended tools.

In the context of Asia, it is the partners who express the need for feedback from T11 on their outcome journals to facilitate two-way communication rather than one way reporting. This would allow partners to flag concerns early on and clarify elements from their reports. From the side of T11, information captured through outcome journals has been reported as somewhat cumbersome to translate to T11's own reporting, while acknowledging also that the Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD) reporting mechanism is relatively light. A foreseen next adaptation with regards to partners' reporting mechanism is for the outcome journals to be drafted in a way that can make outcome harvesting logical. This would be a step towards moving away from reporting tools for purposes of reporting to using them as strategising tools, which can reveal interesting insights into what is politically essential, given the complexity of T11's work and the contexts in which it operates. Indeed the evaluation has made a recommendation related to this.

In the Andes region, the planning, budgeting and reporting tools are overall appreciated. In the beginning it was difficult to enter the mindset of qualitative reporting but partners in the Andes, as in Asia, see the benefit and in some cases the templates have been used to organise work internally or report to other donors.

3.2.2 Adjustments of budgets and schedules

The reduction of the DGD grant led to a reformulation of the grants to partners. However, partners report that this was handled well and they did not face challenges. In general, funds that are left over from one year can be transferred to the following year, although this is not possible in

the last year of the funding cycle. Only one partner stated having faced the latter challenge, but in general partners did not report challenges there. In terms of budget management however, covid presented many situations where activities had to be moved from physical activities to online activities, leading to significant underspend. Some partners, notably in the Asia region indicate that their advocacy activities reduced up to under 25%. T11 was flexible enough to allow for this shift of activities to use the funds to meet livelihood needs, and provided additional funding to partners to do capacity development on linking their work on ecological justice with covid in their narratives.

The GLR partners needed 10-35% additional funds to top up the initial budget in order to cover covid related expenses. T11 made contributions to this, with other donors also contributing. Particular to the GLR is that partners expressed appreciation that the regional coordinator is a Congolese person. In this respect, they find communication easier, more understanding of contextual sensitivities that are necessary when it comes to advocacy. Indeed the MTE recommended that T11 needs more diversity within its staff in order to diversify the movement and recommended that in the long term, expat staff should be replaced by local staff. The evaluation has no information on whether this particular case is a move in that direction for T11, but it is nevertheless commendable noting that there are also local staff in the Philippines and in Peru. Apart from the diversity element, the recruitment of local staff is also an efficient way of using financial resources and a move away from colonial practices in development where the knowledge of the locals of their own environments was not recognised.

3.2.3 Collaboration with other organisations

One of the limitations of the evaluation is that we did not get much insight into the collaboration between the international programme and T11 members. We nevertheless take note that a recommendation of the MTE was to flesh out some joint learning trajectories. We do not know the extent to which this has been done, but to help operationalise this recommendation, we suggest that the areas of advocacy towards implementation and risk of shifting of problems from one sector to another in advocacy may be starting points for such a joint trajectory of mutual sharing and reflection.

In spite of the consensus on the value of regional and international networking, and its centrality to the programme objectives, it remains that this is a challenge for partners because of limitations in human and financial resources. Often there is one person managing the programme and in light of the many national level fires that partners have to put out, they do not have capacity to

effectively engage in regional and international networks. As such some of this networking is deprioritised. We will recommend later that partners do an analysis of the resources needed to be more effective in this kind of collaboration and cost it in a way that T11 can consider as part of the grant. In the particular case of the GLR, partners report that exchanges outside of the region are limited and not necessarily part of the programme. Given regional politics that make it difficult to collaborate and move between countries, there is a lot to do at a local level before making inter-regional collaboration a strong focus.

3.3 Sustainability

What is the degree of probability of maintaining the benefits of the programme intervention in the long term?

3.3.1 Sustainability of social changes

A common articulation across all regions is that the programme has achieved social change, whether or not this social change is measurable. The creation of spaces for conversation, the awareness raising on different issues, the presentation of alternative ways of thinking and living, are introductions into society that cannot be withdrawn, but can only spread, be adapted, be implemented and form synergies beyond this particular programme and its related activities.

