**Sclr training of trainers’ co-design workshop, Nairobi, October 2018**

**Notes from sessions (by Mandeep Mudhar)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Collaborative design, aka Co-design*** | ***ToT / SoE*** |
| **Module 0 Introduction to the workshop and each other** | |
| * Planning process – start at the end, and plan your way backwards * Would be good to have finance staff join the workshops; transferring power and control usually means transferring money – a key part of shifting power * This is a not a talk-shop – implementation will follow the workshop directly! * Co-design can / should be defined together * **Flipchart**: experience in the room, and character type of a co-design team | * Whole module for all introductions and blah blah must not take more than 1.5 hours – you cannot afford to waste more time than that. * Individual introductions always take min 5 mins for all pairs to interview each other and then min average 1 minute per person per intro. 20 people in 30 mins is a real achievement! * The key objectives are developing the mindset, building confidence, creating space, breaking barriers * What are the skills we have in the room? Start with that … flipchart with experience and skills mapping on flipchart * Repeat the schedule for the participants again, just to check with them * Workshop principles and ground rule – these change with each training, could be developed in a participatory way, but at the beginning flag the most important ones, so the facilitator needs to prepare these in advance * In the introduction, allow anyone with burning questions to ask them, so that we can anticipate what needs to be addressed, and when they will be addressed over the course of the workshop * What is most important is ‘organisational buy-in’ *before* coming to the workshop * **Suggestion**: Good to see how community led approaches have come into being over the years in a timeline – from the 80’s in “development” but relatively recent in mainstream “humanitarian” aid * Creation of safe space to design – this is a free space to discuss, especially if participants come from different organisations – emphasis the safe space * Don’t forget: the approach is demand led, accountability, and feedback mechanisms * Decide yourselves what to give as handouts – slides are a short cut, so perhaps design proper handouts * Practical real-life examples that can be applied when ideas come up – the more you can relate to examples, the more participants like it * **Suggestion**: 3-minute videos from local voices that speak to the value of the approach (soundbites) – critiquing the current system * Review at the end of each session / module (what has been successful, what is good enough but could be improved, what needs to be redesigned) * Find one or two participants who are good at energisers – locally led energisers * Feedback committees to collect feedback from the participants throughout the day |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Module 1** | |
| * Do we risk damaging that self-help that happens without us if we engage? Be cautious of this * The quickest way to destroy a local CBO can be by off-loading cash on it … if we do it the wrong way * How to strike the balance between global and local? Help participants to feel part of something bigger (in terms of improving the wider humanitarian institutional system – and the chances they have to tap into the current interest and focus on doing “localisation” in practice. Spend a few minutes on that, without getting into the jargon and lofty concept. Plus, this will be influenced and/or supported by who you ask to participant in the group – snr mgrs. and doers on the ground. * “External assistance” = anyone not part of the crises affected community themselves (includes local authorities), national or international. However, locally-led could also include government and other local actors * Be aware of bias, i.e. where external actors come in with specific expertise, e.g. livelihoods, and will look for, or recommend, the same action * Power imbalances can be increased or reinforced during crises * Improvised sharing: looting? Or helping each other to survive? * Accountability is a good link to development, i.e. bottom up planning and action – there is so much of the CHS within sclr * **Flipchart and groupwork**: what are the risks and challenges of sclr – again, use this as a ‘live flipchart’ throughout the week, and revisit at the end of the week to check that all have been addressed * Risks and challenges of sclr – an example from the Marawi crises in the Philippines was that finding people with skills and cohesiveness in the immediate aftermath of the crisis was difficult; these communities needed help to think about their capacity, the importance of social cohesion, and also with forming groups * It is important to anticipate capacity support needed to prepare communities before sclr implementation * There doesn’t have to be experience of having worked with emergent SHGs * Prior to a crisis – although they may do fantastic work, it may not be possible to hand over all responsibility to them fully; they may need some support. Afterwards, they will return to their normal lives and roles – anticipate this, which is okay. | * Resilience * It may be pertinent to define resilience, as it means different things to people – or maybe do not use the word at all! * Resilience includes the capacity to anticipate and prepared for – but this depends on your starting point (i.e. ability to transform root causes and weaken vulnerability is also about avoiding potential risk or severity of next disaster) * Resilience outcomes vs resilience process – sclr contributes to establishing principles, creating/strengthening systems & capacities as well as to actual outcomes that reduce vulnerability * Maybe use absorb, adopt, transform (AAT) – then use the KCL research within the LPRR project, which outlines the definition from survivors * Whatever people define themselves delivers to X (e.g. resilience, protection) – leave the global definition on the wall, but what does this mean in people in their own language? Whoever is present at the workshop, or in communities, it is to their definition we should work * The exercise on characteristic of a crisis-affected population in the absence of aid; this may be rephrased to “what are the positive and negative actions of local people during a crisis when there