MASTER TRAINER WORKSHOP REPORT TURIN, 27 APRIL -1 MAY 2015

1. COURSE DETAILS

Location: UN System Staff College, Turin, Italy

Dates: 27 April – 1 May 2015

Facilitators: Valerie Svobodova, Jennifer Kline-Kvernmo, Natalia Pascual, Giovanna Federici, Megan Lind, Jorn Casper Owre

Hosts: NRC, UNHCR, IOM

Number of participants: 28

2. CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

For more than 10 years, one of the main tasks of the global CCCM cluster has been to build competence of CCCM stakeholders working in field operations. A considerable amount of time, energy and resources have been invested to develop field capacity to raise the quality of the interagency CCCM response and ensure effective coordination and management of CCCM operations.

In recent years, new thematic areas of work have been developed within the CCCM cluster including a focus on urban and out of camp populations, referrals and prevention of gender based violence, a renewed interest in participation and accountability to affected populations, and the development of a conflict resolution approach that promotes nonviolent communication principles.

These thematic areas are also reinforced in specific requests for support identified in a capacity building survey conducted during the CCCM retreat 2014. According to the survey the main learning needs identified from CCCM practitioners are gender analysis and prevention of GBV in camp settings. The main learning needs identified in general CCCM thematic areas are community participation and Urban Displacement and Outside of Camps.

3. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The main goal for the workshop was set to reflect on the evolving sector of Camp Management and make recommendations for new topics and strategies for capacity building within the CCCM cluster. With the following objectives 1). A validation of tools and piloting of related training sessions on effective communication, coordination and facilitation. 2). Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes. 3). Building capacity to introduce CCCM methodologies adaptable in urban and outside camp contexts. 4). Strengthen analytical capabilities for CCCM actors to identify, refer and resolve protection incidents including Gender Based Violence.

4. PARTICIPANT SELECTION

The participants were nominated from CCCM missions and shared profile characteristics of expert CCCM trainers with current operational responsibilities within CCCM missions or practitioners with operational expertise. Agencies sending delegates included IOM, NRC, UNHCR, DRC, ACTED and IFRC. Freelance trainers with experience in CCCM operations and capacity building were also included as participants.

5. INTRODUCTION / PECHA KUCHA

The workshop started with a welcome from the facilitators, where the importance of experience sharing in the workshop was underlined. Thereafter, the workshop goals were presented along with objectives and an overview of the proposed agenda. Ground rules were set for the upcoming days. Participants got to know each other through an interactive exercise 'I am'.

The expectations exercise was followed by a Pecha Kucha exchange to highlight who the participants were, where they work, and their expectations for the workshop. "Pecha Kucha" meaning "chit chat" in Japanese is a dynamic way to show pictures and keep to time.

6. NEW REFLECTIONS ON ADULT LEARNING

The first content session of day one was in line with *Strategic Objective 1 – A validation of tools and piloting of related training sessions and presented an overview of adult learning to the participants who had mostly attended CCCM Training of Trainers events over and applied the adult learning principles to their work as camp coordinators.*

Objectives of the session:

- To have an increased understanding of the fundamental elements of adult learning theory

- To identify and reflect on participants' learning preferences

- To appreciate the need to deliver training sessions that cater to all learning preferences

- To recognize how the learning cycle is utilized in training

The facilitator presented a recap on the fundamental elements of adult learning to encourage participants to reflect on their own training style, role as a facilitator, and areas which could be improved in their own understanding and practices in adult learning. Adult learning techniques, such as styles of facilitation and communication of key messages, which were recapped during this session, were practiced throughout the workshop with integrated practice exercises in the sessions on thematic areas. This provided the opportunity to explore ways the new thematic areas in CCCM in relation to adult learning. Within the session, this led to discussions on techniques and guidance on advocacy specifically for CCCM.

The discussion following the adult learning presentation focused on the skill transfer of communication skills to coordination functions of CCCM coordination roles. The group recommended that developing a guidance tool for CCCM advocacy is one area that is currently lacking and would help to apply the skills of adult learning to a broader set of competencies used in CCCM settings.

Recommendations:

6.1 Develop guidance for CCCM advocacy

7. THE STATE OF CAPACITY BUILDING

The next session was entitled "the state of Capacity Building" and was in line with *Strategic Objective 1 – A validation of tools and piloting of related training sessions. The module was divided into three parts and divided in presentation responsibilities between Valerie, Natalia and Jennifer.*

In the first part of the session, the activities and developments of the **Global Protection Cluster's Task Team on Learning (TTL)** were presented as an example platform to discuss how to improve both the organization of learning support systems and development of competencies of cluster specialists. Updates included Cluster Coordinator Trainings delivered in 2014-2015, development of a Protection Cluster Competencies Framework, matrix on existing learning resources, introduction of

a common global training calendar, ToT on protection coordination, pilot of coaching approach, and impact evaluations on training activities.

Discussions centered on capacity building tools for remote coordination, plans to expand the GPC help desk, development of a strategy for national authorities and communities, the possibility of combining CCCM and Protection coordination training, inquiry into whether the CCCM need to develop a similar cluster coordination training using some modules from the Protection cluster, use of capacity building for strategic team building and action planning. There was also discussion on how to bridge the knowledge gap between international and local NGOs, and whether there can be a link between cluster evaluations and training evaluations.

The participants' recommendations followed inline with the presentation of the TTL and were inspired at the organizational follow up to each training event that the GPC provided in support to their learning systems.

Recommendations:

7.1 Development of a CCCM trainers' community of practice and working group

7.2 Create a matrix of existing CCCM learning resources

7.3 Create a help desk for CCCM Practitioners

7.4 Development of a standalone CCCM Cluster Coordination Training and competencies for CCCM cluster coordinators

7.5 Connect CCCM and Protection training packages and capacity building material

7.6 Develop systems for impact evaluations of training events: Follow up with missions, participants and Cluster Coordinators 3 months after training.

