# Lessons learned workshop

**FACILITATORS GUIDE**

This facilitators guide is written for the *deeper with a focus on impact* review, but depending on the format of review taken, this guidance should be adapted accordingly.

# Preparation activities

* Share and invite feedback within NS on ToR
* Confirm participants. Approx. 10-15 participants are ideal. It is critical all relevant individuals are in the room. This includes members of the CVA Technical Working Group, Heads of Departments, staff that were most involved in the CVAP activities, representatives of senior leadership, and representatives of branches.
* Identify venue
* Organise workshop materials

DAY 1

**8.00 – 9.00 Introduction, Objectives of Workshop**

**In Brief** - This session introduces the background to the workshop. It begins with providing a basic overview of the rational for having a Lessons Learned Workshop, the key objectives and format, plus ways of working. Any suggestions or changes to the scheduling for the next days can also be mentioned here.

**Outcomes: Clarity on objectives of lessons learned review**

**Process:**

* Introductions: facilitators introduce ourselves. And our respective roles.
* Everyone introduces themselves – one thing about themselves, and one thing about their experience using cash.
* Introduce (10 mins): Explain purpose of LL workshop (So we can improve preparedness. So that we can be quicker and better at cash)
* Explain methodology – project cycle – and then prioritization of findings so that we can get improved preparedness and CVA interventions
* Explain this is an internal review – not an evaluation; emphasis on process vs impact
* Explain we will be evidence based – drawing in a) participants’ on experience, b) info from field, c) PDM
* Explain the set out of the agenda.
* Emphasise timekeeping.
* Agreeing expectations and ways of working (10 mins). Ask everyone what they want to get out of the workshop.

**9.00 – 10.00 – THE RIGHT TIME?**

**In Brief** - This session serves to a) engage people in the process and ensure a basic and shared level of understanding of the programme (key activities and timeframes). It also analysis the first aspect of quality of the response: timeliness.

**Outcomes: Assess whether the assistance was provided at the right time, when it was more needed and more beneficial. Identify the reasons behind delay (if any) and measures to enhance timelines.**

**Process:**

* Group Activity: Timeline (20 mins):
* Arrange two groups (make sure that there is people from NHQ and Branches in both groups). Have stick in two colours ask them to choose one colour and then to gather according to the colours. Each colour one group.
* Explain that:
* Explain that this is to get everyone on same page around what was planned and what happened and start identifying lessons. Explain that only main activities should be included.

1. one group is going to construct a timeline of the project. It will start since the disaster started and cover the full project cycle.
2. The other group will look at the initial planning, identify if there is any discrepancy and put a post-it where discrepancies are.

* Once it is completed, including flags on delays, if any, NRCS PM will provide a brief overview of activities and confirm delays/or changes as compared to initial plans.
* Presentation of community views, field findings (PDM, FGD and KII) (10 mins)
* Plenary discussion about community views. Do participants agree, anything to add (10 mins),
* Group Activity: In the same groups as before, try to identify the reasons, if any for delays.

What needs to be done differently next time? Three top recommended actions to enhance timeliness. (20 mins)

**COFFEE BREAK**

From here on, the workshop will be structured following the project cycle stages. It is important to capture at each stage if the roles and responsabilities were clear.

**10.15 – 12.30 Stage: Assessment and Response Analysis- Part 1**

**THE RIGHT ASSISTANCE? (Right modality)**

**In Brief** -

Assessments -The timeline begins with the Assessment phase carried out by the NS and examines how well this phase went in terms of gathering sufficient information quickly, efficiently, that could be used to identify which people had which needs, and which responses were most appropriate to address these needs. It also examines how well the assessment and cash feasibility side was carried out in terms of complying with standards, such as beneficiary data protection, and communications between those involved in collecting and those using the information.

Modality choice - Analysing which form of assistance is best for meeting the needs of vulnerable communities is often one of the most difficult tasks. It often has to be done quickly with very little or partial information and conditions can be rapidly changing. In kind assistance risks delivering people assistance that is not appropriate or not as useful, while cash assistance assumed that people can actually buy the intended relief items in local markets with ease. It can often be the case that blends of bother forms of assistance are needed. This session examines more closely how well this worked and what could be done differently in the future to better match assistance with beneficiary communities’ needs.

**Outcomes:**

**Assess whether the assessment process provided the necessary information to inform an evidence based response analysis. Anything to be improved for next response? Top three actions to improve assessments**

**Assess whether the CVA modality choice was the best option to meet the identified needs.**

**Process:**

* Presentation of community views, field findings (PDM, FGD and KII) (10 mins)
* Plenary discussion about community views: do participants agree, anything to add (10 mins),
* Presentation/description of all the process (activities carried out) related to both needs assessment and cash feasibility analysis (30 mins including Q&A)
* Group Activity: In the same groups as before, identify a) what went well; b) what should have gone better; at least 3 top recommended actions to improve the quality of this phase. (40 mins)
* Group presentation and plenary feed-back (including validated recommendations) (20 mins):

What needs to be done in the same way next time?

What needs to be done differently next time?

Three top recommended actions to improve modality choice

* Additional group activity: Identify three reasons why the type of CVA was or was not the right modality (20 mins)

**Handout:** [Modalities, Delivery Mechanisms and Transfer Values](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Workshop-Handout-1-_Modalities-delivery-mechanisms-and-transfer-values.docx)

Afternoon

**13.30 – 15.45 Stage: Assessment and Response Analysis – Part 2**

**THE RIGHT ASSISTANCE? (Right Amount)**

**In Brief** – **Assess whether the the ammount of cash provided was the right amount to cover the needs for the intended period.**

**Process:**

* Presentation of community views, field findings (PDM, FGD and KII) (10 mins)
* Plenary discussion about community views: do participants agree, anything to add (10 mins),
* Presentation/description of the ROA process: how were the decisions and calculations made for the transfer value? (30 mins including Q&A)
* Group Activity: In the same groups as before,

Identify a) what went well; b) what should have gone better; at least 3 top recommended actions to improve the quality of this phase next time. (40 mins)

* Group presentation and plenary feed-back (including validated recommendations) (20 mins):

What needs to be done in the same way next time?

