

**ODS** GREATER IMPACT

**Final evaluation**

**11.11.11 International Programme**

**2017 - 2021**

*Regional Report - Andes Region | 10 June 2022*

*Rue Joseph II | 1000 Brussels, Belgium*

*[www.odsupport.eu](http://www.odsupport.eu) | [info@odsupport.eu](mailto:info@odsupport.eu)*

## CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	3
-----------------------	---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
-------------------	---

This evaluation examines the effectiveness and efficiency of the 11.11.11 International Programme (T11) implementation from 2017 to 2021, as well as its long-term sustainability. It identifies key lessons and makes recommendations for future programme actions. These recommendations, both in terms of activities and approach, refer to the most effective and sustainable way to implement the programme and future programming focused on supporting local CSOs and their networks and achieving system change. The programme has been implemented in the region of the Great Lakes, the Andes, and SouthEast Asia. This is the Andes Region regional report. The analysis in this report focuses on Ecuador. 4

### Evaluation methodology

The analysis was structured to answer evaluation questions about effectiveness, sustainability, and efficiency. The findings for the Andes region are the result of a desk review, document analysis, and consultations with key stakeholders. Consultations took the form of 14 group and individual interviews with T11 staff in Brussels and the regional office, external stakeholders- Broederlijk Delen, BOS+, and a former representative of the Belgian Embassy in Lima- and representatives of the partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders in the three countries. On March 30, 2022, a roundtable discussion on the programme's efficiency was held, and the results were presented at a regional validation workshop on May 3rd, 2022. 4

Conclusions and Recommendations	4
---------------------------------	---

INTRODUCTION	8
--------------	---

1.1 Context Analysis	8
----------------------	---

KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	11
------------------------------	----

2.1 Effectiveness	11
-------------------	----

Intended Outcomes	12
-------------------	----

2.1.1 PM1	12
-----------	----

2.2.2 PM2	14
-----------	----

2.2.3 PM3	16
-----------	----

2.2.4 PM4	18
-----------	----

2.2.5 Progress Markers system	19
-------------------------------	----

2.2.6 11.11.11's Role	19
-----------------------	----

2.3 Sustainability	20
--------------------	----

2.3.1 Social changes	20
----------------------	----

2.3.2 Social and institutional sustainability	21
---	----

2.3.3 Financial sustainability	21
--------------------------------	----

2.3.4 Enabling environment	22
----------------------------	----

2.3.5 Risks	22
-------------	----

2.4 Efficiency	23
----------------	----

2.4.1 Programme Management	23
----------------------------	----

	<b>2</b>
2.4.2 Collaboration with others	23
2.4.3 Budget, schedules and timetables	25
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>25</b>
Table 1 : Conclusion	25
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>27</b>
Table 2 : Recommendations	27
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>29</b>
Annex 1: Participating organisations	29
Annex 2: Scores obtained per PM in Ecuador	31

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>CDES</b>	Centro de Derechos Económicos y Sociales
<b>CONAIE</b>	Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organisation
<b>DAG</b>	Domestic Advisory Group
<b>DGD</b>	Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid
<b>DRC</b>	Democratic Republic of the Congo
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FTA</b>	Free Trade Agreement
<b>HRD</b>	Human Rights Defender
<b>IACHR</b>	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
<b>NGO</b>	Non governmental organisation
<b>PM</b>	Progress Marker
<b>RH</b>	Right holder
<b>T11</b>	Triple 11 - 11.11.11

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This evaluation examines the effectiveness and efficiency of the 11.11.11 International Programme (T11) implementation from 2017 to 2021, as well as its long-term sustainability. It identifies key lessons and makes recommendations for future programme actions. These recommendations, both in terms of activities and approach, refer to the most effective and sustainable way to implement the programme and future programming focused on supporting local CSOs and their networks and achieving system change. The programme has been implemented in the region of the Great Lakes, the Andes, and SouthEast Asia. This is the Andes Region regional report. The analysis in this report focuses on Ecuador.

**Evaluation methodology**

The analysis was structured to answer evaluation questions about effectiveness, sustainability, and efficiency. The findings for the Andes region are the result of a desk review, document analysis, and consultations with key stakeholders. Consultations took the form of 14 group and individual interviews with T11 staff in Brussels and the regional office, external stakeholders- Broederlijk Delen, BOS+, and a former representative of the Belgian Embassy in Lima- and representatives of the partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders in the three countries. On March 30, 2022, a roundtable discussion on the programme's efficiency was held, and the results were presented at a regional validation workshop on May 3rd, 2022.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Effectiveness				
C1- the programme has been hands-on in providing capacity building activities to improve internal technical elements and communication capacities of partners. At the advocacy level ,the Andes region has been a leader in the conceptualisation of notions such as rights of nature, and the truth and reconciliation	C2 - Financial autonomy, like in other regions, has been difficult to achieve with continued dependence on donors. However, the institutional funding provided by T11, which comes with an autonomy that is incomparable with most other donors is highly appreciated. Further, it covers a big gap	C3 - Links with rights holders are strong and there is a strong activism climate. Efforts have been made to strengthen the capacities of rights holders through providing technical support to face human rights violations. Several achievements have been made in which rights holders participation have been key. There is therefore relatively strong	C4 - While there have been efforts and successful integrations of gender into the narratives of some partners' work, this has been inconsistent and more needs to be done in this area. In some cases gender is included in the agendas of partners but not those of rights holders. Capacity building, with the support of women's organisations has been identified as a strategy to facilitate a stronger gender	C5 - The role of T11 in the region has accelerated and facilitated some work flows. It has brought together several partners, created a space for cross-pollination of themes and thus facilitated the application of a holistic approach.

