



Addressing Root Causes - Regional Learning Sessions in Uganda and Burundi

Report

A teal square containing two white curved lines. One line starts from the left edge and curves upwards towards the top right. The other line starts from the bottom left and curves upwards towards the right edge, intersecting the first line.

Addressing Root Causes - Regional Learning Sessions in Uganda and Burundi

author: Giorgio Ferrari,
Messina Manirakiza
date: 13 June 2022

Table of contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Objective and structure of the report	5
1.2	Methodological note	6
2	Context and Approaches	8
3	Main Learning Insights	11
2.1	Contribution	11
2.1.1	<i>Strengthening social cohesion and meeting root causes of conflict</i>	11
2.1.2	<i>Learning and adaptation results</i>	12
2.1.3	<i>Equality in the partnerships</i>	13
2.2	Factors that influenced success	14
2.2.4	<i>Strengthening social cohesion and meeting the root causes of conflict</i>	14
2.2.5	<i>Learning and adaptation</i>	15
2.2.6	<i>Equal partnerships</i>	16
4	Recommendations	17
5	Evaluation of the learning events	19
4.1	Methodology	19
4.2	Event evaluation findings	20
6	Financial Report	22
7	Annex 1 – List of Participants	25

Table of acronyms

ARC	Addressing Root Causes
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
DSH	Department for Stabilisation and Humanitarian Affairs
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
KPSRL	Knowledge Platform for Security and Rule of Law
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NL	Netherlands
VLSCs	Village level savings committees



Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Objective and structure of the report

This report highlights the key outcomes of the Addressing Root Cause (ARC) Regional Learning and Exchange Events that took place from May 17 to May 19, 2022, in Bujumbura, Burundi, and from 24 to 16 May 2022 in Kampala, Uganda.

The ARC fund (2016-2021) has been the latest centrally managed tender program that the MFA's department for Stabilization and Humanitarian Aid (DSH) launched and managed for addressing root causes of conflict and irregular migration through "bottom up" civil society engagement in fragile states.

Now that the ARC programme has ended, the ARC partners organized, with the support of the MFA and the Knowledge Platform for Security and Rule of Law, two regional learning events to identify and reflect on lessons learned. The events were organized and co-hosted by Help a Child-Burundi (Red Een Kind), ZOA, and the KPSRL. Around 60 participants mostly from country-based organizations took part in the learning events, chosen from those who have contributed to the implementation of ARC programs in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Mali, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan. Representatives from the Dutch Embassy in Goma, DRC, also participated at the learning event in Burundi.

This report is organized as follow.

1. The first part covers ARC's context and approaches. It sets the stage for the insights on contribution and conditions for success that come in the second part.
2. The second part summarizes what contribution the ARC approaches have made, particularly to social cohesion, but also considering the results for learning and being adaptive. It then explores the conditions that seems connected to producing this contribution.
3. The third part evaluates the learning events using feedback from participants to the Uganda event.
4. The fourth part contains the financial report.

Annex 1 contains the full participant list, and Annex 2 contains the event agenda.

1.2 Methodological note

The events' co-host had created a framework for the learning event, with objectives for learning from what worked and did not work in the ARC implementation and innovative approaches, both in terms of effectiveness of interventions, and learning, adaptive approach, and partnership dynamics.

The agenda was then shaped by the contributions from country partners, as they were welcome to choose the topic of their presentations and discussions inside this framework. The co-hosts have then integrated the agenda with topics that resulted missing from this bottom-up approach. Most country partners submitted contributions on thematic issues connected to their interventions' effectiveness. To this, the co-hosts added discussion sessions on learning and adaptation to draw out additional insights.

At the learning events, learning moved from participants sharing their contributions to joint sense-making. For example, in Uganda, participants heard presentations (usually 20 minutes per presentation), then they divided in cross-consortia break-out groups and discussed the presentations to identify

- 1) Open questions to ask the presenter (not clarification questions, but dilemma-style questions),
- 2) The insights that they found most relevant for their future work.

Each break-out group shared their insights in the plenary, and these insights became some of the key insights included in this report. Additionally, there were also roundtables where the participants identified the main lessons learned across presentations.

This report presents insights coming from participants' analysis and sense-making. It does not contain additional analysis and sense-making on the part of the KPSRL.

This is the meta chain that I was discussing yesterday and that we need to be careful about when discussing. The KPSRL reporting role is here about amplifying the voices of these country partners so that they reach the global level and can also inform the global learning event.

Furthermore, this report does not contain evaluative findings, meaning that it does not rely on robust evaluation methodologies, such as random or representative sampling, extensive data collection, and methods of analysis and triangulation of the findings. It reflects what participants have presented and discussed.

As such, its strength relies on a more holistic view to the insights, allowing to build on cross-project discussion and presenting more general insights that are supposed to connect the lived experiences of, but also studies conducted by the participants, with the portfolio level.



Figure 1 – Participants
at the Uganda event



Figure 2 – Participants
at the Uganda event

Chapter 2

Context and Approaches

The communities in which the participants worked were diverse in terms of country and regional conditions (for example, some were embedded in open conflict environments, some in post-conflict, and some in fragile situations). They were also heterogeneous under socio-economic conditions, ethnic composition, and main production systems (pastoralists, settled agriculturalist, and in the role of trade).

This meant that the ARC projects faced a variety of practical problems. However, some of the most frequently mentioned across presentations were conflicts between migrant pastoralists and settled farmers, distrust between migrant and host communities, intra-and intercommunal conflicts related to land use, social discrimination against women, youth, and ethnic minorities, limited inter-communal communication, remnants of conflicts (militias, arms), open civil wars, and lack of employment opportunities and basic services.

Finally, being a programme that addressed the root causes of conflict, most projects experimented with methodologies to understand the drivers of a changing context and of the root causes of conflict: The participants mentioned analytical tools for zooming out from community-level interactions to the broader social landscape and understanding discrimination and exploitation. They also mentioned established tools such as participatory rural appraisal, conflict analysis (to identify connectors and dividers), systems-based approaches that consider linkages beyond the limit of a project to the entire social system, actor and power analysis, and risk analysis.

Strengthening social cohesion was the linchpin concept holding together most of ARC's interventions to respond to these problems. Nevertheless, ARC implementers have understood and operationalized this and other linked concepts and approaches, such as the bottom-up approach to social cohesion or adaptive programming, in diverse ways, reflecting the complexity of a multi-country and multi-component programme and their organizational cultures.

