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| **All Implementing Partners Reflection Meeting****Imperial Botanical Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda** |
| **16 – 17th August 2017** |
|   |

**Introduction**

The All Partners’ Reflection Meeting took place from August 16 -17, 2017 at Imperial Botanical Beach Hotel, Entebbe. The meeting was organized by CARE International in Uganda to provide space for CARE and her partners to further examine the nature and substance of our partnership through sharing lessons, successes and challenges and further harness and shape a shared vision. The meeting brought together 26 participants of which 17 were from the Implementing Partner Organisations (IPOs) and 9 were CARE staff. *See Annex 1: Attendance sheet.*

**Welcome Remarks from Ag. Country Director-CARE**

After participant’s introductions, the Acting Country Director – CARE welcomed all participants to the first All Partners meeting and thanked each organisation that was represented for taking their time to be part of the meeting, this reflected the commitment to partnerships. He explained the principle of partnerships, as being like a marriage where two people agree to move together, despite the good and bad experiences. He requested participants to be critical and share the low and high moments of partnerships and this should be taken as positive criticism that will benefit all. He observed that for confidence building there is need to get to know partners before the marriage partnership. He wished everyone good deliberations.

**Setting the Scene**

The reflection meeting aimed to provide space for CARE and her partners to further examine the nature and substance of our partnership, learn together, build synergy, setting partnership standards, and reflecting on in-house cleaning - doing it right.

*Specific Objectives:*

* Take stock of our achievements and challenges using the current partnership approach against CARE’s intended goals.
* Reflect on the Quality of our partnerships (technical, ideological and strategic).
* Map out and analyze the partnership trends against the prevailing and future political, socio-economic and operating environment.
* Identify partnership models that can be jointly documented in regard to institutional growth and support.
* Recommit to a sustainable partnerships approach and shared vision for the future.

**Wishes/Meeting Expectations:**

| **Wish to see** | **Wish to know** | **Wish to hear** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A strong Growth in partnership together | Available programmes for partners and opportunities to build partner capacity | Honest feedback on what is going well and where we need to improve |
| Wish to see collaboration and togetherness | Know the future of partnership in light of new NGO governance in Uganda | Whether CARE works with the grassroots organizations |
| Wish to see a cooperative partnership between us | Know more about CARE Programs | Wish to hear what each organization does (alone and with CARE |
| Strong synergy among partners | Know how different partners take partnership to be with CARE and among other partners | Commitment from partner’s to taking CARE work forward |
| Wish to see open interaction amongst partners and CARE discussion | Know how to strengthen our partnerships and keep them strong/ how to make partnership work better | Opportunities for capacity building of partners |
| A share CARE/partners vision with clear strategies – this came out strong | Know the gender of the heads of different partner organisations | How partners can work together beyond CARE, how we grow together |
| To see CARE IPOs who are willing to work with UWESO in thematic areas | Know when our partnership will be formalized | Opportunities of strengthening current and engaging in new partnerships with other IPOs |
| To see other implementing partners | To become a strategic partner and get to know what other partners are working on | Strategize to strengthen the partnership |
| Active participation of all participants |  | Know about more potential partnership beyond financial inclusion |
|  |  | New programmes available at CARE |
|  |  | CARE expanding into partner institutional strengthening through CARE funding/granting |
|  |  | Wish to hear that we are getting bigger donor grants supporting our partnerships especially development programs |
|  |  | Inadequate involvement of partners in initial stages of program development |
|  |  | Value added and synergies in partnerships |
|  |  | Shared achievements |
|  |  | Joint implementation based on partner capacity and competence |
|  |  | Joint planning & reflection meetings with partners  |
|  |  | Effective communication |

As part of setting the scene, the Program Director, CARE provided an exercise – switching roles whereby Partners acted as CARE while CARE staff acted as partners and requested them to brainstorm on “What does a typical interaction between CARE and Partners look like?” This was to be presented in two scenarios – the good one and bad one.

