

# - Summary Report -

## Quality & Accountability Facilitation Workshop for CARE's Standing Team & Regional Emergency Coordinators

23-27 February 2009, Geneva

### Introduction & Background

In February 2009, the CARE Emergency Group (CEG) hosted a week-long workshop aimed at CARE's Standing Team of Quality and Accountability Advisors (ST) and Regional Emergency Coordinators (RECs). This workshop was designed to both improve competencies of CARE's Standing Team members in the five technical areas outlined in the Standing Team's "Offer of Services"<sup>1</sup> and enhance participants' facilitation skills. RECs were also invited in their role both as potential facilitators of After Action Reviews (AARs) and as coordinators/supporters of ST deployments.

The workshop agenda is attached as Annex 1 to this report. Following an introductory day and a facilitation self-assessment session, each of the participants took turns in presenting the technical sessions either individually or in groups of two and at the end of their session "invited" participants to provide them with verbal feedback on areas of where the facilitation was good and where it could be improved. Each day started with a summary of the previous day. The workshop resulted in an agreed set of action points. The workshop was held just prior to CARE's meeting to launch the second phase of the ECB Project and thus provided an opportunity to feed into the development of CARE's performance plan. The workshop was evaluated very positively by the participants.

### Objectives

The objectives of the workshop were:

1. Clarify expectations on the role of the Standing Team;
2. Exchange perspectives on facilitation competencies;
3. Share and develop team knowledge in the five ST technical service areas;
4. Develop a common understanding of quality and accountability and associated messaging;
5. Define how RECs can coordinate and provide support before and during ST deployments;
6. Provide relevant inputs to various CARE internal and external (e.g. ECB) planning processes;
7. Team building.

### Participants

The workshop was attended by 7 members of the ST and 4 RECs.<sup>2</sup> Four of the seven ST members had signed on during the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the ECB Project, the three others had been recruited at the end of 2008. The sessions on facilitation techniques (Days 1 and 2) were led by an external facilitator.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Annex 13 - Standing Team "Offer of Services" was developed in 2007 during the first phase of the ECB Project

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 2 (list of participants).

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 3 (report prepared by Sean Lowrie, independent consultant).

## Overview of the sessions

**Day 1 (morning):** Welcome; introduction/expectations; Review of the emergency landscape, humanitarian reform, and progress on implementing the CARE SD#1 Emergency Strategy; Clarifying roles of ST members in supporting SD#1

This session highlighted the importance of accountability in CARE's humanitarian work and the critical role of the ST in this respect. Areas highlighted by the recent mid-term evaluation of CARE's emergency strategy as needing improvement, including stronger linkages between relief and development, were also discussed. Finally, a presentation was given on the existing emergency strategy, which focuses on capacity building and capacity development.

**Day 1 (early afternoon):** Overview of how the ST works: imagining deployment scenarios and ST requirements for each

The discussions during the first part of this session centered on the importance of having an accountability framework that helps to put to put interagency standards, such as the Sphere minimum standards and Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) standard, into practice and the implications of "compliance". The second half of the session was used to present outcomes and challenges related to three ST deployment scenarios (development of accountability system after a major disaster; After Action Review (AAR); Real-Time Evaluation).

**Day 1 (late afternoon):** Conversation about facilitation skills and interpersonal aspects of the standing team role; identify the topics for tomorrow, and preparation

This session was facilitated by an independent consultant, Sean Lowrie. Prior to the session, the participants had completed a self-assessment form.<sup>4</sup> During the session, participants openly discussed areas of concern and the challenges they face during a deployment. Based on this dialogue, the facilitator helped the participants compile a list of themes (areas for improvement) to be addressed the following day.<sup>5</sup>

**Day 2 (morning and early afternoon):** Constructive feedback, peer review, self-awareness, and continuous learning; Mini-sessions

The facilitator presented the participants with a background document entitled 'Golden Rules of Facilitation'.<sup>6</sup> Participants then discussed the value and role of constructive feedback, as well as how to give and receive feedback. For the 'mini-sessions', ST members facilitated a 30-minute discussion/exercise about facilitation.<sup>7</sup> Each presentation was followed by a peer-review.

**Day 2 (late afternoon):** Lessons about facilitation; individual learning and development plans; preparation for technical sessions

The debriefing on facilitation identified the core of facilitation (how to make the conversation happen; how to facilitate to get content out of conversation; how to summarize all the inputs; how to stimulate

---

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 4 (self-assessment form).

<sup>5</sup> Interpersonal skills, negotiating expectations, group dynamics and organizational politics, creating environments of safety, balancing tensions. See Annex 3 for more detail.

<sup>6</sup> Tolerate the anxiety that ambiguity produces in you; summarize the evolution of conversation; be curious and ask; trust your instincts.

<sup>7</sup> The topics were: building trust; negotiating expectations; stimulating a passive group; creating an environment of safety; balancing the tension in a facilitator's role.

and to be subjective) and action points (one-on-one talk; different projections; don't expect to make changes in the field). At the end of the afternoon, participants were given time to prepare their technical sessions.

