BILL & MELINDA
GATES foundation

Final Report to BMGF about the project "Supporting SuSanA and broader Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Community of Practice through on-line platform"

- This is a slightly edited version compared to what was submitted to BMGF in January 2019 (last edit on 29 May 2019; final report was mainly written by Arno Rosemarin and Simon Okoth; edits in May were made by Elisabeth von Muench)

General Information			
Investment Title	Supporting SuSanA and broader Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Community of Practice through on-line platform		
Grantee/Vendor	Stiftelsen The Stockholm Environment Institute		
Primary Contact	Simon Okoth	**Investment Start Date**	October 3, 2016
Feedback Contact[1]	Simon Okoth	**Investment End Date**	November 30, 2018
Feedback Email[1]	simon.okoth@sei.org	**Reporting Period Start Date**	October 3, 2016
Program Officer	Jan Willem Rosenboom	**Reporting Period End Date**	November 30, 2018
Program Coordinator	Katie Madson	**Reporting Due Date**	January 31, 2019
Investment Total	$1,508,644.00	**Opportunity/Contract ID**	OPP1152884
Remaining Funds (If applicable)	[...]		

Submission Information			

By submitting this report, I declare that I am authorized to certify, on behalf of the grantee or vendor identified on page 1, that I have examined the following statements and related attachments, and that to the best of my knowledge, they are true, correct and complete. I hereby also confirm that the grantee or vendor identified on page 1 has complied with all of the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement or Contract for Services, as applicable, including but not limited to the clauses contained therein regarding Use of Funds, Anti-Terrorism, Subgrants and Subcontracts, and Regulated Activities.

Date Submitted	[Jan 31 2019]	**Submitted by Contact Name**	Simon Okoth
		Submitted by Contact Title	Senior Project Manager
		Submitted by Contact Email	simon.okoth@sei.org
		Submitted by Contact Phone	+254722789642

Note on 23 May 2019: When this report was submitted to BMGF last January it contained several annexes. These have now been uploaded to the SuSanA library here (main documents), here (Communications plan with 9 Annexes) and here (secondary documents). Furthermore, many hyperlinks within this document went to a Google Drive folder. Those files have mostly been copied to the SuSanA library now and the new links are provided in the report.

This report has been very lightly edited to convert it into a public document, mainly by adjusting the internal links so that they now go to the SuSanA library.

Progress and Results

1. Final Progress Details

Provide information regarding the entire investment's progress towards achieving the investment outputs and outcomes. In addition, submit the Results Tracker with actual results as requested. If this investment has an Integrated Product Development

After review of the first year of the project including the October 2017 meeting in Seattle and the subsequent deliberations between the project team and the Gates Foundation, the project duration, budget and priority deliverables were reviewed culminating in the shortening of the project period to the end of September 2018 and cutting the budget from 2.7M USD to 1.5M USD.

This end of project report provides the actual overall achievements of the project based on the revised priority activities but guided by the original results framework.

Outcome 1: Improved use of the SuSanA Platform by identified target groups, through a clear communications plan and platform improvements. Under this outcome there were a number of outputs planned to be achieved within year 1 of the project as follows:

The "Supporting SuSanA and broader Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Community of Practice through online platform" project aimed at improving SuSanA's ability to improve the access to sanitation by improving the platform and increasing SuSanA's reach to different sector practitioners through quality and targeted information by the right channels. The original project as outlined in the project document and the contract had three key outcomes including:

1. Improved use of SuSanA Platform by identified target groups, through a clear communications plan and platform improvements.

2. Demonstrable improvements in the impact that use of the SuSanA platform has on members' work in sanitation.

3. Strengthened governance and institutional sustainability of SuSanA as reflected in an operational plan that includes a plan for funding the budget needed to assure the future of SuSanA.

1.1 The ToR for the UX (User Experience) and Market studies were developed, reviewed and endorsed by the Project Advisory Board (PAB) for circulation.
- **Achieved:** The two ToRs were developed, reviewed and endorsed by the PAB. A request for proposals for the two studies were then floated, bids evaluated, contracts awarded and the studies were successfully completed in 2017.