<p>process associated with it, as well as its entrenchment in the constitution in the case of Ecuador. These concepts have been exported to other regions, supporting other partners in forming their own narratives and designing their own advocacy around them. However, in the region, media coverage of advocacy remains difficult due to the government avoiding controversial topics and the media going for mainstream topics. As such the tactic to focus on the local level in different areas has been key.</p>	<p>in funding, for organisations that cannot access international cooperation funds, here referring specifically to the fund that was created by Broederlijk Delen and T11 to provide more timely support for small and innovative initiatives.</p>	<p>capacity among rights holders to organise and participate.</p>	<p>approach. While this is in any case a valuable approach, the evaluation concludes that as concluded for other regions, a more fundamental change may be required here.</p>	
<p>R1- Inter-regional exchanges between T11 partners can be facilitated more, particularly exchanges between the Andes region and the Asia region given the similarities between the regions on focus areas and their related</p>			<p>R2- The capacity building strategy related to gender can be tackled more fundamentally by taking a more intersectional view in order to better address the structural causes in a holistic way. At this stage, the programme can begin by exploring how this can be done concretely through including within its network partners who have this experience and approach, connecting</p>	

dynamics.			with research institutions, etc.	
-----------	--	--	----------------------------------	--

Sustainability		
<p>C6- Ecuador is characterised by strong activism, more so than other countries where partners of T11 are. As such the creation and retention of strong networks is a contributing factor to sustainability. The collaboration with the University of Simon Bolivar in bringing together rights to nature experts is also key to the sustainability of social changes.</p>	<p>C7- The approach that T11 takes to have partners design and own their programmes is key, as is the approach to not impose standard definitions or methods for capacity building has enabled partners to tailor activities to their own needs.</p>	<p>C8- There remains strong dependence on donor funding, even if within this space some partners have managed to diversify their funding pool. While T11 has provided support through for instance a workshop on accessing funding, it sees its value add more as improving the strategic work of partners. The reliance on donor funding will realistically remain for the foreseeable short-medium term. However, where T11 has added great value is to be a donor who works on equal footing, limiting the negative effects that the traditional donor-grantee power dynamic creates.</p>
<p>R4- Continue to empower civil society and to bring together organisations working at the national and regional level. An empowered civil society is able to oppose abusive political processes.</p>		<p>R3- On financial sustainability, think along with the partners on practical solutions and prompt an internal reflection on sustainability, fundraising at the local level, sharing functions among different organisations, and collaborating with universities.</p>

Efficiency
<p>C9- Budget flexibility is valuable to the programme and the equal partnership approach that T11 takes. The management of budget cuts that happened during the programme period was done well and did not affect partners significantly. The open communication and co-design approach to programme management is highly appreciated, as was the effort taken by T11 to introduce the new strategy for 2022 in consideration of partners' advocacy strategies. However, feedback sessions are mostly organised after report submission and limited to individual partners, whereas partners would benefit from a broader conversation that includes other partners in view of increasing synergies.</p>

R5- Prompt more international exchange (also online) especially on lessons learned in campaigns and advocacy.

R6- Engage in deeper strategic discussions with partners at the programme level and facilitate feedback sessions that include several partners to facilitate exchange on achieved results and adjustments in view of increasing synergies and learning between partners. This could be in the form of yearly sessions after submission of the outcome journals between all partners to exchange on results, synergies strategies going forward and discussing lessons learned, at country or regional level. This could also support the translation of approaches and agendas at the European level.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation primarily looks at how effectively and efficiently the programme has been implemented thus far, and assesses its sustainability moving forward. The evaluation is an opportunity for 11.11.11 (T11) to be accountable to key stakeholders including local partners and the main donor, the Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid (DGD). The evaluation takes a forward-looking approach by formulating recommendations on the basis of the conclusions. These recommendations refer to the most effective and sustainable way to implement the programme and future programming focused on supporting local CSOs and their networks and achieving system change, both in terms of activities and approach.

The programme is implemented in three regions: the Great Lakes Region (Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Burundi, Rwanda), the Andes region (Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador) and Southeast Asia (Philippines, Indonesia) and at the global level. This is the regional report for the Andes Region. In this report, the analysis focuses on Ecuador. The mid-term evaluations - the Burundi evaluation, the MTE on alternatives with a focus on Andes (case study Peru) & Asia (case study Philippines) – have been taken into consideration. While this report will also discuss the programmes in other countries in the region (Bolivia and Peru), the focus will nonetheless be on Ecuador.

Our regional findings for the Andes region are based on a combination of desk review and document analysis and consultations with key stakeholders. Consultations happened in the form of 14 group and individual interviews (with T11 staff in Brussels and in the regional office, with external stakeholders- Broederlijk Delen, BOS+ and a former representative of the Belgian Embassy in Lima) and with representatives of the partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders in the three countries. A roundtable discussion on the efficiency of the programme was conducted on the 30th March 2022 while results were presented in a regional validation workshop on 3rd of May 2022.

### 1.1 Context Analysis

Here below, we briefly summarise the main contextual elements that characterised the programme implementation period at the regional level.

A shared challenge that is common to the three countries is the **difficult and unstable political context**, with weak, fragmented political parties and political institutions as well as a general lack of confidence in democracy. These factors contribute to a continued instability in the region, and

often favour the rise of personalist leadership. For instance, in Peru, in the evaluation period, five presidents entered into power and ended their mandate. This lack of political stability negatively impacts the growth of the country and slows down the work of T11's partners, who are continuously confronted with new leadership and have to review approaches and strategies accordingly, and re-establish key relations for advocacy purposes.