Across projects, community-based structures for peacebuilding were a common intervention strategy to strengthen social cohesion. These are forums where the members of a community or representatives of more communities have a dialogue to solve their conflicts peacefully and organize common action. ARC seems to have assumed that when people meet, they understand each other better, enough to find common values. These structures also aimed to reduce the geographical, intellectual, and technical distance between the beneficiaries and the programmes.

1. Some ARC projects collaborated with the community associations already present, and some established structures for the purpose of ARC projects, such as peace committees.¹
2. For some projects, such as in Mali, the community-level dialogues were the first steps in a process that aimed to connect the dialogues vertically with regional and national authorities. In other projects, such as in Burundi, the dialogues remained at community level because it was not deemed possible to achieve progress with the authorities.
3. Some projects created intra-community structures, whereas others created structures inter-communal structures.
4. In some projects it was left to the community to decide who should be a member of these structures. In others, the intervener had some requirements, such as having some women as members.

Alongside community-structures for social cohesion, ARC projects employed a mix of thematic interventions in ways that were project-specific: Some ARC projects focused on legal aid, access to justice, and transitional justice.² Others included a component on expanding basic service delivery at community level.³ Finally, others used a livelihood approach, assuming that if community members were economically empowered, then they would have a stake in a peaceful society.⁴

Most projects provided capacity building and / or awareness raising.⁵

Most of them also had the ambition of being adaptive to changes in contexts, even though their conceptualisation of and capacity for implementing this concept differed across projects.

During a round-table on learning, the participants had the opportunity to identify why they found learning important. They mentioned that it is important to improve their work, to inform future work and not to make the same mistakes again, but also to learn from the mistakes of others too as well as communicate their learning to others.

From the programmatic learning perspective, the KPSRL has performed the role of learning facilitator, facilitating the identification of a global learning agenda and the self-organisation of five global-level thematic learning groups on: adaptive programming, working in highly securitized environments, conflict sensitivity, gender transformation, income generation activities for peace and social cohesion. The ARC global learning questions were identified through an event at the MFA facilitated by an external

¹ Among the forms of associations that were already present were youth associations, women association, local association for funerals, school clubs, religious institutions, disability associations (federations), and participatory structures created by government. As for the ad hoc structures, the most mentioned were the peace committees, sometimes stacked one on top of the other from village to inter-communal level.

² This included mobile provision of legal advice and community-level discussions on transitional justice

³ This included the construction of schools, health centers, the provision of psychosocial support, and the provision of water. Usually, the basic service delivery component was supported by community agreements achieved through the community structures. Some projects offered micro-grant schemes to the communities to fund part of the costs.

⁴ They did so through interventions strategies such as: Village level saving groups. Market mapping and advise. Startup capital. Trainings. Facilitation to acquire business licenses. Financial inclusion via banks and MFIs.

⁵ Trainings involved community leaders, social workers, and government staff. Among themes of capacity building were legal or policy framework for refugee policy, humanitarian principles, and legal aid. The projects experimented with ways to raise to awareness of community members of peace and inclusion, including through informal songs and drama.

consultant, but without the participation of hardly any people directly involved in ARC. People were appointed to lead the thematic working groups and take responsibility for the learning questions.

The KPSRL did not, however, have funding nor mandate to dedicate to research or capacity building to the benefit of the ARC implementers, functioning only as facilitator for learning groups that were essential understood as self-organising and self-funding⁶. ARC partners had their own learning budget and were also encouraged to apply via KMF for learning grants.

Organisational learning seemed focused on monitoring and evaluation, and especially on the requirements set by the MFA for quantitative reporting, with at times additional insights available through qualitative methods and limited investments in dedicated research and learning. All ARC projects reported against the ARC result based framework and its indicators. Aside from this, a few other organizations, such as Saferworld, Oxfam-Burundi, and ZOA adopted more qualitative forms of monitoring, such as outcome harvesting, also as part of their adaptive management approaches (as it could track flexibly tentative outcomes). Even fewer organizations commissioned studies on the effectiveness of their intervention strategies that were not part of monitoring and evaluation but focused on broader learning (such as was the case of CARE with peace committees and village level savings committees (VLSCs).

⁶ As a learning facilitator, KPSRL's mandate was to [te](#)-continually stimulate participants to animate the ARC global learning agenda space with their ideas, data, lessons, analysis, energy, queries, and dilemmas.

Chapter 2

Main Learning Insights

2.1 Contribution

2.1.1 Strengthening social cohesion and meeting root causes of conflict

Participants reported positive contribution to social cohesion at community and sometimes inter-community level.

Chiefly, they regarded people coming together when they were not doing so before as an instance of social cohesion, especially with groups diverse by ethnic composition, gender identity, and age and with groups that connected community members with power holders, such as local government officials and representatives of security forces.

Modification of social norms and values that were conducive to conflict was another instance of social cohesion to which some ARC projects claimed contribution. For example, in Sudan, ARC projects claimed to have been able to modify the social norms that were embedded in popular songs, from songs that celebrated violence and avenging personal or community honour to songs that celebrated peace. The ARC projects also claimed on occasion the shaping of personal identities, as persons that understood themselves as members of an ethnic group shifted to see themselves as entrepreneurs.

Peaceful conflict resolution was the primary function of the peace committees and an instance of social cohesion to which ARC projects claimed contribution.

ARC projects with a livelihood component also claimed contribution to expanding well-being across the community and through that giving people a stake in the community's economic wellbeing, which they also considered an instance of social cohesion. The sense of having a stake in the economic wellbeing of the community could stem from receiving basic services, cooperating in investment projects, or increasing savings or starting a business.

Aside from remaining at community and, occasionally intercommunity level (rather than national or regional), participants recognized that their interventions' contribution did not always achieve positive results nor that they met all, or most of, the root causes of conflict.

As mentioned, none of the projects addressed root causes of conflicts at national and society-wide scale, hampered in this by the scale of the programme and, also by its project-based, rather than

system-based thinking. Progress was always fragile and prone to reversals due to larger, national scale events.

Additionally, participants reported that the same intervention might work in a community, for example in successfully expanding female participation to meetings, but not in the next community. This is an element of complexity that is to be recognised as inherent in complex interventions rather than to lead to blaming implementers.

2.1.2 Learning and adaptation results

Participants reported some positive cases of learning on the effectiveness of their interventions during ARC projects. For example, Reed een Kind Burundi decided to focus on community level interventions because it understood that interventions aimed at national level were not likely to be effective, given the civic space available (understood from trying to make in-roads with national authorities but failing to). In Mali, learning took place on making the conditions that enable adaptive programming, especially on the need for more flexible and qualitative forms of monitoring.

