



STRENGTHENING CIVIL SOCIETY'S ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT: A PARTNER'S PERSPECTIVE

PRESENTATION AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

NOVEMBER 8, 2017

PRESENTERS

Susan Pologruto, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Stanlake Kaziboni, World Vision

Suzanne Cant, World Vision

Carolyn Barker-Villena, Lutheran World Relief

Sara Nitz, InterAction

MODERATOR

Julie MacCartee, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Julie MacCartee:

Good morning, afternoon or evening, everyone. On behalf of the Agrilinks team and the USAID Bureau for Food Security I would like to welcome you to the November Agro Links webinar on Strengthening Civil Society's Role in Development, a Partner's Perspective. I think this is a topic that is relevant to nearly everyone who works in international development. So I'm excited for some great conversation today on the webinar.

My name is Julie MacCartee and I'm a knowledge management specialist with the Bureau for Food Security. And if you've attended an Agro Links webinar before you've probably heard my voice. I'll be facilitating the event this morning.

So before we get started with the content I would like to provide a few reminders. First, the chat box is your main way to communicate today. And I can see that a few people are taking advantage of that. That's great. Please do use it liberally to introduce yourselves, let us know where you're joining from, your org, to network, to share resources. It looks like we have a bit of a small crowd today, but that can be great for engagement. For everyone talking, chatting, asking questions. So please don't hesitate to ask questions at any point and to use the chat box.

Let's see. We'll be holding many of the questions until the end, but we'll also – if anything really important comes up along the way we'll see if we can answer it along the way. And we'll also have our experts typing into the chat box along the way to help answer your questions.

We are recording this webinar and we'll post the recording, the transcript and the other resources to Agro Links. And if you're watching the webinar right now that means you're already on the email list to receive a link to the recording. So you can watch any parts you missed or share it with your colleagues. And you'll also see some key links and file downloads on the left of your screen. Those will point you to the handbook that will be in question today. And a few other key resources that we're encouraging you to download.

Okay. So I think it's time to dive into the content. So I'm going to introduce our speakers upfront. So I'll click through and show you their bios as I move along. To

introduce the topic and kind of the material today we will have Susan Pologruto with the USAID Bureau for Food Security. And she is our advisor on civil society and local engagement and spearhead of the development the Civil Society Engagement handbook. So we're excited to have her as our first speaker.

We'll also have Carolyn Barker-Villena. Yes. Excellent. Who is with Lutheran World Relief and has been there quite a while. A decade. Serving as the senior regional director for Latin America and the Caribbean.

And then next up we'll have Stanlake Kaziboni with World Vision who is World Vision's business development and quality assurance director in Tanzania.

We will also have – let's see. Oop. Sue Cant with Word Vision who is technical advisor to World Vision's social accountability programs. So she'll be up at that point.

And then also Sara Nitz with InterAction. The policy and advocacy manager for food security and agriculture. So this is a really great lineup. I'm excited to dive into the content and I'll pass the mic over to Susan Pologruto.

Susan Pologruto:

Great. Thank you so much, Julie, for that introduction. And good morning and afternoon and good evening to everybody who has joined us today. I am Susan Pologruto. I'm with the Bureau for Food Security here in USAID and I'm going to do a very brief and quick overview of how we've been engaging civil society and why. And how we've gotten to the point where we are today into the introduction of the handbook. So you're going to hear from me and Sara's gonna help me with that. Because InterAction and some of our implementing partners and the civil society organizations here in DC have been very key components as well as collaborators in that process.

So as some of you may recall, Hillary Clinton gave an impassioned speech at the UN to focus more on a collaborative effort to engage local actors and civil society in our

food security and nutrition efforts in 2012. And soon thereafter our former administrator, Raj, asked the advisory committee for voluntarily foreign aid to launch a specialized working group focused specifically on Feed the Future and our ways of engaging civil society and how we can promote collaboration.

So this was the beginning of some of the very specific efforts to have a more specific and targeted approach. And as many of you who have worked, if you have any experience working in this space also know around the same time and probably now for a decade now we've seen an increase in closing spaces. So closing spaces is a term that we use for closing spaces for civil society, for voice, for their activism. So that has been also the backdrop and the context for things we've been seeing and experiencing.

