

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION

Realizing Rights for All: Tackling the Structural Drivers of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Deprivations Facing Marginalized Groups

Duration	April 2022 - December 2024
Budget	2.124.771,64 EUR
Donor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Finland
Partnering Organizations	Minority Rights Group International (MRG) in partnership with the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), the Global Initiative on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (GI-ESCR), and national in-country partners in all target regions.
Geographic Scope	CESR: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Nepal, South Africa, Thailand, Tunisia, Zambia GI-ESR: Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Ivory Coast, India, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Zimbabwe MRG: Ethiopia, Kenya, Nepal, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine (scoping missions Burundi, Colombia, Egypt, Guatemala, Mongolia, Morocco, Uzbekistan)
Evaluation Type	Final External Evaluation
Evaluation Team	Mr. Silviu Kondan and Ms. Rowena Symss – <i>Kondan & Symss Consultancy Inc.</i>

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CEDAW	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CERD	Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination
CESCR	Committee of Economic Social and Cultural Rights
CESR	Center for Economic and Social Rights
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
FfD	Financing for Development
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
HDIM	Human Dimension Implementation Meeting
HLPF	UN High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
IACHR	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
ICRICT	Independent Commission for the Reform of International Corporate Taxation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IWGIA	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GI-ESCR	Global Initiative on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights
MRG	Minority Rights Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NHRIs	National Human Rights Institutions
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PwD	People with Disability
ReAll	Realizing Rights for All: Tackling the Structural Drivers of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Deprivations Facing Marginalized Groups
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNFCCC CoP	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties
UNFMI	UN Forum on Minority Issues
UNPFII	UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT.....	5
1.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.0 EVALUATION SCOPE, METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	8
3.1 EVALUATION SCOPE AND PURPOSE.....	8
3.2 METHODOLOGY.....	8
3.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	11
4.0 FINDINGS.....	12
4.1 RELEVANCE AND CROSS-CUTTING THEMES.....	12
4.2 COHERENCE.....	21
4.3 EFFICIENCY.....	31
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS.....	39
4.5 IMPACT.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.6 SUSTAINABILITY.....	49
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	58

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report captures the key findings obtained through the final external evaluation of the “Realizing Rights for All: Tackling the Structural Drivers of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Deprivations Facing Marginalized Groups” (ReAll) programme. The evaluation is produced for the three implementing programme partners – the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), the Global Initiative on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights (GI-ESCR) and the Minority Rights Group (MRG) – the programme donor (i.e., the Government of Finland) and ReAll programme partners. The evaluation was conducted between December 2024 and February 2025, covering the full duration of the programme (April 2022 - December 2024).

1.1 PROGRAMME BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development seeks “to realize the human rights of all” through its commitment to address systemic discrimination faced by marginalized groups, including women, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, and others, as encompassed in its core pledge to “leave no one behind.” The principle of “leave no one behind” requires combating discrimination and rising inequalities within and among countries, addressing their root causes to ensure the dignity and rights of all individuals.¹

However, nearly a decade after the Agenda’s adoption, there remains challenges to fulfilling the commitment. Structural barriers that perpetuate disparities in economic, social, and cultural (ESC) rights persist, with the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbating these inequities. Nine years following the 2030 Agenda commitments, many goals are moderately to severely off track.^{2,3} The United Nations Sustainable Development Group has also underscored that the commitments to eradicate poverty, end discrimination and reduce inequalities remains unmet. Overall, secondary data suggests several ongoing challenges:

- The COVID-19 pandemic revealed and intensified vulnerabilities within marginalized populations. Women bore an unequal burden of unpaid care responsibilities, with research highlighting how pre-existing gender disparities in care work grew substantially during this period.⁴
- Indigenous communities globally have faced encroachment on their lands, driven by intensified resource extraction during the pandemic, with devastating consequences for both their environmental rights and health (e.g., research from the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) describes how miners and loggers encroaching on indigenous territories brought the coronavirus to remote communities, who often lacked access to adequate healthcare).⁵
- Persons with disabilities encountered increased barriers during the pandemic, particularly in accessing healthcare and education.⁶

¹ United Nations Sustainable Development Group (2023). *Leave No One Behind: A Promise to End Discrimination and Reduce Inequalities*. United Nations Sustainable Development Group. Available at: <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values/leave-no-one-behind>.

² United Nations (2024). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA). Available at: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2024/>.

³ United Nations Development Programme (2022). *Human Development Report 2022: Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives: Shaping Our Future in a Transforming World*. New York: UNDP. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/>.

⁴ UN Women (2020). *Gender Equality and COVID-19 Response and Recovery*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. Available at: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications>.

⁵ IWGIA (2022). *Indigenous Peoples and COVID-19: Report on Impact*. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. Available at: <https://iwgia.org/en/resources.html>.

⁶ International Disability and Development Consortium (2021). *The Impacts of COVID-19 on Persons with Disabilities*. International Disability and Development Consortium. Available at: <https://www.iddcconsortium.net/>.

- Structural discrimination and identity-based politics in post-colonial states have reinforced exclusionary practices, as noted by the UN Special Rapporteur on minority issues in 2021. These systemic inequities are set to worsen with the intersection of inequality and the climate crises, which disproportionately affect vulnerable populations.⁷
- A study by CESR further demonstrates how austerity measures and insufficient domestic resource mobilization have eroded public service delivery, disproportionately harming marginalized communities.⁸ Furthermore, the commercialization of public services has also deepened inequality. For instance, in South Africa, dichotomized health systems leave the public sector underfunded and overstretched, with private healthcare accessible only to the wealthiest, perpetuating disparities.⁹ Moreover, the transition to renewable energy—a critical component of global climate goals—has largely excluded marginalized groups from decision-making processes, while large-scale renewable energy projects often displace indigenous communities without adequate consultation or compensation.¹⁰

In this context, MRG International in partnership with CESR, GI-ESCR, and national in-country partners, formulated the ReAll programme to address underlying structural causes of ESC rights disparities, focusing on systemic issues such as inequitable tax policies, underfunded and commercialized public services, unsustainable natural resource management as well as climate inaction, under the ReAll programme.

The ReAll programme's objective was designed "to strengthen the voice of marginalized groups in the design and implementation of economic and environmental policies affecting their ESC rights, including by supporting them to demand accountability when such policies do not comply with human rights standards and principles." In accordance with this objective, the three implementing partners sought to achieve the following outcomes based on key actors that collectively influence ESC rights:

- Among the **marginalized groups and the civil society organizations** (CSOs) representing and supporting them, partners and beneficiaries of the programme:
 - Strengthen capacity to use participatory approaches and cutting-edge methods for innovative research and creative advocacy;
 - Share the existing body of knowledge, analytical skills, and tactical repertoire among a broader community of allies working with marginalized groups;
 - Increase cross-sector collaboration that amplifies the voices of marginalized groups in regional and international advocacy spaces.
- Among **accountability bodies and other targeted policy influencers/makers**:
 - Develop clearer normative standards and specific policy recommendations articulated to address structural factors underlying ESC rights disparities, and action plans for governments and other responsible actors.
 - Enhance monitoring and enforcement of standards, amplifying accountability demands to governments and other actors.
- Among **national authorities and other targeted responsible actors**:
 - Increase responsiveness to and capacity to act on ESC rights claims from marginalized groups (demonstrated through steps taken to design and implement rights-based economic and environmental policies).

⁷ UN Special Rapporteur on Minority Issues (2021). *Annual Report on the Rights of Minorities*. United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-minority-issues>.

⁸ CESR (2020). *Fiscal Policies and ESC Rights During COVID-19: A Human Rights-Based Approach to Economic Recovery*. Center for Economic and Social Rights. Available at: <https://www.cesr.org/publications>.

⁹ Van den Heever, A. M. (2021). *South Africa's Healthcare Dichotomy: The Public-Private Divide and Its Impact on Equality*. University of Cape Town Open Access Repository. Available at: https://open.uct.ac.za/bitstream/handle/11427/35178/40249_2021_Article_804.pdf.

¹⁰ MRG (2023). *Renewable Energy and Indigenous Peoples' Rights*. Minority Rights Group International. Available at: <https://minorityrights.org/publications/>.

- o Strengthen regulatory frameworks to ensure that private actors do not impede or violate the ESC rights of marginalised groups.

2.0 EVALUATION SCOPE, METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

2.1 EVALUATION SCOPE AND PURPOSE

The ReAll programme evaluation seeks to provide a comprehensive assessment of the programme's results as outlined in its Results Monitoring Framework (RMF) and aligned with standardized evaluation methodologies. In addition to measuring achievements against stated objectives, **the evaluation aims to guide the design of future interventions by providing a forward-looking assessment.** The evaluation will also support final reporting obligations to the donor, ensuring transparency and accountability to all stakeholders.

The evaluation will adopt a results-oriented and human rights-based approach, assessing the programme's:

- **Relevance** – The alignment of programme objectives with the needs of marginalized groups and key stakeholders.
- **Coherence** – The effectiveness of partnerships and collaborations among the three implementing organizations (MRG, CESR and GI-ESCR) and local partners, its coherence with the broader 2030 Agenda principles.
- **Efficiency** – The extent to which resources, including financial and human, were used cost-effectively to achieve intended results.
- **Effectiveness** – The degree to which the programme achieved its objectives and delivered intended results across its key components.
- **Impact** – The tangible and sustained changes brought about by the programme, particularly in capacity-building among local partners and beneficiaries.
- **Sustainability** – The likelihood that the results achieved will endure beyond the programme's lifecycle.

The evaluation also incorporated principles central to human rights and equity, including inclusion, accountability, accessibility, local ownership and adherence to "*do no harm*" and "*leave no one behind*".

The programme's geographic scope includes Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, West Asia and North Africa, with activities spanning local, national, and international levels. Specific countries of focus for each implementing partner include:

- CESR: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, South Africa, and Zambia.
- GI-ESCR: Chile, Egypt, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, and Uganda.
- MRG: Ethiopia, Kenya, Nepal, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, and Ukraine.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation framework and designed evaluation tools were based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria areas and cross-cutting themes (see Table 2). The evaluators employed a mixed-method approach that integrated data from a variety of sources to ensure a comprehensive analysis. This approach drew upon programme documentation, such as progress reports, programme proposals and deliverables, to gain insights on the programme's implementation, objectives and achievements. Relevant secondary data and external publications supported the evaluation by providing contextual information on thematic issues, helping evaluators to frame findings within a broader scope of ESC rights. Furthermore, strategic recommendations and guidelines were considered, leveraging established global and regional frameworks, such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Primary data collection involved remote key informant interviews and focus group discussions with programme staff (from the three implementing organisations) as well as CSO partners/beneficiaries and the programme donor focal point. These sessions allowed evaluators to collect qualitative insights directly from stakeholders, which were critical for understanding programme results and identifying areas for improvement. The evaluators also used primary data collected by CESR and GI-ESCR through two end-of-programme surveys sent to their respective programme partners.

The evaluators adhered to appropriate data confidentiality and privacy practices to protect the stakeholders involved in the evaluation process (e.g., the United Nations Evaluation Group Evaluation Standards and Codes of Conduct). Interviewee and respondent input were kept confidential for the purposes of this evaluation and any identifying data was appropriately and permanently deleted upon the completion of the evaluation.

Table 2: OECD-DAC Standard Evaluation Criteria Areas and Evaluation Indicators

Evaluation Indicators
<p>Relevance and Cross-cutting Themes <i>Extent to which the programme’s objectives and intended results remain valid as originally planned and are suitable to the priorities of various stakeholders (incl. duty-bearers, non-governmental beneficiaries and marginalized communities).</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrated consideration of beneficiary needs and priorities in project design and inception phase. 2. Demonstrated adaptability to changing circumstances and priorities of key stakeholders. 3. Examples of ways gender pluralism, equity, and human rights were considered and incorporated into the design and adhered to.
<p>Coherence <i>Compatibility of the intervention with other projects, programmes and/or interventions in the geographic region, and across sectors.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Quality of scoping review in planning stages and quality of needs assessment (including both internal coherence and external coherence). 5. Demonstrated successes in supporting collaboration and cooperation amongst actors. 6. Demonstrated consideration of relevant policies/guidelines in project design, with examples of alignment to applicable norms and standards.
<p>Efficiency <i>Extent to which the programme delivers results in an economic and timely way (i.e., how resources translated into outputs), with consideration of project planning, implementation and management.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Demonstrated successes in project management and consideration of areas for improvement 8. Resource allocation (timeliness, cost-effectiveness, technological adaptation, etc.) 9. Quality and validity of M&E tools
<p>Effectiveness <i>Extent to which the programme achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results according to the programme design.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Achievement of outlined targets for planned results
<p>Impact (early indication): <i>Any long-term positive and negative changes, or potential changes, produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (i.e., how the intervention affects outcomes for stakeholders).</i></p>

11. Demonstrated assessment of long-lasting results within broader changes in systems or norms (incl. Evidence of adoption of best practices, standards, and tools promoted through the programme)
Sustainability (early indication): <i>Extent to which the net benefits of the programme will continue or are likely to continue.</i>
12. Documentation of lessons learned and communication of key learnings with relevant stakeholders
13. Identification of degree to which parties are prepared for future risks and constraints
14. Assessment of scalability and replicability

Sampling

Purposeful (non-random) sampling was used to select informants from beneficiary/partner organisations. The selection of participating interviewees and respondents was informed by staff from the implementing teams using an evaluation contact register. **In total, 27 individuals participated in the evaluation process through interviews across selected stakeholder groups. Interviewees included programme team staff members, a donor representative and CSO partners/beneficiaries.**

The chosen sampling approach was deemed the most suitable for this summative evaluation, as intentional and targeted participant selection is essential for gathering specific information required. Purposeful sampling allowed the programme team (inclusive of staff from MRG, CESR, GI-ESCR involved in the programme's implementation) to strategically select individuals based on predefined criteria, such as their involvement and level of engagement in the programme. This ensured that the selected sample was relevant to the evaluation objectives

Table 3: List of Informants to the Evaluation

Type of Contact (Programme Staff, Partner, Beneficiary)	Organization/Institution/Agency n/Institution/Agency
Development and Learning Manager Global Partnerships Lead Manager	CESR Staff (2)
Programme Officer on the Right to Education Associate Programme Officer - Economic Justice Programme Officer Africa Associate Programme Officer Africa Programme Officer - Climate & Environmental Justice	GI-ESCR Staff (5)
Global Programmes Manager Asia Programmes Manager Thailand Programmes Coordinator Disability Programmes Coordinator Africa Programmes Coordinator OSCE Region Programmes Coordinator	MRG Staff (6)
Senior Adviser on Good Governance and Democracy	Donor Representative (1) - Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Department for Development Policy
Ukrainian Federation of The Death (1)	MRG Partnering Organizations (7)
Roma Women's Fund Chiricli (1)	
Endorois Indigenous Women's Empowerment Network (1)	
Armshield International Peace Champions (1)	
African Initiative for Mankind Peace Organisation (1)	
Institute for Peace Studies (1)	

Foundation for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities / Inclusive Learning Center on Disability (1)	
Women's Life Wellness Foundation (WLWF) (2)	CESR Partnering Organization (2)
Fab Riders Learning Labs Consultant (1)	CESR Partner (1)
Privatisation In Education and Human Rights Consortium (PEHRC) (1)	GI-ESCR Partnering Organizations (3)
FIMA (1)	
Engineers Without Borders (ESF) (1)	

3.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The implementation of the evaluation methodology faced some limitations, which were identified early on, with mitigation strategies proposed for the programme team's consideration. A key limitation included a lack of endline beneficiary data from affected populations (i.e., community members not directly engaged with local or national organisations), as interviews were conducted mainly with programme implementation staff and staff from partnering/beneficiary organisations. This data would have enriched insights into programme's relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability for endline beneficiaries. Nonetheless, the evaluators recognize that evaluation data collection cannot necessarily be prioritized, particularly with vulnerable groups. The evaluators also considered that many of these communities already provided data through the programme's research activities and may have been out-of-reach during the final evaluation, which aligned with the end of the programme implementation period.

Another constraint was limited interview availability with some stakeholders from partnering organisations primarily due to the data collection timeline (i.e., over winter holidays) and stakeholders' availability. Duty-bearers, such as policymakers, and government representatives from target countries were also not included in the shared contact register. This led to a lack of evaluation input pertaining to national-level evaluation data, which is important considering the programme's focus on national-level policy and practice, and duty-bearers as a target group. For example, there was no input or relatively limited input from key stakeholders in most implementation countries (e.g., Nepal, Tunisia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, etc.). However, the evaluators note that this was out of scope given that the ReAll programme evaluation had a limited budget and timeline to allow the evaluators to conduct a more thorough in-country analysis across the case country contexts. Additional input from the evaluators on recommended adjustments to future evaluation cycles is noted in the *Efficiency Section*.

Additionally, conducting the evaluation prior to final programme reporting period prevented the evaluators from verifying all interview data against cumulative reporting/programme documentation, particularly in assessing the programme's effectiveness and efficiency (in terms of meeting result targets and budget utilization).

4.0 FINDINGS

4.1 RELEVANCE AND CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

In accordance with the OECD-DAC definition of relevance, the evaluators assessed the extent to which the ReAll programme's design addressed the needs and priorities of CSOs and the marginalized communities they represent. The evaluators also assessed the extent to which the programme's design and implementation approach incorporated considerations related to cross-cutting themes, such as the promotion of gender mainstreaming, equity and human rights.

RELEVANCE & CROSS-CUTTING THEMES INDICATORS
Demonstrated consideration of beneficiary needs and priorities in programme design and inception phase (including through needs assessment process)
Demonstrated adaptability to changing circumstances and priorities of key stakeholders
Examples of ways gender pluralism, equity, and human rights were considered and incorporated into the design and adhered to

Demonstrated consideration of relevant beneficiary context and needs in programme design and implementation (incl. needs of beneficiaries)

Key Finding 1: The ReAll programme was well designed to meet the needs of CSOs and the marginalized communities they represent. Key design aspects that contributed to the relevance for target populations at the local national levels were the:

- grant model, under which national/local grantee organizations, that possess contextual knowledge and access to target communities were supported in leading programme design and implementation.
- the OPERA framework and participatory action research methodology, and associated trainings as they better equipped affected community members to navigate, understand and advocate for ESC rights applicable to their communities.

The evaluators found that the programme was very well designed to address the needs of beneficiary CSOs and the communities they represent/affected communities, to lead research and advocacy activities. **All partnering CSO representatives who participated in evaluation interviews concurred that the programme addressed relevant needs and priorities for their organizations and marginalized communities (n=11/11).** This extent of relevance was attributed to multiple factors. Firstly, the programme team (referring to staff involved in programme implementation from CESR, GI-ESCR and MRG) opted to use a sub-granting model under which CSOs would co-design interventions with the programme team, and lead implementation in their respective contexts. **This allowed the CSOs to leverage their existing contextual knowledge on community needs and challenges; their knowledge of what their organizations could feasibly lead and how it could be best achieved; and the expertise of the programme team, to guide projects.** Interviewed CSO representatives and programme staff consistently noted that this was a key factor contributing to the programme's relevance for their organizations and communities.

"We appreciated being able to independently lead out work, because we have worked with our beneficiaries closely and know what their needs are." – Ukrainian CSO Sub-grantee Representative

"Before working with MRG, we were already doing this work as it was part of our core [areas of focus] but we did not have the finances that we got through this partnership. The grant allowed us to reach more people, and lead more activities and training for our target communities." – Kenyan CSO Sub-grantee Representative

“The grant was designed well. It allowed CSOs to provide resources and address community needs at a local level. It also enabled them to engage with prioritized advocacy, untangling the structure of issues affecting these groups from the local to global level.” – Programme Staff

Programme staff echoed these perspectives, adding that the grant model also enables their teams to support organizational growth among CSOs, while absorbing more administrative tasks. This then allows the sub-grantee organizations to focus their already limited capacities on implementation. A programme staff member summarized this well in stating:

“We follow the lead of our local partners. We carry more of the ‘transaction cost’ to make sure that the work being done actually aligns with project plans. We try to integrate this very early on when designing the project. Partners have shared that this approach is valuable for them because of the learnings they benefit from, rather than them just having to share data to meet donor requirements. It makes the experience more meaningful to them.” – Programme Staff

Furthermore, programme staff (n=4) expressed that because of the wide array of policy issues covered by the grant, the programme directly corresponded and addressed emergent challenges as well as those that arose as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, CESR was able to link climate change to austerity, tax, debt, financing, that are affecting target communities.

However, the evaluators would like to point out that some programme staff (n=3) stated that the division of this budget across many CSOs led to reduced grant totals and capacities among sub-grantees to produce more relevant and impactful results (see section 4.3 *Efficiency*) (i.e., the sub-grant constituted 20 per cent of the programme budget in initial plans). A programme staff member recommended that for future phases or similar initiatives, increasing the awarded grant amounts by reducing the number of sub-grantees would likely produce better results for sub-grantees and target communities. Doing so would allow the sub-grantees to have more comprehensive project designs and would better equip them to address key community priorities and needs.

