Right2Grow
Mid-Term Review 2023

Right2Grow

Table of contents

List of acronyms

ACF	Action Contre La Faim; Action Against Hunger
BMET	Budget Monitoring and Expenditure Tracking
BNNC	Bangladesh National Nutrition Council
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CCHST	Community Clinic Health Support Trust
CCOCSAD	Coordination and Monitoring Committee for Development Actions
CEGAA	Centre for Economic Governance and Accountability in Africa
CMAM	Community Management of Acute Malnutrition
COVID-19	Corona Virus Disease - 2019
CSA	Civil Society Alliance
CSC	Country Steering Committee
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CU5	Children Under Five Years
CVA	Citizens Voice and Action
CVC	Comité de Veille Citoyenne (Citizens' Watch Committee)
DLG	District Local Government
DNCC	District Nutrition Coordination Committee
EKN	Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
ENLN	Ethiopia Nutrition leadership Networks
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
FMoH	Federal Ministry of Health
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security
GCC	Global Coordination Committee
GPT	Global Programme Team
GSAN	Group de Soutien des Activités de Nutrition (community based nutrition group)
HDN	Humanitarian Development Nexus
HDP	Humanitarian Development Peace
HOA	Horn of Africa
HVA	Healthy Village Approach
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IGG	Inclusive Green Growth
IRC	Indirect Cost Recovery
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
L&A	Lobby and Advocacy
L&L	Linking and Learning
L&S	Learning & Sharing
LCG	Local Consultative Group
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MCD	Mutual Capacity Development
MCLDU	Movement for Community Led Development – Uganda Chapter
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MIS	Management Information System
MoFA	The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoH	Ministry of Health
MtMSGs	Mother to Mother Support Groups

MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NIS	Nutrition Information System
OPDs	Organizations of People with Disabilities
PLL	Partnership Learning Loop
PTT	Project technical Team
REPASEN	Parliamentary Network for Nutritional Security
RESONUT	Civil Society Nutrition Network
SC	Save the Children
SCS	Strengthening Civil Society
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEAH	Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment
SIWI	Stockholm Water Institute
SSFH	South Sudan Humanitarian Fund
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
TFs	Task Forces
THP	The Hunger Programme
TOC	Theory of Change
TWGs	Technical Working Groups
UDCC	Upazila Nutrition Coordination Committee
UN	United Nations
UP	Union Parishad
UPAFNS	Uganda Parliament Alliance on Food Security and Nutrition Security
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WL	Women Leadership
WUCs	Water User Committees

Programme overview

Country names	Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali, South Sudan, Uganda
Programme number	PoV Activity 4000004339
Lead Partner	Stichting The Hunger Project Nederland
Consortium Partners	Action Contre la Faim (Spain) Centre for Economic Governance and Accountability in Africa (South Africa) Max Foundation (Netherlands) Save the Children (Netherlands) World Vision (Netherlands)
Contact persons:	Eliane Vrolings, The Hunger Project Nederland Paul Gabula, CEGAA Stephen Otieno, World Vision
Donor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands Inclusive Green Growth Department
Contact Person:	Annoek van den Wijngaart

Acknowledgements

The Right2Grow partnership would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank the following groups and people who were essential in this Mid-Term Review (MTR) process:

- Community stakeholders across programme countries and implementation areas who participated in household interviews, Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). Information gathered from these groups forms the basis for analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- Right2Grow partners at country and global level who were consulted during this exercise and who provided valuable insights into the programme's implementation;
- The country and global MTR Task Force, as well as the country and global teams who were involved in the process.

This consolidated MTR report is a product of six country and one global level review, all conducted by external consultants. The contributions by the consultancy teams in conducting the MTR despite challenging contexts and tight timelines are highly appreciated.

Executive Summary

Introduction

Right2Grow is a Strategic Partnership between Action Against Hunger, the Centre for Economic Governance and Accountability in Africa (CEGAA), Max Foundation, Save the Children, The Hunger Project and World Vision. With funding from the Dutch Government (Civil Society Strengthening – Power of Voices), Right2Grow collaborates with communities, community-based organisations, and civil society organisations (CSOs) in Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali, South Sudan, and Uganda from 2021-2025. In addition to the global partners, in each of the programme countries local strategic implementing CSOs play a crucial role in the implementation, finding appropriate solutions to local contexts and ensuring programme sustainability.

The Right2Grow partnership commissioned the MTR mid-2023, in order to:

- Enable the partnership to learn about and leverage its successes, and assess areas for improvement at country and global levels (including partnership governance);
- Inform possible adjustment of Theory of Change (ToC) and planning for 2024-2025, including the adjustment of targets and indicator framework;
- Inform strategic decisions and investments for increased impact and added value in 2024-2025 and beyond;
- Meet the accountability requirements of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The MTR was concurrently conducted across the six programme countries as well as at global level. The MTR looked at programme implementation at both country and global level, (governance) processes at country and global levels as well as the interlinkage between those levels. The process of the MTR demonstrated the consortium's ability to critically self-reflect and its drive to continuously improve its strategies and governance structure to obtain the most optimal results.

Methodology

A standard Terms of Reference was developed to standardize country and global MTR processes, which was adapted for each country context and the global context. Both country and global level MTR processes took place concurrently though independent of each other. The MTR consultancy teams utilised a combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment methodologies to develop a suitable approach that aligned with the MTR objectives and encompassed all programme areas. The methodology and relevant tools were adjusted in consultation with the Right2Grow MTR taskforces at each country and global level. Data collection methods at country level included detailed review of key documentation, household interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and outcome harvesting workshops. For the global MTR component, key research elements included desk research of partnership documentation, the ToC, in-country evaluations and other relevant information about the partnership, global lobby and advocacy (L&A) and finances, a meeting with country MTR consultants, an online survey, observations during meetings, and FGDs with global partner teams.

As part of the MTR process, an internal capacity assessment and Linking and Learning survey was conducted, led by the Mutual Capacity Development (MCD) and Linking and Learning (L&L) teams respectively. The capacity assessment was meant to assess the status of CSO capacity at mid-term in relation to L&A, as well as assess overall capacity to inform planning for 2024 and 2025. The Linking and Learning survey was aimed at assessing the status of the consortium learning agenda

and key topics for the Right2Grow Global learning week which is to be held in November of 2023, as well as for prioritisation towards 2024 and 2025.

Quantitative data was analysed and presented in this report as tables mainly, while qualitative data was audio recorded and transcribed to produce transcripts. The transcripts were labelled, and data cleaned to remove any errors after which results were used in the reports. Prior to development of the various reports, validation workshops were held at country level and a debrief on global MTR component was done virtually.

This report has been consolidated from six country and one global level MTR reports. Country MTR reflection workshops were organised in each country, and additionally a face-to-face global reflection workshop with both global and country partnership representatives was organized to discuss and validate key findings from country and global MTR reports. During these workshops we discussed what changes were necessary in the ToC, programming for 2024 and 2025, and in the way we are organised and work together in this partnership.

This report contains the most important findings and recommendations from all seven reports. It was compiled by the Right2Grow consortium. Summaries of all the separate reports can be found in the annexes.

Key findings, recommendations and Right2Grow response

A. Outcomes of the programme

Based on context analysis and mapping of harvested outcomes linked to the Theory of Change (ToC), the MTR indicates that the Right2Grow **ToC is still relevant** and appropriate, and is being used effectively by the consortium partners, including local CSOs, to guide programme planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation across six countries and globally. However, some of the ambitious targets set at the start of the programme need to be adjusted based on current context and achievements. This is specifically the case for the targets set on Outcome 4 (see B, Global lobby and advocacy and Outcome 4).

Assessment across the four outcomes shows that the programme has made progress despite challenging political contexts, as well as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The **effectiveness of the programme** is demonstrated by the increased awareness among households and communities on food security, nutrition and hygiene issues. Advocacy initiatives have contributed to tangible results, leading to improved service delivery in line with community needs. Capacity strengthening efforts have increased the technical skills and capacities of local civil society so that they can influence decision-makers and speak with a loud collective voice. Additionally, the review indicated that strong governance is in place at the country level, enabling learning and knowledge sharing, while focusing on impact.

The programme has established effective collaboration with sub-national and national government actors, which has enabled meaningful policy level engagement with duty bearers.

Whereas the overall review provides evidence of good progress, **some challenges** have emerged that have to some extent hindered optimal achievements. For instance, programme delivery has been partly affected by delayed implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic and persistent insecurity challenges. In addition, the MTR shows that in some cases budget constraints, continued

capacity gaps, staff turnover and suboptimal collaboration have somewhat hindered effective implementation.

MTR Recommendations:
- Strengthen collaboration with sub-national, national, and local governments to facilitate meaningful policy improvements related to nutrition and WASH, as well as monitoring budget allocation and expenditures for revised policies;
- Continue capacity strengthening and empowerment of local CSOs, CBOs and communities, especially on Budget Monitoring and Expenditure Tracking (BMET) and budget advocacy, to increase their capacity to participate, demand and engage in policy making and budgeting processes for nutrition and WASH;
- Strengthen efforts to ensure local private sector and CSO participation in existing government-led multisectoral nutrition coordination platforms;
- Set more realistic indicator targets for some of the programme outcomes, such as Outcome 4, based on current context and achievements so far.

Right2Grow response to the findings and recommendations:
In order to enable better translation of community needs into advocacy asks Right2Grow identified and included capacity strengthening priorities and needs expressed by the programme countries in the 2024 annual plan and budget. This will strengthen collaboration with policy makers at all levels and support the uptake and roll out of "Bridge4Voices" among local partners (more on Bridge4Voices in B, Global lobby & advocacy and Outcome 4). We will expand utilization and application of BMET and budget advocacy, effective communication, campaigning and working with media in the programme countries. Increased investments are made to ensure comprehensive technical support in BMET in all six countries in 2024.

Working with local, community-based private sector partners will be discussed more in-depth during the Right2Grow Global Learning week, in order to highlight best practices and approaches and to encourage countries to learn from each other. This should enable us to develop concrete and effective strategies for engagement of local private sector partners in Right2Grow initiatives planned for 2024-2025, especially those to be implemented under Outcome 1. Collaboration with local private sector partners and social enterprises, together with provision of quality and affordable WASH and nutrition services in line with community needs are seen as critical precondition for ensuring sustainability beyond Right2Grow.

Some targets set at baseline were ambitious and there was not yet a common understanding on indicator measurement across programme countries. In the second year of the programme, we provided technical support to country MEAL teams on the global indicator guidance. The MTR findings provided opportunity to review targets and set more realistic targets for our work. The revised targets are reflected in MTR Report Annex 4 - updated Global Results Framework.

B. Global lobby & advocacy and Outcome 4

Outcome 4[1] has not yet been as effective as the other outcomes and needs more attention in the coming years. The focus within Right2Grow in the first 2,5 years has been on delivering effective L&A and advocacy at country level. It is now time to complement country advocacy efforts with a strong global and regional L&A agenda, which would in return support and strengthen local advocacy, this MTR shows. Country experience, grassroot engagement and community voices, coupled with evidence generated locally can be leveraged to achieve more at the global and Dutch level. The approach used until now with regard to Global L&A needs to be more specific and focused in order to yield tangible results under Outcome 4.

Partners see three elements of global L&A that could further support L&A in programme countries: L&A capacity strengthening, L&A tools, guidelines and frameworks (especially BMET) and opportunities for cross country sharing and learning.

Involvement in global events has profiled Right2Grow and its work in the global food, nutrition and WASH arena, while building networks within the Netherlands has strengthened collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other Dutch actors. However, the difference between global and Dutch L&A is not well understood, and the division of roles needs to be readdressed.

MTR Recommendations:
- Strengthen the Global L&A strategy and support function, including BMET, within the Right2Grow partnership and ensure that it is a central component of the programme;
- Strengthen the link between different thematic areas to facilitate the sharing of evidence, best practices and to better inform advocacy efforts at the local and global levels;
- Enhance cross-country knowledge sharing and exchange based on the implementation experiences within Outcome 4, with the aim to generate strong evidence for enhancing engagement strategies among donors and other international development actors, ultimately maximizing the impact of Right2Grow programme.
- Ensuring more integrated and needs based technical support while responding to continuously evolving country priorities.

Right2Grow response to the findings and the recommendations:
We recognise and welcome the findings and recommendations on the Global L&A. Even before the MTR, Right2Grow assessed progress and had identified the need to further strengthen our advocacy efforts in the second half of our programme. We also acknowledge that global L&A should follow harvesting of results and evidence at country and local level, and that this evidence base takes a while to build. Since receiving external input on this crucial component of our work was important to us, Right2Grow made evaluation of its L&A approach a key component of the MTR ToR. The findings are in line with our own experiences and during the MTR reflection workshop we have jointly agreed on the next steps to take to maximize our advocacy impact.

To ensure a more integrated and comprehensive technical support provision for L&A to the programme countries, in line with the needs identified through the MTR, a Technical Support team has been formed. This team brings together the former global/regional leads on L&A, BMET, Communications, Mutual Capacity Development (MCD), Linking and Learning (L&L) and MEAL. Compared to the previous global governance, this more integrated structure should provide

---

[1] Outcome 4: Donors and international development actors coordinate and collaborate along the humanitarian-development nexus to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition.

better alignment between different thematic areas and should significantly reduce overlaps in roles and responsibilities.

The Technical Support Team is currently finalising country-specific technical support plans, in line with the MTR recommendations, which should enhance national and local advocacy efforts. These plans will be finalized in Q3 of 2023, and will be approved by the newly formed Program Management Unit, which consists of Country Leads. The Technical Support budgets will be managed by countries from 2024 onwards. This bottom-up approach, having countries in the lead, is also reflected in our adjusted governance structure and decision-making processes.

We will also facilitate exchange and learning between countries, especially those with similar contexts (e.g. Mali and Burkina Faso). Activities to strengthen our advocacy work at both country and global level have been incorporated in our 2024 annual plan.

In addition to needs-based technical support provision, this team will also work on facilitating knowledge exchange, collaboration, and the dissemination of best practices among programme countries, as well as on promotion and adoption of innovative and effective approaches to address programme implementation challenges.

Bridge4Voices, the Right2Grow L&A approach jointly co-created by all six programme countries, local partners and global teams to bridge the gap between local and global advocacy, has become a common foundation for all Right2Grow advocacy work. Bridge4Voices was developed in year 2 of the programme and e-courses in English and French became available in 2023. The roll out and uptake were still ongoing at the time of the MTR, and therefore the full effect of this new approach is not yet visible in the MTR findings. We will intensify our efforts to implement, further strengthen and promote the roll-out and uptake of the Bridge4Voices advocacy approach in our programme countries, especially by Right2Grow local partner organizations.

As a result of the MTR findings and our internal reflections we have already initiated the process of developing a more specific and focused international advocacy strategy, building on 1-2 clear advocacy asks, identified and jointly agreed upon by our six programme countries. This strategy builds on country advocacy priorities and aims to further support country advocacy agendas. The strategy will target donors and key international development actors to address underlying determinants of undernutrition in an integrated way, while collaborating along humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

C. Governance, Shifting the Power, partnership and collaboration

On partnership and collaboration, the programme has been mostly successful in establishing a working and effective partnership, enhancing capacity and joint decision making on key programme operational and administrative issues. There is a supportive atmosphere and generally a lot of goodwill in the consortium to work collaboratively and achieve optimal impact together.