So the advisory group for voluntary foreign aid soon formed and they made very specific recommendations and a report that was submitted in September 2013. That report had really specifics for how USAID in particular can be working internally to support staff, to have trainings, as well as things we can do to promote more conversation and learning among ourselves. And one of those specific things was the development of an action plan, which we did in 2014. And around also some of the, some of more of that same backdrop with civil society almost in that same month that that recommendations report was submitted from the advisory group, we had for civil society that was also issued. It was a presidential memorandum focusing on the important role that civil society plays in shaping our lives.

And that is an interesting document because it really directed all US government personnel and staff to really consult with civil society organizations to seek their feedback, to focus on how we can collaborate more intentionally together. So that is also some of the backdrop and also one of the specific deliverables around that time.

So after we had the civil society and after we had the civil society action plan, we had – sorry. Okay. I'm back on track. So I'm going to wrap this up here. So with the civil society action plan just to emphasize, we had just a couple of main objectives. And, again, this is your brief overview. And one was enhancing the civil society engagement and the second piece was our messaging with our communications team.

So those were our big pieces for deliverables. And now we're moving into another deliverable that was part of this action plan but separate. And that deliverable was focusing more on the engagement. And this document was just released in the spring. And that's what we're gonna focus on today.

So it is focusing on more specifically not just how we can work together as a team and as an agency and with our partners, but this one's more about, well, what have we learned? The engagement handbook. Some of our best practices or even ideas for just how we want to go about working together, and in particular, with local actors.

So I'm about to hand it over to Sara right now. So she's gonna talk about the genesis of these two documents and how we've collaborated together and what that process has looked like. And taking it from the top and the working group and interactions role. So thank you, Sara. I'm gonna turn it over to you.

Sara Nitz:

Yes. Thank you, Susan for that introduction and that great overview. So InterAction is an alliance of 190 plus US based humanitarian and development organizations. And we've been engaged in this civil society guide book Feed the Future process really from the beginning in a consultation with USAID. We developed a policy brief in 2011 to help kind of guide or help bring perspective from our organization on what we'd like to see and how we'd like to have civil society be better engaged in the future.

So this is kind of a couple of the key points that we hit, as you see on your slide, in that brief that we wanted – really that have also been echoed in the final document. Which was really great to see. So that's kinda – I don't want to go through all the different points on that, but that's the key area there.

Then that transitioned after we worked that brief and working with USAID, it transitioned into the strengthening civil society roles and development handbook and hit three key areas of practice. First was we wanted to – the goal of promoting aid effectiveness principle and norms. The second is providing a guiding framework

for development effectiveness and stakeholder consultation. And then that manifested itself in four engagement principles that were selected and came from a little bit from the InterAction's policy brief.

So we're gonna walk through kinda the four engagement practices that are included in the handbook. If you have the document you can kind of follow along as we walk through them.

First is the engagement practice of meaningful participation. Where local and civil society and other stakeholders should participate meaningfully and help shape priorities and strategies. From InterAction's perspective this really is an idea that civil society should be engaged from the beginning not as an afterthought and really should help emphasize throughout the entire process of program planning.

If you see through all of these different space – all these different engagement practices, there's additional resources in the back in the handbook that you can look at to help facilitate these kind of discussions.

The second practice that was highlighted is the whole of society development and local ownership should be based on a multi-stakeholder whole of society approach. That it should not just be working directly within implementing partners but really working with everyone in the community so you can get a variety of perspective and a variety of approaches. And that really helps make a robust conversation.

For engagement practice two, Lutheran World Relief will really help discuss that area a little bit further in their portion of the project.

Next in engagement practice three, it's about the enabling environment. And creating an enabling environment and operating space for civil society and other non-state actors that should facilitate their participation and development. There's some really wonderful examples that you can look in the handbook from Burma or Tajikistan that really help highlight how this looks in practice. And I think that was

the goal of this handbook was to provide not only overall overarching practices and engagement principals, but highlighting how this can actually be used in the field.

And then the last one is engagement practice four which is capacity strengthening. Civil society engagement and participation may require strengthening organization's capacity to be effective and sustainable. Again, this is like really key one from InterAction's perspective. Before anything happens you have to understand the capacity of the people that you're working with and work with them prior to a program to help bring them to the level that they can be most effective and engaged in a program or a process. That they can really have that engagement in the strategy from the beginning. That you're all talking the same terms. You're all engaged in the same way. And that you really create that relationship that can help make programs and projects sustainable beyond the initial implementation.

And I am now going to hand it back to Susan to kind of wrap up on the overarching and background space before we head into the rest of our presenters.