Also, at programmatic level. participants have remarked that they have experienced the spaces for learning as expanding, particularly for what concerns the regional learning events taking place in the second half of the programme.

Nevertheless, the participants revealed serious gaps in learning results, especially at the level of cross-project and cross-country learning. There was a sense that ARC implementers (and the donor) had a lack of common understanding of what was meant by learning. For example, how learning is different from a capacity building session and what the mechanisms and practices lead to learning. There was a sense that learning has often not been fed back into programmes and also that it remained a challenge to use MEL processes in such a way as to formulate lessons learned for broader learning.⁷ More broadly, participants have revealed that they wished to learn more about learning, as it remains a topic with which many of them had less familiarity.

When questioned about their experience with the ARC learning questions, participants have remarked that the learning questions were top down and not aware of realities in the field. This led to a learning framework where people felt locked in and which they did not have any possibility to change. They raised some fundamental questions about the ARC learning questions:

- 1) ARC was operating in volatile conflict situations, why were the learning questions also not adapted as the situations changed?
- 2) ARC participants felt that they could not capture the learnings co-produced throughout the programs.
- 3) How do we go from global questions to the country and locality relevant questions, and how can we feed the bottom up learnings from the local community to the consortium to the donor?

⁷ Often learning reports contained confirmation of what was already known, too much common sense, too statements that are either too general or too specific.

The types of questions that the participants shared as relevant were more practical than the overarching ARC learning themes and questions. They were questions, such as wanting to understand the market in order to do appropriate vocational training, or learning from their own gender analysis how to work with women in particular local areas. But also, how to talk about concepts such as transitional justice in a shrinking space in the local languages so that communities understand. One participant remarked that even as a Burundian sometimes they feel like a foreigner at the local level. So a key issue is to learn how the local people think. Another example was wanting to understand the local security issues to drive the community level response.

The projects showed the capacity to adapt to a changing context. They reported to have adapted successful to the conflict in South Sudan (by remaining neutral), the Ethiopian civil war (changing the mix of interventions), Burundi's turn to authoritarian government (collaborating with communities rather than authorities), Covid (approaches to reach stakeholders and communities), and funding opportunities from the government falling through (adding micro-grants instead).

Nevertheless, the capacity to implement the adaptive programming remained uneven inside and between implementing organizations and the programme management structures put in place by the MFA did not facilitate learning.

Participants reported some confusion on what is and is not part of adaptive approach. They recognized that they still have space to move adaptation that is mostly risk management towards learning and adaptation as core programming strategies. This would entail going beyond the 'design → implement → evaluate'-logic. by integrating continuous feedback loops and ongoing learning and interim program adjustments.

2.1.3 Equality in the partnerships

The partnerships inside ARC projects had some positive aspects, such exchanges of experience inside project consortia, more equal decision making at the country level, and some elements of a programmatic learning approach through the global learning agenda and the regional learning events.

Participants also believed that partnership dynamics did improve over the course of ARC, such as for transparency in budget and expenditure management. Local partner staff too experienced that they were given progressively more space and authority, with the positive effect that this had on capacity and experience.

Nevertheless, the ARC partnerships and consortia do not appear to have been equal in terms of powers and resources between international and in-country organisations. In-country partners seem to have been dependent from consortium leads for budget and programme choices, starting from proposal development. Among other elements of unequal partnerships that were mentioned were: the absence of core funding for the local partners and the maintenance of country offices with many international staff by the INGOs (international staff that was paid several times more than local staff at comparable positions).

Participants at the Burundi event also reported additional problems with the partnership, such as the absence of complementarity inside a common theory of change and issues with respecting proper communication channels (whereas in Uganda no sessions dealt specifically with this topic).

2.2 Factors that influenced success

2.2.4 Strengthening social cohesion and meeting the root causes of conflict

Getting personal with community members to understand their personal situations and problems, and consequently seeing the community from a prism of many different perspectives helped build trust in the interveners. Based on the participants' experience, asking a "What's up question?" from a personal point of view to individual community members is already a sufficient entry point to open insights on lived experiences of conflict. It makes people feel that they and their opinions matter personally. And when these conversations are compared, they offer an entry point to understand the complexity of community life.

Inter-communal based structures are necessary to solve inter-communal conflicts. Intra-community structures were not sufficient, not even when such intra-community structures had been established in both communities. However, bringing together people from diverse communities remain challenging cause of the heightened distrust between members of different tribes, and ethnic and parochial identities.

The most effective bottom-up approach to strengthening social cohesion is one that connects community level dialogues vertically to regional and national dialogues and authorities. But such a connection was not always possible because space at national level was limited, so at times interventions had to settle for second best.

Remaining neutral to national and local conflicts and political priorities ensures continued access to conflict areas but cannot address the drivers of conflict. Being perceived as impartial and neutral is the outcome of a long-term process. Intervenors need to introduce themselves as impartial, and then show in practice that they are impartial. According to the participants, this means absorbing what both parties are saying and remaining in a facilitating position over time.

Positive examples were effective in increasing participation of women. For example, local contact points could be accompanied to the meetings by female volunteers. Additionally, projects could train and skill women so that they can perform well in the committees and be a positive example. Or they could engage female role models like the Hakamat singers in Sudan.

Other effective interventions were engaging men in accountable practices to deal with toxic masculinity and having committees inclusive of women as a requirement (not a community choice).

Nevertheless, participants recognized that expanding women participation in the public sphere does not always work and sometimes carries the risk of backlashes from conservative elements, which entails

personal risks for the women involved. They suggested that at times a first phase might be needed when men and women meet separately.

Collaborating with government had an ambiguous effect. In some cases, projects used a strong relationship with local authorities to manage local conflicts (such as land conflicts and conflicts over cultivation of cash crops).

But sometimes problems emanated from national or local governments. Politics was often a driver of conflict and was at times a barrier in successfully implementing interventions. It was a barrier when government lacked the capacity to fulfil mandates on which the interventions relied, also for sustainability, and when local authorities aimed to influence community-based structures and interventions for partisan interests.

2.2.5 Learning and adaptation

Learning was less integrated as a theme and less understood among the various ARC implementing organizations. The theme's complexity, particularly in terms of developing a learning agenda and integrating it systematically into programme and project levels, became apparent during the discussions at the learning events.

The absence of country or regionally defined learning agenda underneath the ARC global agenda has hampered the ownership and relevance of learning for country partners.

Participants tended to agree that learning can usefully take place at multiple levels, including global, regional, country, and project level. Each of these levels require questions and methods that are suited to the interest and capacity of the learners. But in ARC, global level learning was the only level of programmatic learning present.

