



# ÉCOLE DU FLEUVE CONGO (EFC) CONGO RIVER SCHOOL

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Brief  
March 2026

## BACKGROUND

The École du Fleuve Congo (EFC), or the Congo River School, is a program jointly implemented by EarthRights International and African Resources Watch (AfreWatch) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The EFC piloted a 10-day training in 2023 with 24 participants from communities affected by environmental and human rights abuses brought about by large development projects and mining activities. The pilot included training on documentation, building campaigns, and harnessing networks of environmental and human rights defenders. In addition, instructors provided mentorship to participants as they developed action plans that will support their communities.

In 2024, EarthRights and AfreWatch implemented a second EFC (from hereon forward referred to as “EFC 2”) aimed to support the initial 24 alumni through: (1) training that builds on their advocacy, communication and implementation knowledge and skills; (2) facilitating meetings with relevant state and non-state actors in Kinshasa; (3) strengthening/supporting participation in networks at the local level, within the DRC, and across regions with other environmental and human rights defenders; and (4) providing sub-grants to alumni for action plan implementation.

This MEL brief covers observed changes and verified contributions from EFC 1 (2023) and EFC 2 (2024).

## KEY OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

Below are a few highlights of the outcomes and impacts of the Program.

- 82% of alumni self-reported that their knowledge and skills for documenting human and environmental rights abuse have improved.
- Fifteen of twenty four (62%) alumni felt that their knowledge and skills improved. At the end of the training, most trainees felt that they were either very knowledgeable or fairly knowledgeable in all 15 topics on advocacy.
- Alumni developed 12 action plans that focused on the community advocacy and campaigns efforts.
- All alumni implemented their action plans in 2025.
- Of the six action plans evaluated after the training, 100% demonstrated completion of advocacy and campaign activities\*
- Mining corporations have begun to address community needs and demands in four of the six evaluated focus areas\*

• The evaluation assessed 6 of the 12 action plan focus areas of alumni.

## WHY IT MATTERS

Mining companies are drawn to the DRC because of its natural resources. The concentration and grade of minerals such as copper, cobalt, and lithium are unlike anywhere else in the world. In addition, companies operating in the DRC are able to mine and extract these resources with little oversight and accountability for what happens to nearby people and places. This leads to predictable and catastrophic violations of human and environmental rights. Communities have long borne the injustice with little to no voice in decisions being made for their communities.

## PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**2**  
Trainings conducted, one in each year

**24**  
Advocates trained and mentored  
15 Male  
9 Female

**24**  
Subgrants issued \$36,000/ year  
Totaling \$72,000

Mentored trainees in formulating  
**12**  
action plans

Action plans potentially impact  
**27**  
communities in the DRC

Fostered networking at the national level and at the global level through our network of environmental and human rights defenders and experts

# ÉCOLE DU FLEUVE CONGO TRAINING MODULES

## ÉCOLE DU FLEUVE CONGO 1, AUGUST 25 - SEPTEMBER 4, 2023 LUBUMBASHI, DRC



For more about EFC 1, visit [Activism and Education in the DRC, Dec. 2023](#) on our website.

### Core topics:

- Techniques for documenting human rights abuses
- Sampling Techniques
- The impact of mining activities on the environment and public health: case of water, soil and air pollution
- Practical questions for interpreting laboratory sample analysis results
- Human Rights: What are the priorities?
- How to use images and sampling results: reporting, advocacy, whistleblowing
- Advocacy elements and strategies
- Design thinking
- Practical guide to publishing documentation results
- The important elements of communication
- Case studies from Zimbabwe, Ghana, and Liberia, and Lualaba, DRC
- Relocation of local communities by mining companies: laws and practices
- Documentation and interview process and preparation
- Problems of practice and action plan preparation
- Practical security issues for human rights defenders

## ÉCOLE DU FLEUVE CONGO 2, AUGUST 5-15, 2024 KINSHASA, DRC

### Core topics:

- Systems and structures of power in Kinshasa
- Stakeholders and power mapping
- Security and security forces
- Making meetings into win-win situations
- Connecting the law and advocacy
- What do we want? Developing an ask
- Getting to the root cause
- Leaving a message
- Effective communications and interactions with mining companies
- One vision, one voice for communities
- Developing a record
- What's next? How to follow up and move forward



For more about EFC 2, visit [When Your Rights Are Violated, You Must Fight, October 2024](#) on our website.

