Post Humanitarian and Development Resilience Collaboration Training Workshop Report

March 2015

Tim Frankenberger
TANGO International

Overview

Combining humanitarian assistance and development assistance in practice is far easier said than done. While many of the conceptual pieces may make sense, history and culture make this endeavor extremely difficult. For decades, humanitarian practitioners have been quick to action in areas of extreme poverty and that are highly susceptible to crises; meanwhile, development practitioners take time to assess a situation, plan and design a program, and implement in stages, usually in locations where some enabling conditions already exist. Even though organizations have discussed options for combining these two areas for at least two decades, the need to change organizational culture and programmatic world views has been slow to materialize. A five-day workshop was held February 2-6, 2015 in Dakar, Senegal to promote understanding of the processes involved in joint assessment, program planning, design and implementation of crisis modifiers, and collaborative learning.

The workshop was organized into five sessions. These included sessions on: 1) joint programming and comprehensive assessments; 2) integrated program planning including discussion on theory of change and baseline evaluations; 3) program implementation when crises hits and the importance of crisis modifiers, and joint shock monitoring; 4) collaborative learning and adapting including knowledge management strategies; and 5) transition strategies and RISE action planning. For each session this report will discuss what went well and what didn't, what should be changed if the workshop is held again, the perspectives of the participants, and recommendations for follow up skills and future training based on the knowledge level of the participants.

Module 1. Joint Programming and Comprehensive Assessments

The first module explains the process of combining humanitarian assistance and development assistance in a resilience programming context. This module began by introducing concepts related to integrated programming, including resilience frameworks, as well as layering, integrating and sequencing interventions. The second half of the module moved into how to conduct comprehensive assessments, interpreting the results and beginning joint problem analysis. The main objectives of this module were:

- To understand the case for joint programming and the resilience framework.
- To promote dialogue between humanitarian and development practitioners that will be sustained throughout the training and outside the training.
- To introduce the case study, including sample instruments and data that will be used by the participants throughout the training.
- To practice relevant comprehensive assessment techniques and how to utilize the tools in a joint manner.

What went well-The majority of the participants felt it was a good overview of the concepts of integrated programming, the concepts of resilience, and linking , layering and sequencing interventions. People also appreciated the discussion on comprehensive assessments. There was good general discussion, sharing and participation although some people dominated the conversation more than others.

What could be improved-Things that could be improved include a more structured case study, more group work early in the day, more information on the types of interventions that support each of the capacities, more on how to prioritize which capacities to focus on in joint programming, more background information on the history of JPC process, more information on assessment tools and their application, and a session on the historic background of the roots of resilience in the Sahel and the role that USAID played in this history.

One problem the facilitator faced was that the technical background of the participants varied greatly. Many had never engaged in an assessment nor had they had much experience with resilience frameworks. Some of the more skilled participants in the audience felt that the training was too basic for people already familiar with the topics and project design. It was a real challenge to strike a balance. The other problem was the lack of attendance of humanitarian practitioners.

Module 2: Integrated Program Planning

This module explained the process of combining humanitarian assistance and development assistance in a resilience context. This module builds on Module 1, which provided an introduction to resilience and covered conducting joint humanitarian-development comprehensive assessments and interpreting the results. With this background, we moved on to Integrated Program Planning, where participants learned about developing a Theory of Change. In addition, during Module 2, participants discussed baseline evaluations and how these are different from assessments. The main objectives of Module 2 were:

- To understand the key elements in a theory of change and the process of developing a theory of change.
- To practice checking the logic that drives the creation of a theory of change.
- To understand and discuss baseline evaluations and how to effectively conduct and utilized this tool in joint programming.

What went well-Overall, the majority of participants thought the day went well. They thought there was a good explanation and discussion of the resilience/livelihood capitals especially social capital. For many it was the first time they had been introduced to the Theory of Change concept. The facilitator also clarified the distinction between a theory of change and a results framework. Participants realized that a results framework is harder to change because it is tied to a contract and funding streams. They realized that to program for resilience, the contracting mechanism needs to be more flexible but there are several self-imposed constraints to this such as non-flexible budgets and procurement constraints if you deviate too much in the SOW. Participants also thought that the problem tree and solution tree exercises were very good.