**Day 3 (morning):** *Technical session 1: After Action Reviews*

The facilitators of this session presented the steps and components of After Action Reviews (AAR) and identified a list of action points.<sup>8</sup> The participants were then divided into 3 groups: agenda review and objectives; lessons learned; recommendations and action plans. Each group identified several action points.<sup>9</sup>

**Day 3 (early afternoon):** *Technical session 2: Evaluations*

After a presentation on the objectives, definition, and types of evaluations, the participants split into two groups to discuss the donor perspective and the CARE perspective on evaluations respectively. The implications for the ST<sup>10</sup> and their roles and responsibilities in evaluation<sup>11</sup> were identified.

**Day 3 (late afternoon):** *Technical session 3: Training and awareness-raising on the Good Enough Guide, Sphere etc.*

The objectives of this session were: familiarization with the CARE "Good Enough Guide"; training module on accountability and impact measurement (AIM); and familiarization with HAP and Sphere. The participants discussed each of these tools in turn, with particular attention to the definitions of accountability<sup>12</sup> and impact measurement. CARE-specific training on accountability was seen as an important element in ensuring CARE's accountability. This session included a presentation on HAP by HAP's Membership Services Coordinator, Barb Wigley.

**Day 4 (morning):** *Technical session 4: How to establish accountability systems*

The facilitator stressed the importance of clearly communicating HAF/benchmarks to target audiences and ensuring they understood their role and responsibilities in implementation and compliance. During subsequent group work, the participants designed trainings on accountability for three audiences: 1) field staff and local partner staff; 2) senior management; 3) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Coordinator.<sup>13</sup> It was agreed that typically two key M&E gaps are seen during in emergency responses: either 1) not much of an M&E capacity exists; or 2) some M&E capacity exists, but there is little knowledge or experience on how to adapt systems to an emergency context. Next, the participants brainstormed the following aspects of an accountability system: essential components; purpose; major gaps at CI level; drivers; and entry points.<sup>14</sup> Various outstanding issues were identified, including the revision of the terms of reference (ToR) for early deployment,<sup>15</sup> process flow chart for deployment,<sup>16</sup> reporting lines,<sup>17</sup> and partnership and accountability.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> No description on AAR in Toolkit; how to involve external participants: technical service and communities; lessons learned on accountability, quality and standards; how to make improvements on the intervention have a basic guideline; background preparation agreement on what type of actions we need in AAR.

<sup>9</sup> See Annex 5 (Technical Session 1: AAR – outcome of group work).

<sup>10</sup> Help ST define purpose; develop checklist of key elements of evaluation; policy relates to HAF; ensure resources in advance; argue for specific case; help focus on what needs to be done as ST.

<sup>11</sup> Ensure good preparation for evaluation; evaluation tools; bring accountability out; gender issues; affected population of a value-added for ST; feedback system on evaluation results to community.

<sup>12</sup> C.f. "Good Enough Guide", p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> See Annex 6 (Technical session 4: How to establish accountability systems – outcome of group work).

<sup>14</sup> See Annex 7 (Technical session 4: How to establish accountability systems – outcome of brainstorming).

<sup>15</sup> Action point 3.

<sup>16</sup> Action point 2.

<sup>17</sup> Action point 5.

**Day 4 (afternoon):** *Technical session 5: Reflective processes and participatory reviews & audits*

A guest speaker from the Sphere Project gave tips on conducting training on the Sphere handbook (e.g. build the workshop on what is relevant to the participants), and discussed the challenges of compliance with Sphere standards (e.g. competing standards/indicators). The application of Sphere standards is context-dependent, hence there is no compliance mechanism. In groups, the participants discussed the principles and logistics related to SCHR peer-review and participatory accountability review (e.g. Sphere, HAF).<sup>19</sup> The need for clear ToR for ST,<sup>20</sup> synthesis of lessons learned,<sup>21</sup> and a pilot accountability review were suggested.<sup>22</sup>

**Day 5 (morning):** *ST processes; protocols; funding; CERT deployment; performance management*

During this session, CEG's intermediary role in ST deployment was explained. The CARE Emergency Response Team (CERT) roster<sup>23</sup> and its similarities and differences with the ST were also clarified. Next, in groups, the participants listed the steps of deployment (pre, during, post).<sup>24</sup> The participants worked on defining the ST mandate, with one group looking at the ST ToR and another comparing a CARE ST deployment with an inter-agency deployment.<sup>25</sup> Finally, the need to clarify the mechanism and process of ST deployment was emphasized by the participants, particularly with regard to responsibilities for covering cost of ST deployments.

**Day 5 (early afternoon):** *Lessons learned: how accountable are we? Evaluation lessons, SCHR peer review, lessons from early deployment*

In groups, participants reflected on how committed CARE is to being accountable and identified mechanisms to operationalize the recommendations that had been targeted at CARE following the SCHR<sup>26</sup> Peer Review of humanitarian accountability. Each group focused on organizational policies/leadership, programming tools, and measuring accountability respectively. The need to raise awareness of accountability and build country office capacity to use tools to implement and measure accountability were emphasized.

**Day 5 (late afternoon, part 1):** *Strategic issues; how RECs provide Q&A support; inputs to various processes*

The participants identified the areas of responsibility of RECs.<sup>27</sup> During small group work participants discussed the implications for CARE's HAF of findings and recommendations resulting from the recent mid-term evaluation of CARE's emergency strategy.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Action point 9.