**Corruption** also remains one of the biggest challenges for the region, as it continues to impact daily lives of individuals and local communities, the availability of public resources and undermine human development. In the evaluation period, high profile cases of corruption sent shockwaves through the entire region (Odebrecht, Lava Jato) and involved high profile politicians and business people.

**Commercial liberalisation** through a general lowering of trade barriers with the establishment of Free Trade Agreements (FTA) has also been identified by the interviewees as an important contextual factor affecting the work of the partners.

**Shrinking space for civil society is a global phenomenon** and Latin American countries are not an exception. The complicated regional political context of the last decade often corresponded with the insurgence of regulations limiting the work of CSOs and the rise of authoritarian practices from the Governments to hinder their operation and efficacy. This created obstacles and led to the shutdown of several organisations. Human rights defenders continue to face enormous challenges across Latin America and the evaluation period is characterised by high levels of crime and violence towards these individuals, who also might suffer from judicial harassment and physical attacks.

The **Covid-19 pandemic** had widespread economic, social, and political effects in the three countries, and especially in Peru which had the highest recorded mortality rate in the region. Global investments, trade and tourism are the most heavily affected sectors and the ones that most of the countries of the region rely on for their income. This economic contraction increased poverty and exacerbated income inequality. In addition, the inadequacy of public services, lack of strong welfare and social measures that existed before the spreading of the virus explain the eruption of social protests in the region from 2019 onwards. The Governments' response to such protests has been strong and violent repression.

At the same time, several **'indigenous movements in the region have been gaining strength,** contributing to the opening up of spaces for collective actions that did not exist before. Despite the fact that these movements are often the primary target of state violence and repression, they

managed to be key protagonists in promoting change and being a powerful counterweight to the government.

## Ecuador

Correa's government (2007 to 2017) coincided with a period of economic growth for Ecuador. He implemented economic policies that led to an expansion of social spending and this, combined with the rising price of oil, contributed to reducing poverty rates.

Despite the fact that initially some progressive policies were enacted, his government also enacted a series of decrees which were restrictive and highly discretionary, aimed at civil society organisations (CSOs). His administration became more and more dependent on the extraction of natural resources, for the implementation of the economic and social agenda. Several measures to increase the country's extractive capacity have been taken, such as the authorisation of drilling for oil in natural reserves as well as the opening of new big scale mines, often located where indigenous communities live. This meant that a direct **confrontation with indigenous movements started**, as many of them have been negatively affected by these developments.

Moreno's government continued these trends, recurring to neoliberal policies. While at the beginning of his presidency it showed more openness to dialogue with civil society, in fact the general conditions for CSOs to operate in the country did not change drastically. In addition, the fall in price of oil, the serious country overindebtedness and cases of high profile cases of corruption have been identified in the consultations as the main three trends that led to **the massive demonstrations** in October 2019. The government responded with an excessive use of force and judicialization of political dissent.

The general lack of government capacity and the absence of institutional channels to process social demand, creates a persistent risk for conflicts and the unleashing of social violence.

There are a number of complexities also within the indigenous movement. Indigenous organisations in Ecuador are not monolithic and their agendas might differ. This has been instrumentalised by several governments when possible.

Lazo is insisting on more foreign investment and expansion of the activities on and on a further deregulation and liberalisation, as agreed upon with the IMF. There is a law of progressive use of force that guarantees the impunity of the police and the military.

## 2. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 2.1 Effectiveness

In the Andes region there is a good level of integration of the work of T11 within the work of the partners, especially at the thematic level. This is due to close coordination and open communication (having the team based locally has been recognised as a critical success factor) but also to a good level of flexibility of the programme, that is able to adapt to a fast changing context.

Partners in the Andes region have outstanding thematic expertise on climate and environmental justice. Some of them have been working in this area for twenty years now, providing innovative solutions and continuously framing their activities under the narrative of alternatives. Rights of nature were integrated in the Constitution of Ecuador more than ten year ago, making it the first country in the world to recognise the Rights of nature. Through the actual constitutional process in Chile, it is possible that these rights will also be recognised in the new constitution. By supporting the partners, T11 also positions itself as a pioneer organisation in the protection of environmental justice. Partners' work in developing alternative approaches that promote a society that will realise the well-being, dignity, and human rights of all is a long standing tradition that often started before the funding of T11.

Overall, T11's work in the Andes region has been effective in facilitating interactions and creating spaces for several organisations to work on common agendas and develop joint activities. T11's strategy is to categorise partners on the basis of predefined selection criteria. This helps to come up with more tailored solutions and approaches while also contributing to increasing T11 effectiveness in realising their objectives. It also reduces the risk of working exclusively with well-established networks and alliances, as some partners get ad-hoc support because of the innovative component that they might present in their approach, which in some cases helped them flourish. This is the case of Instituto Natura, a small non governmental organisation (NGO) located in Northern Peru. The organisation contributes to capacity building and organisational strengthening of civil society and grassroots organisations by promoting environmental education, risk management, urban environmental management and sustainable management of coastal marine ecosystems. Supported by T11, this organisation has been enabled to work with others (for instance, collaboration with MOCICC resulted in the proposal of energy transition that leaves aside the use of fossil fuels and avoids the exploitation of new wells) and participated in relevant networks and roundtable discussions.

**Intended Outcomes**

The outcome journals ensured the monitoring of the programme in different regions. The partners are requested to reflect on their progress towards the identified outcome progress markers (PM).

**2.1.1 PM1**

**Partners contribute to a more autonomous civil society (narrative and financial).**

**Ecuador PM baseline-endline analysis**

Progress marker target value: 70	Indicator value: 95
Number of PMs: 20	Number of PMs with score of 2: 19
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

This indicator has been achieved in Ecuador **95%** of the time with partial achievement only by 1 partner and only once in 2019. Annex 2 shows the evolution of the PMs over the programme period.