The difference between a comprehensive assessment and a baseline was also clarified. Baselines are more in-depth and focused than comprehensive assessments, whose main purpose is to determine the "what" and "why" needed for program design. Baselines allow you to know the current status on key indicators before the project starts, which can then be compared with values for the same indicators at

the end of the project. Research questions and data collection protocols are important to have as part of the baseline preparation and needs to be planned for as part of the design process.

People also enjoyed the presentation of the PRIME baseline survey. This was not part of the original training package. This presentation should be part of future trainings.

What could be improved-Many participants wanted a presentation of the Theory of Change that was the based on RISE. Such a presentation would have reinforced the concepts, methodology and principles of the TOC and improved peoples understanding of the rational, methodology used in the formulation of RISE. This should have been the basis of day two presentations and discussions.

In addition, some people felt that the content was too similar to basic program design. They wanted to drill down more to focus on what is different regarding resilience and the challenges this presents. Some participants also felt that the problem set and results set had too many components. They also would have liked the case study and exercises to be based on actual programs in the Sahel.

As stated earlier, the challenge for the facilitator was to determine at what level to pitch the content of the workshop since the participants consisted of beginners and experts. This was reflected in the daily evaluations. Most people appreciated the basic explanations and fundamentals while a few thought it was too simple for experienced program designers.

Module 3: HA/DA Program Design and Crisis Modifier

This module focused primarily on designing and implementing programs in the face of shocks and how to use crisis modifiers in these instances. The main objectives of this modulewere:

- To define and understand crisis modifiers and how they can be used in HA/DA programs.
- To develop example guidance for a crisis modifier.
- To discuss and understand shock monitoring in joint HA/DA programming.

What went well-Many of the participants felt that the discussion around crisis modifiers was very informative. Some felt it was the best technical content of the training thus far. Many were unfamiliar with the concept of a crisis modifier or trigger indicators. Many felt that the discussion highlighted the weakness in the crisis modifier currently being used in the REGIS project. Many also liked the discussion of what each stakeholder brings to the table. They also appreciated how difficult it is to get the different bureaus with different cultures within USAID to work together in program implementation. This difference becomes exacerbated when a crisis hits. The group also discussed what needs to be done differently regarding a crisis modifier in the REGIS project. The people implementing FFP projects were able to identify lessons learned from their work that had relevance for the REGIS project.

What could be improved-Several people felt that we could have spent less time on the Ebola case study. People were also suffering from training fatigue and needed a break. There need to be more variety of activities during the day to keep people energized. Some were upset that OFDA was not present. We needed to have more discussion on the current baseline and crisis modifier being used in the region. Some people regretted that the contract people were not in the room so that we could talk about program flexibility. Some felt that more emphasis should be given to trigger indicators for the Sahel. Some people wanted more examples of crisis modifiers in other projects and to dive more deeply into

how they function. In summarizing the group work, it would be better to have each group present one thing that is new that was not mentioned by another group to avoid redundancy.

Module 4: Collaborative Learning and Adapting

This module explained the process of combining humanitarian assistance and development assistance in a resilience context, how to measure it, and how to capture lessons learned for future adaption. The main objectives of the module were:

- To understand concepts and importance of Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting and resilience measurement.
- To learn and discuss elements of resilience monitoring.