7.7 Further development of guidance on contextualization of CCCM training materials in the facilitator's guide.

7.8 Expand reach of CO-LEAD training to include NGOs, as it currently UNHCR specific.

The presentation on the state of capacity building also included a reflection on how the private sector offers capacity building opportunities to their staff. Building upon the **Deloitte Innovation Program** which the IOM CCCM unit was awarded in 2014, the session introduced Deloitte's "4 E's Framework" of Experiences, Education, Exposure, and Expectations in capacity development.

Investigating how *expectations* are embedded with work opportunities; *experiences* are focused on for easy transferable skills and knowledge to job responsibilities; *exposure* is purposefully introduced and linked with tools and technology allowing both structures and forums to be explored; the framework builds a fora where *education* is aligned with the job requirements.

Comparing corporate methodologies to those used by the CCCM Cluster was a useful exercise as it revealed the limited scope of the CCCM cluster capacity development objectives. Currently, CCCM

capacity development has few learning opportunities; the primary objective is of informing participants of what CCCM is, while not exploring how specific knowledge, skills and capabilities of CCCM personnel at the operational, coordination and strategic levels should be improved.

Recommendations:

7.1   It was discussed that to transition to a corporate model, specific roles and key performance indicators would need to be adopted as well as investment in both formal and informal learning opportunities. Specific recommendations regarding moving toward to such a model were made during the plenary discussion._ *The specific recommendations were to:* Shift training model for CCCM to how we do CCCM for different profiles (e.g. coordinators, managers)

7.2   Contribute to mapping exercise of different capacity development approaches

7.3   Review CCCM training methodologies and resources for CCCM trainers (based on field needs and CM Toolkit update)

The next part of the session focused on the **E-learning pilot project** that NRC has facilitated in Latin America. The session provided a general background to e-learning and highlighted how the methodology could be expanded to a broader audience.

Objectives of the session:

- Define e-learning

- Explore the use of e-learning within the cluster

- Describe the e-learning pilot course in the Americas

- Identify e-learning opportunities in CCCM

During the first part of the session the facilitator presented the definition of e-learning, its benefits, the evolution from Learning Management Systems-based courses to MOOC (Mass Open Online Courses), and advantages and disadvantages of e-learning versus classroom trainings. The plenary discussions developed around the wide outreach of e-learning courses, how virtual systems move from centralized and instructor–centered courses to decentralized learning models with learner-led approaches, e-learning tools available, and the benefits of classroom trainings vs online courses. This was followed by a brief presentation on the CCCM e-learning course in the Americas in partnership with IFRC.

The plenary discussions centered on the target group profile, the outcomes of the course, participants' feedback, the framework of cooperation for the pilot, the possibilities of using e-learning with national authorities and the necessary conditions to make it effective and sustainable.

Plenary recommendations following the presentation focused on what steps would need to be taken to expand the current use of e-learning globally.

Recommendations:

> 7.4 Expand the current use of the CCCM website
>
> 7.5 Develop a learning platform with different courses targeting different learners' profiles (e.g. coordinators and managers, national authorities)
>
> 7.6 Analyze the advantages of other agencies' and clusters' learning platforms (UNHCR GLC CCCM course, UN agency for environment, etc.) with a view to expanding CCCM's learning platforms.
>
> 7.7 Revisit the CCCM training corner on the website and include a calendar, request system, training materials, sharing system, etc.

In the last part of the session conducted a presentation on the benefits of the use of **Open Data Kits (ODKs)** in operations (e.g. registration, emergency distributions) and illustrated how this could be adapted for camp managers, for instance downloading the CM Toolkit onto smart phones. IFRC described how they uploaded national Collective Centre Guidelines for use by Red Cross volunteers and field officers. Some participants raised concerns about potential negative impacts of new technologies on community engagement efforts; others argued that emphasis should be placed on staff training (in terms of skills and attitudes when conducting assessments) rather than assessment support.

Recommendations:

> 7.8 Exploring the use of ODK to raise awareness, disseminate and operationalize the use of the CM Toolkit in the field.

8. CAMP MANAGEMENT TOOLKIT PRESENTATION

The last session on day 1 was a continuation of the ***Strategic Objective 1 –*** *A validation of tools and piloting of related training sessions, where the updated Camp Management Toolkit was presented to the participants.*

Objective of the session:

- Introduce the new revised version of the Camp Management Toolkit 2015: process, content, structure, next steps

The presentation highlighted that the new revised version of the Camp Management Toolkit was designed to highlight the Camp Management Agencies' roles and responsibilities for each aspect of the camp life cycle, similar to the 2008 version. The 2015 Camp Management Toolkit differs from the 2004 version as it is endorsed by the Global CCCM Cluster, presents new practices and voices from the field, highlights the role of national authorities as a Camp Management Agency and mainstreams specific issues related to Collective Centre Management in each chapter. The presentation outlined

the development process; starting in 2013 and including the input of 24 contributors and 64 collaborators. The Toolkit was designed as a living document to be regularly updated in an online version (http://www.cmtoolkit.org/).

The plenary discussed focused on the plans for translation in several languages, the importance of advocating for camps as option of last resort, the links between the new version of the Toolkit and the Collective Centre guidance and how to ensure the collection of input and best practices from the field is included in the online version.

Recommendations:

8.1   Translate the CM Toolkit into several languages (including French, Arabic and Spanish)

8.2   Review and update the Collective Centers Guidelines and harmonize with CM Toolkit

8.3   Revisit the CCCM training materials according to the new Toolkit

9. COACHING

In the evening an informal session on Coaching was presented inline with ***Strategic Objective 1 – A validation of tools and piloting of related training sessions.***

The coaching session was facilitated by two participants. The session began with a discussion on the theory of coaching as a state of mind and the methodological process of asking open questions to develop CCCM staff capacity. The presenter emphasized that the "asking" methodology had the added benefit of developing staff's capacities to think on their own and achieve a better result. The facilitators then elaborated on the GROW model which stands for G=goal; R=reality; O=objective; W=will. This model was pioneered in the 1980s by performance coach John Whitmore, and NRC piloted a similarly designed coaching program for self-managed camps in Sri Lanka following the tsunami in 2005, and later in Dadaab in 2006-8.