Some participants remarked that sometimes learning could not be separated from programming, and that it was a good thing that it was not separated. The learning questions might have been confusing but in practice country partners were already answering some of these questions. Others remarked that they have a learning partner within their consortium with a primary role on learning - rather than implementation – with an independent lens to observe them. And that has also been appreciated.

Even at the global level, the learning agenda defined the learning groups and specific learning questions but lacked an implementation roadmap for the functioning of the groups and for answering the questions. At a later stage, the development of terms of reference with a working structure of the groups (serving as a guide) and clarifying roles and responsibilities has helped to boost learning conversations within learning groups. But consortia continued to lack incentives to invest in answering the ARC learning questions.

Cross-organisational and cross-consortia learning came with additional challenges. Participants remarked that some organisations and staff members might be under the illusion that their approaches are already the best and, therefore, that they have little to learn from others. Moreover, they also remarked that the fact that ARC projects had conflicting approaches and understanding of key concepts by implementing partners, also inside the same consortium, hindered learning processes when not

effectively managed. Unequal partnership structures (more on this topic in the next section) was also a barrier to adaptation because it influences the way they were also connected to unequal distribution of information, which linked to problems in reaching a consensus on necessary adaptations. Finally, the learning was managed at the top level of consortium and done remotely and by people who were not on the ground. Country partners could not get answers to their own learning questions through those consortia-level learning processes.

The role of the KPSRL was also perceived as too much hands-off on learning, as they would have appreciated a stronger leading role in ensure that learning activities happen also at programme-level (stronger compared to the mandate of the KPSRL was). The self-organising learning groups in practice became inactive as coordination was weak because the implementing organisations that were leading them did not or could not put in the required effort.

Hierarchical organisational cultures were also sometimes obstacles to adaptation because they were conducive to create fear of managers higher up and this dampened the requests for adaptation from field staff, leading them to self-censor.

Coming to MEL processes, the indicators against which ARC project had to report did not allow to collect interventions' unexpected effects and were therefore not always relevant. Participants reported that seeking to change the indicators in the name of adaptive programming proved complicated or impossible. However, some ARC projects responded to this challenge by adopting other methods, such as outcome harvesting and the everyday peace indicators (bottom-up indicators of what peace means for the local communities). Participants were also of the opinion that MEL processes had an ambiguous connection with learning. They might hamper motivation to learn when the push to show positive results was strong.

2.2.6 Equal partnerships

According to participants, key elements that led to unequal partnerships were already present in the call for proposals to the Dutch government.

The call for proposal favoured large Dutch INGOs and did not give any weight nor guidance for establishing equal partnerships. The INGOs that became consortia-leads had therefore neither motivation nor understanding to do otherwise than take advantage and perpetuate these unequal partnerships.

Other factors driving ineffective partnerships were practical, such as the absence of harmonised approaches inside and between consortia, and the absence of cross project and cross-country interactions and reflections for most of the ARC programme.

Chapter 3

Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed by the events' participants. They are not to be understood as simple solutions to the challenges of programmes like ARC, but as inspiration for continuing the discussion.

To implementing partners:

1. Recognise the limitations of all approaches used in ARC to address the root causes of conflict and **strengthen the analytical capacity to leverage partial approaches and limited funding with system-based approaches.**
2. **Expand the understanding and use of the adaptive approach,** by among others including technical assistance from expert organisations in their consortia and planning for programme modifier for the case of conflict or the closing of civic and political space to collaborate with national authorities.
3. **Integrate programme learning agenda(s) into programmes from the design phase and support them with adequate budget.** Learning agenda at multiple levels should interlock and feed into each other, such as from global, regional, country, and project level.
4. **Provide specific outcomes for gender mainstreaming.**
5. **Address the inequalities in dynamics and power relations inside consortia,** such as contributing to core costs of local partners, emphasising expertise and knowledge sharing or leveraging mutual technical and institutional capacity, addressing pay inequality between internationals and national staff. Additionally, monitor the health of the partnership through indicators for complementarity and partnership.
6. **Strengthen the sustainability approach,** including by collaborating with local authorities when possible, diversifying the origins of funding for scaling up approaches (rather than relying on promises of large funding from governments), systematically integrating economic recovery into human security programs, and establishing platforms that bring together CSOs increase their leverage on national government and local government.

To the donor,

1. **Recognise the limitations of all the approaches used in ARC to address the root causes of conflict** and design programme frameworks that incentivise implementing partners to understand how to leverage limited funding and contribution with system-based approaches.
2. **Reform the subsidy framework to go beyond the Dutch INGO-led model** and expand the provision of core funding and institutional capacity building for the country partners.
3. **Involve the embassies in the monitoring of projects/programs.**

4. **Expand the space for using the adaptive approach** by, among others, providing a flexible fund to deal with fluctuations in the context (or expanding the flexible budget lines in project budgets), and clarifying and simplifying the practical procedures to communicate and approve changes in interventions. =
5. **Plan a second phase of projects for ownership and sustainability.**

To learning partners,

1. There should be a more first-hand, leading role for the learning partner (the KPSRL) during implementation of learning activities, with a dedicated budget for incentivising and supporting learning activities.
2. Learning partners should organise learning events regularly, starting from the initial stages of a programme.
3. Learning events should contain as much as possible practical exercises, as well as debates on similarities and differences of different projects. When they do contain presentations, they should preferably be thematically oriented (such as on social cohesion in South Sudan) and impact-based (such as focusing on what had changed on the ground because of the intervention) rather than project and approach-based ones (such as presentation of one project's approach).
4. Before formulating learning questions, there needs to be context research to be aware of the realities in the field and the knowledge and interests of the country partners, and the country partners should be part of the conversation as well. If useful, an approach is to identify multiple lists of learning questions at global, regional, and country level.
5. There should be a process to review the learning questions to ensure that they remain relevant, but also a strong coordination process for answering them.

Chapter 4

Evaluation of the learning events

4.1 Methodology

The events were implementing partners-led, with the knowledge partner, the KPSRL, in a facilitation role. Implementing partners have designed the agenda of the events and selected the sessions, have made the organisational arrangements for the venues, and have led the dissemination campaign. The KPSRL has provided advice, support, and facilitation at all moments.

The events combined thematic presentations from the implementing partners, both on development effectiveness and learning, with reflection moments aimed at unpacking the learning points. The following thematic aspects have been:

1. Bottom-up approaches and community-level structures and their contributions to reducing violent conflict and improving social cohesion.
2. The experience with Adaptive Programming.
3. Approaches to expand involvement of women.
4. Collaboration with authorities.
5. Experiences with strategies and processes enabling learning.
6. Peace related data collection and usage (outcome harvesting and bottom-up indicators).
7. Partnership & Interdependence of areas of intervention.