1.2 The UX (User Experience) study undertaken and the recommendations of the study shared with the Project Advisory Board for consensus and implementation.
- **Achieved:** The user experience study was completed and the recommendations agreed upon by the PAB for implementation. The Bentley University User Experience Centre signed a contract on January 30, 2017 with SEI to undertake the study. The UX Study was completed and the final study report shared as well with SuSanA members on the Discussion Forum (see here). The report highlighted a whole range of issues that needed improvement (more so on the mother website than on the Forum). These included for example, improvements of search filter structure, search functions and improved performance of the website for slow internet connections among others. **See Section 2.2.1 below to see how we implemented the recommendations.**

1.3 Consensus reached within PAB on the ToR for the Market/Stakeholder Study including methodologies. For the latter including a review of survey instruments, the sampling approach, geographic spread, topic diversity and other measurable market parameters relevant to the WSH sector.
- **Achieved:** After the development and approval of the ToR for the consultancy on the SuSanA stakeholders market study, the tender was released. From the 12 bids received, a contract was awarded in May 2017 to a consortium consisting of the Centre for Appropriate Water and Sanitation Technology (CAWST) and Seecon. The joint proposal by the two companies was found to be the most pragmatic and fit our selection criteria the best. After filing the inception report, the market study was completed at the end of September 2017 and the consultants submitted the study report complete with findings and recommendations, including a draft Communications Strategy. This report was reviewed by the PAB who gave very valuable feedback which was then incorporated by the consultants. Find the Market Study and annexes here.

1.4 Consensus reached within the SuSanA Core Group on which recommendations from the Market/Stakeholder Study to implement through a Communications Plan.
- **Achieved:** After the Consortium meeting with the Core Group Representatives in Stockholm in August 2017, a Core Group (CG) meeting was held at SEI during which the stakeholders' market study was extensively discussed. The CG was generally in agreement with most of the recommendations that were arising from the study and provided further recommendations for inclusion in the final documents. The CG representatives highlighted specific recommendations in the reports that needed to be prioritized when drafting the Communications Plan. Of particular interest to the CG Representatives was the identification of target user

groups - so-called "personas". Plans were initiated for Year 3 to provide SuSanA with a persona-based user profile system to make targeting and curation much more sophisticated.

1.5 Communications Plan
- **Achieved:** The Communications Plan was drafted and consensus reached within the project team on the same after a review exercise involving the Consortium and the CG Representatives. This was then made ready for the meeting in Seattle on 23 October 2017. The Comms Plan is found [here](#).
- Implementation of the Comms Plan was initiated following the Seattle meeting following production of the Strategy Document and Workplan in 2018.

Outcome 2: Demonstrable improvements in the impact that use of the SuSanA platform has on members' work in sanitation.
This outcome has three key outputs which are further split into a number of sub-outputs.

2.1 Improved thematic content and curated KM tools for the Forum and Website

2.1.1 Project database on the SuSanA mother website is expanded and serves as an entry point to find information and a source for curation work, to assist with learning and to be an institutional memory for past projects

- **Achieved:** Through the work of the project team and SuSanA partners, new sanitation and hygiene projects have been added to the project database of SuSanA. The status after Year 1 (October 2017) was that nearly 400 projects were in the database. The global map of sanitation projects has been much improved and is now located on the front page of the website to receive more attention.
- Besides adding projects to the project database, a major overhaul to the project database was done in Year 1 including checking through all the projects to improve project titles, descriptions and filters (see [here](#)). Improvements were made so that the project database is now more visible and central within the new SuSanA website.
- The project team and the Secretariat improved the "partner profile page" functionalities so that all SuSanA partners can now add and edit their own projects directly themselves. The project database, map function, library and the partner profile descriptions are now fully interlinked. A good example of a partner profile page is the one by EAWAG, see [here](#).
- Further improvements during Year 2 included adding more visual options (people can now add images and videos to their projects), displaying the chosen filters as a cloud tag at the bottom of the project description and adding more detailed descriptions for each project. A good example of a project in the project database that is using all the options is the UBSUP project in Kenya, see [here](#), as well as the Nanomembrane Toilet project at Cranfield University, see [here](#).
- New projects in the West Asia and North Africa (WANA) region have also been added by the project staff within the Secretariat as part of the WANA Regional Chapter work.
- We have improved the filtering and search functionalities (the search tool is the same as used for the library as they are both databases within the website). For example, in relation to emphasizing the private sector engagement within the project, it is now possible to filter projects based on different partners including those of private sector partners. This filtering option is useful for any outreach efforts to the private sector.
- The project team and the SuSanA Secretariat are continually contacting grantees, project owners and SuSanA partners to get more information on their projects into the project database (either by updating existing projects or adding new ones) or to encourage making Forum posts about their projects. This is done for example via the SuSanA newsmail and during the onboarding of new partners: When new partners join, they are already asked during the joining process to add at least one project to the project database.
- As of November 2018: Over 470 projects are now included in the project database. There are currently 308 BMGF grants in the project database (out of a total of 470 projects). Of these 308 grants, 209 (or 68%) have a quite detailed description already. 173 grants have been introduced on the SuSanA discussion Forum, and many have received one or several replies and discussions there.
- The consortium partners also added several of their projects to the project database during Years 1 and 2. WaterAid now has 22 projects in the project database, GIZ 21 projects, BORDA 9 projects (BORDA is mentioned here because the project assistant located at GIZ was contracted via BORDA) and Oxfam 10 projects.