## ÉCOLE DU FLEUVE CONGO 3, FEBRUARY 21-MARCH 3, 2026 LUBUMBASHI, DRC

The MEL brief does not cover results from this most recently completed training program.



For more about EFC 3, visit [3rd Congo River School](#) on LinkedIn and [AfreWatch's Video about EFC 3](#) on Youtube.

### Core topics:

- The basics of building an organization
- Building a strong recognized organization in the DRC
- Digital tools for defenders
- Strategic path forward
- Plan the message, move the community
- Reporting for accountability
- When communities Hold Power: real Cases, real Lessons
- Exploring and building partnerships
- Security and risk management
- Social Change Map and Networking
- Budget Basics for Strong Organizations
- From Grassroots to Grant-Ready
- From Mines to Headlines: Turning Local Struggles into global stories
- Critical Minerals: from global to local
- On the Air for our Rights
- Lessons from the Forest

# OUR MEL FRAMEWORK

Central to EarthRights' and AfreWatch's MEL Framework is the Kirkpatrick Model for Training Evaluation. The Model applies four levels of assessment: Level 1 (Reaction), Level 2 (Learning), Level 3 (Behavior), and Level 4 (Results).

Level 1 was designed to measure participants' expectations and reactions to the learning product. Level 2 was designed to measure the extent to which training program participants have improved their knowledge and skills as a result of the training. This assessment utilized pre and post perception survey and a predefined rubric that was used to review the action plans completed by alumni. Level 3 evaluations were intended to assess the degree to which participants apply the knowledge and skills they learned during training. Specific to the EFC 2, Level 3 evaluations were intended to assess behavior changes such as (1) their level completion of action plan activities; (2) how they have managed amidst challenges and collaborated with the community and other stakeholders; and (3) advocacy products and quality of advocacy efforts. Level 3 evaluation is incorporated in the outcome harvest.

Level 4 evaluations seek to measure if and how behavioral changes have affected the community or the sector targeted by advocacy efforts. This is assessed through the outcome harvest and through reflection sessions.

To implement this Framework, EarthRights along with its partner, AfreWatch, implemented a two-pronged approach to measurement and learning. The first prong is progress monitoring. It consists of pre-identified indicators at the output and outcome level to assess key steps or milestones in our overall approach. The second prong in our framework is learning and consists of both our evaluation strategy and learning agenda.

## THE OUTCOME HARVEST

EarthRights and AfreWatch commissioned an outcomes harvest to identify perceived and observable outcomes in a sample of communities that project alumni aim to support/represent. The outcomes harvest aimed to answer the main question : "To what extent has the support provided by the project contributed to the defense and protection of the rights of the communities they represent?"

By answering the main question, the outcome harvest determined the following:

- 1.What changes have been felt or observed by the community?
- 2.Which of these changes are considered the most important or significant?
- 3.For those identified as having the most impact,
  - Who are the agents of change (apart from alumni)?
  - What was done differently?
  - When did the agent make the change?
  - Where did the change occur?
  - Why is this change important?
  - What was the contribution of the project?

The Outcome Harvest covered thirteen (13) communities that was the focus of 6 of the 12 action plans: Rianda, Kapaso, Kiandu, Israel, Munjendje, Katay, Luilu, Musonoie, Tshabula, Pierre Muteba, Oshwe, Kassapa, and Kipushi. The interviews conducted to gather evidence of outcomes and impacts were held in Rianda, Musonoie, Israel, Luilu, Kipushi and Kasapa.

The study provides for conclusive evidence of outcomes and impacts based on reports of alumni. Due to constraints in context, time and resources, validation of these outcomes and impacts was limited to available individuals in the vicinity where the interviews with alumni were held. Thus, the evidence collected may show bias towards the views of the alumni themselves who have self-reported on these outcomes and impacts.

### *Disclaimer:*

*The key findings, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this report are solely those of the author's. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the EarthRights program staff, its implementing partners, and the donors supporting this project.*

# KEY OUTCOMES

## IMPROVEMENT IN KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

**92% of trainees reported improved knowledge in using three methods for documenting environmental and human rights violations, advocacy, and the laws that affect their rights.**