The events were aimed at the national partners and most of the participants were indeed based in the ARC project countries.

The country partners have shared reflections and based on that; they have engaged in sense-making. For example, in Uganda, they heard a presentation (say 20 minutes) and then divided in cross-consortia groups and discussed the presentation to produce:

1. Open questions to ask to the presenter (not for clarification, but dilemma-style questions), and.
2. What they found most relevant for their future work in the presentation.

The participants would hear from all groups. And this then constituted some of the key's insights that ended up in the report. The learning events also reserved dedicated sessions to think about the most important insights across sessions.

4.2 Event evaluation findings

Participation to events was adequate, especially of in-country partners, with gaps in the participation of Embassy staff.

In total, 63 peacebuilders participated to the learning events. The participating organisations were from both international and country-based NGOs.

The Uganda event was smaller, with 25 participants, because Uganda was not an ARC project country and so there were higher costs for participants from the ARC project countries to attend. Burundi was a project country and saw the participation of around 40 people, the majority of which from Burundi.

All participants had participated in the implementation of the ARC programme, except for two participants to the Uganda event which are grantee of the Dutch bilateral rule of law programme in Somalia (managed by the Somalia Unit of the Dutch Embassy in Nairobi).

Only one Embassy representative, from the Embassy in Kinshasa, attended the event. Many of the Embassy SROL staff was in the NL during the learning events to attend the terugkomen dag.

Anonymous feedback was collected after the Ugandan event through a paper survey (N 19):

Participants agreed with the statement that they had learned something useful that challenged a previous assumption. They rated their agreement as 4,5 on average on a 5-point scale. This value is in line with the highest scoring events organised by the KPSRL in 2021.

Participants have revealed that the most important insights were about how they can improve learning in collaboration with the donor, but also the chance of reflecting on the different conditions for success of different approaches and in different contexts, and on system-based approaches to programming. Participants reflected that it would have been useful to have similar events during the early months of ARC implementation.

Participants rated the event as good (4 out of a 5-point scale). They have appreciated that every organisation had the opportunity to share their experience with the project. Here participants appreciated the organisation and facilitation of the event but rated the accommodation as of low standards (in Uganda the choice of venue and accommodation was influenced by high transport costs). They also reflected that the presence of the NL Embassy or a Dutch MFA representative would have given the event a higher profile.

98% of the participants agreed with the statement that they had made contacts with whom they planned to follow up. For comparison, the highest value registered in 2021 at KPSRL events was 89%.

100% of participants agreed with the statement that the event was an open and safe space where they could express themselves.

They also had suggestions to improve future events:

1. Learning events such as this one should take place earlier in the programme phase.
2. The organisers should have communicated earlier to participants the topic of the event and templates for presentations.
3. There should be less presentations and more practical exercises, as well as debates on similarities and differences. And for the presentations, they would have preferred presentations that were more thematic-oriented (such as on social cohesion in South Sudan) and impact-based (such as focusing on what had changed on the ground because of the intervention) rather than project and approach-based ones (such as presentation of one project's approach).
4. There should be a more first-hand, leading role for the learning partner (the KPSRL) during implementation of learning activities.
5. Some participants would have preferred a higher number of participants, with presence of donors and some stakeholders.
6. Participants would have preferred that the event had been held at a better venue.

They also had suggestions to improve future events:

1. Learning events such as this one should take place earlier in the programme phase.
2. The organisers should have communicated earlier to participants the topic of the event and templates for presentations.
3. There should be less presentations and more practical exercises, as well as debates on similarities and differences. And for the presentations, they would have preferred presentations that were more thematic-oriented (such as on social cohesion in South Sudan) and impact-based (such as focusing on what had changed on the ground because of the intervention) rather than project and approach-based ones (such as presentation of one project's approach).
4. There should be a more first-hand, leading role for the learning partner (the KPSRL) during implementation of learning activities.
5. Some participants would have preferred a higher number of participants, with presence of donors and some stakeholders.
6. Participants would have preferred that the event had been held at a better venue.

Chapter 5

Financial Report

The combined learning events achieved a minor underspent of EUR 2,453.56 over a combined budget of EUR 46,538.29, of which EUR 32.537,30 provided by the MFA.

Figure 3 presents the budgeted and actual expenditures for the Burundi event. The budget for the Burundi event has been completely depleted: EURO 21,030.29 had been budgeted and EUR 21.103.24 spent. The main discrepancies in allocation of funds between budget and actual expenditures were that:

1. Transport costs were lower than expected, as mainly Burundian-based staff participated to the event.
2. However, the venue was more expensive than expected because of the need to accommodate more participants than expected.

In the end, the two budget items balanced themselves out.

Figure 4 presents the budgeted and actual expenditures for the Uganda event. The Uganda event experienced an underspent of EUR 2,453.56 (budget of EUR 25,508 and actual expenses of EUR 23,054.44).

1. Transport costs were lower than expected, as fewer international staff participated to the event.
2. However, the venue was more expensive than expected.
3. A EUR 1,000 set aside for contingencies remained unused.

Event ARC Regional Learning & Exchange Symposiums
Date
Projected Subtotals to Date € 21.029,30
Actual Subtotal to Date € 21.103,84

CATEGORY	PROJECTED SUBTOTAL	ACTUAL SUBTOTAL	COMMENTS
Venue	SUBTOTAL € 900,00	SUBTOTAL € 4.435,73	
Location Rental	€ 900,00	€ 4.315,73	
Event Staff			
Equipment Rental		€ 120,00	
Additional Tables / Chairs			
AV			
Travel	SUBTOTAL € 16.369,30	SUBTOTAL € 11.508,73	
Flight / Driving	€ 7.470,00	€ 5.806,11	
Lodging	€ 5.760,00	€ 5.124,84	
Per Diem	€ 3.139,30	€ 577,78	
Public Relations	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Announcements			
Graphics			
Press Releases			
Décor	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Linens			
Lighting			
Additional Signage			
Event Programming	SUBTOTAL € 3.000,00	SUBTOTAL € 4.279,11	
Speakers	€ 3.000,00	€ 4.279,11	
Performers			
Video Production			
Presentation Graphics			
Social Media	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Twitter			
Facebook			
Pinterest			
Instagram			
Google+			
LinkedIn			
Snapchat			
Advertising	SUBTOTAL € 760,00	SUBTOTAL € 880,27	
Online			
Print	€ 760,00	€ 880,27	
Outdoor			
Radio			
Television			