2.1.2 Curation activities and improvements and Forum moderation carried out

- There are curation activities that are continuously taking place to ensure discussions and knowledge products are being brought to the members attention:
  - The Forum has been extensively moderated to ensure the quality remains high by. This is carried out by

 Final Narrative 01/31/19

re-arranging threads to improve ease of reading and access to information, grouping posts together when appropriate, or splitting threads if more than one topic is being discussed. The Forum moderation also allows the development and running of high quality thematic discussions on pre-selected topics with experts in the field.

- Publications which are brought to our attention via Forum posts are being added to the SuSanA library, which has now grown to 2869 publications. See here.
- We migrated information about videos from our Youtube channel and from the "conference materials" section into the SuSanA library to make it easier for users to find information.
- We have added a map view to the SuSanA library by re-checking all of the library entries and adding a pin on the map if the document refers to a particular place. This helps users to quickly see whether there are library entries in the regions they are interested in. So far we have added the location (pin on the map) for around 900 publications.
- We made important improvements to the library search function (users can now search by all words, exact phrase, or any word)

2.1.3 Working Group (WG) structure of SuSanA is utilized and supported to activate their members in a more targeted way and to provide more useful services and tools to them via the SuSanA platform.

- **Achieved:** The project strengthened the Working Groups' participation in the Forum as well as organisation of webinars with key topics within their thematic areas. 23 webinars were carried out during the project period (see webinars in YouTube Playlist here).
- SuSanA is still working on how to motivate further the WGs' membership to participate even more in the Forum discussions and how to make the WGs' leadership more active. These are no longer small groups but networks of practice containing several thousand people. A concept note *'Revitalizing the SuSanA Working Groups'* was developed with the aim of finding new ways on how to improve network engagement in order to reap the benefits linked to SuSanA (see concept note here).
- Curation work linked to the WGs was carried out through an engagement with four Cranfield University Masters students between March-April 2017. A number of factsheets for some WGs have also been updated with one WG (WG6) creating a video. Both Oxfam and WaterAid provided support to the WG leads in terms of content management and organization of meetings throughout the two years of the project.

2.1.4 Wikipedia pages that relate to sanitation are improved and serve as an entry point for sharing and collaboration among those working in the WSH sector, and to provide orientation to non-specialists and the general public.

- **Achieved:** A set of **indicators** for Wikipedia work were finalized and agreed upon within the consortium (see here). The indicators are grouped into three categories: 1-Related to Individuals (people, editors); 2-Related to Partner Organizations; and 3-Related to certain pre-selected articles (we call them the "Top-70" Wikipedia articles and chose them carefully based on importance for the WASH sector). For example, we worked on readability improvements and expanding the lead sections of articles (which serve as summaries of the articles). We determined the baseline values for the indicators of the 70 selected articles and decided on target values. Target 1 was after World Toilet Day on 30 Nov 2017 and Target 2 was after World Water Day on 31 May 2018 (6 months later). In each case, we ran an intense advertising campaign to encourage SuSanA members to contribute to Wikipedia editing.
- **Achieved:** We used an "Outreach Dashboard" here to monitor participation and number of edits. We also set up a new Wikipedia Meetup page available here and called it "Sanitation Wikipedia" similar to "Medical Wikipedia". We used the SuSanA Discussion Forum intensively to encourage people to join our Wikipedia activities and to give them feedback about our achievements, see here.
- **Achieved:** The finalised report about the March 2017 Wikipedia event is here. A proposal for the way forward with Wikipedia initiatives is available here. Two annual "drives" around World Water Day and World Toilet Day were proposed, as well as ongoing lower level activities, mainly built around watchlists of Wikipedia articles.
- **Achieved:** We ran three well-advertised campaigns to get SuSanA members interested in editing Wikipedia articles (virtual edit-a-thons in March 2017, November 2017 and March 2018, in connection with World Water Day and World Toilet Day). A report about the November 2017 event is available here. The March 2018 event was described on the Forum here. The detailed scores for the last two events are available in this sheet. Low-level Wikipedia editing work continued (without further edit-a-thons) throughout 2018.
- **Achieved:** A **survey** was conducted among SuSanA members about their perceptions on Wikipedia's sanitation content by using the Discussion Forum here. The report from this survey is available here. The main purpose was to check if SuSanA members had noticed an improvement in WASH related content in the English Wikipedia during the last two weeks. We received 310 responses. About one-third of the respondents felt that the sanitation content on Wikipedia had improved lately (by agreeing or even strongly agreeing to this statement). We see this as a positive result, given how difficult it is to notice subtle changes in the quality of a

Wikipedia article over a two-year period.

