

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE (MR) - FINAL EVALUATION 11.11.11 INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM 2017 - 2021

Type of evaluation	Final / outcome Evaluation
Subject of evaluation	Outcomes of the country programs DR Congo, Burundi, Rwanda, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Philippines, Indonesia 2017-2021
Date of evaluation report	June 2022
Evaluation team	ODS Organisation Development Support: Zdena Middernacht, Anna Cesari, Ritha Sukadi Mata & Mees Bakker
Contributed to MR	Entire team of the international department
MR validated by	Validation by team international department > validation by management 9/11/2022
Date first version MR	Oct. 2022
Date last update	

CONTEXT

In February 2022, 11.11.11 contracted ODS to conduct the end evaluation of the international program 2017-2021. The main objective was to account to the subsidizing government for the achievement of the identified outcomes in the program. The main components were described as follows; (1) to assess whether / to what extent the international program of 11.11.11 has succeeded in achieving its stated specific objectives (effectiveness) and (2) to assess its sustainability and efficiency. The relevance of the program was already extensively researched and demonstrated through the mid-term evaluations (2019 and 2020), which had a strong focus on Peru, Burundi and the Philippines. This explains why the final evaluation focuses on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program with a focus on Ecuador, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Indonesia.

The final evaluation reports and, in particular, its conclusions and recommendations were the subject of a specific working session during the international working weeks in June 2022. The entire team of the international department participated in this. This session laid the foundations of this management response, which were subsequently supplemented and finally validated by the entire team.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Effectiveness	
Conclusion 1	The programme has been successful in its contribution to an autonomous civil society, particularly in terms of narratives. The financial autonomy aspect remains limited because of the continued dependence on donor funding. What the programme has done however is to limit the typical limitations associated with the donor/grantee power dynamic by creating an equal partnership. The programme's focus on building synergies have been valued and it has made a huge impact and created chain reactions by connecting its partners to its own networks and supporting them to engage in networks beyond its own.
Conclusion 2	The exchanges that have been facilitated between partners across regions have enabled the travelling of concepts and the travelling of advocacy tactics, which has strengthened partners' advocacy work. Nevertheless, there remains room for further engagement inter-regionally, particularly between the Andes region and the Asia region, given the common elements of the programme focus areas as well as regional dynamics related to climate change, extractivism and gender to mention a few. At the same time it has been noted by partners that there are limitations in human and financial resources which limit the extent to which they can meaningfully engage in regional and international platforms. Furthermore, there is room for more strategic partnerships with types of partners that are well positioned to accelerate the narratives on alternatives, notably youth movements. At the same time there is the recognition that in many contexts, there are few to no organised or structured youth movements.
Conclusion 3	While the south-south synergy building is important to the evaluation, there are opportunities for equal north-south exchange on common advocacy issues, even in spite of different advocacy contexts. In fact, where advocacy contexts are starkly different, partners are able to get inspiration from being able to imagine what 'things could look like' and what is possible, through engagement with those from contexts where there is more space for certain kinds of advocacy. As such it is important to, while strengthening the south-south exchange, to not deprioritise the north-south exchange on common issues.
Conclusion 4	The gender inequality aspect has been generally inconsistent, ranging from little marked progress to progress that seems to still be somewhat at an awareness raising level. The evaluation concludes here that the approach to gender as a stand alone element may not be adequate for a programme focusing on systemic change from a holistic point of view. For this programme, intersectionality may be a more useful framework to address gender issues in a more holistic way that 'leaves no one behind'.
Conclusion 5	The approach that T11 has taken of having different types of partners, institutional partners, thematic partners and adhoc partners has been effective in bringing in different perspectives while maintaining stability and a space for sustainable programme implementation through its steady 5 year long funding.

