

The HC's Structured Dialogue – Kenya Workshops January 2015 REPORT

Executive Summary

A joint InterAction-UNHCR mission went to Kenya from 20 to 28 January 2015 to follow-up on the implementation of the High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue on UNHCR-IFRC-NGO Partnership. The goal of this mission was to evaluate the state of UNHCR-NGO partnerships in Kenya and to support actions for further partnership strengthening and complementarity. The mission team held two workshops: one in Dadaab for partners working in the camps and one for Nairobi-based heads of agencies and their country office representatives.

Via a pre-workshop questionnaire participants indicated areas in which they experienced improvements over the past two years. Joint planning, advocacy and problem resolution were identified within both workshops as areas in need of further improvement. Consistent with findings in the DRC and Pakistan, participants indicated limited awareness of the recommendations to strengthen partnership made through the Structured Dialogue. Commitment to strengthening partnership, however, was quite high.

Participants in both locations indicated that over the past two years partnership had improved in terms of information sharing, advocacy and joint planning. Throughout the course of the workshops it was clear that these improvements are seen as the result of a change in senior management. Grant/Fund management was noted as improved but by a much smaller percentage. Over the fall of 2014 the Kenya program followed the new implementing partner section procedures (part of the Implementing Partner Framework) which became a significant source of confusion and tension. All parties said it felt like a tendering process that may satisfy an audit but left no room for discussion and negotiation and did not promote the spirit of partnership.

Follow-up is critical to ensure that planning is comprehensively participatory, advocacy is complementary and strategic, and that resources (human and financial) are maximized to ensure the most comprehensive and coordinated support possible.

Key Findings

- Significant advancements made in information sharing, advocacy and joint planning recognized by all parties. Issues certainly remain but improvements widely appreciated.
- Limited awareness on the High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue amongst both UNHCR and NGO staff alike.
- While it creates an auditable process, the Implementing Partnership Framework is not partner-friendly according to both UNHCR staff and partners. The lack of feedback on

concept notes, the absence of discussion on projects/how to harmonize them with other initiatives and insufficient transition time between implementers negatively impacts both service delivery as well as the partnership more broadly.

- Senior UNHCR staffs in general demonstrate and follow through on the Principles of Partnership. However, unproductive power dynamics continue creating tension, fear of recrimination and inhibiting open communications with partners.
- Clarity needed on the centralization/decentralization of decision making authority and advocacy messaging between the Sub-offices and Country Office.

Key Recommendations:

- **Joint Planning:** Initiate the Kenya Refugee Partnership process at field level; Include Operational Partners in planning, implementation and reporting; Planning should be needs-based rather than based on anticipated resources and build on previous objectives to ensure continuity. Sectors need to collaborate within the prioritization process.
- **Problem Solving:** Regular feedback and timely written responses to formal queries. Clearer lines of decision making and accountability needed. Complaint mechanism set up and shared with partners.
- **Information Sharing:** UNHCR's Nairobi and Dadaab offices should ensure that information and messages with partners are harmonized. Review the meeting schedule with an eye to consolidate meetings.
- **Advocacy:** Harmonize sub-office, Nairobi and international advocacy messages. Sub-office and partners to provide greater input into national-level advocacy initiatives. More engagement with affected populations and county governments. Continue work with media to counter refugee stereotypes.

Way Forward

The Mission will consult with UNHCR Kenya to decide on which recommendations will be taken up, how (and by whom). A follow-up teleconference, will be held in May/June to discuss progress and challenges.

Conclusions

Based on these two workshops and bilateral meetings with various partners, the mission team drew a few general observations.