In summary of the submissions made from the above exercise, the following observations were made:

* Communication is impromptu
* Partner involvement is key
* Breaking point – there is pressure on each side
* Good Quarterly meetings are required
* Need for timely feedback
* There is need for openness
* Teamwork and coordination (harmonization) is required
* Big Brother syndrome was noted
* Assertiveness is required
* Differentiated interest with partner was highlighted
* CARE should “Act as Team”
* Appreciation of good work

**CARE’s Partnership Vision -** Stock Taking

Annet Kandole and Omona Venis from GWED-G facilitated this session. Participants were requested to reflect on where the partnership came from, where we are and what happened along the way. The following reflections where highlighted

| Question | Responses |
| --- | --- |
| Where have we come from | Came from Direct implementation to partnership (around 2009) |
|  | Big number of partners implementing project (WAYFIP -24, NUWEP-7) |
|  | Adhoc identification of partners  |
|  | Implementing and strategic partnerships (2011) on board |
|  | More of joint implementation because of more trust |
|  | Reflection on our partnership strategy |
|  | Project to Partnership P2P shift (Design) done by CARE |
|  | Limited capacity to deliver, few staff, small operational area, low household income for beneficiaries, limited saving culture, limited coordination and collaboration with SL, limited synergy building, few partnerships, limited policy influence |
|  | Nurturing organizations e.g. UWESO – 15 yrs, JESSE-9 yrs, APROCELL- 9 yrs, EA-11 yrs, ACCU-6 yrs, WEMNET-5 yrs, FAPAD- under courtship |
|  | From consultancy model into granting/partnership model, Environmental Alert engagements with CARE led to the development/ establishment of the FOREST program |
| What happened along the way | Strengthening of partnerships, more beneficiaries came on board, more institutional strengthening |
|  | More funding opportunities, change of staff both at CARE and IPOs, change of implementation strategies, projects end without proper sustainability strategy |
|  | P2P shift implementation, reduction of CARE’s footprint, development of PQL guidelines, experience of non-compliance leading to policy review, development of new financial system (Padmoz), Development of tools to assess partnerships |
|  | From nothing to system strengthening, institutional technical back stopping, improved service delivery, coordination for the ENR i.e. PCC meeting, opportunities for more funding and increased visibility |
| Where we are now | CARE being more of facilitators, working with fewer partners, cross cutting of partners across programs, equal footing, CARE playing the role of capacity building, fewer CARE staff thus increased work load, joint proposal development with partners, partners learning from each other, synergy within partners |
|  | Stronger relationships with local partners, large operational areas, improved and increased saving culture, improved synergy building and partnership, policy influence and running MOU, improved coordination, communication and feedback, increased number of staff at partner level and staff capacity building. |
|  | Discussing new partnerships i.e. FAPAD, VSLA methodology has been adopted as community entry model, earned legitimacy e.g. through MOUs with local governments, NFA, Private sector, credibility for partners to attract new granting opportunities. |
| Outstanding Game Changers that have shaped the partnership | Policy influence – environmental, OVC, Tier IV, Land tribunals, reaching out to poor, Assessing the achievement of the purpose and goal, Yes because of multiplied impact, strengthen and building alliances and reduced poverty. |
|  | Changing funding land scape, private sector and academia engagement, governance and accountability issues, INGOs vs partners, contributed to broad movements, strengthened partners (CBOs, Banks) |
|  | Partners have been able to influence policy through influencing decisions of leaders, have built alliances by giving other organisations, platform to air out their issues, |
|  | Inclusion of the vulnerable groups, built stronger alliances and partnership, informal interactions transited into the strategic FOREST program that involves several players |
|  | Staff turnover, new programs, media involvement, working in coalition/consortium, dwindling funding for women rights, input into environmental related policies, recommendations to land tribunals |
| Bad issues | Abrupt changes in funding modalities, delayed disbursement of funds, need for increased flexibility in implementing projects, engaging 3rd party service providers like UCC, Airtel on short codes, closure of partner organizations due to end of funding, absence of flexible funding modalities, need for inter-programmatic funding to the same partner to be strengthened across the different partners |

**Open Reflection Stock Taking - Walk and Talk done by Delphine**

After the session onreflecting on where the partnership has come from, where we are and what happened along the way; the following points were summarized as key areas emerging segregated into three segments.

