

Annex E Feedback from participants at the de-briefing workshop

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Conclusions</i>
<i>What purpose would such meetings have?</i>	The purpose would be to maximize impact of the ROI funds and avoid any kind of overlaps. The meetings would also serve the purpose of being able to feed experiences into policy levels especially via the NSP.
<i>What would the agenda be?</i>	<p>Agenda points:</p> <p>Share information especially from the provincial levels.</p> <p>Discuss problems encountered and provide examples of how these were solved.</p> <p>Discuss best practices from the field.</p> <p>Making the Embassy aware of issues which should be taken to the Government/policy level.</p>
<i>Who should host the meetings?</i>	<p>The Embassy will be hosting when meetings are held in Kabul.</p> <p>In the provinces the meetings will be hosted by partners taking turns.</p>
<i>What could the role of the Danish Embassy be?</i>	The Embassy is expected to initiate the first partner coordinating meeting, facilitate the Kabul based meetings, host the meetings and take the lead in organising them.
<i>How often should the meetings take place?</i>	Meetings in Kabul every six months, hosted by the Embassy. In case of urgency, additional meetings can be proposed.
<i>Could the meetings take place at provincial levels as well?</i>	Yes, the group would like to see quarterly meetings in the provinces. Partners who are present in the province will take turns to arrange the meetings. This would include: Hosting, chairing and circulate minutes. The meetings could also be combined with visits to field sites. Issues discussed at provincial levels would feed into the semi-annual meetings at the Embassy in Kabul.
<i>Can other stakeholders participate?</i>	Yes, it should be possible to invite other stakeholders as well, for instance specific government agencies.
<i>Will the added value of meeting and strategising together outweigh the transaction costs involved?</i>	Yes, it will be worth it. The transaction costs will be limited because of the low frequency of the meetings and that partners participating in the provincial level meetings will only be those who are present in the province. Central level staff and Embassy staff will not participate in provincial level meetings.
<i>How to involve the new ROI partner DRC who will be working in the urban areas? All other ROI activities are for now at least in the rural areas.</i>	It is expected that there will be many common issues to discuss and exchange experience on regardless of whether you work in rural or urban areas. For instance: targeting of most vulnerable, how to deal correctly with female headed households, how to hand over projects to communities, how to work best with Government.

When should this start?

Such coordination mechanisms should start now. This will be beneficial to all of us as we are in the process of developing new proposals for the ROI Phase 2b. We will then be able to discuss between us how the proposals jointly best serve the ROI purpose.

The evaluation team held a debriefing workshop for the Embassy and ROI partners at the Serena Hotel, Kabul on October 5th. A total of 15 representatives participated. This included participants from the current four ROI partners as well as country representatives from DRC. After the presentation of the initial evaluation findings there was a brief discussion. Following this the workshop participants were asked to discuss three issues:

- Coordination and collaboration between ROI partners
- Capturing of lessons learned within ROI
- How do we better reach our target groups?

The conclusions and individual concerns mentioned below are deduced from the discussions in plenum amongst all workshop participants.

E.1 Group 1: Coordination and collaboration between the ROI partners

Whereas some coordination takes place between the partners at provincial levels there are only limited efforts made to bring partners together at the central level. Assuming that a closer interaction between the partners will be beneficial for the overall performance of the ROI programme please discuss how this can be best done.

Table 17 (on previous page): Issues discussed in Workshop Group 1

It could be an indicator in the new ROI programme document that the Embassy should host two such coordination meetings a year and document issues arising from these.

Some participants felt that if we do not start coordinating during this formulation phase then do we really need a coordination mechanism under ROI? We can meet in so many other fora with partners with whom we have more in common than the ROI partners. So, it should be part of the formulation exercise or not at all.