- Prior to this mission there was limited knowledge among all participants – UNHCR and NGOs -- about the recommendations to strengthen partnership made through the Structured Dialogue.
- The Principles of Partnership need to be understood and applied by all organizations and staff at all levels.¹
- Partnership is dynamic and must be constantly nurtured. It is important for partners, including operational partners, to have a space where they can regularly come together to discuss partnership, including mutual accountability and complementarity. Several evaluations requested that workshops similar to the ones facilitated in January be held on an annual basis.
- Joint planning has significantly improved over the past couple years but presents the most significant area for partners and UNHCR to be more collaborative and complimentary.
- Advocacy was discussed within both workshops with clear linkages to both information sharing and improved collaboration between field and country offices.
- While general meeting fatigue was apparent, there seemed to be a true desire from all stakeholders to move forward on the issues impacting partnership in Kenya.

¹<http://dev.icvanetwork.org/sites/default/files/7934-principlesofpartnership.pdf>

Background

The Kenya workshop follows on the heels of successful missions to the Democratic Republic of Congo and Pakistan (2014). It is the first of four country missions slated for 2015 in partnership with ICVA and UNHCR.

The sessions were co-facilitated by Caroline Nichols (InterAction) and Tiziana Clerico (Partnership Section, UNHCR Geneva). In Dadaab **46** partners, inclusive of four UNHCR staff, participated in the workshop. In Nairobi there were **26** partners, inclusive of four Senior UNHCR staff.

In addition to the workshops bilateral meetings were held with a number of Kenyan and international NGOs.

Methodology

Every participant was asked to fill a pre-questionnaire exploring if there were improvements in information sharing, advocacy, joint planning and funds managements over the past two years.²

Each workshop begins with a brief overview of the Principles of Partnership,³ an introduction to the Structured Dialogue and a brief review of the Structured Dialogue's ten recommendations.⁴

Participants were asked to anonymously identify issues or themes related to the recommendations that they would like to discuss further, relative to their operation. The top four-five topics were chosen for discussion in small groups. Participants self-selected into groups. To the extent possible small groups had a UNHCR staffer in each and a balance of, funded and operational partners.

The group discussions were led by four questions: *“what is working well,” “what is working less well,” “what are the opportunities for complementarity” and “identify one or two follow-up actions.”* The results - recommendations and suggested actions - are listed below (the complete list of answers can be found in the annexes).

² The scale given was “yes, improved”, “yes, a little bit”, “no improvement” and “worsened.” The time period of two years was selected because it coincides with the field dissemination of the Structured Dialogue recommendations for strengthened partnerships.

³ **equality** (mutual respect between members irrespective of size and power); **transparency** (in dialogue, communication, strategies and priorities, increasing the level of trust among participants); a **results-oriented approach** (committing to activities only if the means, skills and capacity to deliver are there); and **complementarity** (building on comparative advantages and complementing each other's contributions).

⁴ **joint assessment, analysis, prioritization and strategic planning; information sharing; joint advocacy; IDPs; following up government pledges made on refugees and statelessness; strengthening capacities; urban settings; review of fora for collective dialogue; complaints mechanisms and a yearly report.**

Workshops - Dadaab

The 21 February workshop was hosted in UNHCR’s conference space in Dadaab and included 46 participants.⁵ The participants were mainly implementing partners focused on delivering service to the refugee population in the camp complex.

The results of the anonymous pre-workshop questionnaire:

- **90%** indicated that information sharing had improved
- **87%** reported that advocacy had improved
- **97%** felt that planning had improved
- **72%** indicated that funds management improved, with **15%** reporting no improvement and **3%** reporting that it worsened

In advance of the workshops **98%** of participants indicated that they felt committed to partnership. Afterwards **94%** of participants said that they were “more committed” to strengthening partnership.

The topics chosen for small group discussion were: **joint planning** (), **advocacy**, **problem resolution** and **information sharing/partnership** (the group opted to discuss the two topics together).⁶

Findings

Joint planning:

Works well: There was consensus that **joint planning meetings** are **well organized** and **participatory** with both implementing and operational partners attending at the Dadaab level. Joint planning meetings provide a venue for feedback, prioritization exercise and formulation of sectoral strategies.