2.1.5 Applying SuSanA to In-country Activities

- Oxfam and WaterAid were sub-grantees in this project. Oxfam and Wateraid both led outreach and dissemination programs in specific thematic areas bringing staff from their country offices into the SuSanA Platform to benefit their staff and partners as well as a wide range of current and potentially new SuSanA members. This initiative aimed to improve, strengthen and maintain country practitioners and SuSanA partner's participation in the SuSanA network, including participation in face-to-face SuSanA meetings and on the online platform. Additionally the initiative aimed to bring knowledge on the ground from the countries of implementation into the SuSanA platform. The final reports of Oxfam and WaterAid are found here.
- **Achieved:** Oxfam organized an in-country event in Lusaka to understand how SuSanA can support the achievement of SDG6 sanitation targets through establishment of city-wide on-site sanitation service chains. The event report can be found here. Oxfam also ran a meeting covering Emergency FSM activities in Cox Bazar, Bangladesh.
- **Achieved:** WaterAid conducted several in-country events through the first and second years of the project An event in Ghana facilitated a collaborative partnership between SuSanA and the Ghana Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources, increased global awareness and understanding of the sector in Ghana and encouraged engagement in the SuSanA platform of Ghanaian stakeholders. The event report can be found here.

2.1.6 Making optimal use of online meetings (webinars) and thematic discussions for advanced knowledge management and sharing

- *Accomplished:* This is one area where the stakeholders' market study had strong recommendations. From the study, it emerged that respondents from different categories e.g. policy makers, government officials, practitioners, CBOs, etc. attached increased value to knowledge sharing. Periodic webinars with follow up on-line discussions were arranged almost every month during the project in order to help reach this goal.
- The SuSanA Secretariat and partners have run a number of successful thematic discussions on the Forum in the last two years linked to Working Group topics, leading to a rich exchange of information and a synthesis document at the end. These can be found here.

2.2 Improved usability of Forum and Website (based on IT modifications) and improved system for tracking of long-term performance data of the platform

2.2.1 Implementation Plan for UX changes has been fully deployed for improvements to the Forum and mother website

- *Completed:* The UX Study and recommendations from the Consortium and Core Group reps resulted in the upgrading of the two websites www.susana.org and forum.susana.org. The new upgraded SuSanA website was successfully launched on Sept 1, 2017 and lots of good feedback has been received. Feedback by SuSanA members was invited (here) on the Forum while those from the Core Group reps were collected separately by e-mail. This feedback has enabled us to improve the relaunched versions of the websites even further.
- We implemented the vast majority of the recommendations and this is detailed in this presentation here. All these processes were undertaken with continuous consultations with the Core Group representatives and the project officer at BMGF ensuring sufficient consensus on the emerging recommendations for implementation. Where appropriate, the information was also shared on the Discussion Forum to get broader buy-in from SuSanA members. Useful feedback was received that way, too.
- **Completed:** The improved SuSanA website has been up and running since early September 2017 (and the new Forum since May 2017). We are continuously collecting user feedback via the Discussion Forum and Twitter and have been refining the website during Year 2, particularly the library, project database and filtering functions. The SuSanA Secretariat will continue with selected improvements beyond the end of this grant.
- **Achieved**: The website's FAQ section has been much improved (shorter and more to the point). In addition, the partner benefits have been made more explicit.

2.2.2 The Forum software (Kunena) and Content Management System (Joomla) was upgraded to the most recent version of this open source software and the customized features were re-programmed in the new version

- *Achieved:* The new Kunena in an actual Joomla CMS has been installed and configured. The Forum website was running on an 8 years old open source CMS software Joomla 1.5.x with the free Forum

component/extension Kunena in version 1.7.0. Over the years the core files of the CMS and Kunena component had been modified with own code to implement new functions the systems were not providing. For a detailed report see here.