Effective partnership has at times been hindered by an inadequate coordination mechanisms, as is often the case in a new partnership. The COVID-19 restrictions in the first two years of the partnership have also been a challenging factor for partnership building.

Respondents in programme countries generally perceive higher levels of synergy and value, compared to those based in headquarters. The relationship with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is generally characterized as equal, although respondents in programme countries see the ministry

and embassies more as equal partners than those at headquarter level. Appreciation of the relationship with embassies varies from country to country, and is usually influenced by the level of alignment with embassy priorities.

With regard to decision making and leadership, Right2Grow leadership was intended to be shared among partners. From a community-led paradigm, there has been a focus on self-management, personal responsibility, decentralized and consent-based decision making and creating space for innovative ideas and solutions that are action oriented (based on *Holacracy*).

However, in practice there appeared to be lack of joint understanding on what this concept means, which led to a feeling of fragmentation and unclarity on where decisions are made. Partners expressed the need for a more structured and lean approach and clearer decision making processes. Partners also expected more (strategic) guidance from THP as the consortium lead partner, especially around project cycle processes and progress. At the same time, more active engagement and a feeling of joint responsibility is expected from all other partners. Overall, partners appreciate the willingness to listen and the flexibility that THP and the *B-team* (the most important support function that coordinates the work within the consortium) has shown.

Although the concept of **Shifting the Power** is emphasized in all documentation within Right2Grow, there is limited shared understanding of what this means within the consortium by different partners and at different levels. In practice, it is promoted by appointing lead staff in programme countries, involvement of country staff in global decision-making bodies, flexibility in programme implementation and in-country program and budget design (in line with the overall ToC). Local partners are also part of country steering committees, as are other key stakeholders such as local governments. There is an ambition to be accountable to communities, and based on the MTR that has not yet been operationalised. There are differences in the way Shifting the Power principles are interpreted at different levels (i.e. at country, with regard to how INGOs work with CSO's, and between global and local partners).

Partners ask for clearer guidance on this principle, as well as on consent-based decision making. There is an urge for country leadership that mirrors shift the power principles, continuous learning for informed decision making, synergy between the partners with clear roles and responsibilities and a simplified governance structure and processes.

MTR Recommendations:
- Revising the current Right2Grow global governance structure to focus on country leadership that mirrors shift the power principles, continuous learning for informed decision making, synergy between the partners with clear roles and responsibilities, and to support a simplified governance structure and simplified processes;
- Reallocation of (financial) resources to mirror Shift the Power principles, shifting more resources from global budgets to programme countries (Shift the Power tire 1) and from INGOs to local CSOs (Shift the Power tire 2).

Response to the findings and the recommendations:
It is important and crucial to note that **Right2Grow partners were already discussing changes in governance before the MTR commenced**. For this reason, governance was made a key component of the Global MTR. This not only underscores Right2Grow's proactive recognition of the existing governance challenges, but also highlights our ongoing efforts to address it. The MTR, in this context, served as a valuable tool that helped us formulate more concrete recommendations to

further enhance and simplify our governance structure and actually shift the power in our decision-making processes.

Based on the MTR findings and through a collaborative process with both country and global representatives, Right2Grow has decided to adapt its governance structure. The adapted structure puts countries even more in the lead, with the country leads positioned in a newly formed Programme Management Unit (PMU) with operational decision-making power. It also simplifies our meeting and governance structure and brings together global lead roles in joint teams or working groups.

Right2Grow decided that the technical support budget, which was previously managed at global level, will be transitioned to countries from 2024 onwards. The newly formed PMU (with 6 Country Leads) holds decision making power over the technical support plan. Finally, Right2Grow decided to continue increasing investments in local partners in our programme countries.

Our joint understanding of Shift the Power, also in relationship to sustainability, was discussed during the Right2Grow MTR reflection workshop. We identify two levels of shifting power and resources; first from global offices to programme countries (Tier 1) and then from INGOs to local NGOs and CBOs (Tier 2). In the second half of the programme Right2Grow aims to further shift power to local organisations in our programme countries. The Right2Grow Shift the Power working group will be revived, and the first task is to co-create an implementation guidance for the partnership on Shifting the Power to further intensify our Shift the Power efforts in the remaining two years of the programme.

D. Cost effectiveness

The MTR shows there is no universal approach to cost-effectiveness within the consortium. Most partners approach cost effectiveness in terms of how to use existing resources in relation to anticipated results, emphasizing the relation between investments and results. Some also approach it the other way around: to have enough resources to achieve the anticipated results.

General budget principles were agreed upon between partners at the start of the programme, but it is not clear how they have guided the decisions made after the full program budgeting done in 2020. Overall, staff in programme countries are more content with cost-effectiveness of the work than global staff.

MTR Recommendations:
- Define joint financial principles, integrate cost-effectiveness analyses and link these to Right2Grow principles in such a way that resources are re-allocated to those interventions that have most impact in the countries;
- Position the MEAL and Finance team better for more effective programme implementation. They could lead more strategically and pro-actively on global level by sharing their insights, overviews, and information to several teams for compliance purposes;
- Reallocate resources to mirror Shift the Power principles, especially shifting resources from global roles to programme countries.

Response to findings and recommendation:
Right2Grow discussed cost-effectiveness in the MTR reflection workshop and has addressed it in the 2024-2025 budgeting process, by making efficiencies through shifting small LOE at multiple partners to a bigger LOE concentrated at fewer partners (e.g. Communications, MEAL). We have

also addresses cost-effectiveness by simplifying our governance and meetings structure and decision-making processes, as we anticipate this supports us working in a more cost-efficient manner.

Additionally, the Finance and MEAL Teams are positioned better to monitor results in relation to financial investments (expenditure) by creating a Monitoring & Compliance Team in our new governance structure, in which they are both represented.

1. Introduction

1.1 Programme Brief

Right2Grow is a Strategic Partnership between Action Against Hunger, the Centre for Economic Governance and Accountability in Africa (CEGAA), Max Foundation, Save the Children, The Hunger Programme and World Vision. With funding from MoFA (Civil Society Strengthening – Power of Voices), Righ2Grow collaborates with communities, community-based organisations, and CSOs in Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali, South Sudan, and Uganda from 2021-2025. In each of the programme countries in addition to the global partners, local strategic implementing CSOs are playing a crucial role in the implementation, finding appropriate solutions to local contexts and ensuring programme sustainability.

Right2Grow believes that to ensure all Children Under Five years (CU5) are well nourished, changes in mindset and behaviour are required at all levels - from the household up to the state. To bridge the gaps between promising national policies and realities, mutual efforts of all nutrition and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) stakeholders are needed. Stakeholders should speak a shared language, and work in mutually reinforcing and interconnected ways, building and sharing evidence, knowledge, and expertise -so that all relevant decision-makers can jointly and effectively address undernutrition in a multisectoral, gender sensitive and inclusive way (medium-term impact), while applying people-centred and community-led approaches. Success in this domain is expected to pave the way to open up the civic space, a critical precondition for the success of the SDGs - so that every child will be able to achieve its potential (ultimate goal). As such, Right2Grow created four Pathways for change: community mobilisation, strengthening CSOs, engaging public authorities, and mobilised international development actors. These informed the following four expected outcomes to be achieved over the programme period through key interventions implemented at country level with support from global partners:

1. Communities demand and invest in basic social services and adopt good nutrition and WASH practices, jointly addressing barriers with private sector partners
2. Representative and empowered CSOs effectively navigate the civic space to advocate for leadership and good governance to prevent undernutrition
3. National government and decentralised entities adopt and mainstream an integrated, multisectoral approach to undernutrition in policies, action plans and budget allocations
4. Donors and international development actors coordinate and collaborate along the humanitarian-development nexus to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition

1.2 Partnership arrangement

Right2Grow developed a shared vision for its partnership organisation with a strong emphasis on meaningful participation of all concerned stakeholders and on local ownership. Equal participation and joint ownership of the consortium are important principles in the collaboration of Right2Grow. Therefore, each of the consortium members with country-level presence took on the role of "lead" partner in at least one programme country. In addition, each partner also took the "lead" in at least one of the global support roles like lobby & advocacy (L&A) or linking & learning (L&L). As CEGAA has no on-the-ground presence in the programme countries, it does not lead any of the programme country consortium teams, but they have the global lead role in strengthening capacities and learning on budget monitoring and expenditure tracking (BMET).

Table 1.1: Country participation and lead roles of consortium partners at the time of the MTR

Programme Country	ACF	CEGAA	Max Foundation	Save the Children	The Hunger Project	World Vision
Bangladesh	Partner	Partner	Lead	Partner	Partner	Partner
Burkina Faso	Partner	Partner		Lead	Partner	
Ethiopia	Partner	Partner	Partner		Partner	Lead
Mali	Lead	Partner				Partner
South Sudan	Partner	Partner		Lead		Partner
Uganda	Partner	Partner			Lead	Partner

Global Roles	ACF	CEGAA	Max Foundation	Save the Children	The Hunger Project	World Vision
Advocacy and communication	Support		Dutch L&A lead	Global L&A lead	Communication Lead	Support
M&E, learning	L&L Lead					M&E Lead
Capacity development	Global lead	BMET lead		Support		
Coordination		Support			Lead	

At global level the tasks have been divided according to organisational strengths, following a process of consent decision making. All global roles were defined at the start, and could be, and have been adapted as the programme progressed, following the principles of adaptive management.

For governance purposes, Right2Grow operates in six programme countries, each with its own **Country Steering Committee** (CSC), to steer all national planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring, reporting, and learning. To ensure continuity, each CSC is chaired by one consortium partner, the 'country lead' - which receives support from its global counterpart in its own organisation. At the global level, the Right2Grow **Global Coordination Committee** (GCC) includes representatives of all six consortium partners, and one representative from each CSC. They jointly undertake overall coordination and oversight and provide guiding principles to CSCs. While the GCC leads in accountability to the Dutch MFA, the CSCs and (in)formal community groups lead on content.

1.3 Objectives of the Mid-Term Review

The main objectives of the mid-term review were to:

1. Enable the Rigt2Grow partnership to **learn** about its successes and areas for improvement at country and global levels (including partnership governance);
2. Inform possible **adjustment** of Theory of Change and **planning** for 2024-2025, including the adjustment of targets and indicator framework;
3. Inform **strategic decisions** for increased impact and added value in 2024-2025 and beyond;
4. Meet the **accountability** requirements of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The mid-term review was designed to answer two overall guiding questions:

1. *To date, during the first half period of the programme, what has Right2Grow programme achieved in relation to its objectives?*
2. *In the remaining life of the Right2Grow programme, what changes should be made to the programme design and implementation – to maximize the programme's expected outcomes by end 2025?*

The mid-term review looked at programme implementation at both country and global (advocacy) level, as well as at collaboration (partnership structure, processes, cost assessment, governance, power balance) at country and global levels as well as the interlinkage between those levels.

Joint learning was a key objective of the MTR. It was expected that the MTR would provide input for internal reflection and stimulate adaptive planning for the remaining time of the programme, which was also very much the case. Through participatory reflection, validation, dissemination and linking and learning meetings, the mid-term review has contributed to fruitful discussions and decision making on how to strengthen the work, reassess ways of working and exchange, inform planning, improve programming and stimulate innovation. Key findings and recommendations from the MTR have already been extensively discussed during country MTR workshops, the MTR global workshop and will be discussed in more depth during the Right2GRow Learning Week in November 2023 to ensure proper uptake in strategic reflections and ways forward.

2. Methodology
2.1 Methodology and Approach

For effective coordination and quality assurance at country and global level, Right2Grow established a MTR Taskforce at global level with representation from country and global partners as well as thematic teams. Country level MTR Taskforces were also established to facilitate smooth MTR processes at country level. A standard Terms of Reference was developed to standardize country and global MTR processes, which was adapted for each country's and the global context. Both country and global level processes took place concurrently though independently, starting with recruitment of external consultants and inception meetings that informed development of inception reports with detailed MTR plans.

The MTR consultancy teams utilised a **combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment methodologies** to develop a suitable approach that aligned with the study objectives and encompassed all programme areas. The methodology and relevant tools were adjusted in consultation with the MTR Taskforce and were finalised prior to data-collection.

Based on data collection plan, the **following approaches were employed across the countries:**

- **Review of key documentation**: The evaluation teams conducted a thorough review of relevant documents related to the project, including the baseline study report result framework, Right2Grow country proposal, Right2Grow baseline report, programme indicator framework, and periodical annual/monitoring reports as well as relevant policy documents with respect to nutrition and WASH.
- **Household interviews**: Most countries employed this in order to assess individual perception and views on the extent to which the programme has made contributions at individual level and this was based on sampling with respondents distributed across implementation areas.
- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**: Focus group discussions were conducted in the implementation areas across programme countries and respondents were drawn from community stakeholders.
- **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** Key Informant Interviews were conducted using broad-based questions to allow the interviewees to give as much detail as possible without being prompted. Key informants were drawn from government representatives at national and local levels, Consortium partners, Implementing partners and other key stakeholders.
- **Outcome harvesting workshops**: Some countries conducted outcome harvesting workshops to provide opportunity to not only validate outcome statements but conduct outcome mapping in order to review the country Theory of Change (TOC).

For the global component, major research elements were: a) Desk research reviewing partnership documents, the ToC, in-country evaluations and other relevant information about the partnership, global L&A and finances; b) a meeting with all country MTR consultants; c) an online survey; d) observations during meetings; e) facilitation of a meeting on governance attended by Global Coordination Committee members and f) finally Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with global partner teams.

As part of MTR process**, an internal capacity assessment and Linking and Learning survey** was conducted, led by Mutual Capacity Development (MCD) and Linking and Learning (L&L) teams respectively. The capacity assessment was designed to assess status of CSOs capacity at mid-term

in relation to L&A and advocacy with respect to donor indicator 5 "Number of CSOs with increased Lobby and Advocacy capacities" . It also aimed to assess overall capacity to inform planning for 2024 and 2025. Linking and Learning surveys was aimed at assessing the status of consortium learning agenda and key topics for learning week and priorities for learning in 2024/2025.

Quantitative data was analysed and reported on through tables. **Qualitative data** collected through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) was audio recorded and transcribed to produce transcripts. The transcripts were well labelled and data was cleaned to remove any errors. Each MTR consultancy team produced a MTR report, leading to six country MTR reports and one global MTR report. MTR report validation and reflection workshops were held in each programme country and a debrief for the global MTR component was done virtually.

Thereafter, a face-to-face **global reflection workshop** with both global and country partnership representatives was organized to discuss and validate country and global MTR reports. During these workshops we discussed and decided upon what changes were necessary in the ToC, programming for 2024 and 2025 and in the way we are organised and work together in this partnership.

Finally, the seven independent MTR reports have been consolidated into the **overall Right2Grow MTR report** we present here. Thus, this report is based on an intensive participatory validation process by the Right2Grow partnership.

2.2 Challenges, bias and limitations

Some challenges have occurred with regards to **(timely) data collection**. Right2Grow country teams and the MTR consultants put mitigation measures in place to limit significant effect on the MTR process. In Ethiopia and Mali for example, the insecurity situation affected data collection as some of the areas could not be visited. Telephone interviews with key informants were conducted instead. In other countries, the rainy season affected the available time for data collection. In Bangladesh, three MTR members fell ill resulting in delays in the work. Finally, unavailability of key respondents led to delays in some countries as the teams exercised flexibility to ensure key informants were engaged.