In addition, CESR’s application of the OPERA framework and associated trainings, such as the learning labs that focused on the Decoding Injustice methodology, was described as a relevant component of the programme (in consideration of the programme’s focus on research and relevant capacity building). Interviewed CSO representatives noted:

“The OPERA framework was adaptable. The framework can be used to meet local needs. It’s a simple framework that equips researchers and activists to determine if decision makers are meeting relevant social and economic requirements, like access to clean and safe drinking water, health care, and roads. We were able to zoom in on the social issues that were relevant for our communities. The OPERA framework allowed the community members to see how these issues relate to their day to day lives.” – CSO Sub-grantee Representative

“The research capacity building was important to actually equip community members with knowledge of how to unpack information about their rights and identify relevant dynamics in their communities, to inform future advocacy efforts. It also focused on how to approach keeping duty-bearers accountable. It was valuable in bringing together community leaders and members to have a common understanding of how to apply the OPERA framework and leverage it.” – CSO Sub-grantee Representative

Following the Decoding Injustice SWANA workshop, the CESR team reported that participants expressed an increased awareness of how a rights-based approach to monitoring helps researchers in unpacking policies and practices that contribute to discrimination and inequality against minority and marginalised groups. **Participants found the tools particularly useful for examining issues of gender-based inequalities and patterns of geographical marginalisation.** The feedback also noted an increased understanding of best practices around collection and use of data for the aforementioned purposes.

The OPERA framework was also successfully implemented by MRG and its local partners, following a training by CESR for MRG staff. MRG staff reported, “The OPERA methodology has been used as a basis for generating collective advocacy amongst some of the world’s most marginalised and persecuted minority communities and indigenous peoples, such as the Malay in southern Thailand, Batwa in Uganda and Rwanda, Endorois in Kenya, Pamiris in Tajikistan, Roma in Ukraine and Dalits in Nepal.”

Similarly, GI-ESCR’s participatory action research (PAR) methodology was found to be a relevant component of the ReAll’s design. GI-ESCR programme staff reported that the methodology, including trainings, supported the empowerment of communities to address systemic challenges in the four implementation countries (see section 4.5 *Impact* for examples). This methodology represented a shift from GI-ESCR’s use of traditional research methods, prompted through the ReAll programme. When discussing this change in methodology, one staff member shared, “The most important part of the programme was that we were able to include the voices of affected communities.” The PAR was also proven to be highly valuable for informing advocacy activities in the countries where PAR activities were conducted (e.g., the development of the Ivory Coast advocacy plan, based on the PAR study).

Nonetheless, there were some barriers discussed by interviewees on the relevance of the OPERA framework and the PAR methodology. **The overall promotion, dissemination and use of the OPERA framework across the three consortium organizations was an identified challenge.** For example, in Tajikistan the use OPERA framework was limited. MRG staff found that it was not applicable due to the nature of activities being led in this context (i.e., research on budget earmarking for minority communities). Two MRG interviewees also noted that the training on the OPERA framework for MRG programme staff was not sufficient to translate into applicable expertise that could be independently led by MRG staff. In such cases, MRG staff adapted the OPERA framework to support local research (e.g., in Thailand the programme team created a methodology that incorporated aspects of OPERA, developed specifically for budget monitoring work with CSOs). Another MRG staff member stated that from their perspective, there was not an issue with the framework itself but rather with capacity to lead data collection, including available budget allocations to support data collection.

For the PAR methodology, considering that it was being implemented for the first time by GI-ESCR, some challenges arose. GI-ESCR staff noted that it was slightly difficult to engage with certain affected communities and activists, for example in the case of Chile. This was the result of the wide distribution of activists/human rights defenders across the country and security issues resulting from the lithium extraction policy in target communities, presenting challenges for engagement. The programme team had to adapt the PAR to be led from Santiago, which inhibited relationship-building and engagement with the target community. **Future forward, when designing PAR activities, it would enhance efficiency and relevance to identify such contextual challenges early on through consultations with on-the-ground actors like experienced human rights defenders, and plan accordingly.**

Key Finding 2: Regional and international advocacy approaches were relevant to the objective of the programme, notably because the programme team identified and utilized a variety of pertinent platforms and fora, associated with the programme’s advocacy areas.

The programme team was effective in identifying and accessing numerous key platforms and fora related to targeted advocacy areas. The advocacy activities were thoroughly planned, leveraging existing entry points and expertise across the three programme partners:

Advocacy Domain Areas	Target Examples
Fiscal reforms on approaches to domestic resource mobilization,	The Steering Committee of the Independent Commission for the Reform of International Corporate Taxation (ICRICT) is a leading platform for shaping progressive

<p>corporate taxation, wealth taxation, transparency and global tax governance.</p>	<p>tax policies, advocating for fairer global tax rules, and influencing decision-makers, including G20 and UN agencies.[]</p> <p>The CSO Financing for Development Group and the Reflection Group on the 2030 Agenda serve as key spaces for civil society actors to coordinate strategies, develop common positions on financing for development, and influence global economic policy discussions.[]</p> <p>The Global Alliance for Tax Justice's Gender and Tax Working Group provides a critical platform for ensuring that tax justice advocacy integrates a gender perspective, highlighting how current taxation structures exacerbate inequalities, particularly for women and marginalized communities.[]</p>
<p>Participation in key economic governance fora.</p>	<p>The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank set the policy direction for global financial stability, economic restructuring, and fiscal policies that impact debt sustainability and social spending. Engaging in Annual Meetings enables advocacy actors to challenge austerity-driven policies and push for rights-based economic alternatives.[]</p> <p>UN processes, including the UN High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) on Sustainable Development and the Financing for Development (FfD) Forum, allows for direct engagement with states on their economic policies and international commitments to development financing.[]</p> <p>The OECD and UN Regional Economic Commissions play a significant role in guiding economic governance at the regional level, making them key advocacy spaces for influencing tax policies, investment regulations, and economic justice measures.[]</p> <p>National parliamentary bodies are crucial advocacy spaces where legislative reforms on taxation, budget allocation, and economic governance are decided, making them essential entry points for influencing national fiscal policies.</p>
<p>Public services, human rights and accountability.</p>	<p>The World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), and the Global Symposium on Health System Research provide influential platforms for shaping global and regional standards on the right to public services.[]</p> <p>The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) ongoing process of developing a general comment on states' obligations to regulate private actors in public service provision presents a strategic advocacy avenue to influence international human rights standards, particularly regarding corporate accountability in public service delivery.[]</p> <p>The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) provides a legal and policy advocacy mechanism to challenge state policies that undermine public service access for marginalized communities in the Americas.[]</p>
<p>Climate change, SDGs and gender equality.</p>	<p>The UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC), treaty monitoring bodies, the UN General Assembly (UNGA), the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conferences of the Parties</p>

(CoP), and the HLPF are key platforms for ensuring that climate action integrates gender and human rights perspectives.[] The UNHRC and UN treaty bodies, such as the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (CESCR), provide authoritative interpretations of human rights obligations in the context of environmental justice, making them key venues for influencing normative standards on climate justice.[] The UNFCCC CoP serves as the primary space for shaping global climate policies, making it an essential advocacy entry point for promoting equitable and sustainable energy transitions.[] Additionally, engagement in the CSW and HLPF ensures that gender equality remains central to global discussions on sustainable development and climate resilience, particularly in addressing the disproportionate impact of environmental degradation on women and marginalized groups.[]

Advocacy efforts targeting the CEDAW General Recommendation on the rights of indigenous women and girls and CESCR's general comments on land rights and sustainable development ensure that human rights frameworks explicitly recognize the impacts of energy policies on indigenous communities and marginalized populations. These treaty bodies have the authority to influence states' human rights obligations and provide interpretative guidance on how economic policies, including energy governance, should align with human rights standards.[] By drawing attention to these links, advocacy efforts can shape future policy recommendations, legal interpretations, and monitoring mechanisms that hold governments and private actors accountable for rights-based sustainable development.

In accordance with these plans, some examples of implemented advocacy efforts include the following (non-exhaustive list):

- GI-ESCR co-organized two panel sessions on the right to health and consequences of commercializing health systems. The subsequent report was disseminated during annual meetings of the World Bank and IMF in 2022.
- CESR worked with partners to advocate for gender and climate justice at IMF annual meetings, hosting an event critiquing the IMF's gender mainstreaming strategy and participating at a climate strategy workshop.
- MRG supported a Roma CSO to speak at the Human Rights Council meeting in 2022, on behalf of a Roma coalition following the invasion of Ukraine.
- MRG created a platform to verify the reports of Pamiri activists for international actors and media outlets. The team also hosted closed meetings with prominent figures such as diplomats who were well positioned to act as allies, and a closed meeting with the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion and Belief.
- CESR engaged with multiple UN human rights mechanisms such as the Independent Expert on Foreign Debt, Special Rapporteur on Racism, and Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Alongside three partners, CESR then drafted a submission to the Independent Expert on rights-aligned global tax reform.

The relevance of this selection for key avenues in international and regional advocacy in the programme design is further demonstrated by the extent of uptake by these fora/platforms (see section 4.5 *Impact*).

Key Finding 3: The programme's design effectively integrates a structural analysis of exclusion, a well-defined logical framework, a multi-level stakeholder engagement strategy, an emphasis on evidence-based advocacy and a robust rights-based approach. These elements collectively enhance the potential to effectively address root causes and consequences of marginalization in a comprehensive manner.

The programme's theory of change (ToC) demonstrates several strengths, particularly in its clear articulation of the overall goal, which emphasizes addressing the root causes of exclusion faced by marginalized groups. Accordingly, by focusing on

ESC rights, it acknowledges the deep-seated nature of disparities and discrimination in access to essential services such as healthcare, education, and clean energy, as well as the broader regulatory and fiscal decisions that contribute to marginalization. This approach ensures that the programme does not merely respond to the symptoms of exclusion but actively works to dismantle the systemic factors that sustain it.

The programme's well-structured logical flow, which outlines a clear chain of expected results and underlying assumptions, making it easier to assess its impact pathways. For example, the programme identifies the specific mechanisms through which it aims to achieve change, linking research, advocacy and policy influence in a coherent framework. By integrating capacity-building for marginalized groups, knowledge-sharing among civil society actors, and engagement with accountability bodies and governments, the programme ensures that its efforts are both evidence-driven and result-oriented. This structured approach enhances the potential for measurable outcomes, as it provides clear goals to monitoring progress against.

Another notable strength of the programme is its multi-level approach, which targets key stakeholders across different sectors and governance levels. By engaging marginalized groups and the CSOs that represent them, the programme fosters grassroots advocacy and strengthens the capacity of those most affected by exclusion to articulate their rights-based demands. Concurrently, it sought to work with accountability bodies and policy influencers, ensuring that normative frameworks and regulatory mechanisms reflect these demands. Furthermore, by engaging directly with governments and other responsible actors, the programme aims to facilitate policy reforms that create an enabling environment for the fulfilment of ESC rights. This multi-stakeholder strategy is crucial for systemic change, as it ensures that advocacy efforts are not confined to civil society but are also linked to decision-making structures where concrete policy actions can be implemented.

The programme's emphasis on evidence-based advocacy is another key strength. Rather than relying solely on traditional advocacy approaches, it integrates participatory research and innovative methods to support marginalized groups in making their voices heard. This research component is particularly important in contexts where structural exclusion is often under-documented. **By generating new knowledge that highlights discriminatory ESC rights impacts, the programme equips marginalized communities and civil society actors with credible evidence that can be leveraged in advocacy efforts.** Moreover, the programme's focus on community-driven data collection ensures that the evidence produced is not only robust but also reflects the lived experiences of affected communities. This subsequently substantiates advocacy efforts by making them more compelling for policymakers, accountable institutions and international human rights bodies.

Finally, the programme is firmly anchored in a rights-based framework, ensuring alignment with relevant international human rights standards and principles. By framing exclusion and economic disparities as human rights violations rather than mere development challenges, the programme strengthens the normative basis for advocacy and accountability. This approach aligns with key international instruments, such as ICESCR, and reinforces the obligations of states to uphold ESC rights. Additionally, the rights-based approach helps to emphasize the legal and moral responsibility of governments and corporations to respect, protect, and fulfil human rights. This framing is particularly important in advocacy efforts, as it shifts the discourse from needs-based development to one rooted in justice, accountability, and legal obligations.

Demonstrated adaptability to changing circumstances and priorities of key stakeholders

Key Finding 4: The design of ReAll was highly adaptable to address context-based priorities and emerging circumstances within each country context. The programme team worked alongside organizational beneficiaries to ensure that the programme's implementation and results remained relevant to their needs. However, there were challenges with the implementation of PAR, which the team adapted to. Programme staff also faced challenges in applying the programme's progressive model, beginning with training and research among local communities and leading to international advocacy. This was due to the need to first determine relevant progress to-date in communities, and what order of activities would be most beneficial.

As previously noted, the OPERA methodology (and learning labs) and the PAR were adapted to needs identified at the national and local levels. Work pursued through the grant model was also highly specific to each local/national context. The GI-ESCR team noted that implementing a new research methodology when coupled with the need to build relationships with communities and new partners (i.e., in Zimbabwe, Chile) presented some unexpected challenges. **More specifically, building relationships and partnerships proved to be a time-consuming process because the team wanted to ensure that they were connecting with individuals and groups that had inroads with target communities.**

The process of implementing the PAR, required that the GI-ESCR team worked with partnering organizations to design research, then lead consultations and methodology workshops with the community to further inform the research design. These steps were more time consuming than anticipated. **A key lesson learned from the implementation of the PAR was that with more time, the team believed they could lead a more thorough process for community participation, identifying community leaders and establishing relationships.** The design phase of research in context should factor in these processes and should be longer to support these processes. Doing so would also avoid the loss of time meant to be allocated toward research implementation.

Furthermore, MRG staff (n=3) stated that the original idea for the programme's progressive model (i.e. beginning with training and research that would then ultimately support international advocacy), was not always applicable. **There were multiple factors that staff needed to consider such as the stages of progress in context for particular issues, the capacities of partnering organizations, identifying key actors/organizations at the local and/or national level, accommodating political sensitives and/or security risks, among others.** Based on the results of these deliberations, the team adapted by changing the thematic focus of the work in context, or adapted the application of the programme's progressive model regarding its order and inclusion of stages.

For example, MRG staff planned on having an intersectional thematic focus on peacebuilding and conflict resolution in Thailand. However, this proved challenging because at the time there were no active peacebuilding processes in place (this was expected by programme staff). The team adjusted advocacy activities accordingly. In one case, a Thai sub-grantee organization was not well positioned to focus on peacebuilding due to lack of experience and expertise in this area, even with training offered under the programme. To pivot, the programme team opted to work alongside the organization on a project pertaining to youth engagement and disability rights, which was more closely aligned to the organization's mandate.

The MRG team adjusted the implementation of the programme model (i.e., progressing from training/research to national dialogue/advocacy, and finally international advocacy), where needed. In Thailand, the model could be better adhered to because the partnering local organizations were expanding into new areas of work like research, national dialogue and advocacy under ReAll. Alternatively, in Nepal the team needed to adjust because a partnering organization already had research experience (they had previously developed reports), while the Dalit community had already been proactive in national dialogue and advocacy with the Government regarding their ESC rights, prior to ReAll.

The process to inform programme adjustments did require a relatively longer duration of time for staff in the first year of the programme. Similar to the learnings of GI-ESCR, **it would be helpful to accommodate for these contextual design processes as part of the programme's outlined activities by ensuring that there is sufficient time and consideration for their implementation** (see Efficiency Section for more detail). This is especially applicable when considering that MRG was branching into new areas of work under ReAll, regarding the programme's focus on ESC rights and the use of the OPERA framework.

Examples of ways equity, gender pluralism and human rights-related principles were considered and incorporated into the design of the programme and adhered to throughout implementation

Key Finding 5: There was extensive consideration for human rights, humanitarianism and equity-related principles in the planning and implementation of the programme, by virtue of the programme's scope. The

programme team effectively ensured alignment with key guidelines and promoted these considerations during trainings for local partners. Nonetheless, there were a small set of unexpected challenges that arose related to data disaggregation practices, accessibility for persons with disabilities and cultural sensitivity.

The programme's focus was predominately on addressing gaps in ESC rights and demanding accountability from duty-bearers, thereby inherently promoting considerations around equity, human rights and humanitarianism. The programme outline clearly states the methods to realise outcomes in accordance with this objective:

- *Among the marginalized groups and the civil society organizations representing and supporting them, partners and beneficiaries of the project:*
 - Strengthen capacity to use participatory approaches and cutting-edge methods for innovative research and creative advocacy;
 - Develop a shared body of knowledge, analytical skills, and tactical repertoire among a broader community of allies working with marginalized groups;
 - Increase cross-sector collaboration that amplifies the voices of marginalized groups in regional and international advocacy spaces.

- *Among accountability bodies and other targeted policy influencers:*
 - Contribute to clearer normative standards and specific policy recommendations, articulated to address structural factors underlying ESC rights disparities, and action plans for governments and other responsible actors.
 - Support more effective monitoring and enforcement of standards, amplifying accountability demands to governments and other actors.

- *Among governments and other targeted responsible actors:*
 - Facilitate greater responsiveness to and capacity to act on ESC rights claims from marginalized groups, taking steps to design and implement rights-based economic and environmental policies.
 - Support the development and use of stronger regulatory frameworks to ensure that private actors do not impede or violate the ESC rights of marginalised groups.

The programme teams followed this outline in the implementation of activities. The evaluators identified several examples of how the team approached this work. Beyond the PAR and OPERA framework, the programme teams led trainings that promoted human rights considerations, such as through the Decoding Injustice learning labs and foundational trainings on how to ensure that research considers the needs of minority and indigenous communities as well as persons with disabilities. Furthermore, MRG incorporated the Washington Group Question Sets, pertaining to disability research, into its content for initiatives related to persons with disabilities.¹¹ The programme team also had specific outputs connected to movement and network building to amplify the voices of affected communities, such as supporting their attendance at key international fora and provided advocacy training to support CSOs and members of affected communities in their advocacy work (e.g., MRG training for CSOs on presenting at human rights fora).

To support enhanced normative standards and policy, and their monitoring and enforcement, the programme team completed a variety of activities alongside key partners and coalitions. Some examples of this include:

- the published [Guiding Principles on Gender Equality and Human Rights in the Energy Transition](#);
- CESR's contribution to submissions that advocated for human rights, gender and climate justice to be considered as core components of UN Tax Convention;
- and GI-ESCR's written statement to support the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education's report "Securing the right to education: advances and critical challenges";

¹¹ [Washington Group Questions](#)

- the CESR and MRG joint submission on the OECD Tax Agreement, made to several UN special procedures including the Independent Expert on debt and human rights, the Special Rapporteur on the right to health, the Special Rapporteur violence against women and the Special Rapporteur on Racism.¹²

Similarly, the MRG's promotion of *Budget Forums* served as a strong example in which government actors and marginalized communities are taking concrete steps towards addressing ESC rights. These Forums promoted improved processes to ensure the inclusion of marginalized and minority communities in regulatory procedures.

Support toward research and advocacy against the commercialization of essential services, such as healthcare, was also completed to prevent the erosion of ESC rights. For example, GI-ESCR's submission to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights 'Call for Contributions: Example of a Human Rights-Based Approach to Universal Health Coverage', focused on the centrality of public healthcare services for the realisation of Universal Health Coverage. The submission highlighted the human rights risks of shifting healthcare financing, provision, and governance to the private sphere.

Regarding partnership and implementation models, the programme team also confirmed that internal policies and processes (e.g., training for implementing partners, security checks, regular check-ins with local partners to address any related concerns) adhered to the "*do no harm*" principle (n=7). This principle was also built into outputs like the Feminist Energy Transition Plan, which advocates for limiting energy use that is causing widespread harm for populations.□

In terms of more specific measures taken, there were efforts to ensure that there would be balanced gender representation at workshops, where possible. The teams also sought to have thorough data disaggregation practices to ensure that target populations were included as applicable. For example, GI-ESCR staff (n=3) noted during interviews that they noticed the number of women involved in PAR activities was quite low. To address this, they worked with the assigned community liaison to identify barriers for women's participation and were able to address some of these barriers by selecting more convenient times and allowing children to attend.

Though programme staff did share that there were challenges with data disaggregation to fulfil relevant targets. This was associated with targets pertaining to women decision makers and data on ethnicity, which can be a sensitive topic in certain contexts (see section 4.3 Efficiency). Future forward, M&E processes and tools should be standardized during programme planning stages across implementing partners. Co-designing these plans could reduce the risk of unachievable targets or the inclusion of targets where data collection would be insensitive.