| Worthwhile to partner with CARE | Must change or stop | To maintain and Keep |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Synergy Building | Communication and coordination should be streamlined, avoid short notice communication. | Joint resource mobilization/Proposal development |
| Visibility | Timely remittance of funding | Partnership meetings be maintained |
| Institutional development, GWED-G operational policy | Change CARE/Partners relationship to one of equal partners, contributing to shared goals/vision | Program coordination committee be kept |
| Potential for funding (international Networks) | Programmatic approach, rather than “project” | Program Coordination Committee (PCC) be rolled out across CARE Programs |
| It is a partnership by choice | Expand synergies (deepen across thematic areas | Commitment and flexibility |
| Keen interest in developing the capacities of the partner organisations | Information sharing especially narrative reports | Capacity building/institutional strengthening |
| Knowledge, connections and presence in community |  | Programming approaches |
| International – track record, platform for advocacy, funding, experience |  | Flexibility (sub grant modifications to cater for issues arising) |
| Flexible, easily adjust and continue |  |  |
| Approaches to programming targeting the most vulnerable |  |  |
| Respect for partners autonomy i.e. systems, policies and guidelines |  |  |
| Its contribution to the partner’s strategic plan |  |  |

**Quality of Partnerships**

This session was conducted by Melch Natukunda (CARE) and Sam Nyakoojo (JESE) and allowed for an interactive session through which participants highlighted issues on ‘what a sound partnership looks like for CARE and for Partners.

1. **How does it look like in your CARE partnership?**
* Supervisor – supervisee scenarios
* Donor – recipient scenarios
* Departmentalized partnership
* Uncoordinated communication
* Capacity development/organizational development
* Fund raising to support partner initiatives
* Approachable
* Working through partners to achieve a shared goal
* It is inclusive in terms of profile of all partners
* CARE sets the terms and conditions for the partnership
* CARE is not clear with its position on visibility with its partners
* Changing positions of CARE and its partners on their working relationships (some not documented)
* Big brother syndrome is noted
* Bigger goal of CARE with all its partners beyond the key sectors (financial inclusion, governance), (the link and creation of synergy beyond the sectors)
* Duration of the partnership is not clear (currently tagged to funding, what can we do beyond)
* The ground is not levelled, when it comes to decision making. There is no room for negotiation.
* The staff salaries are very low and still no room for negotiations
* Program funds are fitted with no room for adjustments
* It is stressful – too much work within a limited time (pressure)
* Poor quality of programming
* Back and forth blaming

*Comments emerging:*

* Coaching and mentoring of the partners is still needed
* For capacity building, explored attaching a specific partner staff with specific needs to CARE e.g. Accountant to Accounts department at CARE, Advocacy to advocacy partners
* Salary is strictly to be based on qualification across board
* Get salary structure based on thorough surveys conducted
1. **How would you want it to look like**
* Equal/mutual relationships
* Respect and improved communication
* Supportive, no fault finding (positive criticism)
* Trust and compliance
* Joint resource mobilization
* Rewarding partnerships
* Complementary partnership
* Protective
* Meaningful planning with clear expectations – pay more attention during proposal writing/processes, be clear of the strength and weakness during planning process
* Better administrative/staff costs
* Assets should benefit partners after project close – however it was noted that this depends on donor policy/regulations though others e.g. JESE, ACCU, EA etc. have benefited on sharing assets. There should be a developed criteria of Asset disposal to partners
* Visibility for all, to include partner logos on CARE annual reports
* Transparency in regards to donor funds
* Capacity strengthening for partners
* Build and engage IPOs into a collective movement as per the partnership goal (go beyond projects/sectors)
* Build strategic partnership beyond funding and project (CARE should be committed to the partners even when they are no funds)
* Clear articulation of interest for both CARE and partners

**Emerging Comments:**

* Pay more attention during proposal writing/processes, be clear of the strength and weakness during planning process
* It was noted that the issue of asset disposal depends on donor’s policy/regulations some have benefited on sharing disposed of assets e.g. JESE, ACCU, E.A. etc. There should be a criteria for Asset disposal to partners
* Partners should value indirect costs – although it depends on donor policy
* Organize more contracts management meetings with partners
* Visibility opens more doors/opportunities for the partners