Wins that have been made at the levels of legislation, in Andes (entrenching rights of nature into the constitution) and in Asia (adoption to take a human and environmental rights lens in FTAs), the Bonne Puissance outcomes in the GLR to entrench principles of democracy and human rights in organisations and individual ways of being, result in an effective change in current and future advocacy and engagements.

It is worth noting however that there are differences in levels of activism between countries, which are also conditioned by the political climate and how open or repressive it is. Therefore while fundamentally society may be changed, there will continue to be differences in the extent to which changes are explicit and incremental.

3.3.2 Institutional sustainability

The fact that this is a programme in which partners develop and implement their own programmes using their own strategies is a strong predictor of institutional sustainability. It is one

thing to empower partners and develop capacity but it is also another thing to NOT disempower them. In this sense, the international programme does both, through active capacity development in some areas. On the other hand it does not impose its own structures, programme designs, narratives and implementation methods upon its partners. This approach therefore leaves partners with their 'institutional fabric' intact, such that even without T11 grants, they are still able to sustain the institutional fabric which is familiar to them, adjusted to their contexts and able to navigate that context using tools and methods that it knows rather than unfamiliar ones that have been externally imposed. This approach makes T11 a donor who puts in practice the alternatives that they are trying to promote.

3.3.3 Financial sustainability

In some instances in the Andes region, T11 actively sought to increase the financial sustainability of its partners (for instance, through the organisation of a workshop with Broederlijk Delen and Peruvian CSOs where participants explored innovative venues for funding). In the GLR, capacity building was conducted to assist partners to become attractive to other donors and in the Asia region, partners engage in an open conversation on how they would work together as partners without T11 funding. Therefore while there is still a high dependency on donor funding, and it is clear that T11 is filling in a big gap as there are few donors providing core funding in this same way, the way of working with partners empowers partners. The institutionalisation of budgeting, planning and reporting templates for example strengthens internal processes of partners in a way that gives them room to be independent and capable of attracting other donors. At the same time there are looming threats in certain countries as we discuss in the risk analysis section following.

3.3.4 Contribution of the programme to an enabling environment

Particularly in the GLR where the programme focuses strongly on democratic justice, it has created there spaces for rights holders to express themselves, increased the visibility of CSOs and created various platforms for issues to be discussed- community radios and various platforms for exchange between the population and local authorities.

In Andes and Asia, as mentioned earlier, legislative wins have created legal precedence on several issues, making the advocacy and campaigning environment more open and increasing the continuation point for them to a higher level.

While there are trends contributing to an enabling environment that cannot be attributed to the programme for instance the strengthening in indigenous groups, global youth and feminist movements, the programme has incorporated these groups and the narratives they present into its work, riding on the wave of progressive trends to push for change. We have discussed earlier in the report that there is room for improvement.

3.4 Risk Analysis

Table 3: Risk analysis and mitigation measures

Donor level risks	Mitigation strategies	Region
European political climate, conservative politics pushes for a more internally focused agenda	Partners need to continuously develop narratives that link their contexts with the global context to ensure that the relevance of their issues remains visible.	All
War in Ukraine affects prioritisation of the fiscal envelope which might affect how much money T11 gets for its programmes		
Change in which regions become a priority of Belgian and European institutional funding		
Partner level risks		
Political climate of partners deteriorates in a way that threatens their ability to receive foreign grants	Have local organisation be responsible for handling funds, for instance, the Human Rights Commission	Asia/Philippines
Progress that has been made by CSOs is reversed by new regime	CSOs need to unite around a common narrative in order to increase mobilisation of civil society	Asia/Philippines
Demotivation of rights holders to engage due to lack of funding	Facilitating discussions with rights holders and partners on meaningful incentives for participation that contribute	GLR

	to the empowerment of rights holders	
The security of human rights defenders continues to be threatened	Partners continue to engage with the global campaign on binding standards for the protection of human rights defenders and collaborate with other organisations who are working on protecting human rights defenders, e.g. Protect Defenders	All