<sup>19</sup> See Annex 8 (Technical session 4: Reflective processes and participatory reviews & audits: Outcome of group work).

<sup>20</sup> Action point 3.

<sup>21</sup> Action point 6.

<sup>22</sup> Action point 7.

<sup>23</sup> This is a list of people who have signalled themselves as being available for rapid deployment (within 72 hours) and for deployments that would range from a few weeks up to 3 months. ST members are registered on the same system (tool will be ready in a few weeks), but they will not appear as available for rapid deployment. See <http://www.care-international.org/Download-document/109-All-About-CERT> for more information.

<sup>24</sup> See Annex 9 (Technical session 5: ST processes; protocols; funding; CERT deployment; performance management: Outcome of group work).

<sup>25</sup> See Annex 10 (Technical session 5: ST processes; protocols; funding; CERT deployment; performance management: Outcome of group work (2)).

<sup>26</sup> Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response

<sup>27</sup> Backstop COs emergency response; improve emergency preparedness at CO and regional level; monitoring threats and emergency conditions; capacity building of COs; support relevant CI initiatives: climate change, DRR and Sector specialists; represent CARE in relevant regional events and debates on clusters, UN reforms and humanitarian funding.

<sup>28</sup> See Annex 11 (Strategic issues; how RECs provide Q&A support; inputs to various processes: outcome of group work)

**Day 5 (late afternoon, part 2):** *Next steps and group accountability; workshop evaluation*

Action points raised during the week were categorized under 3 headings (ST general; ST deployment; ST & REC common issues) and 8 priority areas were selected. Next, specific responsibilities were assigned to follow up on priority action points. As summary of next steps is attached as Annex 12.

Results from the evaluation of the workshop confirmed that participants felt that the objectives had been met and that the design had proved to be very appropriate and constructive. An improvement suggested by several participants was that five days in a row was found to be too much by some participants. Suggestions ranged from providing a half-day break in the middle of the week, to ending after 4 ½ days to extending the number of days by including a weekend. One participant suggested the latter option since this had been his first time to Geneva and would have liked to look around a bit more.

**List of Annexes**

Annex 1 – Workshop Agenda

Annex 2 – List of Participants

Annex 3 – External Facilitator’s Report “The Art and Craft of the Standing Team”

Annex 4 – Standing Team Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Annex 5 – Technical Session 1 (After Action Review) group work summary

Annex 6 - Technical Session 4 (Establishing Accountability Systems) group work summary

Annex 7 - Technical Session 4 (Establishing Accountability Systems) plenary brainstorming summary

Annex 8 – Technical Session 5 (Reflective processes, participatory reviews,...) group work summary

Annex 9 - Standing Team deployment protocols, etc. - work summary Group 1

Annex 10 - Standing Team deployment protocols, etc. - work summary Group 2

Annex 11 – How RECs support Q&A activities (ST deployments) – group work summary

Annex 12 – Next Steps, Roles & Responsibilities for follow-up

Annex 13 – ST TOR (2007 version)

## Annex 1 Agenda

	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday	
<b>Morning</b>	Welcome  Introduction/ expectations  Review of the emergency landscape, humanitarian reform, and progress on implementing the CARE SD#1 Emergency Strategy. Clarifying roles of ST members in supporting SD#1	JB  JM HS	Constructive feedback, peer review, self-awareness, and continuous learning  Mini-sessions <i>ST members facilitate a 30 minute discussion and/or exercise about facilitation. Each followed by peer review</i>	SL	Technical session 1 After Action Reviews	HH AN	Technical session 4 How to establish accountability systems	CS YR	ST processes Protocols Funding CERT deployment Performance management	SR ??
	<b>Lunch</b>		REC lunch with HS/DS							
<b>Early afternoon</b>	Overview of how the ST works: imagining deployment scenarios and ST requirements for each	JB	Mini-sessions (continued)	SL	REC Separate Session	Technical session 2 Evaluations (ST only)	?? ??	MS ??	Lessons learned: how accountable are we? Evaluation lessons, SCHR peer review, lessons from early deployment	TT ??
<b>Late afternoon</b>	Conversation about facilitation skills and interpersonal aspects of the standing team role.  Identify the topics for tomorrow, and preparation	SL	Lessons about facilitation. Individual learning and development plans  Preparation for technical sessions	SL  Participants	Technical session 3 Training and awareness raising on the Good Enough Guide, Sphere etc.	LT ??	REC Separate Session		Technical session 5 Reflective processes and participatory reviews & audits	Strategic issues How RECs provides Q&A support Inputs to various processes
									Next steps and group accountability Evaluation of this week	JB

JB – Jock Baker, JM – Jon Mitchell, HS – Holly Solberg, SL – Sean Lowrie (external facilitator), HH – Hauke Hoops, AN – Alio Namata, LT – Lise Tonelli, CS – Clare Smith, YR – Yves-Laurent Regis, MS – Michael Schroll, SR – Sarah Ralston, AM – Ayman Mashni, MK - Mohammed Khaled, AS – Amadou Sayo, GK – George Kurian, TT – Taheeni Thammannagoda, DS – Daniel Seller