Most trainees under EFC 1 felt that their knowledge and confidence improved on the methods taught during the training. Some 92% of trainees felt that their knowledge had improved and 67% felt that their confidence had improved in the use of photo documentation methods. More than half showed improvement in their understanding of how to use photo documentation in advocacy campaigns. Furthermore, 81% of trainees surveyed also indicated that their knowledge in the use of air and soil collection to document environmental rights violations had improved. Overall, trainees felt the most improvement in their knowledge of this method. Lastly, some (67%) participants surveyed felt that their knowledge of the use of interviews for documenting rights abuses had improved as well. 17 While most trainees felt that they were knowledgeable of laws affecting their rights and the stages of advocacy campaigns, more than half of the trainees felt that their knowledge improved in these areas. At the start of the training, 40% of the trainees felt that they were knowledgeable about the relevant laws that affect environmental and human rights, and close to half of the trainees felt that they were aware of the stages for advocacy campaigns. At the end of the training, more than half of the trainees felt that their knowledge improved in these two areas – 52% on the stages of advocacy campaigns and 57% on knowledge of laws, respectively.

**Most trainees felt that their knowledge and skills in advocacy and campaigns improved as a result of their training.**

Most of the trainees felt that they did not know or need to know more about the 15 major training topics that were offered under EFC 2 at the start of the training. 87% of the trainees indicated at the start of the training that they do not know or do not know enough about the topics focused on in EFC 2. 21% trainees felt they had fair knowledge of preserving records of environmental and human rights abuse in the community, conducting outreach and scheduling meetings with various stakeholders compared to other topics.

At the end of the training, trainees' perceived level of knowledge shifted. Most trainees at the end of the training felt that they were either very knowledgeable or fairly knowledgeable in all 15 topics. A significant reduction of individuals who felt they did not know about the topics covered under the training is also observed. Compared to having the majority of trainees indicating no knowledge to little knowledge on all topics at the start of the training, at the end, alumni indicate that they had knowledge of 12 of 15 topics. In three topics, there was just one trainee that felt he/she still needed more training in how to interact with security forces, steps to ensure safety as an environmental defender, and how to unify the community and address internal dissent on differing positions around natural resource use and mining in their communities.



“

*“We believe that with the theme we had this year, we will conduct advocacy, train our communities, and try to expand our influence to further carry the cries of our communities, that communities no longer cry, that communities no longer complain, but raise their voices higher,”*

-Simplice Bambie Hioma, trainee.

”

# KEY OUTCOMES

## ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

**All of the 12 action plans developed by the 24 alumni have been started and some have been completed.**

The Program continued to mentor alumni and monitored the status of implementation after the trainings and verified that all action plans have initiated.

Of the 12, the evaluation commissioned by EarthRights and AfreWatch validated activities under six of the action plans through site visits and interviews in May and June 2025. The external evaluation commissioned found that **all six alumni interviewed utilized the knowledge and skills they have acquired under EFC 1 and 2 and that with the funding provided for action plan implementation, all have completed their 2023 activities** which helped substantiate their concerns in their community/ locality, document the negative impacts of mining companies, further identify cases of human rights abuse in their communities, or raise awareness in their community about their rights and/or the issues. **All alumni also have started implementing the activities they planned under EFC 2 which focused more on advocacy.**

**Of the six action plans reviewed under the evaluation, alumni reported completing all activities of two action plans:** The action plan for Rianda, Kapaso, and Kiandu; and the action plan for Israel, Munjendje, and Katay. Alumni that planned and implemented the other four action plans have completed most of their activities under their 2023 and 2024 action plans but were not able to complete their advocacy activity/ies because of the challenges they faced required additional funds for them to continue. For example, in Kipushi, Luilu and Kassapa, advocacy required more follow through activities than anticipated. For Luilu and Kassapa based alumni, it was very hard to reach institutions located in urban centers. Alumni recognized that their subgrant funding may have needed buffers given political and proximity challenges that are common in the DRC.

Aside from resource constraints, the evaluation also highlighted some aspects that affected alumni's ability to implement their action plans:

- Alumni that formed teams during action plan formulation had less opportunity to collaborate when they got back to their communities. This may have affected their ability to complete advocacy activities that were more complex or tedious. This may be in part or whole a result of resource constraints as well.
- Alumni did not have expertise to gather specific evidence that required technical expertise or for monitoring the bill of specification of mining companies in their communities.
- Alumni recognize that their efforts may not be sustained if funding does not continue. Most alumni paused advocacy efforts because more resources are needed to implement in their complex context. Issues like officials not showing up in meetings or travel to cities require much resources for communities.
- Alumni also reported that there was limited understanding within communities about the efforts alumni were implementing to start with and this affected their timelines and resources significantly.