4. Conclusions

Effectiveness	
Conclusion 1	The programme has been successful in its contribution to an autonomous civil society, particularly in terms of narratives. The financial autonomy aspect remains limited because of the continued dependence on donor funding. What the programme has done however is to limit the typical limitations associated with the donor/grantee power dynamic by creating an equal partnership. The programme's focus on building synergies have been valued and it has made a huge impact and created chain reactions by connecting its partners to its own networks and supporting them to engage in networks beyond its own.
Conclusion 2	The exchanges that have been facilitated between partners across regions have enabled the travelling of concepts and the travelling of advocacy tactics, which has strengthened partners' advocacy work. Nevertheless, there remains room for further engagement inter-regionally, particularly between the Andes region and the Asia region, given the common elements of the programme focus areas as well as regional dynamics related to climate change, extractivism and gender to mention a few. At the same time it has been noted by partners that there are limitations in human and financial resources which limit the extent to which they can meaningfully engage in regional and international platforms. Furthermore, there is room for more strategic partnerships with types of partners that are well positioned to accelerate the narratives on alternatives, notably youth movements. At the same time there is the recognition that in many contexts, there are few to no organised or structured youth movements.

Conclusion 3	While the south-south synergy building is important to the evaluation, there are opportunities for equal north-south exchange on common advocacy issues, even in spite of different advocacy contexts. In fact, where advocacy contexts are starkly different, partners are able to get inspiration from being able to imagine what 'things could look like' and what is possible, through engagement with those from contexts where there is more space for certain kinds of advocacy. As such it is important to, while strengthening the south-south exchange, to not deprioritise the north-south exchange on common issues.
Conclusion 4	The gender inequality aspect has been generally inconsistent, ranging from little marked progress to progress that seems to still be somewhat at an awareness raising level. The evaluation concludes here that the approach to gender as a stand alone element may not be adequate for a programme focusing on systemic change from a holistic point of view. For this programme, intersectionality may be a more useful framework to address gender issues in a more holistic way that 'leaves no one behind'.
Conclusion 5	The approach that T11 has taken of having different types of partners, institutional partners, thematic partners and adhoc partners has been effective in bringing in different perspectives while maintaining stability and a space for sustainable programme implementation through its steady 5 year long funding.
Conclusion 6	Partners have built up expertise over time to engage with rights holders and different types of target groups. The shared tactic of evaluating when to focus on local levels and when to focus on the national level, as well as supporting local level leadership candidates who support systemic change to rise to positions of influence are solid tactics. Moreover, partners assess that local level change achieves more direct impact and such an approach has brought them closer to rights holders. Capacities of rights holders differ across regions and partners have done well in capacity building, in spite of persisting capacity limitations here and there on the level of engagement with legislative processes on the part of rights holders.
Conclusion 7	The progress marker system is well appreciated by partners. Its quantitative element complements the quantitative reflections usefully and this evaluation has experienced consistency between these two elements. This is in spite of the fact that the qualitative element is dominant and thus subjectivity is a strong factor. While the contributions of T11 to the outcomes are highlighted clearly in several instances, it remains that the monitoring system does not adequately capture information that demonstrates this contribution clearly.

Sustainability	
Conclusion 8	The T11 model as an equal partner facilitates financial sustainability because of the space it provides to reflect on sustainability beyond its own funding, the transparency it gives to its partners and the capacity development it offers explicitly but also implicitly through providing budgeting and reporting systems that are easy, can be institutionalised and can strengthen the internal management processes of its partners.
Conclusion 9	The approach of equal partnership without imposition of narratives and implementation methods, in combination with the requirements on reporting are key in the context of the current reliance on donor funding. They at least limit the negative effects of this reliance, which continue to be limitations in the development sector in general
Efficiency	
Conclusion 10	The programme has generally been efficient and aligned with its own view of what efficiency means in its political work. Aforementioned elements related to flexible budgets, light reporting systems and outcome based reporting have contributed to efficiency.

5. Recommendations

Effectiveness	
Recommendation 1: Incorporate youth movements as strategic partners	Of the target groups that the programme identifies, it is important that it strategically moves beyond ‘awareness raising’ or ‘involvement’ of groups who are well positioned to be more strategic partners because of their social positioning in this current moment. The evaluation suggests that youth movements, whose narrative is beyond ‘development’; SDGs and sometimes beyond the north-south divide because of their social media connectedness can be strategic partners for the programme. As such, to the extent that there are organised youth movements, partners should consider engaging them at a more strategic level rather than ‘involving them’ as they may be key in advancing certain campaigns and alternative narratives and initiatives significantly.