Susan Pologruto:

Thank you. All right. Thank you so much, Sara. So that was a great overview of our handbook. Thank you so much. That was a great overview of our handbook. The four specific engagement practices or best practices that we're focusing on and you're gonna hear, as she mentioned, two from – two more specifically.

This handbook is really serving as a guide to put the US government and USAID's vision of country ownership and local ownership into practice. That's why we created it and that's why we're having this webinar today. It also builds upon our global Food Security Act of 2016, as well as our own global food security strategy that we developed last year that is emphasizing the local ownership and partnerships to improve sustainability.

It is also very much related to systems thinking. Systems thinking is really – systems thinking is one of the things we've been focusing on at USAID for a number of years now. And we have the local systems framework paper, as well as the five R's and a number of other resources that are publically available. But basically systems thinking is really an integrated approach to sustainability. It's refocusing our efforts

around what we used to call local solutions five plus years ago to more of a local systems framework. More of a systems thinking approach. And as we move forward, we want to increasingly play a convening role to bring local and international partners together around a specific development challenge or problem we're trying to address.

We also want to connect the partnerships and the people and the players to address these challenges and problems together. And then we want to catalyze and scale up the solutions that these partnerships produce.

So that's, again, just some more framing for how it's related to some of the agency's bigger picture policies and how we can work into civil society together. So without any further ado, I am going to turn it over to Carolyn. So she can then give you some more specific information about Lutheran World Relief Project.

C. Barker-Villena: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Susan, very much. I want to thank you not only for inviting Lutheran World Relief to participate in this webinar but also to participate in the civil society engagement handbook. Move my slides up. There it goes. Great.

Okay. So as Sara had mentioned, in the handbook it highlights four different engagement practices. And the case study that I'm going to be presenting focuses primarily on the second engagement practice of whole of society development. However, I would say that this project that I'll be presenting actually touches on all four of the engagement practices. Cause really you need to have all four to be most effective.

The particular project I'll be talking about is called Gender and Agriculture from Policy to Practice. Or we also call it GAPP. This project was funded by USAID through the Bureau for Food Security, Feed the Future and it was actually a program called Innovations for Gender Equity and APS that went out I believe in 2011. So the project is very much focused on gender approaches to food security.

move on. I keep pushing the wrong button. Okay.

All right. So I'm gonna just briefly explain the approach. First of all, this project took place between October 2013 and July 2016. So it did end about a little over a year ago now. And it took place in Honduras, in the western part of Honduras in the Department of Agriculture in ten different municipalities.

The approach that we took to this, this was very much of a pilot project. Again, under this Innovations for Gender Equity program. And the approach we took to it was not only to focus on the role of women in terms of their involvement in civil society, but also to pull in the role of men. And to recognize that men have a key role in terms of both supporting women's leadership but also advocating for more policies that promote gender equality.

So that was really kind of the basis of this programming. But at the same time the idea being that we really wanted to focus on the development of a locally driven gender equality agenda. And I think we all are very familiar with the fact that to achieve food security goals gender equity is a key driver for food security. So that's really, again, at the basis of this project approach. Pulling together both men and women, again, to advocate for policies that will ultimately reduce gender gaps.

I wanted to highlight in the context of Honduras there were several policies that we were able to build on that were already in existence. Specifically three laws that were in place. One related to the law of equity for opportunities for women. Which led to the national plan for gender equity. A second law as the law of food security and nutrition. Interestingly though, in Honduras that law for food security and nutrition did not highlight the role of women or gender particularly. And then thirdly the law of municipalities. And this law was particularly important for – this last was particularly important for the implementation of this project because it required that at least a minimum of 5 percent of the municipalities' budgets needed to go towards women's activities. So essentially the idea of being access for women to resources for economic activities in particular.

Having said that, despite the fact that these three laws existed as we all know there is often a gap between policy and practice. So a lot of what we were trying to do was bridge that gap. And help women's groups to further take advantage of these laws. To promote their access to resources.

Now I'm gonna go on and talk a little bit about some of the results that we solve from this project. You can see here that we had over 4,000 direct beneficiaries. And the breakdown below shows that the majority of those beneficiaries were women. So, again, the idea of being promoting the involvement of women in advocating for their rights and access to resources. But we also had quite a few men who were involved. And this is because, as I mentioned in the last slide, a big part of the approach was this what we refer to as the masculinities approach. So not only were women being trained in leadership skills, but men were also being trained in sort of gender equity awareness, awareness of different roles that men and women play in their community, etcetera.

