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BACKGROUND

The Food Security Cluster (FSC) has been coordinating food security-related activities in Somalia with support from the UN, International and local NGOs since 2012. The role of the vice-coordinators (VCs) ¹ has been crucial in coordinating stakeholders in 15 regional hubs. In this task, they are supported by representatives, the Focal Points,² from the lead agencies, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP) in the respective areas.

The overall objective of the Food Security Cluster was to contribute to the capacity development of the food security actors (UN, the NGO community, national, regional and local authorities). More specifically, it was to improve the quality of food security-related responses throughout Somalia; promote the exchange of food security analysis and information for response; and facilitate the development of local-level response planning for anticipated seasonal shocks.

The cluster focuses on the following activities to achieve this objective;

1) Coordination of responses and provision of response guidance. This should contribute towards proportionate, appropriate and timely responses.
2) Reporting, monitoring and identification of gaps
3) Emergency preparedness and contingency planning.
4) Development and application of technical standards and best practices
5) Advocacy and resource mobilization
6) Strengthen the capacity of humanitarian actors

The vice-coordinator is an elected position by the partners who operate in the given constituency and with a one-year term, unless re-elected. Each year a nationwide nomination process results in elections held in Somalia for the 15 vice-coordinator positions, which prompts the FSC to conduct an orientation workshop for their induction. The workshop aims to equip and familiarize the elected officials with skills and knowledge to facilitate the effective discharge of allocated duties and responsibilities.

The vice-coordinators take lead in cluster coordination at the regional level by ensuring that all the partners/members working within the geographical footprint of the cluster are aware and actively engaged with the Food Security Cluster, focusing on the activities above.

Fourteen vice-coordinators attended this workshop (hailing from Bakool, Banadir, Bay, Galgaduud, Galkayo North, Gedo, Lower Juba, Lower Shabelle, Middle Shabelle, Somaliland, Galkayo South, Hiran, Middle Juba and Bosaso). In addition, one sub-cluster coordinator from Sanaag region joined, as did seven lead-agency focal points and one WFP Nairobi staff.

Overall Objectives

The primary aim of the annual orientation workshop is to provide the elected and incumbent vice-coordinators and nominated focal points with training that will ensure stronger capacity in regional coordination related to humanitarian emergencies, in preparedness and response.

¹ Representatives of the FSC at the regional level elected by the FSC membership annually
² Staff nominated by the lead agencies to support FSC activities at the regional level and work in collaboration with the FSC Vice Coordinators
Specific Objectives

- To facilitate discussions and analysis of the terms-of-reference (TORs), including performance indicators, for vice-coordinators and focal points; this will enable effective transfer of duties to new leaders of hitherto duties.
- To transfer the technical skills and knowledge the FSC employs in its day-to-day operations, i.e. tools and methodological approaches, specifically in the filling out of the FSC reporting template/matrix, food security assessment tools, using the 3W (who does what where?) matrix, interpreting food security standards such as the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC).
- To facilitate appropriate sessions on lessons learnt, challenges to be expected and opportunities upon which to capitalize to ensure effective and efficient local coordination among food security and livelihood partners.

Methodology

- The workshop was pegged on a four-day agenda (See Annex 1) and facilitated by the team of the FSC Secretariat, the REACH initiative for more effective responses to humanitarian action, the gender-based violence (GBV) sub-cluster and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The sessions were delivered through a combination of:
  - Participatory approaches wherein participants were encouraged to raise questions, concerns and comment on the various modules covered during the workshop. In addition, experiences and lessons were drawn from the audience in a move aimed to contextualize the cases studies used.
  - Active learning through peer discussions and group work was used in certain sessions. This would later help building rapports between the vice-coordinators and focal points. Furthermore, each day began with a recap that was facilitated through peer instruction.
  - During the workshop, participants were encouraged to examine their own learning preferences. In addition, facilitators carried out these sessions with different approaches to reduce monotony and encourage active learning.
  - Facilitators ensured presentations were shared with the participants for reference.
  - After the conclusion of the workshop, a participant took a survey to provide feedback.
Workshop flow

Day 1: Introduce the focal points and vice-coordinators to the humanitarian architecture, cluster approach and FSC membership categories, then review their roles, responsibilities and skills in the areas of communication, organization and facilitation of meetings.

Day 2: Raise awareness on Integrated Phase Classification, localized food security assessment roles, introduction to the humanitarian project cycle, types of funding and ways to coordinate cash-based responses.