“

*“I am delighted because everything I have learned here will not stay with me alone. I will also share it with my community so that my community knows what our rights are.”*

*-Méda Masengo Banza, trainee.*

”

# IMPACT STORIES

**Revisions in the bill of specifications of mining companies to include major projects like schools and health centers and restoration of agricultural livelihoods and address socio-economic impacts of mining in Rianda, Kapaso and Kiandu.**

## **The Action Plan**

Three alumni, under their action plan, aimed to improve the awareness and capacity of their communities to advocate for the needs of their community so that the following may be achieved:

- The bill of specifications for the mining companies will be modified to include adequate responses to socio-economic needs of the community;
- AGRs (or revenue generating activities that are normally linked to armed groups that engage in illicit mining activities) in the community contributes to socio-economic development goals of the community; and
- The Luilu Sector will contribute to the socio-economic development of communities within the framework of the Mining Royalty.

## **Accomplishments**

Alumni accomplished all the planned activities under their action plan, including the following:

- Evaluation of the implementation of one mining company's bill of specifications in Kapaso, Rianda and Kaida.
- Community training on identifying and prioritizing development needs within the framework of the bill of specifications.
- Awareness raising workshop with the communities about mining royalties
- Documentation of the non-contribution of mining royalties to local development
- Advocacy action in the Luilu sector on mining royalties
- Advocacy action by all three communities to demand for their community's needs

## **Outcome**

As a result, community members in Rianda, Kapaso and Kaida peacefully advocated for their rights regarding royalty, endowment and their demand to input to specifications that should be for their benefit. The Rianda community negotiated for four projects to be covered under MUMI's royalty/ revision to their bill of specifications: (1) rehabilitation of the Kando agricultural service road, (2) fish farming, (3) chicken coop in Rianda and Kaindu, and (4) pig farming.

## **Impact**

Advocacy efforts yielded modifications in the bill of specification of MUMI and Dot Somidez. Dot Somidez built a health center in Kapaso and in 2025 supported 15 agricultural households in market gardening.

Of the four projects Rianda negotiated for MUMI revised it's bill of specifications to include the following projects in their 2021-2026 bill of specifications: Addition of buildings to EP SAKANAMA in Kapaso; Construction and equipment of a secondary school in Kaindu (project in progress); Agricultural support for households including support with agricultural machinery and inputs in 2 communities; and Construction and equipment of a primary school in Rianda (project in progress).

In 2024, MUMI also built and equipped 3 chicken coops (1 chicken coop has the capacity to raise 1,500 chicks).

# IMPACT STORIES

## Relocation and safe drinking water sources (wells) in Israel, Kaponda 1 and 2, Mundjendje, Muvunda, Maseka, and in the city of Musoka Ntanda are underway.

### The Action Plan

The expansion of copper mines in the area resulted in forced evictions for the Mundjenja, Muvunda, Maseka, Musoka Ntanda, Israel and Katay communities, with huge repercussions to their economic and living conditions. The copper mine is found to have polluted the Mbula Mema River which is the primary source of drinking water for these communities. Community members reported losing their source of living especially since most of them farm and work in the fields. The community also suffers from unsafe replacement homes, lack of access to healthcare and no electricity. The copper mines that affect these communities are in the Kamoja-Kapala Copper Complex owned by Ivanhoe mines and Zinji Mining Group with the DRC government and Crystal River Global Limited owning some shares.

The action plan developed by two alumni aimed to relocate the Mundjendja, Katay, and Israel communities to safer living areas, ensure that the communities in Israel and Kaponda 2 have access to safe drinking water, and ensure that copper mining company in the area addresses their obligation of repairing damages and reopening the privatized Mulungwishi and Tshimbundji rivers.

### Accomplishments

The alumni accomplished all the planned activities under their action plan, including the following:

- Documentation of the negative impacts of copper mining operations in the communities of Israël, Kaponda 1, Kaponda 2, and Mundjendje, as well as in the local communities of Muvunda and Tshimbundji,
- Organization of the press conference on the negative impacts of copper mining on the local communities of Muvunda and Tshimbundji.

### Outcome

As a result of these and other efforts led by the community, community demands are now being peacefully negotiated. Alumni reported that there has been less uprisings from the community as their needs are now being heard and negotiated.

### Impact

In 2025, the copper company agreed to collaborate with the Muvunda land chief to clean up pollutants in the Mulungwishi River.

The copper company also drilled 15 wells in 2024 restoring access to freshwater for these communities: 2 in Israel (1 operational); 6 wells in Kaponda 1; 1 well in Kaponda 2; 1 well in Mundjendje; 2 wells in Muvunda; 1 well in the city of Maseka; and 1 well in the city of Musoka Ntanda.