Figure 3 Budget and actual expenditures for the Burundi event

Event ARC closing Entebbe, Uganda
Date 24-27 May 2022
Projected Subtotals to Date € 25.508,00
Actual Subtotal to Date € 23.054,44

CATEGORY	PROJECTED SUBTOTAL	ACTUAL SUBTOTAL	COMMENTS
Venue	SUBTOTAL € 6.758,00	SUBTOTAL € 9.301,86	
			This is the amount paid based on the quotation by Central Inn (event venue). The amount in the quotation is USD 9753, the exchange rate on the day of payment 18th of May was used. There is a difference of USD 528 between quotation and invoice, but this is amount has not been explained satisfactorily by Central Inn yet, so the remaining amount has not been paid yet.
Location Rental	€ 6.258,00	€ 9.301,86	
Event Staff			
Equipment Rental			
Additional Tables / Chairs			
AV			
Local travel costs	€ 500,00		
Travel	SUBTOTAL € 16.400,00	SUBTOTAL € 12.402,58	
Flight / Driving	€ 15.000,00	€ 11.115,46	
Lodging			included in venue costs
Per Diem			
Visa costs	€ 1.400,00	€ 766,18	
Covid tests		€ 520,94	
Public Relations	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Announcements			
Graphics			
Press Releases			
Décor	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Linens			
Lightning			
Additional Signage			
Event Programming	SUBTOTAL € 1.350,00	SUBTOTAL € 1.350,00	
Facilitators	€ 1.350,00	€ 1.350,00	
Performers			
Video Production			
Presentation Graphics			
Social Media	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Twitter			
Facebook			
Pinterest			
Instagram			
Google+			
LinkedIn			
Snapchat			
Advertising	SUBTOTAL € 1.000,00	SUBTOTAL € 0,00	
Online			
Print			
Outdoor			
Radio			
Television			
Unforeseen	€ 1.000,00		

Figure 4 Budget and actual expenditures for the Uganda event

Chapter 6

Annex 1 – List of Participants

-
1. **Adam Mukhtar** – WASH coordinator - World Relief – Sudan,
 2. **Alexis Niyibigira** - Focal Point ARC programs - THARS
 3. **Alida Kaneza** - Team Leader Women, Peace & Security Program - CARE international – Bujumbura
 4. **Aline Nivyabandi** - Project Coordinator - CORDAID Burundi
 5. **Alix-Marie Himbaza** - Communication Officer - HaC Burundi
 6. **Amani Munguakankwa Safari** – Programme Manager - Paix et développement durable (PDD)
 7. **Andries Shuttinga** - CEO/Director – HaC
 8. **Angelo Paterno** – Country Director – Help a Child - Burundi
 9. **Apollinaire Niyongabo** - CEJP
 10. **Bertin Chiza Kasuka** - War Child Holland
 11. **Bonaventure Nzisabira** - Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation for Accountability and Learning (PMEAL) - OXFAM - Burundi
 12. **Bonaventure Nzisabira** – PMEAL officer – Oxfam - Burundi
 13. **Christella Niyonzima** – Project Lead & Researcher - Impunity Watch
 14. **Clement Nkubizi** - Country Director – Help a Child - Burundi
 15. **Corita Corbijn** - Peacebuilding Advisor – ZOA
 16. **Cynthia Kwizera** - Office Manager - HaC Burundi
 17. **Didace Nyandwi** - ALB Buta Coordinateur projet
 18. **Diomède Ninteretse** – Legacy Consultant - OXFAM – Burundi –
 19. **Eltayeb Hamid** Programme Manager for Darfur – ZOA - Sudan
 20. **Ephrem Shiferaw Wolde** – Country Representative and Senior Programme Advisor – Woord en Daad - Ethiopia
 21. **Floris D'Udine** – Project Manager – CARE Nederland - Netherlands
 22. **François Bizimana** - MEAL Coordinator - HaC Burundi
 23. **Fulgence Ndagijimana** – Country Director – CORDAID Burundi
 24. **Gaëlle Shaza** - AFSC
 25. **Genene Yilma Beyene** – Head of Refugee and Migration – Plan International - Ethiopia
 26. **Giorgio Ferrari** – Learning Officer – KPSRL - Netherlands
 27. **Hibo Abdi** - Somalia
 28. Izzeldien Alfaki -
 29. **Jean-Berchmans Nduwayo** – Programme Director - Help Channel
 30. **Jean-Pierre Niyonzima** – Director and Legal Representative - MIPAREC – Gitega - Team HaC Burundi
 31. **Jean-Pierre Simbaruhije** – Project Manager – CORDAID Burundi
 32. **John Bitaha** – Policy Officer - Dutch Embassy - DRC

33. **Joseph Yencing Modi**
34. **Kate Welch** - CORD – UK
35. **Loochi Muzaliwa** – Country Director - VNGI - DRC
36. **Mahlet Tekalegne** – Manager of Programme Quality – ZOA - Ethiopia
37. **Mekides Kumsa** – Junior Manager of Programme Quality – ZOA - Ethiopia
38. **Merkeb Seyoum** – EECD coordinator – Plan International - Ethiopia
39. **Messina-Laurette Manirakiza** - Knowledge Broker Programming and Practice - Knowledge Platform Security & Rule of Law (KPSRL)
40. **Michèle Kaneza** - Youth and Work Manager - HaC Burundi
41. **Mohamed Osman** – Somalia Country Representative – University for Peace - Somalia
42. **Mohamed Yarow** – Programme Coordinator – Saferworld - Somalia
43. **Nadine Ndikumasabo** – MEAL Officer – AFSC
44. **Neto Mwendilung** – Programme Manager - Union pour l'émancipation de la femme autochtone (UEFA) – DRC
45. **Nicolas Nimenya** – Psychosocial support officer - Centre Ubuntu
46. **Nussaibah Younis** – Consultant for the KPSRL – United Kingdom
47. **Oscar Ndikubwayo** – Programme Manager - Geste humanitaire
48. **Pascal Bugafiro** - CEJP
49. **Patrick Andama** – MEAL coordinator – CARE International – South Sudan
50. **Peter Bos** – Project Coordinator - War Child Holland
51. **Peter Das** – Coordinator of Monitoring and Evaluation – ZOA - Netherlands
52. **Prince Kalenga Kabwe** - Team Leader Women, Peace & Security Program - ZOA – DRC
53. **Raïssa Iteriteka** – Programme Manager - Biraturaba
54. **Rayan Nimir** – Policy Advocacy and Communications Manager – Saferworld - Sudan
55. **Rickie-Nelly Ndagano**
56. **Rickie-Nelly Ndagano** - Lead Researcher - HaC Burundi
57. **Sadik Alewi** – MEAL Advisor – Saferworld – Sudan and South Sudan
58. **Sékou Doumbia** – M&E specialist - ICCO
59. **Sharawi Alkamil** – Peacebuilding coordinator – World Relief - Sudan
60. **Sosthène Maliyaseme** – Programme Director - Action pour la paix et la concorde (APC)
61. **Théophile Djedjebi** - Senior Program Manager - Human Security Collective (HSC)
62. **Tigist Fisseha** – Protection project manager – World Relief – Ethiopia.
63. **Timothée Rukundo** - Country Director - ZOA – DRC

