



## The text of the GWA-B part of the 2018 Report of Watershed Project in Bangladesh

Find our text in black.

### Watershed Format WP annual report 2018 (8-11 pages + annexes)

*This report is the responsibility of the WP lead. The main basis for the report is the monitoring information gathered in July-August 2018 and the analysis made during the PMEL workshop with the ToC review in August/Sept 2018. The quarterly reports and outcomes harvested are also important sources of information. We suggest that the WP lead provides a first full draft and shares this with consortium and implementing partners before sharing it with the PWG on 15 February.*

If you have public videos, picture, quotes, etc please do add them to the relevant section. Adding a caption and crediting the photographer. We want to use the best in the Annual Report.

### 1. Executive Summary (1 page)

GWA:

The main aim of the Watershed programme (2016-2020) is to strengthen capacity of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) to advocate and lobby in the interrelated fields of IWRM and WASH to ensure equity and social inclusion, as well as sustainable usage of water resources. It contributes to the Sustainable Development Goal for universal access to water and sanitation services and water security (SDG6) by making the voices of citizens heard and strengthening governance and accountability (Inception report October 2016).

The overall aim is to empower citizens, leaving no one behind.

Gender aspects are at the core of both WASH and IWRM, when aiming for improvement.

Because of considerable experience in the subject and the region, GWA-B (the Gender and Water Alliance – Bangladesh) was asked to be involved in the project to make sure gender, diversity and inclusion of all, will be effectively operationalised. To do so, a plan for 2018 was made, but also GWA was asked to be pro-active, and get active when needed. Therefore, not all work done fits exactly in the budget-items of the Gantt Chart of 2018.

GWA participated in most events, meetings and workshops, but also developed some own activities, especially by activities in Bhola itself, such as coaching sessions, meetings, transect walks, visit to Watershed achievements, FGDs (Focus Group Discussions) etc. GWA's work is directed at capacity building of two levels CSOs: DORP (at national level) and the two CSOs in Bhola, which again consist of various NGOs and CBOs. A number of changes took place during this second year, such as more involvement of women in the CSOs, more attention for women and the people from marginalized groups in the coaching sessions than before, some inclusion of gender disaggregated information in the documents of DORP, and most importantly, raised awareness of the CSO members and other stakeholders regarding gender and social inclusion issues of WASH and IWRM.

### 2. Relevant contextual information of the countries + NL + International (0.5 page)

GWA:

During 2018, various activities at different levels, from the grassroots level to the national level, have taken place in and by the Watershed project, resulting from the efforts of GWA for the project. For instance:

1. GWA-B organized a two-day (2-3 January 2018) long **Capacity Building Workshop on Gender and Inclusion** for DORP and Wateraid to ensure understanding of the need to integrate gender and inclusion even better in the project activities. In the workshop, there were 4 men from DORP, 1 woman from WaterAid, and 4 women from GWA-B. The contents focused on the Capacity Building that Wateraid does with the CSOs in national level and DORP with the CSOs in Bhola. The main purpose was that DORP will do their coaching totally inclusive and in a gender sensitive way, which makes the presence of GWA-B in Bhola ultimately less necessary. The direct objectives of the workshop were:
  - a. The understanding of gender and inclusion related to IWRM and WASH is strengthened.
  - b. The capacity to recognise the different categories of people, their different needs and knowledge, and to realise who are missing out, is strengthened.
  - c. The capacity of DORP and WaterAid staff to include all different people in their work is improved.
  - d. Specific knowledge on gender and diversity in advocacy work and its application in practice is increased.
  - e. DORP staff is able to do all their coaching in the selected areas (in this case Bhola) in a gender inclusive way.
  - f. A draft Gender Action Plan for the watershed project 2018.

The partners were given suggestions to their presentations. Based on their contributions GWA listed a number of activities, which are clearly needed, and then prepared the draft Gender Action Plan for DORP in the Watershed Project 2018 accordingly.