2.2.3 Procedure in place for longer term (i.e. even beyond this project) measurement and evaluation to track the usefulness and impacts of the SuSanA Platform

- **Achieved:** Based on the work provided by CAWST, an MEL template (Annex 5) was first developed to monitor user benefit to evaluate SuSanA's effectiveness.This water later refined into a SuSanA Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (November 2018). The MEL framework provides a foundation for how to measure the contribution of SuSanA's KM activities in achieving its global perspectives and ultimate vision of 'sustainable sanitation for all'. The activities captured in the developed measurement template are those specific to the four components of Knowledge Management (KM) as defined by Pete Cranston[1]--Information Management, Knowledge Sharing, Learning Processes, and Communication. The details of these four components are detailed in the May 2017 Stakeholder Market Study Inception Report.

2.3 Improved outreach to identified target stakeholder groups

- Based on the UX study and the stakeholder market study results and recommendations, the Communications Strategy was developed by CAWST/Seecon and project team, reviewed by the Project Advisory Board, then shared and approved by the SuSanA Core Group (see the Communications Plan and Implementation Strategy here).

- Improvements were made to the SuSanA newsletter which is sent to all members and partners. The latest one is seen here.

- Implementation was laid out in the Strategy Document and Workplan which were produced following the Oct 2017 meeting in Seattle.

- It is however worth noting that the Communications Plan, Strategy Document and Workplan have not been fully implemented due to the changes in the project to reduce it to two years. The Secretariat currently does not have the capacity to carry out all that was proposed.

2.4 Sphaera survey results

- Sphaea conducted a user survey consisting of 38 questions which was also posted and discussed on the forum here. Although Sphaera only got about 100 returns (1% of the membership) this still turned out to be a useful way of finding out whether the project had an impact on users. The survey results were analysed with graphs put together by Sphaera, Consortium and Secretariat staff.
- In summary
  - **a majority of those responding agreed**
    - the information found on SuSanA is useful in one's daily work some of the time
    - they felt welcome on the Forum and enjoyed participating all of the time
    - to increase its impact, SuSanA would need to have presence in regions with greatest need for sustainable sanitation solutions
    - the Working Groups are effective at advancing the field
  - **no clear pattern was seen (no strong knowledge detected) when asked**
    - SuSanA is governed by a non-elected "Core Group", with no formal process for selection and no requirements for becoming a part of that group
    - knowledge that SuSanA has no legal structure and is a loose network
  - **a neutral to positive response was given for the following:**
    - The value I derive as a Member of SuSanA is unique, and not replaceable by any other network, platform, or service that I am aware of
    - SuSanA's purpose is clearly articulated, and I know where to find it
  - **regarding regional interests**
    - provision of content in local languages was not seen as important
    - hosting and sponsoring local events was seen as important
    - a regional or national chapter was seen as important
    - matching with potential partners was seen as an important feature

---

[1] Cranston, P. and Chandack, A. (2016). Strengthening learning and knowledge management: Review of WaterAid's approach to knowledge management. Paper at 39th WEDC International Conference, Kumasi, Ghana.

 Final Narrative 01/31/19

Outcome 3: Strengthened governance and institutional sustainability of SuSanA as reflected in an operational plan that includes a plan for funding the budget needed to assure the future of SuSanA (originally planned for years 2 and 3)

3.1 A ToR for this assignment was written by the consortium and discussed in detail with the SuSanA Secretariat and Core Group (see the ToR here). The contract was let directly by BMGF (without tendering) in May 2018 to Sphaera using funds from this grant.

3.2 The Consortium and Secretariat worked very closely with Sphaera, providing materials and contacts for their assignment.
Discussions around the work by Sphaera on the organisational/operational study were held in Bonn, June 2018 and August 2018 in Stockholm, all feeding back to the consultant with comments and recommendations.

3.3 The Consortium, Secretariat and Core Group Representatives discussed a draft of the final Sphaera report and sent comments and recommendations to the SuSanA Core Group.

3.4 In light of the draft Sphaera report, the SuSanA Core Group met in August 2018 to discuss the future of SuSanA in terms of organizational structure, governance and funding models and reached a consensus.
    Accomplished: The project team together with the Core Group agreed to proceed with the implementation of the organisational/operational study.

3.5 Sphaera finalised their report in October 2018.

3.5 The SuSanA Core Group discussed plans for going forward with developing an acceptable organizational structure, governance and funding model.
    Initiated: The Core Group Representatives (so-called Group of 5) proceeded to initiate the implementation of the organisational/operational study through the setting up of an independent Task Force. This work is now ongoing.

