Workshop on Integrated Programming for better Nutrition Outcomes, Juba, South Sudan, 21st - 23rd November 2018.
1.1. Introduction & Background

This three day Integrated Inter-Cluster Workshop for nutrition outcomes was supported by the Global Inter-Cluster Nutrition Working Group (ICNWG), which is a joint working group of the Global Food Security Cluster (gFSC), co-led by Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP); and the Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC), led by UNICEF.

The ICNWG was established in 2012, and its overall goal is to contribute to safeguarding and improving the nutritional status of crisis affected populations, preventing a deterioration of the nutrition situation in at-risk population groups and enhancing the overall nutritional situation of the affected population. It aims to do this by providing technical direction, guidance, coordination solutions; and by promoting a coherent multi-sectoral integrated approach, with the needs of the affected population at the centre; to ensure good nutrition in humanitarian crises.

The ICNWG has been working towards improving coordination and collaboration between nutrition and food security clusters at country level, and has been working with water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), health, education, and protection clusters at global and national levels to enhance emergency response effectiveness to address malnutrition.

The ICNWG identified limited capacities of humanitarian partners and clusters for multi-sectoral nutrition sensitive programming among the main barriers to effectively achieve nutrition outcomes in humanitarian settings.

To address this barrier a multi-cluster workshop with participation of the two global clusters was held in Geneva in June 2017. This led to the development of a three-days training package “Integrated Inter-Cluster Training Package for Nutrition Outcomes” to support in-country cluster coordinators and partners in applying integrated nutrition-sensitive approaches to achieve a better nutrition outcome across sectors, with specific focus on: nutrition, food security, health, WASH, education, and protection.

The Integrated Inter-Cluster Training Package for Nutrition Outcomes was field tested in Ethiopia in June 2018 and Nigeria in July/August 2018.

In South Sudan the importance of implementing an integrated response was reinforced by the Rome Famine Meeting in April 2017 and the Call for Action on Integrated Famine Prevention and Response of May 2017. Development of an integrated response plan started in October 2017 during the preparation of 2018 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) for South Sudan, when the health, water, WASH, food security and livelihoods (FSL), and nutrition cluster coordinators started drafting their respective minimum packages to be implemented in prioritized locations/counties.

The global cluster coordinators for Health, WASH, FS and Nutrition were requested to facilitate preparation of an integrated response plan for South Sudan. However, due to unavoidable circumstances, the global cluster coordinators were unable to travel to South Sudan to facilitate the planning workshop in early 2018.
Materials developed by the ICNWG were shared with the South Sudan famine Cluster Coordinators, who facilitated a one-day workshop on integrated programming for famine prevention in South Sudan in January 2018. During the workshop, the minimum package for famine prevention for food security, health, nutrition and WASH was presented and further developed based on participant feedback. The main participants included the strategic advisory group (SAG) members of all four clusters including donors and the main cluster lead agencies. The integrated programme / minimum package has since been implemented in eight priority counties (out of the seventy-nine counties across South Sudan). Integration of varying degrees is also ongoing in other counties, although this has not been tracked.

2.1. Objectives of the workshop

This three-day workshop aimed to build on the integration work already carried out in South Sudan

The specific objectives of the workshop are as follows

• To build capacity for integrated programming for improved collective outcomes

• To develop proposed action points for better integrated programming for improved nutrition outcomes in South Sudan.

See Annex One – Workshop Agenda

2.1. Participants

A total of 27 participants attended the workshop: 27 on day one, 22 on day two and 21 on day three. Participants were made up of a combination of coordination and operational programme staff, from education, FSL, health, nutrition, protection & WASH clusters. A representative from OCHA actively participated in day one and day three.

The number and representation of participants was very disappointing. The workshop was originally planned for 38 participants, unfortunately – not all clusters sent coordinators or key coordination team members from county, state or national level

See Annex Two – Participant Names

2.2. Facilitation team and support for the workshop

The workshop was facilitated by Darana Souza (FAO), Michele Goergen (Technical Rapid Response Team) and Vivienne Forsythe (FAO Consultant).

Logistical and administrative support before and during the workshop was provided by FAO office, UNICEF Field Operations Section and the FSL and Nutrition Clusters in Juba.

Obia Achieng Chief of Field Operations from UNICEF and Esteban Sacco Deputy of OCHA attended the introductory session of the workshop and gave some very
encouraging opening remarks. Closing of the workshop was handled by the facilitators and both the Nutrition and Food Security cluster co-coordinators made some opening remarks.

2.3. Methodology

The workshop was conducted using a variety of participatory approaches, facilitating active engagement of participants and sharing of participant knowledge and experience; with the aim of building on work already carried out in South Sudan. Sessions were conducted through a combination on interactive presentations, videos, group work and discussion; and action planning.