2. GWA-B representatives participated in the **Watershed Learning Trajectory Social Inclusion and Gender** to learn more about social inclusion and gender; share GWA-B's experiences and stories from the field with other colleagues from different work packages as well as learned about other's experiences and stories from the field; sharpen up the advocacy messages to ensure "No One is Left Behind" in access to and use of WASH services.
3. GWA-B representatives participated in the **Watershed progress meeting** and discussed about partner's plans for 2018 and their current situation as well as how partners can involve each other in their activities.
4. GWA-B took part in **bilateral meeting with DORP on 7 March 2018** to discuss the situation in Bhola, the gender-budgeting documents and how to process them, including gender aspects, and other current issues.
5. Also, **with WaterAid on 11 March 2018** a bilateral meeting to discuss current situation, and about Watershed Gantt chart 2018.
6. GWA-B representatives actively participated in the various level workshops and meetings, so that attention for gender and inclusion was ensured in WP5 at various levels.
7. GWA-B representative took part in **the Writing-workshop in Ede**, from Bangladesh, and wrote the briefing paper on gender and social inclusion aspects of WASH, including the comments of various readers, and completing it in time.
8. GWA-B representative Khadiza participated in **Mid-Term Review meeting on 9th August**. In the MTR meeting, including the representative of Gender and Water Alliance, representative of Wateraid, DORP, Akvo and Weltland International were present. In that

meeting, **ToR of MTR was reviewed, Capacity Self-Assessment (CSA) and QIS ladder of DORP and CSOs were reviewed**, sharing and discussion about the activity plan 2018: how far partners are; sharing and discussion about the activity plan of 2019; and answering MTR questionnaire together.

9. GWA (3 facilitators) conducted a day long **Capacity Building Workshop on Gender and Social Inclusion for DORP on 4th September**. The workshop was for all the staff of DORP who are working for not only Watershed but different projects implemented by DORP. So this was an opportunity for a larger group of DORP activists and staff to learn more about gender and inclusion and implement in their work focusing on WASH, advocacy and budgeting, reproductive hygiene, resettlement etc. total number of participants from DORP was 17 (7 men, 10 women). Of all subjects the gender aspects were discussed, and plans were made during group work. See our comprehensive report.
10. **The GWA team, Joke and Khadiza, visited Bhola from 9-12 September**. In Bhola, GWA conducted two **coaching sessions on Gender and Social Inclusion** in Bhola for Water Management Citizen's Committee and separately for the NGO Network. Participants were 27 + 11 (13 women and 14 men, 7 women and 4 men). In their offices we had **meetings with DPHE (8 men), LGED (5 men), and BWDB executive officers (24 men and 3 women) and their teams**. The gender aspects of their work, and the need for more consideration with the poorest people, who otherwise always lose out, were the topics of the meetings. GWA also had **meeting with the Union Chairpersons of Bhedhuria and Dhania Unions, together with all the Union members** (14 men and 10 men and 1 woman). GWA team visited one so called **Cluster Village**, where people live who lost their land to river erosion. They are now very poor. We had a **FGD (10 women, 11 men, 6 girls, 10 boys)** and **individual interviews**, saw the dramatic WATSAN facilities. GWA conducted one more **FGD with poor women and men**, whose toilets are very unhygienic. Participants: 16 women and 12 men, and lots of children. During our **long walk along the river**, over the embankment we talked with many people, and saw the **achievements of DORP's work**: some stretch of riverbank protection by BWDB, resulting from DORP's advocacy, and one hand-pump for the river-nomads. Other work of DORP we visited were **Union Parishad Offices, where the budget is painted on the wall**, including the separate amount for WATSAN. See our comprehensive report, if only for the pictures. On invitation by DPHE, we visited a **government primary school (mixed) and a high school for girls to see the toilets** that are built under their responsibility. We found 3 good new toilets for boys (170 boys), and further dilapidated unusable toilets for the 670 girls, who have to go home in case they need the toilet. During this fieldtrip we overall found functioning and adequate handpumps, but **poor toilet facilities**, and too few. We visited many families in their houses or yards. We saw the **Bede "village", a ghat (harbour)** where their boats stay most of the time. Bede is the name of river nomads, who appear to be the poorest category of people in Bhola Sadar.
11. GWA-B representative participated in the **Watershed Annual Partners' meeting in Uganda** and played an active role in the designated **international Social Inclusion Team (SIT)** from 1-5 October 2018. The main goal of the SIT was to help assess whether WPs' plans, activities, presentations, inputs are socially inclusive, as well as giving feedback to teams on how they can improve. The SIT performed this responsibility throughout the