Conclusion 6	Partners have built up expertise over time to engage with rights holders and different types of target groups. The shared tactic of evaluating when to focus on local levels and when to focus on the national level, as well as supporting local level leadership candidates who support systemic change to rise to positions of influence are solid tactics. Moreover, partners assess that local level change achieves more direct impact and such an approach has brought them closer to rights holders. Capacities of rights holders differ across regions and partners have done well in capacity building, in spite of persisting capacity limitations here and there on the level of engagement with legislative processes on the part of rights holders.
Conclusion 7	The progress marker system is well appreciated by partners. Its quantitative element complements the qualitative reflections usefully and this evaluation has experienced consistency between these two elements. This is in spite of the fact that the qualitative element is dominant and thus subjectivity is a strong factor. While the contributions of T11 to the outcomes are highlighted clearly in several instances, it remains that the monitoring system does not adequately capture information that demonstrates this contribution clearly.
Sustainability	
Conclusion 8	The T11 model as an equal partner facilitates financial sustainability because of the space it provides to reflect on sustainability beyond its own funding, the transparency it gives to its partners and the capacity development it offers explicitly but also implicitly through providing budgeting and reporting systems that are easy, can be institutionalised and can strengthen the internal management processes of its partners.
Conclusion 9	The approach of equal partnership without imposition of narratives and implementation methods, in combination with the requirements on reporting are key in the context of the current reliance on donor funding. They at least limit the negative effects of this reliance, which continue to be limitations in the development sector in general
Efficiency	
Conclusion 10	The programme has generally been efficient and aligned with its own view of what efficiency means in its political work. Aforementioned elements related to flexible budgets, light reporting systems and outcome based reporting have contributed to efficiency.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

<p>RECOMMENDATION 1 EFFECTIVENESS</p>	<p><u>Incorporate youth movements as strategic partners</u> Of the target groups that the program identifies, it is important that it strategically moves beyond ‘awareness raising’ or ‘involvement’ of groups who are well positioned to be more strategic partners because of their social positioning in this current moment. The evaluation suggests that youth movements, whose narrative is beyond ‘development’; SDGs and sometimes beyond the north-south divide because of their social media connectedness can be strategic partners for the program. As such, partners should consider engaging them at a more strategic level rather than ‘involving them’ as they may be key in advancing certain campaigns and alternative narratives and initiatives significantly.</p>			
<p>MANAGEMENT RESPONSE</p>	<p>It is not our mission to structurally link up with youth movements, but we do see opportunities and challenges to ensure a better reach out to young people. At this moment, we do not have the capacity nor the resources to ensure a structural collaboration with youth movements; the scope of the program and organizations to cooperate with, is already broad. Depending on the context in the specific countries, 11.11.11 has been supporting movements – often more mixed than focused on young people (eg. Indigenous organisations, activists ...). Also, not in each of our intervention countries, there are strongly organised youth movements on system change and SEJ / EJ / DJ (except for RDC in which we collaborate with some strong youth movements); our partners already take up efforts to strengthen the relations and involve more youth in their organisations – especially by promoting activism on human rights and climate.</p>			
<p>Action</p>	<p>Timing</p>	<p>Person(s) responsible</p>	<p>Follow-up</p>	
<p>1.1 Maintain the motivation of partners on the importance of collaboration and investing in youth activism</p>	<p>2026</p>	<p>Serge Beel (International Director)</p>	<p>Status</p>	<p>Comments</p>

1.2 Maintain the good relations we have in RDC with youth movements	2026	Adolphe Baduda (Coordinator Great Lakes Region)		
RECOMMENDATION 2	<p><u>Consider having a budget dedicated to facilitating networking and synergy building</u> In spite of the importance of network and synergy building in the program, partners do not have enough human and financial resources to communicate and remain a sustainable part of regional and international networks given the pressure they have from their internal workload. We recommend that partners do an analysis of the resources needed to be more effective in this kind of collaboration and cost it in a way that T11 can consider as part of the grant.</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	<p>That is already included in our program, in the collaboration with our partners, in the dialogue on the use of the budget. Partners always have the possibility to use part of the budget for networking and synergy. We also – additionnaly - support networks in which our partners are actively involved. And we try to support some small extra initiatives on top; this is limited because of the budget restrictions.</p>			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
2.1: Continue the flexibility for the partners within the budget support, and continue to highlight the importance of networking and synergy building.	2026	Serge Beel (International Director)		