What went well-People liked the presentations and enjoyed the discussions. The discourse during the day highlighted what efforts were already going on in the region for sharing and learning and where the weaknesses were. Many felt that USAID was not doing a great job in CLA or knowledge management. Examples were given of work in Niger to create a resilience team that promoted information sharing in weekly meetings and joint visits. They are hoping that SAREL will be the major catalyst for promoting an adaptive management approach for RISE. People recognize that they need more training in systems thinking to promote double loop learning. People said that they try to use portfolio reviews for learning moments. Monthly meetings also help but they felt that too much structure can limit creativity and learning. There was a suggestion of bringing in staff from Uganda to help staff in the Sahel to strengthen CLA. People also said that we need to be part of the RISE program rather than identifying with separate projects to enable cross learning. People at the workshop recognized that they want their partners to work together but they do not create any incentives for them to do this. The RISE implementing partners are trying to come up with joint planning. This should be encouraged and not stifled by funding mechanisms that are not flexible. They all agree that someone needs to document all of the good things that are happening.

What could be improved-People felt that more time should have been given to opportunities for improving CLA and knowledge management in their program. It was helpful to see what was missing but needed more time on how to fill the gaps. People felt that the high turnover of staff also had a negative impact on knowledge management. The example they give was the fact that few in the room knew what the Theory of Change for RISE looked like. Some would like to have more examples of successful knowledge management activities and models. More could have been said about SAREL and how it was going to support this effort. People also said it would have been good for FFP to share more of their tools and approaches.

Module 5: Transition Strategies and RISE Action Plan

This module discussed the importance of transition strategies and the methods for creating them. Then, participants had an opportunity to plan a transition strategy and an action plan applicable to their real-life work within RISE (or the program with which they are associated). The major objectives of this session were:

- To understand concepts related to transition strategies in joint HA/DA programming.
- To develop a transition plan for RISE activities.
- To create an action plan for RISE activities using HA/DA programming concepts.

What Went well-The participants brought all the learning together in day 5 and proposed some real ideas about how to move it forward. This session was very important and probably should have been the focus from day one. Action planning was a great exercise and people have identified things they will take forward. The proposed action plan that came out of this session is presented below.

Group 1: Understanding Resilience

-Actions
1) Create clear understanding of resilience programming and successes including models of collaboration among partners
2) Internalized resilience in the agency

-Responsible parties: SAREL; new KM/CLA team or working group in SRO; Sally and Agrilinks team in BFS; DOC

-**Plan and timeline:**
1) Plan retreat with partners ~4 months with the first one in May or Sept; Planner is SAREL and SRO
2) Knowledge transfer materials written and approved by April by Tyce and Jeremy
3) Blog launch: May; Sally, Jeremy and Agrilinks team will work to get this off the ground; the DOC will be involved in reviewing content; SAREL will be involved in producing content as well through its existing work on culling through best practices in current programming

-Other Issues: Partners may believe their existing programming is already resilience-based.

Group 2: Partner Coordination

-Actions:
1) Organize coalition workshop to come out with a shared vision on resilience and to identify comparative advantage of each org; Responsible party: USAID
2) Develop an action plan for coordination; Responsible parties: USAID working with EU
3) Develop common measurement process for performance monitoring and evaluation; Responsible Parties: CILSS and SAREL
4) Develop communications strategy; Responsible Parties: host country governments and partner NGOs

-Responsible party: Thibault; Dramane

Group 3: Partner coordination

-**Actions:**
1) Introductory meetings which focus on what each partner is doing, where and how to come up with comparative targeting, activities, strategy, and geographic area; Make action plan for collaboration
2) Set up mechanism to ensure the implementation of the engagement taken in Action 1. This will be a verification mechanism.
3) Capitalize, share our experience and successes.

-Responsible party: Siaka

Group 4: Partner coordination

-**Actions**:
1) Quarterly partners meeting-coordinated by DO with the 1st one by April;
2) DO team sets agenda and communicates with all parties to set up meeting. This builds on the currently ongoing governance meeting with partners in Niger. These will be much more specific than the RISE meetings.