From a **content point of view**, in the five years of the programme, T11 contributed to the reinforcement of a more autonomous civil society in the Andes Region. This took the form of increased coordination at the international and regional levels (some examples are to be found in the coordination achieved in the Foro Social Pan amazónico, or in the creation of the Consultative Group for the European Union (EU) FTA with Ecuador, Peru and Colombia, or the National Coordination group of Indigenous Territories affected by mega-works in Bolivia) and a strong contribution of the partners to capacity building activities, providing also technical and communication support in specific processes, with instances of increasing project management capacities of partner CSOs.

The reinforcement and the contribution to a more autonomous civil society in Ecuador also goes through the development of innovative approaches. One of T11 's partners, Acción Ecológica, took the leadership in organising the ‘Ruta por la verdad y justicia para la naturaleza y los pueblos<sup>1</sup>. This is an intensive process aimed at promoting a "truth and reconciliation mechanism" on the rights of nature, structured around three thematic areas: oil and mining exploitation and

---

<sup>1</sup> The route for the truth and justice for nature and the peoples

industry in urban areas. Las "rutas" end in hearings, where experts and defenders present their arguments and give testimony of the violation of their rights. The recognition of rights of nature in the Constitution of Ecuador (as well as the Rights of Mother Earth in Bolivia) implied the need to explain what these rights are, how they are violated and to make visible the work of defenders.

The contribution to a more autonomous civil society from a **financial point of view** happened to a lesser extent. While there are some instances of successful fundraising activities in partners' organisations and in some cases a greater diversification of funding sources has been reached during the review period, this cannot be attributed directly to T11's intervention and CSOs still rely heavily on international donor funding. However, institutional funding has been recognised by all interviewees as key in the achievement of greater independence: the flexible support has allowed organisations to further professionalise themselves. For instance, it enabled processes such as strategy developments, evaluations, improving management structures and tools as well as working per programme objective. Professionalisation referred mostly to the methodological level when using the PM system.

Broederlijk Delen and T11 have established a fund to provide more timely support for small and innovative initiatives. The first experience, which supported six interventions, occurred in 2020. These small contributions are intended to help organisations and initiatives that do not have access to international cooperation funds with specific activities such as event participation and are soon to be expanded to Ecuador and Bolivia. At the beginning of the programme, a joint workshop was organised by Broederlijk Delen and T11 to push partner organisations in thinking about alternative strategies for fundraising.

**Administration of a dedicated Fund to CONAIE**

Providing dedicated support to peasant and indigenous organisations to increase their financial and management capacities is key in enhancing their autonomy and capacity to focus on the programmatic and political side of the work.

In 2020, Inredh collaborated with the administration of a T11 fund approved for Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE). CONAIE is the confederation of indigenous nationalities of Ecuador, the umbrella organisation of all indigenous organisations. It plays a central role in the advocacy for indigenous rights, access to land, autonomy, basic services, environmental protection, and political representation. The organisation was founded in 1986 and has a decentralised structure

with local bases scattered around the country. Regional and national gatherings are key to ensure that decisions around national campaigns, actions and leadership are representative and promote the creation of a cohesive indigenous identity.

In the past, and in particular during Correa's administration, CONAIE has been pushed out of the political debate and police repression has been used to silence the organisation's dissent. After the mass protests of 2019, CONAIE has been questioned as an organisation that supported the spur of violence, without any proof.

The fund aimed at providing humanitarian support and awareness-raising on Covid19 to communities in various areas. In addition, the fund helped the organisation of the annual CONAIE General Assembly, and this is an important result given that the organisation plays a central role in empowering indigenous communities and territories.

## 2.2.2 PM2

***The programme expects that partners 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.***

### Ecuador PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 70	Indicator value: 95
Number of PMs: 20	Number of PMs with score of 2: 19
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

This indicator has been achieved in Ecuador **95%** of the time with partial achievement only by one partner once in 2018.

Partners increased their capacity to reach out and influence specific groups. T11's partners in the region work to achieve structural changes and often engage in lengthy processes. This is particularly true when the work is done at the level of judicial processes as the application of laws in practice is rarely immediate.

At the regional level, interviewees reported reduced space and general lack of interest in the media for the themes they are mostly working on. When possible, partners sought to increase the interest from the media by seizing the opportunities that emerged from issues that gained a lot of media visibility. For instance, corruption scandals have been given visibility in traditional media, and partners used this wave of interest to reiterate the link between corruption and judicial processes, corruption and human rights, and overall to reinforce their campaigns and advocacy. In Bolivia, advocacy processes proved difficult at the national level, as there is a general level of closure from the government to discuss any theme that might be controversial. This drastically reduced the advocacy themes that the partners could push forward in their agenda. However, the coping mechanism to advance in this area has been to move advocacy actions to the local level in different areas (renewables energies, tax justice and human rights defence).

In Ecuador, progress towards this objective has been enabled by the establishment of the Government of Moreno that started a process of roundtable discussions with CSOs, for instance around the topic of amnesty for indigenous leaders<sup>2</sup>. In general, several advocacy processes were carried out during the evaluation period, on cases of human rights violations, cases related to the recognition of natural rights with the Constitutional Court, and cases that emerged after the October 2019 demonstrations, where a joint report was prepared and submitted to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) by the alliance of which the four partners are members, and which monitors the rights violations until today.

### **Work in the FTA agreement between EU and Ecuador, Peru, Colombia**

The EU-Colombia-Ecuador-Peru Trade Agreement includes full or partial tariff liberalisations and claims to commit the parties to respecting human rights, guaranteeing employment rights and ensuring an adequate level of environmental protection.

