

ODS GREATER IMPACT

Final evaluation

11.11.11 International Programme

2017 - 2021

Final Regional Report - Asia Region | 10 June 2022

Rue Joseph II | 1000 Brussels, Belgium

www.odsupport.eu | info@odsupport.eu

CONTENTS	1
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Context Analysis	6
KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	8
2.1 Effectiveness	8
Intended Outcomes	8
2.1.1 PM1	8
2.1.2 PM2	10
2.1.3 PM3	11
2.1.4 PM4	12
2.1.5 Progress Markers system	14
2.2 Sustainability	14
2.2.1 Social changes	15
2.2.2 Social, financial and institutional sustainability	15
2.2.3 Risks and enablers of sustainability are summarised below:	16
2.2.4 Enabling environment	16
2.3 Efficiency	17
2.3.1 Programme Management	17
2.3.2 Collaboration with others	17
2.3.3 Budget, schedules and timetables	18
CONCLUSIONS	20
Table 1: Conclusion	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
Table 2: Recommendations	22
ANNEXES	25
Annex 1: Participating organisations	25
Annex 2: Scores obtained per PM in Indonesia	26

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DGD	Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
EU	European Union
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
IGJ	Indonesia for Global Justice
JATAM	Jaringan Advokasi Tambang – Mining Advocacy
PM	Progress Marker
T11	Triple 11 - 11.11.11
Walhi	Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia – Forum for Environment in Indonesia

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. In this report on the Asia region, the analysis focuses on Indonesia. The operational costs of the programme over the estimated period amounted to €5.970.178. million for the region, including €1.464.500. million for Indonesia.

Methodology

The evaluation was conducted in three main phases (inception, consultations, reporting). The analysis focused on the evaluation areas (effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency). The consultations for the Asia region included 13 consultations in the form of group and individual interviews with (i) T11 staff in Brussels and the regional office, (ii) partners and (iii) other CSOs in the region. A round table on the efficiency of the programme was organised with partner organisations. The results of the evaluation were presented to them at a validation workshop. The evaluation was implemented from January 2022 to May 2022.

Conclusions and recommendations

Effectiveness					
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	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	C3 - Gender equality benefitted from the experiences of partners on ecofeminism , feminist perspectives and women in mining and extractive industry. Nevertheless the gender	C4 - 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	C5 - Partners have built up expertise to engage with rights holders using tailored tactics which at national levels and local levels where impact is more direct	C6 - Progress markers have been a useful way to track progress over time, with complementarity between qualitative reflections and quantitative scores.

been successful, characterised with networking and network facilitation	Andes and Asia regions	lens seems limiting and can benefit from a more fundamental re-framing.			
R1 - Explore how much additional capacity is required to elevate regional and international networking and build it into the programme budget to address the fact that while synergy building is key to the programme, partners have limited capacity to sustainably engage in regional and international platforms given their own workload and limited human and financial resources	R2 - Facilitate more inter-regional exchanges between T-11 partners particularly between Asia and Andes partners given regional similarities on focus areas and their related dynamics	R3 - Take a more intersectional view on gender in order to better address the structural causes in a holistic way. The programme can begin by exploring how to do this through including within its network, partners who have experience in intersectionality, connecting with research institutions and learning from the work being done by the NGO Forum on feminist perspectives	R4 - Involve youth movements as strategic partners in programme design to the extent that there are organised groups, given their new ideas, connectedness to other global movements and narratives which speak and language of justice and sustainability and would help advance the narratives on alternatives.	R5 - To bridge perceived distance for rights holders, between what happens on the ground and legal frameworks, use Right to Information (RTI) laws to facilitate engagement between rights holders and the law. Some CSOs in Indonesia, including JATAM, have experience with this.	R6 - Facilitate more content discussions between sectors to manage the risk of problems being shifted from one sector to another. Lessons from ongoing discussions between partners working on energy and mining in which Walhi is a part, can be taken forward as an approach that strengthens the holistic approach of the programme.