Data collection took place concurrently in the six Right2Grow programme countries and at global level, gathering both quantitative and qualitative data. To prevent missing or having unvalidated information , the consultants triangulated data by combining findings from different sources such as documentation, FGDs and KIIs. Workshops were held in each country and a debrief was organised for the global MTR bringing country and global teams together, to validate MTR findings and to provide input on the draft MTR reports.

For the global MTR component, **limited documentation on global L&A** was a challenge. Therefore and overview of global L&A activities and results was generated for assessment purposes. The status of leading documentation on partnership and collaboration, was not always clear to partners themselves as well as to the evaluators. A limitation of having **separate MTR processes at programme country levels and at global level** is that each of them only assess a part of the Right2Grow collaboration and advocacy efforts. By bringing this together in this consolidated report we are able to present a comprehensive assessment. In addition, the global MTR component provided a clear assessment on Right2Grow collaboration which allowed the consortium to learn about the setup, design, expectations, daily operations and (expected and perceived) results of the global partnership and how to strengthen our work and collaboration.

Right2Grow aimed to assess its **cost effectiveness** during the MTR. It was however not possible to do a costs/benefits analysis of the Right2Grow programme. As an alternative consultants assessed how partners define and experience cost-effectiveness in Right2Grow and what suggestions partners have to be more cost-effective in the future. In addition these assumptions were tested and relevant questions and patterns have been drawn from documentation and financial overviews in consultation with Right2Grow current and former Financial Lead.

3. Key findings

3.1 Context analysis, risk analysis and Theory of Change

3.1.1 Relevant changes in the country and programme context

Since Right2Grow inception, there have been changes in social, economic and political contexts across programme countries. These changes have affected programme delivery and country consortia have adapted accordingly.

In all countries, the economy is facing internal and external challenges causing **increase in prices** of essential commodities. This surge in prices is particularly detrimental to households with limited incomes, as it has diminished their purchasing power. It has also posed a threat to food security, leading to issues such as malnutrition and stunted growth. In our programme countries we also see competing priorities for **budget allocations** of governments 'scarce resources, or that budget allocations do not trickly down from national to local level, affecting relevant nutrition and WASH services at local level.

Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Mali and South Sudan have experienced **political instability and armed conflicts** over the first half of the programme. The political instability and security issues shifted the attention of government officials to managing political and security issues away from actively engaging in supporting development programmes. Increased displacement of people and humanitarian needs as a result of the political instability, conflicts and natural disasters also shifted attention of key government actors and partners towards humanitarian and service delivery interventions, with little focus to advocacy efforts on development issues. The insecurity situation in these countries also significantly impacted access to humanitarian aid. Also for Right2Grow, access to intervention zones has sometimes been restricted, limiting actions to the main towns.

> *"…Right2Grow is an advocacy project. The project had an ambitious plan to support implementation of government Nutrition and WASH policies and strategies. However, the security situation, displacement and conflict in the last two years forced the key partners including government decision makers to focus on humanitarian interventions instead of development activities. Due to the government reform and security issues, most of the key decision makers in the government sector offices changed frequently and this affected the intensity of advocacy initiatives of the project. Attention of decision makers has been occupied with other political and security issues…" (KII, Ethiopia Consortium partner)*

Climate change has also impacted Right2Grow implementation. Following five consecutive seasons of below-average rainfall, the Horn of Africa and the Sahel regions are facing longest drought in four decades. Compounded by years of conflict and instability, the impact of climate change and COVID-19 as well as the rising food prices due to the war in Ukraine, millions in the programme countries face **acute hunger**. Ethiopia and South Sudan have been particularly badly affected with millions of children in the region in need of treatment for acute malnutrition and greater proportion experiencing life-threatening malnutrition[2]. At the time of the review, famine had not been officially declared in the programme countries. However, with projections of a sixth consecutive below-average rainy season, the Famine Early Warning Systems Network has estimated that some of the target countries will face a famine in 2023.

---

[2] https://fews.net/east-africa/key-message-update/november-2022

Finally, **shrinking civil space** remains a challenge in programme countries, in particular in anticipation for national elections. For instance in Bangladesh as the national parliamentary election approaches end of 2023, beginning of 2024, there has been a continuous shrinkage of the overall civic space. This is due to the imposition of new policies, such as the digital security act, and increased control by local administration and law enforcement agencies. The shrinking civic space has created a reluctance for CSOs to speak up and hold the local government accountable, as they perceive a risk to their organizations.

3.1.2 Risk analysis

Based on reflections and the above analyses from programme countries, the review indicates main potential risks related to: high inflation and exchange rate, food crises, political instability and armed conflict and shrinking CSO space. The table below outlines these and provide implications on the programmes and proposed mitigation measures.

Risk	Implications	Mitigating measures
High inflation and exchange rate losses	Increased costs for human resources and implementation of activities within Right2Grow budgets	Need for adaptive management in country level budgets
Natural disasters, climate change, other climate-related obstacles	Negative effects on household Food and Nutrition Security status across programme countries	Interventions related to promoting food security and nutrition also target the reduction of climate change impacts
Political instability and insecurity, including armed conflicts	Reduction in government spending on social sectors such as WASH and nutrition	Continued strategic discussion on the humanitarian-development-peace integration agenda in debates and other engagements
Shrinking or contested civic space to support successful advocacy efforts	Increased organisational and personal risks for CSOs and their staff to speak up and hold the local government accountable	Utilise existing spaces at local and national level to push for relevant Right2Grow related policy changes, using Bridge4Voices approach

3.1.3 Implications on Global Theory of Change

The MTR was meant to inform any changes or adjustments in the Global Theory of Change through assessment of country contexts and programme implementation across the four pathways. The review indicates that communities in programme areas have shown increased awareness and engagement in matters related to better nutrition, WASH, and mother/childcare. However, private sector engagement is still a challenge across programme countries. Capacity building of consortium partners is on track across all programme countries, and this has enabled engagements with governments at local and national level towards nutrition and WASH policy improvement and/or development even though tangible results are yet to be realised in most countries. Finally, achieving Outcome 4 still appears to be quite ambitious given the timeframe of the programme and the reduction in development aid due to the Ukraine invasion, the global economic crisis as well as a shift towards humanitarian and emergency responses.

"As a consortium, we have not been able to penetrate through the private sector and engage them successfully, and we should start thinking in the remaining two and a half years by first reflecting and asking ourselves questions as the consortium on how best to engage and bring the private sector on board to play a greater role in the Right2Grow programme".
Uganda Consortium

Countries reflections on MTR findings indicated the need for minor adjustments on the Theory of Change while still focusing on the original four pathways.

In Burkina Faso, the implementation of the Right2Grow programme has shown that pathways can be adopted based on the country context to achieve the desired results. As one member of the consortium put it:

"Working with parliamentarians became necessary because of the security situation. RESONUT works a lot with the network of parliamentarians for nutrition and facilitated Right2Grow's advocacy for the setting up of REPASEN (Réseau des Parlementaires pour la Sécurité Nutritionnelle) after the coups d'état and the suspension of MPs' mandates. REPASEN is currently being strengthened by Right2Grow on the importance of nutrition".

In Ethiopia, modifications on outputs, indicators and actors targeted under pathway four may be required based on the MTR findings, and the ongoing changes in context of the country since the start of project implementation. One update made on the ToC following the baseline results in February 2022 was in relation to the fourth pathway, where a new output was added to the existing outputs under this outcome, in to the humanitarian-development nexus. The consortium partners perceive that the decision made at the time to add this new output was too ambitious and lacked adequate analysis and understanding of the country context and operation of donor financing modalities. As such, there's need to review. The MTR also indicated that the consortium partnership has not been able to make any major progress with implementation of planned interventions and materializing the humanitarian-development nexus advocacy topic in the past two years due to various challenges, including capacity constraints, global nature of the humanitarian-development nexus advocacy agenda and lack of entry points for advocacy on this matter at national level.

In Mali, the review suggests the need for inclusion of land management under pathway 1 as this can influence the availability and quality of water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses. Furthermore, unsustainable agricultural practices, such as deforestation and soil erosion can have an impact on groundwater recharge and the availability of freshwater, which can affect the nutrition and health of the people who depend on it.

In South Sudan, a key takeaway from the development and implementation of 'Bridge4Voices' L&A approach was that an assumption was made that citizens knew their rights on nutrition and WASH. As country teams indicated this is often not the case, adaptations were made to the ToC to include more activities focusing on training and promotion of knowledge around rights.

As to whether the ToC is still relevant or not, there's general consensus across programme countries that the **Theory of Change is still relevant with minor suggested adaptations**. At outcome level, outcomes 1, 2 and 3 have been significantly relevant, and a lot has been achieved, with the building blocks across the ToC really fitting within the programme intervention areas. The contextual and operational elements mentioned above show that the ToC remains valid and therefore consistent with the need for change in order to achieve results. Indeed, the various activities described in the

ToC are consistent with each other and respond to the current context of community members and stakeholders across programme countries. As such the Right2Grow Global ToC will remain the same, with country level adaptations to ensure more strategic actions to achieve intended results over the remaining programme implementation period.

3.2 Achievements to date on the intermediate and outcome level

3.2.1 Main (intermediate) outcome results achieved at mid-term

3.2.1.1 Communities demand and invest in basic social services and adopt good nutrition and WASH practices, jointly addressing barriers with private sector partners
Interventions in this pathway are geared toward mobilising, engaging and facilitating communities, community-based organisations and local private sector to:

- Raise the awareness on doable actions at community level for better nutrition and WASH and how to put them in practice;
- Strengthen community organisation and community voice for action; and
- Increase access to affordable nutrition and WASH products and services in the community.

Broad interventions were designed by the partnership, and countries contextualised these in order to contribute to this outcome at country level. The broad interventions include:

1. Assessing food, nutrition security and WASH situation in intervention areas, including context specific gender analysis
2. Needs assessments and mapping of communities and community-based organisation
3. Community sensitisation and awareness raising about good nutrition and WASH practices, and social accountability, by using gender sensitive and transformative approaches
4. Capacity strengthening of local communities/CBOs to addresses barriers to good WASH and nutrition practices;
5. Sensitising and partnering with private sector on social marketing approaches and women entrepreneurship
6. Strengthening or creating local level platforms for participation of communities in decision making processes and voicing the concerns of the most vulnerable, including women

The programme has made major contributions towards this outcome as demonstrated from country reviews.

In Bangladesh, the MTR highlights the positive impact of Right2Grow in increasing awareness about WASH and nutrition, empowering parents to take action and improving the overall health and well-being of children under five. Right2Grow is currently providing consistent support to the community, but there is a concern that this support may create dependence in the long run. To address this it is important to involve multiple stakeholders and sectors. The local private sector (e.g. health promotion agents and local entrepreneurs) also requires continuous financial and technical support. It is necessary to establish a connection with national level companies to access WASH and nutrition-related products at discounted rates. By obtaining these products at a lower competitive price, the local businesses can maximize their profits and improve their sustainability.

In Burkina Faso, analysis of the results of Outcome 1 shows that the programme has performed well in terms of effectiveness. Although the target value was not set for some indicators, the MTR shows that several indicators have been fully met or exceeded their targets (five indicators with a defined

target) at mid-term. Of the eleven (11) indicators analysed in this category, only one (number of people trained in women's empowerment (access to credit, women's resilience, etc.) has a very low achievement rate (6%) and requires a great deal of attention in terms of effort. Otherwise, 10 out of 11 indicators are on a good performance trend, demonstrating the programme's effectiveness on Outcome 1.

In Ethiopia, the programme adopted a local level advocacy and social accountability approach by working with *Citizen Voices and Action* (CVA) taskforces to support community awareness, sensitization and familiarization sessions and dialogues carried out amongst the different target groups. Capacity strengthening efforts contributed to improved awareness on community rights and entitlements regarding nutrition and WASH services and enhanced community capacity and empowerment to demand such services.

"…We raised community awareness and empowered community members to engage in dialogues with the service provider institutions. We are able to create a demanding community. Awareness of the community to demand the service standards of government institutions has grown significantly since the project started operation…" (KII, Muhur Aklil Woreda, SNNPR)

Furthermore, capacity strengthening support to *woreda* administration officials and engagement of CVA taskforces contributed to enhanced capacity and commitment of *woreda* administration offices to allocate budget for nutrition and WASH interventions and improved monitoring of appropriate budget utilization and accountability at local level.

"…Ensuring accountability on budget utilization at kebele level is a key achievement of the project. The CVA taskforces are responsible for ensuring proper utilization of budget allocated for nutrition and WASH activities. For example, we follow up the budget utilization on the construction and maintenance of water points, toilets, etc. We have a responsibility to report to the community the budget utilized, and the construction works undertaken. Now the community has become demanding. They started to ask the where about of their money…" (CVA taskforce member, Muhur Aklil Woreda, SNNPR)

The Right2Grow programme has contributed to improved capacity and contribution of private sector actors to invest in production and provision of basic nutrition and WASH services. Review of annual performance reports of the programme indicated that since inception, more than 42 private sector enterprises were able to increase their production of nutrition products (poultry, egg, vegetables, fruit, dairy products, etc.) as well as WASH products and services (soap, satopa, slab and sanitary products). This has contributed to improved access to WASH and nutrition services and addressing existing barriers to nutrition and WASH services. Improved private sector engagement in multisectoral nutrition coordination meetings also created opportunities to influence government sector offices to provide required inputs and support to private sector actors.

"…Before the Right2Grow project, no private sector was participating in nutrition intervention activities. But, as a result of this project, currently private sectors are contributing a lot through supplying fish, chicken and meat products for nutrition purposes. Some private sectors are also supplying slabs for toilet hole cover…(WHO, Habro woreda, Oromia)

In Mali, the review revealed that the consortium initiated advocacy actions at national, local and municipal level to encourage community participation in municipal budget sessions. As a result, the Comité de Veille Citoyenne (Citizens' Watch Committee, CVCs) advocated on the payment of taxes for local development, which led to WASH issues being taken into account in basic schools (Ségala,

Kayes cercle) and nutrition (Marintoumania, Gounfan) through support for the Groups de Soutien des Activités de Nutrition (GSANs, community based nutrition groups) and the cereal bank respectively.

In **South Sudan**, the training and advocacy work conducted by Right2Grow has played a significant role in building the capacity of Water User Committee (WUC) members. These activities have led WUCs to take ownership within their own communities as demonstrated through the construction of water points, boreholes and flood resistant water platforms, and the maintenance of these amenities. Whilst the direct impact of Right2Grow in some of these achievements is less clear, the capacity building efforts with WUCs have led to an increased awareness and willingness to take ownership of issues surrounding WASH in their local communities.

In Uganda, the Right2Grow- affiliated CSO/CBO forum, through advocacy efforts with their District Nutrition Coordination Committee (DNCC) demanded that demonstration gardens are established in all primary schools. This was done through submission of their action papers to the DNCC, after consultations with stakeholders at parish and sub-county levels. They were then presented to the district council, which passed a resolution in April 2022 requiring all primary schools in the district to have demonstration gardens for learning purposes. A circular was followed that was sent to all head teachers in the district.

Figure 1: Community investments in WASH activities in Kyangwali Sub-County in Uganda

Table 3.1 Provides summary of performance across key indicators through contributions across programme countries. Country disaggregated data can be found in Annex 4 of the report.