**Annex 2**  
**List of participants**

**Regional Emergency Coordinators (RECs)**

Amadou Sayo - REC, south & west Africa  
Hauke Hoops - REC, Latin America region  
Mohammed Khaled - REC, east & central Africa  
Taheeni Thammannagoda: REC, Middle East & Europe

**Standing Team Members**

Ayman Mashni, CARE USA  
Michael Schroll, CARE Zambia  
George Kurian, CARE India  
Alio Namata, CARE Niger  
Clare Smith, CI-UK  
Yves-Laurent Regis, CARE Haiti  
Sarah Ralston, CARE USA

**CARE Emergency Group**

Jon Mitchell  
Jock Baker  
Daniel Seller  
Holly Solberg  
Lise Tonelli

# The Art and Craft of the Standing Team

A report from the meeting of CARE's Standing Team of quality and accountability advisors in Geneva Feb 23-27, 2009

*Prepared by Sean Lowrie, independent consultant, info@seanlowrie.com*

## ***Overview***

This report has two goals. For the CARE International Secretariat and its Standing Team of Quality & Accountability advisors, this report documents some of the key issues that arose during the initial days of first meeting for the Standing Team (ST) and the CARE Regional Emergency Advisors (REC). In the spirit of transparency and shared learning, this report has also been written for advisors to the Emergency Capacity Building Project within the other IWG agencies. The first section documents the meeting process, the second identifies the issues that arose during the first two days of discussion, and the third highlights some main messages about facilitation and the nascent art & craft of the Standing Team (ST).

## ***The process***

A self-assessment questionnaire (annex 1) was sent out to meeting participants about one week prior to the event. The questionnaire encouraged reflection on: the attitudes and skills of a facilitator; and their competence in the five main technical methods of the standing team (after action reviews, evaluations, training workshops, reflective processes and audits, and accountability systems). The event itself consisted of five days, with the agenda (annex 2) offering a progression of topics as follows.

**First**, the context for the meeting was set by presentations of the contemporary humanitarian response environment, humanitarian reform, and elements of the organisational strategy.

**Second**, plausible deployment scenarios for the ST were created.

**Third**, a sense-making conversation about the role and requirements of the ST resulted in five issues requiring further discussion.

**Fourth**, participants divided into groups with each responsible for managing a problem solving discussion about one of the aforementioned issues. At the end of each discussion, the facilitator was given constructive feedback on their technical skills by the group.

**Fifth**, an overview of CARE's performance against quality and accountability commitments was presented, drawing on results from the SCHR peer review.

**Sixth**, participants divided into groups to explore each of the five technical methods so as to: (a) agree the expected procedure, and (b) share experience and generate knowledge. At the end of each of these technical sessions, the facilitator was given constructive feedback on their performance.



*Finally*, the place of the ST inside the organisation was explored and next steps agreed. ***It is important to highlight that an environment of peer feedback and learning was created. This 'critical friendship' encourages self-awareness, and demonstrates the required level of group safety and accountability for full participation and knowledge generation to occur.***

## ***The role and requirements of the Standing Team***

When the ST is deployed, the individuals are required to achieve a robust understanding of the situation quickly. Not only does this understanding apply to the crisis context, but it applies to the culture and people in the 'client organisation' on the ground. Simultaneously, the ST individuals need to build trust quickly with their clients, establish effective working relationships, and engage productively with the relevant power structure. These are ***sophisticated interpersonal skills***. Paradoxically, while the ST is deployed with urgency, successful behaviour in this area seems to be about listening and observing – and managing the urge to produce results quickly. Preparation is important, as is demonstrating that the ST is not a threat but an ally. Engaging with the Country Director (CD) is important, and must respect their competing demands.

A second area of interpersonal competence is in ***negotiating expectations*** with the client organisation / Country Office (CO). It may be that the CO wants more from the ST than the ST can deliver. It may equally be that the CO is not clear about what it wants from the ST. In this case, the ST will need to help facilitate clarity about goals first, and then negotiate expectations. Once the ST and the CO are clear on their respective expectations, mutual accountabilities will need to be negotiated. This is a significant amount of negotiation and a degree of ambiguity is to be expected. This ambiguity will stem from the workload of a Country Office during a crisis. The CO is overworked and usually doesn't have the space to think through carefully what it wants from the ST. Moreover, the nature of crises is such that goals often evolve. The paradox should be clear. Everyone would prefer to nail down a clear and unambiguous agreement between the ST and the client CO prior to deployment, but due to the realities of emergency work this often proves to be impossible.

A third critical area for Standing Team members is in engaging with ***group dynamics and organisational politics***. At one level, ST members are perceived to be technical experts in quality and accountability systems. Staff of a client CO can defer to this perceived expertise. Yet, the goal is for the CO to drive and own the work of the ST. The challenge for the ST is about stimulating engagement in a potentially passive audience. Each ST member will have to adopt an engaging way of working that exploits their strengths and personal style. At another level, ST members will be required to perceive and manage hidden conflict and power issues in the CO that influence quality and accountability. Conflict is a natural part of life, and can reasonably be expected to accompany the changes associated with new organisational systems. To some degree, ST members will need to be able to perceive and respond to this.