-Barriers: time; competing priorities

-Responsible party: Krista

-Other Issues: Should it be organized by country? Need for technical teams to familiarize themselves with partners

Group 5: Set of Cross-cutting Actions

-Actions:
1) Advance our understanding of resilience
2) Use Google drive
3) Document JPC process for new staff
4) Revisit Theory of Change including the causal links that lead up to each chain and improve understanding among ourselves
5) Crisis modifier: a) Look at our awards to see what each one has in terms of crisis modifiers, contractually, and how they are monitored; b) convene meeting with REGIS and FFP about this
6) CLA: Go through scenarios and map them against what we are able to do contractually for each award
7) DRM: Carry out pilots and explore what other risks we need to manage and what other ways we can do this; Responsible Parties: Megan and Connie
8) Document successes, particularly those around layering, sequencing, etc.; Create fact sheet and send it out with newsletter
9) Collaboration: Be more specific with our partners on what sort of collaboration we expect to see; Pick 3 key activities or goals to focus on first (e.g., family planning; microfinance)

What could be improved-Although the action planning exercise went well, there is no one person that is responsible for insuring that all the good recommendations are taken seriously. Someone needs to be put in charge. I was also disappointed that these recommendations did not receive further attention in the RISE retreat that followed the workshop. This was an opportunity missed. Also I do not think it was a good idea to not include the implementing partners in the workshop. By including them both in the training, USAID and the implementing partners would have a better understanding on what needs to be done to make RISE a more effective program.

Conclusion

Overall I think the workshop was a success and should be replicated. The majority of the participants gained a great deal from the training. In the future I would reduce the amount of material covered, try to have more examples from the region, begin with a focus on action planning from the beginning, and try to involve both USAID and implementing partners. I would try to make sure that people attending the workshop had a minimal understanding of some of the basic concepts covered in the workshop to

avoid having such a mixed crowd with variable experience. This will allow for the workshop content to be at the right level to maximize learning.

Annex 1: Daily Feedback from Participants Participating in the Workshop

Day 1

Good:

- Good discussion on different risks for livelihoods.
- I was pleasantly surprised to know how big role social capitals play in building and maintaining resilience. The different capacities are not independent of each other. I was particularly happy on how ___ ____ the three capacities and how they relate.
- Problem tree group activity was great and we were well prepared by previous sessions. 2. Good participation from trainees though it became clear who within group had most experience. 3. Learning objectives for day clear, realistic. 4. Enthusiastic presenter
- Lots of great contributions from colleagues. Liked getting info on the SPC analysis and vision, examples of resilience from other places. Lots of "basics" on resilience thinking. Sad to say I dn't know these things already.
- Well facilitated introduction to integrated programming, assessments that encourage people to participate and get to know each other. Concepts explained well with examples.
- The different definitions of resilience, the different types of capacities and the comments provided by the facilitator on the ____ and implementation of resilience activities were really helpful. Good coverage of the day's schedule.
- Semi-structured discussions gave room for key issues hampering implementation to come out useful.
- Very participatory learning approach with Q&As. Key resilience concepts well classified.
- Reviewing concepts of capacities. Case study was a good example of how to organize the thought process. The time for discussion was excellent and allowed people to share.
- The flexibility of the discussion. Opportunity given to participants to share their views and experience. It helps others to understand more the topics. End of day exercise with the problem analysis.
- Enjoyed hearing feedback from participants
- There was great discussion about resilience and different forms of capital, coping strategies.
- Presentation and team exercise
- The info in the morning was great and conversation very helpful.
- I appreciated the grad school atmosphere and being exposed to some theories that were new and being reminded of other I had forgotten. The informal format is great. It is nice to see that everyone from different backgrounds and different levels of experience all feel comfortable.
- Excellent overview. I think more time spent on resilience capacities is always good since many still don't understand these concepts.
- Very positive interaction and insightfully conversation
- The discussion during the day was informative and the examples given accurate.
- Discussion, explanation of resilience lens; walk through on HA/DA coordination; exceptional definition of concepts; one of the best technical courses that I have had in __.
- Excellent facilitator. Lots of experience and real-life examples. Engages participants.
- Great discussions and high level of participation. I think we missed the 'bringing it home to RISE'. Would love to have follow up on specific field tools that could help staff produce better assessments.