four-day meeting and had given time in the programme to engage with the full group. The main responsibilities of the SIT members were to support the full group **to identify and address social inclusion gaps**, with the **Social Inclusion (SI) framework checklist**; have a critical look at everything done/ present/ discuss, from a social inclusion perspective / point of view throughout the meeting constructively; check the content and take concise notes of the key findings; and at the end of the **workshop present final findings and recommendations** to full group in a motivating way for improvement.

12. Visited the **Water and Life photo exhibition** organized by DORP as an activity of Watershed project on 18 October 2018.
13. Found out the outcomes of GWA-B for 2018 in the Watershed project and participated in **the Outcome harvesting workshop from 19-20 December 2018**. In 2018, GWA-B played a very active role to ensure gender and social inclusion in the activities of Watershed project and has several outcomes out of that. For example, two local level CSOs (Water Management Citizens Committee and NGO Network) in Bhola; DORP as a national level CSO; the government duty bearers of Department of Public Health Engineering (DPHE), Local Government Engineering Department (LGED), Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB); and two Union Parishad chairpersons become more aware about the gender and social inclusion aspects of WASH and IWRM and took some initiatives and made some commitments in response to that.
14. Updated the **Organizational Inclusion Assessment Tool (OIAT) of DORP** which was developed in December 2016. After one year, in November 2017, it was updated and on 29 December 2018 it was updated again as the second time. During the updating session, a big group of DORP staff was present. GWA-B representatives discussed about the OIAT first and then presented and updated the OIAT. A lot of progress has been noticed in the level of inclusion and activities done to achieve the targeted level.

### 3. Cooperation (1 page)

*Only incorporate comments if you think they have been relevant for Watershed in 2018*

- 3.1. Cooperation between Consortium and CSO partners
  - Analyse complementarity in roles and capacities of consortium partners
  - In what activities have the CSOs participated?
  - How do the CSOs view the partnership?
  - What is the added value of the consortium and CSO partners?
- 3.2. Cooperation with MFA/Embassies
  - Relation MFA/Embassies (balance between partnership relation and donor-recipient relation)
  - View of Embassy on Watershed
- 3.3. Cooperation with government partners

GWA:

The GWA team met with the government duty bearers, service providers in Bhola. They all were interested to discuss the gender aspects of WASH and the inclusion of all. The result of the meetings will not be materialised before next year, when revised policies and plans will be implemented, at the earliest.

- Assessment current relations with CSOs
  - View on Watershed by government partners
- 3.4. Has Watershed leveraged new partnerships and extra funding

- Add cooperation with other organizations/NGOs that are not Watershed partners?
- Add additional support and other donors?

#### 4. Progress towards the ambitions of our Theory of Change: how is the capacity strengthening of CSOs leading to the changes we want to see? (1 – 2 pages)

- Looking at the Capacity Self Assessments and Capacity Action Plans of the WP CSO implementing partners done last August and the intended expected impact, provide a short narrative on your assessment of the progress in capacity of each of the Watershed implementing CSOs to effectively lobby their governments. Refer to the intended outcomes of your ToC as appropriate.
- Report briefly on the WP team *participation* in the Learning trajectories / Learning themes and value added (or not).

#### 5. Progress towards the ambitions of our Theory of Change: outcomes achieved (2-3 pages)

Please include the excel database with your **harvested outcomes including classification, as annex**. At least all outcomes harvested until mid-2018 should be included<sup>1</sup>. Outcomes until end-2018 are welcome, but only if finalised.

GWA:

The file with GWA's Outcome Harvesting, is already with Ranjan. Thank you for making sure it is included.

- 5.1. First put here your top 3 outcomes of 2018. These should be those you are most proud of. Explain why they are so relevant for the TOC.
- 5.2. The *contributions made by Watershed partners* towards the harvested outcomes. Where are we most effective, where do we need to change and if so, what?