In the agreement, article IX refers to the participation of civil society in the form of a domestic advisory group (DAG). The agreement envisages the intergovernmental Sub-Committee on Trade and Sustainable Development to convene once a year an open session with civil society organisations and the public at large to discuss implementation of the Title.

All countries must establish this coordination space which shall comprise independent representative civil society organisations. Ecuador joined in 2017, with Centro de Derechos Económicos y Sociales (CDES) having an advisory role in the DAG.

---

<sup>2</sup> See PM3 section below.



This is one of the central advocacy processes of the programme 2017-2021 in the Andes region, where 11.11.11 facilitated communication among different organisations and the connection between organisations in the 3 countries, in view of the Sub-Committee meetings. Learning from previous years brought the parties to start planning activities and thematics in advance, making it a solid coordination space. Also, different workshops around the FTA agreement brought together the Peruvian CSOs REDGE and CDES.

According to the interviewees, the mechanism that brings CSOs in the framework of the agreement does not work. Partners filed a complaint, which is also recognised as the result of good cooperation, facilitated by T11. The complaint also shows the high level of expertise of partners, in both labour and environmental rights.

### 2.2.3 PM3

***The programme expects that partners 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.***

#### **Ecuador PM baseline-endline analysis**

Progress marker target value: 70	Indicator value: 90
Number of PMs: 20	Number of PMs with score of 2: 18
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

This indicator has been achieved in Ecuador **90%** of the time with steady full achievement as of the second year of the programme.

In the Andes region, the majority of T11's partner organisations have strong links with grassroots organisations and rights holders and good outreach in the communities where these rights are violated. Some of the partner organisations working on human rights provide accompaniment in cases of criminalisation and violation of rights and carry out legal activities at the national and regional levels.

Rights holders are actively involved in specific cases to demand protection for their rights, despite the fact that successes are not straightforward and might take time. During the programme period, this aspect got stronger with many partners that adapted their approach to different

issues, contributing to the strengthening of rights holder (RH) capacities, providing some technical support to face rights violations. The action to claim rights is also carried out by the rights holders themselves - with the support of organisations. This link with rights holders faced difficulties during the pandemic, due to the lack of in-person interactions. However, there have been no major setbacks.

Partners' approach to the selection of cases to be accompanied takes into consideration the final strategic objective and the amplitude of the results it might achieve. For instance, Inredh in Ecuador selects rights holder cases that: represent a structural problem for the country, are already supported or can count on a collective that might spur social mobilisation, can generate clear rules of jurisprudence or can generate interest on similar cases, offer the possibility to integrate a gender perspective and human rights approach.

In 2020, one of the biggest successes was the approval from the national assembly of amnesty for indigenous leaders in Ecuador. Several factors contributed to the achievement of this result. Of note was the continuous work of partner organisations with the rights holders to prepare the agenda in amnesty processes and for the dialogues with the government in thematic roundtables. Furthermore, the establishment of campaigns coordinated with other organisations, a targeted approach with the media and a more systematic use of social media allowed for increased visibility with the public. The 2018 visit of the UN SR on the rights of indigenous peoples constituted an additional opportunity to discuss the theme of indigenous justice and criminalisation.

### **CDES work with #FurokawaNuncaMas**

In Ecuador, Furukawa workers have managed to continue the process of defending their rights despite the difficulties and manoeuvres of the company. Supported by one of T11's partners, CDES, the #FurukawaNuncaMas Solidarity Committee accompanied and supported the families that for decades have lived and worked on the farms of the company Furukawa Plantations' C.A. of Ecuador in living conditions that represent a case of modern slavery.

The process has allowed more than 100 families to open a justice process for the comprehensive reparation of their labour and human rights. Rights holders have generally won several cases in court, but are still waiting for reparation and justice. They have generated campaigns and research to contribute to this human rights case. They have also presented the case in a space for denunciation within the European system. The accompaniment and advocacy work on the case has been central: CDES contributed to strengthening the population's awareness of the obligation of the states to guarantee the fulfilment of human rights, and in particular the

economic and social rights, through social networks, media and the production of a video about the Furukawa Never Again case. During and after the demonstrations they have shared their analysis and opinion through various media of communication (such as interviews).

#### 2.2.4 PM4

*The programme expects that partners 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.*

##### Ecuador PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 60	Indicator value: 70
Number of PMs: 20	Number of PMs with score of 2: 14
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

This indicator has been achieved in Ecuador **70%** of the time with full achievement by all partners in the last two years of the programme period. Compared to the other PMs, this has been the most inconsistent in terms of achievement, particularly in the first three years of the programme.

Overall, gender is sufficiently considered and integrated in the work of T11's partners in the Andes region, but progress against this objective is medium and mixed among the different partner organisations. Some interviewees reported difficulties in integrating gender equality into their activities and narratives, especially those working on themes such as economic rights, while it remains easier to integrate the gender approach into their work with human rights defenders.

In general, partners are clear about the importance of women's participation in spaces for debate and advocacy. Some have incorporated gender equality into their work and personal reflection; however, more progress is needed. In some cases, an approach to gender is included in the agenda of CSOs, however, it seems less present in the agenda of rights holders. The strategy to include the gender approach is to do capacity building and accompaniment of women's organisations (farmer, indigenous mostly).

In Ecuador for instance, Accion Ecologica has worked with indigenous communities and women human rights defenders for a long time and has a solid base of work developed in this area. They closely engage with La escuela de Las Orquídeas Amazónicas, which was created to strengthen the role of indigenous women from the northern Amazon in the surveillance of the oil industry, through community monitoring as a strategy for the defence of ancestral rights. In some cases, this coordination goes up until the international level. Women's perspectives in the defence of their rights are taken more and more into account and they have been further explored through training and inclusion in advocacy processes.