- With day's training I better understand the concept of layering, integrating, and sequencing; I know that good connection and good relationship allows to have rapid assistance; For resilience, we have to link many problems at the same time in order to respond all to them.
- Method of learning worked well as it was very participatory.

Could be better/ want to know more

- There wasn't enough discussion about the theory of change for RISE and the premise behind HA-DA programming. I would like to know more about the successful resilience programs in Kenya and Ethiopia – discussion of them was not detailed enough.
- Case study exercise could have been more structured. Not sure how it was different that doing a problem tree.
- More details on the types of interventions that support each of the capacities would be interesting. More details on how to conduct assessments, not just what to look at; in other words, how exactly do dev and HA actors do the joint analysis.
- I would like to go in deep on the coordination among donors who have different points of view of project design, implementation and procedure.
- Not understanding clearly how to prioritize capacities in a joint programming.
- Explanation of terms and concepts would have been better if you take a little time to explain deeply for beginners.
- It seems that resilience concepts are new as is programming. Would like to know more about development and evaluation of concepts and approach. Resilience very much seems a work in progress.
- Something on the roles of the different main actors like the host govt and also the communities served
- How feasibility are the donors in accepting the action plan proposed by the implementors in the frame of layering, sequencing and integrating principle?
- Lot of discussions, different points of views and real life examples. People also shared things that didn't work out and how it could be improved.
- Few details on the indicators of absorptive capacity on the contrary(?) of adaptive capacity.
- The concept of SLI still need to be the subject of more thinking and clarity – what's ___ with synergy for example?
- Too basic of a training for those of us who have already been working on this. Need to focus on country experience so that training is practical. The trainer did not listen enough to participants' input. Need to make this training more like a clinic.

Suggestions

- Very brief background on history of JPC process would have been helpful at the outset. Also would encourage group work part way through the day to keep people active. Reading the case study could be assigned as homework prior to training.
- I thought that more time will be need next time when doing the joint problem assessment. This was the only weak point.
- More about real life examples of how HA and DA programs have been able to integrate their activities.
- Useful discussions complemented theoretical material. A good balance between the two.
- More information on assessment tools and application would be useful.
- The length of time for the case study would gain to be more.

- Would have been more helpful to have historic background on the roots of resilience (eg OECD DAC dialogues from NGOs to EU/ECHO work on LRRD and lead-up to formation of AGIR – what impact/influence of USAID? Other resilience efforts, experience, frameworks from other development partners.
- The first day was interesting. But if we have more time to discuss little bit more the exercises. Also, we need some tools/ approaches for a rapid assessment about community resilience.
- A slide to discuss low-climate risk livelihoods would have been helpful also.
- The activity at the end of the day was great, but if it had been a little earlier, it would have been more effective – I had lost all focus by thte end of the day.
- It would be helpful to ___ on what is different with resilience programming from other programs. How is layering, sequencing and integrating different.
- I think we're looking at things at the 10000 feet level. I'd be interested in exploring possible on the ground solutions to these problems.

Day 2

Good:

- Theory of change is new concept for me. I'm very glad to learn it. It will help us in Sahel project designing.
- Excellent day.
- I liked the exercise of the outcome matrix. Theory of change is much clearer for me now.
- The small group work and discussion went extremely well and everyone was very engaged.
- Very interesting module 2.
- Very clear module
- Open communication atmosphere; practical exercise related to resilience program planning; nice venue
- We learned a lot about theory of change, result framework and how complex it is to come out with actin plans to help us reach desired outcome.
- Everything was well done for me.
- It was great to hear from field colleagues about their challenges. The frank exchange was very useful. Comments from Niger staff about the challenges of having to know someone in order to get something done were illuminating. As a generalist from DC, I greatly appreciate the exposure to the theories and frameworks. It will make things much more alive when I hear/read about them in DC and will allow me to better support my field colleagues.
- Good explanation of "Theory of Change" and how different from a Results Framework; problem tree and solution tree exercise were very helpful; baseline survey = difference from comprehensive assessment was well explained and useful
- Really liked discussion around TOC and RF
- Now I understand more the TOC. Clear explanations, good examples.
- The topics have been well discussed with field examples that helped better understand them. The M&E session was particularly interesting maybe because it is still a big issue in program implementation.
- The detailed explanation of the theory of change and the great deal of discussion around helped master the expansion and understanding of topic. The social capital discussion was interesting was well. I found the overall module interesting and adaptable to program designing.

