Evaluation thématique transversale "Gestion, Echange et Diffusion des Connaissances" (2008/2013) - PROTOS

Mission d'évaluation
Grands Lacs (Rwanda, Ouganda et Burundi)

Version provisoire – Juin 2012

HYDROCONSEIL

Ingénieur-conseil : Eau potable, environnement, services publics

Table of contents

A. Rwanda

A.1. Analysis of the Implementation of GC/EDC

A.1.1. Implementation of GC/EDC

a) General

Conclusions:

1. **Exchange of knowledge largely happens based on informal communication and happens more frequently than in most other CARs.**
2. **No external programme documentation is available**
3. **The monitoring component of the programme is not designed to generate persuasive knowledge intended for national advocacy purposes**
4. **GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into its activities and PROTOS-Rwanda lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement GC/EDC**
5. **The District level is the principal target of (informal) advocacy efforts**

Findings:

- Great enthusiasm exists about the progamme at District Level. The beneficiaries, the local authorities, and the local partners have a positive perception of the programme in the Mahunga District. Knowledge among these parties is almost exclusively shared on an informal basis (field visits, conversations, email etc).
- The use of knowledge for advocacy purposes is targeted at the District level
- Due to the "chargés de programme" in Kigali, who have joined the programme at the beginning of MYP2, informal exchange of knowledge between the CAR-countries has increased.
- Regional exchange visits have been a mechanism through which knowledge about the Muhanga Programme has been shared with PROTOS colleagues and partners in the 3 other countries of the CAR.
- No external programme documentation is available.
- Monitoring efforts concentrate on the programme indicators of the LogFrame. Indicators that could draw out data which could produce more persuasive knowledge have not been identified. It may be argued that he LogFrame contains only one indicator interesting enough for advocacy purposes, namely : « augmenter la superficie irriguée et ses rendements ».
- There is no baseline to help generate persuasive knowledge (a baseline survey will be conducted in the near future).
- As a consequence of the above two points, the monitoring component of the programme is not designed to generate persuasive knowledge intended for advocacy purposes.
- GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into its activities and PROTOS-Rwanda lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement the GC/EDC (what does PROTOS-Rwanda wants to achieve with the advocacy at national level, and how does it want to attain it).

b) Human Resources

Conclusions

6. **The priorities, responsibilities and motivation around GC/EDC play a role in the limited development of knowledge**

Findings

- The team perceives that advocacy is important and that interesting knowledge is embedded in the programme that could be used for advocacy purposes. Moreover, the team's preferred way of sharing knowledge is through formal documents. Finally, the team members believe that they have the capacity to properly document programme experiences (source: survey)
- Yet, there is limited motivation to get involved in GC/EDC and it is perceived to be someone else's responsibility (source: survey)
- Subsequently, the team members rarely spend time to document experiences.
- Other reasons why the team does not take sufficient time to capitalize on the experiences are:
  - Insufficient resources allocated by the Donor (as negotiated by PROTOS)
  - Low partner capacity

c) Capitalization

Conclusion

7. **The only type of capitalization that exists is an internal evaluation of GIRE + CC published in March 2011**

Findings

- Although no external programme documentation exists, but for internal purposes, two years ago an IWRM and Climate Change evaluation has been conducted titled : « Évaluation transversale 2010: Mise en œuvre de la stratégie GIRE et intégration de la problématique changement climatique » . That report was published in March 2011 and concluded with regards to information management:

  > *Les résultats des projets sont rarement publiés ou partagés en dehors du réseau PROTOS ou dans le pays. Ceci diminue alors l'importance de la qualité des activités de PROTOS : donner des exemples qui inspirent les autres.*

d) Relationship between Grands Lacs and other PROTOS offices

Conclusions

8. **GC/EDC of the Rwanda concentrates on developing knowledge for its own national purposes and the CAR**

Findings

- PROTOS-Rwanda's primary concern is sharing knowledge that leads to the adoption/scale up of positive PROTOS experiences at the District level.
- The office intends to be more involved in advocacy at the national level, for which it realizes it has to generate knowledge suitable for persuasive advocacy (e.g. evidence-based).
- The office is less occupied with the question if other CARs can adopt their knowledge. But knowledge is shared a lot between the Grands Lacs countries.
- In addition, the knowledge generated in other countries is perceived to have limited applicability in Rwanda because of the importance of the differences in political/socio-economic and agro-ecological contexts between the countries.