Sustainability	
C7 - There have been significant wins at the	C8 - The non-imposition approach of the

<p>advocacy level, including entrenchment of rights into legal frameworks and awareness raising. These together have elevated the starting point of future advocacy efforts.</p>	<p>programme has not tampered with institutional fabrics of its partners, making them sustainable. Financial dependence continues to be a limitation.</p>
<p>R6 - Facilitate more content discussions between sectors to manage the risk of problems being shifted from one sector to another. Lessons from ongoing discussions between partners working on energy and mining in which Walhi is a part, can be taken forward as an approach that strengthens the holistic approach of the programme.</p>	<p>R7 - Partners would benefit from feedback from T11 staff on their reports and outcome journal submissions in order to facilitate two way communication and flag gaps more directly</p>

<p>Efficiency</p>	
<p>C9 - The budget flexibility, easy reporting tools and programme management tools have built in efficiency into the programme.</p>	
<p>R8 - The budget flexibility approach in T11 is well appreciated by partners and should continue</p>	

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 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) and to reflect and learn in order to make continuous improvements to the international programme. 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 systemic change, both in terms of activities and approach.

The programme is implemented in three regions: the Great Lakes Region (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 Asia Region. In this report, the analysis takes a closer look at Indonesia, as the mid-term evaluation focused on the Philippines.

Our regional findings for the Asia region are based on a combination of desk review and document analysis and consultation with key stakeholders. Consultations happened in the form of group interviews with T11 staff members; a group interview with T11 Philippines partners (4 partners); a group interview with T11 Indonesia partners (5 partners); a roundtable discussion on efficiency of the programme with Asia partners (9 partners) and individual interviews with other organisations (2 non-partners who are in the network) and a final regional validation workshop conducted on the 18th May 2022 in which results were shared with participating partners (4 partners from Indonesia and Philippines).

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 two 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. At the time of writing the report, the Philippines election outcome is that Ferdinand Marcos Jr., son of the former dictator is now president, sending many of T11's

partners into crisis mode. These factors contribute to the non-linear path of civil society's wins, which are characterised by periods of progression and periods of regression, sometimes happening simultaneously on different fronts.

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.

Economic liberalisation, which is the lowering of government regulations and restrictions to make more room for private entities, affects the work of partners. At a governmental level, where for instance partners manage to make headway with the EU to take a stronger stance with partners' governments on an issue/policy, other interested parties provide leeway to the latter, which has the counter-effect of relieving the pressure exerted by Europe. Further, the interests of private companies are often prioritised over human and environmental rights, sometimes leading to policies being overturned.

Shrinking space for civil society is a global phenomenon and Asian countries are not exempted. The complicated regional political context of the last decade often corresponded with the insurgence of regulations limiting the work of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and the rise of authoritarian practices from the Governments to hinder their operation and efficacy. Human rights defenders continue to face enormous challenges in both Indonesia and the Philippines with partners working from time to time on legal cases to release imprisoned human rights defenders.

The **Covid-19 pandemic** had widespread economic, social, and political effects in both countries. Its effect on the economies has exacerbated inequality and its associated restrictions in movement have worsened certain forms of injustice (gender based violence), and limited activities pursuing justice and accountability (campaigns and gatherings). In addition, the inadequacy of public services, lack of strong welfare and social measures that existed before have not been helpful.

At the same time, several **indigenous peoples' movements, feminist movements and youth movements** in the region are gaining more strength, contributing to the opening up of spaces for collective actions that did not exist before.

2. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

2.1 Effectiveness

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

Intended Outcomes

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

2.1.1 PM1

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

Indonesia PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 70	Indicator value: 88
Number of PMs: 25	Number of PMs with score of 2: 22
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

This indicator has been achieved in Indonesia **88%** of the time with partial achievement by some partners in the first two years of the programme and full achievement by all partners in the last three years of the programme. Annex 2 shows the evolution of the PM over the programme period.

Across all regions, including the Asia region, a shared challenge is the difficult political contexts in which civil societies function. Within this context, CSOs continue to be **over-reliant on donor funding**. Typically, this is associated with the risks of limiting CSO independence in narratives, political positions, programme types and implementation methods. In the Asia region, CSOs have made efforts to fundraise independently. Examples of this are the Jaringan Advokasi Tambang – Mining Advocacy (JATAM) coffee shop and the Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia – Forum for

Environment in Indonesia (Walhi) cooperative and online platform which sells rice and other products by its members.