Starting in January 2025, communities near the Kamoja copper crusher began to be relocated. In Katay, field identification has begun as well.

# IMPACT STORIES

**Relocation of a large number of Tshabula and Pierre Muteba community members was completed, relocation for the Oshwe and Tshabula communities underway, and restored full access to safe drinking water for residents of Musonoie.**

## **The Action Plan**

The expansion of mining operations by COMMUS (Compagnie Minière de Musonoie Global SAS), a joint venture between China's Zijin Mining Group Ltd and the Democratic Republic of Congo's state-owned Gécamines, near the city of Kolwezi, including areas like Musonoie, has led to significant and controversial impacts on local communities and the environment. Some of the impacts recorded include noise and air pollution from the mines' embankments, lack of access to clean and potable water, damage to houses, deteriorating health conditions, among others. Many communities were also forced to evacuate with severely limited compensation and to places without consultation and property they do not own. An overflow of some embankments also caused flooding and damage to communities in Tshabula with no compensation or resolution granted by the state.

The action plan developed by three alumni aims to address the need to relocate victims of the flooding from the retention basin of the COMMUS company, the victims living near the waste rock embankments in Tshabula, and the Oshwe residents affected by destroyed/dilapidated houses and air pollution due to their proximity to the waste rock fill. The action plan aimed to also address the need for safe drinking water of these communities and demand for the full compensation for damages caused by the mining company.

## **Accomplishments**

As of 2025, alumni have completed most of their planned activities. They have documented the negative impacts of the COMMUS Company in the Kapepa, Tshabula and Musonoie communities, and the extent to which drinking water supply in the city of Musonoie was affected. Alumni were also able to share the results of these documentations in a workshop in the City of Musonoie.

## **Outcome**

As a result of these efforts and other community driven action, community demands are now being peacefully negotiated. Alumni reported that there is broader awareness of the negative impacts of the copper mines and the ability of the community to demand for the mining company to address the community's needs.

## **Impact**

In 2025, the mining companies started acting on community demands:

- A large number of Tshabula and Pierre Muteba households have been relocated. The Oshwe and Tshabula communities are currently in the process of relocation as well.
- Barricades to prevent projectiles from hitting communities were also installed.
- A diversion drain in case of water overflow and flooding was also built in Kapepa.
- Safe drinking water is now made accessible for residents of Musonoie.

# IMPACT STORIES

## Safe drinking water was restored for Kassapa, Kamatete, and Kashimbala communities.

### The Action Plan

The Kassapa community and nearby communities of Kamatete and Kamisepe have endured significant environmental and health impacts from mining operations of the Congo Dongfang International Mining (CDM), a subsidiary of Zhejiang Huayou Cobalt, a Chinese company, that operates the Kasulo mine in the DRC. The mine is a source of cobalt, a key component in electric vehicle batteries. The CDM company discharged acidified water into the communities of Kassapa, Kamatete, and Kamisepe. Toxic fumes were also released, causing widespread harm—including respiratory distress, sore throats, nasal irritation, premature corrosion of metal roofing, soil infertility, and other significant impacts.

The action plan drawn by one alumni aimed to engage the community in documenting cases of mining company abuse and pursuing redress for the abuses incurred by the community, whether it be through judicial or non-judicial procedures. The action plan also aimed to build practices that ensure that the communities' rights will continuously be respected.

### Accomplishments

The alumni organized a workshop on documentation, environmental responsibilities and judicial and non-judicial mechanisms with the community and proceeded to engage the Kassapa Community in documenting the negative impacts of CDM. The results of community documentation were presented, citing abuses to Mamatete, Kamisepe and Kassapa communities.

### Outcome

Community demands are now being heard and the mining companies are now responding directly to demands. In February 2025, when the CDM pond overflowed, the affected community members peacefully campaigned and demanded action from CDM. In response, CDM identified victims from the community. According to the alumni, the community remains vigilant for pending action by the CDM.

### Impact

Access to drinking water was restored for Kassapa, Kamatete, and Kashimbala communities in 2024.

# IMPACT STORIES

**A bridge was built and the noise pollution that affected the Kipushi community was reduced.**

## **The Action Plan**

The Kipushi mine is a historical underground mine with significant reserves of zinc, copper, germanium, silver, and lead. KICO reopened the mining area in 2024.

The action plan developed by two alumni aimed to equip community leaders to assert the rights of the community in cases of abuse and encourage the community members to gather and campaign against abuses and negative impacts they have endured due to KICO company's mining activities in their area.