- As a consequence, the internet page and the intranet page are hardly consulted or used.
- Furthermore, PeM is not spoken about with a lot of enthusiasm. In line with the above findings, its content appears to be of little value to the team and delayed feedback hampers real discussions.
- If general approaches are documented and shared (on for example MOL/SDD/GIRE+CC), the staff members believe that short documents based on a limited number of key principles could have more value than guidance materials of over 100 pages.

A.1.2. Relationship with partners

PROTOS works with three local NGOs and the District Authorities. The NGOs are called DUHAMIC-ADRI, UGAMA-CSC et COFORWA.

a)   *Producers of knowledge*

Conclusions:

9. **Currently the Partners do no produce knowledge for advocacy purposes, and currently they do not have the capacity to fulfill this task adequately.**

Finding

- None of the implementing partners of PROTOS in Rwanda have documented knowledge about the project with PROTOS. One staff member of DUHAMIC-ADRI incidentally wrote an article which has never been shared externally.
- Besides, the partners themselves indicate that many elements that are normally part of a properly operating knowledge management system (formulating indicators, data collection, data analysis, reporting) form a substantial challenge for them.
- PROTOS-Rwanda acknowledges the challenges around programme monitoring.

b)   *Consumers of knowledge*

Conclusions

10. **When partners use PROTOS knowledge, it's through informal communication.**

Findings:

- When the three NGOs and the District Authorities use knowledge from PROTOS, it is through informal communication (conversations, field visits, planning meetings etc).
- Formal documents are used, especially to develop capacity building materials. These documents frequently are often from other organisations/institution. The below table presents the sources that NGOs use to develop their capacity building material:

Les document des quelles institutions vouz utilisez pour chaque subjet (le top 4)
Eau Potable
MIN-INFRA
Banque Mondiale
OMS
RBS (buerau des standards)
Eau Agricole
PPZM (NGO)
MIN-INFRA/REMA
Institutes de Recherche (RAB + Universitées)
MIN-AGRI
Hygiene et Assainissement
UNICEF
MIN-INFRA
MIN-EDUC
MIN-SANTE

c)   National Platforms

PROTOS Rwanda is practically not represented at national level

d)   Regional PROTOS Meetings

- Regional for MOL (Dec 2012)
  - o The partners have greatly appreciated this workshop. It was the first and only capacity building iniitiatve organized by PROTOS during MYP2. The workshop has given the partners a much better appreciation of the MOL approach
- Partners JESE and Burundi have previously visited Kigale – Ruterana (year?)
  - o Programmes in Burundi and Uganda have adopted the bassins versin strategy
  - o And the kitchen garden
- In 2013 there will be another regional Meeting on SDD

A.2. Link with Action Research

A.2.1. Action Research for Rwanda

Conclusions

11. The fact that monitoring, reporting and capitalization are currently weak programme elements underlines the need for a careful and step-by-step introduction of Action Research in Rwanda

Findings

- Although the approach that has been employed in the Muhanga District by PROTOS today is seen as a process involving regular "concertation et re-orientation" (MYP2), the difference with actual Action Research is arguably quite considerable. Action Research would require better indicators, monitoring, reporting, feedback and capitalization.
- The need for good feedback from the field (a prerequisite for Action Research) bears some concern because of the limited monitoring and reporting capacities of the implementing partners. Nevertheless, PROTOS-Rwanda believes that these capacities can be strengthened.
- How Action research will be introduced in Rwanda has yet to be defined. In any case, the introduction is understood to be phased, in the form of a pilot. The fact that monitoring is currently a weak programme elements would underlines the need for such a careful introduction.