RECOMMANDATION 3	<p>Initiate the trajectory of common issues to exchange as part of north-south sharing</p> <p>In the MTE it was recommended that progress markers be used for ‘north’ and ‘south’ partners of T11, aligning them to the identification of joint learning trajectories. To build on this, we suggest in this evaluation that the advocacy follow up tactics towards implementation of adopted legislation as well as conversations on the gaps and risks of shifting problems from one sector to another as discussed in the report are global challenges and possible common learning points between the Belgian T11 members and the international partners;</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	<p>As international department, we continuously try to link up the political actions in Asia, LAM, Africa or MENA region with the actions in Europe. We have an intensive dialogue with the policy department, on the different global issues and specific actions; we are making efforts to keep on strengthening the dialogue, but we also have to be realistic on how complex the agenda of each colleague is, and the limitations of our possibilities (in terms of time and dedication). We also have been strengthening direct interaction of the colleagues of the policy department with the experts of our partner organisations. Also there, it is important to be aware of the limitations, in time, language etc.</p>			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
3.1: Strengthen the exchange and interaction between the international program (department) and the policy department by participation of staff of international department in policy department meetings. Involving partners when it is opportune.	2023	Serge Beel (International Director)	Status	Comments

RECOMMANDATION 4	<p><u>Strengthen internal mechanism for sharing information among regional staff</u> Beyond bringing partners together, it is important for T11 to strengthen its internal mechanism for sharing information between staff working in different regions. This could support the holism of the program, transferring tactics and insights from one region to another at an institutional level. Given the pathway that T11 is taking on linking the international program more with its policy work, more internal coordination will be necessary to ensure that policy contributions are aligned;</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	<p>We have been trying to promote south-south exchange, and exchange between the regional teams. We keep on considering it is very important, but are also aware of our limitations (time and resources). We have to keep on promoting the exchange, but at the same time be realistic. Therefore our internal learning process will be updated and define yearly clear learning trajectories. One of those trajectories will be on political theories and strategies. We plan also some trajectories on other specific issues – see also recommendation 6.</p>			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
4.1 Updating learning methodology ‘Onzology’	End 2023	Serge Beel (International Director)		
4.2 Learning trajectory on ‘political theories and strategies’ for the department (and linking with Belgium program).	2023 - 2024	Serge Beel (International Director)		
RECOMMENDATION 5	<p><u>Build capacity of rights holders and simultaneously include them in campaigns through Rights to Information laws</u> Across the regions, rights holders face challenges in engaging with campaigns or legal cases that would advance their rights for several reasons among which is capacity to organise sufficiently. One of the common limitations is the intimidation of legal processes, and the perceived inaccessibility of legal language which sometimes creates a perceived distance between what happens on the ground and the legal frameworks in place.</p> <p>The evaluation recommends that where capacity building is being done, such capacity building needs to be closely linked to engagement with the legal structures. A place to start from is to use the Freedom of Information laws (in countries with such laws) to develop rights’ holders capacities on how to use Rtl laws to access their basic human rights. Rights-holders can therefore submit Rtl requests to the relevant authorities requesting information that is related to their grievance. In this way they develop the capacity to engage with the existing law and use them as a way of increasing pressure on the grievances that they are advocating on. There are examples from CSOs in Indonesia, including JATAM, who used the Right to Information laws (Right to Information Act in Indonesia and Freedom of Information Act in the Philippines) to facilitate the engagement of rights holders with the law.</p>			