 **Open Reflection on Quality Partnerships**

The objective of this session was to stimulate discussions among the participants on where we desire to be in quality partnerships and what actions can be adopted to take us to another level (where we want to be). The following areas were highlighted:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Areas* | Specific Areas |
| *Complementary Partnership:* | * Opportunities for co-funding
 |
|  | * Identify strategies beyond CARE for sustainability
 |
| *Rewarding Partnerships:* | * Renewed mentorship and coaching strategies and approach
* Joint planning and proposal development
* Fundraising for the same work beyond CARE
* CARE to refer the partners to other funders
* Information sharing
* Shared visibility
 |
| *Supportive, not fault finding (positive Criticism)* | * Objectiveness in receiving feedback
* Continuous engagement and reflective meetings/peer review
* Voluntary ownership of fault
 |
| *Respect and improved communication:* | * Timely response to communication
* Regular face to face
* Sharing timely reminders
* Blame game doesn’t work
 |
| *Building Strategic Partnership beyond funding and projects* | * Building the capacity of partners in concept development
* Joint implementation of activities
* Facilitate partner to engage on different spaces
 |
| *Building & engaging IPOs into a collective movement as per the partnership goal* | * Forming thematic working groups
* Profiling/documenting partner’s interventions
* Initiating a communication platform
 |
| *Joint Resource mobilization* | * Building capacity in resource mobilization
* Resource mobilization strategy
* Agree/identify areas for collaboration
 |
| *Trust and compliance:* | * Understanding and adherence to agreements, guidelines, policies and procedures
* Strengthening governance structures
 |
| *Equal mutual Relationships* | * Mutual respect
* clear communication
* Respect for agreement and contracts signed
* Respect for partners policies
 |

*Emerging Comments:*

* Partnership beyond donor funding is key (identify the networks in different coalitions)
* Co-funding (cost sharing with CARE and partners) is an area for consideration
* Application of professionalism is a must.

**Partnership Trends Analysis - Joshua/Noeline:**

This session focused on partnerships trends analysis in the prevailing and future political, socio-economic and operating environment and how to engage differently; keeping in mind where we are going and the challenge before us. The following points were brainstormed:

| Questions | Brainstormed Responses |
| --- | --- |
| 1. What are the current partnership tends in development work?
 | Changing Donor priorities – Competition for donor funds (some regions no longer attractive |
| Focus has shifted on Private Sector(presentation of Business case is required, value for money) |
| Focus on Partnership Building (value addition partnerships) |
| Co-funding is key |
| Shrinking space for civic and NGO work |
| Interest in working with partnership relationships already approved and accredited |
| Policy Framework |
| Registration with the NGO Bureau/not yet already in place |
| Channel of funds through governments (for sustainability purposes) |
| Digital solutions/innovations |
| The Trump Effect |
| Change from MDs to SGDs |
|  |
| 1. What opportunities and challenges exist in the current political social economic operating environment?
 |  |
| CARE’s existence (and its strategic plan) |
| Working in consortium |
| Private sector engagement |
| Government opening up to work with civil society (Recommendation and accreditation) |
| Using the skills within the CARE partnerships to complement each other |
| Donors working directly with national and local NGOs |
| Donors and funders want to work directly with partners |
| Do not compete with each other as partners, reach out to other partners who are knowledgeable in certain areas and work with them |
| Use of Technology |
| 1. Challenges - How do we remain relevant yet everyone is taking same root
 | Hidden Agendas for Donors |
| Dwindling funds from the donors |
| Limited creativity and innovation |
| Digital/innovations overtaking implementation |
| Local fundraising not explored/no commitment to raise funds locally |
| Position ourselves well – e.g. UGMT a platform for governance was closed, we should draw a line where we can stop as CSOs on some contentious issues. |
| 1. How do we position ourselves to remain relevant within the prevailing trends?
 | Developing partnership competencies |
| Flexibility/revise our mission, visions and organizational goals |
| Understanding the new trends and fit in accordingly |
| Creating synergies with critical partnerships |
| Think out of the box on partnership such as partnership with academia/Research Institutions |
|  |
|  |

**Mapping our Potential - Do we have what it takes to be a strong force**

This session was done in Group work and facilitated by Cissy Kagaba (ACCU). Participants in plenary shared about the partnership potential areas currently exhibited and how to organize better and smarter for implementation.