<p>Recommendation 2: Consider having a budget dedicated to facilitating networking and synergy building</p>	<p>In spite of the importance of network and synergy building in the programme, partners do not have enough human and financial resources to communicate and remain a sustainable part of regional and international networks given the pressure they have from their internal workload. We recommend that partners do an analysis of the resources needed to be more effective in this kind of collaboration and cost it in a way that T11 can consider as part of the grant.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Initiate the trajectory of common issues to exchange as part of north-south sharing</p>	<p>In the MTE it was recommended that progress markers be used for ‘north’ and ‘south’ partners of T11, aligning them to the identification of joint learning trajectories. To build on this, we suggest in this evaluation that the advocacy follow up tactics towards implementation of adopted legislation as well as conversations on the gaps and risks of shifting problems from one sector to another as discussed in the report are global challenges and possible common learning points between the Belgian T11 members and the international partners.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Strengthen internal mechanism for sharing information among regional staff</p>	<p>Beyond bringing partners together, it is important for T11 to strengthen its internal mechanism for sharing information between staff working in different regions. This could support the holism of the programme, transferring tactics and insights from one region to another at an institutional level. Given the pathway that T11 is taking on linking the international programme more with its policy work, more internal coordination will be necessary to ensure that policy contributions are aligned</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: Build capacity of rights holders and simultaneously include them in campaigns through Rights to Information laws</p>	<p>Across the regions, rights holders face challenges in engaging with campaigns or legal cases that would advance their rights for several reasons among which is capacity to organise sufficiently. One of the common limitations is the intimidation of legal processes, and the perceived inaccessibility of legal language which sometimes creates a perceived distance between what happens on the ground and the legal frameworks in place.</p> <p>The evaluation recommends that where capacity building is being done, such capacity building needs to be closely linked to engagement with the legal structures. A place to start from is to use the Freedom of Information laws (in countries with such laws) to develop rights’ holders capacities on how to use Rtl laws to access their basic human rights. Rights-holders can therefore submit Rtl requests to the relevant authorities requesting information that is related to their grievance. In this way they develop the capacity to engage with the existing law and use them as</p>

	<p>a way of increasing pressure on the grievances that they are advocating on. There are examples from CSOs in Indonesia, including JATAM, who used the Right to Information laws (Right to Information Act in Indonesia and Freedom of Information Act in the Philippines) to facilitate the engagement of rights holders with the law.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: Advance decolonisation work through taking an intersectionality approach to gender equality</p>	<p>There is still room to bring decolonisation into the lenses that the programme uses to look at issues. A colonial legacy is the tendency towards binaries and the separation and categorisation of elements that in fact are interconnected. The evaluation recommends that intersectionality is a more useful framework to address gender inequality and incorporate it better into the programme narratives. A first step towards this is capacity building on intersectionality should ideally be done at the beginning of the programme. An intersectionality lens will also be crucial to operationalising the Leave none behind approach through its connection of different structures that together reinforce exclusion on the basis of several factors which coexist simultaneously with gender. Some partners, for example TPKT and the NGO Forum in Asia have this intersectionality and feminist perspectives approach and would be useful to engage with to explore how they could support capacity building efforts to other partners on this</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: Incorporate mid-reporting check in points for GLR and Asia regions in order to facilitate two way feedback for the latter and to facilitate mid-way reflection for the former.</p>	<p>For GLR, provide templates for After-Action-Reviews (AARs) for partners to self facilitate light review and reflection sessions at the end of the programme interventions. These AARs could be referred to later for reporting, making reporting easier and not reliant on memory, while facilitating self-directed moments of reflection and internal learning.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: Consider an outcome harvesting methodology for the next programme evaluation</p>	<p>The progress markers provide a useful way to track progress over time and the accompanying quantitative markers support the qualitative reports well. However, their interpretation at the final evaluation stage could benefit from an outcome harvesting methodology. The fact that most partners have institutionalised the progress markers system as part of their planning means that the progress markers are a good foundation as a form of outcome mapping. As such outcome harvesting should follow smoothly. In this case, outcome harvesting would aim to identify, describe, verify and</p>

	analyse outcomes in a systematic way. While the methodology of this evaluation constitutes some elements of outcome harvesting, it was not designed according to this methodology,
Sustainability	
Recommendation 9:	T11 could act as an advocate for the model it is applying on donor/grantee equal partnership to contribute to the shift in the larger donor community on this global problem. This would also contribute to making the benefits of its own efforts in implementing this model sustainable.
Efficiency	
Recommendation 10: Continue with the system of budget flexibility	The budget flexibility approach in T11 is well appreciated by partners and should continue.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of documents