So ultimately what we were looking for are structural changes, both from the political side but also from the cultural side. Recognizing that you can't change policies and implementation in policies without changing sort of the cultural approach. And I think this kind of a little bit to the systems approach that Susan was talking about. Here we talk a lot about the need for structural change and also the need for having agents of changes. Both these women and men who were trained we saw as agents of change within their communities.

Okay. So a couple of sort of concrete results from the project. The women that were trained, they were part of what we referred to was the women's network. Women's municipal network. And these municipal networks had already been formed previous to the project, so we were working within these existing groups to further strengthen their capacity of the women members to be able to, again, advocate for resources. And a lot of this was leadership training, but it was also very practical training around how to design a project to present to municipal governments for support out of that 5 percent of funding that I mentioned earlier.

Due to all of that training they were able to put together a variety of project proposals and ultimately we had 170 projects that were supported by municipal

governments representing close to \$70,000.00 worth of disbursements from those local governments for these 170 projects.

I think what's interesting is to see that breakdown is that of those projects, even though this is a food security sort of ag focused project, the reality is that these women were not only looking for support for directly for ag projects but also for nonagricultural. Basically businesses. So we're talking about bakeries. We're talking about beekeeping, as you can see in the photo on the ag side. Coffee. Nurseries. And a variety. Small stores. Kitchen gardens. A variety of different activities that women were engaged in. And I think the key piece here is the recognition that you have to listen to women as well and recognize that what we as an NGO or as USAID thinks would be their priorities are not necessarily always going to be the priorities. So, again, here we were focused a lot on agriculture. But what came out of these proposals often was not necessarily agricultural.

So this slide, I'm missing a word in the first bullet. But this slide refers to rural savings and loan institutions. We focused a lot on these role saving, these locally based rural savings and loans institutions because they're the ones who provide access to credit for women. So, again, this is another way in addition to accessing resources from the municipal governments, we wanted women to have more access to credit from these local rural savings and loans institutions.

And as you can see, there were 56 of I think they were a total of 60 savings and loans institutions that did change some of their policies around accessing, providing more access to women. And some of the ways that they did that – looking at my notes here. Were by reducing the annual membership fees that had to be paid by women. They often gave women extensions for their payment plans. They, for their meetings of the local – of the rural savings and loans institutions they ensured there were flexible meeting times so that they could respond to when women were available to participate. They had – some had credit lines exclusively for women, etcetera. So ultimately that led to an increase in credit availability for women.

And then I wanted to highlight that nine of the ten municipalities that we worked with in western Honduras did integrate into their policies, their food and nutrition polices a gender approach. So I mentioned this in an earlier slide that while there

was this food and nutrition law it did not highlight the role of gender in that. And so as part of the advocacy efforts we were able to influence and advocate for more of a gender approach within the policies of these nine different municipalities. There was one municipality that ultimately was very difficult to work with and that had a lawyer, sorry not a lawyer. A mayor who was not open to the project as much as the other municipalities had been.

So lastly I just wanted to highlight that in this entire approach we, I mentioned earlier this was really a pilot project to sort of test out this innovative approach by bringing together men and women and we documented that approach in a toolkit that can be found at this link, genderandagriculture.org. So I welcome all of you to take a look at that because it goes into much more detail than I have time to describe today in this webinar.

I think I'll leave it at that.

Susan Pologruto: Thank you. Thank you so much, Carolyn. So now we're going to turn it over to Sue who's on the phone. Sue, if you're on mute now would be a great time to unmute yourself.

Sue Cant: so just touching quickly on the global food security strategy as Susan did, I want to reinforce effective governance system strengthening within that is very important. And the strategy recognizes that to have effective governments requires capacity for dialogue between citizens, government and the private sector. And there are many terms that describe this. And this is obviously the work of the – of what's being promoted through the civil society handbook.

There are many attempts to describe this. Mutual accountability. Bottom up accountability. Demand led governance and social accountability, which is the term that I will use today.

So what are the elements of social accountability? Well, there are three key elements that make up these social accountability interventions. Civic information. The right to information collective action and government response. And if you remember nothing from this presentation I fervently hope that you remember these three key elements. Because when communities are empowered with knowledge about their specific rights to services and we're talking very, very tangible knowledge here, they have the confidence to speak up on their experiences with those services. And in speaking up and sharing on that experience and providing that feedback it helps government to do a better job by responding in a more appropriate and efficient way.