A fourth area of interpersonal skill in the standing team is in ***creating environments of safety***. Safety is critical for learning. Explained simply, when people feel there is a safe space to express their thoughts and feelings, productive knowledge generating conversations can occur. An area of concern for ST members is around the variety of CO working cultures they might encounter. To what degree are ST members obliged to take action when they experience a CO working culture that contravenes the organisational accountability standards and ethical principles?

Finally, as can be construed from the discussion above, the practice of ST members when deployed can be viewed as a managing set of competing interests. Here are three examples. ST members are part of the same organisation as the client CO, but they are also independent. ST members are technical experts, and they are neutral facilitators. ST members are catalytic change agents, trying to achieve local ownership and they are accountable for making change happen. ***Balancing these tensions*** will be an inherent part of the ST craft. While ST members will have to clarify the ambiguities in their role as often as possible, they will also have to make contextually appropriate decisions about managing these tensions. A fourth tension may be about scope of ambition, organisational complexity and pragmatism. A realistic outcome from a ST deployment may not, on the surface, appear to be of sufficient complexity. ST members may need the confidence and courage to defend their decisions upon return to HQ, and they may need robust organisational support to enable that courage.

### ***The art of facilitation and the craft of the Standing Team***

CARE is refining its technical methodologies for Standing Team deployments, and there are plenty of toolkits to provide the basic framework and techniques for facilitation. Missing is some guidance on how to manage the relational aspects of facilitation. Standing Team members are organisational change agents. Change is an exciting, threatening and challenging process for organisations and employees. At the core, I believe the Standing Team needs to be highly adept at interpersonal relationships.

Here are some concluding thoughts therefore, on the craft of the Standing Team:

- Be very clear on your objectives
- Tolerate the anxiety that accompanies an ambiguous conversation
- Summarise frequently
- Be curious and ask questions
- Trust your instincts
- Play to your strengths

**Annex 4**  
**Self-assessment form**

# Self assessment questionnaire

*CARE Standing Team and REC Retreat Geneva 2-6 March, 2009*

---

*Greetings! In a few days, you will be sharing knowledge at the first CARE International Standing Team and REC Retreat. This questionnaire will help you prepare for the retreat in two ways: as a self-assessment tool, and as an orientation to the discussions of the week. Try to find about half an hour of quiet time to complete this questionnaire. When you do, think about the skills you feel confident about, and skills you would like to build upon in the future. The questionnaire will be for your personal use, and please bring it with you to the retreat. Please also come to the retreat prepared to talk about the technical methods identified in part 2 of this questionnaire. In particular try to identify a few good examples, stories or anecdotes. Kindly note that everyone is required to lead a discussion about one of the technical methods. Jock Baker will contact you about the topic you are interested in leading. See you soon.*

## Questionnaire part 1 – Facilitation skills

1. To what degree is safety important for meetings and workshops?

*Please rate each statement on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1=strongly disagree with the statement and where 4= strongly agree with the statement*

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>				<b>Strongly Agree</b>			
The job of the meeting facilitator is to manage process and ensure the agenda is addressed within the planned timeframe.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Facilitators should deal with disruptive behaviour swiftly and conclusively	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
“First impressions” that occur when people meet for the first time, can linger and influence the results of an entire workshop	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
A facilitator should try to gain an understanding of the participants and their needs prior to the workshop	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
A facilitator that fails to show respect in even the most subtle of ways will have difficulty in producing results	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Diverse groups will progress through a discussion more slowly than a homogeneous group.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
If a facilitator loses track of a group discussion, or is having difficulty in understanding what is being said, they should keep quiet and wait for the group to come to an agreement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

2. Some ideas about facilitation competencies

The table below contains a list of ideas about facilitation. Score each twice. First, in your personal opinion, how important is this idea to facilitation success. Second, rate your competence in this area. (1= Very Low, 2= Low, 3=High, 4= Very high). If there are important ideas which are not on this list, please add up to three more and score them in the same way.

Ideas about facilitation competencies	Importance of this to facilitation success			My personal competence in this area		
	Low		High	Low		High
Identify the client, clarify your objectives, and their needs	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Design a process that is appropriate for the context	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Identify participants and understand their needs early	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Select clear methods that provide variety and entertainment	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Plan for an appropriate physical meeting environment	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Create and sustain a participatory environment	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Encourage diverse perspectives	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Demonstrate active listening	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Facilitate group self-awareness about its task	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Guide the group to consensus and desired outcomes	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Build and maintain professional knowledge	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Model positive professional attitude	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3
Act with integrity	1 4	2	3	1 4	2	3

3. Identify three aspects of your facilitation style which you would like to review and for which you would like to receive feedback during the standing team retreat

I \_\_\_\_\_

II \_\_\_\_\_

III \_\_\_\_\_

**Questionnaire part 2 – Technical methods**

*Please identify your state of readiness to conduct each of the following five technical methods. Rate your competence level for a new emergency environment, and identify the important things that ensure this method will improve quality and accountability in a CARE Country Office.*

**A – After Action Review**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level 1 Awareness	Level 2: Understanding	Level 3: Experienced	Level 4: Embedded and improving	Level 5: Excellent capability established
I am aware of this method, but do not understand how it works.	I understand the basic principles of AARs and how it works, but have not participated in one	I have participated in at least one AAR, and could describe to others how it works and the results it produces	I have facilitated at least one AAR and have identified ways I can improve my use of this method	I am a confident AAR facilitator, and am thinking about modifying the method to best suit my personal facilitation style