Not so well: The groups shared concerns too that prioritization within the planning process was **resource- as opposed to needs- driven**. Similarly participants perceived that decisions on implementers and projects were **pre-determined** in advance of resource allocation. The view was that a partner’s capacity does not influence planning or resource allocation. **Poor consultations with affected persons and other stakeholders** in operational areas, disconnects between the plan and the resultant implementation (a failure to adhere to project design and sector strategies), a **compressed planning process** and a sense fear in raising issues were

⁵ Please see Annex 1 for the full participant list.

⁶ While capacity building was identified as a topic to discuss when it came to self-selecting into groups none of the participants wished to discuss it further. In the previous two workshops (DRC and Pakistan) the deep field participants had robust discussions on this topic.

identified as issues that constrain and negatively impact the planning process and implementation.

The group also discussed the need for **mutual respect amongst partners** and a recognition of partner strengths and specialties. They suggested that partners develop **MOUs with each other** (partners working together) to highlight complementarities.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- Increased inclusion of implementing and operational partners in **decision making** at all levels. Operational partner contributions should be reflected in reporting documents.
- Planning should be **needs-based** rather than based on the anticipated resources available.
- The planning process should start earlier and build on previous objectives to ensure **continuity** and progress in the results. All partners must be more transparent in terms of available resources and programming intent.
- Identify **sector focal points** responsible for ensuring that strategies are followed and feedback provided.
- Develop a **joint fundraising** strategy.

Advocacy:

Works well: Participants agreed that strategic, complimentary advocacy is an opportunity for partners to leverage each other's strengths. The group reported that **advocacy targets** are well identified, that UNHCR **sectoral specialists** were engaged as necessary and useful to broader advocacy efforts. It was noted in plenary discussion that advocacy has enhanced both due to **improved information** flows as well as behind the scenes work.

Not so well: Despite these improvements, the group identified **funding** as a constraint. They also felt that a **common advocacy forum** where local, national and international messages could be harmonized would be useful. This harmonization would include greater linkages with advocacy taking place at the Nairobi level. The group suggested that partner expertise and resources could be better leveraged to both improve advocacy outputs and reach a larger target group.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- Sub-office and partners provide greater input into national-level advocacy initiatives.
- Develop and disseminate joint position papers to steer advocacy and help ensure common messaging.

Problem resolution:

Not so well: In both the Dadaab and Nairobi workshops there was significant interest in discussing problem resolution. In both instances the conversation veered into a conversation on problems themselves, which fostered especially honest conversations in Nairobi (see below).

Both groups identified that there is a need for a mechanism or forum to resolve issues between UNHCR and partners, but given the diversity of challenges faced by different partners the groups recognized that there couldn't be a "one-size" approach.

In Dadaab, there was strong interest in resolving issues locally, if possible, and recognition of all parties to resolve problems equitably.

Some of the "problems" that came up in discussion included the need for coordinated follow-up and written feedback on issues. Specifically NGOs expressed concerns around the **lack of written responses and feedback from UNHCR** particularly with regard to partner selection. Moreover there is a perception that project decisions are made unilaterally making partners question their ownership/role of their programs.

Participants are also eager to see **a complaint mechanism set up and information on how it works and how to access it shared with them**. The Implementing Partner selection process, in its current design, does not foresee the possibility, for rejected candidates to appeal the decision.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- **Equal recognition/respect** for partnerships.
- Clarity needed around who is responsible for key **partnership decisions**.
- **More transparency** and documentation of decisions
- Better mapping and recognition of **partner expertise** and programming to use as a basis for analyzing complementarity.
- Set up a **complaint mechanism** allowing rebuttals and appeals.

Information Sharing and Partnership:

Works well: A large group focused on information sharing and opted to tackle broader partnership related issues as well. They found that the **working groups** coordinated by UNHCR were effective. Also working well is inter-agency camp level information flow and informal, consultative inter-agency meetings.