E.2 Group 2: Capturing of lessons learned within ROI

As the ROI program progresses and experience emerges, it becomes increasingly important to gather, share and learn from the lessons emerging. The individual ROI partners all have well tested internal progress reporting procedures and various ways of updating and capacity building own staff. However, the evaluation has not come across any evidence suggesting that efforts are made more collectively across the ROI partners to gather lessons learned and formulate possible best practices when working with returnees and IDPs.

Table 18: Issues discussed in Workshop Group 2.

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Conclusions</i>
<i>How are lessons learned best communicated to other ROI partners?</i>	These are best communicated via a coordination mechanism with the Embassy. The communication of lessons learned will be dependent on this.

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Conclusions</i>
<i>Would there be any merits in arranging cross partner visits? And who would do this?</i>	See Working Group 1 and discussion about the possibility of arranging quarterly provincial level meetings between ROI partners.
<i>Suggest some topics that you would like to meet around and discuss with other ROI partners.</i>	Reaching the most vulnerable groups. Working with landless returnees. Handing over projects to communities. Working with government departments.

There was some discussion in plenary about the actual need to meet and learn together. The differences between the partners, their mandates and some of their working areas were seen to be substantial.

A consensus did emerge that it would make sense to meet soon (during the formulation phase of partner proposals for Phase 2b) and thereafter frequently during the implementation of Phase 2b. At micro level (geography) the partners felt they would be able to complement each other within several of the target groups.

A joint meeting during the formulation would also open up the possibility to develop and share some of the indicators.

An example of a lesson learned was the recently completed impact monitoring exercise by DACAAR. This had not found its way to the other partners yet although many of the considerations and challenges presented in the monitoring report could benefit other ROI partners.

None of the partners felt that they belonged to a ROI programme. This was only the second time all were together.

One of the partners questioned the need to meet and collaborate because all had so many different donors and did their own things. It was felt that they had more in common with other agencies that were not part of ROI.

E.3 Group 3 How do we better reach our target groups?

The ROI programme has four well-identified target groups:

- a) People returning to where they originally came from** and who have some kind of land to return to. We have seen evidence that this target group is reached although it is unclear as to what a returnee is and for how long you can claim to be one in an ROI perspective.
- b) Landless**, i.e. the most vulnerable and most difficult group to work with. We have only come across very limited evidence that this group benefits much from ROI. And what does it mean to be “landless”?
- c) Returnees/IDPs in urban areas.** Although there is plenty of evidence that there is a clear need, the identification of ROI phase II eventually decided not to work with IDPs in urban areas. The evaluation has however found that there is a substantial presence of vulnerable IDPs in urban areas.
- d) Receiving communities:** We have seen evidence that work is on-going with this group i.e. the UNHCR shelters, NRC work with the legal system, the work of DACAAR especially within WASH-P and NSPs work with CDCs.

There was an agreement within the group that target groups a) and d) are adequately covered by ROI partners. There was also an agreement that the other two groups (landless and IDPs) are poorly covered.

The group came to the conclusion that the landless and the urban IDPs are often identical. All agreed about the difficulties and challenges in reaching the most vulnerable returnees – and that the Government did not make it easier by setting up complex land acquisition schemes and long bureaucratic procedures. Furthermore, the Government had prohibited organisations from providing more permanent service delivery provisions to IDPs in urban areas. This complicates basic service provision such as water.

The group members were of the opinion that a major cornerstone in meeting the needs of the most vulnerable would be to lobby the Government to become more responsive towards IDPs in urban areas, but that none of the partners singlehandedly had the ability to move this process forward. It was recommended from the group that based on the experience of ROI partners the Embassy could take the initiative to start an active policy dialogue with the Government on the difficulties facing these two ROI target groups.

In the meantime, the partners could provide on-going services such as livelihood opportunities (DACAAR), vocational training (DRC), and legal assistance/protection (NRC).

It was also mentioned that some confusion existed on the landless issue – many urban refugees have been forced away from their land. The land certificate issue was raised again: You may own land but unless you can prove it with a document you can sometimes quickly become landless.