*Please list at least three important things that in your opinion contribute to a successful AAR*

## B – Evaluations

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level 1 Awareness	Level 2: Understanding	Level 3: Experienced	Level 4: Embedded and improving	Level 5: Excellent capability established
I know about evaluations, but have never seen one happen	I understand the basic intent of evaluations, and have observed other people conduct evaluations, and may have been interviewed for an evaluation	I have participated in at least one evaluation team	I have participated on several evaluation teams and can discuss what makes for an effective evaluation	I have led evaluation teams and have opinions about improving evaluation performance

*Please list at least three important things that in your opinion contribute to a successful evaluation*

## C – Training and awareness raising on the Good Enough Guide, Sphere etc.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level 1 Awareness	Level 2: Understanding	Level 3: Experienced	Level 4: Embedded and improving	Level 5: Excellent capability established
I know about training and awareness raising, but have little personal experience, even as a participant	I can discuss what makes for a good training workshop, but have never facilitated one	I have facilitated at least one workshop or meeting and am seeking other opportunities	I have facilitated several workshops on Q & A tools, and am actively developing my skills	I feel confident in front of groups, regardless of the subject

*Please list at least three important things that in your opinion contribute to a successful training workshop*

### D – Establishing new accountability systems

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level 1 Awareness	Level 2: Understanding	Level 3: Experienced	Level 4: Embedded and improving	Level 5: Excellent capability established
I know about accountability systems but am unable to describe how they work in practice	I have discussed in detail what a good accountability system looks like	I have observed an accountability system in action, and can describe it to others	I have worked to establish a new accountability system, and have opinions about different ways of doing it	I have helped establish several accountability systems, and could lead a project in this area

*Please list at least three important things that in your opinion contribute to effective accountability systems*

### E – Reflective processes and participatory reviews and audits

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level 1 Awareness	Level 2: Understanding	Level 3: Experienced	Level 4: Embedded and improving	Level 5: Excellent capability established
I have heard about participatory reviews, but don't understand what they are	I have talked about participatory reviews, or have read about them, but have never seen one in action	I have been in a participatory review workshop, and can describe what happened	I have facilitated at least one participatory review workshop and am seeking more opportunities to practice	I have facilitated several workshops and am actively experimenting with different ways of doing it

*Please list at least three important things that in your opinion contribute to effective participatory reviews*

**Annex 5**  
**Technical session 1: After Action Review**  
**Summary of group work**

**Agenda review and objectives**

- Objectives:
  - Identify lessons learned and make action-oriented recommendations to enhance CARE Haiti's ongoing and future EPP.
- Agenda:
  - Non negotiable aspects of the response to be reviewed
  - Positive and negative lessons learned
  - Achievements and challenges
- Action points:
  - How to improve CO Programming
  - What's applicable for CO and what are transferrable lessons learned
  - Have a report format
  - Revise the objective?

**Lessons learned**

- Develop minimum set of themes
- How to develop lessons (get into survey's result)
- Ensure lessons are specific
- Identify shared key lessons and share with stakeholders
- Ensure subject matters expert in discussion groups
- Action points:
  - How to manage resource person/experts– clarify their role
  - Clarify what are lessons learned, build a common understanding

**Recommendations and action plans**

- During the preparation phase:
  - Identify how AAR is in line with CO strategic directions and capacity.
  - Discuss who will be invited
  - Community participation including staff
- During the workshop:
  - Recommend participants why they are there
  - Being realistic on priorities
  - Splitting groups (thematic, department, etc)



**Annex 6**  
**Technical session 4: how to establish accountability systems**  
**Summary of group work**

**Field staff and local partner staff**

- Why is accountability important?
- How do you apply it?
- What kind of issues come up in your country related to accountability?
- Introduction to *Good Enough Guide*. (go through particular points – read them out and discuss them) – issue of translation?
- Use lessons learned from other Country Offices.

**Senior management**

- Introducing self (role, etc.)
- Self-assessment – what Country Office does/has in place in regular programmes in terms of accountability.
- Introduce HAF by linking it to other programme principles, standards, policies, and tools.
- Non-negotiable aspect. E.g. introduce humanitarian mandate and some protocols.
- How can we support you?
- Get buy-in from senior management.

**Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator**

- Build the trust, communicate how important HAF is, how to translate values into action.
- Explain the main components of HAF, develop good understanding of at least one benchmark as a model, talk about indicators.
- Explain what compliance means (internal and external process).
- 'Mentoring' on how to operationalize HAF – giving staff the real capacity/competency to carry on the work.