The plenary discussion focused on how coaching can be phased out, use of indicators and synergies with mentoring programs.

Recommendations:

9.1   Contribute to a mentoring/coaching training package

9.2   Write a 1 pager clarifying terminology related to coaching and mentoring to be shared with CCCM practitioners

9.3   Develop guidance on coaching for CM teams

9.4   Cultivate a coaching and mentoring approach for CCCM practitioners

10. PARTICIPATION

The start of day 2 began with a session on Participation inline with **Strategic Objective 2** – *Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes*

Objectives of the session:

- Analyze how to build different CCCM stakeholders' capacity on participation

- Describe global developments and main findings on community participation

- Identify main modalities of participation in relation to CCCM practice

- Draw lessons learned and recommendations in relation to different context-specific participation systems and tools

The session was structured in two parts; one focused on capacity building and the second on current CCCM practices.

In the capacity building part of the sessions, participants were divided into 4 groups and each group was assigned a different target audience (national authorities, national staff, affected communities and service providers). The groups reflected on what approaches, methodologies and content they would use to convey key messages on participation to their assigned audience in a given scenario.

In the second part of the session, participants were introduced to the main findings the ALNAP paper on *'Engagement of crisis affected people in humanitarian action'* (2014).[1] The paper was introduced by listening to the speech of Robert Chambers, one of the panelists of the ALNAP meeting, introducing this report. Participants were asked to reflect on the speech and share their main reflections in plenary.

The main contents of the ALNAP paper were presented including that the term engagement encompasses a wide variety of activities, levels and types of engagement at different phases in the project cycle, rationales for participation with affected communities and that levels of meaningful engagement in two-way communication activities are often lacking. They were presented to the participants as means to trigger questions and reflections on current CCCM practices in participation and engagement of affected communities. In particular, 3 questions were given to the participants to further analyze what works and what needs to be improved: Are CCCM participation approaches and methodologies rhetoric or reality? Are we listening to the affected community? How do we know if participation is working?

---

[1] The recording of Robert Chambers' speech can be found at http://www.alnap.org/what-we-do/engagement/meeting-2014

Brown, D., Donini, A., Knox Clarke, P. (2014) *Engagement of crisis-affected people in humanitarian action*. Background Paper of ALNAP's 29th Annual Meeting,11-12 March 2014, Addis Ababa. London: ALNAP/ODI.

Participants then discussed and analyzed the complexities of participation in South Sudan, Myanmar and Kurdistan (Iraq). Divided in 4 groups, with a facilitator presenting each case study, the discussions were structured around the following questions:

- Myanmar

What is the role of faith-based national organizations in CCCM and the values and principles of these CMAs that can uphold increased participation?

How to increase and maintain participation in a protracted/active conflict setting where camps are numerous, dispersed and often remote;

How do we maintain the capacity of the local NGOs to promote and capitalize on participation good practices?

How can we increase capacity/participation of camp residents when there is stress on local parishes and host communities due to the protracted nature of the displacement?

- South Sudan: Traditional leadership structures

How do we deal with issues of power and politics?

Do you think the tools proposed can help to minimize leadership issues?

- South Sudan: Inter communal clashes in camps

What could be done differently in terms of community engagement?

How do we incorporate security?

Humanitarian access dimensions in participation/ community engagement

What kind of role do we expect the camp leadership to play in ensuring a safe and secure environment?

- Kurdistan: Politicized camp committees

What kind of participation do we wish to achieve?

How can be balance meeting humanitarian need vs. "empowering" the population?

Are committees the right formula?

- Syrian response: Cross border response

How do we ensure participation in cross border responses?

How can we effectively use new technologies to engage more effectively with camp populations and how will these populations use new technologies to engage with aid agencies?

How can we maintain accountability and cost efficiency (cash transfer)?

The recommendations from the session were derived from a question and answer session at the end of the group work. The plenary debriefing from the facilitator was framed through the lenses of the 3 main questions introduced by the ALNAP paper at the beginning of the session.

Recommendations:

> 10.1   Share participatory tools through the website and the CM Toolkit
>
> 10.2   Develop monitoring tools for participation methodologies (indicators)
>
> 10.3   Develop ToR for impact evaluation of CCCM participatory strategies/ methods

11. NON-VIOLENT COMMUNICATION (NVC) AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

The second half of day two was dedicated to **Strategic Objective 2 –** *Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes and introduced a new topic on Non Violent communication and conflict management for camp management actors.*

Objectives of the session:

- Practice communication and listening skills as essential elements of NVC and conflict resolution

- Explain the NVC model

- Practice NVC methodology

- Describe the mediation process

- Apply the solution diagram for day-to-day conflict situations as a conflict resolution tool

- Identify next steps in learning to strengthen CCCM practitioners' competence in NVC

The Non Violent Communication (NVC) session was structured in 3 parts. During the first, the participants practiced and reflected on communicating with others in group decision-making

processes. Following this, participants practiced their active listening skills, and drew some conclusions about the importance of differentiating facts from evaluation; feelings from thinking, being able to identify and express internal feeling states in a way that does not imply judgment, criticism, or blame/punishment; and connecting with the universal human needs in us and in others that are being met or not met in relation to what is happening and how we are feeling.

This exercise set the stage for introducing the Marshall Rosenberg theory on NVC and how this type of communication contributes to de-escalating conflict. In addition to the three levels of listening (observations, feelings and needs), participants were introduced to the 4th level: how to communicate our needs via "requests".

Participants practiced the use of "I language" (giraffe language) vs. "you language" (wolf language) in different situations. NVC used two animals as symbols: giraffes has the biggest heart of all land animals and has c clear overview and vision due to its long neck, whilst the world represents competitions and languages that judging, criticizing, analyzing and accusing. Giraffe language was presented as unifying whilst wolf language is separating.