What needs to be done differently next time?

Three top recommended actions to improve transfer value

* Additional group activity: one group each to discuss a) Advantages and disadvantages of a fixed amount vs variable amount, b) how often should the cash be distributed, and should the amount be adapted with changing prices? (20 mins)

**Handout:** [Modalities, Delivery Mechanisms and Transfer Values](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Workshop-Handout-1-_Modalities-delivery-mechanisms-and-transfer-values.docx)

**16.00-17.00 – THE RIGHT RISKS? (Risk management)**

**In Brief –** This (optional) session looks at identified risks for CVA and analyses which ones may be relevant for the NS’ programming and how this can be mitigated. It includes an overview of the main types of risks, mitigations and likelihood. It is also important to flag in the session that doing CVA is no more risky than other forms of assistance, as a principle, provided it is designed well.

**Process:**

* Presentation/description of the identified risks in relation to CVA (20 mins including Q&A)

Group Activity: In the same groups as before, for the forthcoming CVA project

Identify a) what are the top 3 risks; b) what are the key mitigating actions; c) based on this, is using CVA feasible? (20 mins)

* Group presentation and plenary feed-back (including validated recommendations) (20 mins)

**DAY 2**

**Morning**

**8.00-10.15 – Implementation and Monitoring (Targeting and CEA)**

**THE RIGHT PEOPLE?**

**In Brief** – Targeting is one of the most sensitive activities within a programme and one of the activities that can lead to more dissatisfaction and risk to not meeting the objectives. Robust CEA has proven to be key to reach as much impact as possible and also good information is a right for the people we serve.

**Outcomes: confirm that we targeted were those in most in need of assistance and that communication to communities, engagement and accoutability was of high standards.**

**Process:**

* Presentation of community views, field findings (PDM, FGD and KII) (10 mins)
* Plenary discussion about community views: do participants agree, anything to add (10 mins),
* Presentation/description of the targeting process (30 mins, including Q&A). This should cover the three elements of targeting:

a) The criteria themselves - were they fair?

b) The process of defining the criteria – did the NS involve the community in that?

c) The process of applying the criteria – did the selected beneficiaries correspond to the criteria?

* Group Activity: one group to look at targeting the other to look at registration

Identify a) were there any other targeting criteria/mechanism that would have been more adequate for this response? b) could beneficiaries have been registered differently?

Make at least 3 top recommended actions to improve the quality of this phase next time. (30 mins)

* Group presentation and plenary feed-back (including validated recommendations) (20 mins):

What needs to be done in the same way next time?

What needs to be done differently next time?

Three top recommended actions to improve targeting and registration

* Presentation/description of the CEA process (10 mins including Q&A)
* Group Activity: Each group focuses on one phase of the cycle and assesses and explains the CEA actions that were conducted for each phase, the gaps, and provides future recommendations (15 mins)

**Handouts:** [Beneficiary targeting, registration and verification](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Workshop-Handout-2-_-Beneficiary-targeting-registration-and-verification.docx); [Community Engagement and Accountability](https://cash-hub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2024/02/Workshop-Handout-3-_CEA.docx)

**10.30-12.30 – Implementation and Monitoring (Distributions and monitoring)**

**THE RIGHT WAY?**

**In Brief** – Once the decisions were made in terms of which assistance to provide to which communities and HHs, plans and actions are put in place to actually deliver the assistance. This session looks more closely at how well implementation worked, especially the ability to make adjustments along the way to respond to change and asks what is done well already, and what could be done more effectively in the future to implement in particular food security and livelihoods through cash when feasible. Also, did the programme choose the best delivery mechanism?

**Outcomes: Review that information gathered is used to make adjustments if/when needed and that distributions where smooth, secure and as planned and through the most appropiate delivery mechanism/use of FSP.**

**Process:**

* Presentation of community views, field findings (PDM, FGD and KII) (10 mins)
* Plenary discussion about community views: do participants agree, anything to add (10 mins),
* Presentation/description of the delivery/distribution and monitoring process (30 mins including Q&A)
* Group Activity: One group to look at FSP selection, one at distribution, one at monitoring

FSPs and distribution groups: a) what went well; b) what should have gone better; at least 3 top recommended actions to improve the quality of this phase next time. (40 mins)

Monitoring group: a) What monitoring tools were used? b) What adjustments were made based on monitoring?

* Group presentation and plenary feed-back (including validated recommendations) (20 mins):

What needs to be done in the same way next time?

What needs to be done differently next time?

Three top recommended actions to improve targeting and registration

**Afternoon**

**13.30 – 17.00 Recommendations for future CVA programmes and to strenghthen NS capacity on CVA**

**In Brief** – this session is to conclude about the strengths and weakness of the programe and whether CVA can be a good modality to respond to the needs.

It will also draw on the recommendations to prioritise the key actions that the NS should engage with to enhance its CVA capacity and action plan.

**Process:**

* Recap and revise the top recommendations identified in the workshop
* Discuss how well these are captured in the CVA Action Plan or if revisions needed
* Presentation of the results of the CVA self-capacity assessment and review findings in line with this
* Categorise, prioritise and refine the recommendations
* Wrap up and closing remarks.