Table 3.1: Programme achievements across key indicators under outcome 1

Code	Indicator	Baseline value (2021)	Target (2023)*	Target (2025)*	MTR Actual (mid-2023)
R2G.OC.1.1	# of actions in which communities formulate demands for improved (WASH and nutrition) services	0	284 (Eth: 91 Mali: 168 Ug: 25)	920 (BF: 30 Mali: 840 Ug: 50)	348 (BD: 65; BF: 38; ETH: 89; MAL: 127; UG: 29)
R2G.OC.1.3	# of barriers to good nutrition and WASH services successfully addressed by joint community, government and/or private sector initiatives	0	97 (Eth: 67 Ug: 30)	Ug: 60	114 (BD: 25; ETH: 46; MAL: 7; UG: 36)
R2G.OP.1.1 (SCS 6)	Number of CSOs involved in R2G	0	45	45	45 (BND: 7; BF: 6; ETH: 7; MAL: 8; SSD: 8; UG: 9)

* Not all countries set targets for 2023 and/or 2025 for the indicators presented in the table. However, the MTR did assess progress towards these indicators in each country, the achievements mid-2023 are presented in the column labelled MTR actual.

Review of progress on key outcome indicators with regard to number of actions in which communities demand for nutrition and WASH services indicate that **in Bangladesh**, 65 actions were organised to formulate demands for improved WASH and Nutrition services. Further analysis indicate that 40% of target communities have observed positive changes in nutrition services due to community demands or actions (e. g mobilised private sector to sell products at door step, increase *Union Parishad* budget, reconstruction of community clinics, disclosure of list of *Union Parishad* standing committees, etc). At the same time, 46% of beneficiaries have observed some positive changes due to community demands or actions in WASH services.

In Burkina Faso, the 38 actions carried out include the organisation of radio broadcasts, community dialogues between the community and the authorities, and participation in regional and provincial consultation frameworks with the various players involved in nutrition, WASH and food security to discuss the challenges in these sectors and propose solutions (lobbying and advocacy workshops) to meet them.

Some of the 29 actions carried out **in Uganda** were community dialogues to influence community investment in food and nutrition security for better nutrition and resilience. As a result, 3,480 acres of land were donated by community landlords to boost the production of nutritious food at the household level.

With regard to barriers to good nutrition and WASH services that were successfully addressed by joint community, government and/or private sector initiatives, it was reported that the most common barrier reported **in Bangladesh** is the lack of availability or affordability of nutritious food affecting 44% of the beneficiaries and so far this has significantly been addressed**.**

In Mali, 7 out of 37 barriers identified at baseline have been successfully tackled. The review process involved validation of outcome statements to assess evidence generated to demonstrate contribution country consortia towards this outcome during the implementation period. Some of the validated outcome statements are presented in Annex 2.

3.2.1.2 Representative and empowered CSOs effectively navigate the civic space to advocate for leadership and good governance to prevent undernutrition

Main actions under this outcome focused on two aspects: a) Increasing the legitimacy and capacity of CSOs to voice the concerns of marginalised and disempowered members; and b) Strengthening CSO capacity in engaging with local and national governments in their programming and financing of nutrition and WASH services.

As such, key interventions include:
1. Stakeholder mapping and capacity needs assessments of CSOs, including gender analysis;
2. Grassroot community mobilisation around the issues of poor access and quality of WASH and Nutrition services;
3. Capacity strengthening and technical support provision, particularly on BMET;
4. Advocacy and communication, gender and inclusion, policy analysis, governance and collaboration, research and data collection;
5. Evidence generation for advocacy, policy making and scaling up of successful approaches, and community led monitoring;
6. Facilitating dialogues between stakeholders, bringing the voice of communities, women and vulnerable groups to decision making processes and strengthening government accountability on nutrition and WASH.

As a result of Right2Grow capacity building initiatives, CSOs have been able to engage at local and national levels.

In Bangladesh, CSOs from the Right2Grow programme actively participated in budget planning and serve as members of the standing committee responsible for budget monitoring and expenditure tracking. Union CSO platforms and Upazila CSO platforms play a crucial role in mobilizing the community and advocating with service providers to improve WASH and nutrition status in all Upazilas. Right2Grow supports capacity strengthening for effective lobbying and advocacy by CSOs, facilitates CSO forums and network formation, and nurtures these networks to enable constructive dialogues with Union Parishads. CSO representatives are empowered to participate in *Ward Shavas*, standing committee meetings, UDCC meetings, and open budget meetings to ensure that their voices are heard and their perspectives are considered in decision-making processes. CSO forums work in coordination with *Union Parishads* and school authorities to establish public hygiene corners in public places and schools, promoting behavioural change in students and the general public, and increasing handwashing practices.

Figure 2: Bridge4Voices Advocacy Framework and Guideline Dissemination Workshop in Bangladesh

In Ethiopia, Right2Grow successfully carried out advocacy initiatives and influenced decision makers to take key policy actions. These include budget allocations for nutrition activities, and joint planning and reporting on nutrition activities at *woreda* levels. Right2Grow carried out a social accountability initiative in its operational areas and engaged in various decision-making processes and influenced nutrition policy implementation, budget allocation, and put nutrition and WASH issues on the policy agenda. At *woreda* level, Right2Grow has participated in Woreda Nutrition Coordination and Technical Committee meetings and influenced budget allocation discussions. At regional level, Right2Grow voiced its concern on the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) Strategy implementation in Amhara, Oromia, and SNNP Regional States. At national level, Right2Grow established a strategic partnership with ECSC-SUN, Ethiopia Nutrition leadership Networks (ENLN), and Seqota declaration programme delivery unit.

"…We received nutrition leadership trainings, Citizens Voice and Action (CVA) trainings, and Budget Monitoring and Expenditure Tracking (BMET) trainings. All these trainings enabled us to lead the project with the leadership knowledge and skill required. …" (KII, Local partner, SNNP - Ethiopia)

In Mali, the MTR indicates that, the workshops provided an opportunity for CVC members to engage in advocacy, which in turn facilitated the invitation of CVCs to participate in the preparation of the 2023 annual budgets of the communities and in the sessions for the restitution of the administrative accounts. Furthermore, the CVCs are invited by the local authorities to take part in the budgetary process (drawing up the primary budget) and also in the sessions for presenting the administrative accounts of the municipalities.

As a result of positive interactions with parliamentarians **in South Sudan**, consortium members were invited to attend the third national budget reading. As well as being cited as a significant

achievement in secondary sources, this was also highlighted by the consulted stakeholders. One consortium staff member stated that the fact that the CSOs were invited to the budget reading shows that they are effective enablers of change[3]. Such interactions with budget specialised committee parliamentarians and being invited to attend the third national budget meeting highlight the fact that interactions with government stakeholders are being well received and that Right2Grow partners and linked CSOs are respected by government actors, which is a positive indication of the potential influence Right2Grow partnership and its related advocacy and government engagement may have. However, whilst this is undoubtedly positive, as of yet evidence has not been presented to indicate that their presence has resulted in changes to budget allocations for WASH and nutrition.

In Uganda, CSOs/CBOs under the Right2Grow programme had conducted consultative meetings with at least one of two sub-counties per district involving farmer groups, water and sanitation committees, institutions such as health centres, schools, religious institutions to assess WASH and nutrition status. Through the consultative meetings, knowledge gaps on WASH, good nutrition, and community involvement in planning, budgeting, and monitoring were identified. Later, local government officials were engaged in refining the recommendations from the meetings and presented them to the district as position papers. This validates the information provided in the Right2Grow annual reports that Movement for Community Led Development – Uganda Chapter (MCLDU) conducted three peer learning sessions for CSO capacity strengthening in enhancing community participation to achieve desirable and sustainable change[4].

The achievements recorded across programme countries are linked to performance on the indicators as outlined in Table 3.2 showing significant contributions against mid-term targets with country disaggregated data also presented in Annex 4.

Table 3.2: Programme performance across outcome indicators

Code	Indicator	Baseline value (2021)	Target (2023)*	Target (2025)*	MTR Actuals (mid-2023)
R2G.OC.2.1 Donor indicator SCS 3	# of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage national level	0	N/A	860 (SCS031: 159; SCS032: 701)	281 (BND: 60; BF: 64; ETH: 51; MAL:23; SSD: 2; UG: 81)
R2G.OC.2.2 Donor indicator SCS 4	# of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/ constituency	0	N/A	855 (SCS041: 302; SCS042: 553	190 (BND: 39; BF: 27; ETH: 3; SSD: 4; UG: 117)
R2G.IO.D.1 (SCS 5)	Number of CSOs with increased L&A capacities	0	45	45	45 (BND: 7; BF: 6; ETH: 7; MAL: 8; SSD: 8; UG: 9)

* Not all countries set targets for 2023 and/or 2025 for the indicators presented in the table. However, the MTR did assess progress towards these indicators in each country, the achievements mid-2023 are presented in the column labelled MTR actual.

---

[3] KII B4

[4] The three sessions were: 1) Community Resource Mobilisation, 2) Strategic Planning, and 3) Participatory Community-Led Development.

The review of progress showed Right2Grow has made efforts in creating spaces for CSO demands, positions and/or creating space to engage at national and international level. For instance in **Bangladesh**, 60 spaces were created for CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate, and national level engagement. In **Burkina Faso**, 64 out of the overall target of 500 spaces were created while in **Ethiopia** the consortium was able to create 51 spaces. Progress to data indicate that 23 and 39 spaces were created by **Mali** and **Uganda** consortia respectively. Additionally in **South Sudan**, two spaces were created. The key one was attendance of Right2Grow consortium members to the third national budget reading in 2022 as a result of consortium engagement with the budget specialized committee of parliament.

In terms of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, **Bangladesh** consortium carried out 39 initiatives with the MTR indicating that 26% of beneficiaries believe that CSOs play a crucial role in advocating for community demands and positions at the national level. In **Burkina Faso**, 27 initiatives were carried out and in **Ethiopia** the consortium carried out 3 initiatives. Progress data further indicate that 48 spaces were created at national level by **Uganda** consortium. In **South Sudan**, the consortium members have been able to support four non-consortium member CSOs to develop and deliver advocacy initiatives through the following events: World Breast Feeding Week, 16 Days of Activism, and a hybrid Regional Youth Convention in Juba, in 2022. During the review period a number of CSOs (AIRD, MTA, NPA, CAO UNIDOR and Women League) participated in key calendar events where they sensitized various community members on WASH and nutrition.

Capacity assessment conducted internally and led by Right2Grow MCD team as part of the MTR indicates that compared to the baseline in 2021, there has been an increase in technical knowledge and skills needed to conduct effective L&A initiatives, including to engage with key stakeholders for 1st and 2nd tier partners. These consist of 45 CSOs across the 6 programme countries. Comparing results from baseline (2021) and MTR (2023), all Right2Grow consortium partners feel more equipped and have gained/strengthened capacities to engage in advocacy initiatives and undertake effective advocacy efforts. The results show a clear positive trend regarding averaging scores on technical L&A knowledge and skills within organisations, including capacity to engage with key stakeholders. Fewer organisations reported having high training needs in this area and more organisations indicated they feel capacitated and empowered to be expertise providers, especially related to the ToC outcomes on 1) communities demanding and investing in basic services, as well as 2) empowered and capacitated CSOs effectively navigating civic space. An increase in L&A capacities between baseline and MTR has been found. However, the MTR shows an increase in support to CSOs is needed for ToC outcome 4 on coordination of donors and international actors along the humanitarian-development nexus about undernutrition, compared to the baseline. In summary, the results suggest that capacity strengthening efforts implemented by Right2Grow since the beginning of the programme have successfully addressed some of the initial gaps, leading to changes in the overall landscape of needs.

Besides assessing the L&A capacities, Right2Grow partners also self-assessed their organisational capacities. The assessment shows that little progress has been made since baseline. Organisations point out the following gaps for their organisational capacity: the lack of performance measures for impact, lack of effective communication and/or advocacy strategy to accelerate progress towards the achievement of organizations' objectives, insufficient staff levels, facilities and equipment compared to the workload and needs of different advocacy projects they are involved in. The majority of organizations disagree that they have sufficient capabilities to successfully engage in resource mobilization activities aimed at securing new and additional financial, human, and material resources to advance their mission. If the L&A knowledge and skills are to be practiced in day-to-

day work and if the positive trend is to be sustained beyond Right2Grow, additional efforts are needed to strengthen organizational capacities of local CSOs. Detailed results per country can be found in the MCD MTR report (Annex 5). In addition to direct capacity strengthening efforts of Right2Grow programme partners, various activities have been undertaken to strengthen L&A capacities of 3rd tier organisations as well, and these have been captured in the country MTR reports.

3.2.1.3 National government and decentralised entities adopt and mainstream an integrated, multisectoral approach to undernutrition in policies, action plans and budget allocations

In this pathway, communities, their organisations and CSOs gather data and experiences on the quality and inclusiveness of nutrition and WASH service delivery. Field research generates evidence about the importance of an integrated, multisectoral approaches to combating undernutrition as well as local innovations. The data and evidence is shared by Right2Grow partners and CSOs with government and other stakeholders in order to inform possible development, improvements of blockage of relevant policies.

Planned key interventions included:
1. Ensuring uptake of data and evidence for policy and decision making at national and decentral level, while ensuring gender-sensitive policies, strategies and decision-making
2. Strengthening multi-sectoral collaboration and engagement of multiple stakeholders in decision making processes around WASH and nutrition
3. Strengthening or creating national or lower-level platforms for information and evidence sharing on nutrition and WASH as well as monitoring country progresses towards achieving WASH and nutrition related SDGs

Programme countries have made efforts in making some contributions towards this outcome albeit with different levels of achievements. In **Bangladesh**, it emerged that previously *Union Parishads* prepared their fiscal budgets confidentially, excluding community involvement and limiting their participation in the development process. However, through training, advocacy, and effective communication, *Union Parishad* bodies in Right2Grow intervention areas have become more aware of their roles and legal requirements. As a result, there was an average increase of 2.56% (2.49% for WASH, 2.72% for Nutrition) in local government budgets for WASH and nutrition services in FY 2022-2023 compared to the previous year across the 40 Union Parishads.

In **Ethiopia**, historically nutrition coordination and implementation has been considered a responsibility of the health sector only. The MTR indicated that Right2Grow advocacy efforts to influence policy implementation at regional and *Woreda* levels contributed to improved multisectoral ownership for nutrition. The baseline survey identified a major gap regarding joint planning, implementation and monitoring for nutrition across multisectoral actors in Right2Grow implementation *woredas*. Right2Grow has laid down a good foundation for comprehensive nutrition activities at woreda level through strengthening capacity of multisectoral actors and to ensure joint planning, reporting and evaluating performance accordingly, through which underperforming sectors are made accountable.

> *"Right2Grow helped our zone in establishing nutrition council at zonal level and in the six implementation woredas and assisted in establishing nutrition advisory committee in each of the three program intervention Kebeles of the six implementation woredas in Guraghe zone. Right2Grow is assisting the government in coordinating and networking with other NGOs, CSOs and private sectors to work together for improved nutrition and WASH activities in our zone…" (KII, Goraghe Zone Health Department, Ethiopia)*

The MTR indicates that in **Mali**, the consortium was involved in drawing up and finalising the 2021-2025 Multisectoral Nutrition Action Plan (MNAP). Right2Grow contributed to improvement of the content of the plan, which was adopted afterwards. During the review period, Right2Grow contributed significantly to the revision of the Mali constitution, which now includes the right to food and water in Articles 10 and 22.