The use of these two types of communication skills led to looking at what to do in conflict situations when trainers, coordinators or managers may have to mediate between two parties. At this juncture, the solution diagram in conflict resolution (see Annex 5) developed by Johan Galtung[2] was briefly introduced so that participants could take away a tool (model) where focus is placed in "transcendence" rather than cooperation (win - win scenarios).

The session concluded with a short brainstorming on where these tools could be relevant for participants, how to use them on the ground in their respective roles, and what type of support they would need to put them into practice. The plenary recommendations did not elaborate the specific support that would be needed but the majority of participants felt that the NVC materials could be relevant to both camp managers and cluster coordinators as a methodology to deal with particularly tense and stressful environments.

Recommendations:

11.1   Development of NVC training materials for camp managers to use with their teams or cluster coordinators in opening dialogue for assistance

12. COMMUNICATION TOOLS AND SOCIAL MEDIA

---

[2]Johan Galtung is a Norwegian sociologist, mathematician and the principal founder of the discipline of peace and conflict studies. He has developed several influential theories, such as the distinction between positive and negative peace, structural violence, theories on conflict and conflict resolution, and the concept of peace building among others.

This session was in line with **Strategic Objective 2 –** *Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes. The final session of Day 2 focused on communication tools and the use of Social media for the CCCM cluster.*

Objectives of the session:

- Describe the main global CCCM communications tools and outline their use at global and field   levels

- Link tools to Global Communication Strategy

- Discuss how tools can be improved

The first part of the session started with the participants having to guess the meaning of two figures: 1,200 (monthly visitors to the website) and 84,170 (monthly reached individuals on Twitter). The figures indicated the importance of communication tools and the possibilities they create. The session then focused on explaining, discussing the objectives, and field engagement with the following two functions of the website:

a) Information platform: containing a Workspace, Trainer Corner, and serves as a host for surveys and databases.

b) Field support focus: every active CCCM operation has its own country profile on the website, containing key information as well as links to relevant websites and vacancies.

After that, the session looked into the functions of the global Twitter account:

a) Real-time updates: Through selecting relevant accounts, choosing information and disseminating it to followers of the Global CCCM account

b) Campaigns: creating visibility for global and field initiatives, creating opportunities to engage with donors and potentially attract more funding

c) Disseminate content from the website: With the Global CCCM website as most important communication tool containing all relevant information, we constantly need to strive to link to it as much as possible.

The session concludes with a plenary discussion on current ways of using the website and Twitter, what the possibilities are, how we can improve the website and make it more accessible **Recommendations** from the group focused on improving the ownership of the website for field operations by:

12.1   Seeking content updates, from camp managers, not necessarily Cluster Coordinators

13. URBAN DISPLACEMENT AND OUTSIDE OF CAMPS

Day 3 was thematically focused on the topic of Urban Displacement and Out of Camp responses in line with *Strategic Objective 3 – Present UDOC thematic area of work for CCCM practitioners.*

The objectives of the session:

- Describe UDOC area of work and CCCM areas of expertise relevant for urban and outside camps displacement

- Share lessons learnt and challenges from pilot assessments and other coordination experiences

- Practice introducing UDOC thematic areas of work to stakeholders in specific scenarios

- Gather suggestions and reflections for future work

UDOC (Urban Displacement and Outside of Camp) is a thematic area of work with the Global CCCM Cluster that explores how CCCM methodologies and experiences of camp-based response can be applied to address the needs of the affected population outside camps and has been part of the joint CCCM funding from ECHO the last two years.

The session started with the facilitator presenting the background and current activities of the UDOC thematic area of work within the Global CCCM Cluster. First the UDOC Desk Review that was conducted in 2013-2014 was presented. From the Desk Review, the 5 areas of CCCM expertise relevant to urban and outside camp settings were presented: capacity building, community participation, information management, monitoring and advocacy for key services and protection, and advocacy for durable solutions.

The presentation also highlighted the community outreach centres as one of the proposed response mechanisms for CCCM actors, by discussing how it can address some of the needs of the affected community in term of communication, community engagement and coordination, and by utilizing some core functions and resources normally used in camp-like settings. The outreach model is currently being piloted in Gaza and feasibility assessments are ongoing in Myanmar and Lebanon so as to understand the operational requirements. Lessons learned from the pilot in Gaza and any pilots following the feasibility assessment will be shared.

This was followed by a plenary discussion on the analysis, challenges and dilemmas of this new area of work of the CCCM cluster.

Four case study examples in different contexts in which CCCM actors are engaged in analysis and response to outside camps displacement were presented to the plenary. The case studies addressed the following topics:

- Cooperation between the CCCM and Protection Clusters in outside of camps, with examples from Yemen and South Sudan. Presented by Martha Kow-Donkor, UNHCR South Sudan.

- Assessment and contextual stakeholders in the context of Myanmar. Presented by Kelly Flynn, based on the work of NRC Myanmar.

- Defining CCCM's scope in respect to OCHA, resources and capacity required, with an example from Iraq. Presented by George Swinimer, UNHCR Rapid Response Officer.

- Partnerships in a refugee context with a focus on a neighborhood approach in Lebanon. Presented by Kristin Vestrheim, NRC Lebanon.

The presentations were followed by small group work, which required participants to prepare a presentation of 10 minutes on the case studies. The case studies included presenting a potential pilot project's relevance to a municipality, training CM staff for a future pilot project, presenting the main contents of the Desk Review to senior management and explaining how CCCM expertise could be relevant to support an outside camp response to a Humanitarian Country Team.

The session on UDOC was concluded with a brief overview of some of the most recent and relevant papers, tools and methodologies on humanitarian response in urban and outside camps settings. Plenary discussion suggested the following recommendations based on partnership, the development of specific tools and guidance and the pilot project.

Recommendations:

Developing tools and Guidance

13.1. Add a chapter on UDOC to the CM Toolkit

13.2. Draft guidance on UDOC for training modules, mentorship and tools for CCCM actors

13.3. Translate the CCCM UDOC desk review into Spanish, Arabic and French

13.4. Separate Urban displacement and Outside Camps

Partnership and Consultation

13.5. Explore synergies with new stakeholders including private sector and architecture/urbanism actors

13.6. Seek to have UDOC endorsed by the IASC, OCHA and humanitarian community, clarifying roles and responsibilities across clusters.