A CESR staff members stated:

"We have internal strategies that help guide our work in alignment with equity principles, gender mainstreaming expectations, and rights-based approaches. For example, we try to co-create understandings of what is meant by equity and justice in collaboration with partners, and we check in with them throughout implementation to ensure that we are holding ourselves accountable. We also consider factors like race, patriarchy, and costs for partners, as part of how we lead Decoding Injustice work in each context so that we can effectively account for the lived realities they are experiencing. For example, in Zambia and Ghana we worked on decoding climate injustice looking at the disproportionate impact on women."

Another good model identified by the evaluators was that MRG staff shared that they specifically sought to work with local organizations that are minority-led, led by persons with disabilities, and/or organizations that "*needed support getting*

¹² The submission critiques the OECD's Two Pillar Solution, stating that it would have racially discriminatory impacts by widening the inequalities between countries, specifically between former colonial powers in the Global North and their former colonies in the Global South.

on their feet, to help develop their capacities to lead efforts pertaining to ESC rights. This approach constituted effective actions taken to promote the inclusion of marginalized/minority voices

In addition, there were examples where the programme team adapted in response to security challenges. GI-ESCR reported that there were security challenges in Zimbabwe, hindering the publication of social media posts and video content during on-the-ground activities related to the PAR. GI-ESCR staff adopted specific safety measures to ensure the team's security while conducting the work, and adopted a Travel Security Standards policy and being integrated into the staff handbook. Additionally, GI-ESCR took steps to safeguard human rights defenders as well, completing an assessment of their risks and maintaining ongoing communication with the communities and national organizations. This allowed the team to respond and provide support in the event of any emerging security issues.

Finally, there were two suggestions provided by partnering CSOs on areas for improvement in future initiatives:

- A CSO representative expressed, "We are at the bottom of a pyramid and the donor is at the top. It is important to bridge these gaps to ensure that needs are met in a sustainable manner. We have never been asked what can be done in this regard. It's important for stakeholders across the pyramid to come together and plan resources and time accordingly." To address this challenge, the programme team may wish to consider taking steps to develop connections between the donor agency and local organizations, such as hosting knowledge exchange events or hosting bi-annual progress update meetings, attended by local organizations and the donor agency. Such efforts could improve accountability to local organizations and the communities they represent and better support their organizational efforts over time.
- A CSO representative noted that there was an issue in which a data collection tool designed for research in community was not culturally sensitive and suggested that if there is a lack of cultural awareness/familiarity among the programme team applicable to a specific context, oversight responsibility should be led by an alternative team with this knowledge. This would mitigate the risk of culturally insensitive approaches. In addition, the informant noted that there were challenges with transportation accessibility for persons with disabilities, causing them to be late. They stated that this was not the fault of the programme team, but rather public transport capacities. They suggested that in consideration of this risk it would be beneficial for private transport to be arranged for participation at important events, if possible.

Overall, the evaluators found that the programme team systematically incorporated human rights, humanitarianism and equity-related principles. Further discussion on alignment with relevant rights-based conventions and guidelines is captured in the following section on coherence (under the "Demonstrated alignment to applicable international and regional frameworks, guidelines, norms and standards" section).

4.2 COHERENCE

Coherence, as outlined by the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria standards, refers to the fit of an intervention to its applied context, in consideration of other relevant interventions. Generally, interventions should not be duplicative and should capitalize on opportunities for coordination, collaboration and complementarity by design.

Coherence includes both internal and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution (in this case, assessing the programmatic areas of both the consortium and beneficiary implementing actors). External coherence assesses the degree to which there is complementarity and coordination with interventions led by other institutions in the same context, including to avoid duplication. Moreover, the evaluators also examined the degree to which the intervention articulated and promoted its alignment with any relevant international and regional frameworks, guidelines, norms and standards.

COHERENCE EVALUATION INDICATORS

Quality of scoping review in planning stages and quality of needs assessment (including both internal coherence and external coherence)

Demonstrated successes in supporting collaboration and cooperation amongst actors

Demonstrated alignment to applicable international and regional frameworks, guidelines, norms and standards

Quality of scoping review in planning stages and quality of needs assessment (including both internal coherence and external coherence)

Synergies

To determine the extent to which ReAll successfully built synergies with similar initiatives at the national, regional and international levels, the evaluators conducted an in-depth analysis of programme activities and consulted key stakeholders. **The findings indicate that the vast majority of informants (26 out of 27, or 96 per cent) confirmed that strong linkages were established. Only one informant expressed uncertainty regarding the positive or negative extent of these synergies.**

These connections were evident across multiple dimensions of ReAll's implementation, reinforcing alignment with complementary initiatives, leveraging existing networks and fostering coordinated advocacy efforts. The integration of programme activities into regional and international policy dialogues, cross-sectoral partnerships and grassroots coalitions further strengthened its coherence, ensuring that interventions did not operate in isolation but rather contributed meaningfully to ongoing national and global advocacy efforts.

International and Regional Synergies

Key Finding 6: The ReAll programme demonstrated strong coherence at the international and regional levels by strategically aligning with institutional networks, global advocacy initiatives and long-term policy dialogues. For example, ReAll's integration into high-level policy discussions and across multilateral platforms further strengthened its influence, with consortium partners ensuring that research findings and grassroots perspectives informed major global governance debates.

Firstly, the evaluation found that the ReAll programme demonstrated strong coherence by effectively leveraging existing institutional networks and ongoing initiatives to reinforce the work of its beneficiary organizations. The programme's strategic alignment with its implementing actors' broader mandates ensured that interventions were not standalone efforts but rather integrated into long-term advocacy strategies, research frameworks and global policy dialogues.

A prime example of this alignment and strategic reinforcement was CESR's Decoding Injustice Learning Labs, which served as a critical platform for equipping activists with research tools to analyse systemic injustice in the Global South. **The Labs were designed to complement and strengthen standard approaches (i.e., Interrogate, Illuminate and Inspire) by providing activists with practical tools and methodologies for identifying rights violations and advocating for policy reforms.**¹³ Through ReAll, CESR convened a second cohort of the Decoding Injustice Learning Lab, engaging activists collaboratively from Asia, Africa and Latin America around key human rights issues, including climate justice, economic justice, the right to health, disability rights and gender justice.

¹³ CESR. Decoding Injustice: Using data to right the wrongs of systemic oppression. Available [here](#).

Another critical coherence mechanism was CESR's OPERA framework, which integrates widely recognized human rights benchmarks from OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF and WHO – and is promoted across initiatives, including the **Decoding Injustice Learning Labs**.¹⁴ This framework provided a structured and evidence-based approach to monitoring ESC rights (incl. through the simplified four step model). By embedding the OPERA methodology within ReAll's implementation, CESR (as well as MRG) ensured that beneficiary partners were aided through a tried and tested approach to ESC data gathering.

CESR also promoted the research work of their partners through their international network. For example, CESR supported the dissemination of findings from research findings of IBON International who used the Decoding Injustice approach to identify the actualized impacts of IMF loans on smallholder farmers and peasant communities in the country (e.g., assessing the outcomes of the World Bank project: *Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling*), **bringing this grassroots-led research into broader global dialogue**.¹⁵ CESR and IBON amplified these findings through targeted advocacy efforts at the IMF spring and annual meetings, ensuring that ReAll's research directly influenced high-level economic governance debates.

Similarly to CESR, GI-ESCR played a pivotal role in fostering cross-regional collaboration and ensuring that ReAll's interventions were strategically embedded within existing advocacy networks. **A key example of this was GI-ESCR's facilitation of expert meetings between the ACHPR and IACHR, aimed at strengthening regional legal interpretations of social rights protections.** This effort contributed directly to the adoption of General Comment 7 in October 2022¹⁶, which stands as the most comprehensive legal interpretation of state obligations regarding the provision of essential social services. **GI-ESCR's involvement in this process ensured that civil society perspectives were meaningfully incorporated, demonstrating how ReAll's work reinforced long-term advocacy efforts at the regional level.** To further support this effort, in 2023 GI-ESCR organised an expert meeting on human rights approaches to sustainable social services, bringing together key experts of more than 17 nationalities.¹⁷

Beyond legal dialogue and advocacy, GI-ESCR deepened its role in transnational collaboration through its engagement with the Privatisation in Education and Human Rights Consortium (PEHRC) Network, a coalition of 180 CSOs across 105 organizations. As a founding and highly active member, GI-ESCR contributed to multiple working groups under ReAll, particularly those focused on public-private partnerships and economic justice advocacy.¹⁸ **Informants (n=4) to the evaluation emphasized that PEHRC's members routinely utilize locally collected research and data from ReAll's partners, leading to more informed discussions and strategic planning among network members.**

Similarly, GI-ESCR collaborated with the Climate Finance Group of Latin America and the Caribbean (GFLAC) to launch the Latin American and Caribbean Network for Sustainable Financial Systems (REDFis) in 2024.¹⁹ **While GFLAC led the administrative establishment of the network, GI-ESCR played a key role in shaping its thematic focus, ensuring that human rights and distributive justice were central to the goals of the initiative.**

GI-ESCR also strengthened fiscal justice advocacy through its engagement in the Fiscal Platform for Latin America and the Caribbean (PTLAC). A notable milestone was the engagement of both partners, and dozens of other civil society actors,

¹⁴ CESR. The OPERA Framework Assessing compliance with the obligation to fulfill economic, social and cultural rights. Available [here](#).

¹⁵ CESR. Decoding the WBG's SPLIT Project in the Philippines: Resisting Agrarian Injustice. Available [here](#).

¹⁶ ACHPR. General Comment 7. Available [here](#).

¹⁷ GI-ESCR. GI-ESCR gathered experts to mainstream in their agendas tax justice and public services. Available [here](#).

¹⁸ GI-ESCR. 2025. Key Insights from the PEHRC Webinar Public-Private-Partnerships in Education: Rationales, Realities and Regulation. Available [here](#).

¹⁹ GI-ESCR. Launch of a New Network of CSOs aiming at promoting Climate Financing. Available [here](#).

at the 2024 G20 Ministerial Declaration on International Tax Cooperation in Rio de Janeiro, where recommendations on progressive taxation were incorporated into the final statement.²⁰

MRG's contributions to similar ways of leveraging its networks was evident, particularly through its cross-cutting institutional portfolio on disability rights. Given its extensive global network and expertise in advocating for marginalized communities, MRG leveraged core institutional funding dedicated to this portfolio to co-finance select ReAll activities, ensuring that beneficiaries supporting disability-related programming at the case country levels had direct opportunities to participate in international forums (e.g., Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).

As mentioned in the Relevance Section, MRG also more broadly prioritized opportunities for indigenous and minority communities to participate in regional forums, such as through MRG's OSCE region portfolio efforts. This included supporting the representation of local actors and their work at the regional Civic Solidarity Platform, the OSCE Parallel Civil Society Conference and through engagement with both the High Commissioner on National Minorities and Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.²¹

Additionally, MRG's strategic engagement with the African Union at the outset of the project contributed to an agreement that further reinforced ReAll's promotion of an expanded focus on minority rights in Africa. This engagement also led to a visit by an ACHPR Commissioner to Uganda, a rare but important monitoring visit that provided firsthand exposure to issues affecting marginalized communities in the country.

Indeed, the evaluators note that the participation of the consortium partners across various international frameworks and forums, was a major added value for beneficiary informants.²² For example, informants (n=5) who were supported by MRG shared that they were made aware of the various possible forums and organizations that promote similar areas of work as them, but at the global level.

National-Level Synergies

Key Finding 7: The ReAll programme strengthened national-level coherence by integrating international human rights frameworks into localized advocacy efforts, ensuring that research and policy recommendations remained relevant, actionable and participatory. Moreover, by strategically leveraging pre-existing national networks and coalitions, the programme enhanced its reach.

In addition to demonstrating strong coherence at the international and regional levels, the ReAll programme also exhibited significant coherence at the national level within each case country context. Informants and vetted documentation indicate that the programme effectively built synergies with existing national initiatives, bridged international guidelines within local advocacy and leveraged pre-existing networks to enhance the programme's overall national-level results. *The evaluators provide a variety of these examples below.*

²⁰ GI-ESCR. G20 Social Summit Rio de Janeiro Takeaways. Available [here](#).

²¹ OSCE. 2024. Civil society's role in strengthening resilience highlighted at OSCE Civil Society Conference. Available [here](#).

²² For example, MRG holds consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council and observer status with the ACHPR, the Conferences of the Parties of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

Firstly, a central aspect of ReAll's national coherence was its ability to connect international human rights frameworks with localized advocacy efforts, ensuring that research and policy recommendations were practical, relevant and informed by participatory research.

In Nepal, CESR's collaboration with the National Indigenous Women Forum and the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development evolved into a comprehensive research initiative: the Women's Human Rights Impact Assessment.²³ This tool was designed to empower grassroots feminist activists to document and analyse the impacts of privatized development projects—such as the Sunkoshi Hydropower Dam—on women's rights. The research process was community-driven and participatory, ensuring that affected populations were not only subjects of research but also active contributors in shaping the methodology and the resulting advocacy strategies. **The pilot gathering in May 2024, which brought together 24 grassroots activists, indigenous women, NGO/CSO advocates and international human rights experts, further reinforced ReAll's role in facilitating research-driven policy influence at both national and international levels.**

Similarly, GI-ESCR demonstrated strong coherence in Kenya, ensuring that interventions were embedded within national advocacy structures and pre-existing coalitions. The organization's PAR component was a new and innovative methodology in the Kenyan context, particularly within Mathare Sub-County (Nairobi), where communities were already actively advocating for the right to education in informal settlements.²⁴ **Rather than operating independently, GI-ESCR strategically integrated its activities with the Regional Education Learning Initiative (RELI), particularly its Equity and Inclusion Thematic Group, ensuring that ReAll's interventions reinforced ongoing education-related reform efforts.**²⁵ Furthermore, this partnership was also supported by the International Commission of Jurists (Kenya) and the East African Centre for Human Rights, whom both have experience working in the informal settlement field.²⁶ The collaboration between all partners has led to support for integrating research recommendations into national education policies, with ongoing discussions around the establishment of a new school through Kenya's national education system. Additionally, ReAll's research is expected to directly inform Kenya's upcoming UN CESCR review, underscoring the programme's role in shaping national human rights reporting and accountability mechanisms.²⁷

In Ivory Coast, GI-ESCR's research on healthcare privatization and commercialization was conducted in collaboration with Mouvement Ivoirien des Droits Humains (MIDH), aligning with national public health advocacy and previous donor-funded initiatives.²⁸ The research strengthened existing health policy dialogues, ensuring that civil society organizations had evidence-based advocacy tools to demand stronger public oversight over private healthcare providers.

MRG's efforts to support coherence at the national level were also widespread, this was particularly evident in Kenya and Uganda, where local networks and government partnerships reinforced existing efforts. In Kenya, MRG worked closely with the Armshield International Peace Champions, a beneficiary organization with strong ties to county-level administrations and relevant government agencies such as those that deal with public participation, civic education and budgetary planning. In Uganda, MRG's collaboration with Equal Opportunities Commission Uganda, a government institution under the Ministry of Gender Labour & Social Development, helped amplify the voices of marginalized communities within national decision-making spaces.²⁹ **A significant success of this partnership was the advocacy efforts that brought the concerns of the Maragoli community to the Ugandan Parliament and the National Planning Authority,**

²³ NIWF. 2024. Indigenous Majhi Women Resisting Construction of Sunkoshi Hydropower Dam. Available [here](#) & Issues Facing Indigenous Women Migrant Workers from Nepal. Available [here](#).

²⁴ GI-ESCR. Report Launch on Calling on the State of Kenya to Build More Public Schools. Available [here](#).

²⁵ RELI. Thematic Groups. Available [here](#).

²⁶ ICJ. 2023. Kenya: ICJ, EACHRights and GI-ESCR discuss with community leaders strategies to enhance access to education in the Mathare informal settlement. Available [here](#).

²⁷ GI-ESCR. Strengthening Public Services: Submissions to CESCR for Kenya's 6th Review. Available [here](#).

²⁸ GI-ESCR. MIDH and GI-ESCR present reports on the right to health and access to healthcare services in Ivory Coast. Available [here](#).

²⁹ MRG. Equal Opportunities Commission. Available [here](#).

where policymakers were encouraged to integrate minority representation into national data collection efforts and policy frameworks.

Beyond individual country engagements, ReAll's work in Uganda and Rwanda complemented the MRG Irish Aid-funded IA3 project, which operated across DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda.³⁰ While IA3 focused on strengthening advocacy capacities of marginalized groups, ReAll played a critical role in enhancing data collection and capacity-building efforts, ensuring that CSOs/NGOs and government stakeholders had the necessary tools to promote inclusion through evidence-based policymaking. In Rwanda, this synergy facilitated collaboration between 19 NGOs/CSOs and government officials, strengthening national dialogues on minority rights and inclusive policy development.

In Ukraine, ReAll's contribution to national coherence was reinforced through MRG's partnership with the Ukrainian Society of the Deaf, which ensured that programme activities directly contributed to expanding national legal frameworks on disability inclusion. The organization advocated for policy reforms that explicitly recognized the rights and needs of the deaf community alongside protections due to the ongoing invasion of Ukraine, ensuring that disability rights were incorporated into national development plans and legal protections. Additionally, MRG built upon its previous partnership with the Roma Women Fund Chiricli under the EU-funded project: *Partnership for All* by introducing a disability justice component, aligning Roma advocacy with broader intersectional inclusion efforts.³¹ This strengthened the Strategy for Promoting the Realization of the Rights and Opportunities of Persons belonging to the Roma National Minority, ensuring that ethnic minority rights and disability inclusion were addressed within the same policy framework.

In Thailand, ReAll's coherence was demonstrated through its complementarity with two EU-funded initiatives on peacebuilding and disability inclusion: i) *Inclusive Peacebuilding in Thailand's Southern Border Province* ii) *Movement on Disability Equality in Thailand's Southern Border Provinces*. One of the most tangible sustainability outcomes was the ability of a ReAll beneficiary organization to secure a larger grant, which included disability as a focus area, built around the learnings from the ReAll programme. Furthermore, a particularly innovative aspect of ReAll's national coherence in Thailand was the public budget monitoring training, which brought together minority rights organizations and national authorities to strengthen fiscal transparency and inclusive budgeting practices. The training was delivered directly by government representatives, allowing civil society actors to gain firsthand insights into national budget planning processes while also educating government officials on the importance of incorporating minority voices into fiscal decision-making. This two-way learning mechanism exemplified a best practice for fostering institutional coherence between civil society and government actors.

Risk of Duplication

Key Finding 8: The ReAll programme was deliberately structured to minimize duplication, with the vast majority of informants confirming that its interventions were distinct from other initiatives. This was achieved through a comprehensive mapping exercise during programme development, which assessed overlaps with other global and regional projects, particularly those funded by the Government of Finland and EU institutions. The programme's uniqueness was also reinforced by the specialized expertise of consortium partners, who filled gaps in policy advocacy, grassroots capacity-building, and thematic areas such as fiscal justice, minority rights and social protection.

Alongside evaluating the synergies built through ReAll, the assessment also examined whether programme activities overlapped with, or duplicated, other ongoing interventions. The findings indicate that the programme was deliberately

³⁰ MRG. Final Evaluation: Ireland Aid 3. Available [here](#).

³¹ MRG. A partnership for all: Developing strategies for socio-economic cooperation between Roma communities and local authorities in Ukraine. Available [here](#).

structured to minimize duplication, with 21 out of 22 informants (95 per cent) affirming that ReAll's interventions were distinct, while only one informant expressed uncertainty regarding the degree to which there might have been duplication.

To proactively prevent duplication, the consortium conducted a comprehensive mapping exercise during the programme's development phase. This assessment analysed whether other global or regional initiatives—particularly those funded by the Government of Finland, other EU Member States or EU bodies—had overlapping scopes. Furthermore, as will be noted in the next sub-section, several key partnerships that were promoted during the ReAll programme, were first initiated under a previous MRG-CESR joint project: *From Disparity to Dignity*.

Furthermore, one of the most defining factors ensuring ReAll's distinction according to informants (n=6), was the specialized expertise of the consortium organizations, particularly in their ability to support grassroots and emerging organizations in ways that larger IOs/INGOs often cannot. These informants expressed that MRG, GI-ESCR and CESR each played a unique role, filling gaps in policy advocacy, grassroots capacity-building and thematic specialization in fiscal justice, minority rights and social protection advocacy:

MRG's role within the consortium demonstrated how minority-led advocacy could be effectively integrated within broader international development strategies. **The organization has long championed the principle of minority-led engagement, ensuring that affected communities play a central role in advocating for their rights at national and international levels.** This approach was already well-established in MRG's broader portfolio, which meant that under ReAll, its contributions were not duplicative but rather an extension of its existing comparative advantage in minority rights advocacy.