A.2.2. Ongoing initiatives

Findings

- Before the end of MYP2 PROTOS-Rwanda wants to have documented the GIRE experience in the Muhanga District

A.2.3. Other areas

a)   Advocacy

Findings

- Advocacy efforts are targeted at the District level without the use of formal documentation

b)   *Capacity Building*

Findings

- At the end of 2012 the partners have benefited from a regional workshop on MOL. That has been the only organized form of capacity building during the MYP2.
- In January 2013 PROTOS-RWANDA has asked the partners to list their capacity building needs. The formulating of indicators, data collection, data analysis, reporting are all areas that form a substantial challenge for them.
- The partners do not necessarily use formal PROTOS resources to develop their capacity building material (which they use with the target population during the implementation of the programme)Conclusions et recommendations

A.3. Conclusions and recommendations

A.3.1. Challenge n°1: Adopt measures in order to manage knowledge for effective advocacy purposes

The expected result of knowledge management in Rwanda is:

- *Partners' experiences are capitalized mutually shared and used for policy advocacy.*

The following conclusions underline the shortcomings that PROTOS-Rwanda experiences with regard to that objective (grouped conclusion from earlier in the report).

- No external programme documentation is available
- GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into the programme cycle and PROTOS-Rwanda lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement the GC/EDC
- The monitoring component of the programme is not designed to generate persuasive knowledge intended for national advocacy purposes
- Currently the Partners do no produce knowledge for advocacy purposes, and currently they do not have the capacity to fulfill this task adequately.
- The District level is the principal target of (informal) advocacy efforts
- The priorities, responsibilities and motivation around GC/EDC play a role in the limited development of knowledge
- When partners use PROTOS knowledge, it's through informal communication
- The only type of capitalization that exists is an internal evaluation of GIRE + CC published in March 2011

Recommendations:

In order to generate persuasive knowledge that is needed for effective advocacy at the national level, it is recommended that PROTOS-Rwanda:

- Develops a knowledge management strategy that lays out 1) why knowledge is needed for district and (in particular) national advocacy purposes, 2) the type of knowledge that is needed, 3) with whom it needs to be shared, 4) in what form and 5) the critical moment for sharing that knowledge (why, what, who, how, when).
- Identifies the potential <u>evidence</u> that is embedded in each result area of the logframe, define indicators to obtain the data to generate the knowledge and subsequently integrate the indicators into programme monitoring activities
- Defines roles and responsibilities for each actor involved in each step of the knowledge management (identification, collection, analysis, documentation, distribution etc).
- Increases the capacities and motivation of the actors involved in the various steps of the knowledge management process

- Ensure that in the MYP3 sufficient resources are allocated for knowledge management

A.3.2. Challenge n°2: strengthen the link between knowledge management and action research

The findings in section C of this report concluded that because monitoring, reporting and capitalization are currently weak programme elements, it would be desirable for PROTOS-Rwanda to undergo a careful and step-by-step introduction of Action Research.

In order to increase the likelihood that the knowledge that will emerge from Action Research can be used for advocacy purposes, it is recommended that PROTOS-Rwanda:

- Investigates problems that have relevance for policy makers and the target population (is there a demand for the potential outcomes of the action research?)
- Ensures that the feedback from the field is of high quality
- Identifies problems that need to be overcome (problem-driven)
- Ensures that the solutions to problems are properly documented and shared
- Ensures the results are evidence based (baseline, relevant measurements)
- Uses the documented knowledge to position itself as a knowledge-broker on key themes within Rwanda so as to more effectively advocate at the national level

B. Uganda

B.1. Analysis of the Implementation of GC/EDC

B.1.1. Implementation of GC/EDC

a) General

Conclusions:

1. **PROTOS-Uganda has capitalized on various experiences and has attempted to position itself as a knowledge leader on IWRM.**
2. **For PROTOS-Uganda knowledge management has a clear purpose: In order to scale-up successful approaches, the experiences have to be made visible so that other actors (governmental and non-governmental) can adopt, adapt, learn from- or invest in them. Visibility is key.**
3. **The content of the documented experiences is often not persuasive (evidence-based)**
4. **A list with specific indicators that would generate data to produce essential knowledge for evidence based advocacy does not exist.**
5. **As a consequence, there is no systematic collection of data needed to generate convincing knowledge for evidence based advocacy.**
6. **In general, the choices around the type of knowledge, the format, channel of communication, target group and the timing are not made in a deliberate fashion. Instead, the documentation and distribution of experiences is usually haphazard.**
7. **GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into the activities and PROTOS-Uganda lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement GC/EDC**

Findings:

- Despite similar time and resource constraints as other offices within the CAR, PROTOS-Uganda has made efforts to capitalize on the various programme experiences. Various short articles have been documented and shared at national and sub-regional level (see annex for a list with documents). Some examples have been used for internal purposes.
- PROTOS-Uganda tries to publish a short article in every edition of the annual Water and Sanitation NGO Performance Report (NGO-led) and the Water and Environment Sector Performance Report (Ministry-led).
- The baseline survey that PROTOS has conducted in 2011 has also been shared.
- Two Films on IWRM have been developed. On has been used for sensitization purposes, the other was a capitalization of project with UNEP (see annex)
- PROTOS-Uganda chairs the UWASNET working group on IWRM, Climate Change and Environment and PROTOS-Uganda is a member of the Ministerial Thematic Theme on IWRM
- PROTOS also takes part in an annual regional learning forum (Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum), of which the proceedings are also intended to contribute to scaling-up of experiences
- Because of their involvement in these national IWRM groups and their work on IWRM they are perceived to be a knowledge leader on IWRM.
- For PROTOS-Uganda knowledge management has a clear purpose: In order to scale-up successful approaches, the experiences have to be made visible so that other actors can adopt, adapt, learn from- or invest in them. Visibility is key.

- The use of knowledge for advocacy purposes is targeted at both District, Regional and National levels.
- The content of the documented experiences is often not persuasive. They are written in a "lessons learned" style and are usually not supplemented with noteworthy evidence on the impact of the programme. In addition, they often consist of text only (as opposed to graphs or maps).
- In general, the choices around the type of knowledge, the format, channel of communication, target group, timing are not made in a deliberate fashion. Instead, the documentation and distribution of experiences is usually haphazard.
- Readership of the articles is unknown, and the impact of their knowledge management efforts is hard to measure (Nevertheless, PROTOS had an opportunity to further IWRM in the Mpanga River catchment almost entire based on their status as a knowledge leader on IWRM).
- The programme monitoring indicators that are found in the LogFrame do not generate the knowledge needed to advocate at the national level. Although there is a baseline and an end-line survey, a list with specific indicators that would generate data to produce essential knowledge for evidence based advocacy does not exist.
- As a consequence, there is no systematic collection of data needed to generate persuasive knowledge for evidence based advocacy.
- GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into its activities and PROTOS-Uganda lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement the GC/EDC (what does PROTOS-Uganda wants to achieve with the advocacy at national level, and how does it want to attain it).

b) Human Resources

Conclusions

8. **Despite a number of constrains, the willingness and capacity of the PROTOS-Uganda team to enhance the visibility of the programme experiences is high**

Findings

- PROTOS-Uganda is convinced of the value of GC/EDC and committed to share their experiences. To some degree, GC/EDC is a priority for PROTOS-Uganda. The team is small and there is not a lot of funding for GC/EDC, but they are nonetheless motivated to increase the visibility of the programme results.
- Consequently, capitalization is not strictly a function of the time or budget allocated for GC/EDC. Time is taken to document experiences when a valuable opportunity to share arises.
- The base-line and end-line surveys that are conducted demonstrate that the team wants to generate more evidence about the results of the programme.
- The quality of the documents could increase when more data is available to supplement the lessons-learned style articles that have been developed thus far.

c) Capitalisation

Conclusion

9. **Despite a number of challenges, PROTOS-Uganda has documented and shared various experiences. Advocacy would be more effective if these documents would contain more evidence.**

Findings

- The below table list examples of what has been documented. Materials developed for capacity building or sensitization purposes or surveys are not captured in the below table. Please see Annex A for a more comprehensive table of resources.

Title	Type
Sustainability and functionality of water facilities through the water user association	Article/Example
Optimizing ecological sanitation in schools	Article/Example
A functional water users committee, against all odds	Article/Example
Water and Environment Sector - Performance Report Box 10.2 Ecosan Cost reduction in Kamwenge District, by PROTOS (2010)	Article/Example
Water and Sanitation NGO Performance Report - 2012 - Case Study 4-9: Optimizing Ecological Sanitation in Schools - Case Study 4-12: Community Involvement in IWRM: A Tool for Climate Change Adaptation	Article/Example
Climate change adaptation (IWRM)	Film (UNEP)
Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum (8 surrounding districts) proceedings	Meeting Report
A report on the sensitization of the community in and around river mpanga and its catchment using the orugendo rwakavera film (upstream downstream)	Report