JATAM coffee shop- contributions to narratives on alternatives

Beyond providing some form of financial independence, these initiatives are set up to provide alternatives to communities who are dependent on mining activities and some who are struggling to keep mining out of their villages, by presenting an ecological option of how they can be independent from the mining economy. The JATAM coffee shop recently ran a workshop on making coconut oil as an alternative to palm oil, which has become very expensive as a result of the oligarchic market which is dominated by a few big players, and more recently followed by the export ban on palm oil. These initiatives, while modest, provide both financial support and support the narratives on alternatives in a practical way.

In light of the contextual challenges, for instance, in Indonesia, political elites pushed through the Omnibus law, which was a huge blow to the already weak participation of CSOs to policy. Conservative religious groups are also claiming the political debate on identity, making the state more Islamic. As CSOs have stuck to principles of transparency, participatory democracy and human rights, their strategies have had to be proactive. A common strategy in both Indonesia and the Philippines has been that of promoting allies of alternatives and systemic change to rise to local government positions, recognising that implementing change requires a certain amount of power. The focus on local levels has also been applied in advocacy, where it is at times more strategic to advocate at local government level rather than at national government level. CSOs have noted that wins that are made at local levels have a much more direct impact.

Where the T11 international programme has played a role here in spite of being a major player in a field in which CSOs are heavily reliant on donor funding, is that it has taken an approach which is starkly different from traditional donors. In this sense, it has not interfered with the **narratives, positions and implementation methods** of its partners, giving them flexibility to design their own programmes and decide how to implement them. Furthermore, the additional support that T11 provided during Covid kept the campaigns of its partners and their narratives visible, in addition to responding to livelihood related needs. For its partners, this would indirectly have increased their relevance and connection with rights holders. Finally, the facilitation of networking has helped partners to plug into international narratives, through being part of international conferences. Here T11 has provided funds to attend relevant conferences that may have been outside of the initial programme budget. At the same time, sustaining membership and participation on international platforms has been a challenge for T11 partners in Asia, largely due

to limited human and financial resources. Given the many national ‘fires’ that partners have to put out, they often do not have additional staff to focus on communication and international networking, and for existing staff, doing this becomes overwhelming and thus, deprioritised.

2.1.2 PM2

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

Indonesia PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 75	Indicator value: 64
Number of PMs: 25	Number of PMs with score of 2: 16
Conclusion: Indicator partly achieved	

The achievement of this indicator, unlike the others, has been somewhat inconsistent, with partners achieving it fully in some years and partly in others. At the same time, the objective of PM2, because of its policy influence focus, is probably the most vulnerable to the fluctuations that characterise the political work that T11 does, with moments of great advancements and moments of regression. For this indicator, in Indonesia, it has been **fully achieved 64%** of the time, falling below the target value. At the same time, the evaluation asserts that the contribution to this progress marker is overall good. Partners in both Indonesia and the Philippines have different strategies to reach interest groups and these have been refined over time, with their advocacy experience.

In Indonesia, the increase from 3-5 partners facilitated more synergies in campaigning and coordination. Regionally, there has been more social media engagement due to Covid, which was out of necessity but still a positive development. The shared strategy to work at local levels also facilitates reach to specific target groups and while covid restrictions had several negative effects, they also resulted in local communities becoming more directly involved as funds had to be channelled directly to them. In terms of influencing social and political actors, partners are working on the legally binding instrument on business and human rights, which is an effort that is part of a global campaign to tackle human rights abuses from corporations. On this, negotiations in Indonesia have advanced significantly over the last two years.

Inter-regional synergies between Asia partners and particularly the Andes region have facilitated the travelling of concepts such as the Rights of nature concept from the Andes region, and facilitated thinking on how to link this concept to that of no-go zones in Indonesia. The no-go zones concept has not been that effective in Indonesia due to the changeable status of protected areas to suit company interests. Thus the Andes region approach of entrenching Rights of nature into the constitution becomes inspirational as an advocacy pathway. Having said this, it remains that the inter-regional ties between Asia and other regions, particularly the Andes region could be improved as there is room to facilitate more sharing of advocacy strategies.

Youth have been involved in several activities by both Indonesia and Philippines partners. In the work towards systemic change, this is an important group both as rights holders and as allies who can accelerate campaigns and narratives.

With respect to target groups, the multi-partner approach that T11 has adopted in the programme has been effective in helping to reach several target groups through different partners focusing on different elements, e.g. ecofeminism; indigenous populations, in order to weave their perspectives into the narratives for change.