Day 3: Hold discussion on involvement of government and other stakeholder in the cluster, participation in other coordination forums (Regional -Inter Cluster Coordination Group), assessment meetings, technical working groups etc.), emergency contingency planning, workshop review and closure.

Day 4: More conversation on ways to involve government and other stakeholders in the FSC and emergency contingency planning, followed by workshop review and closure.

SESSION RESULTS

I. Overview of Humanitarian Architecture, Cluster Approach and Transformative Agenda

The orientation of VCs/ FPs took off on a good start with participants brainstorming about the cluster’s approach to humanitarian. Prior to the workshop, participants were advised to enroll in FAO online training session to facilitate the effectiveness of this and other parts of the training. This session intended to enhance the participants’ understanding of overall humanitarian architecture, the cluster’s approach and transformative agenda.

The facilitator presented a global overview of the humanitarian situation highlighting the total population affected annually by conflict-related crises and natural disasters. Participants were also introduced to the Humanitarian Response Review (HRR) of the global humanitarian system. Among other points, the review is relevant because it gave impetus humanitarian reform process further strengthened at the Humanitarian Summit in 2015, including the areas identified for reform (humanitarian leadership, humanitarian financing and humanitarian coordination). The facilitator tried to link relevant parts of the report to humanitarian coordination within the cluster. and explained the difference between the cluster’s approach to humanitarian coordination and sector coordination, and the different nature of global and country level cluster coordination. They also discussed the role and nature of the designated cluster lead agencies (FAO and WFP), and the cluster’s role as a provider of last resort. This included providing the participants with a simplified structure of how coordination works within the cluster that shows the roles and position of each. Brainstorming and question-and-answers sessions further enriched the discussion.

II. FSC Membership:

Participants were able to understand the FSC membership categories (Partners, Members and Observers) and the criteria for each. The membership categories define agency involvement and

participation with the cluster. The three main membership categories ensure inclusion of an array of key humanitarian stakeholders in the cluster. Partners are organizations that are principal recipient of NON-implementing donors (SHF, ECHO, EU, DFID, USAID, OFDA, CIDA) or have a proposal in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) or hold elected positions within the FSC (VC, SAG, CRC) and as such, they mostly contribute to food security responses and undertake strategic decision in the cluster.

Members are organizations that participate in FSC meetings or are recognized by local authorities in their engagement in food security-related activities in the field or are implementing partners of implementing donors.

Observers are organizations and members of the wider humanitarian community who are kept appraised of the cluster activities vis-a-vis the cluster response priorities and strategic priorities like the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Participants were informed that membership status is reviewed on a rolling basis and the current statistics stands at 150 partners and 355 members and 1 Observer.

III. Facilitation and Coordination of meetings:

Participants engaged in discussions and exchanges of ideas on how to efficiently and effectively coordinate meetings with emphasis on practices that promote ownership below.

1. Develop a positive attitude toward the meetings by seeing partners and members as a vital part of coordination practice;
2. Invite all FSC Stakeholders to the meeting;
3. Meet in a safe and accessible place for all attendees;
4. Set and circulate an agenda and keep to the scheduled timing;
5. Share information with participants, listen, treat all attendees equally;
6. Manage group dynamics;
7. Follow up on action points to fruition;
8. Prepare written minutes and distribute them within a week.

IV. Roles and Responsibility Session:

This discussion focused on what the Terms of Reference (ToR) prescribed are and the essential elements and outputs expects of the elected and nominated officials. Each output was linked with an indicator that would be used to measure effectiveness and efficiency in their daily discharge of functions. The major concern noted was in the developing of the emergency contingency planning template for each region (this concern had a session specifically dedicated to it).

V. IPC Awareness raising:

This session aimed to familiarize the participants with the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification methodology that is widely used in Somalia for classifying the severity of acute and chronic food insecurity situation. Participants also familiarised with the IPC core functions, tools and procedure. Participants who had previous been involved in the process assisted the facilitator. The session was followed by one on the role of seasonal assessments.
VI. Role of Seasonal Assessment and IPC:

This session focused on what is expected from the larger FSC membership, vice-coordinators and focal points in relation to conducting, leading and participating in localized food security assessments as well as FSNAU lead seasonal food security assessment. The food security core and expanded tools developed to assist localized food security assessment discussed at later session to compliment this module.