Participants observed that as a partnership we do have what it takes to be a strong force because of the existence of different skills, knowledge, expertise, resources (money), and voice/platforms. We also have the numbers in terms of beneficiaries (VSLA) groups, and bigger geographical coverage. We also focus on different thematic areas that contribute to social change. We have professionals with diverse expertise; our credibility is high in terms of internal assessment; we have the resources especially human resource.

How do we organize ourselves better and smarter to take advantage of the above?

*Group I. presented the following:*

* Join and work with consortiums
* Institutional strengthening/succession plan – governance, functioning systems
* Increased information sharing
* Pro-activeness – Promoting local fundraising
* Innovation and creativity – implementation, joint fundraising
* Adherence and compliancy to the legal and policy framework
* Inbuilt sustainability plan

*In addition Group II shared the following points:*

* Through profiling partner skills and scope of work
* Adopt local fundraising
* Establish strategic partnerships like (Churches, private sector, schools/universities etc.)
* Partnership mapping
* Documentation of success stories
* Joint implementation
* Strong Partnerships with media
* Visibility and publicity
* Networking and advocacy

DAY TWO

**Examining our Partnership Models**

This session was facilitated by Dezi (CARE) and Betty Angiro (UWESO) in group work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 |
| 1. What model of partnership is in place?
 | * CARE is lead agency and sub-grants to agencies (alone)
* In other cases it is implementing the consortium model (joint proposals)
 | * Networks
* Consortium
* Convener
 | * Donor-recipient model
* Collaborative model
* Mutual sharing
 |
| 1. What is cementing this partnership?
 | * Shared vision (all fighting against poverty
* International linkage and network expertise (global experience and local experience)
* Trust, reliability, accountability (shared values)
* Operational systems known to partners
* Capacity building which builds sustainability
 | * Shared vision and concerns
* Trust
* Diverse expertise
* Informal interactions
* Results attained call often for scaling up
 | * Shared vision
* Credibility and trust
* CARE’s purpose
* Resources
 |
| 1. What are the roles of each of the parties in the partnership
 | **CARE**: -Lead agency, accounting agency and ensuring quality assurance, institutional strengthening of partners through technical support, learning, research and feedback**IPOs:** Implementation of activities, accountability and reporting to CARE, learning and feedbackLocal expertise and linkage | IPOs: Based on competences of each of the parties* The profile that CARE gives and IPOs give to CARE
* CARE as convener
* Strong institutional capacities
 | CARE: Capacity building, financial support, linkages to opportunities and strategic spaces, monitoring, documentationPartners: Implementation, collaborative engagement, linkages of beneficiaries, scaling up models (VSLA, RMM), Mainstreaming approaches into other programs |
| 1. How has the current partnership model promoted institutional growth?
 | * Good Reputation
* Resource mobilization through development of new partnerships
* Expertise in areas work
* Systems strengthening e.g. policies, financial management procedures, procurement procedures
* Built networks with other IPO’s and government
 | Institutional:* Actions contribute to mission and vision
* Regular institutional capacity assessment
* Sharing experience and lessons
* Joint fundraising
* Linkages and visibility
 | * Capacity building (institutional)
* Sustainable structures/networks
 |
| 1. Suggest any model you think could be more effective than the current one in order to be more effective
 | Moving from the direct lead model to consortium model ***(see diagram 1.)*** | * Mapping synergies to strengthen collaboration
* Shouldn’t be project based but program
* Think about succession
* Co-opting gov’t onto the PCC framework ***(see diagram 2)***
 | * Enabled reach a wider coverage
* Strategic alliance & partnerships
* Innovativeness and creativity for sustainability
* Ownership of the shared goals for mutual,, benefit
 |

**Diagram 1 Diagram 2**

 