3.6 Improved monitoring system of the in-kind contributions from the main actors within SuSanA (e.g. the WG leads who bring their funded activities to SuSanA as a workplace) is in place
    Completed as an integral part of the SuSanA monitoring and evaluation framework.

Additional comments regarding what went well and what went less well follow.

What went well:

- There are many facets to a knowledge management project and the contributions of each of the consortium members were vital in the achievements made within the project. While SEI largely managed and implemented the project, the SuSanA Secretariat (led by GIZ) played a critical collaborative role, mobilization of the Core Group members as well as organization of the larger SuSanA meetings in which project progress was shared.
- Organization of the project activities in Task Groups drawing their membership from persons of diverse expertise within the consortium assisted the project to achieve quality outputs. These collectively steered the project towards revitalizing SuSanA's contribution to the components of knowledge management.
- Despite temporal and spatial dispersion of the project team in various countries, there were little communication and coordination issues between the project team members. The use of various online tools, like Google Drive for sharing documents and Google Worksite for sharing progress and planning, video hook-ups with Adobe Connect, and a closed Google discussion group have been very helpful.
- Due to the funding by BMGF the SuSanA Secretariat was able to operate at a much higher level of ambition for the 2-year period which benefited the Platform enormously on many levels: increased membership, active Discussion Forum moderation, massive expansion of the project database, discussion of projects in the Discussion Forum, development of partner profile pages with added functionalities for SuSanA partners, expansion and quality assurance of the library, more webinars, support to working group leads, ongoing improvements to user experience of the website, support to some in-country activities in selected pilot countries etc. These are all activities that the Secretariat would have been unable to do otherwise to the same extent and will struggle to (partly) keep up now that the project has finished. As an example, there is no plan for ongoing funding of the moderation of the Discussion Forum. That is currently being discussed here.

What did not go as well:

- There was a six-month delay in acquisition of the services of the Project Manager (PM) in Nairobi (a stipulated deliverable by BMGF was that the project be led by an individual from a LDC) and the project assistant at the SuSanA Secretariat located within the GIZ office in Eschborn. This was mainly due to HR processes (applications, short-listing, interviews, removal (process of leaving present jobs), contracting). The delay meant that their contributions during the first year to the project activities were seriously reduced. For the PM, this made it difficult to quickly take on a leadership role after so many norms and processes for communication and action were (by necessity) already in place. The PM was hired in order to manage the various Task Groups led by people in various parts of the world and at the same time bridge with the SuSanA Secretariat. SEI provided additional support throughout and during Year 2 set up a stronger project management team that would have made major positive impacts during Year 3 had the project continued.
- Although the project acquired services of very good tendered consultants for the stakeholders' market study, a number of the consortium members were often called upon to support the consultants mainly to provide explanations about the project and add more of their experience in the development of the inception report, the study report and the tools. This resulted in several weeks of delay in the delivery of the final material to SEI.
- The project components implemented at the SuSanA Secretariat level were in Year 1 largely resourced through existing staff that still had their normal business duties to fulfil. The additional support person sponsored by the grant half-way through Year 1 was then also drawn into non-grant related activities to support the SuSanA Secretariat, and was thus unable to carry out all expected grant activities. Both Wateraid and Oxfam experienced project staff turnover over the two years of the project. The staff member in the Officer role at WaterAid left in September 2017 and her cover began in October 2017.
- Part of the first year of the project involved consensus building within the Consortium, including the SuSanA Secretariat. The project and its high level of ambition created challenges for the Secretariat mainly due to manpower constraints. Weekly planning meetings to make priorities were introduced to help share responsibilities between the Consortium and Secretariat.
- A number of project consortium members felt excluded from the wider SuSanA structure especially in day to day liaison with the Secretariat.
- The new Work Plan which was written during Year 2 after the Oct 2017 meeting in Seattle, could not be fully implemented because the project was terminated early. This also didn't allow for a proper exit strategy agreeing on what tasks were to be taken on by the Secretariat following project closure.
- The process of getting large organization partners to add their projects to the database was not easy or straight forward. It appeared that these large organisations, including GIZ, WaterAid, Oxfam and BORDA, were hesitant to determine which details of their projects exactly could be shared, and often required lengthy and cumbersome approval processes. Formalising routines between SuSanA and partner communications staff will be necessary in order to streamline this process.