VII. Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), Humanitarian Need Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)

Most of the participants had a limited understanding of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. They had not seen or been referred to the Somalia Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plan despite the cluster effort efforts from the cluster to promote both documents among its members and partners. The facilitator introduced the project cycle for Somalia and its key elements, along with the HNO and HRP.

Participants also learned about the difference between the relatively new HRP process and the former Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP). In addition, they discussed how to submit such a plan through the Online Project System (OPS). Finally, the facilitator touched on priority needs outlined in the 2018 needs assessment and key objectives of the response plan – participants received copies of both documents.

VIII. Pooled funding:

Participants received information on the different types of pooled funding – Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF) and the Emergency Response Funds (ERFs)– and the eligibility criteria for accessing these funds. More specifically, they learned that to access CHF NGOs must pass an OCHA capacity assessment. Capacity assessments of NGOs are aimed at determining whether an NGO has sufficient institutional, managerial, financial and technical capacity and expertise to receive funding from the SHF and implement projects. Participants were also guided through the scoring matrix that the Cluster Review Committees (CRC) uses for vetting funding proposals submitted for CHF.

IX. Centrality of Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)

The facilitator introduced the basic concepts in protection and AAP below.

1. Safety and Dignity: This includes fundamental rights such as life with dignity, right to assistance, and right to safety and protection.
2. **Access:** This focused on the access to humanitarian assistance. Among the barriers identified were clan-based discrimination, economic access (mainly a problem for the urban clientele) and physical access, meaning the ability to travel to where the assistance is provided and make productive use of it. Those designing projects and plans need to be sensitive to these barriers and strive to remove them wherever possible. There is also need to be sensitive to populations who face extra challenges and vulnerabilities, particularly women and girls, the elderly, persons with disability, the chronically ill and enable victims of Gender based violence, and ensure they receive access to the assistance they need.

3. **Accountability:** This includes a) Transparency – or the need to ensure there is a two-way communication with the affected population. The information that agencies share should be first and foremost relevant to the affected populations, timely and reliable. b). Participation and Consultation – all-inclusive consultative processes that enhance the decision-making and promotes ownership. This subsequently empowers the affected populations. c). Feedback and Complaints Handling – a process that amplifies the voices of community members through different channels that should be accessible and safe. The affected populations should feel safe to complain and critique programming. This should subsequently lead to programme improvement and re-designing. Accountability builds confidence, trust and ensures money is spent in ways that provide the most value to the communities and populations that the intervention intends to serve.

4. **Do No Harm:** the do-no-harm principle is a conflict sensitive approach to programming that begins with context analysis to help practitioners better understand the situation they work in. It includes a) an analysis of connectors and local capacities for peace (LCP). Connectors are the things that unite the communities, including through the structures and institutions that make up these local capacities for peace and ultimately sustain them. b). an analysis of dividing forces and causes of tension. c). An analysis of how the programme it is strengthening connectors or dividers to ensure that the assistance does not do harm to the community. The participants were taken through the do-no-harm analytical framework.

5. **Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse:** Based on the UN Secretary-General's Bulletin, the following point were highlighted. a). Sexual Exploitation and Abuse are considered serious misconduct and grounds for disciplinary measures including summary dismissal. b). Sexual activity with persons under the age of 18 is prohibited. This includes exchanges of assistance, money, employment, goods or services for sex or through intermediaries, regardless of the age of the majority or age of consent. c). Sexual relations with ‘beneficiaries of assistance’ is strongly discouraged. This relation is based on inherently unequal power dynamics. It undermines the credibility and integrity of the agency. The bulletin also stressed that: mistaken belief in the age of a child is not a defense. Staff are obliged to create and maintain an environment that prevents SEA. Managers at all levels have a responsibility to support and develop systems that maintain this environment.

Participants and facilitators discussed the following steps to mainstreaming AAP and Protection in humanitarian programming.

1. **ASSESS** – This step involves assessing the local context dynamics which includes the local social organisation and power structures, community preferences particularly on how they would want to receive information and feedback and complaints mechanisms. The assessment also reviews the current practices. Assessment of the implementing agency and
their ability to integrate the principles of Protection and accountability to affected communities and other cross-cutting themes is critical.

2. **DESIGN** – Based on the community preferences, the agency designs information protocols, systems and other mechanisms that promotes two-way communication and enables the implementing agency to share information that is timely reliable and verifiable in medium and formats preferred by the affected populations. The feedback mechanisms should be responsive, safe and accessible. All these should be contextualized, meaning they should consider local culture and power dynamics. The community, in turn, needs to be sensitized to these principles and methods to make sure everybody understands they have the power to come forward and provide feedback to project implementers, to guarantee protection and accountability.