Not so well: Similar to the advocacy group they acknowledged that the **struggle between priorities** impacts information sharing and partnership, but had no suggests other that more clarity on purpose and agency intent. On a more tangible level the group was frustrated with the consolidation and **management of information**; too much information is duplicative and doesn't give implementers what they need to help make decisions. One example of this are the bi-weekly sit reps. The group found them too summarized and wished that they included all sectors or covered lower priority sectors more consistently.

Similar to both the joint planning and advocacy groups they too felt that information between Dadaab and Nairobi is not harmonized and would like to see more of the information from the Dadaab level better reflected in Nairobi level outputs. Last, the group felt that there were **too many meetings** and that the meeting schedule could be consolidated.

Recommendations and proposed actions

- Create a **web-based Information Management System** for data collection to facilitate transparent, real-time data sharing accessible by all agencies.
- Review the coordination and information sharing meeting schedule with an eye to **consolidation of meetings**.

Workshops – Nairobi

The 26 February workshop was hosted in UNHCR's regional office in Nairobi and included 26 participants.⁷ The participants were a mix of implementing and operational partners.

The results of the anonymous pre-workshop questionnaire were:

- **100%** indicated that information sharing had improved
- **86%** reported that advocacy had improved
- **82%** felt that planning had improved
- **76%** indicated that grant management improved, with the remainder indicating no improvement.

In advance of the workshops **100%** of participants indicated that they felt committed to partnership. Afterwards **100%** of participants said that they were "more committed" to strengthening partnership.

⁷ Please see Annex 1 for the full participant list.

The UNHCR Representative for Kenya, Raouf Mazou, opened the workshop with the recognition that, over the past five years, UNHCR is increasingly seen as the entity responsible for refugees. He noted that changes within the humanitarian architecture have been difficult. If things are changing both internationally and in Kenya, then UNHCR must change and adapt, which is what they recognized in 2010. Part of this recognition is that refugees need real support. The average length of asylum is 17 years. Is it then still humanitarian? Is it development? This underpins UNHCR's efforts to look at refugees in a more comprehensive and coordinated way.

He also acknowledged the barrier between Nairobi and the field. The November exercises were an attempt to address this. He suggested developing a schedule for field consultations to discuss partnership issues as well as to get their planning inputs earlier. The field needs to be empowered.

He concluded that culture change takes time and requires constant conversation; that together we need to address areas of resistance.

The topics chosen for small group discussion were: joint planning, problem resolution, advocacy, urban issues and capacity building.⁸

Findings

Joint Planning:

Works well: The Nairobi group reported that the **comprehensive planning process is working well**; the involvement of implementing and operational partners, donors, other UN agencies and the Government of Kenya is appreciated. They felt that this approach is increasing buy-in and that the plan itself is more complimentary and **harmonized with the plans of key stakeholders**. The group also felt that overall the implementing partner selection process was good, additional points on this below in the "problem resolution" section.

Not so well: This said, assessment and monitoring tools need to be re-defined. Like the group in Dadaab, they felt that planning is **resource-based** as opposed to **needs-driven**; that prioritization is based on funding available. More needs to be considered in term of complementarity. A good place to start this is looking at the sector level strategies. Last, there is limited understanding of the broader planning process. NGOs need to come to the table more prepared to plan effectively.

The group seconded the suggestions put forward by the representative around **senior managers from both UNHCR and NGOs should meet at the field level more regularly and**

⁸ Information sharing was the third-highest ranked topic for further discussion but when participants self-selected into groups no one opted to pick up this issue.

initiating the next comprehensive planning process at the field. They suggested a mid-year review as an opportunity to review and learn from the implementation of the sector strategies and potentially revise indicators. This could then also facilitate cross-sector planning and positively influence prioritization.