A particularly notable example of this distinction was MRG's leadership in intersectional discrimination advocacy, which has shaped international best practices in the field. UNDP's *Minority Guide: Marginalised Minorities in Development Programming*,³² a referenced framework for ensuring the inclusion of marginalized groups in policymaking, was informed by MRG, underscoring the organization's recognized normative authority in this space. The long-standing relationships that MRG has cultivated with minority communities, particularly its 30-year engagement with the Batwa, further exemplified how the programme leveraged established trust and expertise to enhance, rather than replicate, existing work.

GI-ESCR's contributions were similarly non-duplicative, as the organization brought specialized approaches to participatory research and multilateral policy advocacy, filling critical gaps in national, regional and international economic and social rights work. Many IOs/INGOs and other development actors focus on service provision and governance reforms, but fewer have the technical capacity to challenge policies (incl. economic and tax justice, health and education) through a human rights lens. GI-ESCR's role in integrating fiscal justice advocacy within national policy dialogues and regional economic frameworks ensured that ReAll contributed a unique and necessary perspective to global economic governance debates (e.g., see alignment between the new OHCHR Vision and GI-ESCR's Strategic Plan 2021-2025)³³.

CESR, on the other hand, played a distinctive role in providing structured methodological tools for rights-based economic justice research. The organization's OPERA framework was instrumental in shaping ReAll's research-driven advocacy approach. Rather than duplicating existing research tools, OPERA was strategically applied across programme activities, ensuring alignment with international benchmarks while providing implementing actors with a standardized, rights-based approach to evaluating policy impact.³⁴

³² UNDP. 2015. *Marginalised Minorities in Development Programming*. Available [here](#).

³³ GI-ESCR. 2023. *Annual Report*. Available [here](#).

³⁴ CESR. 2020. *2020-2023 Strategy*. Available [here](#).

At the national level, informants (n=21) confirmed that programme interventions were designed to be unique, ensuring that local efforts complemented, rather than duplicated, existing initiatives. Moreover, consortium staff were in constant communication with beneficiary organizations, who were requested to provide an ongoing update on the partnerships and collaboration at the local level. Generally, **the consortium informants (n=6) noted that the beneficiary organizations operated individually, or were one of the very few organizations, working within the same thematic or geographic scope.** The evaluators further note that there was one instance whereby there was a risk of funding duplication, which was reported to the donor and later resolved (see: *Efficiency Section*).

In Thailand, informants (n=3) shared that MRG's disability rights project was the first of its kind in the southern border provinces, directly integrating global disability rights standards into local advocacy. While other organizations in the region focused supported persons with disabilities to varying degrees, they remained heavily reliant on government social services, which lacked alignment with international human rights frameworks. Similarly, in Ukraine, the Ukrainian Society of the Deaf is the only organization working specifically on deaf-related advocacy – and also has strong linkages with regional government agencies that allow it to identify institutional gaps and ensure that disability laws incorporated the needs of the deaf community.

A similar pattern emerged in Tajikistan, where MRG's research on the Pamiri community was particularly distinct, given that no other IOs/INGOs had sustained access to these communities. Informants noted that this was a major benefit of the programme, as many organizations struggle to engage with historically isolated minority groups. MRG also ran two projects simultaneously in Tajikistan—ReAll and the EU-funded *Resilience, Inclusivity, Support and Equality* (RISE) project—which were designed to be complementary. While RISE focused on advocacy and in-country human rights monitoring, ReAll strengthened local data collection mechanisms, ensuring that both initiatives reinforced one another while serving distinct purposes.³⁵

The evaluators also found that GI-ESCR's PAR components were uniquely structured to address gaps in existing research on minority populations. In Ivory Coast, GI-ESCR's collaboration with MIDH built upon prior advocacy efforts on healthcare privatization but introduced a human rights-centred framework that had not previously been used. Similarly, in Kenya, GI-ESCR's initiative to build community capacity for engaging with national and local duty-bearers was designed as a new and unique approach, addressing a significant gap in minority representation in policymaking spaces.

Moreover, GI-ESCR's work with FIMA was distinct, as this PAR focused specifically on women in mining communities, a demographic rarely included in prior studies. Informants noted that while other participatory research efforts existed, none had taken a gender-sensitive approach to mining-affected communities. The research ultimately led to the publication of a report, providing a first-of-its-kind gendered analysis of mining-related human rights concerns.³⁶

In Zambia, CESR's partner, the Women's Life Wellness Foundation (WLWF), ensured that ReAll's interventions did not duplicate existing efforts by drawing on longstanding institutional knowledge. **Their regular stakeholder mapping process kept track of actors working in gender mainstreaming and health, including civic leaders, parliamentarians, government ministries and community representatives.** This systematic engagement model helped ReAll remain complementary to national initiatives rather than overlapping with them.

Demonstrated successes in supporting collaboration and cooperation amongst actors

³⁵ MRG. Resilience, Inclusivity, Support and Equality. Available [here](#).

³⁶ GI-ESCR. Parallel Report on Chile for the CEDAW Committee on the Gender Implications of Critical Mineral Extraction. Available [here](#).

Key Finding 9: The evaluation found that while the ReAll consortium partners—MRG, GI-ESCR and CESR—maintained some degree of collaboration together (incl. The continuation of partnership between MRG and CESR from the previous “From Disparity to Dignity” project), there were missed opportunities for stronger collaboration and joint-implementation of activities. Most informants acknowledged that each organization largely worked independently, particularly at the operational level, where programme coordinators led on-the-ground implementation within their respective mandates. Concurrently, high-level staff, engaged with each other periodically, field-level coordination was limited due to competing priorities and the absence of dedicated mechanisms to facilitate more structured engagement.

Firstly, the evaluators notes that the ReAll programme built on lessons learned from a previous collaboration between MRG and CESR under the *From Disparity to Dignity* project, which ran from 2019 to March 2022 with funding from the Government of Finland. Many of the partnerships established during *From Disparity to Dignity* continued under ReAll, though case country focus shifted, with less emphasis on certain case countries, e.g., Ethiopia, Namibia and Morocco. Despite operating during the COVID-19 pandemic and associated restrictions on in-person engagement, the programme-maintained continuity in its partnerships and advocacy efforts.

At the ReAll consortium level, directors from the three organizations did meet periodically, particularly at international forums, but these engagements were not exclusive to ReAll. At the programme’s inception, directors met to discuss objectives, but there was a significant gap in the continuity of this form of engagement, with limited structured follow-ups throughout the programme’s duration. Informants (n=4) shared that over time, efforts were made to improve coordination through quarterly steering committee calls and the creation of Slack channels, though informants noted that these measures were not always sufficient to fully integrate implementation strategies across the consortium. One of the key takeaways from the programme is the need to allocate dedicated budget lines for inter-consortium collaboration, ensuring that organizations can convene and exchange insights without drawing resources away from direct programme implementation (see *Efficiency Section* for more detail).

Informants also shared that there was a missed opportunity in collaboration between MRG and CESR, despite the fact that both organizations were implementing activities in Thailand and Nepal and had co-implemented the *From Disparity to Dignity* project previously. While initial introductions were made, there was no sustained engagement amongst staff from the two partnering organizations. Informants (n=6) noted that CESR’s expertise in public budget monitoring, particularly through its OPERA methodology, could have been better integrated across MRG-led initiatives. While an MRG staff member in Africa participated in CESR training and was equipped with the methodology to use the framework, this knowledge transfer did not translate into a practical, systematic adoption of OPERA within MRG’s broader implementation. This gap was evident in Thailand, where MRG ultimately adapted OPERA to create a new budget monitoring methodology.

Indeed, future programme designs may require a more structured knowledge-sharing mechanisms between consortium partners. Informants (n=8) emphasized that joint training sessions, cross-consortium technical exchanges and collaborative reviews/promotion of advocacy products could be simple but effective measures to enhance coherence. One informant highlighted that MRG could play a stronger role in bringing consortium partners into broader EU-level engagement. Given MRG’s existing relationships with EU institutions, for example, there are opportunities to further leverage these connections for more structured advocacy engagements at the regional level. For example, MRG could facilitate joint representation at EU policy dialogues, as this could allow partners to amplify collective advocacy efforts without requiring extensive additional resources.

At the country level, there was an initial vision for cross-cutting, transnational beneficiary engagement, where participants from different country portfolios would collaborate and learn from each other’s experiences. However, this component

had to be removed due to budget constraints, significantly reducing opportunities for direct cross-country synergy-building. As discussed in the *Efficiency Section*, many of the activities that were eliminated were precisely those designed to connect beneficiaries across different national contexts, an area that informants recognized as a critical gap in the programme's implementation.

Demonstrated alignment to applicable international and regional frameworks, guidelines, norms and standards

Key Finding 10: The ReAll programme demonstrated strong alignment with international and regional human rights frameworks, reinforcing its advocacy, research and policy initiatives within globally recognized legal and policy instruments. By engaging with key treaties such as the UDHR, ICCPR, ICESCR, CEDAW, and CRC, alongside regional mechanisms like the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration, the programme effectively positioned its work within established legal commitments, enhancing its credibility and influence in policy engagement.

The evaluation confirms that the ReAll programme actively aligned with and promoted a substantial number of international and regional human rights frameworks, guidelines and standards, reinforcing its commitment to globally recognized legal and policy instruments. Through interviews with informants and a comprehensive document review, it was evident that the programme's advocacy efforts, research initiatives and policy recommendations were consistently framed within the context of established human rights obligations and development commitments.

ReAll's alignment with universal human rights treaties and sector-specific guidelines ensured that its activities were not only rooted in international law but also reinforced by regional mechanisms that provide additional legal and political accountability for marginalized communities. Among the core international frameworks that ReAll supported were:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and its companion treaties, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which together form the International Bill of Human Rights.
- The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which frame rights-based advocacy on gender equality and child protection.
- The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities, both of which directly align with ReAll's objectives in disability inclusion and minority rights advocacy.
- The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), both of which were critical in ensuring that the programme's work in marginalized communities was framed within legally binding state commitments.

Beyond these universal frameworks, ReAll was also closely aligned with regional human rights mechanisms, ensuring that its advocacy efforts were deeply contextualized within specific geopolitical and governance structures. Some of the key regional frameworks referenced included:

- The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and its Protocol on the Rights of Women in Africa (Maputo Protocol), which provided a key framework for advocacy within African Union (AU) institutions.
- The American Convention on Human Rights and its Additional Protocol on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (Protocol of San Salvador), which informed policy engagement efforts within Latin American human rights bodies.
- The ASEAN Human Rights Declaration and the ASEAN Convention Against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, both of which provided relevant policy frameworks for ReAll's engagements in Southeast Asia.

- The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Council of Europe), both of which were highly relevant in supporting ReAll's work on legal protections for minority groups in Europe.

Additionally, the programme referenced and utilized technical guidelines developed by international institutions and regional bodies, including:

- The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, which informed programme strategies on disability rights mainstreaming.
- The Tallinn, Hague, Oslo, and Lund Recommendations from the OSCE, which directly addressed issues of minority media representation, linguistic rights, and political participation, key areas of ReAll's advocacy work.
- The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was referenced in discussions on climate finance and the intersection of fiscal policy and environmental justice.

Key Finding 11: While ReAll successfully integrated international and regional frameworks into its programming, the evaluation found that beneficiary organizations would like to continue receiving guidance to internalize and apply these frameworks in practice. Many acknowledged increased awareness but lacked the technical expertise to integrate legal frameworks into policy advocacy and grant writing.

While the ReAll consortium partners actively cited and promoted these international and regional frameworks, the evaluation found that the extent to which these alignments were internalized and understood by beneficiary organizations varied significantly. Informants (n=8) expressed that while their awareness of these frameworks increased through their participation in ReAll, they still require structured support to fully integrate them into their advocacy and programming efforts.

Beneficiaries highlighted that while they recognized the value of referencing these frameworks—particularly in advocacy engagements with national authorities who have made formal commitments to them—they often struggle to articulate how their specific work aligns with these obligations. **They expressed the need for practical guidance on how to frame their initiatives within international and regional human rights frameworks, particularly when engaging in:**

- *Policy advocacy and stakeholder dialogues* – Beneficiaries noted that government officials are more likely to engage with policy recommendations that are grounded in international legal commitments but require support in framing their arguments using these frameworks.
- *Grant writing and donor engagement* – Many funding opportunities require alignment with global human rights and development standards, yet beneficiaries often lack technical expertise in demonstrating these linkages within proposals.
- *Legal empowerment and rights education initiatives* – While organizations are engaged in community-level awareness campaigns, they require structured tools and training to integrate human rights frameworks into their legal empowerment strategies.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency in the evaluation of the ReAll programme was centred on the overall approach to programme management and the ability of the consortium teams to implement activities successfully in alignment with the initial proposed schedule, budget and scope. This assessment aimed to examine how efficiently the implementing teams converted various inputs (i.e., resources such as funds, expertise, networks and other assets) into tangible results.

EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

Demonstrated successes in project management and consideration of areas for improvement

Quality and validity of M&E tools and practices

Demonstrated successes in project management and consideration of areas for improvement

Key Finding 12: ReAll programme achieved notable successes in its planning, implementation and management, with several key factors contributing to its overall efficiency. Informants consistently highlighted strong organizational capacity, adaptive communication structures, pre-existing relationships, localized research engagement, risk mitigation planning and hands-on support from consortium staff as critical components that enhanced programme delivery.

A core strength identified by informants was the high level of organization within consortium organizations. One informant noted that their consortium focal point was *“one of the most organized teams they have ever worked with”*. Another emphasized that the staff leading the grant were *“extremely organized, very good with monitoring the budget and targets in accordance with our goals.”* This structured approach to budgeting, tracking deliverables, and maintaining programmatic focus ensured that ReAll met its planned objectives effectively.

Informants (n=7) also highlighted the importance of having both formal and informal communication channels between consortium teams and implementing partners. **This flexibility in communication allowed for quick adaptations in response to challenges and changing circumstances.** The ability to pivot and respond to emerging needs (incl. brainstorming solutions and change management) helped maintain smooth implementation throughout the programme’s duration. At the same time, a good practice that was identified by beneficiary informants was the importance of **establishing clear timelines, step-by-step processes and expectations at the inception of the partnership.** This helped them planned their engagements accordingly – with staff often implementing tasks across multiple projects at once.

Another factor contributing to ReAll’s successful management was the long-standing relationships between consortium organizations and their subgrantee/beneficiary partners, where applicable. **Many local organizations had prior working experience with consortium partners, which created a strong foundation of trust.** In these cases, the previous engagement made subgrantees familiar with reporting expectations. Additionally, the consortium staff had previous experience with subgrantees leading activities independently, therefore they were able to focus efforts more directly on new partnerships. There were few exceptions in certain circumstances, as noted by GI-ESCR staff where they were applying the PAR in new contexts (e.g., Chile) and working with new partners.

A particularly strong aspect of programme management that was shared by several informants (n=6) was the support provided for **research and data collection activities among subgrantee and beneficiary organizations.** The consortium placed significant emphasis on familiarizing stakeholders with research methodologies, ensuring that local partners had the necessary technical capacity to conduct high-quality data collection and analysis. At the same time, MRG and GI-ESCR informants (n=7) noted that the research methodologies were new for their staff – themselves, requiring a level of collaborative learning and adaptation. Overall, the various teams were able to navigate the complexities of research design and methodological refinement in each country context, leading to several research products.

The attentiveness of consortium staff to the needs of beneficiaries was also highlighted several times throughout interviews with beneficiary informants (n=8). One informant described how a MRG staff member personally accompanied them to meet with national authorities. This was helpful for the subgrantee as having an external actor directly involved often was perceived as a factor that legitimized their in-country activities. However, this was also helpful for the consortium

informant, whereby they were able to witness firsthand the discrimination faced by beneficiaries, and as a result, were better equipped with guiding the subgrantee when it came to identifying project interventions/advocacy brainstorming.

Indeed, consortium staff made efforts to build personal relationships with local partners and authorities, traveling where possible to be present during key programme milestones. This in-person engagement strengthened collaboration with stakeholders and ensured that ReAll was implemented in a way that was locally relevant and responsive to shifting dynamics. **Ensuring that there is a sufficient budget for periodic monitoring/field missions is a good practice that the consortium staff may wish to plan for in future programming.** Informants also noted that **HQ/international staff were readily available to provide additional support to in-country teams, ensuring that field teams had the necessary resources and expertise when challenges arose.** However, in-country teams did note that having HQ staff participate in field missions would be helpful, where HQ staff could then also gain a better understanding of the realities of each context (incl. identifying challenges when it comes to progress reporting, data collection, procurement of services/human resources, geographic distribution of activities, etc.).

Lastly, the evaluators wish to highlight that risk planning was well considered from the beginning of the programme, with consortium teams periodically reviewing and updating their risk matrix/categorization. The programme adopted several good practices in risk mitigation, particularly in operating in politically sensitive contexts and ensuring the safety of local partners. Most importantly, the experience of consortium staff in high-risk contexts allowed them to implement strong security measures, including:

- Remaining flexible to support with emergency protection, including identity protection measures, secure communication channels and contingency plans for project and travel security for consortium personnel and for beneficiary organizations. This also includes earmarking funds for activists facing threats or harassment, covering legal support and emergency assistance when necessary.
- Activation of an international network of human rights actors and agencies in response to specific threats, with local CSOs/NGOs advising on whether activities should be relocated or temporarily suspended based on security concerns.
- Reducing direct risks to local activists by ensuring that, in some cases, advocacy efforts were led by non-local staff based in international offices (e.g., New York and London), allowing engagement without exposing local partners to retaliation.
- Use of third-party financial transaction mechanisms in cases where direct transfers posed a risk of detection by national authorities.
- Ensuring that all programme activities were framed within international human rights obligations, referencing state commitments under national constitutions and international treaties to provide legal backing for advocacy efforts.

"The ReAll staff were flexible with us but always available. We could go to [them] for support but we also had autonomy to lead implementation at the pace that made sense here." Beneficiary organization informant

Key Finding 13: While the ReAll programme demonstrated several strengths in planning, implementation and management, key challenges were identified by informants and through a detailed desk review, that affected the programme's overall effectiveness. These challenges related primarily to time constraints, budget limitations, administrative barriers, financial transparency risks and communication gaps:

- **The programme faced significant time limitations, exacerbated by delays in funding disbursement during the first year, which compressed implementation timelines and created difficulties for beneficiary organizations, particularly in activities requiring sustained engagement, such as the PAR and policy advocacy.**

- A reduction in the originally proposed budget led to a broad scaling down of activities, requiring partners to spread limited funds across all programme countries. Additionally, rigid budget allocations, the requirement to distribute funds evenly across all three years, and inflation rates impacted financial planning.
- Staff faced heavy administrative workloads, with human resourcing constraints placing pressure on consortium partners, particularly in balancing compliance and reporting requirements with direct implementation.
- Minor challenges with financial oversight, risk management and communication/visibility were noted by the evaluators, emphasizing the need for clearer and more structured partnership onboarding and guidance.

Activity Scheduling

Firstly, informants provided mixed feedback on whether the timeframe for programme activities, particularly for partnering organizations (incl. subgrantees), was adequate. The extent to which the available time was sufficient depended on the type of activity, the level of engagement with national authorities as well as the political and operational environment in each case country.

One significant challenge was the delayed start of implementation in year one (i.e., largely due to timeline for programme's funding disbursement). This created a compressed implementation period, forcing organizations to adjust timelines and condense activities into shorter timeframes. This issue was compounded by the fact that the original proposed budget was reduced and restructured, requiring a stricter allocation of spending per year. As a result, programme partners had to carefully determine when it would be best to implement activities, in order to manage funding allocations per year. This in turn created delays in dependent activities, particularly in cases where funded projects/components of the programme were intended to complement or build upon previous initiatives.

An example of this was in Kenya, where a gap between the end of one MRG project and the start of ReAll-funded activities led to a loss of momentum among partnering local NGOs. This delay in mobilization made it more difficult to re-engage stakeholders and sustain advocacy efforts, particularly where pre-existing forums had already been established.

More broadly, while feasibility may depend on funding constraints, several informants (n=8) recommended that collaborative, multi-stakeholder programmes like ReAll would benefit from a longer implementation period of at least three-five years. A longer timeframe would allow for more sustained and meaningful engagement with key stakeholders, particularly national institutions that require extended coordination across ministries and government agencies. More specifically, given the complexity of policy advocacy and institutional reform, longer project cycles would enhance the likelihood of securing tangible, long-term commitments from government actors and facilitating deeper systemic change.