**Annex 7**  
**Technical session 4: how to establish accountability systems**  
**Outcome of brainstorming**

**Essential components**

- System made up of different parts/elements that are inter-linked. E.g. tools/resources/people, time, principles/benchmarks, clarification of individual roles and responsibilities of staff
- Financial accountability and governance systems
- Not a check-box system

**Purpose of having an accountability system**

- Increase our comparative advantage.
- Perceptions others have of us.
- Evidence for advocacy.
- Promote change (continuous improvement).
- To increase transparency and external communication (cost-benefit analysis).
- Increased coordination.
- To implement
- To measure compliance
- To make adjustments
- How we add value to humanitarian mandate

**Major gaps at CI level**

- No information disclosure policy
- No 'organisational' complaints mechanism

**Drivers**

- External d
- rivers. E.g. One World Trust
- Leadership concern about "profile" – how we are perceived, the resource implications
- Implication: what is the cost benefit? (Business case)

**Entry points**

- M&E: opportunity to collect feedback; including compliance monitoring
- Emergency Preparedness Planning (EPP)
- Emergency strategic planning

**Annex 8**  
**Technical session 5: Reflective processes and participatory reviews & audits**  
**Group work summary**

**SCHR Peer Review**

Method/activity	Definition/purpose	when implemented?	approach/participation	remarks	approx cost
<b>external peer review</b>	process to review and facilitate organisational learning in order to improve policies and performance	no specific timeframe - depends on objectives.	two or more agencies (or members) conducting HQ and/or field reviews. Involve senior staff, partners?	tools: appropriate mix of desk review, FGD, KII, field visits, community assessments	from travel costs - \$15,000
<b>internal peer review</b>			as above, except between different parts of the CARE confederation.		

**SPHERE Audit/Review, HAF Review**

Activity	Description	Purpose	when?	approach	Time	cost	Role of ST	remarks

<p><b>Participatory accountability review</b></p>	<p>to use CARE's HAF to review a response through the lens of accountability (to disaster populations)</p>	<p>to analyse compliance with HAF</p> <p>to generate an action plan for improvements</p> <p>to build capacity of staff</p>	<p>no specific time frame</p> <p>Example s: midterm of project, at end of project to inform next phase, before an AAR, LRSP.</p>	<p>between 10-25 CARE and partner staff make up the review team</p> <p>External representatives can be invited to join the review team</p> <p>ST (external facilitator)</p> <p>internal facilitation from within CO</p> <p>review includes feedback from community groups and other stakeholders</p>	<p>3-5 days</p>	<p>\$10,000 (with external facilitator)</p>	<p>to facilitate review</p> <p>to extract transferable knowledge and ensure this is disseminated</p>	<p>(focusing on a project, sector, disaster affected population, etc.)</p>
								<p>aim is to review project lens of acct. Entry point is CARE HAF.</p>

								Can use various tools such as SPHERE, CEG.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Annex 9**  
**Standing Team processes; protocols; funding; CERT deployment; performance**  
**management**  
**Outcome of group work**

### **Pre-deployment**

- ST members should all be copied on alert [ST can register to receive info]
- Advertise opportunity to all ST including non-CARE ST [Jock/Clare – send people depending on strengths, also professional development]
- Expression of interest (from ST members) and copy line managers
- Updated CV, arrangement of back-stopping [ST member – update every 6 months, send to Marc]
- ToR best shared with advertisement, request it if not already shared
- Briefing on CO, security, logistics, etc. [REC?]
- In-country counterpart identification [Jock/Clare]
- Negotiate the level of authority (reporting lines)
- Get visa [LM at HQ level, CO letter of invitation – process should be clarified during initial contact with CO (Jock), CEG working on list of visa requirements]
- Negotiate salary/other costs [based on policies of each member]

### **During deployment**

- Orientation/briefing
  - Finalise ToR (objectives, expectations, deliverables)
  - Security briefing
  - General briefing (briefing to ST member on CO; briefing on ToR to CO staff)
  - Supplementary document review
- Develop workplan (key!)
- Defining the purpose of your visit and who needs to be involved, including:
  - Review existing activities
  - Decide who participates
  - Itinerary [logistics]
  - FGDs, KIs, meetings/debriefs
  - Training events [who is the audience? Etc.]
  - Make time for reflection and documentation [regular meeting with counterpart, rest of team]
  - deliverables
- Senior management roles/responsibilities
  - Briefing/debriefing, approval of workplan
  - Agreeing on how processes and deliverables fit with ongoing CO processes/work
  - Define “format” for deliverables
  - Confidence in and ownership of results
  - Management response
  - Define role of lead member/RMU [follow-up?]
- Handover/exit strategy
  - Initial findings (ideally) validated by staff and partners and finally by senior

- management
- Action plan agreed with senior CO management to identify resources for follow-up (people, funds)
- Facilitate discussions on how to integrate follow-up into AOP, IOP(s)
- Agree on follow-up and monitoring processes

### **Post-deployment**

- Exit/debrief interview should be before departure
- Performance appraisal and technical sheet (also preferably undertaken before departure)
- Psychosocial support (before, during, after) [provided by the employer? CARE Austria/USA/Canada have external support system (network of counsellors, but there may be language issues; contact info in CET; CEG to implement soon!)]
- Workload v. need to rest upon return from deployment
- Remote support to CO (coaching; need to clarify what you can do; depends on type of deployment; accountability systems may need some support; \$ built in budget for additional costs; translation)
- Reports (for CO, for learning purpose), verbal debrief (Jock, REC?)
- Effective sharing/learning of experience and lessons learned when back from deployment; could conflict with CO/homebase (CO, RM, ST, HQ) priorities/time

**Annex 10**  
**ST processes; protocols; funding; CERT deployment; performance management**  
**Outcome of group work (2)**