is no external support, such as during war?” * Be sure to remember and highlight psychosocial aspects * **Flipchart and groupwork**: characteristics of community in absence of external aid – it would be good to summarise these into positive and negatives during plenary, and use throughout the week * **Suggestion**: (extra) Exercise on what crisis-affected people think of external aid; add points on dependency, reinforcing power structures, sense of powerlessness / helplessness. Might not work on day 1, plenary takes a while to get comfortable with * Will this be a difficult workshop to facilitate for those who have not ever responded to a crisis? It is important to unlearn previous biases, but to also working with people who are outside of the system … this adds a freshness! * Put up your own list of practical examples of when / how the sclr approach has been used * Remember to highlight to participants that it was communities themselves who identified the need for psychosocial support (a finding from the LPRR project) * Might be good to have a plenary discussion on the 2nd question – what do crisis-affected people think of externally-led humanitarian assistance? Might not work on day 1, plenary takes a while to get comfortable with * Be aware of the overuse of the word “community”; all should be treated as individuals – sclr recognises that there are multiple groups within a community * Be aware of the differences between HH cash transfers and community grants * The impact of remittances from the community diaspora globally is much bigger than all our interventions combined. This global phenomenon can be tapped into with sclr - for example, YMCA East Jerusalem was about able to generate interest among the diaspora via sharing updates on social media on the process of community micro-grants. * Spending some time with the finance officers in-country and feeding back to finance controller in head office in INGOs. * The group work will define the sclr approach objectives and challenges to address; at the end of the co-design workshop, go back to these points and discuss if the design approach can meet the objectives and address the challenged – it is important to go back to these! |
| **Module 2 - palc** | |
| * This module is not proposing to do away with the institutional system and its procedures; rather, it endorses a parallel process as an alternative or complementary method. Over criticism is counteractive. * Facilitating the learning within the PALC process is currently the weakest developed step. The local organisation should be facilitating the learning, where the PALC / communities doesn’t have the capacity (yet), whilst at the same time, building the capacity of the PALC volunteers. Whilst working with the communities and PALC volunteers, it may be possible to identify key individuals to lead this in the future. * Documenting learning – whose role is it? The more survivors can do the more the ownership of lessons learned (LPRR experience). There is a huge memory within the community, and committee members (e.g. treasurer), e.g. gifts-in-kind and livestock, especially the illiterate – this will be central to the reflection and learning process. * Give communities guidelines whether or not local or international organisations are there throughout the process * The PALC volunteers play a key role in starting conversations with communities and other stakeholders on addressing root causes * Self-care among volunteers is important too! Example from the Philippines of volunteer-volunteer massage. | * Feedback / mood meter – draw up a flipchart and introduce on Day One. The facilitator may tick the unhappy face at a quiet moment during the first day to make others feel that it is okay to give such feedback * Recap the benefits and challenges of the approach (revisit the flipcharts); anything to add or change? * palc might be called something else, i.e. localised. Don’t worry too much about the term * **Suggestion**: perhaps diagramise the palc process * Appreciative enquiry vs needs assessments – prepare for this explanation * **Flipchart and groupwork**: review and comment on the checklist; brainstorm the objective of the palc in the given context, and identify gaps and concerns to address throughout the module and workshop * The exercise which involves role play to test PALC is very useful and always well received, especially when conducted in the local language – give it one hour * Re-emphasis that communities can do much more than we think * On recording information: experience has shown that community information is in place. however, INGOs collect data and don’t share it back with communities for their reflection. It is also a way to keep local knowledge local. It has also been mentioned that local knowledge is dying off, so there is a need to keep it alive. Sharing back information is one way to doing this. |
| **Module 3** | |
| * Practice has shown that having a finance person from the NNGO during the co-design workshop helps significantly to adapt formats to internal procedures, whilst keeping them accessible to SHGs | * Recap: stress the need to un-learn. Also that we need to learn how to participate in community groups’ responses, not how communities should participate in our humanitarian interventions * Have a checklist of practical examples to showcase the benefits of micro-grants (PVCA type) * Micro-grants are auditable! * Optional: this session can be used to translate the proposal format into local language (and look for improvements), and possibly to improve the checklist   **There is an idea to split the workshop into 3 days (shorter intro, palc, micro-grants, and capacity building up to 4.3), then have a follow up workshop 3 months later to organise the learning review, and the rest of the modules.** |
| **Module 4** | |