- None of the articles listed in this table are very persuasive. That is mostly because they not contain the type of evidence that is needed to effectively advocate, which is related to the fact that indicators that could generate essential knowledge have not been defined. The article about water users association is a case in point. It contains very interesting information, but some essential facts about the effectiveness of associations are not included (e.g. changes in average downtime of hand pumps). Predefined indicators demonstrating the effectiveness of the association would contribute to higher quality and evidence based advocacy.
- The report on the community sensitization around the Mpanga catchment by use of mobile cinema is another interesting example of capitalization. The report is public and has been written by a local research institute (KRC). The document contains interesting qualitative knowledge. The findings could not have been predicted, and underscores that the identification of interesting knowledge cannot always be planned (for example, that communities themselves recommend to arrange a dialogue between upstream and downstream communities).
- Another film about climate change adaptation has been a form of capitalization of the work with UNEP developed for their own publicity, and not really used by PROTOS for advocacy purposes.
- PROTOS-Uganda explicitly collaborates in the Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum to exchange knowledge with other partners.

d) Relationship between Uganda and other CARs

Conclusions

10. **PROTOS-Uganda concentrates on the visibility and advocacy with regard to its own programme, and to some extent it's own CAR. Sharing with- or adopting knowledge from other CARs is secondary.**

Findings

- PROTOS-Uganda's primary concern is increasing the visibility of its own programme experiences for national advocacy purposes.
- KNowledeg is shared often with other offices within tit's own CAR
- The office is less occupied with the question if other CARs can adopt their knowledge, or if knowledge from other CARs can be applied in Uganda.
- In addition, the knowledge generated in other countries is perceived to have limited applicability in Uganda because of the importance of the differences in political/socio-economic and agro-ecological contexts between the countries.
- If general approaches are documented and shared (on for example MOL/SDD/GIRE+CC), the staff members believe that short documents based on a

limited number of key principles could have more value than guidance materials of over 100 pages.
- The internet page and the intranet page are hardly consulted or used. The PROTOS internet pages do not serve the visibility and advocacy purpose of PROTOS-Uganda. They are considered to be old-fashioned.
- PeM is not spoken about with a lot of enthusiasm. In line with the above findings, its content appears to be of little value to the team and delayed feedback hampers real discussions.

B.1.2. Relationship with Partners

PROTOS primarily collaborates with local Authorities and with an NGO called JESE. PROTOS has also collaborated with KRC and TBG.

a)   Co-producers

Conclusions:

11. **Capacity exists among the local partners to generate knowledge for evidence based advocacy. They have the capacity to be more involved in the production of high quality knowledge.**

Finding

- JESE shows to be an NGO that is keen to monitor, document, and share programme experiences. They have already contributed to a number or articles. The staff speak with enthusiasm about high quality knowledge needed for advocacy purposes.
- KRC is a local research institute that has the capacity to design, conduct, analyze, and document quantitative and qualitative research. Moreover, they regularly think about how to strategically share knowledge so as to influence policy makers. They have previously worked together with PROTOS and appear to have a lot of potential as a partner to develop evidence based policy advocacy.

b)   Consumers

Conclusions

12. **PROTOS-Uganda has been involved in the development of a lot of materials that are used by partners to transfer knowledge to the target population/institutions**

Findings:

- Various materials for capacity building, sensitization, promotion have been developed that are used by the partners (see below table)

Title	Type
Orugendo Rwakavera (IWRM) (upstream to downstream)	Film
Baseline study WASH	Study
Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum (8 surrounding districts) proceedings	Meeting Reports
Understanding Climate for Sustainable Development in the Rwenzori Region, A trainers' manual	ToT
Manual on community action plans	Manual
Modules for primary schools - Soil water conservation - Keeping the school and home environment clean - Understanding and monitoring our rivers - Understanding the weather and climate	Teaching Module

In addition, the following regional exchanges have taken place.