Last, the group requested that UNHCR contribute more to support costs; that the amounts contributed seem to be in decline and are not proportionate with the volume of work being done.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- **Review** the planning process and **redefine** as necessary the assessment and monitoring tools.
- Consultations for the Kenya Comprehensive Refugee Plan should **begin with the field** offices.
- **Sectors need to collaborate** within the prioritization process.
- Conduct a **mid-year review** of how the plan is being implemented to facilitate course correction and learning for the next planning process.

Problem Resolution:

Not so well: As noted above, much of the conversation focused on challenges within the partnership given how different partners reflected on their relationship with UNHCR. Specifically the group honed in on:

- Absence of timely, written response to written queries.
- Unclear process for operational partners to get support letters.
- Decision making; how do partners know the focal point for a particular decision. “Ping pong” effect; partners must approach multiple UNHCR staffers to get answers.
- Lack of feedback or appeal mechanisms for concept notes.
- Unclear roles and responsibilities between departments, between sub-offices and Nairobi.
- Fear of contractual repercussions for speaking out.

The report-back led to an honest, wide-ranging exchange largely focused on the IP framework selection process as well as communication expectations.

Recommendations and proposed action:

- Develop a **confidential feedback mechanism.**

Advocacy:

Works well: The group reported that **advocacy coordination**, information sharing, human and financial support, **linkages** with government actors and collaboration among partners are working well.

Not so well: Challenges remain however in terms of information being **filtered** on some issues such as UNHCR’s “behind-the-scenes” advocacy over the new Security Law. There was also a sense that the diplomatic limitations of UNHCR undermines visibility in particular instances, that there is a tension between Government priorities versus operational priorities. Last, the “securitization” of refugee matters was cited as a challenging advocacy issue to for the entire community.

Despite these challenges the group seemed optimistic, noting the vibrant legal environment in Kenya and the strengths and diversity of UNHCR’s partners.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- More **engagement** with county governments.
- More engagement with **affected populations** on advocacy.
- **Identify and target** influential decisions makers, government actors.
- Continue engagement with the media to **counter refugee stereotypes**.

Urban issues:

Working well: **Information sharing** and **coordination** as well as **community dialogues** facilitated within the “16 Days of Activism” were identified as advocacy strengths.

Not so well: The group identified a wide range of challenges, from a generally un-protective environment in which NGOs tend to work in isolation to avoid attention, to the perception that UNHCR is not doing enough in response to government directives and the new security law. The group also discussed gaps in coverage caused by both a lack of resources as well as the lack of mandate on the part of some NGOs. Specifically the group focused on their inability to effectively support at-risk minority groups including gays and lesbians, the disabled etc. Challenges also included the inconsistent quality of legal aid provided by lawyers who are not specialists in refugee law, weak government support on urban programming.

The group proposed more outreach to local NGOs in an effort to mainstream refugee issues in their projects/mandates, including livelihood support as well as joint programming and planning to better identify gaps, work more collaboratively with UNHCR and other partners. Additionally, reinforcing joint messages/positions vis-à-vis the Department of Refugee Affairs

(DRA) may encourage them to take more responsibility on refugee management and protection.

Recommendations and prioritized actions:

- **Harmonize** sub-office, Nairobi and international advocacy messages.
- **Sensitize** private lawyers on refugee law to provide “better” legal aid to persons of concern (detention issues).
- **Pursue** strong advocacy about urban refugees and the urban program towards the government and the Kenya public.
- **Joint planning** for advocacy; to better identify advocacy gaps, priorities and complementary roles.

Capacity Strengthening:

Works well: The group discussed a local NGO mentorship program that they felt was working well. Overall, however, they felt that capacity building needs to be approached in a more holistic manner; with a structure and dedicated resources.

The manpower and presence of development INGOs was seen as an a strength to be better capitalized on and utilized to establish a mechanism for capacity strengthening, particularly with support from other donors.