So I'm talking broadly to World Vision's social accountability approach because we've developed this over 12 years of research and application now with Oxford, Columbia, John Hopkins and Georgetown universities among others. Through systematic reviews, randomized control trials, quasi experimental designs, more than two dozen evaluations. We have hard evidence of its impact and we've scaled more than 400 program across health, water and sanitation education, food security and livelihoods in 48 countries.

As I said, we're talking about proven efficacy here and we're talking about the gold standard in evaluations. For example, randomized control trial that was led by Oxford University found strong results in student test scores, reductions in student/teacher absenteeism and a similar intervention in health from a long run impact study found dramatic results in reductions in child mortality. But what I'd really like to draw people's attention to is a very significant macro evaluation that was done by Dfid. And which shows, and I quote, "compelling evidence of social accountability programs, which, and I quote, "almost always impacted services." And next week USAID's global health team will deliver a major review of evidence in health, which will also touch on this evidence in health.

So how does this social accountability work? Well, this is from researchers at Columbia University. Their description of what they saw in the process. And we're talking about improved citizen knowledge of specific entities as I mentioned services. Which enables citizens to have a dialogue with government. I mean that information is really super critical in order that communities can talk with government. The development of action plans which are agreed publically with

community service providers and government officials is really a critical part of the approach. That enables the monitoring of improvements in services and the holding of governments to account.

A little bit more on the detail, because Susan was quite keen on the how we implement this. And a lot of you will have heard of community services scorecards. I'm just talking through some of the participatory approaches that we use in World Vision and many other NGOs also use scorecards. What you see are four interlinked participatory processes. An initial meeting for everyone to understand the process. And what we call monitoring standards or a social order. Which put simply is the government standard for a particular service a government commits to in its policy and technical documents. So for example, maybe the number of extension workers per administrative area, what functions those extension workers are meant to carry out. Including how often they should be in the field supporting farmers. And then we have scorecards. Which allow communities to come up with their own priorities for services. And we've seen in the case of Tanzania and farmers, which my colleague Stanlake will shortly talk to, it's there around access to land tenure, which we need government services to facilitate. In Rwanda and Uganda it's been improved quality and timely delivery of seed and fertilizer.

The information about farmer priorities and the needs and gaps and constraints in governments meeting service standards are then shared in an interfaith meeting. Which is where an action plan is jointly developed between farmers, agricultural extension workers and key government decision makers. And I'll shortly show you an image of one of these meetings that we had in Bangladesh.

So just briefly talking to one of our programs in Bangladesh is a large program. A USAID program. Reaching more than 850,000 beneficiaries. Here is an image of an action plan or interfaith meeting we call between service users and providers of a health clinic in southwest Bangladesh.

All these participatory activities that I've mentioned before in the civic education particularly, that culminate in the meeting that you see here. With service users and providers and key decision makers all attend.

So I identified earlier the three core elements of social accountability, which I'll again reinforce. Information, collective action and government response. And what you see here I want to illustrate is that the very, well, I hope you can see. At the very front of the room the person speaking is actually the chairman of the union. Who's the head of the local government there. And he's committing to the community, this particular community about their particular health clinic that what he will make sure, he will ensure that water access is made available in their local clinic. Now this is water that is already promised and committed under the rural health clinic policy there. Again, this is information about that policy that is being broadly shared as part of the civic education process. And I just want to stress that the local media were there to record the commitment and many bureaucrats.

So some of the outcomes we are seeing are increased community knowledge and action. Service provider knowledge action, ownership and improved local leadership are some of the key components. I briefly talked to this, but the systematic review that we had done of our and other's work we're seeing the results along the lines of these key triggers for change in Bangladesh. So for example, one of the very key mechanisms which is described by the researchers is the way this, these approaches work is to allow communities to act as the eyes and the ears in their communities. And that acts as a trigger or an incentive or sanction for government to act. And it's these processes of civic information providing the skills and confidence to citizens to monitor their government's performance.

So by way of example in Bangladesh we've already seen where they have information on when the health clinic should be opened and closed. What drugs should be available that community members are already starting to monitor the staff attendance and the drug availability. And we're seeing more organized and proactive local leaders galvanizing their communities into action.