2.1.3 PM3

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

Indonesia PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 80	Indicator value: 96
Number of PMs: 25	Number of PMs with score of 2: 24
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

The evaluation did not manage to speak directly to rights holders in the Asia region and thus has no insights on the perspective of rights holders. It is nevertheless clear that partners have strong links with community-level organisations and solid approaches to working at that level.

Throughout the programme period, partners have **fully achieved** this indicator with only partial achievement on the end of one partner and that only in the first year of the programme. As such the indicator has been achieved up to **96%** of the time. The notable increase in protests against

new plantations and mining in the context of the Philippines and Indonesia is indicative of the growing capacities of rights holders to claim and defend their rights in this region.

A more general reflection on possible limitations of rights holders is that the link between legal frameworks and on-the-ground experiences is not always clear to rights-holders not least because legal language may be inaccessible to those who do not often engage with it and because legal structures may often seem distant from local realities. It is unclear to the evaluators the extent to which such a limitation applies to the Asian context, however, there are suggestions we have made at a global level, drawing from other contexts, on efforts that can facilitate the engagement of rights holders with the law. These may be useful for the Asian context to reflect on as well.

Victory at constitutional court as legal bases for advocacy on incorporating human, social and environmental rights in Free Trade agreements (FTAs)

In the context of Indonesia, the criminalisation of human rights defenders continues to be a challenge, coupled with corruption that affects the independence of the judicial system in Indonesia. Yet, a significant win on the legal front is the research on International Treaty Law. This research was used to submit a lawsuit in the Constitutional Court to incorporate human, social and environmental rights in trade agreements. This was won and provides a strong legal basis for advocacy. This process was a collaboration between Indonesia for Global Justice (IGJ) and T11 and according to IGJ, was the best collaboration they had with T11.

2.1.4 PM4

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.

Indonesia PM baseline-endline analysis

Progress marker target value: 60	Indicator value: 84
Number of PMs: 25	Number of PMs with score of 2:21
Conclusion: Indicator achieved	

The evaluation of the gender aspect of the Asia programme has considered the partners as a whole, and not focused on each partner’s specific integration of the gender equality lens. On the whole the evolution of partners’ progress on this indicator has remained consistent throughout the programme period, with the monitoring showing that the indicators have been **fully achieved up to 84%** of the time, with full achievement in all years and part achievement in some years and

this being the case for only one partner.

In the Asian context, partners such as WAMA, the Sisters (which are regional networks encompassing the Philippines and Indonesia) and TPKT have brought in perspectives of ecofeminism and women and mining advocacy.

A broader reflection on the gender equality aspect which also builds on the previous evaluation, is that intersectionality may be a more useful way of approaching gender equality within a systemic change framework, than approaching gender equality as its own strand. There are several risks with focusing on gender without an intersectionality lens.

Firstly, it risks gender being watered down into 'gender inclusivity' which implies including gender into an existing status quo, This is different from deconstructing the structural elements that cause exclusion. e.g . patriarchy, capitalism, etc. Secondly, it overlooks the fact that multiple marginalising identities occur in the same person at the same time, e.g. gender, sexuality, being indigenous, being a youth, etc. can all exist within the same person at the same time.

An intersectional approach would therefore allow for holism (which the international programme is about), elevating these multiple discriminations to a structural analysis of intersections between systems of patriarchy, capitalism, tribalism, etc. which work together to form structures of exclusion, rather than engaging with each of these structural elements in isolation of others which reinforce them. Such an approach would also be consistent with the decolonisation approach of T11, as part of decolonisation is also the moving away from binaries and categories, towards holism and interconnectedness.

NGO Forum feminist approach to gender

Within the NGO Forum, they are in the process of developing a training conducted by Indonesian members, which is focused on feminism and feminist perspectives as a central driving force. With this, they are trying to break away from gender mainstreaming to identifying political and institutional structures which are oppressing gender participation within their framework of work. This includes employment structure, labour differences, participation in the workforce, decision making within member organisations. This will look into existing gaps and what needs to be done to address them. The evaluation highlights that this structural approach to gender equality should be engaged across the programme and taken as a pillar for an intersectional approach.

2.1.5 Progress Markers system

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.