Recommendations on follow-up for the SuSanA Core Group:

- Overall, the project did well to highlight some of the important sector knowledge management gaps SuSanA needed to fill and the necessary changes to the whole SuSanA set up to achieve the three project outcomes. The three studies were extremely important to SuSanA as they provided valuable recommendations requiring follow up that the governing body of SuSanA felt should be implemented in order to turn it into the 'go-to platform' in the sector.
- There are very important and applicable tools and plans in the SuSanA strategy, communications strategy & implementation plan, the monitoring and evaluation framework as well as the studies that should be pursued by the Core Group/Secretariat towards improving the overall network and its services to the sector.
- SuSanA needs to develop an engagement strategy for government organizations in target countries. Often ministries in governments cannot actively reach out to SuSanA as key partners. The regional chapters do fulfil this function to some extent but are led by organisations that may not reach government departments.
- Based on the communications plan, there is a need for a funded communications expert to help steer the planned outreach activities within SuSanA.
- To ensure quality products that fit with the needs of the different target groups, there is also a need for a funded writer/journalist/curator who will be in charge of writing summaries and organizing of products for the target audience.

2. Geographic Areas to Be Served

Provide the final list of countries and sub-regions/states that have benefitted from this work and associated dollar amounts. If areas to be served include the United States, indicate city and state. Add more rows as needed. More information about Geographic Areas to Be Served can be found here.

Location	Foundation Funding (U.S.$)
Global	$1,508,644

3. Geographic Location of Work

Provide the final list of countries and sub-regions/states where this work has been performed and associated dollar amounts. If location of work includes the United States, indicate city and state. Add more rows as needed. More information about Geographic Location of Work can be found here.

Location	Foundation Funding (U.S.$)
Global	$1,508,644

4. Lessons Learned

Describe the top one to three takeaways or lessons learned from this project.

1. We should have built in a process from the start to ensure there was a strong agreement among partners regarding the aims of the project (ie to change and further develop SuSanA and that these changes would be adopted by the Secretariat).
2. The provision of an independent Project Advisory Group could have been done with more neutrality built in – the one devised did not represent the stakeholders adequately and was too northern- and euro-centric. *Note added in May 2019:* Over time, the "Group of Five" became a very important de-facto advisory group during the project duration and beyond. The Group of Five was meant to represent the SuSanA Core Group (a difficult undertaking as the Core Group is large - about 50 people - and has widely varying levels of commitment). The Group of Five was selected by GIZ in 2017 (with backing by the Core Group) and consisted of Claudia Wendland, Thilo Panzerbieter, Roland Schertenleib, Prit Salian and Carol McCreary. The aim was to have a mixture of North-South, male-female representation.
3. Ownership of SuSanA was not considered a top priority issue in the project from the start. However, the project would have benefited greatly if the organizational/governance/financing study was commenced from the start along with the UX and Market Studies. Delaying it stalled the process of change towards developing a formal new organization and Board of Governors. The project was terminated before this process was initiated properly.
4. Although the in-country activities and other project support activities provided by the sub-grantees WaterAid and Oxfam were significant and greatly appreciated, we could have extended this collaboration more strategically in terms of building this into a communications and eventually a funding strategy for SuSanA.

5. Feedback for the Foundation

Provide one to three ways the foundation successfully enabled your work during this project. Provide one to three ways the foundation can improve.

How the Foundation successfully enabled the work

1. The Foundation took a hands-on approach for this project which was very beneficial. There was close contact and it was seen throughout that there was sincere interest to further develop SuSanA. The project did succeed in giving SuSanA a new and robust future and a basis to improve over the next years. The meeting in Oct 2017 in Seattle with broad attendance from senior staff showed again that the Foundation was dedicated to the cause of SuSanA.
2. The Foundation sponsored attendance by Arno Rosemarin (twice) Simon Okoth (twice) at the MEDS (Measurement, Evidence and Dissemination for Scale) meetings in various locations. This allowed for in-depth networking, learning and exposure of SuSanA to the global WSH community of practice.

6. Global Access and Intellectual Property

If your funding agreement is subject to Intellectual Property Reporting, please click the following link to complete an [Intellectual Property (IP) Report](#).

If not, please acknowledge by typing "N/A": N/A

To delegate permissions to another member of your project team or for any questions regarding the Intellectual Property Report, please contact GlobalAccess@gatesfoundation.org.