Short timeframes were particularly challenging in activities related to PAR. In some cases, informants (n=3) noted that they were expected to complete PAR activities within as little as six months, which restricted the time available for consultation, trust-building and local ownership of the research processes. In Zimbabwe, for example, GI-ESCR faced challenges in establishing partnerships in new territories due to the initial need for building new connections. Given the complexity of multi-stakeholder research and advocacy, informants suggested that this form of research should ideally be implemented over a period of a year.

Moreover, advocacy efforts require extended timelines for effective dissemination and stakeholder engagement. Informants (n=4) noted that organizing high-level policy meetings with national institutions can take three months or more, making it difficult to achieve meaningful dialogue and institutional buy-in when constrained by short project cycles. One

informant shared that their subgrant funding arrived in August with activity completion deadlines by September, creating major challenges in advocacy planning and follow-up engagement.

Indeed, a common theme among informants was that research and advocacy inherently require sufficient time allocations, and that buffer time should be built into future programmes in the event of unexpected challenges. Many recommended adding three to six additional months to account for factors beyond their control, such as political instability, logistical delays, and unforeseen challenges in engagement with local stakeholders.

Budget

At completion of the project, 100% of the budget had been spent as envisaged.

As noted, a major challenge for the ReAll team was the significant budget reduction from an initially proposed €3.3 million to €2.1 million—a cut of approximately 25-30 per cent. Rather than removing countries from the programme, the consortium decided to reduce budgets across the case country portfolios, ensuring that each partner could maintain a presence in all planned locations. While this approach allowed for broad geographic coverage, it also meant that some activities had fewer resources than initially planned.

Budgeting challenges were further compounded by a requirement to allocate funds evenly across all three years. This created rigid spending allocations, making it difficult to adjust expenditures based on evolving programme needs. MRG attempted to balance this by frontloading a higher proportion of activities in the first year to provide flexibility for other partners in later years. However, this structure placed additional strain on MRG's team, as they had to manage an intensive workload in the initial phase of implementation. Importantly, the ReAll programme staff are already aware of the constraints imposed by these restrictions and are therefore requesting an advancement of funds in future programming proposals.

Additionally, the evaluators would like to highlight that inflation affected programme finances. Given that the budget was set in 2022, inflationary pressures significantly reduced the real value of planned expenditures. This required ongoing communication with local partners to manage their expectations and ensure their expenses accounted for these changes, as many subgrantee organizations expected larger financial allocations based on initial funding discussions.

Informants (n=6) also shared that it is important for the consortium organizations and the donor to have some flexibility across budget lines. For ReAll, some financial commitments were highly specific, making change management difficult. For example, the proposed budget included a budget line item for participation in a conference in Japan, but when GI-ESCR's abstract submission was rejected, the team had to negotiate with the donor to reallocate funds for participation in a different conference. Additionally, the suspension of activities in Ethiopia due to deteriorating civil society space and political instability highlighted the complexities of working in uncertain environments. Despite initial efforts to establish a focal point for regional monitoring, sustaining engagement proved unsuccessful. This led to MRG's decision to withdraw activities and reallocate resources to other regions.

While the donor ultimately accepted these adjustments, programme team members (n=2) did express that overall, they felt constricted by the initial plans for activities. **Elaborating on this same point, the informants highlighted that the proposal was developed by individuals who were no longer with the organizations.** Therefore, certain implementing teams had to interpret and adjust activities while maintaining strict adherence to reporting requirements in accordance with initial plans.

Another significant challenge that was shared by informants (n=6) was the lack of funding generally available for operational costs. While the programme provided funding for specific activities, it did not cover essential organizational costs for beneficiary subgrantees, such as staff salaries/wages and office expenses. This meant that grassroots partners were often operating with significant constraints, many of whom relied on volunteers to execute sub-grant project activities. Informants emphasized that, if possible, future programming should include more flexible funding mechanisms, allowing beneficiary organizations to allocate funds based on their operational needs.

Human resourcing in general could be re-considered in the future, for interventions of this scale. At the consortium level, the ReAll programme was able to maintain overhead expenses under 10 per cent, and salaries remained under the expected 40 per cent of the budget. **However, given the heavy administrative workload, this structure placed pressure on staff, particularly those working across multiple projects simultaneously.** MRG, for example, had individuals assigned to the ReAll programme who were not directly or exclusively managed by the programme lead, creating additional internal coordination inefficiencies. These challenges have already noted by the consortium staff – and will be adjusted in future proposal planning.

In addition to this, informants (n=4) envisaged the need for dedicated programme coordinator responsible for oversight across all consortium partners. Without this role, coordination responsibilities were often dispersed across multiple staff members, leading additional burden on implementing teams.

The evaluators would like to point out that a financial transparency issue surfaced near the end of the programme, relating to a subgrantee organization with potential funding duplications under by ReAll sub-grantees in other MRG-supported projects. To not, the issue of duplication was not related to ReAll activity, but affected a ReAll sub-grantee who had duplicated activities on another MRG funded project. While the issue was ultimately resolved, it underscored the importance of close monitoring and financial oversight when working with local partners. Informants noted that additional human resourcing could better ensure compliance with financial reporting standards.

Visibility

While there were no significant issues noted, some informants (n=3) did share **opportunities to better promote logo usage, and consortium and donor branding requirements.** One instance involved a local partner inadvertently using logos during a political demonstration, despite explicit agreements prohibiting programme funding from being associated with political protests. Indeed, given the large number of organizations and activities involved, maintaining uniform compliance with visibility protocols proved somewhat difficult to monitor. **Additionally, informants (n=2) emphasized the need for clearer protocols on photo usage and informed consent, ensuring that images captured during programme activities align with ethical standards and safeguard the rights of participants.** Future interventions should standardize guidance on branding and ethical media usage, incorporating pre-activity briefings and training on visibility requirements to mitigate risks and enhance compliance across all partner organizations. This should be included as part of onboarding processes for partnering organizations, and should include programme staff to better equip the programme team in managing compliance.

Quality and validity of M&E tools and practices

Key Finding 14: The ReAll programme demonstrated several good practices in M&E, particularly in qualitative data collection and structured internal review mechanisms. The use of post-activity questionnaires to assess capacity-building efforts ensured meaningful beneficiary feedback, while biannual internal reviews allowed consortium partners to track progress, budgets and logframe achievements.

One of the key strengths of ReAll's M&E approach was the commitment to collecting qualitative data from beneficiaries. **Consortium staff made deliberate efforts to ensure that capacity-building activities were systematically assessed, with post-activity questionnaires focusing on beneficiaries' experiences, whether expectations were met, identifying their learnings, and what they planned to share with their communities.** This approach ensured that monitoring processes were meaningful and directly linked to programme learning (incl. outcome-focused narrative reporting).

Another good practice was the internal review process undertaken by focal points from consortium organizations every six months. These reviews enabled partners to track progress, budget spending and logframe achievements in a structured manner. MRG also developed a tracking mechanism that consolidated results per country and region, providing an overview of programme-wide implementation applicable to components led by MRG. This was housed in a single document, which partners found particularly useful for regional progress assessments and financial planning. This was applied in the final 6 months of the project and planned as a tool for the proposed but unsuccessful application to the Finnish MFA in 2024. Additionally, dedicated project management tools, such as their Slack channel and SharePoint folder, were set up to facilitate collaboration, contributing to improved information sharing across the consortium.

Importantly, the programme also demonstrated a high degree of sensitivity to data collection risks. Local staff and beneficiary organizations flagged early on that collecting certain demographic data—such as ethnicity disaggregation in some contexts—could pose security/protection risks. In these cases, consortium staff were adaptable and did not push for the collection of sensitive or potentially harmful data, recognizing that historical discrimination had made certain communities wary of sharing demographic information. This flexibility was noted as an important ethical approach, especially given the inflexibility of the RMF's predefined targets and reporting requirements.

Moreover, despite constraints, the consortium partners were highly committed to detailed, outcome-based reporting. Informants (n=3) noted that narrative reports were comprehensive, capturing progress toward intended result areas rather than just output-based metrics. This was seen as a strength, ensuring that programme achievements were well-documented and contextualized.

Key Finding 15: The ReAll programme faced M&E challenges related to indicator disaggregation, fragmented data collection systems, high reporting burdens on local organizations and limited dedicated MEAL resources. The absence of a unified M&E framework across consortium partners led to some challenges in standardized data collection and reporting, while disaggregating beneficiary data—particularly for women and persons with disabilities—proved difficult due to fluctuating participation and self-identification barriers. Future programmes should invest in centralized MEAL structures, streamlined reporting processes, dedicated MEAL personnel and earlier planned evaluations to enhance data quality, programme oversight and long-term impact measurement.

One of the most significant challenges related to M&E was the difficulty in disaggregating certain indicators, particularly the requirement that 50 per cent of beneficiaries are women and 10 per cent are PwDs and in other cases, 40 per cent of decision makers responding to the programme are women and 10 per cent are PwDs. Informants (n=4) found this requirement challenging to measure accurately, particularly in contexts where disability status is not always self-identified, or where participation fluctuated across activities. **Additionally, indicators for outcomes and objectives, such as changes to organizational norms/practices, were difficult to measure due to the number of them in the RMF, the various sources/means of verification that needed to be recorded and the overall programme timeframe (i.e., many implementing activities being pushed to the final year of implementation).**

Another challenge is that there was no unified M&E system across the three consortium partners. While individual organizations tracked their own results, there was no overarching structure to consolidate data/verify sources and

means of verification across all activities, leading to variance in tools/methods to collect data. Programme staff (n=3) suggested that future programmes should invest in a centralized M&E framework, defining standardized indicators and planning for systematic knowledge exchange. This could be significantly aided by having dedicated MEAL staff/consultant working across the entire programme from start-to-finish, ensuring consistency in design and application of M&E methodologies and learning processes.

Another major challenge was the heavy reporting burden placed on local organizations. Many beneficiary organizations do not have dedicated M&E staff, making the level of reporting required under ReAll significantly more difficult than what they were accustomed to. Some informants (n=4) described the reporting process as overly cumbersome, requiring substantial administrative effort that diverted time away from implementation. In future programmes, simplifying reporting templates, providing templates/examples of data collection tools and providing additional technical support for M&E could help mitigate this challenge.

Additionally, as mentioned, informants suggested that more frequent in-person monitoring could improve data quality and programme oversight. Site visits not only allow for more detailed assessments of implementation progress but also provide an opportunity for real-time problem-solving and support to local partners.

Programme Evaluation

The evaluators would like to highlight that the evaluation process itself faced several constraints, primarily due to its late initiation and minimal budget allocation. Given the scale of the programme, the geographic diversity of informants and the complexity of ReAll's implementation, the available resources were not proportionate to the effort required. As a result, the evaluation was limited in its ability to conduct a more in-depth assessment of programme's impact, particularly for marginalized groups, particularly in areas requiring cross-context comparisons and the identification of differential results among beneficiary groups.

Despite these challenges, the final evaluation process was recognized as a valuable opportunity for programme staff to reflect on lessons learned, document achievements and identify areas for future improvement. Informants (n=7) emphasized that the evaluation prompted critical introspection, enabling teams to consolidate insights and refine strategies for future programming. However, for evaluations to be more comprehensive and effective in future interventions, several key structural improvements should be made:

- ***Earlier Engagement of Evaluators for More Comprehensive Assessments.*** Ideally, evaluators should be engaged earlier in the programme timeline to allow sufficient interaction with each team, ensuring a deeper understanding of the programme and its components, leading to a more comprehensive evaluation. This would not necessarily require a change in deliverables for the evaluators' contract but rather, would only extend the timeline of the evaluation contract to start earlier and end after all activities, monitoring data collection and reporting (even report drafts) are completed.
- ***Simplifying the Results Chain and Improving Logical Frameworks.*** A recurring challenge identified by informants was that the programme's RMF was overly complex, making it difficult for teams to clearly communicate expected outcomes and contributions across different partners. Staff often struggled to articulate how specific activities aligned with broader programme objectives, leading to inconsistencies in internal reporting, data collection, and impact measurement. Future interventions should simplify the results chain, ensuring that:
 - Programme objectives and indicators are streamlined, with clear distinctions between outputs, outcomes, and impact-level changes.
 - Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, ensuring that each implementing partner understands its contribution to overall programme goals.
 - Reporting mechanisms are structured around intuitive and actionable metrics, ensuring that programme staff can efficiently track progress without excessive administrative burden.

- ***Ensuring Feasibility of Data Collection.*** The evaluation process was constrained by challenges in collecting high-quality data from affected populations, particularly in contexts where political instability, logistical constraints, or cultural sensitivities posed barriers to access. Future programmes should conduct early-stage feasibility assessments to determine what types of data can realistically be collected from different stakeholder groups; what conditions are required for the data collection to be completed; and what ethical considerations should be made when engaging vulnerable populations. Collectively, this would ensure that data collection does not place participants at risk or contribute to survey fatigue.
- ***Structuring the Final Evaluation to Coincide with Joint Learning and Reflection Processes.*** To maximize the utility of final evaluations, future initiatives should schedule evaluation data collection to coincide with programme-wide lessons learned workshops or closing forums. This would enhance the depth of qualitative insights, as evaluators would be able to facilitate focus groups and discussions during structured reflection sessions. This can also help improve participation rates, ensuring that a broad spectrum of programme stakeholders—including beneficiaries, and consortium staff—are engaged in the process.
- ***Clear Guidelines on Language and Translation Needs.*** Future calls for evaluations must include explicit note on language requirements, ensuring that evaluators are aware of which languages are needed to gather data across the different regional components of the programme that may be required for comprehensive data collection. This would evaluators to adequately budget, plan for the recruitment of translators/interpreters, and prepare for multilingual data collection efforts (e.g., multilingual surveys), ensuring that language barriers do not limit the depth of insights gathered from programme beneficiaries.
- ***Clarifying Staff Support and Stakeholder Engagement Expectations.*** Another key area for improvement is ensuring that evaluators have clear information on the level of staff support available during the evaluation process. This includes clarifying which programme staff members will be available to assist evaluators with coordination, logistics and contextual briefings (e.g., who the focal contacts are from each partnering organization). It would also be helpful to ensure that all partners understand their commitments to the evaluation process, particularly in terms of participation in interviews, workshops and data validation sessions.

4.4 EFFECTIVENESS and IMPACT

To determine the programme’s effectiveness, the evaluators considered the achievement of planned targets associated with the programme’s objective and five result areas. The assessment of the ReAll programme’s impact focuses on longer-term benefits and transformative effects resulting from the intervention. Due to the timing of the evaluation, it is too early to comprehensively assess the programme’s impact. As such, definitive conclusions regarding the programme’s overall impact are not provided in this evaluation. However, early impacts and indications of future impact based on data collected are noted below. The discussion on impact also encompasses various outcomes that have and/or are expected to have the potential to transform systems, attitudes, knowledge, and/or practices for beneficiaries.

EFFECTIVENESS and IMPACT INDICATORS
Achievement of outlined targets for planned results
Perceptions/demonstration of long-lasting results (incl. Evidence of adoption of best practices, knowledge, standards and tools promoted through programme)

Achievement of outlined targets for planned results

Key Finding 16: Overall the programme team was found to be effective in achieving planned targets across the 5 result areas (16/20 achieved) and objective level targets (3/4 targets achieved). Progress toward many of these targets far exceed original goals. The outstanding five targets were partially achieved. However, this extent of achievement did not account for targets that had disaggregated goals of 40 per cent of decision makers responding to the programme being women/50 per cent being women, and 10 per cent being PwDs (included in 5 targets).

Of the 20 result level targets and 4 objective level targets, 19/24 targets were successfully achieved by the programme team, with many targets being exceeded over the programme's implementation period. The outstanding targets were associated with the objective (1 target), and result areas 3 (1 target), 4 (2 targets) and 5 (1 target). All of these outstanding targets have been partially completed.

However, this evaluation of effectiveness did not include progress toward disaggregated targets under result areas 1, 2 and 5. This disaggregation required that 40 per cent of decision makers responding to the project are women/50 per cent are women, and 10 per cent are PwDs, applicable to 5 targets. The programme team reported that:

"It is a challenge working in contexts where public authorities are still highly patriarchal, [in which] the greater significance of action the more male representatives serve in the hierarchy of the public bodies related to taking action. Also, there is a question of ensuring that the decision maker[s] targeted [are those] most capable of influencing some of the immediate changes. This practicality of the indicator was under-estimated by partners and while we have limited influence, we still emphasize the role of women and persons with disabilities within public bodies as essential to the changes the project is seeking, and will continue to take actions to improve this result."

During evaluation interviews, programme staff also noted that the target of 10 per cent persons with disabilities represented in target samples was difficult to achieve because of the limited representation of PwDs in relevant partnering organizations, or the existence of PwD-led organizations across targeted thematic/policy areas.

Perceptions/demonstration of long-lasting results (incl. Evidence of adoption of best practices, knowledge, standards and tools promoted through programme)

To discuss the programme's impacts, the evaluators considered the primary objective of ReAll, "To strengthen the voice of marginalized groups in the design and implementation of economic and environmental policies affecting their ESC rights, including by supporting them to demand accountability when such policies do not comply with human rights standards and principles," and supporting result areas/outcomes. The discussion of impact is framed in reference to the five programme result areas that were designed to support this objective. **Overall, most evaluation interviewees (n=23/26) believe that ReAll will have a long-lasting impact, with each interviewee sharing sound rationale regarding the anticipated impacts of their respective activities and results.**

Result 1: Strengthened capacities/knowledge/expertise amongst rights holders (activists, para legal, civil society organisations, community representatives; 50% women at least 10% representing PwD) to use participatory approaches and cutting-edge research methods to inform creative and targeted advocacy for substantive equality of marginalized and discriminated against communities and for the respect of their ESC rights.

Indicators:

- b) At least 80% of organizations supported can demonstrate that the support received has positively impacted their work: Target achieved.
- b) Tools developed as part of the programme receive at least 1000 unique views annually: Target achieved.

Key Finding 17: Based on reporting by the programme team and interviews with partnering CSOs/NGOs, the evaluators found that the programme has positively impacted the work of partnering/beneficiary CSOs/NGOs, regarding their capacities to conduct participatory research and advocacy pertaining to the ESC rights of marginalized communities. This was strongly connected to the implementation of capacity building efforts, implemented as research and advocacy trainings for CSOs. Though there are challenges with determining the impact of most tools developed under the programme, the effective dissemination of these tools is believed to have supported awareness raising among target communities and actors.

The evaluators found that in respect to result 1, the programme is expected to have impact for organizations that were supported. 100 per cent of survey respondents to the CESR and GI-ESCR end-of-programme surveys to partners expressed that the *“partnership positively supported their work”* (CESR survey) or that they *“found the joint work to be positive and useful.”* Moreover, interviewed MRG partners (n=7/7) reported that the programme enhanced their organizational capacities.

In Year 2, MRG reported that all 17 of their partners stated that the support received from the programme had a positive impact on their work. Programme partners of CESR, GI-ESCR and MRG also shared the following feedback during evaluation interviews (non-exhaustive list):

“From [organization name redacted]’s side, we work a lot on energy transition and community development but we didn’t have experience at the global level with important international institutions and mechanisms. This gave a lot of strength to our work and sustainability at the national level, while also adding the element of a global perspective. Having all of these components built into one project is very essential, including having an advocacy perspective.”

“These activities have informed us on how to work with local populations. We are also more well-versed on working at regional and global levels. This has helped inform our work moving forward with local participation - including how to use community-based language alongside human rights concepts.”

“[The programme] allowed our organization to work with marginalized communities and learn how to better include marginalized groups in peacebuilding processes. This has affected our work moving forward because we want to continue working with marginalized groups to better ensure their participation.”

“The outputs of this programme have helped us identify the significant gaps still affecting the [community and country name redacted]. This research is important to various stakeholders. The results of this research will be shared with suitable government agencies. Our organization was also able to gather information across various regions of [country name redacted], allowing us to have a better understanding of the needs of our beneficiaries across the country. This is important because gaps are not just notable at the national level but also at the regional and local levels, where it is often overlooked. We were also able to identify positive practices in some local areas from local authorities taking into account the needs of [community name redacted], and make guidelines relating to their rights at these local levels. Overall, we’d like to highlight that MRG pushed our organization to collect important data, to educate advocates/representatives across [country name redacted] and to empower individuals to promote their legal rights. This

will have a broader impact when it comes to advocacy efforts on the protection of their rights. We seek to promote the findings in the national framework on barrier free rights to people with disabilities.”

The application of OPERA, the Learning Labs and the PAR were all found to be positive contributors toward supporting this impact on CSOs skill and expertise levels. In addition, the supplementary trainings offered, such as the trainings on advocacy presentations in UN Forums, M&E trainings, foundational trainings and supports on the use of intersectional frameworks and human rights were also specifically cited by CSO evaluation informants. Collectively, these capacity building efforts were found to have been factors that improved knowledge and expertise to lead research and advocacy pertaining to the ESC rights of marginalized groups.