Annex 2 – Event Programme

Day 1: May 24, 2022

Time	Topic	Objective	How?	Who?
9:00 – 9:10	Opening of the conference	Setting the stage, understanding the purpose of the conference	Plenary session, introduction of the programme	Nussaibah
9:10 – 10:30	Introductions	Getting to know each other as participants and understanding the different ARC programmes	Each of the 8 consortiums introduce themselves and shortly present their ARC programme.	Participants / Nussaibah
10:30 – 11:00	<i>Coffee & tea break</i>			
	I. Addressing Root Causes: Peace building approaches and Social Cohesion			
11:00 – 11:30	Presentation 1: The use of locally designed innovative approaches that activate communities to lead the process of engagement and campaigns on issues that affect social cohesion. Examples of innovative approaches are What Up, Zoom out and Boruboru.	Learn about innovative peace building approaches and their impact on social cohesion	10 minutes plenary presentation	Angelo Lubang (Help a Child)
			20 minutes of discussion and questions	Peter
11:30 – 12:00	Presentation 2: The mobilization of cooperation and coordination within and between communities and people from different tribal backgrounds, age, and gender through the intervention across 5 states in Sudan. People were	Learn about how the intervention in Sudan by Sudia led to improved social cohesion.	10 minutes presentation	Dr. Izzeldin Alfaki & Adam Mukhtar (Sudia) Nussaibah

	brought together to engage in dialogue and to address social issues or challenges linked to e.g., basic services.		20 minutes of discussion and questions	
12:00 – 12:30	Presentation 3: the role of ARC-supported Peace Committees and VSLAs in supporting social cohesion in South Sudan.	Learn about Peace Committees and VSLAs contributed to improved social cohesion in South Sudan	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes of discussion and questions	Floris D'Udine (CARE Netherlands) with Patrick Andama (CARE South Sudan) Peter
12:30 – 13:00	Presentation 4: Community based structures and the maintenance of social cohesion.	Learn about the role of community structures at the local level and key elements for maintenance of social cohesion.	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes of discussion and questions	Genene Yilma (Plan International) Nussaibah
13:00 – 14:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>			
	II. Addressing Root Causes – Gender & Peace Building			
14:00 – 14:30	Presentation 1: Change of behaviour and attitude on Women's role in conflict resolutions at community level.	Learn about behavioural change towards women's roles in Peace Building	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes of discussion and questions	Mohamed Ali Yarow (Saferworld) Peter
14:30 – 15:00	Presentation 2: How did community-based peacebuilding interventions contribute to change on gender norms and attitudes?	Learn about how change in gender norms and attitudes materialized	10 minutes presentation	El Tayeb Omer (ZOA Sudan) Nussaibah

			20 minutes of discussion and questions	
15:00 – 15:30	Presentation 3: how local communities deal with issues like social conflict, injustice, women's rights, and harmful cultural gender norms, as well as the impact these cultures might have on social cohesiveness.	Learn about SWDC's approach to resolving social conflict, injustice & women's rights.	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes of discussion and questions	Jamal Ahmed Nassir (Somali Women Development Centre) Peter
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee & tea break			
16:00 – 16:30	Presentation 4: Engagement with conflict-affected communities to build an evidence base that is used for various purposes.	Learn about how the evidence base can be used to draw attention to conflict, maintain pressure for negotiated settlement.	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes discussion and questions	Tigist Fisseha & Sharawi Alkamil Nussaibah

Day 2: May 25, 2002

Time	Topic	Objective	How?	Who?
9:00 – 9:30	Recap of day 1	Connect with what was discussed and learned on Day 1	Plenary 'light' exercise	Peter + volunteer
9:30 – 11:00	Harvesting lessons learned for future programming	Better understanding of how to improve/innovate on the ARC community-based peacebuilding interventions for future programmes.	Group work (4 groups)	Nussaibah

11:00 – 11:30	Coffee & Tea break			
11:30 – 12:00	Group presentations	Stock taking of group work	4 break-out groups present back to the plenary about their most important lessons learned for future programming.	Participants
	III. Learning & evaluation methodologies applied in ARC			
12:00 – 12:30	Presentation 1: Outcome harvesting, what are the pros and cons; how does it combine with other methodologies; what are donors' stances on this methodology	Get a better understanding of Outcome Harvesting as an evaluation methodology	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes discussion and questions	Rayan Nimir & Sadik Alewi (Saferworld Sudan) Nussaibah
12:30 – 13:00	Presentation 2: Best practices from the implementation of the ARC Program in Ethiopia	Learn from best practices	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes discussion and questions	Mahlet Tekalegne (ZOA Ethiopia) Peter
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break			
14:30 – 15:00	Presentation 3: The role of Peace Building Committees in addressing roots causes of conflict, establishing the culture of peaceful conflict resolution, trust among members of community and reconciliation.	Learn about the role of Peace Building Committees	10 minutes presentation 20 minutes discussion and questions	Joseph Yencing Modi (HDC, South Sudan) Peter

15:00 – 15:30	Round Table session (part 1)	What conditions are required for learning to take place and be captured?	Plenary session	Giorgio Ferrari (KPSRL)
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee & tea break			
16:00 – 16:30	Round Table session (part 2)	What are the challenges and barriers for enabling learning at distinct levels, i.e., structural, programmatic, and contextual?		Giorgio Ferrari (KPSRL)

Day 3: May 26, 2022

Time	Topic	Objective	How?	
9:00 – 9:30	Recap day 2	Connect with what was discussed and learned on Day 1	Plenary ‘light’ exercise	Volunteers
9:30 – 11:00	Experience sharing exercise (“Story telling”)	Learn from unexpected things that came up during programme implementation.	Small group discussions (groups of 4)	Peter
11:00 – 11:30	Coffee & tea break			
11:30 – 12:00	Highlighting lessons learned Participants present their most valuable lessons learned from the experience sharing exercise.	Harvesting the results from the Experience sharing exercise.	Small group presentations with highlights of lessons learned.	Peter & Nussaibah
12:00 – 12:30	Parking lot	To discuss issues that were touched upon during the discussion but could not be dealt with at length because it would divert to much from the topic of the session.	Plenary discussion	Peter
12:30 – 13:00	Closing of the conference			Nussaibah & El Tayeb Omer