Thereafter you assess on the basis of all your outcomes:

- 5.3. **Progress made towards civil society, communities and citizens *doing things differently***, i.e. effectively lobbying for environmentally sustainable and equitable governance of WASH and IWRM?

Please list:

- 5.3.1. How CSOs have succeeded in creating space for CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage, to which Watershed has contributed

GWA:

The coaching and other awareness raising work by GWA-B has resulted in much more attention in Bholā gatherings and meetings and agenda's, for inclusion of vulnerable women, men and children. How concretely effective this in the end will be, remains to be seen. So far we are not impressed with the impact at grassroots' level, but are convinced that this takes time.

- 5.3.2. The advocacy initiatives carried out by partner CSOs, for, by or with their membership constituency, to which Watershed has contributed
- 5.3.3. What makes you confident that we will achieve the ambitions of the ToC? What makes you worry we might not? Refer to the 6 ToC key theme areas<sup>2</sup> (see OH excel database) as relevant.

GWA on Theory of Change, Civil Society Capacity Building:

<sup>1</sup> In case you have not harvested outcomes yet, or only after August 2018, then please write this paragraph based on other monitoring data and the information you have.

<sup>2</sup> The 6 ToC elements are: Data for evidence; Social inclusion; Coordination and collaboration; WASH/IWRM integration; Accountability; WASH finance / budget tracking

1. CSOs awareness and understanding of Inclusive and Sustainable WASH & IWRM increased :  
Yes, increased, but not enough regarding IWRM and inclusion, and regarding the part that WASH has within IWRM.
2. CSOs engage with other stakeholders in discussions related to WASH & IWRM:  
Not sufficiently understood.
3. CSOs have increased capacity to do L&A for Inclusive & Sustainable WASH services for all:  
Yes, they have. They tell us that they talk about inclusion when meeting with Duty Bearers.
4. CSOs have capacity to advocate for enforcement of WASH & IWRM rules & Regulation:  
We do not know this, but have no reason to believe that CSOs are aware of IWRM rules. They probably are aware of WASH rules.
5. CSOs facilitate monitoring public plan & budget for WASH & IWRM at Upazila level & downwards taking into account inclusiveness and sustainability:  
DORP does this, but, in case with CSO's the Bhola CSOs are meant, then we have no evidence of this, so far.
6. CSOs track and/or monitor Sustainability & Inclusiveness of WASH Services & IWRM:  
Yes.
7. CSOs generate evidence from monitoring activities (i.e. on public budget, Sustainability and Inclusiveness of WASH services, linkages between IWRM, implementation of rules and regulations):  
DORP on public budget, and on inclusiveness of WASH services, implementation of rules and regulations.
8. CSO's actively share acquired knowledge & best practices in CSO networks & Platforms:  
we suppose so.
9. Replication of best practices shared by CSOs by other stakeholders:  
The publication of the Union budget, painted on the wall, is replicated in other unions.
10. CSOs hold public & private WASH & IWRM Service providers & authorities accountable at Upazila level:  
We are not aware of private service providers. Public service providers are held accountable, probably by CSOs, and so far by GWA whenever we meet.
11. CSOs influence decision making process to ensure Sustainable & inclusive WASH Services:  
Probably, yes, but not with much concrete effect yet.

#### 5.4. Progress made towards governmental actors *doing things differently?*

Please list:

- 5.4.1. the documented significant changes in laws, policies, norms which have been adopted or improved, by targeted governments<sup>3</sup>
- 5.4.2. the concrete, observable changes in practices of targeted governments, where they actually implement laws, policies or norms<sup>4</sup>.
- 5.4.3. What makes you confident that we will achieve the ambitions of the ToC? What makes you worry we might not? Refer to the 6 ToC elements as used in the OH database.

## 6. Reported Outputs (0,5 – 1 page)

<sup>3</sup> With your answer, the scores for the harmonised Dialogue and Dissent indicator DD2 “# of laws, policies and norms/attitudes, blocked, adopted, improved for sustainable and inclusive development” will be generated at programme level

<sup>4</sup> With your answer, the scores for the harmonised Dialogue and Dissent indicator DD1 “# of laws, policies and norms, implemented, for sustainable and inclusive development” will be generated at programme level

Please fill out the Excel sheet with your Gantt Chart 2018 and Q1,2,3,4 reports.