Conversations with T11 programme staff are highly appreciated and remarked as pleasant and collegial. These conversations are reported to be comprehensive, often taking place informally, particularly in pre-covid times, and providing a space to reflect in depth and freely about the programme. At the same time, particularly during covid, it is remarked by partners that there is space for T11 to engage them more on the particular progress markers in the form of feedback, so that the reporting is a two way system.

In the way that the progress markers have been used by partners in Asia, the evaluation finds that there is consistency, which makes it possible to track progress over the years with ease. Additionally, the quantitative element supports the qualitative narratives in a useful way. However, in terms of the interpretation of progress markers, particularly at the final evaluation stage, the programme could benefit from an analysis that is based on an outcome harvesting methodology. We elaborate on this in the recommendations as well as the level of the global report.

2.2 Sustainability

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

2.2.1 Social changes

Given the already discussed focus of the partners’ work on campaigning and advocacy work, on influencing through legal cases, on working with rights holders and strategising to focus on the national level where possible and the local level where it is more strategic to do so, it is foreseeable that social changes will continue. Quite apart from the specific wins that have been made, the work that has gone into building societal awareness on issues and perspectives and political sensitisation is remarkable. We can conclude that once society is aware, that awareness in itself facilitates other processes beyond this particular programme and the campaigns it

supports, creating changes that may not necessarily be easy to attribute directly to the programme in the long term, but some of whose seeds can credibly be assumed to have been planted by the programme. An example is the constitutional court win on the inclusion of human and environmental rights in FTAs, which although advocacy needs to continue to see it implemented, did not exist before and now it does, and has provided a legal precedent which changes the pathway and possibilities for advocacy in this regard going forward.

2.2.2 Social, financial and institutional sustainability

The principle that T11 has taken to ensure that partners fully own the development and implementation of their programme is important for partners' institutional, social and financial sustainability. T11 is reported by partners as the most horizontal donor they have, who engages them on an equal footing. More importantly, the grant element is not the most important part of the partnership, as T11 is seen as a partner in solidarity with the issues that partners work on, and as part of the movement towards change. In an operational sense, this has meant that the reporting mechanism towards T11 is light, and is based on learning and reflection rather than control. This has meant that programme reporting and planning tools have been institutionalised by partners, using them for their own internal learning, planning and reporting to other donors, in itself a form of capacity development.

On the financial sustainability side, apart from the modest income generating initiatives that some partners are implementing, T11's transparency enables ongoing discussions among partners on how to sustain their work and partnerships beyond T11. A continuous risk assessment of such an occurrence and an ongoing brainstorm around it form strong pillars for financial sustainability.

2.2.3 Risks and enablers of sustainability are summarised below:

Enablers	Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth movements and mindsets that through social media and other means connect with global youth movements that are pushing for a different narrative. Continued engagement with youth as strategic partners in change narratives will be important • An intersectionality lens can expand the space for human rights issues which are politicised and rendered difficult to engage with by approaching them from a holistic perspective that does not present them as standalone issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deterioration of political contexts • Global trends which are beyond the influence of the programmes • Global emergencies which shift interests and fiscal priorities of funders, e.g. the Belgian government and public funding of T11 which could affect its capacity as a funder to its partners • While in some CSOs, change in leadership is periodic and there is a steady flow of incoming younger leaders. For others, leadership is more stable, lasting over a long period of time with less generational diversity. Advantages of the former include a flow of new perspectives and skills and less risks of weaknesses in leadership weakening the organisation in contrast to the latter. Advantages of the latter include stability, while risking that weaknesses in leadership may have longer lasting effects on the organisation and risking less flow of new perspectives and skills.

2.2.4 Enabling environment

As in other regions the difficult and unstable political context limits the programme’s impact on the enabling environment. In Asia, there have been some wins, in particular the constitutional court win on including human and environmental rights in FTAs, which in many ways can be regarded as creating an enabling environment for further advocacy on these issues. Yet it is necessary to understand that policies are somewhat vulnerable to political changes. A case in point is the earlier mentioned example of how the status of protected areas in Indonesia changes to accommodate company interests depending on those in power. As such, wins are not permanent nor linear, they are often accompanied by moments of regress. The election outcome of the Philippines elections can be seen as a demonstration of this, as partners are currently in crisis mode, unsure of the policy changes to come and what elements of their efforts so far will remain or be reversed. Nevertheless, as earlier indicated, the strength of the advocacy and campaigning work that partners do is that while policies may be volatile depending on politics, the awareness that has been raised on alternatives cannot be un-raised; and the strategies to focus on

local levels including supporting allies to rise to power- all these efforts create a steady build up towards an enabling environment.