3. **IMPLEMENT** – Implement by mainstreaming protection and accountability systems and mechanisms and promote participation by all segments of the community, that is men, women etc; ensure that the affected populations have access to a two was information systems that shares information that is reliable, accurate and timely and feedback/complaints mechanisms that are safe, responsive and accessible even to the most vulnerable.

4. **EVALUATE** – Stop implementing the steps if they are not working, amend if necessary, review documented feedback, make project adjustments. The implementers should periodically evaluate methods and systems based on feedback from the affected populations;

5. **TRANSITION** – Review transition plans, share information on programme transition timelines, be clear on handing over activities.

X. **Information Management Session:**
Facilitators ensured that VC/FP were sensitized on: the three FSC response objectives and targeting logic; key reporting terms; ways to use IPC information to determine appropriate response objectives for different IPC phases (Stressed, Crisis and Emergency); the importance of reporting to the FSC; and different ways to deploy the 3W data to create various information products.

XI. **Harmonization of food security assessments:**
The participants were taken through the harmonized Food Security Assessment Tool that REACH developed in consultation with other cluster partners. The initial questionnaire was drafted following a desk review of the existing tools that partners use to conduct assessments. The objective of this session was to enable focal points, vice-coordinators, and local actors to integrate the harmonized process for emergency assessments into their operations.
XII. Regional Coordination – opportunities and challenges:

The aim of this module was to not only identify the constraints and challenges in regional coordination but to share ideas on how to mitigate and provide lasting solutions to the foreseen challenges. The VC’s and FPs were able to deeply reflect on this, which led to the development of an action plan that VCs and FPs will implement during their tenure.

The table below summarises the opportunities and challenges for the VC and FC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for VCs</th>
<th>VC /FP Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transfer of adequate and precise information to the cluster stakeholders through vertical and horizontal methods of information sharing.</td>
<td>1. Low attendance at regional cluster meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The VCs have an opportunity to enhance their capacities through interaction with other stakeholders.</td>
<td>2. Low participation by partners and members in regional level coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The VCs have an opportunity to advocate for contingency planning.</td>
<td>3. Lack of commitments in the implementation of action points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Lack of reporting by partners, e.g. 3 W matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Conflicting meeting schedules owing to competing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Weak linkages between FSC and local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Low motivation owing to lack of incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Low capacity of partners and members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for FPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve participatory needs assessment and other activities related to logistical and human resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage local and international partners to fully participate in joint activities and cluster meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage the participation of respective local administration in joint activities and cluster meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. Emergency Response Preparedness (ERP) and Contingency Planning

The Emergency Response Preparedness is the least understood core function of the cluster and often confused with contingency planning. The facilitator presented the three elements of the ERP to explain the linkages and relationship between the ERP and contingency planning. The three elements of the ERP are 1) Risk Analysis and Monitoring 2) Minimum Preparedness Actions (MPA) and 3) Advanced Preparedness Actions and Contingency Planning. Contingency planning is one element of the ERP.

The facilitator called on one of the participants who was recently involved in the preparation of an ERF document – one that foresaw in likely conflict between Somaliland and Puntland – to help fellow participants better understand the concept of ERP and related process. The facilitator also brainstormed on the benefits of preparedness and consequences of a lack of preparedness by actors in a given country often affected by recurring disaster. The facilitator subsequently explained what the ERP means, its three element and who is involved in ERP and contingency planning, respectively.
Participants also received the emergency preparedness guidelines of the Inter-Agency Standing committee (IASC) as reference material.

XIV. Gender-based violence in food security programming:

Part of the FSC is to mainstream the prevention of gender-based violence within food security activities. The objective of this session was to orient the participants on GBV and the responsibilities of key actors in addressing this type of violence, as well as essential on actions to prevent, mitigate and respond. The GBV focal point in Hargeisa shared the IASC Guidelines on Integrating GBV for reference by the participants. This document assists humanitarian actors and affected communities in planning, implementing and coordinating, along with monitoring and evaluating their work, all in a way that minimizes GBV-related risk across all sectors of the humanitarian response.