In **South Sudan**, Right2Grow has undertaken a range of advocacy and influencing activities with the government, advocating for increased budgets for nutrition and WASH services in 2022-2023. As a result, the government committed to prioritising conducting a needs assessment - based on public participation - to inform the 2023-2024 national budget process, which, it is hoped, will help to ensure that WASH and nutrition needs are effectively represented[5]. However, government national budgeting processes and timelines reportedly remain unclear, which means there remains a high burden of expenditure for the delivery of improved nutrition and WASH services among NGOs; for example, the construction of boreholes in Unity and Jonglei States is noted to still fall primarily to NGOs[6]. It is also reflected that the national government often simply has insufficient funds to implement its plans, even where it is willing to do so.[7]

According to the MTR, there was clear evidence of allocation of budgets to nutrition issues at district and sub-county levels in **Uganda**[8]. Resolutions have been passed by councils to incorporate nutrition in the community services, health, and production departmental work plans following the engagement of Right2Grow partners with the district leadership and technical officers.

"In the past, nutrition was taken as a cross-cutting issue that obstructed it from getting the attention it deserved because there was a lack of understanding of its importance and what the situation was" (CAOs and DCDOs, Uganda).

At national level, Right2Grow Uganda provided technical support and assistance to Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) towards the review of the National Agriculture Extension Strategy 2022/26 resulting in the inclusion of nutrition and gender guidelines in the National Agriculture Extension Strategy 2022-2025, which was adopted by the Budget Committee.

Internal programme review indicate that while there have been engagements with government agencies at relevant levels across programme countries, level of achievements differ from one country to another with respect to the indicators as shown in Table 3.3.

---

[5] Right2Grow. Right2Grow: South Sudan Annual Report 2022
[6] Right2Grow. Right2Grow: South Sudan Annual Report 2022
[7] KII A8; KII B3
[8] In one of the examples, in Kabale district (Uganda) a council resolution was passed in April 2022, requiring all schools to have a demonstration garden targeting all pupils in primary schools across the district for learning purposes. A circular was written and sent to all head teachers in the district.

Table 3.3: Programme progress across outcome indicators

Code	Indicator	Baseline value (2021)	Target (2023)	Target (2025)	MTR Actual (mid-2023)
R2G.OC.3.1 Donor indicator SCS 1	Number of laws, policies that are better implemented for sustainable and inclusive development [SCS012: # of government policies for sustainable and inclusive development that are better implemented as a result of CSO engagement]	0	N/A	23	5 (MAL: 1; ETH: 4)
R2G.OC.3.2 Donor indicator SCS 2	Number of laws, policies blocked, adopted, improved for sustainable and inclusive development SCS022: # of governmental policies for sustainable and inclusive development as a result of CSO engagement	0	N/A	9	5 (SSD: 1; UG: 4)
R2G.OC.3.3	% of public budgets allocated and implemented for nutrition and WASH services (increased funding).	Bangladesh: 1.45%			Bangladesh: 2.56%

Review of progress data indicates that efforts by Right2Grow have contributed to policy changes in some countries, as mentioned above for Mali and Uganda. With regard to translating policy into budget allocation, this has been the case in Bangladesh: in the last fiscal year (2022-2023) average *Union Parishads* budget allocations for WASH and Nutrition were increased by 2.56%. In Ethiopia, Right2Grow Consortium is working on the implementation of three polices. These include the implementation of the Food and Nutrition Policy and Strategy (FNP/S) at the National level, and the efforts made at regional and *woreda* levels are also showing promising progress. The partnership is closely working with Seqota Declaration national programme in addition to advocating for the implementation of One WASH National Program.

3.2.1.4 Donors and international development actors coordinate and collaborate along the humanitarian-development nexus to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition

Fragile and protracted crisis contexts have impacted persistent stunting and wasting, with higher-than-average levels and a considerable proportion of the global burden of stunting across Right2Grow programme countries. Right2Grow therefore joins an ongoing push for greater coherence amongst humanitarian and development programmes in order to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition. This is driven by the recognition that longer-term development approaches addressing underlying undernutrition in combination with necessary lifesaving humanitarian interventions help to build resilience to future shocks and to minimise the impact of current crises.

As such key interventions include:
1. Scoping, mapping and pre-positioning of donors and development actors at national and international levels;
2. Advocating for adoption of multi-sectoral approaches to donors' strategies and funding instruments; promoting WASH Nutrition nexus;
3. Sharing of good practices, research findings based on community-led monitoring and action research, capitalising on existing national and international events such a "world days" (water, nutrition, food etc);
4. Lobbying for increased resource mobilization and adoption or scaling up of proven approaches;

5. Bringing local / community voices to international arena.

The MTR indicates that minimal contributions have been realised under this outcome but there is evidence that current efforts are likely to form the first positive steps:

At mid-term in Bangladesh, there is a coordination mechanism among the development partners and the **Bangladesh** government which is called 'Local Consultative Group (LCG)'. All development partners and all ministries and departments are engaged in this platform. The LCG has 14 working groups with respective ministries and departments, and one of them is 'health working group' under the leadership of Ministry of Health. the MTR recommends Right2Grow to further explore opportunities in engaging with this platform to convince development partners and government to mobilise additional funds for WASH and nutrition. The Embassy of Netherlands in Bangladesh could support the link with Right2Grow as the Embassy is an active member of LCG.

In **Ethiopia**, the consortium partnership has not been able to make a major progress with implementation of planned interventions and materializing the humanitarian-development nexus advocacy ask in the past two years due to various challenges faced. The MTR shows that due to the fact that most donors have internal policies, strategies and funding modalities that originate from the policy of the donor country, Right2Grow perceives their chance to influence these key actors at national level as limited. This means the level of engagement and advocacy for the humanitarian-development nexus agenda should be taken to the global Right2Grow level with support from country consortium partnerships.

"… Most of the donors in Ethiopia have internal policies and funding modalities that emanate from the policy of the donor country. Right2Grow has very little chance to influence these key actors at national level because it is not the national level donor offices that make decision on this or respond to requests from the national Right2Grow office to discuss the issue. Thus, the level of engagement should be global, thus the HDN agenda should be taken to the global Right2Grow level with support from country consortium partnership…" (KII, Ethiopia Consortium Partner)

The MTR indicated that the consortium has an opportunity to contribute to advancement of the humanitarian-development nexus agenda at national level in Ethiopia due to the growing attention that the Federal Ministry of Health is recently giving to operationalizing the Humanitarian Development Peace (HDP) Nexus. The ministry is currently working with partners to produce a national nutrition centric operational guideline and implementation roadmap for HDP Nexus. The MTR also identified the need for the global team to strengthen its technical support and investment in supporting the country consortium partnership to realize ToC outcome 4.

In **South Sudan**, Right2Grow has been involved in a number of platforms including: the Peer Review Committee responsible for reviewing the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) proposals; Nutrition and Food Security Clusters; and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) response. The purpose of these engagement was to collaborate on multi-sectoral approaches to address undernutrition. Several key informants indicated that work done under this outcome area was impactful: for example, one noted that a donor workshop had been held in Juba in which gaps in humanitarian and development funding were highlighted and donors were encouraged to make commitments, and a second noted that as a result of these engagements there is now more interest from donors to conduct multi-sectoral programming to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition. Right2Grow has also participated in various technical working

groups on matters such as community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM), maternal infant and young child nutrition, and the nutrition information system (NIS). However, there is generally very limited consensus or data from key informants on progress made against this outcome; the majority of participants either noted they have very little involvement with donors, or that they felt the Right2Grow efforts in this area were not meeting with much success given the challenging donor and international funding context in South Sudan.

In **Uganda,** the MTR established that high level inroads were made by Right2Grow through engagements of international stakeholders. For instance, during the World Water Week at Stockholm Water Institute, at the sector ministers' meeting in Jakarta, issues of WASH-nutrition were prioritised by stakeholders, including donors.

Despite the MTR shows minimal contributions towards outcome 4, there's general consensus withing Right2Grow country teams that it's still relevant. What is required, is a more strategic and focused approach at global/regional level based on respective countries' contexts and asks.
Table 3.4 provides programme performance across key outcome indicators.

Table 3.4: Programme performance across outcome indicators

Code	Indicator	Baseline value (2021)	Target (2023)	Target (2025)	Actual (2023)	Qualitative
R2G.OC.4.1	Level of success of L&A roles byRight2Grow and its partner towards donors and international actors	Low (0)	Medium	High	Low	Cross country review shows no major progress
R2G.OC.4.2	Degree of integration of the WASH-Nutrition nexus by donors along the humanitarian-development nexus to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition	Low (0)	Medium	High	Low	Cross country review shows no major progress

As already mentioned, actions across programme countries have not made major changes on this outcome. However, the MTR indicates that there are potential gains expected in the second half considering what has been done so far and that these changes usually require time. The MTR also showed Right2Grow has been successful in bringing grassroots voice at the national level and country level voice to the international level and to create momentum for policy dialogues on WASH and Nutrition.

3.2.2 Achievements on Lobby and Advocacy at Dutch and Global levels
Right2Grow global advocacy efforts as described in the Right2Grow proposal emphasizes community-led, evidence-based, and inclusive approaches, engaging multiple stakeholders to achieve sustainable improvements in WASH and nutrition policies and budgets. Right2Grow aims to stimulate community led, evidence-based political dialogues (at community, country, regional and global levels) and to mobilize resources to effectively scale up successful approaches for ending undernutrition and improving WASH services:*"Right2Grow seeks to become a catalyst for progress beyond its funding period, by involving various key actors who share its goals."*

Right2Grow has been advocating at three distinct but overlapping advocacy arenas: country-level, global level, and the Dutch level.

1. **Country Level Advocacy**: At country level, each programme country extensively addresses their advocacy roles and goals in their country plans. They aim to strengthen civil society advocacy through evidence-based strategies and collaborative efforts. Local partners seek help in developing strategic L&A planning, monitoring budget allocation, and cooperating with other partners at country level.
2. **Global Advocacy**: The global advocacy strategy is based on the bottom-up approach from programme countries. Right2Grow aims to provide a global platform for local voices by connecting partners internationally. The focus is on linking WASH and nutrition policies, scaling up community-led initiatives, and lobbying for long-term and localized funding.
3. **Dutch Advocacy**: Right2Grow also targets Dutch stakeholders due to its funding relationship with the Dutch government. The focus is on the link between nutrition and WASH, and coordinating with the Dutch government, parliament, and key spokespersons. In addition, Dutch L&A aims to make undernutrition and access to WASH a priority in policy development and budgeting, involving CSOs and knowledge institutions.

The global advocacy agenda was planned to be continuously adjusted based on programme countries' lessons and research findings. The Dutch L&A lead was anticipated to work closely with the Global Advocacy lead, ensuring local voices from Right2Grow programme countries would be included in relevant advocacy activities in the Netherlands. The main task of the Dutch L&A was the political lobby and policy development and relation building with MoFA on nutrition and WASH in an integrated manner. In the period of review the Global L&A main task was to serve as a linking pin to the L&A focal points in each country, as the regional L&A officer role was not fulfilled, and to develop a bottom-up and joint advocacy approach within Right2Grow that would reflect the main principles of the programme. This resulted in the co-creation and validation of the Bridge4Voices approach.

Bridge4Voices is a common foundation for Right2Grow advocacy work and for countries to align their advocacy work while being able to contextualize to their own setting. The approach has yet to come to full realization in practice. According to internal review information and MTR interviews, global L&A has contributed to the ToC intermediary Outcome 2 (CSOs navigating civic space to advocate for leadership and good governance) and specifically outputs 7 and 8 ('Right2Grow partners CSOs, government engage in (sub)national platforms for data sharing, peer learning and adaptation', and 'Right2Grow partners and CSOs lobby donors to better align funding and programming') related to Outcome 4. When comparing this information with internal review information and country MTR findings, it gives a consistent picture of Outcome 4 'Donors and international development actors coordinate and collaborate along the humanitarian-development nexus to address the underlying determinants of undernutrition' lagging behind compared to the other outcomes.

MTR interviews confirmed that the focus in the first two years of the programme has been on laying a foundational structure for global L&A in the form of participation in networks, showcasing Right2Grow's work and strengthening the voice of CSO's in international fora and developing a joint advocacy approach. The global advocacy team also faced some challenging with recruitment and continued filling of global advocacy positions. According to internal L&A review information[9] between 2021 and mid-2023, global L&A efforts have centred around (global) events, such as attendance at the World Food Summit, global WASH cluster meeting, UN food systems summit, World Water Week, World Food Day, World Water Forum, UN Water Conference, and the

---

[9] Internal review Global and Dutch L&A

International Women's Dialogue. During these events, grassroots level participants would showcase examples from Right2Grow's work.

During monthly meetings with the Dutch MoFA Department of Inclusive Green Growth (IGG), Right2Grow L&A would update IGG on progress, governance and exchange on policy and political developments. Right2Grow's Dutch L&A efforts between 2021 and mid-2023 focused on building a network within the Netherlands, with increasing collaboration between the Dutch L&A focal point and Netherlands Special Envoy for International Water Affairs. With input from Right2Grow's Dutch L&A Lead, meetings and conversations with different political spokespersons were organized to emphasize the need to integrate nutrition and WASH policies and programming. Letters to parliament were co-signed and, in some cases, co-drafted by the Dutch L&A Lead.