Provide here a short justification/explanation in the text of the difference between planned and realised outputs

GWA: See our Q1, Q2, Q 1+2, Q3 and Q4 reports.

Most planned activities are realised, but a few documents have not been finalised yet. This is planned for 2019.

#### **7. WP Theory of Change and assumptions (0.5 - 1 page)**

- Add the last 2018 version of the WP ToC diagram and causal assumptions as Annex 3, so readers can see what you are referring to
- Based on your assessment of the progress achieved and outputs generated, reflect on how realistic (e.g. in terms of achievements at the end of Watershed) you think the WP Theory of Change is and why/why not? Did you make any changes?
- Do you need to change or investigate your causal assumptions? How?

#### **8. Main challenges, lessons learnt and best practices (0.5 - 1 page)**

- What are the major challenges and are there alternative approaches required?
- Lessons learnt, best practices, or stories from the field (i.e. CSO member telling about effect/impact of Watershed)? If you have videos, picture, quotes, etc please do add a selection of them.

GWA:

#### **Challenges:**

- For a partner, with a small budget, the obligations for reporting, meetings and workshops are the same as for those with larger budgets and more staff time paid by the project. Proportionately we have to spend more time for such work. Furthermore GWA has to be aware about everything that is going on, read all reports, to be sure that we know where gender mainstreaming needs our support most. Accordingly, a lot of unpaid time is spent for the project, now for two years in a row.
- Getting the contract with Simavi for year two and the first instalment in delay. Because of delay in getting contract and fund, GWA-B could not do its planned activities in due time.
- This time the new contract waits for the audits of the global GWA, which are not yet in view, because GWA works without donors, and auditors are hard to find and outrageously expensive. A solution is looked for with our Bangladeshi auditor.
- A different type of issue was the limited number of participants of the workshop organised by GWA-B in January. We expected DORP and WaterAid to make use of the opportunity by sending more of their staff to the workshop, for the same effort and costs. Their busy schedule has limited the participation. In next workshops more staff joined, including more women, be they mostly from other DORP projects.
- Getting the visa to join the write-shop failed. Completing the paper from a distance, whilst others were together in the Netherlands, was a real challenge. To communicate with 5 hours' time difference was difficult. It is now published on GWA's website.
- GWA-B was planning to go to Bhola with DORP colleagues to see the open budget sessions coordinated by the CSOs in Bhola. As DORP colleagues who work in Dhaka did not go, GWA-B participants also cancelled the trip.

### **Lessons learned:**

- The DORP staff who reside and work in Bhola, were actively participating and appreciating the Gender and Inclusion workshop of 2 and 3 January. The advantage was that the workshop was in Bangla, and facilitated by our team together with Safina Naznin, our GWA member with a lot of experience.
- Overall, GWA-B had good and successful activities in all quarters. We contributed and have learnt a lot and nearly completed all the targeted activities.
- A highlight was our 3<sup>rd</sup> visit to Bhola, of which we wrote a comprehensive report, of which all stakeholders can learn.
- In general, over the project, it is difficult to find the middle-way between waiting to be asked for advice and input on the one hand and proactively minding other partners' business, especially if they themselves don't feel a strong need to be more inclusive.

### **Best practices:**

A first best practice is the active participation in the various level workshops and meetings, so that attention for gender and inclusion was ensured in WP5 at various levels. The second best practice is, although it was not listed in the reported activities, to ensure the activities of Watershed project more inclusive, a Gender Action Plan has been drafted in the Capacity Building Workshop on Gender and Inclusion for Watershed Partners in Bangladesh (by GWA for DORP and WaterAid).

Watershed partners and CSO members are now well aware about gender and social inclusion issues in their activity but coaching on gender and social inclusion issues needs to continue to ensure sustainability of the outcomes. Also involving government officials in awareness raising regarding inclusive WASH remains important.

### **ANNEXES**

[Annex 1: Database with outcomes harvested](#)

[Annex 2: Excel Gantt Chart with Q1,2,3,4 reports](#)

[Annex 3: WP ToC](#)