**Building resilient and sustainable partnerships**

What does a sustainable partnership look like for us? How do we become a sustainable body of Partners? Facilitated by Annet (CARE) and Patience Ayebazibwe (AMWA)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Plenary** |
| 1. What will show that our partnerships are resilient and sustainable - Partnership that can stand the test of time despite the shocks and challenges
 | Ability to absorb shocks: e.g. Financial, staff turnover, government threats etc. |
| Responsiveness to tap into opportunities |
| Adherence to legal frameworks – URA, Registration QUAM, NSSF |
| Strength and expertise of partners |
| Partners supporting each other in times of threats |
| Open to innovations, dynamism – Being able to innovate e.g. Branding, selling organization materials (T-shirts, bags, cups) |
| Enhance/embrace networking and collaboration and alliances |
|  |
| ***Becoming a sustainable body of partners*** – having a common vision and values, being innovative and creative at all levels, hold reflection meeting  |
| ***Indicators of Resilient and sustainable partnerships****:*  |
| * Proposition of partners with shared vision & values
 |
| * Number of innovations developed
 |
| * Frequency & Quality of reflection meeting
 |
| * Frequency of information sharing
 |
| * Level of adherence to agreed principles
 |
|  |
| Resilient partnership is ability to withstand shocks and challenges & continue with the partnership |
| Having a variety of funding sources (Local & international) |
| Having own internal sources not donor dependent |
| Partnership and relationship with government/alliances in government |
| Building capacity of staff to have multiple skills |
|  |
| 1. Looking at the current bottlenecks, trends and best practices what is it that we shall do differently to sustain a partnership?

Sustainable PartnershipDo things differently | Enhance capacity across staff – sharing of information |
| Formalization/adoption of All Implementation Partners Meetings and enhance learning from others |
| Create space where the networks meet and deliberate on issues (Annual general assembly of……… |
| Enhance bilateral relationships |
| Review partnership strategies – partnerships be built on projections of what is likely to happen (5 – 10 yrs) to come |
|  |
| The partnership that continues to exist and replicate beyond the terms and conditions of the partnership |
| Genuine information sharing |
| Adherence to agreed common principles |
| Joint resource mobilization |
| Joint Advocacy |
|  |
| Consortium building |
| Joint fundraising |
| Joint advocacy |
| Private sector engagement |
| Digital innovation |
| Engaging Academia, media, government |
|  |
| Effective Communication |
| Joint planning |
| Celebrating Success and challenges, mourning together  |
| Taking ownership and responsibility  |
| Innovation and creativity |
| Recognition of partners. Each other’s contributions |
| Spreading wings with networks |
| Documenting our achievements |

***CARE Partnership model***

In conclusion on sustainable partnerships; Annet made a presentation on the current CARE Partnership model indicating the process of selection and managing partnerships. CARE considers the following areas in their Partnership models – joint venture, alliances, acquisition, and minority interest (ownership*).*

**CARE’s Partnership Goal:** We seek to contribute to broad movements for social change through our work with and strengthening of partners (CBOs, CSOs, government, private sector, learning institutions, networks and alliances). CARE’s engagement in partnering aims to increase the positive impact of the work we contribute to on the lives of the poorest, most marginalized and vulnerable people, i.e., our impact groups.

**Documenting our Story: Delphine & Jenny**

During this session, the Program Director CARE emphasized the power of storytelling and how to communicate in an interesting way about the uniqueness we have and how we can harness this idea. She shared the 2020 CARE vision, and the 5 bold moves for reaching our impact, indicating that as a partnership we should concentrate on ‘**Bold Move #4: Building a Movement through the Power of Story and engagement’** to increase the impact of our work. She observed that it is very important to build the skill of storytelling within partners and CARE staff to enable them tell a clear and compelling story to all key partners/donors etc. In documenting our story we need to know who we are, our goal, values and beliefs (transformation, integrity, diversity, equality, excellence). In terms of messaging – map your message, frame your message and run the story.

In reference to storytelling, Jenny (CARE) provided a presentation on the steps and different types for writing impactful stories. We seek out stories of the people with whom we work to build solidarity and support, disseminating these stories to a number of audiences, from partners to volunteer advocates, to policymakers and donors.

In writing a story we should include the: ‘who, what, when, where, why, and how’. Start a story with the Genesis, progress, successes, and constraints/dilemmas and end with a story of hope for tomorrow – the struggle continues *(See Presentation attached for details)*

In demonstrating commitment for story writing – partners were tasked to present a case story they will write about and submit by 17th September 2017 and the lead persons at CARE were identified as indicated in the Action Plan table below.