It is difficult to directly connect tools associated with result 1 with demonstrated impacts because they are online publications or communication-based efforts, with the exemption of Decoding Injustice. Nonetheless, the engagement target was significantly exceeded and there is evidence to show widespread dissemination:

- 7 country directory chapters in MRGs [World Directory on Minorities and Indigenous Peoples](#) has been viewed 18836 times, based on year two reporting.
- GI-ESCR's arts festival was covered by a national online media outlet ([Agencia Nacional de Prensa](#)), by the National Radio Station (Radio Nacional de Colombia; average daily audience of 147,500 people in the 68 frequencies around the country), as well as in a local [radio program](#) targeting the community where the Arts Festival took place. A [video](#) on the event has 115 views to date.
- The PAR in the Ivory Coast has been covered by two online media outlets ([Ivoire24h](#) and [AIP](#)) and in 1 [radio](#) show; while the PAR video from Chile has surpassed 70,000 views and 1,200 likes.
- GI-ESCR's "Date-cuenta" campaign video received over 6,800 views.
- The Decoding Injustice Hub received 4000 views in 2022, 3,000 views in 2023 and 6,500 views in 2024.

Based on these results, these tools are expected to have contributed to higher levels of awareness in their respective subject areas, though the extent to which this has occurred cannot be determined (see *Sustainability Section*).

Result 2: Increased cross-sector collaboration amongst communities, those representing them and their allies that contribute to amplifying the voices of marginalized groups in relevant advocacy spaces.

Key Finding 18: The programme has successfully fostered cross-sector collaboration, leading to increased joint advocacy efforts and strengthened evidence bases for organizations working on ESC rights. Over 30 joint initiatives have been documented, with almost 100 per cent of surveyed partners reporting positive impacts. These efforts have contributed the goal of amplifying the voices of marginalized communities in relevant advocacy spaces, but sustaining partnerships, coalitions, and networks will be essential to facilitate ongoing advocacy efforts.

Indicators:

- d) At least 20 examples of joint work between activists for advocacy/research purposes (50% women, 10% PwDs): Target achieved, though not in accordance with disaggregation for PwDs.
- d) Joint work is evaluated as very positive/useful by at least 75% of those involved (50% women, 10% PwDs): Target achieved, though not in accordance with disaggregation for PwDs
- d) At least 80% of partners indicate the collaborative activity contributed to a strengthened evidence base in their work: Target achieved
- d) At least 5 new partnerships of actors working with different marginalized groups occur as a result of lab participation: Target achieved.

This result area has demonstrated benefits for partnering organizations involved through the extensive achievements of targets led by the programme team:

- CESR reported 30 examples of joint work for research and advocacy purposes that included the Learning Labs, learning exchanges, joint submissions, collective advocacy. 100 per cent of survey respondents (partnering organization representatives) indicating positive experiences in joint work and 100 per cent indicating that the work has strengthened their evidence base. The team also had five partnerships associated with the Learning Labs (partnerships with IBON, WLWF, ISER, ISODEC, FUDECEN).
- GI-ESCR led joint research and advocacy with the Mathare education taskforce and the community monitoring committee on access to healthcare in the Ivory Coast; collaborated with the Shine Collab to host a workshop on examining gender and human rights implications of lithium extraction and building community capacity to defend their rights in Zimbabwe; and collaborated with FIMA to produce the “Critical Minerals and Gender Equality: The Voices of the Women of Antofagasta and Atacama” PAR study in Chile. Following the Arts Festival in Bogota, 94 per cent of students expressed that they liked the event. 95 per cent of GI-ESCR’s surveyed partners stated that the joint work contributed to strengthening their evidence. Lastly, the Degrowth Conference Learning Lab led to a collaboration with the Degrowth and Research Network.
- Based on Year 2 data MRG facilitated 6 active coalitions/network actions under MRGs country programs in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Thailand, Tajikistan and Ukraine and 1 regional/international coalition for minority and indigenous PwDs . Based on an interim evaluation conducted in year 2, 100 per cent of organizations participating in the 7 coalitions indicated that the joint work was positive/useful. MRG also reported that 15 of the 17 partner organizations who have been directly supported by the end of year 2 expressed that the collaboration has strengthened their work.

These examples of collaborative efforts have demonstrated benefits for the organizational partners, who shared their positive feedback with programme teams on the fact that the collaborations were useful for them and that it has helped strengthen their evidence bases (see feedback data included in points listed above). In regard to impacts associated with the envisioned outcome for result 2, this data also serves as evidence to indicate that these collaborations have led to the amplification of marginalized voices in advocacy spaces. For example, in year 2 of the programme MRG reported that 14 of 17 (82%) organizational partners participated in relevant international fora, through the programme, documenting each instance.

Additional examples include CESR hosting a workshop linking human rights and debts in Argentina, in partnership with the Initiative on Fiscal Policy and Human Rights in the Americas. The workshop brought together actors from civil society, academia, media, social movements, and the government. In addition, CESR-led collaborations produced key submissions such as the [joint submission to UNSPs on the OECD global tax agreement](#) to UNSPs on the OECD global tax agreement and [collective statement on the World Bank Group Evolution Roadmap and the Cascade approach](#) on the World Bank Group Evolution Roadmap and the Cascade approach. CESR’s participation with partners in women’s rights, economic governance, and climate spaces, including the IMF, CSW, and COP29, also serve as demonstrations of their achievements toward increased cross-sector collaboration and amplification of marginalized voices in advocacy spaces under result 2.

GI-ESCR also organized the “*Our Future is Public*” Conference in Santiago, Chile. The event brought together 410 participants in person and 540 participants online, including activists, researchers, academics from 113 countries and representing 567 different organisations from around the world. Research and advocacy pursued with the Mathare Education Taskforce in Kenya, advanced the Taskforce’s advocacy with local authorities for public school construction. The team’s collaborative workshops with Shine Collab and FIMA empowered women human right defenders, from

Zimbabwe and Chile, respectively, to pursue their actions addressing human rights violations tied to mining activities targeting cross-sectoral actors.

These collaborations have led to results that will have longer term impacts such as inclusion of human rights in the terms of reference to the UNTC, the adoption of a [new executive instrument](#) by the Council of Ministers in Ivory Coast, ensuring stricter regulations and oversight for private healthcare centers, and commitments among regional authorities in Thailand to support research on disability rights. However, for these collaborations to have continued, longer-term impacts, established partnerships, coalitions and networks will need to be sustained (see section 4.5 *Sustainability*).

Result 3: There is a shared body of knowledge, analytical skills, and tactical repertoire available among a broader community of allies working with marginalized groups.

Indicators:

- c) A total of 29 publications (reports/briefing) covering key issues to the project have been published and disseminated widely: Target achieved.
- c) OPERA and other tools are used by at least 20 organizations from the target countries which had not used them before: Target achieved.
- c) At least 10 civil society organisations actively use the Abidjan Principles on the right to education or other innovative tools related to public services and privatisation in their activities and increase awareness and/or commitment to implementation by duty bearers: Y2 achievement was 7; GI-ESCR Y3 report stated 6

Key Finding 19: ReAll enhanced the knowledge and analytical skills as well as advocacy strategies among organizations working with marginalized groups. The programme has strengthened evidence-based approaches to ESC rights advocacy, through the implementation of OPERA, Decoding Injustice and PAR, providing partners with standardized methodologies to document rights violations more effectively. The promotion of the Abidjan Principles has gained traction among civil society actors, though further assessment is needed to measure its long-term impact. To optimize impact, ongoing research dissemination and the use of training evaluation tools will be necessary.

The programme teams were effective in achieving targets under result 3. By year 2, the programme team had collectively produced 30 publications with an additional 16 publications produced in 2024 by GI-ESCR and 2 by CESR. The publications were also widely disseminated in accordance with programme plans. For example, CESR supported continued dissemination of the joint research completed IBON International, on the impacts of IMF loans on farmers and peasants, by facilitating their attendance at IMF spring and annual meetings in 2024. In addition, CESR, along with IBON and WEDO, held an informal event on the sidelines of the CSW that provided a space for those working on women's rights issues across movements to meet each other and share space for reflection and strategizing.

As previously noted, the results of research pursued under the programme have had positive impacts, that are expected to continue in the long-term, among partnering organizations. The research activities have equipped them with better understandings of the needs and challenges of the communities they are part of/represent, and is very valuable to guide their future work and advocacy efforts (see data on strengthened evidence bases for organization's work under result 2). Overall, the evaluators found that the reports were shared through relevant channels and targeted pertinent actors. Nonetheless, two evaluation informants from partnering organizations shared that for the impacts of these reports to be fully optimized, dissemination of the research findings will need to continue (see section 4.5 *Sustainability*).

Similarly, the widespread capacity building on the use of OPERA, led by MRG and through the Decoding Injustice Learning Labs, and the PAR, has led positive impacts for partnering organizations.

As allies, and members of marginalized groups, participation in these capacity building exercises on systematic research methodologies pertaining to ESC rights has contributed to their ability to produce participatory research, which can be leveraged to inform ongoing research and advocacy. In areas where there is collaboration between these actors, having standardized approaches to research that emphasize community participation and methods to identify issues associated with ESC rights is expected to support their joint research and advocacy efforts. The uptake of these standardized methodologies across so many organizations that had not previously used them, and across contexts, is also expected to contribute to increased and enhanced evidence on ESC rights violations.

Nonetheless, for future initiatives in this area, it would be valuable to have training data collection tools, consistently used across the programme team, to evaluate knowledge/skill acquisition among training participants, and to better understanding their training needs and challenges. This would further substantiate evidence on the degree to which this capacity building is effective and impactful, and support programme revisions.

GI-ESCR completed notable actions on the promotion of the Abidjan principles. Examples include:

- GI-ESCR and PEHRC co-organized a hybrid panel discussion, “Reclaiming Public Education: The movement to defend a sustainable, just and human future for all,” as part of the 2024 conference of the Comparative International Education Society. The presentation focused on the Abidjan Principles and use of a human rights framework to regulate the private actor role in public education.
- Through the partnership with PEHRC, GI-ESCR was able to promote focus on the Abidjan Principles within PEHRC. GI-ESCR endorse project proposals by two organizations, the East African Centre for Human Rights (EACHRights) in Kenya and the International Commission of Jurists, to implement the Abidjan Principles in their work.
- In collaboration with IIEP-UNESCO, UNESCO, and the Right to Education Initiative, GI-ESCR developed a set of tools called Planning to Fulfil the Right to Education. These operational tools were designed to assist educational stakeholders in systematically assessing their planning and programming efforts to uphold the right to education, aligning closely with the principles outlined in the Abidjan Principles. The analysis aims to enlighten critical policy gaps in education, paving the way for constructive dialogues with key national stakeholders to enhance the right to education at national and local levels. Leveraging these tools, EACHRights Kenya has adapted and implemented a simplified version tailored to their local context. Through their Right to Education Justice program, EACHRights successfully trained in 2024 County Education Board members in Kajiado and Kilifi Counties on how to use these tools to plan, implement, and monitor quality education initiatives.

This work demonstrates effective promotion and uptake of the principles among partnering organizations. However, it is too early to assess any associated impacts that may result from GI-ESCRs work in this area. Doing so would also require data collection from organizations leading activities that incorporate the Abidjan principles to determine impacts in their contexts and among affected communities.

Result 4: Clearer normative standards (addressing the structural factors underlying ESC rights disparities and setting out policy recommendations for governments and other responsible actors) are produced, more effectively monitored and enforced to amplify the demand for accountability from governments and other responsible actors.

Indicators:

- f) At least 20 human rights mechanisms/fora (national, regional or international) take up programme findings and recommendations: Target achieved.
- f) At least 6 new authoritative pronouncements to demand implementation/accountability for ESC rights standards by relevant bodies (national, regional or international): Target achieved.
- f) At least 20 cases of non-compliance with ESC rights standards are documented and addressed by human rights bodies: [Y2 data; 6 cases reported by CESR; 4 cases by GI-ESCR]
- f) At least 3 oversight bodies at the national, regional or international level acknowledge the role of fiscal policies in impeding the rights of marginalized groups as a result of the project, and take positive steps to redress: Target achieved.
- f) At least 3 oversight bodies at the national, regional or international level acknowledge the links between renewable energy and gender equality of marginalized women and girls:
- f) One secretariat composed by national and international NGOs is created to work on a Feminist Plan for a Just Energy Transition at the global level: Target achieved.

Key Finding 20: ReAll has contributed to strengthening normative standards on ESC rights, with over 20 human rights mechanisms integrating programme findings/recommendations and enabling multiple authoritative pronouncements reinforcing accountability. Increased recognition of fiscal policies as barriers to rights realization has led oversight bodies to take steps toward addressing systemic inequalities. Sustained advocacy and policy monitoring will be essential to ensure these commitments lead to measurable improvements for affected communities.

Outputs under Result 4, though some targets were not fully achieved, are expected to have high levels of impact because this area of work emphasized the production, monitoring and enforcement of clearer normative standards that would support increased calls to accountability among responsible actors. The programme has made significant progress toward strengthening normative standards on ESC rights by addressing structural disparities and influencing policy recommendations.

As a result of sustained advocacy efforts, more than 20 human rights mechanisms and forums at national, regional, and international levels have integrated programme findings and recommendations, exceeding the original target. This includes notable engagements such as the joint submission by CESR and MRG on the OECD Tax Agreement, which prompted UN Special Procedures to call on the OECD to conduct a human rights impact assessment of the Two Pillar Solution to address its racially discriminatory implications. Similarly, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights cited key programme findings on the commodification of education and the Abidjan Principles, demonstrating the direct impact of advocacy on international human rights frameworks.

Furthermore, the programme has contributed to the issuance of new authoritative pronouncements demanding accountability for ESC rights, surpassing initial targets. Examples include the Independent Expert on Debt's report on global fiscal architecture, which incorporated CESR's submission advocating for fiscal policy as a tool to advance rights, and the ACHPR sub-committee's decision to recognize access to education and health as a standing agenda item, reinforcing ESC rights within the African human rights system. At least four cases of non-compliance with ESC standards have been documented and addressed by human rights bodies, including interventions before the Special Rapporteur on Racism on climate justice and the CERD Committee on vaccine equity. For instance, in Uganda's Kitowoi sub-county, programme findings informed local authorities about ESC rights violations affecting health workers from the Benet community, leading to corrective action such as the installation of hoses to improve public health conditions.

A key achievement has been securing the acknowledgment of [24 reported by Y2] on the role of fiscal policies in impeding ESC rights - well beyond the initial target. This includes engagement with the UN Zambia Country Team, which assessed how debt restructuring affects rights to food and education, and a joint press release by the IACHR and REDESCA, calling on states to address poverty and inequality through human rights-based economic and fiscal policies. Additionally, programme advocacy has contributed to at least three oversight bodies recognizing the critical intersection of renewable energy and gender equality, although further documentation is needed to fully verify progress under this indicator.

The expected impacts of the over result area include greater institutionalization of ESC rights norms within human rights mechanisms, leading to stronger enforcement of accountability measures at the national, regional, and international levels. As oversight bodies increasingly recognize the role of fiscal and economic policies in shaping rights outcomes, states and international financial institutions may face greater scrutiny in policy decisions affecting marginalized groups. The adoption of programme findings by UN bodies and treaty-monitoring mechanisms is expected to contribute to more robust normative standards, influencing future general comments, legal interpretations, and guidance for states on fiscal justice, climate justice, and ESC rights implementation.

Additionally, the integration of gender perspectives into renewable energy and economic governance frameworks could strengthen gender-responsive policy interventions, ensuring that marginalized women and girls are included in decision-making processes related to climate and economic justice. In this regard, the Feminist Plan for a Just Energy Transition, developed through multi-stakeholder engagement, is expected to serve as a long-term advocacy tool that informs national and global policies on equitable and rights-based energy transitions. Furthermore, the documentation and submission of non-compliance cases serve as valuable evidence to support policy and legal reforms, particularly in countries where ESC rights violations have been identified, prompting governments to adopt corrective measures in response to human rights monitoring processes.

Nonetheless, while these results indicate substantial progress in strengthening ESC rights enforcement, impacts for affected communities will require translating these acknowledgments and commitments into sustained policy action over time. The impacts of sustained action following the implementation of resultant policies and legislation for affected communities would then be apparent and possible to evaluate.

Result 5: Greater responsiveness, willingness and capacity to act on rights claims from marginalized groups with steps taken to design and implement economic and environmental policies that are more rights based.

Key Finding 21: The programme has made notable impacts related to increased awareness and responsiveness among duty bearers, with duty bearers across target countries demonstrating greater recognition of marginalized communities' rights through actions and policy discussions. Policymakers have also engaged in rights-based advocacy, publicly supporting ESC rights policies. Additionally, 15 well-organized networks and participating organizations are actively addressing ESC rights violations, strengthening civil society representation and advocacy efforts toward rights-based policies. Collectively, these actions are expected to support more inclusive and rights-based policy shifts.

Indicators:

- d) At least 10 relevant duty bearers or other responsible actors (40% women and 10% PwD, where possible) in each target country can be shown to be more aware of the marginalization and discrimination of certain

communities following at least 50 national advocacy campaigns: Target achieved, though not in correspondence with disaggregated targets.

- d) At least 10 policymakers (40% women and 10% PwD, where possible) introduce policy or speak publicly in favour of rights-based policies demanded by marginalized groups: Report as of Y2.
- d) At least 12 networks or rights-holders are well-organised and each respond to at least one new or ongoing major violation of ESC rights affecting marginalized groups in each of the target countries: Target achieved.
- d) At least 4 groups representing marginalised groups are active in every network, increasing the participation and influence of marginalised groups, on CSO policy discourse, leading to a more representative and inclusive approach by CSO networks nationally and internationally to combatting violations of ESCR: Target achieved.

The programme team made considerable progress toward result 5, resulting in concrete steps towards more rights-based economic and environmental policies. The programme saw the successful engagement of 28 duty bearers across target countries who have demonstrated increased awareness of marginalization and discrimination through their actions and statements (far exceeding the original target of 10). A significant milestone was achieved in Uganda, where an informal coalition of Historically Marginalized Peoples (HMPs) was established with support from MRG Africa. This coalition facilitated direct dialogue with senior representatives from the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Health, and the Cabinet Office. This led to the inclusion of issues related to health and education for marginalized communities in a subsequent government cabinet meeting at the request of the Prime Minister's Office. Similarly, in Kenya and Ivory Coast, the PAR reports mobilized 11 duty bearers in Kenya to explore public school construction solutions, while 23 duty bearers in Ivory Coast engaged with findings on healthcare access, committing to implement its recommendations. These developments indicate an increasing recognition of marginalized communities' rights by duty-bearers, and is expected to further influence policy discussions and budgetary allocations future forward.

To date, at least 8 policymakers as of Y2 have either introduced new policies or publicly advocated for rights-based approaches on ESC rights for marginalized groups. A notable example is CESR's work in Colombia, which led to a coalition of public policymakers issuing a joint statement in support of rights-based fiscal policies. Additionally, programme engagement at the 68th session of the CSW successfully mainstreamed gender-sensitive policy discussions, with active participation from policymakers from Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, ECLAC, UN Women, and the ILO. These engagements are expected to support further legislative and policy commitments, particularly in the areas of gender-sensitive economic governance, tax justice, and climate justice.

15 well-organized networks and coalitions as of Y2 (exceeding the initial target of 12) demonstrated the ability to respond to ongoing and emerging ESC rights violations. In Ivory Coast, a community-led monitoring committee was established in Gagnoa to track access to healthcare and report on human rights violations as a result of PAR research and advocacy efforts. Another key success was the support for Pamiri diaspora activists, who have been exiled due to Tajikistan's crackdown on civil society. With MRG's assistance, these activists successfully registered the Pamiri Indigenous Peoples Association (PIPA), a regional diaspora CSO, which has since acted as a watchdog for human rights violations. PIPA then played a crucial role in influencing the adoption of an Urgency Resolution by the European Parliament on the situation of independent media in Tajikistan, marking a significant step in holding the government accountable for its suppression of dissent.

The programme has also fostered greater participation of marginalized groups in policy discourse. Women's coalitions in Zimbabwe and Chile, for example, have become leading voices in opposing extractive industries, ensuring that human

rights and environmental concerns are integral to national debates on resource governance. The programme has proven effective and impactful toward strengthened civil society representation and inclusion in decision-making spaces.

In summary, the engagement of duty bearers and policymakers at national, regional, and international levels is expected to contribute to policy shifts that are more inclusive and rights-based. The programme’s efforts have already ensured that economic policy discourse at the national, regional and international levels incorporate rights-based considerations.