13.7. Sensitize donors and key stakeholders at the field level on the UDOC approach

13.8. Establish online forum and thematic groups for UDOC partners and field practitioners

13.9. Develop messages, SoPs and guidance to coordinate with other sectors and clusters, including Rapid Response Mechanism

13.10. Further develop a social media campaign/awareness raising

Pilot Projects (Outreach centres and others)

13.11. Explain link between UDOC and camp based response: avoid pull factors, assistance in host community, preparing durable solution

13.12. Pilot project in rural remote areas and develop specific guidance

13.13. Fundraising for pilot projects from the Global CCCM Cluster

14. GENDER BASED VIOLENCE IN CCCM

Day 4 was dedicated to *Strategic Objective 4 – Strengthen analytical capabilities for CCCM actors to identify, refer and resolve protection incidents of Gender Based Violence. It was* built on the recommendations of the cluster retreat to provide more guidance on gender and Gender Based Violence and was jointly presented and co-facilitated with UNICEF (co-lead to the GBV AoR).

Objectives of the session:

- Discuss roles and responsibilities of camp managers/coordinators and GBV actors noting pressure points and different perspectives;

- See and use tools designed to respond to specific CCCM operational needs in addressing GBV gaps and referral procedures;

- Practice establishing an SOP between CCCM and GBV actors through a role play exercise/simulation;

- Practice training teams on supporting the GBV actors in executing an SOP; and

- Reflect on capacity and learning needs to improve the protective environment in camps and camp-like settings.

Prior to the session the participants were asked to be familiar with the most recent tools and guidance prior to the session and were provided copies of the forthcoming IASC GBV Guidelines chapter on mainstreaming GBV into CCCM and the GBV chapter of the updated version of the Camp Management Toolkit. The aim of the day was to discuss the roles and responsibilities of Camp Managers/Coordinators to prevent and respond to the operational needs and provider of last resort role (gaps) in incidents of GBV in camp settings.

The session allowed participants the opportunity to use observation techniques; conduct a GBV rapid needs assessment; discuss prevention and response analysis in the form of a case study; practice communication skills during an SOP role play simulation between CCCM and GBV actors; and practice facilitation skills during a mini training for their field teams in executing an SOP, the survivor centered approach and confidentiality. It was highlighted that the role of CCCM s is to support the GBV specialist in creating the SOP.

The recommendations that emerged from the plenary summary focused on the existing tools and resources that are available and the participants' familiarity with the topic of GBV in camp and camp settings.

Recommendations:

14.1   Revision of GBV module in training package

14.2   Put GBV resources from sub-cluster on CCCM website.

14.3   Catalogue and map current tools and best practices and create a resource referral document

14.4   Develop guidelines for community level support for prevention and response to GBV

14.5   Develop rapid assessment for non-protection specialists, including key questions that guide the planning of a GBV response.

14.6   Develop guidance for service providers working in camps and mainstreaming gender markers

14.7   Establishing SOP exercise for GBV incident referrals to be replicated with GBV sub coordinators and cluster coordinators

15. REFUGEES AT SEA

In the last day of the workshop there was a presentation of the topic of Refugees at Sea and related to *Strategic Objective 2 – Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes*

Objective of the session:

- To set the scene and discuss possible CCCM support to the Refugees at Sea response.

This session presented the 3 main challenges related to capacity in responding to migrants and refugees at sea. It highlighted how the places of origin; search and rescue; and reception centers need to be simultaneously addressed to ensure a principled and knowledgeable response according to humanitarian laws and standards.

It was highlighted that a response could be improved through a targeted capacity development strategy, while leaving the operational response to mass displacement to Governments, NGOs, IOM and UNHCR. From a capacity building perspective, the facilitator asked participants to reflect on how CCCM practitioners make sure the responders know what to do and how to do it.

The presentation then elaborated the facilitator's perspective on how migrants and refugees at sea could be addressed from a CCCM perspective, by highlighting the experience and relevance of CCCM through:

1. Site management for conflict and disaster affected people temporarily living in communal environments

2. Development of specific technical knowledge, competencies, skills and tools which link legal frameworks with agreed upon humanitarian standards and principles

3. Operational best practice related to reception center and collective centre management.

The discussion then focused on how CCCM could bring this about by advocating for international protection norms and technical standards, using a rights-based approach and employing the CCCM framework that ensures services and assistance provision to affected populations.

The plenary group then discussed the potential role for CCCM. Participants enthusiastically agreed with the presentation and elaborated that training of personnel and management to build resilience; capacity development should take place on ships and for reception centers managers. Others highlighted the needs for guidelines specific to the context and surge capacity. Participants further suggested particular support to reception centers and camps in Lampedusa, Ceuta, Greece, Bulgaria as priority action areas.

Recommendations:

15.1 Capacity development of shipping industry and reception center staff

15.2 Developing protocol/ standard operating procedures for shipping industry and reception centers' staff related to site management

15.3 Providing comprehensive training, NFI and other assistance as requested

16. ROSTERS

Following this a brief presentation non the CCCM Roster was made under *Strategic Objective 2 – Updating on new approaches and methods related to the implementation of cross cutting themes*

Objective of the session:

- To provide information on and discuss prospects of the CCCMCap Roster

This session explained the CCCMCap Roster and how it is maintained. By providing the background on why it was developed, the presenter illustrated how it aims to improve cluster surge capacity in providing rapid and expert emergency support to field operations. The session was practically organized by explaining the set up, functionalities, and goal of global responsibility that is closely connected to capacity building.

Key discussion points during the plenary were on sustainability of the roster and professional development in the CCCM sector. Participants also highlighted some of the key challenges identified in trainers' deployment and the areas of improvement that are being addressed as a cluster in order to transition from a reactive system which is mostly request driven, to one where a trainers' profile is better match to field needs. Some of the initiatives undertaken as cluster in this regard are the new NRC database.