**Action Plan: Roles, Responsibilities**

* In demonstrating commitment for story writing – partners were tasked to present a case story they will write about and provide it by 17th September.
* All partners meeting will be an annual event
* A small working group was constituted, and nominated 4 partner organisations (2 women, 2 men), 4 CARE staff, this will be rotational
* Develop TORs for the working group and will be meeting per quarter
* Include indicators in the TORs for measurement of progress (results and impact)
* A joint email group for sharing information will be developed
* Share summary of meeting report
* Partners working on different themes to be together – we need integration, synergy building around projects to inform the task force
* Late disbursement/implementation – get coach, peer support for improvement
* Share the resources we have to enhance the partnership to grow
* Improve on communication

The following were selected to constitute the working group:

*Partner Volunteers - are to nominate one person in each of the following organizations.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Partner Volunteers* | *CARE Staff – on the working committee* |
| 1. APROCEL
2. AMWA
3. WENIPS
4. WORUDET
 | 1. Annet
2. Joshua
3. Delphine
4. Melch
 |

**Building a shared Vision – Delphine**

This session focused on exploring how the shared vision for two years will look like and how it can be sustained. Participants were requested to think through the vision, refine it so that implementation can begin. Participants were taken through several exercises in shaping a shared vision and in four groups the following draft vision statements were crafted. These will be worked on to come up with one harmonized vision statement.

1. We aspire to tap into our uniqueness through connectivity and voice to build a strong alliance.
2. We desire to be a resilient partnership where members are linked, well-coordinated and informed.
3. We want to have a vibrant network of partners for enhanced joint engagement.
4. We aspire to be a dynamic, accountable and responsive, inclusive partnership by 2020

 





**Action Plan**

| ACTION PLAN | EXPECTED RESULTS/ STORY TITLE | RESPONSIBLE PARTNER | RESPONSIBLE PERSON AT CARE | TIMELINE | REMARKS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In demonstrating commitment for story writing – partners were tasked to present a case story they will write about  | **The VSLA Model** | **APROCEL & CARE** | **Annet Kandole (CARE)** | By 17th September |  |
| **VSLA and the Youth** | **KPSD & CARE** | **Jennifer Taaka** | - DO - |  |
| **How Women in Otuke District are grappling with the effect of disasters** | **FAPAD & CARE** | **Noeline Nakibuuka** | - DO - |  |
| **Caring at the Center of institutional growth** | **WEMNET-Uganda & CARE** | **Noeline** | - DO - |  |
| **Advocating for operationalization of the Tree Fund** | **ACODE & CARE** | **Melch Natukunda** | - DO - |  |
| **Youth & Women Economic Empowerment through VSLAS** | **UWESO/CARE** | **Dezi Irumba** | - DO - |  |
| **The success of Role Model Men in championing Gender Equality and women empowerment in northern Uganda**  | **GWED-G/CARE** | **Annet Kandole** | - DO - |  |
| VSLA transforming lives of the vulnerable | WENIPS/CARE  | **Noeline N.** | - DO - |  |
| Degazettement of Namanve - illegal give away of one of the forest reserves | **ACCU/CARE** | **Dezi Irumba** |  |  |
| ***Proposed Titles:*** 1. The evolution of the ENR-CSO Network in Uganda
2. The ENR-CSO Network, from a purely informal to a pseudo formal network engaging on issues of environment and natural resources
3. The evolution of the ENR-CSO Network in Uganda; from a purely informal to a pseudo formal network engaging on issues of environment and natural resources
 | **Environmental Alert (EA)/CARE** | **Joshua Ainabyona** | By 17th September |  |
| WORUDET – My story will be about courageous women who are fighting gender based violence. | WORUDET | **Annet** | - DO - | Sent title only with no storyline |
| JESE – Not yet sent | JESE | **Joshua A.** | - DO - | **??** |
| Contribution of Save up project (2009-2012 ) to the economic empowerment of  Women in Rubirizi  District | COVOID | **Melch** | - DO - | Sent the title only, with no storyline |
| Beyond money: We are wealthy as partners | AMWA | **Melch** | - DO - |  |
| UMWA – not yet sent | UMWA | **Janepher Taaka** | - DO - | **??** |
| All partners Reflection meeting  | **Meeting Preparation & Report** | **All Partners & CARE** | **Working Committee & PD CARE** | Annual - 2018 |  |
| Nominated Working Group 4 partners volunteers (2 women, 2 men), 4 CARE staff | **Working Group Quarterly Meetings** | PARTNERS:APROCELAMWAWENIPSWORUDET | **CARE:**AnnetJoshuaDelphineMelch | Quarterly |  |
| Develop TORs for the working group | **Working Group TORs developed** | **Working Group** | **Working Group** | ?? |  |
| Develop joint email group for sharing information | **Joint email address**  | **CARE PD** |  | ?? |  |
| Partner organisations to write and provide their Project Profile (paragraph) describing what they do | **Partner’s Project Profiles** | **Each IPO** |  | ?? |  |