### **2.2.5 Progress Markers system**

The system elaborated by T11 to monitor progress is overall appreciated by the partners in the region. While some reported to have experienced difficulties in working with it at the beginning of the programme, or at least less familiarity with this system, they all recognised its relevance especially when monitoring advocacy work, as the qualitative focus allows them to think in terms of results and to make a more relevant monitoring of the work. In some cases, the system has been adopted at the organisational level and is used more broadly to monitor progress and report internally and to other donors.

Another element that is appreciated about the system is the time that 11.11.11 dedicates to the partners after they submit the report. These conversations are reported to be more comprehensive than a feedback session and offer a moment of reflection on how to adjust the work moving forward. In addition, the changes implemented to the system are considered an improvement by most of the interviewees, as they reduce procedures to the essential while providing the right amount of information.

### **2.2.6 11.11.11's Role**

Our research showed that T11 enabled a type of work in the countries that is particularly relevant for the partners, especially because few international funding schemes are able to support it. This applied for instance to the legal support provided to emblematic cases by some organisations in Ecuador, as they refer to T11 as the donor that makes this type of work flow the most. There is a general perception of the organisation as a political ally and counterpart rather than a donor, and

most partners report a relationship that is rooted on political content rather than being only of a technical- administrative nature.

There are some work flows in the region that have been facilitated and definitely accelerated by T11. The coordination that happened with the EU FTA It is an example of interaction that brings together several T11 partners and where T11's coordination role has been quite central. Partners in Peru are involved in monitoring the FTA and their experience has been key in preparing the work of the CSOs in Ecuador. 11.11.11 facilitated the contacts and cooperation, especially because regional networking on these topics is not quite developed.

The fact that T11 supports organisations that work with different objectives and themes is interesting for some organisations, that flagged that crosspollination among different themes might happen also thanks to the 11.11.11 support: for instance, supporting indigenous movements can help when organisations such as INREDH works on forced disappearance of Human Rights Defender (HRD) cases that are strictly related to these communities. This allows them to have a more comprehensive approach.

## 2.3 Sustainability

### 2.3.1 Social changes

All T11 partners work from a human rights perspective that is strong and well established. The objective is to ensure that human rights are protected, therefore having a law in place is a step forward, creating a precedent is a consistent achievement and partners are involved in following up for implementation and adaptation to local contexts.

In Ecuador, there is a strong activist component in civil society, which suggests that a continuation of the social changes achieved so far is likely to happen. While in other countries this is not the case, the creation and reinforcement of solid networks and alliances is contributing to the creation of solid spaces that are likely to continue to exist in the future.

In addition, there is a strong effort from T11 counterparts to generate spaces so that people can be empowered to continue their work and exchange ideas, as for instance in the case of the Escuela de lideres initiated by Inredh. Or the contribution that Accion Ecologica is giving with regards to the formation of rights of nature experts together with the University of Simon Bolivar. These professionals work at the intersection of human rights and the law, at different levels that

at the time of writing, spans from the local to the constitutional courts. Another initiative that indicates a positive indication of continuation is the Route for truth, justice for nature and peoples: Accion Ecologica organised some territorial hearings as an evaluation of the rights of nature, along several thematic routes on mining, oil, industry, to give visibility to human rights violations.

### **2.3.2 Social and institutional sustainability**

Partners have been involved in the meaningful stages of programme implementation. There is no indication of imposition of themes from T11 to the partners: T11 has been defined by one interviewee as ‘the most horizontal donor we have’. The priorities are defined by the partners and have been working on these issues for years. By supporting what already exists in the region, T11 ensures sustained local ownership. Dialogue is prompted when possible: for instance, at the beginning of the programme, the T11 Andes staff organised an exchange to discuss the main elements of the local contexts that could affect the 5 years execution period.

In spite of the fact that there is not a systematic approach to capacity building and T11 does not want to duplicate efforts of other international organisations, the programme contributed to some extent to partners’ capacity building and strengthening. This happened thanks to the systems and tools that the local team implemented, reviewed and adjusted in an effort to tailor it more to the partners needs, through ongoing conversations around budget and content, and by bringing partners in relevant regional and international coordination spaces where they could coordinate with others. In some cases, T11 contributed to advocacy and due diligence processes with multinational companies in the region by bringing the issues back to their own country, as for instance in the case of REPSOL in Spain. Also, T11 developed a manual/guide to help organisations that want to reduce their environmental footprint in identifying concrete actions.

### **2.3.3 Financial sustainability**

The organisation of a workshop with Broederlijk Delen and Peruvian CSOs where participants explored innovative venues for funding was valued. At the same time, T11 does not see increasing funding opportunities for funding as its role, but sees its value rather as improving the strategic work of partners.

Some of the partners have achieved diversification in their funding pool during the period of the intervention. Even if this is not something that can be directly attributed to T11, in some cases, partner organisations managed to use T11 funds to keep abreast and look for other sources of

funds - this is the case with Fundacion Solon in Bolivia. In 2017, T11 was the main funder of the organisation while currently it represents around 20% of their total budget: in this evolution, it has been indicated as quite important the fact that 11.11.11 do not ask to match funds in their own priorities. In addition, partners reported that T11 has been helpful when requested to provide feedback on the grantees' organisational capacities and to inform conversations around matching funds.

**CDES Sustainability strategy**

There are less and less measures to sustain CSOs in Ecuador, and several organisations are forced to wind down their activities. CDES, one of T11's partners, pursues a sustainability strategy that is rooted in taking advantage of the new lines of international cooperation as they emerge and by taking part in relevant forums where new themes are discussed. This is once again facilitated by the flexibility of the T11 programme, which for instance enabled their participation in the Paramazonian forum and helped them enter the national coordination mechanism. This enabled the organisation to plant a seed for the opening of future funding possibilities. In addition, the work done in the economic programme around business proposals, debt, taxes allowed the organisation to position itself.