Recommendations and way forward:

- **Develop** capacity strengthening framework/strategy for partners.
- **Encourage** consortia applications between INGOs and local NGOs with a clear capacity building element.

Annex 1: Participants

Dadaab

Abdi, Sahal
Head of Operations
KRCS

Hussein, Fahad A
Project Control Assistant
DRA

Moses, Victor
Area Manager
NRC

Asdi, Abdhi M
Education Manager
SCI

Kahiga, Robert
Education Officer
AVSI

Mubai, Michael
Field Manager
FilmAid

Atoko, Clement
Site Manager
Handicap International

Kamau, Geoffrey
Senior Accountant
LWF

Mugera, Hosea
Education Officer
RET

Babu, Michael
Program Manager
CARE

Kiangethe, David
Country Director
DRC

Mulanga, Meruj
EO
LWF

Birik, Musdaf
Logistics Officer
IRK

Kigia, Robert Mooroge
Construction Officer
PWJ

Mulira, Ronald
Camp Coordinator
NCCK

Boulu, Anton
AM
AVSI

Kilorzo, Judith V,
Financial Admin Officer
PQJ

Murithi, Betty
Program Manager
RCK

Coreke, Jeanne
Programme Officer
UNHCR

Kimani, Charles
Child Protection Officer
TDH

Muroki, Moses
Head DRA-DOB
DRA

Fall, Ahmed Baba
Head of Operations
UNHCR

Kirimo, Frankline
Education Officer
WTK

Namuri, Victor
CDM
SCI

Farah, Abdi I
OC
IOM

Mohamed, Abdullahi S.
Assistant Manager
IRK

Nganga, Francis
Construction Officer
PWJ

Farah, Sarah A
Field Coordinator
CVT

Morothi, Anthony
Assistant Area Manager
DRC

Ngari, Anthony
Agriculture Area Manager
WTK

Njonge, Kimani
Programme
NCKK

Ochalla, Henok
Livelihoods Officer
UNHCR

Ocholar, Noah
Child Protection Program
Manager
TDH

Odhiambo, Ronald
Education Officer
RET

Olouasa, Michael
Finance
FAIDA

Omullo, Dan Caleb
Program
PIDAD

Onimo, Paul
Assistant Programme
Officer
RCK

Osinde, Kennedy
Assistant Program Officer
UNHCR

Ostermann, Silja
External Relations
UNHCR

Otieno, Silas
Environment Officer
FAIDA

Ould, Abdullahi
Senior Field Coordinator
UNHCR

Oyuko, Matthew
Senior Program Associate
UNHCR

Samatar, Siyad
Deputy Area Manager
NRC

Shak, Abdi
Project Coordinator
FAIDA

Sheildi, Abdullahi
Area Program Manager
SCI

Sikuku, Meshauk
PM
RRDO

Wesonga, Joseph
CBR Manager
HI

Zulu, Leonard
Senior Project Coordinator
UNHCR

Nairobi

Abdulkader, Milhia
Health & Nutrition
Coordinator
IRC

Bowwison, Laura
Strategic Partnership Advisor
WV

Caredda, Angelita
Country Director
Tierra de Hommes

Eshelch, Alice
Country Director
Heshima Kenya

Funayama, Shizuka
HQ Officer
PWJ

Gikonyo, Mary
Country Director
JRS

Hamon Sharpe, Catherine
Assistant Representative
UNHCR

Higuchi, Hiroaki
Head of Mission
PQJ

Martin, Amani B
Program Officer
NCKK

Masitsa, Solomon Wasia
Program Coordinator
Kituo Cha Sheria

Mazou, Raouf
Representative
UNHCR

Mombo, Lucy
Programme Officer
Don Bosco

Muthungu, Grace
Senior Programme Officer
NCKK

Njeri, Mary
Manager, Humanitarian &
Emergency Affairs
World Vision

Nyoltabi, Catherine
Grants Coordinator
NRC

Odongo, Lean
Program Coordinator
LWF

Omukuba, Martin
Deputy Director of Programs
IRC

Otega, Kate
Executive Assistant
UNHCR

Ramtu, Mari
Program Officer
CWS

Sakwa, Caroline
Program Manager
Heshima Kenya

Shol, Jerden
Country Director
HI

Suge, Stella
Country Director
FilmAid

Unloova, Ivana
Senior Program Officer
UNHCR

Waithisa, Leila
Senior Program Officer
RCK

Wambugu, Jane
Programme Associate
UNHCR

Youb, Shueyb
Program Manager
Relief International

Annex 2: Evaluation Results

Dadaab (21 January 2015)			Nairobi (26 January 2015)		
Do you feel more knowledgeable about the HC's Structured Dialogue?					
Yes – 41 (9%)	A little – 4 (91%)	No - 0	Yes – 18 (85%)	A little – 2 (10%)	No – 1 (5%)