Zeestraat 100
2518 AD The Hague
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)70 314 19 62
info@kpsrl.org
www.kpsrl.org



ÉVÉNEMENT
REGIONAL
D'APPRENTISSAGE-
ARC
BURUNDI-RDC-MALI

AGENDA

DU 17 AU 19 MAI 2022



American Friends
Service Committee



ARC Regional Learning Event – Agenda : Du 17 au 19 Mai 2022

Heures	Thèmes	Présentateurs
Objectif: Capture specific lessons learnt in terms of innovative approaches, what worked and what didn't Résultat attendu: Après 5 ans de mise en œuvre des programmes – ARC, déterminer quelles approches sont déterminantes (ou prometteuses) pour l'impact recherché, quelles innovations ont été développées, et à quel niveau il y aurait besoin d'amélioration pour de prochains programmes de consolidation de la paix.		
8h30 – 9h00	Discours d'ouverture des officiels (Représentants du gouvernant, de la Mairie de Bujumbura, de l'Ambassade hollandaise à Bujumbura, des programmes-ARC au Burundi)	
9h00 – 10h00	Présentation des participants + Présentation des objectifs de la conférence	
10h00 – 10h40	ARC results framework & Adaptive programming	M. John Bitaha (Ambassade Pays-Bas, RDC)
10h40 – 11h25	Approches ascendantes et leurs contributions à la réduction de conflits violents : Forces et limites <i>Cas des « Comités mixtes de sécurité »</i>	Dr. Theophile Djedjebi – Human Security Collective (Coordinateur ARC-Mali) & Loochi Muzalimwa (Directeur programme VNGI –ARC DRC)
11h25 – 12h15	Impact de la programmation adaptative, des approches ascendantes et logique d'intervention (Succès et défis/échecs) sur : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Résilience économique des jeunes - La sécurité humaine - La cohésion sociale 	(Groupes de travail)
12h15 – 13h00	Restitution des travaux en groupes + discussion	
13h00 – 14h00	Pause-déjeuner	
14h00 – 15h00	1. Approche transformative par rapport au Genre 2. Adaptabilité au contexte local <i>Cas de la gestion des conflits fonciers</i>	Aline Nivyabandi (CORD-Burundi) Jean-Pierre Niyonzima (MIPAREC-Burundi) & Sosthène Maliyaseme (APC-DRC)
15h00 – 16h10	1. Adaptabilité au contexte local (2) <i>Approches ascendantes et collaboration avec les autorités</i> 2. Restitution des sessions parallèles + discussion	Prince Kalenge Kabwe Team Leader Women, Peace & Security Program (ZOA-DRC)
16h10 – 17h00	« Takeaways » de la journée	(Groupes de travail)
17h : Fin de la 1^{ère} journée		

ARC Regional Learning Event – Agenda : Du 17 au 19 Mai 2022

Jour 2, 18 mai : Mesurer l'impact des approches et stratégies mises en œuvre pour le changement recherché au niveau communautaire, voire aux niveaux supérieurs (Consolidation de la paix) + Analyse des lieux d'apprentissage		
9h00 – 9h40	Récapitulatif + Feedback des travaux en groupes du 01^{er} jour	
9h40 – 10h40	Lieux et conditions pour un apprentissage réussi	Messina Manirakiza (Knowledge Broker programming and Practice – KPSRL)
10h40 – 11h00	Pause-Café	
11h00 – 12h00	Exemples pratiques : Échanges sur des expériences d'apprentissage réussi	Nadine Ndikumasabo-MEAL officer AFSC (ARC-Burundi) Timothée Rukundo-Country Director ZOA (ARC-DRC) Sekou Doumbia-Responsable M&E Cordaid (ARC-Mali)
12h00 – 13h00	« Mesurer » la paix	Outcome Haversting Bonaventure Nzisabira Oxfam-Burundi (Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Accountability and Learning) Everyday Peace Indicators (EPI)/Bottom up indicators (Indicateurs ascendants) Amani Munguakonkwa Safari (Chargé des programmes PDD-DRC)
13h00 – 14h00	Pause - Déjeuner	
14h00-15h15	Usage des données : - Dans la programmation & rapportage - Défis dans l'apprentissage & Atténuation/Mitigation - Éléments limitant l'adaptation de la programmation/du management & Réponses	(Groupes de travail)
15h15-16h00	Partenariat & Interdépendance des domaines d'intervention Restitution des divers groupes + Discussion (Session précédente)	François Bizimana – MEAL Officer - HaC Burundi
16h00-17h00	Takeaways de la journée au regard aussi des takeaways du 1^{er} jour	(Groupes de travail)
17h00 : Fin de la 2^{ème} journée		

ARC Regional Learning Event – Agenda : Du 17 au 19 Mai 2022

Jour 3 : Réflexion, Influencing & recommandations		
9h00 – 10h20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Présentation des participants - Présentation des programmes-ARC - Présentation des résultats des 2 premiers jours 	
10h20 – 11h00	La santé mentale et le soutien psychosocial (SMSPS) dans les programmes de consolidation de la paix : Présentation de note d'orientation conjointe ARC-Burundi & ARC-DRC	Alexis Nibigira (THARS-ARC Burundi) & Amani Munguakonkwa Safari (Chargé des programmes PDD-DRC)
11h00 – 11h20	Pause-café	
11h20 – 11h50	À la découverte des réalisations des programmes ARC (Poster gallery des approches/résultats/meilleures pratiques)	
11h50 – 12h20	Intervention d'un des acteurs impliqués dans des interventions de Consolidation de la paix au Burundi + Discussions	Julie Claveau Chief of Party, Burundi P2P, 'Turi Kumwe' Counterpart International ?
12h20 – 13h00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcomes et Takeaways de la conférence - Recommandations 	
13h00 – 14h00	Pause-déjeuner	
14h00 - 15h00	Meilleures pratiques à pérenniser ayant retenues l'attention des participants	
15h00 -16h00	Quels outils pour répondre aux causes profondes des conflits ? Takeaways (Leçons apprises les uns des autres) que nous allons intégrer dans nos programmes de consolidation de la paix ?	Clément Nkubizi (Directeur Pays-HaC Burundi)
16h00 – 17h00	Cérémonies de clôture	