**2.3.4 Enabling environment**

The unstable political contexts often represent a huge barrier for partners' activities to move forward, as there is a need to reshuffle priorities and rethink intervention strategies. T11 and its partners have been key actors in holding the line and preventing a backward slide in the situation of the three countries. Because of the volatility of the political context, policy changes are non-linear, with some achievements followed by moments of regress.

**2.3.5 Risks**

- **Financial resources**, also because the envelope for the region is getting smaller at the bilateral and multilateral level (some of the countries are considered middle-income ones, and there might be changes in the regions that become a priority for European institutional funding).
- **Political context**; abrupt changes in the political context can have a huge impact on the effectiveness of the activities of the partners. In Europe there is a system of checks and

balances in place, in the Andes context there is more volatility. Flexibility to adapt strategies is fundamental.

- **Increase in state control:** is a trend that is already shaping up different countries. In Bolivia there is or will be a proposed law to see where the funding attempts have been made, in order to impose laws to control civil society or the financial flows of cooperation. This risk is always present.
- **Reduction in cooperation among different organisations** - increased pressure to turn into competitive organisations that have different levels of access to resources and work on different agendas.

## 2.4 Efficiency

### 2.4.1 Programme Management

Partners reported a good level of project management skills and in general, procedures and accountability requirements have been respected throughout the programme, and this also in spite of the revision requested by Belgian DGD at the inception of the intervention. The T11 team developed tools and templates to help the work of the partners and to streamline the reporting work towards the donor.

A good and open communication between T11 and its partners on delays, changes and accountability needs, has been key in ensuring proper programme management together with the fact that the intervention is co-designed with the partners at its inception. This generally increases the local ownership. There is great appreciation from the partners on the fact that T11 took time to introduce the new strategy for 2022 as well as their own advocacy processes.

Some partners expressed the desire to engage in deeper discussions of these types also at the programme level: while these feedback sessions mostly are organised after submission of their reports and with regard to only their own organisation. Here partners would like to extend the conversation around results achieved and adjustments to include other partners as well, in view of increasing synergies and learning from each other.

### 2.4.2 Collaboration with others

All **T11 partners** recognised coordination among different actors as a central element when aiming to achieve systemic change and when trying to do advocacy at the international level. The partners engage in different networks and with other organisations at the international, regional



and national levels, and in some cases, this coordination also happens within the framework of the collaboration with 11.11.11. For example in Peru, Latindadd, Equidadd y REDGE worked together on different issues. REDGE collaborated with CDES in Ecuador, and finally worked with more than 15 European partners in the framework of the EU FTA. In Ecuador, this type of coordination initiated by 11.11.11 happened to a lesser extent. Some examples of coordination among 11.11.11's partners in the country can be found between CEDENMA and CDES, and between Accion Ecologica y Inredh, which in turn also increased the collaboration with grassroots organisations of indigenous movements in the period of the programme.

T11 partners also have their own networks and platforms which enable them to expand the scope of their work and build common agendas. In Bolivia, instances of coordination are more to be found at the international level with the World Assembly of the Amazon (established during the pandemic), and FOSPA at the level of climate change. In some cases, 11.11.11 ensured the participation of relevant organisations in international fora and discussions: this is the case of the Oil Watch Conference, where the participation of an organisation from Peru was not possible and where 11.11.11 financed the participation of another partner, now part of the network.

Partners found the coordination of T11, whether implemented from the regional office, or from the European level effective. Other enablers have been identified in the methodology of the work of certain partners, as for instance RED GE, which helped the structuring of the work because it is based on strong evidence and on the commonalities of certain processes and political frameworks that required concerted social response.

11.11.11 has a good level of alignment with other organisations based in Europe where the linkage of different agendas for the region is happening. As for Ecuador for instance, T11 coordinates with organisations such as CNCD and FOS. Close coordination with the organisation Broederlijk Delen led to efficiency gains: for instance partners supported by one organisation were migrated under the other where it makes more sense, this is the case for former Cusco Partners, Red Muqui and in the future Cooperación.

**CEDENMA - Collaboration with lawyers**

In the period of the intervention, one of the Ecuador partners, CEDENMA, worked closely with a collective of lawyers. The organisation managed to coordinate with lawyers on specific and diverse advocacy issues. In 2017, they provided legal support to criminalised politically

persecuted activists, and actively participated in campaigns to demand amnesty. In 2018, their work focused more on the process of unconstitutionality of the Organic Environmental Code, and when seeking to position the organisation's work in the National Platform for Climate Justice, the collective helped by providing legal analysis of national regulations and socio-environmental conflicts.

### 2.4.3 Budget, schedules and timetables

Before the start of the programme, there is an initial process conducted by T11 staff and partners in the region that ensures co-design of the intervention and establishment of realistic budgets and calendars.

The programme is organised in country specific objectives defined separately in the global budget. An unforeseen change occurred at the beginning of the project, when DGD made reductions because of governmental reasons. This meant that the T11 staff had to rework the budgets with the partners to take into consideration the budget cuts and to reintegrate them afterwards, during the last two years of the funding period. These processes have been managed smoothly and did not result in a loss of efficiency.