So on to the top takeaways. I just want to reinforce that social accountability is key to improving governance, which as we mentioned earlier, is a effective governance is a important part of the global food strategy. And for agricultural systems transformation. Information is power. I think I've probably empathized this quite a lot throughout. But I can't emphasize enough that communities must have access to civic education, well targeted tangible quality and relevant information in order to

be able to engage with their governments. And there are many social accountability activities that work but in particular we know the evidence around scorecards social orders and participatory budgeting, which I may not have already mentioned are very important.

Now while the evidence is well established in education and health, we are still learning and collecting about, information about how it works in food security, agriculture and livelihoods. But the results are very promising. However, I'll just add that we're talking about governments across all these sectors and that governance and improved governance is obviously really critical to sustainability.

Thank you.

Susan Pologruto: Great .thank you so much, Sue, for that great presentation. And now we're gonna hand it over to Stanlake. He also works at World Vision and he is based in Tanzania and he's gonna talk about the empowered world view. Stanlake, are you on the phone?

Stanlake Kaziboni: Thank you so much. Hi, everyone. Just following up on Sue's great presentation I'm going to focus more on a project that we've been implementing here in Tanzania. In front of you the slide captures the highlights of this project. It's called the Babachi project. It's transforming households resilience in vulnerable environments. The location is Babati. It's a semiarid and arid area. We're targeting 9,000 small holder farmers. The project commenced in 2013 and is schedule to end in 2020.

Next slide, please. Right. So one of the things that this project is focusing on through the empowering capitalize, capitalizing and transformation to a world view. Next slide. I don't have control for my control.

Some of you have reviewed the USAID civil society role in development. The handbook for engagement. You realize that this project was highlighted, that was a few years ago. So the focus of that project is empowered world view. With citizen

voice and action. Which Sue has just presented. Community management of natural resources. Using empowered world view with citizen voice and action as a vehicle to bring people together to increase social accountability. Next slide.

So when, in 2013 when the project started, for many of you who might know or who are they, this is a big issue in Africa. So the system in Tanzania is not favorable to private land ownership. Land is owned by the state. The second issue that the project realized was as a result of one there is increased escalating land pressure. The growing population coupled with depletion of soil has resulted in land erosion. This is also linked to point number one. Because of frontier land system, land is communally owned and shared. So there is really no one looking after the land.

Now with those two that I've just mentioned, we're starting to see a lot of land conflict increasing. In this project site we have different sections of the community that use the land differently. We have agro pastoralists. We have pastoralists. Agro pastoralists who farm the land while the pastoralists focus on grazing land.

Another variable within the project side is this site is surrounded by a famous national parks. Now when you add climate change plus wildlife migration, where animals feed and graze, which animals used to move, to migrate from one area to another area have been invaded. So this is also bringing another new conflict into the mix. So now we have human conflict. But also human and animal conflict. Next slide.

So what did we do? The journey itself. As Sue explained, one of the critical ingredients of a citizen voice and action, we did this through what we empowered world view. Outreach and awareness to fund raising is fundamental. This allows for proper buy-in. The second thing that we did was to mobilize more the farmers. So that they could develop an understanding of what it is, so that they could envision a different way of doing business, but also to create structures for effective engagement.

The third thing that we did after we had organized and mobilized the farmers was now to engage the appropriate stakeholders. In this case, these were the stakeholders.

This was done through systematic engagement. But before that we drew a game plan. It was important for us to make sure that any engagement that we did was viewed in a positive light. So if engagement was more or less a dialogue. We brought in the small holders as part of the solution. And also made sure that they understood that this was a win-win situation. So we co-created action plans with small holders.

SO part of the achievements. Next slide. The achievements. This – many of the achievement that I'm going to describe here are at first in the location and in many parts in Tanzania. Through the things that I've just described, after two years the project managed to, one, organize six land use committees. These are committees. Two, six land use plans and bylaws were approved by local and national government authorities. Number three, 270 certificates of land right of occupancy were issued. That means they have some form of title deed or right to land.

Seventy-six watershed agreements were established. And also since this project commenced we have not encountered any new land conflicts within that location. And as a result of that we've also witnessed that one management plan was established so no conflicts between pastoralists and agro pastoralists. Next slide.

So the main or top takeaways. Recently in technical assistance to NGOs that conducted a study. This study demonstrated the strong –

Julie MacCartee:

It looks like his call dropped but his top takeaways are there on the screen, which is great. I think this was his last slide. So we're in good shape here. And perhaps while we're getting him back we can ask a question.

[End of Audio]