Continued advocacy is expected to enable tangible legislative changes that institutionalize rights-based fiscal and environmental policies. The growing influence of networks and rights-holder groups will likely strengthen collective action and accountability mechanisms, ensuring that marginalized communities have a sustained voice in policymaking and governance processes. The integration of gender-sensitive policies into economic and environmental governance frameworks is also expected to drive stronger protections for marginalized women and girls, reinforcing a feminist approach to economic justice. Moving forward, ensuring concrete policy implementation and enforcement will be critical, as advocacy efforts shift towards ensuring that commitments translate into measurable policy and legal reform.

4.6 SUSTAINABILITY

As this evaluation was conducted during final implementation phase of the ReAll programme, the ability to assess the continuation of ongoing benefits over time is limited. However, the evaluators considered perceptions on the probable extent to which the benefits of this intervention will continue; indicators that sustainability was factored into the design and execution of activities; the degree to which beneficiaries were directly integrated in decision-making aspects of sustainability planning as well as notable areas where future programming supports are needed.

SUSTAINABILITY EVALUATION INDICATORS
Demonstrated incorporation of sustainability measures
Perceived adaptability and longevity of benefits
Demonstrated replicability of good practices/model

Demonstrated incorporation of sustainability measures

To better understand how ReAll supported sustainability, the evaluation first examined good practices that enhanced the programme’s long-term viability.

Key Finding 22: ReAll integrated multiple sustainability mechanisms to ensure long-term impact beyond the programme’s duration, focusing on co-creation, digitalization, policy institutionalization and capacity-building. These approaches strengthened local ownership, policy integration and independent advocacy efforts, allowing beneficiaries to continue applying programme methodologies in their work:

- ***Co-Creation and Local Ownership of Advocacy Tools:*** By co-developing research and advocacy materials with local partners, ReAll ensured that resources remained accessible, adaptable and actively used in ongoing regional networks and advocacy initiatives beyond the programme’s formal duration.
- ***Digitalization for Knowledge Retention and Accessibility:*** ReAll’s emphasis on digital tools and online learning resources expanded access to programme methodologies, enabling beneficiaries

and advocacy networks to continue referencing, sharing and applying key research outputs regionally and globally.

- *Institutionalizing Policy Influence at Regional and National Levels:* ReAll embedded human rights-based policy frameworks within national and regional governance structures, contributing to formal policy reforms, strengthened accountability mechanisms and integration of rights-based approaches in public service models.
- *Capacity-Building for Independent Advocacy and Sustainability:* By equipping organizations and advocates with skills in research, public engagement and fundraising, ReAll enhanced their ability to sustain independent advocacy efforts and secure external funding for long-term impact.

Co-Creation and Ownership of Research and Advocacy Tools

One of the most effective sustainability mechanisms embedded in ReAll was the co-creation of research and advocacy materials with local partners. This approach ensured that outputs remained accessible and usable beyond the programme's duration. Rather than producing research and policy recommendations in isolation, consortium organizations worked directly with local actors to develop network-centric tools that beneficiaries could continue referencing and adapting in the longer-term.

For example, GI-ESCR actively engaged the wider membership of PEHRC in planning sessions on how to share and apply research findings. By directly involving network members and having active participation on the platform, GI-ESCR increased the likelihood that these resources would remain in circulation and influence advocacy efforts long after the programme ended. The partnership is also continuing on a longer-term basis with established follow up activities, including plans to continue sharing how organizations are using the Abidjan Principles through webinars. Similarly, FIMA, a GI-ESCR beneficiary organization, incorporated lessons from its ReAll-supported participatory research into its broader participation and engagement within both the civil society-led Andean Wetlands Alliance and Alianza de Humedales Andinos. Since completing its involvement in ReAll, FIMA has continued expanding research-based advocacy, particularly with networks of women focused on gender rights and environmental justice.

As noted in the Impact Section, ReAll's participatory research also translated into tangible legal and policy action. In Kenya, as mentioned, findings from GI-ESCR's participatory action research are now being used to design strategic litigation training, ensuring that local organizations can challenge barriers to essential services, particularly education, through the legal system. This is a promising action whereby the impact of ReAll results have the potential to remain visible and/or expand in local advocacy spaces.

Digitalization as a Tool for Long-Term Knowledge Sharing

Beyond co-created research, ReAll prioritized digitalizing its outputs to increase accessibility and ensure continued knowledge-sharing. These efforts allow programme beneficiaries and the broader advocacy community to use and adapt ReAll's materials well beyond the programme's conclusion.

Under CESR's Decoding Injustice Learning Lab, a self-paced online version—the Decoding Injustice Playbook—is set to launch in 2025. The Playbook will extend the reach of the Learning Lab by allowing a wider audience of practitioners, advocates and grassroots organizations to apply the methodology in their own advocacy work. This tool will be shared on the Decoding Injustice Resource Hub, which already provides research tools and materials in English, Spanish and

Arabic. The hub recorded over 6,650 views in 2024, reflecting strong engagement beyond ReAll's direct implementing partners.

Moreover, informants (n=6) have shared that publications generated under the programme have been cited within UN human rights mechanisms and widely referenced by external researchers, particularly due to the scarcity of high-quality data on marginalized groups. Additionally, local organizations have increasingly used their own digital platforms and social media channels to promote and spotlight ReAll-supported research, ensuring that findings continue to influence advocacy efforts long after direct programme funding ends.

Institutionalization of Advocacy and Policy Influence

Indeed, ReAll was designed not just to build advocacy capacity but to institutionalize its impact within policymaking processes. The programme successfully embedded human rights-based policy approaches into national and regional governance frameworks, exceeding its initial target of supporting 70 in-country organizations representing marginalized groups.

One of ReAll's most significant policy contributions came from GI-ESCR's ongoing work to bridge expert consultations between the ACHPR and IACHR. As mentioned, this has left to the adoption of General Comment 7 in October 2022 as well as the drafting of the Geneva Declaration on Social Services in Human Rights Standards in 2023. The declaration consolidated regional recommendations for sustainable, rights-based public services, reinforcing ReAll's role in shaping normative frameworks for economic, social, and cultural rights.³⁷ Moreover, CESR's engagement with the IACHR also resulted in fiscal-related policy areas now being officially prioritized in the Commission's strategic plan, signalling long-term institutional commitment to economic justice issues.

At the national level, ReAll's participatory action research projects in Chile, Kenya, Ivory Coast and Zimbabwe led to a number of policy changes. In Ivory Coast, new healthcare regulations were introduced to strengthen oversight of private medical facilities. Similarly, in Kenya, the establishment of a Complaint Management Committee institutionalized a community-led accountability mechanism, illustrating how research-driven advocacy can translate into lasting structural reforms

As another example, MRG's engagement and drafting of an information briefing on the state of affairs for the Malay Muslim community with Inclusive Living Centre on Disabilities (ILCD), a civil society group in southern Thailand, led to the signing of MoUs with five public institutions. This includes the Southern Border Province Administrative Centre, the Provincial Social Development and Security Office and three regional colleges. These MoUs, commit the institutions to providing training programming for students and staff on disability rights, supporting them to embed the newly created roles of disability rights mediators in target communities.

Capacity-Building and Independent Advocacy

Another of ReAll's noted sustainability contributions was its emphasis on equipping local organizations and individuals with the skills needed to continue advocacy independently.

³⁷ GI-ESCR. Geneva Declaration: Anchoring Social Services in Human Rights Standards in the African and Inter-American Regions. Available [here](#).

For example, informants shared that at the UN Forum on Minority Issues in Geneva, ReAll supported the participation of 18 minority representatives (13 women and 5 persons with disabilities), providing training on public speaking, state engagement and advocacy strategies. This initiative not only strengthened participants' immediate advocacy efforts but also provided skills transferable to future international platforms, which have been referenced as “something new [for us] and helpful”.

Additionally, while not a core activity of the ReAll programme, fundraising workshops under the MRG Disability portfolio was cited as supporting local organizations to reduce dependency on consortium-led initiatives, alongside learnings on how to access UN human rights mechanisms.

In general, while less documented, beneficiaries across the programme leveraged their research and utilized their report writing skills for grant applications. Examples include the Institute for Peace Studies in Thailand (i.e., received UN funding to continue research on persons with disabilities and launch a community-led survey) and Chiricli in Ukraine (i.e., successfully secured external EU funding to continue its advocacy work). **However, informants (n=8) emphasized that capacity-building alone is not enough to guarantee long-term financial sustainability.** While skills development has been critical, many organizations still require structured support in securing multi-year funding commitments to maintain their work.

Challenges to Sustainability and the Need for Exit Planning

Despite the abovementioned successes, informants simultaneously highlighted several challenges that could undermine sustainability if not considered by all parties (please see additional detail in the next sub-section):

- *Limited Commitment from National Authorities* – Informants emphasized that policy-focused advocacy takes multiple phases before seeing institutional uptake. While early advocacy efforts have built momentum, full policy adoption requires sustained engagement, which could be disrupted without continued external support.
- *Limited Funding for Continued Advocacy* – While some organizations will continue their work independently, many local partners operate on a volunteer basis, making it difficult to scale up advocacy efforts without ongoing funding. Informants acknowledged that grassroots organizations will remain active, but without financial support, their reach will be limited.
- *Need for Formal Exit Planning* – The evaluators found that while sustainability considerations were embedded in programme design, formal exit planning was lacking. Some partners engaged in discussions on sustainability toward the project's conclusion, but this process was not standardized across all consortium partners.

Perceived adaptability and longevity of benefits

Risks to Sustainability

Key Finding 23: The sustainability of ReAll's results/benefits faces critical risks, particularly related to funding instability, political uncertainty and the continuity of networks and partnerships:

- ***Funding Instability:*** Nearly 47 per cent of responses related to funding instability as the greatest risk, emphasizing that policy advocacy and structural change require sustained financial investment. Short-term funding cycles limit organizations' ability to measure long-term impact, retain skilled staff and strategically grow. Moreover, the declining availability of international development aid further underscores the need for diversified financing models, including

philanthropic partnerships, private sector engagement and pooled donor funds to ensure programmatic stability.

- **Political Risks:** With 33 per cent of responses raising concerns about political challenges, shifting government policies remain a key sustainability barrier. Increasing privatization trends threaten advocacy efforts for public sector accountability, while shrinking civil society space and restrictive legal environments make rights-based advocacy more precarious. Informants also emphasized that marginalized groups—including LGBTQ+ communities, persons with disabilities and refugees/asylum seekers—face heightened risks of state repression and exclusion.
- **Continuation of Networks and Partnerships:** Approximately 20 per cent of responses also highlighted concerns about whether coalitions and partnerships established under ReAll would endure beyond the programme's duration. For example, many networks and partnerships are fragile and at risk of dissolving without continued facilitation and funding. Additionally, changes in national authority representatives often require partnerships to restart from scratch, demanding additional resources and engagement strategies.

Funding Instability

The most frequently cited risk was funding instability, with 47 per cent (n=17/36) emphasizing its critical impact on the sustainability of ReAll programme benefits. *Sustained* funding is essential for long-term advocacy and research efforts, yet local organizations often experience disruptions due to dependency and sole access to short-term funding cycles. Informants (n=12) noted that the work supported by ReAll—particularly policy advocacy and structural change initiatives—requires long-term engagement, but many organizations face difficulties in securing consistent funding to implement comprehensive multistakeholder projects.

Indeed, for many implementing partners, funding limitations also hinder their ability to measure long-term impact. Informants (n=9) emphasized that policy advocacy takes time and requires ongoing monitoring to track outcomes and prevent stagnation or backsliding. Without funding for knowledge dissemination and long-term follow-up, research outputs and policy recommendations risk becoming obsolete or underutilized.

Moreover, a few informants (n=6) highlighted that high turnover among staff due to salary uncertainty directly affects the continuity of partnerships and institutional knowledge. The ability to retain skilled staff in research, M&E and advocacy is contingent on stable funding streams, and gaps in financing frequently lead to loss of institutional capacity. The issue is particularly pressing in grassroots organizations, where funding models typically do not account for capacity-building support, making it difficult to retain expertise and institutional memory over time.

Additionally, informants (n=5) pointed out that short-term funding models do not allow recipient organizations to grow strategically. While larger, more established NGOs can absorb funding fluctuations, smaller, grassroots organizations are particularly vulnerable. Several informants recommended five-year funding models to provide more sustainable capacity-building support (see *Efficiency Section*). Without these long-term investments, there is a risk that progress made through ReAll's initiatives will not translate into enduring institutional change.

At the consortium level, funding concerns were also raised. One informant noted that their organization relied almost entirely on ReAll for work in this thematic area, as other available grants did not cover these specific activities. Informants also highlighted that consortium organizations primarily receive project-based funding with limited core operational support. This funding structure creates barriers to innovation and long-term strategic planning, as organizations must constantly adapt to donor priorities rather than investing in creative, locally driven solutions.

Based on the assessment of the evaluators, the current international development aid landscape presents significant risks and uncertainties that could directly impact the sustainability of initiatives like ReAll. In 2025, major policy shifts by key donor countries, fluctuating financial commitments and geopolitical challenges have led to a reduction in available funding for international development programmes.³⁸³⁹ For example, the dismantling of USAID and the suspension of key humanitarian programmes have severely disrupted long-standing interventions, particularly in public health, economic justice and human rights advocacy.

In this context, securing sustained funding for interventions like ReAll is not only necessary but imperative. The ReAll programme has been strategically designed to promote local ownership, strengthen networks and ensure long-term capacity-building, all of which are critical in mitigating the adverse impacts of unstable international aid policies. From an evaluation standpoint, programmes that embed sustainability measures—such as coalition-building, participatory advocacy and institutional capacity development—are assumed to be more resilient to funding fluctuations. However, without continuous financial investment, even the most well-structured interventions risk being discontinued or rendered ineffective, especially in policy reform and structural advocacy efforts that require long-term engagement.

Furthermore, the evaluation underscores the need for diversified funding models to reduce reliance on singular donors or traditional donor mechanisms. Given the increasingly precarious nature of official development assistance, alternative financing approaches—such as philanthropic partnerships, private sector engagement, pooled donor funds and other innovative financing mechanisms—must be explored to ensure programmatic stability.

Political Risks

Political risks were the second most frequently mentioned challenge/barrier amongst informants, with 33 per cent of all responses (n=12/36) raising concerns about the influence of shifting government policies on programme sustainability. Given the sensitive nature of economic justice, fiscal reform and human rights advocacy, political environments often determine whether organizations can continue their work without interference or suppression.

One of the key risks identified was the increasing trend toward privatization in many countries, which undermines advocacy efforts focused on public sector strengthening. Informants (n=5) noted that while ReAll partners emphasized the importance of public education, healthcare and social services for minority populations, there was growing resistance to progressive fiscal reform as a whole. This shift makes it more difficult for civil society actors to advocate for government accountability, as privatization policies often prioritize market-based solutions over social equity concerns.⁴⁰

Another major political challenge was the reduction of civil space and the securitization of human rights advocacy. In certain countries, organizations working on human rights and governance reforms are subject to strict state controls. Informants (n=3) reported that civil society actors must report all incoming funds from international donors to national authorities, making their activities highly visible to government monitoring. If authorities disapprove of a programme or

38 Focus 2030. The impact of Donald Trump's presidency on international development. An analysis. Available [here](#).

39 OECD. 2025. Global Outlook on Financing for Sustainable Development 2025. Available [here](#).

40 United Nations Press. 2018. World Altered by 'Neoliberal' Outsourcing of Public Services to Private Sector, Third Committee Experts Stress, amid Calls for Better Rights Protection. Available [here](#).

the financial support of an INGO/IO, they have the power to shut down operations, intimidate local partners or impose legal restrictions.

State repression is also often heightened for marginalized groups, including LGBTQ+ communities, persons with disabilities and migrants/asylum seekers. The same informants emphasized that protection policies and government rhetoric in certain countries have actively restricted the participation of these groups in public advocacy efforts. This dynamic poses an ongoing challenge to sustainability, as progress achieved under ReAll could be reversed if civil society space continues to shrink.

Continuation of Networks and Partnerships

The third major sustainability risk, accounted for by 19 per cent of responses (n=7/36), was the risk that networks and partnerships built through ReAll would not endure beyond the programme's duration. Many of the forums and coalitions established or strengthened under ReAll are at risk of dissolving unless they become institutionalized within local organizations' mandates and/or the backbone entities of these collective impact networks are sustained.

Indeed, several informants (n=5) noted that while some networks were likely to remain active—such as those in Uganda and Kenya, where structures were embedded in local institutions—others were much more fragile. Without dedicated facilitators and financial backing, many coalitions face the risk of disbanding once programme funding ends.

Moreover, a couple of informants (n=2) also pointed to how changes in national authority representatives can often result in partnership-building efforts needing to restart from scratch, requiring additional resources and engagement strategies.

Demonstrated replicability and lessons learned

The evaluation explored key thematic areas, operational improvements and strategic directions that should inform future phases of ReAll. Informants emphasized that while ReAll has achieved significant progress in advancing fiscal justice, human rights advocacy and participatory research, there are critical opportunities for expansion, refinement and replication in other geographic or thematic contexts.

New Potential Priorities for Future Phases of ReAll

Key Finding 24: Informants highlighted the need to deepen structural efforts on fiscal reform, focusing on progressive taxation, economic justice and climate justice. There is also demand for income-generating initiatives for marginalized communities, improved direct representation in policymaking spaces and enhanced research methodologies to strengthen advocacy. Expanding media engagement was also identified as a critical strategy to amplify marginalized voices and influence policymakers.

A recurring theme among informants working on economic-related ReAll components was the need to deepen structural efforts that lead to fiscal reform, recognizing that economic policy shifts occur at multiple levels—national, regional and international. **Future phases of ReAll should focus on strengthening international commitments to progressive taxation and promoting advocacy focused on the intersections of fiscal and climate justice, human rights and minority protection.**

Some of the subgrantee informants (n=3) also highlighted that income-generating activities for minority and indigenous communities remain largely underfunded by international grants. **Depending on the scope of the partnership, future programming could include small-scale economic initiatives that enable marginalized groups to become self-sustaining while simultaneously advancing their political and legal advocacy efforts.**

Informants (n=8) also stressed the importance of continuing to sustain efforts that enabled direct representation of marginalized groups in formal policymaking spaces. **For example, informants shared that future phases should increase direct cooperation with government institutions, ensuring greater inclusion of persons with disabilities, women and other marginalized populations in policy dialogues – particularly through a semi-structured or standardized guided approach that can be developed and shared.** Case examples where engagement under ReAll has led to actionable reforms was highlighted as necessary to showcase how national authorities and/or private sector can develop mechanisms or tools for the inclusion of targeted populations (e.g., lessons learned from Ivory Coast, where research findings led to stricter regulations on private healthcare facilities and the establishment of a Complaint Management Committee).

Furthermore, as the participatory research and rights monitoring components were considered highly impactful, informants (n=12) shared that there needs to be ongoing guidance on strengthening the methodological rigor and experience of civil society groups. This can include ensuring that local researchers are equipped with advanced methodologies for both qualitative and quantitative analysis, more extensive training and capacity-building, developing partnerships between civil society actors and academic institutions, developing a promotional guideline on how to “repackage” research findings into policy briefs, interactive digital platforms and advocacy toolkits to make them more accessible to non-academic audiences.

Lastly, informants (n=3) also shared that they are aware about how media visibility can amplify marginalized communities' voices, highlight ongoing challenges and increase public pressure on policymakers. **Therefore, future efforts should focus on building connections between civil society and media.**

Expanding in New Geographic Contexts

Key Finding 25: Consortium partners have identified key regions where ReAll's model could be replicated and adapted, including those where preparatory work has been launched through ReAll (e.g., Egypt, Burundi, Namibia, Uzbekistan). Informants also shared critical considerations needed before launching activities in new countries, including conducting scoping and mapping of relevant actors to ensure projects align with local needs and priorities and ensuring that project implementers have the local knowledge, skills and resources to support partners effectively, including an understanding of local procurement requirements.

The consortium partners have developed a strong understanding of where partnerships can be expanded and how ReAll's model can be replicated based on insights gained throughout the programme's implementation.

Through scoping missions, strategic engagements and direct collaboration with local organizations, they have identified key geographic areas where similar challenges exist, and where the programme's approach could be effectively adapted. **Given the shared structural barriers faced by marginalized groups across different regions, there is significant potential for scaling ReAll's methodologies in new and emerging contexts, provided that the necessary structural components—such as strong partnerships, local capacity-building and multi-sectoral collaboration—are intentionally embedded in future project designs.**

One example of this strategic expansion is MRG's recent scoping missions, which have allowed them to explore opportunities for new projects in regions with limited engagement in minority rights advocacy. In Egypt, they have examined potential interventions in education policy reform, building upon their broader pan-continental advocacy efforts. Similarly, in Burundi, where funding channels have historically excluded the country from broader regional advocacy networks, they have explored ways to reintegrate Batwa advocacy efforts into cross-border policy discussions. In Namibia, a recent phase of extensive scoping on evidence gathering and rights-based programming has provided a strong foundation for future engagements.