- Regional for MOL (Dec 2012)
  - The partners have greatly appreciated this workshop. It was the first and only capacity building iniitiatve organized by PROTOS during MYP2. The workshop has given the partners a much better appreciation of the MOL approach
- Partners JESE and Burundi have previously visited Kigale – Ruterana (year?)
  - Programmes in Burundi and Uganda have adopted the bassins versin strategy
  - And the kitchen garden
- In 2013 there will be another regional Meeting on SDD

B.1.3. Participation in national platform

PROTOS-Uganda purposefully and explicitly participates in the below national and regional platforms to share and increase the visibility of PROTOS experiences

- Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum
- PROTOS-Uganda chairs the UWASNET working group on IWRM, Climate Change and Environment
- PROTOS-Uganda is a member of the Ministerial Thematic Theme on IWRM

B.2. Link with Action Research

B.2.1. GC/EDC and Action Research

Conclusions

13. **The capacity of PROTOS-Uganda, JESE and KRC enable the introduction of action research.**
14. **How Action research will be introduced in Uganda has yet to be defined. In any case, the introduction is understood to be phased, in the form of a pilot. Despite the available capacity in Uganda, the phased introduction is sensible.**

Findings

- Although PROTOS-Uganda uses feedback from the field to adapt the programme, the difference with actual Action Research[1] is still considerable
- But the capacity and willingness of JESE to monitor and the research expertise of KRC combined with the capacity of PROTOS-Uganda provides a lot of potential to introduce Action Research into the MYP3
- How Action research will be introduced in Uganda has yet to be defined. In any case, the introduction is understood to be phased, in the form of a pilot. Despite the available capacity in Uganda, the phased introduction is sensible.

B.2.2. Ongoing initiatives

Findings

- End-line survey is currently being conducted

---

[1] •Compare with the methodology as defined by PROTOS :   (i) L'identification du problème de recherche, (ii) La définition de la question de recherche, (iii) La détermination des méthodes de travail, (iv) Phase de recherche sur le terrain, (v) Restitution et validation des résultats aux participants, (vi) Mettre en oeuvre la solution retenue, (vii) Evaluation des résultats, (viii) Diffusion des résultats.

B.2.3. Other areas

a)   Advocacy

Findings

- Although PROTOS-Uganda is not based in the capital, it does its best to be involved in national NGO and Ministerial for a/working groups

b)   Capacity Building

Findings

- At the end of 2012 JESE has benefited from a regional workshop on MOL. JESE has benefited from a "write-shop", organized by SNV on reporting/writing skills

B.3. Conclusions and recommendations

B.3.1. Challenge n°1: Adopt measures in order to manage knowledge for effective advocacy purposes

The expected result of knowledge management in Rwanda is:

- *Partners' experiences are capitalized mutually shared and used for policy advocacy.*

In order to generate persuasive knowledge that is needed for effective advocacy at the national level, it is recommended that PROTOS-Uganda:

- Develops a knowledge management strategy that lays out 1) why knowledge is needed for district and (in particular) national advocacy purposes, 2) the type of knowledge that is needed, 3) with whom it needs to be shared, 4) in what form and 5) the critical moment for sharing that knowledge (why, what, who, how, when).
- Identifies the potential <u>evidence</u> that is embedded in each result area of the logframe, define indicators to obtain the data to generate the knowledge and subsequently integrate the indicators into programme monitoring activities
- Defines roles and responsibilities for each actor involved in each step of the knowledge management (identification, collection, analysis, documentation, distribution etc).
- Ensure that in the MYP3 sufficient resources are allocated for knowledge management

B.3.2. Challenge n°2: strengthen the link between knowledge management and action research

Recommendations:

The partnership between PROTOS, JESE and KRC could lead to a good Action Research team. It is recommended that PROTOS engages these partners and investigates:

- To what extent these partners actually have the willingness and the capacity to get involved (and in the case of KRC, how much their involvement is going to cost)
- If the three can agree on which topic (that has relevance for both the beneficiaries as well as the ministry) Action Research should be incorporated
- To think about the type of knowledge that is needed to generate evidence-based advocacy materials.
- To discuss the research design
- Bring this plan and share with partners at the meeting in Gand, October 2013

In addition, in order to increase the likelihood that the knowledge that will emerge from Action Research can be used for advocacy purposes, it is recommended that PROTOS-Uganda:

- Investigates problems that have relevance for policy makers and the target population (is there a demand for the potential outcomes of the action research?)
- Ensures that the feedback from the field is of high quality
- Identifies of problems that need to be overcome (problem-driven)
- Ensures that the solutions to problems are properly documented and shared
- Ensures the results are evidence based (baseline, relevant measurements)
- Uses the documented knowledge to position itself as a knowledge-broker on key themes within Rwanda so as to more effectively advocate at the national level

C. Burundi

During this field visit there was no opportunity to go visit the programme in Burundi or to visit the partners. Neither has Burundi participated in the online-survey. The chargés de programme and the RespRep have explained that (in terms of GC/EDC) the situation for Burundi is exactly the same as for Rwanda: Nothing has been documented during MYP2, there isn't a GC/EDC strategy, no systematic approach.