- Appreciated the session on TOC particularly because of the exercise. We're having a lots of the theories, we're applying part of it on the job, but it's important to revisit and get to know other's perceptions. Useful also the background reading received before the training. But did not have enough time to read it all.
- The process of formulating a theory of change from a comprehensive assessment was excellent. Case study helped see some of the wrong assumptions we make. USAID funding mechanisms constraining innovation and creativity.
- Good review of theory of change principles. The group work was insightful and useful but a review or presentation of the "Sahelian Resilience" theory of change would have severed the dual purpose of reinforcing concepts, methodology, principles of TOC but also provided a more practical concept into understanding the rationale process, methodology of RISE especially REGIS. We could have gone into more detail about Bureaucratic constraints

Want to know more/ Could be better:

- The module felt too much like the program design and management training from USAID University.
- A lot of the exercises have been similar to standard program design (eg problem tree, solution tree, assumptions). I'm still trying to wrap my head around how we can adopt this approach to strengthen resilience.
- Still a little confused on assumptions vs. risks and how that impacts program planning.
- We, again, did not make it to the "bringing it home to RISE" module for discussion.
- I wish we had spent more time on the link between the problem and solution tree.
- Content was good, though much of it wasn't resilience specific
- But, until now we don't know the RISE theory of change. We need to know how to track RISE theory of change. What kind of indicators would be very helpful for that. We also need to know what kind of assumption and game changers related indicators are the most important in relation to RISE implementation.
- How to combine HA with Development when building a theory of change. What are the main areas we need to visit(?) on.
- A little too much food! … put some of use to sleep
- Group exercises
- The content has covered a lot of general program design which many of us have seen before. I'd like for discussion to drill down more into challenges of resilience programming and how this programming is different from previous FFP/DA programs that focus on livelihoods/ value chain dev, etc. And what about the HA->DA transition. What exactly does that look like?
- Better than day 1. Would like more examples of how other resilience programs have integrated social capital activities.
- Some theory of change discussion was too basic; we've all gone through project design training; focus should be more on the specifics of resilience theories of change
- To share more experience with colleagues involved in this theory of change in resilience projects.
- Expected outcomes of this week's workshop not entirely clear: While the toolkits/ methodologies applied previously in the resilience process are a helpful point of reference, it is not clear when/ how these will be applied moving forward. Presentations are not directly linked to our programs/ projects or theory of change.

Suggestions

- One thing: The problem set and result set exercises had too many components. Create simple models so people can focus deeply on the logic of a focused area rather than superficially glanced at too much logic.
- The workshop should focus more on specific resilience activities rather than discussing what is a theory of change.
- It would have been great if the case study and the exercises were based on our actual programs. If the theory of change could have been focused on RISE.
- Need to have copies of the presentation done this morning.
- Would be useful at the front end of strategic process > not sure timing works with RISE effort.
- Need to more examples of processes and emphasis on the joint intervention design.
- Group exercise not clear, more detailed instruction needed
- It will be good to have full pages of the maps.
- Please share the presentation on the PRIME baseline survey
- Again no need to revisit theory of change = we are already familiar with this. Would like to hear about new efforts by USAID to change procurement mechanisms. More comparative info on resilienc programs out of Africa regions.
- It is very important to get to know about the outcomes of other resilience programs in Africa.