7. Regulated Activities

Do you represent that all Regulated Activities[1] related to your project are in compliance with all applicable safety, regulatory, ethical and legal requirements? Please mark with an "X":

** X   N/A (no Regulated Activities in project)**

_____ Yes

_____ No (if no, please explain below)

---

1 Regulated Activities include but are not limited to: clinical trials; research involving human subjects; provision of diagnostic, prophylactic, medical or health services; experimental medicine; the use of human tissue, animals, radioactive isotopes, pathogenic organisms, genetically modified organisms, recombinant nucleic acids, Select Agents or Toxins (www.selectagents.gov), Dual Use technology (http://export.gov/regulation/eg_main_018229.asp), or any substance, organism, or material that is toxic or hazardous; as well as the approvals, records, data, specimens, and materials related to any of the forgoing.

8. Subgrants

If your grant agreement (not applicable to contracts) is subject to expenditure responsibility and permits you to make subgrants to organizations that are not U.S. public charities or government agencies/instrumentalities, please complete the [Subgrantee Checklist](#) and attach a copy with this progress narrative for each such subgrantee.

Financial Update

The purpose of the Financial Update section is to supplement the information provided in the "Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet in the foundation budget template, which reports actual expenditures. This section is a tool to help foundation staff fully understand the financial expenditures across the life of the project. Together, the Financial Update section and budget template ("Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet) should provide a complete quantitative and qualitative explanation of variances to approved budget.

Note: If you are using an older version of the budget template, this information could be in a different location in your template.

1. Summary

Briefly describe how total project spending compared against the budget and how your assumptions changed as the project progressed.

There are no significant deviations between the amended total budget and the total project expenditure. The total project budget was reduced through an amendment to the project agreement which reduced the time and scope of the original agreement.

2. Latest Period Variance

Provide explanation for any cost category variances outside the allowable range. Explain causes, consequences for the project, and mitigation plans if relevant. Report whether or not approval for the variance has been obtained from your Program Officer.

Note: "Latest period variance" compares actuals to previous projections for the period. See "Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet in the foundation budget template for calculated variance. If you are using an older version of the budget template, this information could be in a different location in your template. Allowable variance is defined in your grant agreement.

There is only one significant deviation between the budget and actual expenditure for the latest period, which is an underspending for the budget line "Other direct costs". This has no effect on the project outcome.

3. Total Grant Variance

Provide explanation for any cost category variances outside the allowable range. Explain causes, consequences for the project, and mitigation plans if relevant. Report whether or not approval for the variance has been obtained from your Program Officer.

Note: "Total grant variance" compares actuals plus current projections to the budget. See "Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet in the foundation budget template for calculated variance. If you are using an older version of the budget template, this information could be in a different location in your template. Allowable variance is defined in your grant agreement.

There are no significant deviations between the amended total budget and the total project expenditure.

4. Sub-awards (if applicable)

Use the chart to provide the name(s) of the sub-grantee(s) or subcontractor(s), actual disbursement for this reporting period, total disbursement to date from the primary grantee to sub-awardee, total spend to date by the sub-awardee and total contracted amount.

Note: The total of actual disbursements for this reporting period should equal the actual Sub-awards expenses reported on the "Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet in the foundation template for this reporting period. If you are using an older version of the budget template, this information could be in a different location in your template.

Organization Name	Actual Disbursement for this Reporting Period (U.S.$)	Total Disbursed from Primary Awardee to Sub to Date (U.S.$)	Total Sub-Awardee Spent to Date (U.S.$)	Total Contracted Amount (U.S.$)
WaterAid	$ 61,691	$ 135,091	$ 130,961	$ 135,091
Oxfam	$ 33,255	$ 133,333	$ 133,333	$ 133,333
	$	$	$	$
	$	$	$	$

5. Other Sources of Support (if applicable)

List and describe any sources of *in-kind* project support or resources received in the reporting period.

Note: Names of the other sources of funding and their contributions (U.S.$) should be included in the budget template on the "Financial Summary & Reporting" sheet in the foundation budget template in the Funding Plan table. If you are using an older version of the budget template, this information could be in a different location in your template.

N/A

Describe how interest earned and/or currency gains were used to support the project.

There was no interest earned on project funds received. The interest rate in Sweden has been zero or negative since 2014. In terms of exchange rate gains/losses, we have costed the project in accordance with the exchange rate when funds were originally received, so there is no variation on the project.

share information you provide to us (either orally or in writing) with third parties, including external reviewers, key partners and co-funders. This document is subject to the foundation's [Terms of Use](#).

For Foundation Staff to Complete

Progress Analysis

Include analysis of significant project variances and key learnings that may inform portfolio discussions for progress against the strategic goals.

Budget and Financial Analysis

Include analysis of unexpended funds or over expenditures. Refer to the [Unexpended Grant Funds Policy](#) for options available when recommending how to handle unexpended grant funds, or reach out to your primary contact in GCM.