**ST ToR**

- Recommendations specific (pre, during, post) to be included in the ToR document
- Reference to HAF, Humanitarian Mandate in the overall objective
- Reference to organisational learning, ongoing initiatives, CARE structure (relationship)
- Reporting responsibilities
- Suggestion for document to be called 'Memorandum of Understanding'

**Difference between CARE ST deployment and inter-agency deployment**

- More time for preparation
  - Understand how agency works
  - Report to a team leader (lead agency)
  - More communication to motivate agency to participate
  - Identify host agency in case of SPHERE review, prepare logistics, organise meeting
  - Funding – in consultation with ECB
  - CARE is ahead of the game (e.g. pre-release agreements in place)
- Jock/Clare responsible for feeding back outcomes of this workshop to ECB



**Annex 11**  
**Strategic issues; how RECs support Q&A activities; inputs to various processes**  
**Outcome of group work (2)**

**Group 1**

R1

ST members need to have minimum understanding of DRR and conflict sensitivity  
How to implement CARE's HAF through partners  
Opportunistic engagement in EPPs

R4

How soon does it make sense for ST member to go in after an emergency event

R5

First wave (Team leader/Emergency advisors, info manager, media) should be aware about HAF and ST, especially need to involve communities.

**Group 2**

R6

Capacity development  
Work with REC to identify potential capacity building in the region and link it to CO.

R7

System and mechanism in place for response  
Help review the EPP  
Integrate external needs (communities)

R9

Capacity and competencies development  
Incorporating REC and ST learning from the region

**Annex 12**  
**Next steps, roles and responsibilities for follow-up**  
**Summary of brainstorming**

<b>Action point</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Action to be taken</b>
1. Cost recovery	Jock, Daniel	Communicate ST messages/concerns to CARE staff working on cost recovery policy.
2. Process flow chart for deployment (preparations for exit strategy)	Clare, Mohammed	prepare checklist, check format in toolkit
3. Template ToRs for ST deployments and case studies	Clare	set up accountability system and AAR ToRs and guidance
	Ayman	drafts on ToRs and Guidance of evaluation and RTE
	George	draft training TOR
4. Role of RECs in pre-deployment/post-briefing	Taheeni, Mohammed, Clare	Complete work on protocol
5. Reporting lines for ST members		Make sure reporting lines are clear, finalize ToRs; counterparts should be able to do the work after deployment; need to have a report and be ware of it
6. Improve communication, sharing and learning		Try a ST call, WEBEX
7. Piloting accountability reviews (ST)	Michael	check with CD on how to fit this into strategic review
	Sarah	Promote HAF during planned visits to various CARE COs
	Alio, Yves-Laurent	follow up
8. Transparency/information exposure (RECs)	Jock	Share draft of information disclosure policy
9. Partnership and accountability	Amadou, Alio	

## **Annex 13 - Standing Team Terms of Reference (2007 version)**

### **Accountability and Impact Measurement Initiative of the Emergency Capacity Building Project**

**Overall Objective:** As a standing team, we will work towards achieving results by promoting good practice and building capacity on accountability and impact measurement, using the agreed basic elements, and providing feedback to the seven agencies.

We will work in collaboration with the advisors, standing team members and ECB staff, through:

1. Championing accountability and impact measurement in our agencies
2. Undertake joint deployments (e.g. multi-agency evaluations, after action reviews) and facilitating the deployment of others
3. Being accountable to one another and our agencies by feeding back learning and sharing experiences on impact measurement and accountability

#### **Responsibilities**

1. Champion accountability and impact measurement in our agencies
  - Gather, share and encourage good practices within our specific agency networks
  - Identify agency specific resources (such as suitably skilled people) to support the standing team objectives
  - Facilitate the field testing of good practices in accountability and impact measurement
2. Undertake joint deployments and facilitate deployment of others
  - Develop ToRs for team members defining roles, responsibilities and expected outputs of deployments.
  - Work with agency advisors to identify opportunities and appropriate people for deployment
  - Contribute to the country team's development of the event specific ToR
  - Document the process and outputs of the deployment that contribute to answering the following two questions:
    - How is accountability to local people practiced in emergencies?
    - How is impact measurement practiced in emergencies?
  - Where possible, help train and coach field teams in the areas of accountability and impact measurement.
3. Share learning within the agencies on working together, impact measurement and accountability – both in terms of process and outcomes
  - Provide concise documentation of the deployment, with recommendations, learnings, and brief/discuss with both the field team and interagency advisors
  - Identify and share agency-specific knowledge with the IWG agencies, as appropriate
4. We will be accountable to each other to share experiences and good practice.
  - Hold regular meetings/teleconferences and/or use e-mail group lists to share problems and provide solutions (possible methodologies to use are peer assists or action learning sets).
  - Invite other standing team members to deployment debriefs to share experiences.

#### **Core Competencies**

Good writing skills  
Good listening skills  
Good communication skills  
Field experience in emergencies

Working knowledge of key humanitarian standards  
Experience applying DM&E tools  
Committed to accountability and impact measurement  
Team player  
Culturally aware  
Respect for diversity  
Good training, facilitating and/or mentoring skills  
Analytical skills  
Leadership skills