Recommendations

- Vice-coordinators should undertake the advised online training [http://www.fao.org/elearning/#/elc/en/course/FSC](http://www.fao.org/elearning/#/elc/en/course/FSC) to enhance their knowledge of Humanitarian Architecture, Cluster Approach and other related topics the workshop covered.
- More capacity building is required for national partners across board on IPC, food security assessments, partnership and coordination, proposal writing and project management.
- More active learning approaches should be adopted by the cluster including role playing, peer-learning and platforms that encourage exchanges in future.
- Cross-learning platforms – i.e. those that encourage exchanges (skype / what up group) should be formulated by the cluster and participant of the workshop
- Lead agencies should be more active in the FSC
- FSC (secretariat, VCs/FPs) should work closely with government bodies at all levels to ensure effective coordination
- FSC Secretariat should be proactive in supporting the VCs/FPs, through continuous mentor visits
- The secretariat should share the calendar for the 2019 program planning cycle with the VCs and ensure their active participation in the process.
- FSC should share the list of Focal Points in each region
- Meeting invitations to regional cluster partners ought to be sent out at least one week before meeting date
- The secretariat team should jointly produce a comprehensive report on the workshop and share with the relevant stakeholders
- There is need for timely feedback to the partners’ concerns as indicated in minutes.

Lessons Learnt

- Conducting a training during the month of Ramadhan can be very challenging considering that participants were fasting and therefore could not give optimum energy and participation.
- Sending strategic documents to participants and partners without sharing key messages leads to lack of prioritization of the documents.
- Enrolling vice-coordinators in the IPC level 1 training would go a long way in preparing the participants about key food security issues that allow them to practice and follow-up with key actors at the regional level.
- Emphasizing online training and pre-training assignments helps workshop sessions run smoothly, even for those who are new in the respective field.
• The FSC secretariat should encourage the VCs /FPs continued reading on food security and other cross cutting themes to facilitate fruitful discussions at the regional and other fora. The FAO online training on food security compendium shared with VCS/FPs.
• Encouraging coordination with other clusters and government would go a long way in strengthening coordination at the regional level.

Closing
Mulugeta Shibru the co-coordinator of the workshop thanked all participants and the facilitators for their active participation in the workshop and invited all to iftar at 6 p.m.

Annex 1: Workshop Evaluation Results

At the end of the workshop, the participants were asked to fill in a workshop evaluation form. Below is a summary of the feedback from 18 participants;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some 67 percent of participants strongly agreed that the content of the training and other related materials was relevant. The remaining 33 percent agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An overwhelming majority 89 percent “strongly agreed” that the training was applicable to their roles as vice coordinators and focal points. 5.5 percent said it was fair as the remaining 5.5 percent agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On whether the participants would recommend the orientation training to others, 33 percent agreed, and 67 percent agreed strongly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants were asked to comment on the agenda and whether it was well paced within the allotted time. 44 percent agreed while 56 percent strongly agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On facilitators’ ability to communicate well, 22 percent generally agreed, whereas 78 percent strongly agreed that the facilitators were good communicators.

The participants had divided opinions on facilitators’ knowledge on the topics; 17 percent said it was fair, 22 percent agreed, and 61 percent strongly agreed. In future this question should be broken into topics to help evaluate topics that need improvement on the side of facilitators.

Asked whether they would attend future trainings on similar topics, the response was overwhelmingly positive: 17 percent agreed while 83 percent strongly agreed – a clear indication that the training was rated highly.

Lastly, on the overall programme/agenda, 78 percent strongly agreed that the programme/agenda was very good, while 22 percent agreed.
Overall, 4 participants out of 18 gave a “fair” rating, with the rest either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the topics/themes.

The participants committed to;