Recommendations:

16.1   Further development of ToT training materials

16.2   Map specific skills of trainers on the roster

16.3   Revisit idea of building regional pool of trainers

17.   ACTION PLANNING IN CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

The final session was an action planning session where specific crosscutting training materials and checklist were discussed. Topics address included Disabilities and Elderly, LGBTI persons, and Protection Mainstreaming.

The results of the Protection Mainstreaming suggested modifications including:

- Inclusion of urban and outside camp contexts,

- Format that focuses on a camp lifecycle rather than a program life cycle,

- Mentioning boys and men to ensure their inclusion in GBV responses,

- Mentioning remote management, and

- Staff misconduct related to complaint and feedback mechanisms.

Group work on LGBTI highlighted the need to include a definition of LGBTI in the CM Toolkit, as well as further develop CCCM tools and guidance on LGBTI persons of concern. The group discussed issues related to the identification of LGBTI persons and their specific needs and participation mechanisms.

Persons with Disabilities highlighted the need for more practical advice on inclusivity, including more on people with disabilities, guidance on working on mobility in a camp and participatory assessments (including blindness and mental illness), developing camp management perspectives on attitudes required in staff, linking community involvement systems to individuals and linking activities to higher level planning and strategy.

Recommendations:

17.1   Organize a ToT for CCCM actors on Protection Mainstreaming

17.2   Revision of checklist on Protection Mainstreaming

17.3   Include definitions of LGBTI in CM Toolkit

17.4   Expand guidance on LGBTI

17.5   Develop guidance on working on mobility in the camp for those with disabilities

17.6   Request a ToT from Help Age for CCCM actors on Persons with Specific Needs

18. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAYS FORWARDS

This session aimed to provide a format for the group of CCCM practitioners (trainers, capacity-building professionals) to take responsibility toward the recommendations coming from the workshop and build upon their expertise in the field and support the Global Cluster through commitment and specific engagement on the recommendations that resulted over the week.

The session started with a plenary presentation of the ideas, feedback and recommendations made over the course of the workshop. These were presented in two lists, one 'CCCM in Progress' for those related to already ongoing or planned Global Cluster activities. The second list, 'CCCM Global-level action points', consisted of recommendations to the Global Cluster on activities and ideas that have not been planned. See Annex 4 for the full lists.

Following this, two participants facilitated the session and focused on recommendations focusing on areas participants could contribute as a group of CCCM practitioners (see Annex 3). The participants were then given the opportunity to indicate their three priority areas of CCCM interventions. The three most highly ranked areas were to create a capacity building support team/working group, coaching of CCCM practitioners and development of training materials and guidance on non-violent communication. Secondly, they identified the three areas of intervention where they wished to contribute their skills, talents and experience in taking that action/recommendation forward. Following the session, the votes were tallied and recorded for future post-workshop action planning. This will be shared with participants via Dropbox.

19. COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE AND CLOSING SESSION

The closing remarks highlighted that the workshop has created a community of practice, in which master trainers had shared experiences, inspired and learned from each other as well as discussing new techniques and ways forward in CCCM. This was demonstrated through an exercise where the connections between participants was symbolized by each participant unraveling part of a ball of string, saying what they will take with them from the training and apply to their role, then passing the string to another participant, creating a web symbolizing the community of practice.

20. EVALUATIONS

1.   I thought the duration of the course was:

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Too long	Too short

7%	36%	21%	14%	3%
Comments: Course could have been shorter and/or some sessions should have been shorter (7) Duration was appropriate to cover the information and objectives (5) Too short as participants were cut short in sessions (1)				

2.   I found the time given to lectures and discussions appropriate:

Completely agree	Mostly agree	Somewhat agree	Disagree	
3%	43%	29%	7%	
Comments: More time for discussion was needed (6) GBV section was too long (2) Discussions and/or group work were too long (2) Agenda was unclear (1)				

3.   What is your level of satisfaction with the course?

Completely happy	Mostly happy	Somewhat happy	Somewhat unhappy	Completely unhappy
18%	39%	25%	0%	0%

Comments:

Objectives of the training and sessions were not clear (1)

Agenda needed to be developed with participants (1)

Needed more case studies (1)

Needed to be more challenging – adult learning was too basic (1)

Happy with reconnecting/meeting with colleagues (3)

Expected to know more about new approaches (1)

Time management was very good (1)

Happy to able to contribute to shaping CCCM and direction for further development (1)

4.   Did the course fulfill your expectations?

Completely	Mostly	Somewhat	Not at all	
12.5%	36%	32%	0%	
Comments: Needed more in depth information on thematic areas (2) Expected more on capacity building techniques and developments (6) Expectation to get an update of thematic issues were met (1) Expectations met in relation to meeting, learning from or being inspired by colleagues were met (3)				

5.   I found the teaching methods used (video, discussion in small groups, interactive teaching, etc.) during the course to be:

Excellent	Very Good	Good:	Satisfying	Unsatisfying

11%	29%	27%	9%	
Comments: Too many group exercises/ group work (2) Quality varied as the content of some session were " off topic" (1) Too many PowerPoints (2) Good diversity of techniques (4) Liked to have a training focal point (1)				

6.   Did the course strike the right balance between theory and practice?

Completely	Mostly	Somewhat	Not at all	
9%	45%	27%	2%	
Comments: More practice was needed/ the course was too theoretical (3) More case studies needed (1) Required reading should have been sent earlier (1) Felt there were too many exercises and discussions that allowed participants to express themselves (1) Liked to be more challenged on the training skills and creativity (1)				

7.   Will you have the occasion to apply the knowledge acquired during the course to your work?

Definitely	To a certain extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	

36%	36%	11%	0%	

Comments:

Will apply NVC (1)

Will apply UDOC (2)

Will apply learning of Protection Cluster training group (1)

Will have the occasion depending on the context and missions in the field (3)