In assessing the link between local, national and global L&A, some of the MTR respondents indicate this link has been insufficient. Others have described how L&A on country level has strengthened global L&A in several ways: Sharing country experiences, learnings and achievements have contributed to international agenda setting, and through country level efforts and results it is possible to share evidence from countries, advocate for grassroots engagement, and support collective mobilization of voices at global level

"Country-level lobby and advocacy activities provide a solid foundation for global advocacy, with localized messages, grassroots engagement, coalition building, policy influence, and knowledge sharing contributing to the overall success and impact of global advocacy initiatives." (Survey respondent)

3.2.3 Effectivity of programme interventions

Interventions appear to be particularly effective in producing anticipated outputs, and are most likely to contribute to programme outcomes. Right2Grow designed a number of approaches to be employed in programme delivery and these have been contextualised across programme countries. The MTR has established that some of these approaches have facilitated implementation to a greater extent and have therefore made larger contributions towards programme outcomes. These effective approached vary from country to country and are outlined in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5: Evidence of effective programme approaches

Country	Programme approaches	Evidence of contribution to programme outcomes
Bangladesh	Citizen Voice and Action (CVA)	Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) proved that it equips communities to hold their Union Parishad accountable for the promises they make in the ward assembles and UDCC meetings. CVA works by educating civil society about nutrition, WASH, primary health and stunting and equipping them to advocate for improvements
	Healthy Village Approach (HVA)	Healthy Village Approach (HVA) model was developed by Max Foundation which has been adapted and currently is being scaled up in 40 Unions by Right2Grow partners. Through this approach, effective engagement of local government institutions, particularly Union Parishads and communities ensured to ignite desire of individuals, households, and community to improve the health of their children, environments, and lives to achieve the status of 'Healthy Village'
	Budget Monitoring and Expenditure Tracking (BMET)	The BMET tool tested as an effective tool to influence budget decisions of Union Parishads. In the first year, the use of BMET as a part of budget advocacy contributed to increase on an average 2.56% (WASH- 2.49%, Nutrition- 2.72%) of public budgets in FY 2022-2023 from the previous FY

		for nutrition and WASH services among the implemented 40 Union Parishads
	Evidence-Based Advocacy	The data collected during regular check-ups serve as valuable evidence, empowering households and communities to demand necessary services and advocate for their rights. By closely tracking a child's growth, caregivers and community members can identify potential health issues early on, enabling prompt intervention and treatment. It is essential to prioritize and enhance regular child growth monitoring practices as they not only promote individual health and well-being but also serve as a catalyst for community mobilization and advocacy for Right2Grow
	Media Engagement and Advocacy	Right2Grow worked with journalists and launched a campaign in the field called 'Engaging Electronic and Print Media with Right2Grow through Campaign' to bring out Right2Grow related advocacy issues from the field
Burkina Faso	Capacity-building, advocacy and lobbying activities for local players to help them carry out their activities	The priority of awareness-raising and advocacy activities to ensure the success of the activities undertaken, the involvement of decentralised technical services, and the promotion and grouping of local CSOs as advocacy group
Ethiopia	Citizen Voice and Action (CVA)	The approach empowers community members to engage in and influence decision making on nutrition and WASH issues and make service providers and government actors accountable
	Capacity strengthening of key government stakeholders	Nutrition leadership training played a key role in enhancing capacity and commitment of government experts to take meaningful actions to improve nutritional status of the community they serve
	Collaborations with key government actors at national level	Partnership with Seqota Declaration coordination office at national level contributed to successful efforts to integrate BMET tools and resource tracking activities within Seqota Declaration implementation plan in expansion phase woredas
Mali	Learning & Sharing (L&S) benchmark study	The recommendations of this review focused on the strengthening of processes, spaces and tools for formalising/systematising learning, sharing at the level of the constituent organisations and the consortium in the broad sense, and the introduction of in place adaptive management.
	Community involvement	The data indicates that communities have undertaken a significant number of advocacy actions to demand improved WASH and nutrition services. This is the 18 initial budget for the programme, indicating the amount allocated for activities. There have been 9 budget and administrative sessions to evaluate the use of resources. This shows their commitment and interest in promoting access to WASH and nutrition at local level.
	Involvement of local players	The Coordination and Monitoring Committee for Development Actions (CCOCSAD) has 24 members, including prefects, sub-prefects, mayors, leaders, etc., reflecting the active involvement of local players in monitoring and implementing the programme. It can be seen that that all local players are represented.
	Involvement of CSOs	CSOs developed 67 advocacy briefs and participated in more than 24 advocacy actions. This demonstrates their active role in advocacy for nutrition and WASH, and their ability to mobilise and raise awareness among stakeholders.
	Taking gender into account	The data shows that 21% of participants in advocacy activities are women and young people aged between 18 and 35. In addition, 22% of participants are members of women's and youth groups. These figures show that efforts are being made to integrate gender equality into advocacy activities. However, these efforts remain relatively below the 30% mark.

	Successful advocacy	Out of 37 barriers identified, 7 have been successfully addressed. This shows that the advocacy actions have had concrete results in reducing the obstacles to good nutrition and WASH.
	Need for further studies	Some of the results relating to changes in laws, policies, standards and norms relating to nutrition and WASH are currently being studied. It is therefore essential to wait for the full results of these studies before fully assessing the impact of advocacy actions on these aspects.
South Sudan	Mother to Mother Support Group and Water User Committees	These groups are fulfilling their function of putting small, local actions into place by sharing the knowledge they are gaining.
	Collaboration with the SUN CSO Movement	This relationship has helped to ensure that advocacy messages both within the Right2Grow Consortium and with wider civil society in South Sudan can be coordinated. This indicates that forging connections and collaborating with wider partners is an effective means to support the achievement of anticipated outputs and outcomes
	Influencing work with the Ministry of Health (MoH)	Effective influencing work with the MoH to develop the National Nutrition Policy. The key strength of the Consortium here was its contribution of technical expertise to the MoH to guide this work
Uganda	National level advocacy	Through position papers presented to a number of stakeholders including the Parliamentary Alliance on Food and Nutrition Security, budget committee of parliament and the Uganda National Food Systems Coordination Committee, among others, a number of milestones were registered. First, Budget Committee adopted Right2Grow Recommendations for FY 2022/23 resulting in a Budget for Rural/Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Sub programme budget increased by 38% i.e, UGX 747.15 Bn in FY2021/22 to UGX 1,027.78 Bn in FY2022/23. Second, evidence shows that in the FY 2021/22 the CSO Right2Grow Consortium Partner recommendations on food security, nutrition and WASH were adopted by the Budget Committee of Parliament. In total, 21 CSO recommendations were adopted and incorporated into the Committee reports.
	Community level engagement and interventions	WASH interventions have been effective in inducing communities to change mindsets, demand for services such as clean water and invest in others such as digging of pit latrines to end open defecation. Nutrition interventions such as establishment of demonstration gardens and setting up of DNCCs and SNCCs were evident and demo gardens in Kabale, Adjumani and Kamwenge were observed during field visits for data collection.
	Mass education on nutrition	Sensitization and education on food security among community members has been done which has led to shifts in mindsets and building capacity to voice out their needs.

3.2.4 Discussion of progress towards achieving the 2025 targets

Overall analysis of programme performance indicates that the Right2Grow programme is on track to achieve its end of programme targets set under the first three outcomes (empowering local community, strengthening civil societies and enhancing public authorities). The MTR indicates that the end-of-programme targets under Outcome 4 (mobilizing and coordinating international development actors along humanitarian-development nexus programming) can only be realised unless adjustments are made for the Right2Grow international L&A strategy based on country contexts.

Review of countries' ToCs indicate that no major changes are required and that Right2Grow ToC is still relevant. Some minor adjustments and adaptations are necessary for 2024/25 planning, including target setting for some outcome indicators. The MTR has also identified approaches that have made significant contributions towards achievements across programme outcomes. These

approaches provide opportunity to further strengthen our work in order to increase impact and added value towards achievement of 2025 targets.

3.3 Partnership and collaboration

3.3.1 Governance and decision making

Partners within Right2Grow gathered around the joint vision of a world where all children under five (CU5) are well-nourished, stressing a people-centred and community-led approach around the nexus of WASH and nutrition. Right2Grow aims to unite efforts to change on all levels, from local to international. The MTR showed individual partners had varying drivers to take part in Right2Grow. MTR desk review revealed a variety of intentions and partnering principles described in key Right2Grow documents, with three common important elements: 1) Collaborative ways of working, 2) Shifting the Power, and 3) Adaptive Management.

Right2Grow distinguished three levels of programme organization: 1) implementation, 2) programme management and 3) programme oversight. In the global governance structure that was in place mid-2023, three types of governance bodies had been created: 1) Decision-making bodies; the Global Coordination Committee (GCC) and the Global Programmes Team (GPT), 2) Forums; Country Leads Forum, Global Teams Forum, and Global Partners Forum), and 3) Global thematic teams: MEAL, Finance, MCD, L&L, L&A, Communications). Depending on the type, the involved team members of these governance bodies met at different frequencies (mostly virtual). Programme countries are more or less aligned with this global governance structure, with each country having similar teams and thematic focal points.

The MTR shows partners have concerns on the heavy (meeting) time investment and overlap between groups in the current governance structure. While establishing the three different forums in 2022 was an initiative to address complexity of decision making in the existing Global Programmes Team, the forums seem to have led to more fragmentation and increased time needed for meetings and coordination. During the MTR several suggestions were provided to improve the governance structure, processes, roles and responsibilities and decision-making processes to allow for better implementation of the programme and practicing its own principles of Shifting the Power and community led approaches.

Right2Grow leadership was intended to be shared among partners. From a community-led paradigm, there has been a focus on self-management, personal responsibility, decentralized and consent-based decision making and creating space for innovative ideas and solutions that are action oriented (based on *Holacracy*).

However, in practice there appeared to be lack of joint understanding on what this concept means, and the rigorous and structured processes needed for this approach was not observed. This has led to a feeling of fragmentation and unclarity on where decisions are made. Partners expressed the need for a more structured and lean approach and clearer decision making processes. Partners also expected more (strategic) guidance from THP as the consortium lead partner, especially around project cycle processes and progress. At the same time, more active engagement and a feeling of joint responsibility is expected from all other partners. Overall, partners appreciate the willingness to listen and the flexibility that THP and the *B-team* (the most important support function that coordinates the work within the consortium) has shown. All information is available in SharePoint for all staff working on Right2Grow, and a dashboard was recently created to show progress in different areas in response to the need of oversight in the partnership in the different forums. It however contains mainly operational information.

3.3.2 Collaboration outside the Right2Grow Consortium

The MTR also assessed the level of collaboration with other stakeholders in-country. Examples below show we can further strengthen collaboration with partners outside the consortium.

For example, in **Uganda**, the consortium was less successful to initiate and strengthen collaboration with key WASH partners at national levels, including the One WASH programme. Lack of clarity on who coordinates and leads the One WASH national programme at national level was identified as one of the challenges for collaboration. More impact was realised for partnerships and collaborations at national level with regard to nutrition. Partnerships with parliamentarians under the Uganda Parliament Alliance on Food Security and Nutrition Security (UPAFNS) that culminated in Right2Grow signing a memorandum of understanding. This was a good strategy because the voices of members of parliament are more likely to be heard and they were also able to amplify community voices on nutrition and WASH issues.

In **Ethiopia**, the MTR indicated that collaboration with key donors and government actors with the potential to influence the humanitarian-development nexus agenda was not as successful as expected. Partners consider this agenda to be more influenced at global level (such as UN level). The high-level donor platforms and networks in Ethiopia lack entry points for development partner advocacy, thus the consortium partnership has had difficulty to effectively navigate and penetrate the high-level donor networks at country-level, including the UN humanitarian platform at national level where the humanitarian-development nexus agenda could be effectively addressed.

3.3.3 Evaluating strengths and weaknesses in programme delivery and learning

Strengths

The MTR indicates that one of the organisational strengths of the Right2Grow Partnership is the diversity of expertise and areas of focus. Each of the strategic partners is focused on a certain area of interest and each brings that wealth of experience to the partnership. The fact that the partners work together and have one voice, especially at national and district levels, enhances their credibility, allowing them to be more easily supported by duty bearers. This increases the chances of success compared to when each partner would be advocating and implementing independently. Given that the key Right2Grow consortium partners are already established in terms of human resources, hardware and infrastructure, the partnership has been easy to manage and take off within a short time to start implementing activities.

Weaknesses

The partners have different thematic focus areas which can poses a challenge for alignment, coordination and consolidation of joint work, but also in communicating about and having mutual understanding and appreciation of each other's work. Partners sometimes have different priorities, and they plan to execute different activities at different times, which can lead to challenges in timing for joint activities. The other weakness is the lack of flexibility in inter-partner funds transfers. While the current organisational setup of the partnership allows for it, in practice it has been difficult to shift funds among partners. For instance, where a partner is lagging in implementation and budget utilisation, it is hard for another partner to utilize their funds instead, due to contractual obligations that are a result of compliance requirements.

3.3.4 Engagement with the Ministry and Embassies

The MTR indicates that the Embassies of The Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN) are always willing to provide any support that the consortium partnership requires. The embassies engage in occasional events organized by the consortium partnership to share experience and discuss progress made with implementation and provide high level guidance when requested. The Embassy

in each country also has an advisory seat in the country level steering committee. However, the EKN has not been active in providing detailed and proactive strategic support and close follow-up for the Right2Grow implementation as initially expected. Key informants reported that overlapping priorities associated with its extensive programme portfolio in the country, vis-à-vis the limited number of staff may have contributed to lower engagement and support than expected.

Consortium partners confirmed that the Dutch Embassies have been actively involved since Right2Grow programme inception, for example active participation of the Dutch Ambassadors and the Deputy Ambassadors during the programme launches. In addition MoFA held consultations with the Right2Grow partners on progress and the review of the Dutch country's strategic plan.

3.4 Adaptive Management

Adaptive management is key to effectiveness of the Right2Grow implementation due to the complex nature of an advocacy programme as well as the volatile country contexts of programme countries. Several efforts have been made to facilitate adaptive management within the Right2Grow programme.

During the design phase, the programme conducted various consultations with stakeholders at the community, CSO, and district levels to gain an understanding of the context and potential scenarios. This information was used to develop the ToC, implementation strategies, and programme management and governance mechanisms. Baseline studies further informed our programming.

The programme has also established a 'Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)' and 'Management Information System (MIS)' team to capture learnings at all stages of the programme cycle. Programme approaches and strategies are adjusted based on changes in the social, political, and economic dynamics of the programme areas and based on our learning from M&E processes. Consortium partners have the flexibility to adjust operational approaches and strategies, while the Country Steering Committee (CSC) has responsibilities for overall project implementation and budget decisions. A risk register is maintained and shared during quarterly meetings to inform joint decisions for improvement.

The overall intention of the CSC of Right2Grow is to make strategic and operational decisions and adjustments based on new information, risks, and changes in the context. This approach is not a one-time activity, but rather a continuous way of working that reflects and responds to emergent knowledge and context. The CSC promote adaptive management in order to achieve its goals when the steps required for desired change are uncertain. This involves taking calculated risks, questioning assumptions, testing approaches, and being open to changing implementation methods if it will lead to more effective goal achievement.

In some countries, CSCs have provided necessary adaptive management recommendations to their project management teams and made necessary decisions on key project governance issues. This contributed to improved systems for internal and external transparent communication and collective decision-making process within the consortium.

The organizational culture and processes play a crucial role in enabling the programme to adapt. It is important that programme staff feel empowered to challenge the status quo and propose alternative approaches. Staff should also be willing to acknowledge when implementation approaches are not working and be open to changing them. It requires a culture that accepts uncertainty and risk in programming and learning by doing. Leadership should support adaptive management approaches, and staff should have dedicated time for learning and reflection through regular workshops or meetings. The consortium partners of Right2Grow must implement adaptive

management into their organizational management and governance to ensure the effectiveness of the initiatives.

Right2Grow programme interventions are designed to promote a "learning by doing" approach and facilitate 'collective action' for advocacy and social change at the local level. The adaptive management approach has also fostered joint learning among the consortium partners. In the beginning, partners were applying their own lobbying and advocacy approaches and through learning across different countries and different partners, a common advocacy approach Bridge4Voices was developed., and other advocacy tools, such as BMET and CVA should mainstreamed across all consortium partners and interventions as integral parts of the L&A strategy. The Bridge4Voices approach has led to a combined effort in terms of building a shared common advocacy agenda and strategy for the Right2Grow programme, which is taken up by countries as part of adaptive programming.

3.5 Shift the Power

The concept of Shift the Power is emphasized in all Right2grow documentation from the start. The design of the programme was ambitious and brought together both larger and smaller INGOs, and included a shift of power approach to small local CSOs and CBOs whose structures were not yet fully developed to effectively meet the demands of the programme. Shift the Power efforts within Right2Grow within the first two-and-a-half years of the programme include the below.

During the first year of the programme, consortium partners signed sub grantee agreements with local partners or their local counterparts at country level, who were made responsible for project implementation at sub-national levels. The consortium partners also supported and empowered local partners to achieve representation, voice, and recognition within the consortium partnership.

Right2Grow has also been effective in enhancing capacity and empowering leadership of local partners to meaningfully engage and contribute in making joint decisions on major project management and operational issues. Local partner leadership actively engages in preparation and submission of project plans, reports as well as in managing baseline and mid-term evaluations of the project. Local partners are also members of the Country Steering Committee (CSC) as well as Project Technical Teams (PTT). Local partners are also playing leadership role in the various Technical Working Groups established within the consortium partnership. The focal points for Mutual Capacity Development (MCD), Linking and Learning (L&L) and BMET action team are assigned from local partners who coordinate and lead all activities of the technical teams.