The recommendations are the same as for Rwanda:

C.1.1. Challenge n°1: Adopt measures in order to manage knowledge for effective advocacy purposes

The expected result of knowledge management in Burundi is:

- *Partners' experiences are capitalized mutually shared and used for policy advocacy.*

The following conclusions underline the shortcomings that PROTOS-Burundi experiences with regard to that objective (grouped conclusion from earlier in the report).

- No external programme documentation is available
- GC/EDC is not systematically integrated into the programme cycle and PROTOS-Burundi lacks a clear methodology and strategy on how to implement the GC/EDC
- The monitoring component of the programme is not designed to generate persuasive knowledge intended for national advocacy purposes
- Currently the Partners do no produce knowledge for advocacy purposes, and currently they do not have the capacity to fulfill this task adequately.
- The District level is the principal target of (informal) advocacy efforts
- The priorities, responsibilities and motivation around GC/EDC play a role in the limited development of knowledge
- When partners use PROTOS knowledge, it's through informal communication
- The only type of capitalization that exists is an internal evaluation of GIRE + CC published in March 2011

Recommendations:

In order to generate persuasive knowledge that is needed for effective advocacy at the national level, it is recommended that PROTOS-Burundi:

- Develops a knowledge management strategy that lays out 1) why knowledge is needed for district and (in particular) national advocacy purposes, 2) the type of knowledge that is needed, 3) with whom it needs to be shared, 4) in what form and 5) the critical moment for sharing that knowledge (why, what, who, how, when).
- Identifies the potential <u>evidence</u> that is embedded in each result area of the logframe, define indicators to obtain the data to generate the knowledge and subsequently integrate the indicators into programme monitoring activities
- Defines roles and responsibilities for each actor involved in each step of the knowledge management (identification, collection, analysis, documentation, distribution etc).
- Increases the capacities and motivation of the actors involved in the various steps of the knowledge management process
- Ensure that in the MYP3 sufficient resources are allocated for knowledge management

C.1.2. Challenge n°2: strengthen the link between knowledge management and action research

The findings in section C of this report concluded that because monitoring, reporting and capitalization are currently weak programme elements, it would be desirable for PROTOS-Burundi to undergo a careful and step-by-step introduction of Action Research.

In order to increase the likelihood that the knowledge that will emerge from Action Research can be used for advocacy purposes, it is recommended that PROTOS-Burundi:

- Investigates problems that have relevance for policy makers and the target population (is there a demand for the potential outcomes of the action research?)
- Ensures that the feedback from the field is of high quality
- Identifies problems that need to be overcome (problem-driven)
- Ensures that the solutions to problems are properly documented and shared
- Ensures the results are evidence based (baseline, relevant measurements)
- Uses the documented knowledge to position itself as a knowledge-broker on key themes within Burunfi so as to more effectively advocate at the national level

D. Annexes

Title	Type	Author
Sustainability and functionality of water facilities through the water user association	Article/Case Study	JESE
Optimizing ecological sanitation in schools	Article/Case Study	PROTOS
A functional water users committee, against all odds	Article/Case Study	PROTOS
Climate change adaptation	Film	PROTOS
Orugendo Rwakavera (Protection River Mpanga - Solid Waste)	Film	PROTOS
Water and Environment Sector - Performance Report - 2101 Box 10.2 Ecosan Cost reduction in Kamwenge District, by PROTOS (2010)	Examples/Cases	PROTOS
Water and Sanitation NGO Performance Report - 2012 - Case Study 4-9: Optimizing Ecological Sanitation in Schools - Case Study 4-12: Community Involvement in IWRM: A Tool for Climate Change Adaptation	Examples/Cases	PROTOS
Baseline study WASH	Study	PROTOS
Eerst water de rest komt later - CONGO	Film	PROTOS
Rwenzori Regional Learning Forum (8 surrounding districts)	Meeting Report	PROTOS