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	This is a very specific recommendation, linked to the context in specific countries. We support our partners, that have the expertise to see which are the best leverages in their specific country / situation / or on the international level, to promote the claim for rights and the improvement in the effective realization of rights. It depends on the specific country which are the main topics and instruments to be promoted. Laws or instruments for access to information and transparency are important, but there are quite some instruments (on a local or international level). Important note is that the interconnection between right holders and partners is already in our program/logic, so the decision of how partners link up with right holders is theirs and not ours. It is not up to us to impose the dynamic they have. We can participate in the debate but in the end it is not up to us to interfere operationally.			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
5.1 Follow-up with partners which are the best leverages in their specific context	2026	Freya Rondelez (HRBA Focal Point International Department)		
RECOMMENDATION 6	<p><u>Advance decolonization work through taking an intersectionality approach to gender equality</u></p> <p>There is still room to bring decolonisation into the lenses that the program uses to look at issues. A colonial legacy is the tendency towards binaries and the separation and categorisation of elements that in fact are interconnected. The evaluation recommends that intersectionality is a more useful framework to address gender inequality and incorporate it better into the program narratives. A first step towards this is capacity building on intersectionality should ideally be done at the beginning of the program. An intersectionality lens will also be crucial to operationalising the Leave none behind approach through its connection of different structures that together reinforce exclusion on the basis of several factors which coexist simultaneously with gender. Some partners, for example TPKT and the NGO Forum in Asia have this intersectionality and feminist perspectives approach and would be useful to engage with to explore how they could support capacity building efforts to other partners on this.</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	This is more an internal process. It is considered a good idea to take the subject of decolonization, with the lens of intersectionality, as focus for the exchange among staff. We will also take in account the expertise that partners might have in this regard. There are different levels of “decolonization” in the different regions. We will make of decolonization, linked with intersectionality, a digital* learning trajectory. *Serge and Thomas Clauw (MEAL) will be the focal points and create a digital platform (Teams).			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
6.1 Creation of a digital learning platform (Teams) on decolonization and intersectionality	2024	Tracy Bibo Tansia (Decolonization and intersectionality Focal point international Department)		

RECOMMENDATION 7	<p><u>Incorporate mid-reporting check in points for GLR and Asia regions in order to facilitate two way feedback for the latter and to facilitate mid-way reflection for the former.</u> For GLR, provide templates for After-Action-Reviews (AARs) for partners to self facilitate light review and reflection sessions at the end of the program interventions. These AARs could be referred to later for reporting, making reporting easier and not reliant on memory, while facilitating self-directed moments of reflection and internal learning.</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	Thanks to our new monitoring methodology of outcome harvesting, the practice of mid-reporting check in points will get a significant boost, in all regions.			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
7.1 Roll-out and implementation of the new monitoring system.	2022	Serge Beel (International Director)		
RECOMMENDATION 8	<p><u>Consider an outcome harvesting methodology for the next program evaluation</u> 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,</p>			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	We agree and we foresee to use Outcome Harvesting as methodology for the next program evaluation			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
8.1 OH is used as methodology for the next program evaluation	2024	Serge Beel (International Director)		
RECOMMENDATION 9 SUSTAINABILITY	T11 could act as an advocate for the model it is applying on donor/grantee equal partnership to contribute to the shift in the larger donor community on this global problem. This would also contribute to making the benefits of its own efforts in implementing this model sustainable.			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	We are already do that but there is still place for improvement. For example, the ongoing process with the policy department is an important evolution to follow up, also we can do better on equal partnership and donor community. Therefore we plan to invest in innovative ways of financing based on equal partnership (such as reversed financing).			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments

9.1 Follow-up ongoing process with policy department	2026	Naïma Charkaoui (Policy Director) & Serge Beel (International Director)		
9.2 Engaging with ngo-federatie on equal partnership and donor requirements	2026	Serge Beel (International Director)		
9.3 Invest in innovative financing tools based on equal partnership (such as reversed programming).	2026	Serge Beel (International Director) and Institutional Fundraiser		
RECOMMENDATION 10 EFFICIENCY	<u>Continue with the system of budget flexibility</u> The budget flexibility approach in T11 is well appreciated by partners and should continue.			
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	Is done in 2 ways: (1) the way we support our partners and (2) the different type of partners, more specifically the flexible punctual partners. We do not know what next year will bring but small funding creates leverage, so we should rethink the idea about the available money: equal distribution among the different regions or on the basis of several criteria distribute the money where most necessary or most pertinent?			
Action	Timing	Person(s) responsible	Follow-up	
			Status	Comments
10.1 Rethinking exercise of distribution flexible funds	2026	Serge Beel (International Director)		