T11 works with partners with an annual operational plan that is based on an outcome agreement but goes into more details about the activities. Furthermore, in the design of the programme, for all countries there is a flexible budget for those partners belonging to category 3 - this is intended to be able to finance new and emerging initiatives. This has been used in Ecuador with the case of CONAIE<sup>3</sup>

## 3. CONCLUSIONS

**Table 1 : Conclusion**

Effectiveness	
<b>Conclusion 1</b>	In the Andes region, the programme has been hands-on in providing capacity building activities to improve internal technical elements and communication capacities of partners. At the advocacy level, the Andes region has been a leader in the conceptualisation of notions such as rights of nature, and the truth and reconciliation process associated with it, as well as its

<sup>3</sup> See 'Intended Outcomes section' - PM1

	entrenchment in the constitution in the case of Ecuador. These concepts have been exported to other regions, supporting other partners in forming their own narratives and designing their own advocacy around them. However, in the region, media coverage of advocacy remains difficult due to the government avoiding controversial topics and the media going for mainstream topics. As such the tactic to focus on the local level in different areas has been key.
<b>Conclusion 2</b>	Financial autonomy, like in other regions, has been difficult to achieve with continued dependence on donors. However, the institutional funding provided by T11, which comes with an autonomy that is incomparable with most other donors is highly appreciated. Further, it covers a big gap in funding, for organisations that cannot access international cooperation funds, here referring specifically to the fund that was created by Broederlijk Delen and T11 to provide more timely support for small and innovative initiatives.
<b>Conclusion 3</b>	Links with rights holders are strong and there is a strong activism climate. Efforts have been made to strengthen the capacities of rights holders through providing technical support to face human rights violations. Several achievements have been made in which rights holders participation have been key. There is therefore relatively strong capacity among rights holders to organise and participate.
<b>Conclusion 4</b>	While there have been efforts and successful integrations of gender into the narratives of some partners' work, this has been inconsistent and more needs to be done in this area. In some cases gender is included in the agendas of partners but not those of rights holders. Capacity building, with the support of women's organisations has been identified as a strategy to facilitate a stronger gender approach. While this is in any case a valuable approach, the evaluation concludes that as concluded for other regions, a more fundamental change may be required here.
<b>Conclusion 5</b>	The role of T11 in the region has accelerated and facilitated some work flows. It has brought together several partners, created a space for cross-pollination of themes and thus facilitated the application of a holistic approach.
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>Conclusion 6</b>	Ecuador is characterised by strong activism, more so than other countries where partners of T11 are. As such the creation and retention of strong networks is a contributing factor to sustainability. The collaboration with the University of Simon Bolivar in bringing together rights to nature experts is also key to the sustainability of social changes.

<b>Conclusion 7</b>	The approach that T11 takes to have partners design and own their programmes is key, as is the approach to not impose standard definitions or methods for capacity building has enabled partners to tailor activities to their own needs.
<b>Conclusion 8</b>	There remains strong dependence on donor funding, even if within this space some partners have managed to diversify their funding pool. While T11 has provided support through for instance a workshop on accessing funding, it sees its value add more as improving the strategic work of partners. The reliance on donor funding will realistically remain for the foreseeable short-medium term. However, where T11 has added great value is to be a donor who works on equal footing, limiting the negative effects that the traditional donor-grantee power dynamic creates.
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<b>Conclusion 9</b>	Budget flexibility is valuable to the programme and the equal partnership approach that T11 takes. The management of budget cuts that happened during the programme period was done well and did not affect partners significantly. The open communication and co-design approach to programme management is highly appreciated, as was the effort taken by T11 to introduce the new strategy for 2022 in consideration of partners' advocacy strategies. However, feedback sessions are mostly organised after report submission and limited to individual partners, whereas partners would benefit from a broader conversation that includes other partners in view of increasing synergies.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Table 2 : Recommendations**

Action	Rationale	Level
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Rec 1.</b>	<b>Inter-regional exchanges between T11 partners can be facilitated more</b> , particularly exchanges between the Andes region and the Asia region given the similarities between the regions on focus areas and their related dynamics.	Regional/Global

<b>Rec 2.</b>	The capacity building strategy related to <b>gender can be tackled more fundamentally</b> by taking a more intersectional view in order to better address the structural causes in a holistic way. At this stage, the programme can begin by exploring how this can be done concretely through including within its network partners who have this experience and approach, connecting with research institutions, etc.	Regional/Global
<b>Sustainability</b>		
<b>Rec 3.</b>	<b>On financial sustainability</b> , think along with the partners on practical solutions and prompt an internal reflection on sustainability, fundraising at the local level, sharing functions among different organisations, and collaborating with universities.	Regional
<b>Rec 4.</b>	<b>Continue to empower civil society</b> and to bring together organisations working at the national and regional level. An empowered civil society is able to oppose abusive political processes.	Regional
<b>Efficiency</b>		
<b>Rec 5.</b>	<b>Prompt more international exchange</b> (also online) especially on lessons learned in campaigns and advocacy.	Regional / Global
<b>Rec 6.</b>	<b>Engage in deeper strategic discussions with partners at the programme level</b> and facilitate feedback sessions that include several partners to facilitate exchange on achieved results and adjustments in view of increasing synergies and learning between partners. This could be in the form of yearly sessions after submission of the outcome journals between all partners to exchange on results, synergies strategies going forward and discussing lessons learned, at country or regional level. This could also support the translation of approaches and agendas at the European level.	Regional

## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: Participating organisations

(Ex) Staff 11.11.11
Programme Coordinator- Andes T11 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 - coordinator
Acción Ecológica - Derechos Naturaleza
Acción Ecológica - programa petrolero
Acción Ecológica - programa urbano
INREDH - coordinator
CEDENMA - coordinator
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 - responsable Ecuador
DGD - responsable Ecuador
supported by INREDH programme
Accion Ecologica

Annex 2: Scores obtained per PM in Ecuador