Right2Grow has been successful in its efforts to empower local partners through capacity building support. Staff from local CSOs and CBOs have been participating in various national and international trainings and workshops organized to enhance their capacity needed to take leadership roles for Right2Grow implementation at sub national levels, in collaboration with the local government actors. The MTR identified that enhanced capacity on BMET enabled local partners to engage in successful budget advocacy efforts to influence local government actors to allocate or increase budget for nutrition.

Right2Grow is a programme that was designed to have certain overarching and strategic decisions being made at global level while programmatic decisions to be made at country level . The partners in each country are implementing the programme based on the guidance of the global team. According to the programme's design, the power for country plans, budgets and operations was delegated to the CSC, but in some countries decisions and work are being done by the Country Lead

and Country Team without involving the CSC. Additionally, when a country partner needs technical support or assistance with programme implementation, they prefer to rely on the global team.

The governance design of Right2Grow programme is unique, as it aims to promote equal participation, shared responsibility, and the transfer of power based on the subsidiarity principle, as well as support localization. However, at the same time the MTR shows a limited shared understanding of the concept of Shift the Power and what this means for our programme. In practice Shift the Power is promoted by appointing lead staff in programme countries instead of global offices and involvement of country staff in global-decision making bodies.

The MTR reveals that partners ask for clearer guidance on Shift the Power principles and urge for country leaderships that mirrors these Shift the Power principles.

3.6 Cost effectiveness

At the start of the programme, some general budgeting principles were agreed between consortium partners and used for the budgeting process for the full programme[10]:
- An overall 8-9% would be deducted from the total grant amount as Indirect Cost Recovery Rate (ICR), and calculated based actual allocated direct costs (both global as well as country budget allocations).
- Allocation of the total budget of EUR 44 million to programme countries should be at least 70% (after deduction of the Indirect Cost Recovery Rate), with a maximum of 30% as 'global' budget.
- Each country would receive 1/6 or approximately 1 million Euro per country per year, irrespective of size, number of partners present or other country factors.
- Global partners management costs was set at 60% of the global allocation.
- Total allocation for Global Technical Cost, Global Knowledge management and MEAL, and Global Advocacy and Communication was set at 35% of the total grant amount
- The country lead role would take around 5% of the annual country budget year.
- Linking and Learning in each country would also take about 5% of the annual country budget
- Country level management costs would be around 25% of the annual country budget (programme management, finance, admin, MEAL, coordination etc).
- All costs would be grouped according to outcomes 1 to 4.

Costs for activities were agreed to be allocated based on effort, role, and capacity, without a minimum or maximum per partner, and the budget after year 1 to be defined based on the intervention logic in the ToC, developments, performance and learnings in the first year. It would be up to the country consortium team to decide on the country budget allocations. After the application process, these principles were not used any longer by the partnership, except for the principle on division of global budget versus budget allocation in countries.

Based on the actual costs 2021 and 2022 and the revised budget 2023, in combination with the original budgets for 2024 and 2025, the finance team expected expenditure for the entire 5 year period to be lower than the total budget. At country level, the finance team indicates that Bangladesh and Uganda show higher expenditures while the other countries lower. Also, management costs and other costs remain within the 5-year budget so far. At partner level, there are higher costs for ACF, STC and especially CEGAA according to the finance team. For the other partners, expenditure to date is lower than expected. Calculation of costs differs from partner to

---

[10] Right2Grow Budget Principles

partner, with higher rates used for ACF and Save than for World Vision and THP according to the finance team.

The audit report of Right2Grow confirms that in 2022 some partners have used commitments while others have used actual expenditure to account for their costs, guided by external accountants on whether it was the one or the other. There were no irregularities found in the respective partner audits, but in case of Max the ICR can't be calculated and with four partners (World Vision, CEGAA, ACF and Save the Children), the audit report states that information is lacking about when respective organisations consider a partner's spending to be justified. With higher expenditure by Save the Children than expected, the audit report states that the ICR has also become higher than expected. This however doesn't affect the 70/30 budget principle as this principle is applied only after deduction of the ICR.

It was decided that Technical Assistance by CEGAA would be partly be absorbed in the Global Budget Allocation and partly in the Country Budgets. Because, in practice the work CEGAA does directly contributes to the implementation of BMET in the country plans, and in some cases, staff was employed within the country. This had an impact on the 70/30% principle. In practice it meant that around €600,000 of the total €1.6 million for global partner CEGAA was allocated to the countries; around €100,000 each. This construction caused confusion with some partners, as some didn't know that the €4.75 million total country budget included a part of CEGAA's budget.

When asked how much of the budget goes to countries, it depends how the interpretation of 'country' is seen. This question is complicated also because the way Right2Grow global partners are structured internationally differs. Some Right2Grow partners have for instance field offices (e.g. ACF, Max Foundation, Save the Children and World Vision where ACF also works through regional offices), some work in sisterhood structures with partners in country having the same name but are a separate juridical entity (THP), and some don't have country offices or partners (CEGAA). For the sake of clarity, we will use 'offices' here when we talk about the in-country field-office/partners, where Right2Grow global partners have direct accountability/financial relations with, with regard to the Right2Grow programme.

When looking at a stricter interpretation of this principle, leaving offices and work of the consortium partners in programme countries out, in total a little over 7 million (7.055) or 16% is budgeted for local partners (including local BMET partners - not CEGAA) for the 5 year period, of which 1.3 million is allocated for local BMET and 5.7 million for local NGOs[11] Also, at country and partner level, different policies exist about the interpretation of how for example salaries of international staff is allocated. In some cases, salaries of consortium partners field office staff is allocated as 'international staff', in others not, but overall there are no salaries of Dutch, French or Spanish consortium staff booked on country level. Overall, the global finance lead indicated "there is no active monitoring on the 70/30 ratio, but also no major deviation can be found."

As budget allocations had been set on one million per year per country, and the budget had been defined specifically for the first year, it was a simple governance structure for financial resources in theory. Because of COVID and high staff turnover, most countries experienced under expenditure of their respective country budgets, especially in 2021 (under expenditure of nearly 50%). This consequently meant that no difficult decisions had to be made (yet) about reallocation of budgets. However, due to inflation and higher prices, higher expenses are expected in the coming two years. It is yet to be seen how decisions will be made and whether it will be the country consortium team

---

[11] Overview provided by R2G finance team

or the country steering committee (including local partners) that will decide about the (re)allocation of financial resources.

Within the different countries, there is no standard division of staff costs and other programme costs. According to the global finance team this differs per country and per partner; in some cases there are relatively more staff costs, with others there are less. This also depends on the type of work that is done in the country. Steering takes place by the country lead in consultation with the other consortium partners present in the country. Different partners have different systems to register costs. Some partners work with and report on commitments, others on actual expenditure.

This means that both the allocation as well as the calculation of costs in countries is flexible and applied in different terms, with budget principles agreed in advance used as guidelines, but without those guidelines being monitored. Moreover, no cost-accounting based on outcomes takes place, so nothing can be said about costs in relation to results of the programme. At global level the budget per outcome has been split equally into four though the absorption rate differs across the outcomes.

3.7 Gender equality and inclusion

Recognising the strong link between WASH, food security, good nutrition and gender and inclusion, Right2Grow focuses on essential quality standards to be gender-sensitive at minimum, and gender transformative whenever possible. Country level review indicate quite some progress on this.

For instance in **Bangladesh**, a total of 2,587 women leaders are actively involved in committees such as CSOs, Local Entrepreneurs Associations, UDCC, and UP Standing Committees. These women play a pivotal role in driving community movements as change agents, advocating for the needs of their communities, especially in relation to child nutrition, and contributing to the resolution or reduction of issues. During the MTR process, it became evident that the programme management staff in Bangladesh are predominantly male. However, the field staff composition within the consortium partners demonstrates a more balanced gender representation. Despite some women's involvement in the CSC, there remains an imbalance in gender representation within the programme's decision-making processes, indicating a lack of significant participation of women. MTR revealed a lack of deep understanding within the programme regarding the root causes of gender discrimination and inequality at both societal and state levels.

In **Burkina Faso**, the consortium's capacities have been strengthened in terms of the multisectoral approach, gender mainstreaming, and the programme itself is gender-based, due to its multisectoral nature. All components are taken into account to include vulnerable groups (children, women, young people, the disabled, internally displaced persons). Right2Grow has worked to ensure that CSOs can take ownership of this gender-related vision through capacity-building sessions on gender, income-generating activities and child nutrition, and there has been mainstreaming of gender done within CSOs.

According to the review, Right2Grow **Ethiopia** programme has taken significant measures to ensure gender equality, disability inclusion and youth participation in established social accountability platforms in order to amplify the concerns and voices of these population groups at all levels, particularly at woreda levels. The 2022 annual report indicated that in the CVA task forces established at woreda levels, 45% of members were lactating and pregnant women, 10% were people with disabilities and 6% were young people. Moreover, local Organizations of People with Disabilities (OPDs), women groups and youth associations have been actively taking part in established social accountability platforms and continued advocacy works at all levels in strategic

partnership to raise and amplify the concerns, priorities and needs of vulnerable women, people with disabilities and young people.

> *"…We focused on supporting the CVA task forces to impact marginalized groups. People with disabilities, women, elders and other vulnerable groups are deliberately incorporated as a member within the CVA taskforce. Marginalized groups got the chance to participate in nutrition and WASH discussions. We are trying to impact these groups through inclusive participation in trainings and community structures. There is no direct support for these groups. The essence of the project is not geared towards direct support. …" (Consortium staff, Gozamin woreda - Ethiopia)*

Data from **Mali** indicates that the programme has conducted awareness-raising sessions that have improved understanding of gender and human rights issues within communities. This has helped to reduce harmful and discriminatory practices against young people, people living with disabilities and vulnerable women. The active inclusion of these groups in activities and participation in decision-making bodies has strengthened their role and visibility within the community. The 2022 annual report shows that 21% of those involved in advocacy initiatives were women and young people aged between 18 and 35. A further 22% of participants belong to women's and young people's groups. These figures illustrate the steps taken to integrate gender equality into advocacy initiatives.

In **South Sudan** gender norms on the primary role of women are persisting, limiting their ability to participate in the leadership roles other than the mother-to-mother support groups of the Right2Grow programme.[12] Positively, the programme does seek to promote gender equality in an intersectional way by seeking to ensure equal opportunity for women, men, and those with disabilities to participate in its activities, in particular ensuring male and female participation in the mother-to-mother support groups, father to father support groups, and WUCs and WASH/Nutrition platforms.[13] However, there are two challenges in relying on the approach of promoting gender equality through the equal participation of men and women in project activities. First, it does not address the persistent gender norm which limits women's roles, and therefore does not address root causes which are limiting gender equality within project locations. Second, this approach assumes that equal participation will result in equal benefit or equal outcome. This assumption does not necessarily account for the historical oppressions faced by women and other disenfranchised populations, which can mean they benefit less from participation as they may not feel fully able to participate freely.

3.8 Sustainability

Sustainability of Right2Grow concerns the lasting effects for the target groups and ongoing transformational process. This requires institutional change at community level, in involved actors, at policy level and in the concrete actions and behaviour of actors involved. To this far, there's evidence of some steps that have been put in place across programme countries.

1. **Empowered community structures for local level advocacy:** The community groups have become aware of their rights to nutrition and WASH public services, and they have started demanding these services from relevant government organizations. This demand will continue even after the programme ends, leading to lasting changes in attitudes, mindsets,

---

[12] Right2Grow. *Right2Grow: South Sudan Annual Report 2022.*
[13] Right2Grow. *Right2Grow: South Sudan Annual Report 2022.*

and behaviour. In Bangladesh for example, the programme actively involves youth in all interventions and promotes "youth leadership." Additionally, the programme has initiated partnerships with the local private sector through enterprise development and business development services. In Burkina Faso, the involvement of communal leaders, local elected representatives (communal/special delegation) and central and decentralised government departments in supporting the Right2Grow programme has created collaboration and a synergy of actions between them and the CSOs and/or 'advocacy groups' in carrying out the programme's activities. In Ethiopia, the composition of CVA Taskforces, which represents all community segments, including vulnerable and marginalized community groups has contributed to effectiveness of community level advocacy efforts for improved service delivery, accountability and sustainability.

2. **Civil society strengthening:** Right2Grow aims to strengthen civil society by following the "Power of Voices framework" and empowering local voices. During the first half of the programme, efforts have been made to build the capacities of Right2Grow partners and other local CSOs. So far, there's evidence of CSO engagement in advocacy and policy processes. For instance in Bangladesh, CSOs have started working with local Union Parishads and actively participate in various governance processes such as UDCCM, Standing Committee meetings, ward assembly, and budget sessions. In Mali, the programme depends to a large extent on the training of CSOs and NGOs in the drafting of advocacy notes, as well as the generation of income at community level, in particular from mayors, in order to finance the programme's actions on a long-term basis. During interviews in South Sudan, one consortium staff member commented that as a result of Right2Grow many of the local CSOs in the partnership have had their capacity built regarding issues surrounding both nutrition and WASH.

3. **Existing nutrition and WASH policy frameworks across programme countries:** the Right2Grow programme aims to work with the existing regulatory framework and policies, contributing to their effectiveness through evidence-based decision-making, improved coordination, and governance at all levels. The goal is to embed the outcomes of this five-year programme institutionally. Despite minimal progress on this aspect, efforts across programme countries indicate existing opportunities for engagement with potential positive results. In Burkina Faso, the review shows that the gains made will be consolidated at national level and this will ensure the continuity of the advocacy actions undertaken to combat child undernutrition. In Ethiopia, the programme has made progress with regard to integrating resource tracking tools and approaches in nutrition implementation, particularly in Seqota Declaration implementation guidelines. In Uganda, the formation and rejuvenation of structures such as DNCCs and SNCCs as well as capacity development of the members is one way of building sustainability. Even after Right2Grow programme, these structures will continue to deliver on the mandate of developing WASH and nutrition plans, advocate and implement these plans in their districts.

4. Challenges, lessons learnt and good practices
4.1 Challenges

4.1.1 Challenges country programme delivery
Key challenges identified from the review include;

- **Delayed implementation in some countries:** In countries like Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Mali, delays were characterised by security situation. In South Sudan, it was reported that late disbursement of funds caused some delays in implementation. Uganda experienced an Ebola outbreak in 2022 that posed restrictions on travel and convening. This affected implementation and led to the postponement of critical engagement platforms like the 2022 right to food conference which was being organized by the Uganda Human Rights Commission. For all countries the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions caused delays at the start of the programme.

- **Budget limitations:** In Bangladesh a funding gap was identified compared to the approved budget at the start of Right2Grow for which provisional reallocations have been approved. In Ethiopia, consortium and local partners have repeatedly received requests from government partners to support in responding to public health emergencies (such as cholera epidemic) as well as to increase geographic coverage of implementation by including additional kebeles.

- **Existing capacity challenges at grassroot level:** In Bangladesh, there is a shortage of empowered CSO leaders at the grassroots level who possess a voluntary service attitude, lobbying skills, and a mindset focused on long-term sustainable CSO involvement rather than just project-based initiatives. In Uganda, inadequate capacities of CSOs, communities and government technocrats in planning and budgeting for food security nutrition and WASH, especially at local government levels, coupled with conflicting priorities for government officials has resulted in low turn up in advocacy engagements and eventual limited opportunity to integrate WASH and nutrition issues at the District Local Government (DLG) levels.