| * It is good to consider the link between do no harm and the proposal approval process at community level, i.e. what can impact back on individuals and small groups as a result of awarding a grant for this initiative * It is also important to facilitate that communities not only learning within their groups or units, but also together with other communities * Evaluations can look like scrutiny to communities – WASDA learned to make evaluations more forward looking with communities, asking 3 questions: do you remember where you were before the project; do you understand your situation now; are you thinking where you want to be tomorrow, do you have any plans to get there, and how do you know you have reached your destination. This is more of an appreciative evaluation (reflection, appreciation, looking forward, and reaching there). * When communities and groups are given more opportunities to share, then they become more open to sharing skills and capacities, and experience – anticipate this. * Experience from the Marawi crisis in the Philippines found that learning between SHGs was not focused on the projects or activities, but more a reflection on how they coped during and after the crisis, the conditions, and encouraging each other more to seek out IDPs and help them to organise. * Don’t forget money and resources for learning and reflection if needed * Experiential leaning is learning by doing; this is the most common way people learn. We support people to think through the process. The last step of “now what?” in which we think through what we will do differently in the future as a result of our learning, is often forgotten. One of the reasons mistakes often get repeated again and again! | * Day 4 recap session could take up to the morning coffee break * When facilitating this session, come up with your own learning questions, also considering what help is needed by communities to come up with these questions * Q&A of the big questions and issues may need to be prepared, including tips and examples to help explain * The group work on what to do when things go wrong is a good exercise to conduct in both the co-design workshop and also at community level; the message should emerge that community grants are awarded, and issues arising should be debated and resolved by the community themselves, finding solutions together * Give some consideration (and time) to how knowledge transfer could be facilitated, versus facilitating a learning approach; how can more be embedded into the process that already exists, especially considering illiteracy, and wanting to enhance skills transfer? * In sclr, there are 3 typed of accountability * Upwards: to donors * Downwards: to people * Horizontal: between groups * On the community-based PSS diagram: people experiencing severe trauma need referral for specialised support. What happens where there is nobody to whom referrals can be made? It is best to work with what the community is capable of, and their traditional practices, as well as news ones to which they are open |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Module 5** | |
| * A good question to ask is what are the risks of not changing (i.e. not trying sclr), and continuing as we are? * Individuals and emerging SHGs should be encouraged not to discard ideas just because they are not perceived as conventional relief. Encourage creativity and thinking outside the box. * It is important to take time to prepare palc volunteers and teams to be more sensitive to the spirit of the community which may have existed before the crises or developed in its immediate aftermath. Organisations have seen external actors causing more harm through their decisions and actions, not having been sensitive to community cohesion, and its importance during crises * Regarding conflict sensitivity and peace building, this should not be pushed, and should be allowed to grow and develop organically. A useful start is from the perspective of self-protection, this protection will lead to efforts to reduce local level violence, which will in turn lead to local level peace building. Sometimes it is helpful to think of this approach as conflict transformation, over peace, e.g. being able to resume their lives. * Asking communities to visualising the conflict via illustrations is a good way to start the conversation on conflict; once illustrated, ask was it always like that? Is there anything we can do to reduce the negativity here? This is a simple tool, especially for the illiterate. However, it may require the staff of local / national organisations (over volunteers) to gently start the exercise * Talk about the humanitarian impact of conflict resolution and peace work with donors; few have documented the humanitarian impact of protection work. Humanitarian mediation is an accepted term that speaks to the humanitarian and protection impact of peace work. | * Stress that this is a safe space, in sclr you are allowed to think about transformation – how can a humanitarian response contribute to conflict reduction? Let’s explore! |
| **Module 6** | |
| * Don’t be averse to considering start-up money for new coordination systems! | * This session might be worth conducting 3 mths after implementation, perhaps when lessons are being captured, for which communities and SHGs may have ideas after implementing their micro-grants. Consider further taking the 2 orange parts out of the SLCR practice, and conducting them 3 mths later, connecting the pilot, reflection, learning, and scale-up |
| **Module 7** | |
| * None to add. | * Module can be removed from initial workshop, and discussed 3 mths after pilot * **Flipchart and groupwork**: challenges and obstacles faced by participants’ organisations (and partners) in sclr uptake – main hinderances, and how to overcome * Possible discussion points the good opportunity of working in refugee camps, as these have good networks already formed within. But issues may arise with high level of government restrictions on access and activities, and also with working with refugees themselves vs the host community. Consider discussing collaboration with UNHCR, especially the community-based protection units within UNHCR * What to do in the settings were there aren’t local partners, and self/direct implementation is taking place – go for it! As long as this doesn’t become the norm globally, i.e. enabling sclr as a justification for direct implementation * More notes in separate document (Notes on panel debate, and manifesto) |
| **Module 8** | |
| * None to add. | * None to add. |
| **Evaluation and closing** | |
| * None to add. | * 1. On a scale of 1 – 5, 1 being not confident, and 5 being extremely confident, how confident / interested do you feel after this week to facilitate a co-design / training workshop with the materials for local partners, team/staff, et al? * 2. What additional support or information would you need to get to level 5 confidence? * 3. Please share any comments for the facilitator to make necessary changes or improvements, should this ToT be repeated. |