2.3 Efficiency

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

2.3.1 Programme Management

T11 is seen by partners as the most horizontal partner with the simplest and most useful administrative and reporting requirements. Firstly, the 5 year long grant enables partners to plan in useful ways that make programme management easier and more stable. Secondly the autonomy and level of trust between T11 and its partners makes programme management efficient in that it does not comprise multiple checks or control points, but rather achieves accountability in a lean, transparent way that is based on partners' ownership of the programme.

A key point raised by partners which has also been indicated earlier in the report, is the need for feedback from T11 on the reports that are submitted by partners to strengthen two-way communication when it comes to reporting. This would also enable partners to flag any reporting related gaps or concerns.

2.3.2 Collaboration with others

All T11 partners recognised coordination among different actors as a central element when achieving systemic change and in advocacy at the international level. Partners, through T11 and outside of it, are members of several national, regional and international networks. It is broadly appreciated that T11 encourages partners to be part of different networks beyond its own. Among the many networks that partners are a part of are: the Asia-Europe Peoples' Forum; the Philippines Movement for Climate Justice; the Women and Mining Group; the No-Go-Zone working Group; Thematic Social Forum on Mining; the Global Campaign for a Legally Binding instrument; Business and Human rights working groups; Climate Justice Campaign.

Partners highlight that T11 has enabled them to participate in forums or conferences outside of the programme plan if they justify the necessity of these activities to their work. Partners find it valuable to engage with regional and international networks, with benefits ranging from learning new concepts and advocacy tactics to contributing to the advancements of common global goals that in reality cannot be separated into regions and indeed require global cooperation.

In addition to South-South cooperation, which T11 wants to facilitate more of, is the collaboration with European actors. For instance TPKP collaborated with T11 through the women and mining programme and were linked by T11 with JATAM. This relationship with T11 and its partners contributed to the forming of WAMA in the Asia region. T11's partnership also facilitated the exposing of the International Finance Corporation and the private investment arm in the World bank. The partnership also resulted in coming up with the Climate and Environmental cluster in Asia and Europe and a meeting to strategise between energy activists in Europe and those in Asia to come up with a decarbonisation strategy.

Other collaborations have been the youth exchange of Belgian and Filipino youth climate activists. T11 has also facilitated the conceptualisation of the Asia-Pacific gathering on extractives. Exchanges with the Andes region partners also brought the idea of post-extractivism, linking the Philippines and Indonesia to converse on this idea and helped define the concept of No-go zones so that the Asia region could formulate what these meant in their context.

The value of regional and international networking and exchange is clear. A set back however, is that partners have limited resources to engage at these levels in a sustainable way as indicated earlier in the report.

2.3.3 Budget, schedules and timetables

The budget has a useful level of flexibility which was necessary during the covid period. For example, partners were allowed to reallocate budgets from planned programme activities and shift the nature of their work altogether. Their advocacy work went down to less than 25% and funds were reallocated to the immediate needs of livelihoods.

Additional covid related needs were also addressed through the programme. Given the novelty of the pandemic, partners found it difficult to link their work to covid and lacked expertise on doing this. They got professional help to come up with a briefing on linking covid to climate, extractives, human rights, etc. and T11 provided support for this and for capacity building.

Outside of covid, the budget allows to record costs as fixed or variable, the latter providing the necessary flexibility for partners to shift costs where necessary. This is important because as indicated earlier, T11's grant contributes to filling a large gap of limited funding for alternatives, accompanied by the fact that campaigning work is generally difficult to secure funds for. In order to make this contribution meaningful in the operational sense, it is important for T11 to maintain this flexibility, and it has done so well, setting itself apart from restrictive and inefficient budgeting and reporting practices.

Finally, an unforeseen change was made at the beginning of the project, when DGD reduced the budget. 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.