8.   How will the course help you in your actual job?

- Will be able to outline, explain and/or apply new concepts and tools (5)

- Will be able to apply the training methodologies and tools (5)

- Will use UDOC approach in particular (4)

- Will incorporate GBV (2)

- Will incorporate NVC (1)

- Better clarity, awareness and knowledge of CCCM topics (2)

- The course, including UDOC, will help in creating awareness and expanding response. (1)

- Will inform further priorities in their work (1)

- Networking and meeting colleagues (1)

- Will apply linking Shelter to CCCM (1)

- Better network to go to in need of support (1)

- Makes them a better professional (1)

9.   Are there any specific subjects that should be eliminated or cut short?

- Adult learning should shorter – too basic / repetition of ToT. (7)

- All aspects of training were useful (3)

- GBV should be shorter (3)

- Participation should be shorter (2)

- NVC should be shorter (1)

- Roster should be shorter (1)

- Refugees at sea should be shorter (1)

- Subject should have focused on concrete practical application tips – from the 'what' to the 'how' (1)

- Topics don't need to be shorter but could be used in a different way, such as case studies (1)

10.   Are there any specific subjects that should be added to the course programme?

- Practicing/focusing on specific training modules, especially GBV and Protection (5)

- Case studies (2)

- Recommendations that were made (1)

- CCCM Rapid Response Mechanisms and tools (1)

- Latest training techniques (1)

- Persons with disabilities (1)

- Coordination (1)

- Homogenization of tools for the cluster (1)

- Addressing issues between agencies in CCCM (1)

- Livelihoods (1)

- Durable solutions (1)

- Psychosocial support (1)

- More time on refugees at sea (1)

11.   Are you satisfied with what you learnt during the course?

Completely	Mostly	Somewhat	Not at all	

27%	30%	18%	0%	
Comments: Level was not high enough (1) Interacting with other participants was useful (1) Great effort (1) Catalyst for further learning (1)				

12.   What is your opinion of the lecturers?

- Good facilitators (6)

- Engaging (3)

- They were well prepared/ planned well (2)

- Knowledgeable (2)

- Attentive / open to participants (2)

- Instructions were unclear (1)

- Professional (2)

- Some had patronizing tone (1)

- Needed more flexibility in time management and agenda content (1)

13.   What was your most positive experience in the course? What were the strong points of the course?

- Meeting, discussing and learning with/from CCCM colleagues (13)

- Discussions and exercises on UDOC (8)

- Discussions and exercises on GBV (6)

- Learning about tools, resources and methodologies (3)

- Discussions and exercises on NVC (2)

- Discussions and exercises on LGBTI (1)

- Practicing skills (2)

- What was your most negative experience in the course? What were the weak points of the course?

- Agenda was too packed/ Time management (4)

- Some sessions were not relevant/too simplistic, adult learning in particular (4)

- Objective of the training was not clear/ inconsistency (4)

- Discussion could have been more in depth (3)

- Session of adult learning too basic/ repetitive of TOT (1)

- Not enough case studies (1)

- Attitude of some participants (1)

- Not enough time for feedback (1)

14.   Did you find the venue and classroom of the course favorable to sharing ideas and experiences?

Completely	Mostly	Somewhat	Not at all	
61%	14%	0%	0%	

16.   How would you rate the quality of the material provided at the Course (e.g. books, notes, documentation, and hand-outs)? To form your rating and comments, also consider whether they were relevant, useful, sufficient and provided at the right time?

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfying	Unsatisfying
29%	7%	0%	4%	0%
Comments: Good to have printed copies to take to the field (1)				

17.   Please comment on the role, availability, helpfulness, professionalism of the staff.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfying	Unsatisfying
29%	29%	4%	7%	
Comments: Good admin support (2) Good facilitation (3) Lack of coordination between facilitators and courses (1)				

18.   On the basis of the questions asked above, express your satisfaction of this course using a 0 to 10 scale (0 being not satisfied at all and 10 being completely satisfied):

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	**Average**
0	0	0	0	1	1.5	0.5	6	6	2	0	**7.3**

19.   Any other comments?

- A very good training (1)

- Course helped become aware of mistakes made as a trainer and how to avoid them (1)

- Increase human resources of Spanish speakers in your roster (1)

- Clearer agenda and gender balance (1)

- Honored to have you as colleagues and looking to what the future holds (1)

Name	Title/Job	Agency	Duty Country	Email Address
ASTRID ARNE	CCCM CAP	NRC	N/A	astridsarne@gmail.com
VEIT VOGEL	CCCM trainer/expert	NRC	Myanmar	veit.vogel@nrc.no
RAFAEL ABIS	CCCM trainer/expert	NRC	Myanmar	rafael.abis@gmail.com
KELLY FLYNN	CCCM trainer/expert	NRC	Myanmar	kelly.flynn@nrc.no
KRISTIN VESTRHEIM	CM Advisor Lebanon	NRC	Lebanon	kristin.vestrheim@nrc.no
ANNAMARIA FONNEGRA	Trainer/Consultant	Independent	N/A	anamaria@fonnegragerlein.com
CAROLINA MANSUR	Trainer/Consultant	Independent	South Sudan	caro.mansur@gmail.com
KATRINE WOLD	CM Global Advisor	NRC	Norway	katrine.wold@nrc.no
DAVID PREUX	Rapid Response Officer	IOM	Switzerland	dpreux@iom.int
ANDREA PAIATO	Operations Officer	IOM	South Sudan	apaiato@iom.int
STEPHANIE DAVIOT		IOM	Nigeria	sdaviot@iom.int
FLORA CAMAIN	Information Management Officer (CCCM)	IOM	DRC	fcamain@iom.int
FRANK SANTANA		IOM	Haiti	fsantana@iom.int