What is the most useful thing you learned in this workshop?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of coordination between partner agencies when carrying out similar activities • How to strengthen partnership between UNHCR and US partners, problem resolution • Information sharing, advocacy • Open discussion, transparency • The ten principles areas 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of coordination and information sharing • UNHCR is open to improving partnership with NGOs • Similar challenges are faced by other partners • There needs to be more dialogue at the country level • Communicate key areas of concern and how to overcome them • The ten principles areas 		
Moving forward, what will you apply from this workshop into your partnership with UNHCR/NGO partners?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve on highlighted areas of weakness • Improve openness to information sharing • Transparency • Mutual respect and dialogue • Cooperation and joint planning • Having an open/honest partnership with UNHCR • Increase participation in consultative forums 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on coordination • Inter-sectorial strategies • Engage more with UNHCR • Report difficulties to HCR senior management without fear of retaliation • Better strategic planning • Provide more feedback 		
Do you feel more committed to better UNHCR-NGO partnership processes?					
Yes – 42 (94%)	A little – 1 (2%)	No – 1 (2%)	Yes – 20 (95%)	A little - 0	No – 0
No response – 1 (2%)			No response – 1 (5%)		
What could have been better?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of third party donors for inclusivity • More working groups • Objectives of the session could be explained more clearly • More PowerPoint presentations • To discuss further areas of engagement at local level • Information sharing • Sessions led by other countries • More time for discussion (detailed aspect of partnership), More time would have been ideal • More interactive start to workshop • UNHCR's response on how they choose their partners and funding levels • Focus more on local issues • Could have included a presentation on joint fundraising • Handouts to go, forming action points • More openness from participants • Groups should have been smaller 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of UNHCR field-based SPOs and Protection officers • More time to discuss other priorities • Follow-up on progress of action points identified • Acknowledgement by UNHCR of some of the critical issues/concerns raised • Venue and timing of the workshop • Involve stakeholders • Reference to scenarios outside Nairobi should have been made clear to participants prior to meeting • UNHCR should remain objective, do not remain so defensive • Open and sincere feedback and discussions • More time • Incorporation into existing meetings • Keep conversation on productive dialogue, not operational complaints • Could have been longer 		
Did you like the format of this workshop?					
Yes – 40 (89%)	OK – 5 (11%)	No – 0	Yes – 18 (86%)	OK – 3 (14%)	No – 0
Additional comments					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some redundant sessions, but thanks for the opportunity • Everything was well organized and coordinated • Always include the POCs • We should have more of these workshops • Let's keep up this dialogue • Include other issues • Looking forward to report/outcomes • Should include junior/field staff • More funding for NGOs is of paramount importance 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need more of these fora, particularly supervised by Geneva • Continue to emphasize to UNHCR that this needs to be a partnership • Capacity strengthening for local NGOs is key and will need structured framework • Please share group feedback with participants • Keep it up! • UNHCR should look at all partners as partners • More events appreciated • This should be a quarterly exercise 		