- Continually practice what has been taught in the field to improve coordination.
- Share the content of the training with colleagues.
- Read more and study coordination as a concept.
- Encourage partners to engage in contingency planning.
- Develop action plan on how to move forward.
- Share information with cluster members at the regional level.
- Enhance coordination by ensuring that partners at the regional level participate in the regional cluster meetings.
- Organize cluster meetings in government offices to enhance better coordination and local authorities’ ownership.
Annex 2: Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY 21st</th>
<th>TUESDAY 22nd</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY 23rd</th>
<th>THURSDAY 24th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30am</td>
<td>Opening Remarks (WFP/FAO)</td>
<td>Recap for Day 1</td>
<td>Recap for Day 2</td>
<td>Opportunities in Regional Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00am</td>
<td>Introductions, Expectations (Paul)</td>
<td>IPC Awareness raising &amp; Role of Seasonal Assessment and IPC</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Accountability to Affected Populations in Food Security and Emergency Response. &amp; Communicating with communities (Paul Gol)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00am</td>
<td>Somalia Food Security Cluster: Functions Structure &amp; Membership. (Patricia/Nancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30am</td>
<td>Somalia Food Security Cluster: Functions Structure &amp; Membership. (Patricia/Nancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Building Session (Paul)</td>
<td>Team Building Session (Paul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30am</td>
<td>Somalia Food Security Cluster: Functions Structure &amp; Membership. (Patricia/Nancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am</td>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities of VCs and FPs: TOR, Performance Indicators and partner engagement (interaction with state/govt. entities) &amp; Challenges/Experiences from the past (Andrew)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Facilitation and Communication skills: Organisation &amp; Facilitation of Effective Meeting (Paul Gol &amp; Nancy)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Programme Cycle</td>
<td>FSC Information Management</td>
<td>Emergency Contingency Planning (UN OCHA &amp; Mulugeta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00am</td>
<td>Team Building Session (Paul)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)</td>
<td>3W Matrix, Targeting and Gap Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>FSC and Nutrition Integrated Response (Mulugeta &amp; Andrew)</td>
<td>FSC Reporting Tools and Information Products (Patricia &amp; Andrew)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Paul Gol, Nancy, Patricia, Andrew, Mulugeta, HNO, HRP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01:30pm - 14:30pm</th>
<th>Overview of Humanitarian Architecture and Cluster Approach. (Mulugeta)</th>
<th>Team Building Session (Selected VC)</th>
<th>Harmonization of Food Security Assessments Tools and Methodologies. Role/functions of the assessment helpdesk (Mulugeta &amp; REACH)</th>
<th>Review of the workshop and general discussions. &amp; Photo shoot, closing remarks and thanks giving.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:30pm - 15:30pm</td>
<td>Humanitarian Co-ordination: Different levels of co-ordination (Cluster and ICCG) (Mulugeta/Amin/OCHA)</td>
<td>Cash Coordination (Mulugeta, Patricia, Mohamed Amin)</td>
<td>Emerging issues in Food Security Gender Based Violence Mainstreaming, PSEA and protection mainstreaming (Nancy &amp; Paul)</td>
<td>DEPARTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3: Participant List

Vice Coordinators Vice Co coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakool</td>
<td>Action Against Hunger (ACF)</td>
<td>Ali Hassan Maalim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banadir</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council (DRC)</td>
<td>Abdullahi Omar Hassan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration (IOM)</td>
<td>Hared Hassan Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galgaduud</td>
<td>Peace and Development Action (PDA)</td>
<td>Mohamed Abdi Degale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galkayo North</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)</td>
<td>Mohamed Ibrahim Mohamud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garowe</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)</td>
<td>Omar Ahmed Isse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Juba</td>
<td>American Refugee Committee (ARC)</td>
<td>Abdifatah Osman Maalim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Shabelle</td>
<td>Banidam organisation (Baniadam)</td>
<td>Halima Hassan Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Shabelle</td>
<td>Women and Child Care Organization (WOCCA)</td>
<td>Dr Abdullahi Ahmed Idow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>World Vision International (WVI)</td>
<td>Mohamed Amin Nagueyeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galkayo South</td>
<td>Mercy USA for aid and development (MUSA)</td>
<td>Mohamud Adow Abdullahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiraan</td>
<td>Great Hope Foundation (GHF)</td>
<td>Abdiweli Mohamed Garane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Juba</td>
<td>Agency for Strengthening Pastoralists Innovation and Resilience (ASPIRE)</td>
<td>Aidarus Abdi Sheikh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosaso</td>
<td>Shilaale Rehabilitation and Ecological Concern (SHILCON)</td>
<td>Abshir Ali Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanaag</td>
<td>Candlelight</td>
<td>Mohamed Saed Adad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Focal Points / Office Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mogadishu</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Hassan Saney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosaso</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Jama Said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolo</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Mohamed Haibe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galkayo</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Abdirahman Aden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beletweyne</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Ahmed Awil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>Hundubey Ahmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>Food And Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)</td>
<td>Abdinasir Abokor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSC - FAO</td>
<td>Mulugeta Shibru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC - FAO</td>
<td>Nancy Koech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC - WFP</td>
<td>Paul Gol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC - WFP</td>
<td>Andrew Makachia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC - WFP</td>
<td>Patricia Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Abdirahman Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH</td>
<td>Imadi Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Ahmed Jama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>