3. CONCLUSIONS

Table 1: Conclusion

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 its 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.
Conclusion 3	While the gender equality aspect has experienced solid input from partners who bring in perspectives of ecofeminism, women in mining and extractive industries and feminist perspectives, it is questionable whether gender as a lens is a useful framework to work towards tackling the structural elements that hinder gender equality. The evaluation concluded here that the risk for a lens that looks at gender as its own strand is that of watering down the gender equality discourse to being about 'gender inclusivity' which implied inclusion into the current structures without deconstructing the status quo. Whereas intersectionality, as also mentioned in the mid-term evaluation, may be a more useful framework to take a more structural and holistic approach to the issue of gender.
Conclusion 4	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 5	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.
Conclusion 6	The progress markers provide a useful way to track progress over time and the accompanying quantitative markers support the qualitative reports well. While the qualitative element remains dominant the evaluation has found consistency between the quantitative scoring and the qualitative reflections.
Sustainability	
Conclusion 7	There have been significant wins achieved in the Asia region in spite of the difficult political contexts at the level of advocacy and legal frameworks. These changes, apart from showing the effectiveness of the programme, contribute to its sustainability, in that the campaign work that has been done to raise awareness cannot be reversed and the wins on the legal side have elevated the starting point of future advocacy
Conclusion 8	The non imposition approach of the programme has ensured that it has not tempered with the institutional fabrics of its partners, such that they are able to design and own their programmes, thus making them sustainable. Financial dependence on donors limits sustainability on this front. However, transparency about T11's position and openness to discuss a post T11 future among partners is useful.
Efficiency	
Conclusion 9	The budget flexibility, easy reporting tools and programme management tools have built in efficiency into the programme, enabling institutionalisation of tools to strengthen partners' own internal processes.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 2: Recommendations

Action	Rationale	Level
Effectiveness		
Rec 1.	Given the focus of the international programme on building synergies and fostering south-south cooperation, it remains that there is limited capacity across the board to engage sufficiently at that level due to limited financial, human and time resources. It will be useful to explore exactly how much additional capacity is required to elevate this type of engagement and build it into the programme budget.	Regional
Rec 2.	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 dynamics.	Regional/Global
Rec 3.	The gender aspect of the programme would benefit from being approached from the angle of decolonisation. This would mean moving away from binary ways of analysis and categorisation of oppressions and take 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. The work being done by the NGO Forum on feminist perspectives is a good point to refer to.	Regional/Global
Rec 4.	Involve youth groups more as strategic partners in the programme design. Youth play a big role due to their new ideas, ways of seeing the world and connectedness to other global movements and narratives which speak the language of justice and sustainability. They make powerful allies and provide a connection	Regional/Global

	beyond the north-south divide. The next programme can be more strategic about youth involvements.	
Rec 5.	Rights holders face capacity limitations in involvement in legal work, partly due to a perceived distance between what happens on the ground and legal frameworks. To bridge this perceived distance, 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. Use of this can include training right holders in the right to information laws, how to use them to access basic human rights and how to request information practically using these laws. The logic here is that on the one hand, the submission of RTI requests by rights holders to governments in itself increases pressure through the increased visibility of rights holders' interest on a specific issue. On the other hand, it provides an accessible way for rights holders to engage with the law, therefore decreasing the perceived distance between themselves and the law.	Regional/Global
Sustainability		
Rec 6.	In terms of consolidating advocacy wins, it will be important for the programme to facilitate more content discussions between 'sectors' so that particularly environmental problems are not simply shifted from one sector to another. Lessons from ongoing discussions between partners working on energy and mining in which Walhi is a part, can be taken forward as an approach that strengthens the holistic approach of the programme.	Regional/Global
Efficiency		
Rec 7.	Partners would benefit from feedback from T11 staff on their reports and outcome journal submissions in order to facilitate two way communication and flag gaps more directly	Regional
Rec 8.	The budget flexibility approach in T11 is well appreciated by partners and should continue	Regional/Global

Progress markers

Rec 9.	<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 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, which would be an interesting one to consider in the next evaluation. This would also be in line with T11's approach to elevate reporting to a strategising tool which captures political change, which by its nature is challenging to capture.</p>	Global
--------	--	--------

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Participating organisations

(Ex) Staff 11.11.11
Program Coordination- Asia
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
Other organisations
TransNational Institute (TNI)
Rikolto

Annex 2: Scores obtained per PM in Indonesia