GEORGE SWINIMER	Rapid Response Officer	UNHCR	Global	swinimer@unhcr.org
ORIANE BATAILLE	CCCM expert/trainer	UNHCR	N/A	orianebataille@yahoo.fr
DHER HAYO	Cluster Coordinator	UNHCR	Turkey	hayo@unhcr.org
HENOK OCHALLA	Livelihoods Officer	UNHCR	Kenya	ochalla@unhcr.org
MARTHA KOW-DONKOR	Protection Officer	UNHCR	South Sudan	kowdonko@unhcr.org
MAI BARAZI	Consultant	UNHCR	N/A	maibarazi@hotmail.com
HALA ALHORANY	Head of Office	UNHCR	Sudan	alhorany@unhcr.org
MARAN NAU TANG	Assistant Field Officer	UNHCR	Myanmar	maran@unhcr.org
ISLA FRASER	EMPACT emergency response team member	DRC	Denmark	Isla.empact@drc.dk
CLEMENTINE FAVIER	CCCM Cluster Co-lead / ACTED SSD Deputy CD	ACTED	South Sudan	Clementine.favier@acted.org
SEAN MC GIRK	Head of Programs	ACTED	Turkey	sean.mc-girk@acted.org
FRANCESCO RANCATI	CCCM Cluster State Focal Point – Lakes State	ACTED	South Sudan	francesco.rancati@acted.org
MARIE BERIOT O'CONNELL	CCCM Mentorship PM	ACTED	Iraq (KRI)	marie.beriotoconnell@acted.org
SANTIAGO LUENGO	Shelter Emergency Officer	IFRC	Mexico	Santiago.luengo@ifrc.org

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Morning (9.00 – 13.00)	Introductions Expectations Objectives Agenda Pecha Kutcha The state of capacity building	*Recap Day 1* Participation session	*Recap Day 2* Urban Displacement and Out of Camps (UDOC)	*Recap Day 3* Gender Based Violence in CCCM	*Recap Day 4* Mind the gap Action planning in cross-cutting themes: Mainstreaming protection Gender mainstreaming Psychosocial support LGBTI Persons with disabilities and elderly
Afternoon (14.00 – 17.30)	New reflections on adult learning CM Toolkit presentation	Participation and capacity building (Continuation) Non Violent Communication and Conflict resolution	UDOC presentations	Gender Based Violence. Practicing Negotiation skills	Final recommendations and ways forward
Evening session	Coaching in humanitarian	Communication tools and social media		Refugees at sea	Dinner in town

ANNEX 3: CCCM COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

CCCM in Progress:

- Translation of the Toolkit

- Translation of the CCCM UDOC desk review in Spanish, French, Arabic

- Create a map of the CCCM Global team on the website

- Revisit CCCM training corner in the website (include calendar, request system, materials sharing system, etc.)

- Capacity building impact evaluation

- Sensitization and dialogue on CCCM UDOC with cluster leads, OCHA, development actors, etc.

- Share UDOC approach at the field level

- Prepare standard briefing presentation that can be used to present UDOC to other clusters and OCHA

- Revision of GBV module in training package

- Increase awareness of GBV module among the trainers

- Developing and sharing monitoring tools for participatory methodologies (specify and clarify who, how)

Global CCCM Cluster (recommendation for CCCM Cluster to prioritize and work on):

- Develop a guidance for CCCM advocacy

- Endorsement of UDOC (Clusters leads, agencies, OCHA, IASC, internal IOM and UNHCR)

- Sensitive donors on UDOC

- Reach out CM practitioners for updates

- Review guidance collective center and harmonize with CM Toolkit

- Help desk for CCCM practitioners

- Revise CCCM coordination modules

- Develop learning platform with courses for different participant profiles

- TOT for CCCM actors on protection mainstreaming

- Revision of checklist on protection mainstreaming

- Establish a capacity building working group

- Shift training model for CCCM to how we do CCCM for different profiles as coordinators, managers

- Include definitions of LBGTI in CM Toolkit

- Contribute to more resources on handicapped standards

- Put GBV resources from sub cluster on website

CCCM Trainers /Community of practice (with final endorsement of Cluster Agencies required):

- Contribute to mapping exercise of different capacity development approaches

- Contribute to a mentoring training package

- Review CCCM training resources for CCCM trainers (based on field needs, and CM Toolkit update)

- Develop capacity building material and guidance on NVC and conflict resolution for field (national staff, community)

- Guidance on targeted assistance on UDOC intervention (specify and clarify who, how)

- Guidance on coaching for CM teams

- Evaluation of CCCM participatory methodologies (academic partnerships)_

- Sharing participatory tools/methodologies on participation in the Toolkit on line (hosted in participation chapter of CM Toolkit space)

- Mapping existing learning resources (who, by which country, focal points)

- Create a community of practice on capacity building / teacher's corner

- Contribute to creating a capacity development support team (map needs of CC vs CM, revisit tools, share materials, best practices. Contribute to common on line calendar for CB events

- Coaching CCCM practitioners (methodology, agency focus, linked to NORCAP)

- Contribute to guidance for mentorship and capacity building on UDOC

- Adaptation of CCCM training modules and tools for the UDOC approach

- Detailed lessons learnt docs from on-going implementation of CCCM outside camps activities

- Social media package for UDOC

- Include more technical actor related to architecture/urbanism background in the discussions about the UDOC approach

- Explore linkages between UDOC and RRM/RRMP (UNICEF)

- Link UDOC to camps strategy: avoid pull factors, assistance in host community, preparing for durable solutions

- Link UDOC with DRR

- Develop a dedicated UDOC module to integrate within the current CCCM training package

- Guidance for the implementation of UDOC

- Create thematic groups involving field practitioners tasked to work on specific tools related to the UDOC approach

- Contribute to LGBTI guidance for CM Toolkit

- Chapter of the CM Toolkit on UDOC

- Link CCCM and protection training packages/ capacity building material

- Hyperlink to tools

- Pilot UDOC pilot projects in rural/remote areas

- Sensitise donors on UDOC

- Contribute to guidance for mentorship and capacity building on UDOC

- Evaluation of participatory methodologies

- Revision of protection mainstreaming checklist for CCCM

- Clarify Roles &Responsibilities on urban response across clusters