**Final Remarks:**

* Every partner organization to write and provide their Project Brief (in a paragraph) describing their profile
* Prioritize in-house self-reflection on how we can improve on delivering our mandate
* We need to package information about the (All Partner’s Meeting) initiative on the website - Networks
* Partners implementing Humanitarian work should coordinate with CARE for information and networking
* Local fundraising is an area for consideration – for example fundraising through selling organizational branded materials (bags, T-shirts, Pens etc.) funding can be raised through engaging in consultancies in areas of our expertise. Charity is another area of consideration, the likes of Lottery Club etc. – Can the next story line be about philanthropy
* A request was made for CARE to go beyond their area of focus, focusing on the current partners but also engaging other key partners
* Next Partners’ Reflection meeting will be held in Karamoja

**Participant Feedback - Workshop Evaluation**

Of the 26 participants that attended the meeting, 21 participants filled out the meeting evaluation forms. Of these 16 strongly agreed that the objectives of the workshop were clearly defined while 5 ticked ‘agreed’. 19 strongly agreed that participation and interaction were encouraged while two reported ‘agreed’. 16 participants strongly agreed that topics covered were relevant and timely, while 4 reported ‘agreed’ and one reported ‘strongly disagree’. 11 participants strongly agreed that the content was organized and easy to follow, while 9 just ‘agreed’ and one ‘strongly disagreed’. Five participants strongly agreed that materials distributed were helpful and experiences shared were useful, while 11 ticked ‘agreed’ and 5 ticked ‘neutral’. Meeting room and accommodation were adequate and comfortable – 13 strongly agreed, 7 agreed and one ticked neutral. The meals were adequate and a diverse variety – 11 strongly agreed, 8 agreed while two ticked Neutral.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Responses |
| What did you like most about this workshops | * The engagements, interaction, openness and presentation of content
* Participatory approach, open discussions, ideas shared e.g. encouraging partners to be innovative to seek and work together
* Break-out sessions were particularly helpful, informative
* joint facilitation (CARE/IPO)
* The lessons that kept featuring throughout the 2 days
* The discussions around partnership was spot on and provided a direction on the future partnerships we aspire to have
* The workshop location was good and facilitation skills used were perfect
* The moral of every participant to get into a shared vision
 |
| What aspects of this workshop could be improved? | * Include a review on individual IP work/articles
* Profile of partner organisations should have been shared
* Time keeping
* Sessions felt repetitive, re-alignment of topics to avoid repetition
* Handouts be availed to participants
* Giving people enough time to prepare the presentations
* Lunch was always served very late, this has implications for the results of participants
* Sharing of hardcopies of presentations should be instant – for PowerPoint presentations
* Reduce on the content/topics to allow time for deeper reflections
* Some sessions for instance sustaining partnerships could have been given more emphasis during the workshop
* The PowerPoint presentations were crowed with dull backgrounds and small fonts – improve
* Need for more time
 |
| What additional topics would you like to have discussed in this workshop in future? | * How to engage local government partners
* Lessons from our national and international like-minded partnership
* How to sustain and raise local resources (funds)
* Succession Planning
* Governance issues at IPOs
* Partnership Principles & Local Funding
* More structured engagements on sustainability of NGOs & Partnerships
* Sharing of challenges at partners level for joint recommendation
* Sharing of each organization’s work for more/enhanced collaboration/networking across partners - Share vision, mission, strategic objectives, some successes, strategies used, challenges among others
* The meeting can now begin selecting topics for discussion from members for the next meeting
* Economic Development integration
* Future strategy on partnership between CARE and her partners
* Engendering development
* Humanitarian action/emergency response
* Fundraising strategies – locally & international
* Thematic areas handled per partner, CARE Programs, Local IGA’s
* Financial budget process
* Governance of organizations and organizational development aspects
 |
|  |  |