- **Weak thematic integration:** The integration between various global Right2GRow activities from MCD, L&L, and MEL, and how they align with Right2Grow's broader L&A efforts, needs to be improved. The challenge is that the focus seems to be on individual activities rather than how they collectively support or contribute to Right2Grow's L&A objectives. The lack of alignment may stem from the absence of a cohesive Right2Grow L&A strategy and a clear rationale outlining how each global team contributes to this strategy.

4.1.2 Challenges Global and Dutch Lobby and Advoacy
At the time of review, there was weak documentation on Dutch level L&A engagements and this implied little clarity in ensuring that the collective L&A efforts are properly prioritized, strategized, recognized and understood. Overall, participants report a lack of clarity on Global Advocacy and what has been achieved in terms of the anticipated outcomes.

"The role of global L&A is not clear in terms of what they have done and how much they have achieved on any of the objectives. Stories are collected on country level but it is not sure to what extent these stories have assisted in bringing change" – global respondent

This gap is confirmed by (some) country MTRs too, indicating that there is an "*Information flow gap between national and international consortium partners, where information relevant for advocacy is not fast and efficiently shared or disseminated.*" (Country MTR findings Uganda)

The importance of involving the Dutch ministry and see how to collaborate with them on strategic opportunities for Right2Grow is acknowledged. However interview respondents indicate it is not logical to have two separate roles (Global Advocacy Lead and Dutch Advocacy Lead). The regional advocacy liaison role, which was still vacant at the time of the global MTR, was seen as a crucial missing link to ensure connection between countries and regional and global L&A opportunities.

The Right2Grow Dutch and Global L&A efforts and messaging to date focus strongly on the nutrition and WASH nexus. Evaluators observed little focus on deeper systemic sources that lead to global inequality, such as the food industry, export restrictions, and the impact of climate change. The importance of multi-sector approaches is stated in diverse Right2Grow documents. What this means in practice on global level is not yet clearly captured in a global L&A strategy, although Right2Grow has joined other networks such as Food4All (a coalition of nine NGOs) particularly for that reason.

4.1.3 Challenges partnership collaboration
- Review across programme countries indicated that inadequate communication and coordination among partners have to some extent hampered programme delivery. Bureaucracies in funds disbursement was also cited in some countries.
- Partners perceive the existing advocacy strategy to be driven by global team rather than stemming from a common vision that is informed by shared learning and that answers to local requests;
- The review indicated that shifting the power principles currently do not put local partners in the lead in terms of (informed and inclusive) decision making and resource allocation;
- According to the review, Country Leads do not feel adequately considered in decision making processes that mirror shift the power principles, continuous learning, synergy between the partners with clear roles and responsibilities, and simplified governance structure and processes.

4.1.4 Challenges cost effectiveness
- **Budget principles** were developed to guide effective and aligned resource allocation and programme delivery at the start of the programme. The principles were not closely monitored after the initial budget developed at the start of the programme. Now that the partnership moves toward the end of the programme and there is need to invest remaining resources as effectively as possible, reviewing these principles based on results achieved and plans for the remaining programme time could support strategic resource allocation.

- **Flexible budget ceiling:** Budget allocations had been set at one million euro per year per country at the start of the programme. At that time the budget for year 1 had been committed, with the budgets for the following years set as indicative. This flexible budget ceiling was meant to allow for re-allocations between partners in-country based on adaptive management. In theory, this was an efficient way of managing financial resources. However, to do this in practice has been more challenging as the (re)allocation of financial resources between partners or countries is a sensitive issue to discuss, it is hard for partners at country level to question other organisation's proposed budgets that inform the consolidated country budget, and partners also need to work along internal organisational accountability lines (country to global). Because of COVID-19 and staff turnover, most countries experienced under expenditure towards their country budgets, especially in 2021 (under expenditure of nearly 50%). This meant that no difficult decisions had to be made (yet) about

reallocation of budgets. However, due to inflation and higher prices, higher expenses are expected in remaining years. It is yet to be seen how and by whom decisions will be made for the final two years of the programme.

4.2 Lessons learnt and good practices

Over the first half of the programme, a number of lessons and good practices have been generated across the countries. The key ones include;

1. **Involvement of local community structures:** In Ethiopia, the consortium ensured engagement and participation of local partners in key governance structures including the project steering committee and technical teams. These efforts as well as significant investment made to enhance the capacity and internal systems of local partners and ensure joint decision making on key programme operational and administrative issues enhanced ownership and easy integration and adoption of the programme and contributed to effective program delivery. In Mali, the programme has succeeded in integrating local priorities by targeting people's key concerns, in particular improving children's health through access to drinking water and a diversified diet. This approach needs to be maintained and strengthened to meet the specific needs of community members. According to the review in Uganda, evidence generation and community voices empower CSOs to ably advocate for positive change.

2. **Capacity strengthening of consortium partners:** Over the first half of the programme, consortium partners have gone through various Right2Grow capacity building initiatives and these have contributed to effective programme delivery. For instance, the review revealed that capacity development through training in budget formulation and monitoring using BMET has significantly reduced the gaps between Union Parishads' budget plans and their implementation in Bangladesh. There are suggestions for further capacity strengthening, for instance in South Sudan it was mentioned that more capacity building could be undertaken with consortium partners, and with non-Consortium CSO and CBO partners - on matters including gender sensitivity and conducting effective advocacy.

3. **Collaboration with key government actors:** In Ethiopia, partnership with Seqota Declaration coordination office at national level contributed to successful efforts to integrate BMET tools and resource tracking activities in Seqota Declaration implementation plans. In Mali, the review revealed that collaboration with the nutrition coordination unit and other national stakeholders is essential to ensure alignment with national priorities and efficient use of resources. It is worth noting that the collaboration with government requires time. Evidence from South Sudan showed that while it can be a lengthy process to effectively engage stakeholders effectively, doing so ensures government buy-in which is positive for the long-term success of the programme. A lesson learnt from Uganda on the collaboration with government is the importance of community voices; it was reported that duty bearers responded quicker to direct demands from communities rather than when the CSOs doing the talking on their behalf.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

Relevance of ToC
The MTR indicated that the ToC is still relevant and appropriate and is being used effectively by the consortium and local partners to guide programme planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation across programme countries. The review showed that the ToC allows some flexibility based on the different contexts in which Right2Grow is operating and that the programme is broadly making progress in line with the ToC's roadmap - albeit more slowly than perhaps had been intended, in part because advocacy programmes are fairly new to many of the communities with whom Right2Grow is working. Considering the context across programme countries and learning from the first half of the programme, minor modifications on outputs, indicators and actors targeted under outcome 4 may be required going forward.

Effectiveness programme
The programme has made progress considering the challenging political context and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The programme has made contributions in improving the situation of WASH, Nutrition, and Public Health in its work areas through using various strengths of its consortium partners, civil society and media engagement and policy advocacy at both local and national level. The effectiveness of the programme is demonstrated by the increased awareness among households on food security, nutrition and hygiene issues. Advocacy initiatives have contributed to raising tangible awareness, while training activities have strengthened the skills and capacity for action of local players. Additionally, the review indicated that mutual accountability, stronger governance with a focus on country impact, engagement of consortium partners, leadership from the CSC and the Right2Grow Global team, and improved communication, learning, and knowledge sharing all contributes to the success of the programme. However, more attention is needed for optimum change on Outcome 4.

Global Lobby & Advocacy
With regard to Global and Dutch L&A, partners see the highest contribution of global L&A work in the area of CSOs navigating civic space to advocate for leadership and good governance (outcome 2) with outcome 4 (donors and international development actors coordinate and collaborate along the humanitarian-development nexus to address underlying determinants of undernutrition) lagging behind compared to other outcome areas, partly due to the fact that first an evidenced foundation had to be built for global L&A. Secondly, the team encountered some staffing challenges.

Partners see how country experiences, learnings and achievements can support cohesive and adaptive international L&A agenda setting, how grassroots engagement, evidence and collective mobilization of voices increase leverage and how internal Right2Grow processes might support global L&A efforts. Vice versa, partners mention three elements of global L&A supporting L&A in countries: L&A capacity building, L&A global guidelines and frameworks (especially BMET), and opportunities for cross country sharing and learning. However, there is limited documentation about what Right2Grow has done in the area of global and Dutch L&A, what the reasoning has been behind it, what has been achieved in terms of the anticipated outcomes and what the contribution of Right2Grow work has been when changes are reported.

Partnership & collaboration

On partnership and collaboration, the MTR indicated that collaboration between partners is generally satisfactory in terms of the efforts made to set up steering bodies. The programme has been successful in establishing a working and effective partnership within the consortium and made significant investment to enhance the capacity and internal systems of local partners and ensure joint decision making on key programme operational and administrative issues. The programme has also established effective collaboration with sub-national and national level government actors, and has enabled policy level engagement with duty bearers.

According to the review, a number of mechanisms have supported partnership collaboration among the Right2Grow Consortium and its wider partners. These include efforts to share expertise between partners, exchange visits to share learnings and best practices, and efforts by partners to promote localisation, including through technical support provided to national consortium members. However, collaboration outside country consortia is still weak partly due to funding limitations which meant there was limited opportunity for consortium leads to travel to partners' locations. Additionally, a weakness of partnership collaboration has been the high level of staff turnover within consortium partners and wider partners.

Governance structure

Review of governance structure indicated that partners see the highest effective contribution by governance bodies to the Right2Grow objectives for the Programme Country Leads, and the lowest for Global Communication. Partners feel the two decision-making bodies GPT (Global Programs Team) and GCC (Global Coordination Committee) have a limited effective contribution to the programme. Establishing forums in 2022 was an initiative to address complexity of decision making in the existing Global Programs Team, but the forums also led to more fragmentation. Several suggestions are provided to improve the governance structure, processes, roles and responsibilities and decision making processes to allow for better implementation of the programme and practicing its own principles of Shifting the Power and community led approaches.

Right2Grow leadership was intended to be shared among partners. From a community-led paradigm, there has been a focus on self-management, personal responsibility, decentralized decision making and creating space for innovative ideas and solutions that are action oriented (based on Holacracy). Lack of joint understanding about what this means in practice, has led to different expectations about leadership in Right2Grow.

Shift the Power

Although the concept of Shifting the Power is emphasized in all documentation within Right2Grow, there is limited shared understanding of what this means within the consortium by different partners and at different levels. In practice, it is promoted by appointing lead staff in programme countries, involvement of country staff in global decision-making bodies, flexibility in programme implementation and in-country program and budget design (in line with the overall ToC). Local partners are also part of country steering committees, as are other key stakeholders such as local governments. There is an ambition to be accountable to communities, and based on the MTR that has not yet been operationalised. There are differences in the way Shifting the Power principles are interpreted at different levels (i.e. at country, with regard to how INGOs work with CSO's, and between global and local partners).

Partners ask for clearer guidance on this principle, as well as on consent-based decision making. There is an urge for country leadership that mirrors shift the power principles, continuous learning for informed decision making, synergy between the partners with clear roles and responsibilities and a simplified governance structure and processes.

Cost effectiveness

In terms of cost effectiveness, partners generally relate cost-effectiveness to value for money and/or the investment/result ratio, emphasizing the relation between investment and results. Most partners approach cost effectiveness in terms of how to use the existing resources in relation to anticipated results, but some also approach it the other way around: to have enough resources to achieve the anticipated results. Some general budget principles were agreed upon between partners at the start of the programme. However, the interpretation of these principles, the extent to which they are still valid today and how they are applied varies from country to country, from partner to partner and between individual staff. Overall staff in programme countries are more content with cost-effectiveness than global staff.

5.2 Recommendations

To enhance our impact and added value in 2024-2025 and beyond, the following strategic recommendations have been formulated under;

5.2.1 Programme improvement

- Strengthen the focus on L&A (including BMET) within the Right2Grow partnership and ensure that it is a central component of the programme;
- Set realistic indicator targets across programme outcomes based on current context and achievements so far, specifically with regard to outcome 4 where efforts should be focused on awareness raising rather than policy influencing;
- Develop a clear L&A strategy that is informed by the countries and guided by local needs and country advocacy agendas;
- Efforts are needed to transcend siloed approaches, simplify the governance structure, and clarify roles and processes by putting L&A in the middle of the organizational structure rather than as one of the teams, with all other teams supporting to this;
- Bridge4Voices should serve as a starting point to further integrate overarching L&A principles and approach that Right2Grow partners really believe in and act upon;
- Strengthen collaboration and communication on L&A efforts internally;
- Position locally led research more strategically in order to build evidence and to make strategic choices;
- Country consortia to strengthen efforts to ensure private sector and CSO participation in existing government led multisectoral nutrition coordination platforms;
- Country consortia to continue capacity building and mentorship of Local Governments, CSOs, CBOs, and communities, especially on BMET to increase capacity to participate, demand and engage in budgeting and planning processes for nutrition and WASH;
- Country consortia to enhance collaboration with sub-national and national governments to ensure relevant policy changes on nutrition and WASH policies, and follow up on budget allocation for revised policies;
- Develop a focused international advocacy strategy to support Right2Grow's work outcome 4, to advance coordination along the humanitarian-development nexus agenda in donor groups, bilateral and multilateral development and humanitarian actors' platforms at national level.

5.2.2 Technical support

- Integrate different efforts under global technical support, so that they are more aligned and based on country priorities;

- Focus on strengthening the link between L&A, BMET, Communications on the one hand, and MCD, L&L and MEAL on the other hand to share evidence and inform local-level advocacy;
- Capacity strengthening and learning budgets should be transferred to local partners, so that they can decided what kind of capacity they would like to strengthen and what training is most suitable.

5.2.3 Governance structure

- Revise the current governance structure to include country leadership that mirrors shift the power principles, continuous learning for informed decision making and synergy between the partners with clear roles, responsibilities and processes;
- Revive the Shift the Power working group and to prioritize steps they suggest, while creating a mechanism for continuous reflection on Shift the Power;
- Position the MEAL and Finance team better for more effective programme implementation. They could lead more strategically and pro-actively on global level by sharing their (financial/MEAL) insights, overviews, and information to several teams for compliance purposes.

5.2.4 Cost effectiveness

- Define joint financial principles that apply to all partners in the same way and integrate cost-effectiveness analyses. Link these to Right2Grow principles in such a way that resources are re-allocated to those interventions that have most impact in the countries;
- Ensure that financial and programmatic MEAL reinforce each other, by applying cost-accounting based on a joint understanding of what is considered cost-effective by partners, especially around global L&A efforts;
- Position the financial and MEAL teams more strategically together with the country focal points as country focal points have the best view on country context and progress.
- Rearrange or redesign global teams and roles to address current fragmentation and an overload of meetings;
- Reallocate resources to mirror Shift the Power principles, especially shifting resources from global roles to programme countries.

Annexes

Annex 1: Country Information Sheets and Global MTR Summary
Attached Separately

Annex 2: Sample Validated Outcome Statements
Attached separately

Annex 3: Adjusted Global Theory of Change
Attached separately

Annex 4: Updated Global Results Framework
Attached separately

Annex 5: CSO Capacity Assessment Report
Attached separately

Annex 6: Linking and Learning Assessment: From Baseline to Mid-Term
Attached separately