In Uzbekistan, MRG has begun laying the groundwork for a project inspired by their work in Tajikistan, recognizing similar barriers to civil society engagement and human rights advocacy. Their expansion efforts in Mongolia have also been incorporated into future proposals, with a focus on minority rights and political inclusion.

In Latin America, the consortium partners have identified new opportunities to apply lessons learned from ReAll's work in the region. In Guatemala, there is growing interest in strengthening access to public services, informed by successful advocacy and policy initiatives led by GI-ESCR and CESR across the Latin America and Caribbean region. At a regional level, CESR's engagement with the IACHR has solidified fiscal policy as a key priority within the Commission's strategic framework, opening further opportunities for policy advocacy efforts.

Informants also highlighted that ReAll's model could be successfully replicated in other regions experiencing similar structural challenges. However, to ensure effective adaptation, future projects must include:

- Conducting scoping and mapping of relevant actors to ensure projects align with local needs and priorities.
- Ensuring that project implementers have the local knowledge, skills and resources to support partners effectively.
- Developing regular learning exchanges between partners and stakeholders to foster cross-sectoral collaboration within the case country and beyond.
- Allowing greater flexibility in financial procurement processes to reflect operational realities in different contexts.
- Ensuring that project teams have adequate resources to conduct field visits and to enhance risk planning (particularly in conflict-prone regions).

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following list of recommendations were derived from the findings and lessons learned identified through the evaluation process. These recommendations are applicable to project stakeholders (incl. programme and project staff and partnering organizations/institutions).

1. Enhanced Community Engagement to Support Relationship Building

To improve future project designs, project teams should try to lead earlier planning and comprehensive scoping activities with local communities/organizations. This will ensure that activities align with community needs and expectations where new partnerships are necessary, as was the case for activities such as the work on just energy transition. Allocating additional time for trust-building will also strengthen relationships with target communities, enabling smoother implementation and enhanced buy-in. Moreover, future efforts can progressively build upon achievements to enhance sustainability and impact (e.g., improved follow through of strategic advocacy with relevant stakeholders).

Greater collaboration between implementing partner organizations and local actors should be fostered through structured engagement opportunities. Budget allocations should be flexible enough to support in-person gatherings, knowledge exchange, and strategic learning activities across the implementing partner organizations and local actors.

2. Scoping in Target Countries/Regions

Though the project had notable success with resources distributed across a wide range of pilot countries, it may prove more impactful to have future projects concentrate on a smaller number of strategically selected locations, allocating increased resources to each. This approach may enable deeper engagement with local communities and allows for more sustained capacity-building efforts. Additionally, focusing on fewer countries could facilitate more thorough monitoring and evaluation processes, ensuring that lessons learned are incorporated into ongoing and future initiatives. This will also strengthen advocacy efforts, as longer-term relationships with local partners can lead to greater policy influence and community impact. A phased strategy could be adopted, where initial engagement in selected countries is expanded in a second phase based on demonstrable success, to support the scoping in of selected regions/countries.

3. Strengthening Connections Between Local Partners and International Donors

To enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of consortium-based programmes, it is recommended that efforts be made to bridge the gaps between local partners and international donors. Evaluation informants from local organizations emphasized the importance of stronger, more direct engagement with donors to ensure that funding priorities, reporting requirements, and programme objectives align with the realities and needs of local actors, accordance with commitments outline under the Grand Bargain.

To achieve this, consortium structures should include mechanisms for direct dialogue between local partners and donors, such as regular consultative meetings, joint learning exchanges, and participatory grant design processes. Additionally, capacity-building efforts should focus on supporting local organizations in donor engagement, including proposal development, compliance with funding requirements, and financial management. A Consortium Coordinator or dedicated liaison role could facilitate these interactions, ensuring that local voices are represented in donor discussions and decision-making processes. By fostering stronger connections, mutual understanding, and more equitable partnerships, this approach would empower local organizations, facilitate enhanced accountability to marginalized communities, reduce administrative burdens, and enhance the overall impact and sustainability of donor-funded initiatives.

4. Strengthening Internal Coherence and Coordination Among Consortium Partners

Future interventions must prioritize structured and institutionalized collaboration mechanisms to ensure that expertise is effectively shared and applied across all stakeholders working in diverse areas of implementation. The evaluation of ReAll revealed that while high-level engagement among directors occurred periodically, operational teams on the ground worked

largely in isolation (even in the case where there were two or more interventions happening in the same country context), limiting opportunities for cross-learning and joint programming. To prevent fragmentation, risk of duplication and to generally improve coherence, future programmes should embed clear, actionable mechanisms/opportunities that facilitate continuous engagement and knowledge exchange among consortium partners.

One critical step is to establish formalized joint work-planning sessions at the programme's inception. These sessions should not only align strategic objectives and activity timelines but also ensure that partners have a shared understanding of implementation targets, data collection processes, risk mitigation strategies and anticipated budgetary bottlenecks. These work-planning discussions should be regularly scheduled throughout the programme cycle, allowing partners to adjust implementation plans, troubleshoot challenges and ensure that resources are being utilized efficiently across all components of the programme.

Beyond operational planning, future interventions can also integrate structured learning exchanges that promote cross-organizational knowledge-sharing and skill development. A key gap in ReAll was the underutilization of specialized methodologies across consortium partners, such as CESR's OPERA framework, which could have been more effectively integrated into the approaches used by other partners. To address this, future programmes should organize joint training sessions for personnel across all consortium partners so that they can apply relevant methodologies consistently across different geographic and thematic areas.

Additionally, establishing regular joint research/publication reviews and thematic working groups (with local partners) will allow consortium partners to engage in deeper discussions on cross-cutting issues, such as fiscal justice, disability inclusion and participatory governance.

Lastly, to maximize the impact and sustainability of consortium-led initiatives, it is essential to highlight partnerships across all three consortium partnerships through digital articles, blogs, briefs and outcome-focused videos. Noting that this is done to various levels across the three consortium organizations, these publications can serve as practical knowledge-sharing tools, enabling local partner organizations to showcase their work, draw lessons from collaborative efforts and advocate for sustained policy engagement.

5. Enhancing External Coherence Through Regional and Global Policy Engagement

Ensuring external coherence is essential for positioning programme interventions within existing regional and global initiatives, reinforcing collective advocacy efforts and preventing duplication. The successes of ReAll—where policy recommendations were integrated into ministerial declarations and regional/global commitments—demonstrate the potential for strategic, high-impact advocacy. Future initiatives should build on this by systematically channeling programme outputs into decision-making forums at regional and international levels, ensuring that local actions inform global discourse while benefiting from broader policy commitments.

One of the key challenges identified in ReAll was that while local actors recognized the value of aligning their work with international frameworks, many lacked structured experience in applying these frameworks to practical, context-specific interventions. Future interventions should bridge this gap by providing dedicated training on leveraging legally binding and non-binding frameworks in their day-to-day work (e.g., human rights conventions and treaties, Abidjan Principles, SDG targets and associated guidelines, guidelines outlined in the Global Compact for Migration and Global Compact for Refugees).

Beyond technical capacity-building, future programmes should more explicitly demonstrate and promote how local interventions contribute to these applicable regional and international frameworks. By clearly linking grassroots advocacy efforts to global commitments, programmes can position local actions as essential components of broader collective human rights, development and humanitarian assistance efforts. To ensure that these alignments are documented and communicated effectively, consortium partners can consider how to establish mechanisms to track, synthesize and

showcase how local actors engage with, and directly contribute to, international human rights and governance commitments. This could include creating thematic reports, case studies and advocacy toolkits that highlight grassroots actors' expertise and their role in advancing globally recognized priorities. These materials should be designed not only for internal learning but also for external visibility, helping funders, policymakers and IOs/INGOs recognize the strategic value of supporting civil society actors engaged in human rights, development and humanitarian assistance. Additionally, these supports can also lead to civil society actors explicitly incorporating their alignment into funding proposals.

Further strengthening external coherence, future interventions should facilitate direct engagement between local actors and regional decision-making bodies. Consortium organizations can continue their efforts to support beneficiary organizations in establishing formalized partnerships with applicable networks/platforms. Future-forward this could be expanded by including objectives to support partnership agreement and MoUs between local partners and regional/global bodies.

Finally, future interventions should strengthen collaborations with media and public advocacy campaigns to amplify visibility and influence. By integrating media actors as programme partners (or potential beneficiaries), civil society organizations can increase public awareness of their efforts, mission and vision, making these issues more accessible to broader audiences. This strategy also enhances the credibility and reach of grassroots-led advocacy, helping beneficiary organizations attract greater engagement from policymakers, donors and the public.

6. Expanding National-Level Synergies and Strengthening Institutional Partnerships

Ensuring coherence at the national level is essential for transforming advocacy efforts into tangible policy changes and embedding reforms within national institutional systems. While ReAll successfully engaged national authorities in some countries, the evaluation revealed gaps in structured collaboration with government institutions and agencies, limiting the ability of local partners to secure long-term policy commitments and institutionalize programme outcomes. To strengthen national-level coherence, future initiatives may wish to develop realistic, context-specific roadmaps for sustained engagement with government agencies at multiple levels—federal/state, regional/provincial and municipal/local. These engagement models should be designed strategically with the local beneficiary organizations, ensuring that interventions target the level of government where policy influence is most feasible and impactful.

A key strategy to ensure deeper institutional buy-in is the formalization of partnerships with relevant government agencies that align with the programme's thematic focus. Future interventions, therefore, may wish to actively build activities that integrate national authorities into technical working groups, research validation processes and/or programme advisory boards (e.g., national steering group). A more structured involvement, where it is safe to do so, could better support engagement between national authorities and civil society. This could also lead to more detailed and practical recommendations developed in research findings/recommendations (e.g., identifying what steps are plausible given institutional and policymaking restrictions for national authorities) as well as support in the dissemination and formal adoption of these findings/recommendations.

Additionally, to ensure that policy reforms initiated under the programme are sustained, future consortium interventions may wish to invest in capacity-building initiatives targeted at government personnel and public administration officials. Informants emphasized that government representatives often lack the technical skills or institutional knowledge on a variety of topics covered under ReAll. Future interventions can, therefore, seek to address this by organizing trainings and potentially developing national public administration curricula.

Furthermore, informants expressed strong interest in ongoing research and advocacy capacity-building but highlighted that access to sustainable funding remains a major constraint to do so. Future programming could address this by expanding partnerships between local beneficiary organizations and other key actors who can provide longer-term institutional and financial support. One potential strategy is to facilitate formal research partnerships between civil society organizations and national academic institutions. Another approach could be to build joint programming opportunities between civil

society actors and diaspora organizations/networks, particularly those that have national operations and access to transnational fundraising.

7. Strengthening Programme Design and Strategic Planning to Account for Constraints to Schedule and Budget

A critical lesson from ReAll is that early-stage planning plays a defining role in programme success. Where possible, future interventions should ensure that the programme design is both structured and flexible, allowing for adaptive implementation while maintaining strong alignment with the overall objectives/Theory of Change of the intervention. This should account for implementation time required to identify local partners, and support relationship building with new local partners and communities. To mitigate some of the scheduling/timeline dependency challenges experienced with the ReAll programme, consortium actors could consider adopting a phased implementation model, ensuring that activities are sequenced strategically to optimize stakeholder engagement, institutional buy-in and long-term sustainability. For example, they could employ a three-phase programme model, where:

- Phase 1 focuses on baseline needs assessments, partnership-building and stakeholder mapping to ensure that subsequent activities are driven by localized data/information.
- Phase 2 moves into full-scale implementation and advocacy, leveraging the relationships and knowledge gained in the initial phase to implement contextually sound activities.
- Phase 3 prioritizes institutionalization, long-term advocacy promotion and sustainability planning, ensuring that programme results have longer-term sustainability.

Alternatively, where flexibility allows, consortium organizations may consider a tiered implementation approach based on the capacity, structure and longevity of implementing beneficiary organizations. This model recognizes the diverse needs of different types of organizations and ensures that programme support is tailored to their specific growth and sustainability trajectories:

- In Year 1, partnerships could begin with smaller, emerging organizations that require intensive capacity-building support to establish strong operational and advocacy foundations.
- In Year 2, partnerships could expand to more established organizations that already have implementation experience and can operate with greater independence, requiring less direct oversight and support from consortium partners.

At the management level, consortium structures benefit from a dedicated team (e.g., consortium-level manager and programme coordinator) with cross-organizational oversight, ensuring that all consortium operations and activities are complete and to support with financial planning, and reporting obligations.

Beyond programme management changes, consortium logic models and results frameworks (logframes) must be simplified and made clearer to improve communication and understanding among implementing teams. Complex frameworks often hinder clarity, particularly in multi-partner initiatives, leading to inconsistencies in reporting and understanding of the overall intervention. Future programmes may wish to ensure that:

- Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined from the outset, ensuring that each actor (including beneficiary organizations/subgrantees) understand their contribution to programme outcomes, including formally through the RMF targets.
- Indicators and measurement tools are realistic and actionable, ensuring that programme results are effectively tracked without overburdening implementing organizations (e.g., if there is dedicated consortium-level MEAL support, the programme may wish to continue using a variety of outcome-level measures/indicators, however, if there is no support, these might need to be adjusted so that the source/means of verification are not overly cumbersome).
- There are organized annual review sessions where stakeholders—including consortium partners, local implementers and donor representatives—can assess progress and discuss, in detail, any challenges in adherence to the proposed logframe.

- To enhance the overall articulation of programme interventions, it is recommended that the consortium team develops a visual ToC to clearly outline the results chain of the intervention, underlying key assumptions and external influencing factors. A well-defined ToC would help beneficiaries and teams understand the linkages between activities, expected outputs and long-term objectives (incl. how they are all working towards these collective targets globally).

8. Enhancing Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning Systems

Future consortium-like interventions should prioritize the development of a centralized, consortium-wide MEAL framework to ensure harmonized performance indicators, standardized data collection methods and consistent reporting mechanisms across all implementing partners. This should include the collection of data on knowledge and skill acquisition for interventions that have a notable focus on capacity building, and consensus on feasible targets across implementing partners (e.g., targets associated with PwD participation or PwD-led organizations).

Moreover, where possible, the consortium partners should collectively continue to collect data and report on outcome-level results. Wherever possible (e.g., where there are core operations in a case country), consortium actors may wish to consider longer-term post-programme data collection focused on results related to changes in norms, policies and well-being of target populations. Consortium actors would be aided to do so by having a repository of validated and reliable datasets that are conducted periodically at the national/local level. If this is unavailable, the consortium actor may wish to partner with local actors and IOs/INGOs to gather localized data collection assessments periodically (e.g., launching population-based inferential data collection every 5 years).

Additionally, future MEAL systems must reduce administrative burdens on local partners, wherever possible. Smaller, grassroots organizations often lack the technical and human resource capacity to manage complex reporting requirements at the same scale as IOs/INGOs. A key lesson from ReAll was that overly complex reporting processes diverted valuable time and resources away from programme implementation. Future interventions can consider having simplified data collection tools and templates, providing ongoing technical support and training on MEAL and/or having a dedicated MEAL officer/consultant that can design and work with local actors to launch data collection processes. Furthermore, given the complexity of collecting high-quality data from affected populations, particularly in politically unstable environments and areas with logistical constraints, future interventions should conduct early-stage feasibility assessments to determine what types of data can realistically be collected from different stakeholder groups under given conditions.

The evaluation of ReAll also faced significant challenges due to late initiation, minimal budget allocation and logistical constraints. Given the scale of the programme, the diversity of informants (incl. geographic, linguistic, accessibility and security-related differences) and the complexity of implementation, the resources available were not proportionate to the level of effort required to conduct an in-depth, cross-context analysis of the programme's results, in accordance with standardised evaluation criteria (i.e., OECD-DAC). As a result, key learning opportunities were limited, and the evaluation's ability to generate strategic insights for future programming was constrained.

Despite these challenges, the final evaluation process proved valuable, offering programme staff an opportunity to reflect on lessons learned, document achievements and identify key areas for improvement. To ensure that future evaluations are more comprehensive and effective, several structural improvements should be made:

- Future programmes should engage evaluators earlier in the programme/project cycle or have a longer contract duration.
- To maximize the utility and depth of final evaluations, future programmes should schedule evaluation data collection to align with structured lessons-learned workshops or closing forums.
- Future evaluations must include explicit guidance on language and translation needs, ensuring that evaluators can budget for local translators or interpreters as necessary, preventing language barriers from limiting the quality of data collected.

- Clarify which programme staff members from each consortium organizations will assist evaluators with coordination, logistics and contextual briefings (e.g., identifying focal points from each partnering organization).
- Ensure that all partners understand their commitments to the evaluation process, particularly in terms of participation in interview participation.

9. Establishing a Consortium Coordinator Role for Effective Programme Management

To enhance the management, coordination, and implementation of consortium-based programmes and projects, it is recommended that a Consortium Coordinator role be established. Given the complexity of multi-partner initiatives, a dedicated coordinator would play a crucial role in streamlining communication, ensuring alignment of objectives, and facilitating efficient decision-making across consortium members. This role would provide strategic coordination by ensuring that all partners remain aligned with the overall programme objectives, work plans, and reporting timelines. Additionally, the coordinator would oversee operational implementation, monitoring progress, identifying challenges, and facilitating timely adjustments to maintain programme efficiency. By introducing this role, consortium-based programmes would benefit from improved coordination, reduced administrative burdens on implementing partners, and enhanced accountability, ultimately leading to more effective and impactful programme delivery.

A key function of the Consortium Coordinator would be communication and stakeholder engagement, acting as the primary liaison between consortium partners, donors, and other key stakeholders to ensure clarity and cohesion in programme execution. The role would also be responsible for compliance and reporting, ensuring timely and accurate submissions while maintaining adherence to donor and contractual obligations. Furthermore, the coordinator would support internal knowledge management and capacity building, facilitating cross-learning among partners, promoting best practices, and enhancing collective impact.

10. Developing Exit-Planning Resources

Future programmes must prioritize structured and standardized exit planning to ensure that partners and affected communities can effectively prepare for programme closure or withdrawal, where applicable. Without a well-planned transition strategy, this can disrupt ongoing advocacy efforts and lead to financial and operational dependency on IOs/INGOs and donors to maintain benefits from a programme.

A critical element of responsible exit planning is ensuring that partnership transitions are conducted transparently and proactively. Clear and open communication with local partners about programme timelines, funding constraints and/or long-term sustainability plans allows for joint problem-solving and risk mitigation. Future programmes should engage in structured dialogue with partners well in advance of programme closure, discussing potential challenges and identifying alternative funding pathways, operational strategies and opportunities for continued collaboration. Providing sufficient notice and transition support ensures that partners can adjust their financial planning, maintain advocacy momentum and prevent disruptions to essential services.

Organizing end-of-programme “lessons learned” events/forums can provide important opportunities for all stakeholders in the programme to discuss and plan for sustainability measures. The forum can serve as a platform for consolidating insights, it can help identify next steps amongst beneficiary organizations, it can act as a platform for continued partnership-building and engagement and can help the consortium organizations identified future interventions that would leverage the key findings/lessons learned from this phase (see Sustainability Section).

To facilitate exit processes, sustainability roadmaps or exit plans should be co-developed with local partners, outlining clear post-programme transition strategies that focus on the following key areas:

- **Roles and Responsibilities:** Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the transition. This includes implementing partners, consultants, donors and any other relevant actors. Detail what ongoing

supports will be available for implementing partners after the programme ends. This includes any follow-up funding, resources and/or advisory support that will be provided by consortium organizations.

- **Accomplishments and Outputs:** Document what has been accomplished so far, including relevant data capturing key outcomes/outputs. The consortium teams can help identify the main achievements that can be shared or disseminated (incl. development of short shareable briefs). This can be used as a promotional document to highlight achievements made by civil society actors.
- **Reason for Project Ending:** Clearly state why the project is ending. Specify if it is being phased down, phased out or phased over to another entity or project.
- **Continued Objectives and Activities:** Identify the overarching objectives of the transition and determine what key activities need to continue to achieve these objectives. Develop a work plan for these activities, including responsible parties and timelines.
- **Timelines and Expectations:** Establish a detailed timeline for the transition process, outlining key milestones and deadlines. Clearly set expectations for what needs to be achieved at each stage of the exit process.
- **Risk Assessment:** Conduct a thorough assessment of potential risks that could impact the transition. This should cover financial risks, scheduling delays, socio-political risks and any relevant institutional frameworks. Develop strategies to mitigate these risks.
- **Resource Requirements:** Outline the key resources required to sustain the benefits of the programme/partnership for the foreseeable future. Identify potential donors and other actors that can fund future iterations of the activities. Create profiles for all relevant stakeholders, detailing their roles, responsibilities and/or capabilities.