Day 3

Good:

- Crisis modifier discussion very informative. Information on trigger indicators can be directly applied to our program.
- Technically, the best content of the training so far.
- The crisis modifier/ bringing it home to RISE discussion was good.
- Crisis modifier information was very new for me and very interesting. Having an exercise after lunch kept the energy up.
- Topics were the most interesting so far, and I really valued the conversation and examples during the day.
- Useful discussion.
- Detailed prez on TOC well received – clearly explained, slides/ diagrams helpful; group work/ case study effectively helped cement the learning. Good detail to explain differences baseline vs. comp assessment
- Presentation and team exercise; discussion;
- The discussions were really interesting on the modifiers, trigger indicators and how to use them. Knowing that many development programs are collecting info on trigger indicators that is not used effectively, more field base exercise, examples would be helpful. More theoretical examples from the RISe initiative to infuse what is currently ___ in terms of M&E systems.
- Everything was well done. I learnt a lot.
- Knowledge about trigger indicator and follow up. Group discussion about what each stakeholder can bring to the table.
- Discussion on crisis modifier and triggers raised good issues for REGIS-ER to focus on.
- I learned much more about CM how it shapes the implementation of programs. Collaboration is key in programming.

Could be better/ Want to know more

- Could have spent less time on Ebola panel discussion.
- Unfortunately, it seemed that the training fatigue caught up with people in the afternoon.
- Moved through a lot of material at a fast pace at times – esp early morning. Bringing it home to RISE got somewhat lost.
- CM: more examples; Constrain when interviewing very early.
- How stakeholders can collaborate effectively when a shock occurs?
- Time allowed to discussion
- Exercise on collaborating among donors, stakeholders was too general.
- How does resilience programming differ from what FFP has been doing or other DA org focused programs?
- There seems to be the belief that since few of use were involved in the program design, that the team is at a great disadvantage in implementing well. I disagree with this. It's valuable to remember to review the TOC periodically to stay on track or see if assumptions have changed, but we all bring valuable experience to bear in implementation of RISE.
- Too long discussion on crisis modifier/ not enough on the current situation. Where was OFDA? Too much redundancy. Great to be able to hear about baseline survey however again too bad there was no discussion of the current baseline that has not been shared with country office.
- I do think that the training highlighted the weaknesses in our current crisis modifier. For follow up, I think we need to better understand what tools we can use to emphasize more joint assessments.
- Wednesday was a bit slow. We did not have enough variety throughout the day and I felt kind of bored in the PM. Try to mix it up. I did not see the value of the "press conference" exercise.
- Still would like to see RISE TOC to help add variety and compare
- Wish that we had the contracting office with us to get their opinion. Also would be useful to discuss the procurement processes of OFDA/ FFP and DA to understand how best to program for emergencies.

Suggestions

- When doing read out on group work, best to have each group report one thing new, rather than each group reporting everything. Would be useful to have more examples/ work from the Sahel.
- Focus more on how crisis would affect program implementation only. Discuss more how DA can utilize trigger indicators to dynamically shift programming.
- However, overall the examples are fantastic but it would be really useful to actually then look at our own program and discuss is, rather than always saying ' you should get together and discuss your program later'. This is the only chance we have to have everyone in the room together, so why not take advantage of it?
- More emphasis should have been put on defining trigger indicators. Need to know about joint monitoring.
- For me, the most important way to understand is learning by examples. That's why it will be useful in the future to give more time to the examples and to discuss more about these examples.
- Need to go deep in the crisis modifier. It will be good to have real examples of how programs have changes during crises.
- Implementation when a crisis hit depends on the type of crisis. CM may be a way out or not. Need to consider changing the terminology of crisis modifier. May need to embed "contract modifier" early in contracts when a crisis hits.
- Maybe a bit more emphasis on bringing it home to RISE though I understand this may come later this week or at the retreat next week.