Type of document	Specific doc
ToCs for focus countries	ToC narrative 2022-2026 RDC_FR
	ToC narrative 2022-2026 Indonesia_EN
	ToC narrative 2022-2026 Ecuador_EN
Mid-term report- Burundi	rapport évaluation mi-terme 11.11.11 Burundi avril 2019 UCL
Manual for performance measurement	Manual Performance measuring system_EN
Mid-term evaluation report- full programme	Final report midterm evaluation alternatives south 11.11.11_version 110520
Manual	2018 Manual Partner Program & Management_South Department
Programme docs- all 8 countries (some of these are not final for 2021 and will be available in march)	11.11.11 Programa 2017-21 Peru
	11.11.11 Programa 2017-21 Ecuador
	11.11.11 Programa 2017-21 Bolivia
	11.11.11 progr 2017-21 Rwanda
	11.11.11 progr 2017-21 RDC
	11.11.11 progr 2017-21 Philippines
	11.11.11 Progr 2017-21 Indonesia
	11.11.11 Progr 2017-21 Burundi
Additional GL	2017 > 2021 : Priorités du département sud Document de travail sur les alternatives et la région des Grands Lacs
Additional Asia	Outcome Journal Indonesia 2017 - 2021
	Team outcome journal Asia 2017

Additional Andes	Evoluciones políticas, económicas, ecológicas, y sociales en América Latina
	Análisis de contexto de la región ALC_enero 2020

Annex 2: Participating organisations

Great Lakes Region

(Ex) Staff 11.11.11
Programme Coordinator GL Region - Brussels
Regional Coordinator - Bukavu
Former member of the International Department Rwanda & Burundi
Former member of the Policy Department Great Lakes Region
Embassies
DRC - Political section
DRC - Cooperation section
Burundi - Cooperation section
Partner organisations DRC
AETA
AIDPROFEN
IBGDH
ODEP
RECIC
Partner organisations Burundi
APRODH
REJA

Partner organisations Rwanda
AMI - Coordinator
Other organisations
Broederlijk Delen (member of 11.11.11)
Freedom House (protection network)

Andes Region

(Ex) Staff 11.11.11
Coordinator program Andes 11 Brussels
Coordinator regional office Lima
Staff office Lima (partners Peru)
Ex staff member office Lima - partners
Embassies
Former head of belgian embassy NGOs
Responsible belgian embassy NGOs
Partner organisations Ecuador
CDES
Acción Ecológica - Derechos Naturaleza
Acción Ecológica
Acción Ecológica
INREDH
CEDENMA
Latindadd - network on finance and tax
Partner organisation interviews- Regional- linked with Ecuador
Fundacion Solon

REDGE Perú
MOCICC
OCMAL
Other organisations
BOS +
FOS
RIKOLTO
BROEDERLIJK DELEN
FUNDACIÓN PACHAMAMA
Other stakeholders (external)
DGD - responsible Ecuador
DGD - responsible Ecuador
supported by INREDH program
Accion Ecologica

Asia Region

(Ex) Staff 11.11.11
Program coordinator Asia- Brussels
Coordinator regional office - Manilla
Embassies
-
Partner organisations Indonesia
Walhi (Friends of the Earth Indonesia)
JATAM
Sawit Watch
KontraS

SP
TPKT : eco feminism – young women
Indonesia for Global Justice (IGJ) & AEPF (Asia Europe People's Forum)
Partner organisations Philippines
Partner Lilak
Partner ATM
Partner PMCJ
NGO Forum on ADB
Other organisations
TransNational Institute (TNI)
Rikolto

Annex 3: Inception report (attached)