## **Accomplishments**

The alumni accomplished most of their planned activities. They organized a training workshop on the negative impacts of mining companies to the community and presented the concepts they have learned under EFC 2 on advocacy to community leaders. Documentation of the negative impacts of KICO mining was also completed.

## **Outcome**

As a result of alumni efforts, community awareness of the negative impacts of mining and their rights has reportedly been improved. In 2024, alumni and some members of the community were able to self-advocate to KICO about the needs of their community.

## **Impact**

In 2025, KICO responded to some of the demands of the community. A bridge over a KICO discharge line was built. KICO has also reduced the noise pollution from its machines that were endured by the community.

# CONCLUSIONS

The EFC Program was found to be effective in improving knowledge in key areas that are contextually relevant to trainees. Trainees in several surveys indicated their satisfaction in the topics they were trained on and valued the inputs from AfreWatch as well as EarthRights. Direct utilization of what the alumni have learned was verified by 6 alumni as well. This also resulted in the completion of activities that benefit their communities as described in their action plans.

Small grants and training, as well as AfreWatch's mentorship after the training contributed to specific outcomes for the community; without these contributions, the communities were found to not have sufficient means to carry out planned activities and possibly not reach their desired outcomes. These outcomes were significant, mostly impact socio economic conditions and the well-being of community members. Outcomes included relocation of communities, securing access to safe drinking water, reduction of noise pollution, setting up of agricultural and farming capacities among members, and building schools, health centers or bridges.

The training was timed annually in 2023 and 2024 to provide both knowledge building and implementation support to alumni on a timely basis. Despite the complexity of the issues alumni and their communities face and the compounding issues they tackle, most activities that could be implemented in communities such as awareness raising, documentation of abuses and issues, and disclosure and release of information about these conditions were carried out within timelines assigned. Advocacy efforts however required more support than was provided in terms of reaching specific actors, reaching officials based in urban areas, or securing political support.

The program framework is scalable. EFC was framed to provide more than just knowledge and skills development support but ensured that prior to the training itself, identified trainees focus on specific action plans that they commit to carry through completion to support their communities and the issues they face. Sub grant efforts provided means for trainees to implement their plans and continued mentorship allowed for them to strengthen their network with experts and organizations that could support them. Specific focus on mining companies and the rights abuses linked to these corporations also helped keep the program to a manageable scale.

While being scalable, these main issues remain:

1. Much of the efforts of alumni required funding that was more than was ever planned for EFC. Downstream activities that will ensure fair compensation and rehabilitation or their relocation to safer communities were just not feasible. Despite resource impediments, alumni worked with what they had and implemented to the extent they could.
2. The issues these communities face are not well known and their experiences are less documented. Alumni faced challenges with the communities not recognizing their rights and addressed these through awareness campaigns but have no strong networks to bring these campaigns beyond their community to solicit support.
3. Documentation of environmental impact and monitoring of bills of specification in some instances require technical expertise which alumni and their community may not have.

# LESSONS LEARNED

## **More focused and continued support for alumni advocacy plans.**

At this point, some communities will need advocacy support that require expertise, require broader campaigns, or political liaisons to achieve bigger results. Should support continue, these may be best administered on a more focused or smaller scale so that mentorship, funding and other support may be provided to them fully.

## **Equip alumni through more structured training programs and action planning guidance.**

Action plans developed by alumni did not score well particularly in analyzing contextual needs and in budgeting, among others. Alumni could benefit from better guidance documents and mentorship prior to the training and during the training for action plan formulation. Furthermore, training programs must be fully designed from objectives, targets to content and materials in order to ensure that what is developed for one site is replicable to other sites where these materials are relevant. Assessment just as it was in EFC 2, must be planned alongside the training plan.

## **Strengthen alumni connections with experts in their country and in the region.**

In order to sustain their advocacy and to bring their message and demands to a broader audience that could increase the pressure for big and powerful mining companies to address community demands, support from civil society and other experts is required. Continued support to build on their networks will help propel alumni efforts and increase the feasibility of state or mining company response to their demands.

## **Build from the scalable model to enhance efficiency and replicability.**

The team could benefit from thorough reflection in strengthening their systems to be more systematic, coordinated and efficient. For instance, the team could consider drafting standard action plans, providing detailed guidance that support planning and budgeting, detailing training content and materials, and providing for flexible and structured plans to effectively manage mentorship and support activities for alumni.