Day 4

Good:

- Appreciated the whole group(?) discussion, sharing experiences on efforts to operationalize resilience;
- Shock monitoring matrix gave insight into opportunities to learn/understand effectiveness of interventions and test TOC
- It was interesting to hear from colleagues in Niger and BF on how they manage knowledge
- It was good to learn about CLA in theory. What matters is what we do with it
- In terms of learning, it is necessary to focus on activities which are very sustainable and activities which really empower women, as well. In terms of CLA, it is very needed to try to measure collaboration both quantitatively and qualitatively.
- Excellent day since it focused on areas of weakness – CLA and KM
- Decision making tools – new concept to me so I learn new things. I liked the share of experience in the KM section. Discussion was quite interesting.
- Practical discussion on how we can strengthen CLA into our existing program. I appreciate the focus on our specific context.
- What are going well: Presentation and discussion
- Great discussion on how to incorporate these tools into resilience program.
- Many kind of assessment lead us to CLA; in RISE program, we need CLA for decision taking and choosing strategy.
- We had very interesting discussion during that session;
- Good discussion to get us thinking about what SAREL's responsibilities are vis a vis CLA and how we fill the gaps. I like hearing about ongoing data monitoring and uses.
- Good to also have a moment to talk about the positives.
- Good discussion. Appreciated the Uganda video as it showed someone/ someplace that had actually done it. Discussion generated honest opinions about weaknesses in KM.
- I got insights from these themes presented yesterday.

Could be better/ Want to know:

- What need improvement: time allowed to discussion;
- We need to spend time to explore opportunities with our program.
- It was helpful in identifying where our groups are, but then determining how to fill those gaps is still a discussion that will take some time.
- The question will be how to coordinate the KM among the partners (implementing) within RISE.
- Still have not seen the theory of change? Sounds like practically should build time for team to discuss.
- Would like to have more in KM.
- People seem stuck on concept of high turnover of FSOs. Emphasis should be placed on building the desired capacities in the FSN staff.

Suggestions

- Exercise on data collection should be better if we used a case study with a dataset to better analyze the trend
- However I do believe that further analysis should __ the technical tools to manage uncertainties. I also think in the case study the questionnaire for collecting data on diet would gain to put a focus on classic tying it the quality of the diet on a scale.

- Some KM models might have been useful to look at as examples.
- I think the discussion could have been more valuable if we started with a good understanding of what SAREL will/ can do, and then discuss in that context. Also, what tools FFP already has and how do we create collaborative tools we all value.

Day 5

Good:

- I think folks really brought it all together at the end and had some real ideas about how to move it forward.
- Very good issues for future actions had been pointed out. SRO should work on them very good(?) in a participatory way.
- Presentations and case studies were really enriching.
- Overall, it has been an interesting training -- I learned a lot.
- This session was really, really, important. Sustainability is generally overlooked. I liked the actionable approach to this session. All of them should be like that.
- Action planning was a good exercise.
- Good idea to prioritize follow-up/accountability for actions and partner coordination.
- What are going well: presentations, discussion, RISE action plan;
- Great discussion on action plan that will lead into discussions during the retreat
- Very useful for us to look back on action items from the week and identify them and plan on how to move forward
- For me the action planning for RISE will be one of the most important things to do. But before that, it will be necessary to have a solid team around RISE. And to have the same understanding with the all(?) stakeholders (UN, EU, USAID, CILS, etc.)
- The 2 last exercises gave us a better understanding and put into practice what we learnt during the week; Next step is to put all this learning into practice in the field.
- The transition discussion was very appropriate and timely as the "SRO" needs to carry out some substantial thinking/ planning on transition. The session enabled the group to focus on this question and begin to generate solution. Sharing the ideas brought forth concrete ideas for ACTION that I look forward to implementing

Could have been better/ Want to know more:

- We need to have a person who is responsible for ensuring that all the good recommendations are taken into account seriously. We need this person to monitor all of this.

Suggestions

- Important to keep thinking about how what we have learned can be used to improve RISE.
- Should have done Day 5 on Day 1 and repeate the exercise on Day 5.
- In many ways, we should have started with this on Day 1 and spent the week developing an action plan and discussing ways to address/ remedy any potential barriers.