2.4. Content of training

**Day one** was an introduction to integrated planning for better nutrition outcomes. Three main sessions were facilitated i) an introduction to basic nutrition concepts, ii) an overview of integrated planning for better collective outcomes, and what informs the selection of integrated planning; and iii) an introduction to nutrition sensitive interventions. These sessions were conducted in an interactive fashion, with buzz questions and plenary discussion of points through each of the presentations.

**Day two** focussed on technical aspects of integration for better nutrition outcomes. Sessions were held on Integration of nutrition with food security and livelihoods, with health, WASH, protection; and with education and early childhood development. During each session definitions and conceptual issues were presented, and participants then explored the experience of integration in South Sudan, as well as opportunities for greater integration; through plenary discussion and group work.

Through the participant engagement in days one and two, it was apparent that there is quite a lot of operational experience of varying levels of integrated programming in South Sudan, within and between agencies, and across clusters.

**Day three** focussed on developing proposed priority actions to move the integration agenda forward in South Sudan, through group work, presentation and plenary discussion.
During the first session of day three participants were grouped by cluster and asked to put forward three to five priority actions that could be undertaken at operational level, **within the existing resources base**, to improve integrated programming for better nutrition outcomes.

During the second session of day three, participants were divided into groups and asked to put forward three to five priority actions that could be implemented at County, State and National level, within existing resources base or with small investment; to facilitate integrated programming for better nutrition outcomes.

A USB stick with all power-point presentations and additional reference materials was given to each participant at the end of the workshop.

**See Annex Three - Reference Materials.**

The materials are also available in a repository on the South Sudan FSLC website: [https://fscluster.org/south-sudan-rep/overview](https://fscluster.org/south-sudan-rep/overview) under a LINKS section at the bottom of the web page.

**3. Proposed priority action to improve integration**

The following sections outlines the proposed points of action identified by the workshop participants to improve integration.

National, state and county level priority actions to facilitate integrated programming for better nutrition outcomes were put forward.

The education, food security, health, nutrition, protection and WASH clusters each identified proposed actions, for their respective clusters, that could be undertaken at operational level to improve integration.

**3.1. Proposed priority actions** to be implemented within existing resources base or with small investment at national, state and county levels to improve the integration agenda.

**3.1.1. National level Actions** - ICWG and cluster coordinators to support this work

1. Set priorities for integration and advocate for integrated programming with donors, government and other stakeholders – this includes identification of champions for integration
2. Develop integration strategy and roll out plan based on priorities identified which could include
   a) Support finalisation of partially developed harmonised behaviour change messages and roll out on completion
   b) Support establishment of effective cross cluster referral mechanisms
   c) Develop integration check lists / job aids at inter-cluster and cluster level, cluster fact sheets, “how to” guide and supervision tools and roll out on development
   d) With state clusters, produce and disseminate a one-page fact sheet outlining strategy and activities, and specific entry points for each of the other clusters. A template should be developed and used by all clusters, and the FSL, health, nutrition and WASH clusters should
refer to and build on information provide in the January 2018 workshop to develop the fact sheet.

e) Support multi-sectoral vulnerability mapping and analysis that is currently ongoing

f) Map multi-cluster partner services and capacity at county level in priority locations, this would involve advocacy with IMWG to develop these maps, using 4/5W and mapping services currently available through the various clusters

g) Coordinate joint planning and monitoring through the ICWG, with line ministries; and through bi-lateral cluster engagement

h) Document and analyse existing integration activities at different levels ie - within agencies, between agencies and across clusters (looking at specific integration activities currently being implemented, the specific processes & mechanisms to support the integration and the enabling factors to facilitated integration in the first place). Dissemination of learning and sharing of good practice within country: write up and sharing of short case studies/good practice papers, facilitation of workshops a cross project visits.

i) Support capacity building of partners on integration, through cascading of orientation trainings to sub-national level (state and county).

j) Joint supervisory visits to state and priority counties to monitor integrated response.

See Annex Four - Template from Yemen for integrated programming - which SS could consider using/adapting for planning of integrated programming.

3. Commit to integration - Present the results of the integration workshop to the ICWG and determine follow up actions, respective responsibilities and ownership of this integration initiative.
   - Ensure that integration is routinely discussed at the national level ICWG quarterly meeting, to include overview of progress on integrated programming against plans and discussion on key issues and challenges and steps to mitigate against challenges.
   - While there was agreement that integration be routinely included in the monthly coordination meetings there was no consensus on leadership of the integration initiative.
   - There were suggestions that a task force be established to move the agenda forward – ie to further elaborate a plan based on action points above and support / guide the roll out of the plan, however there was no agreement on this at the workshop.
Facilitator recommendations

In addition to supporting ongoing integrated response activities the facilitators would suggest the following priority actions at national level for consideration as integration priorities are identified and strategies developed

- Solid leadership is necessary for the strategic development of integrated programming – and subsequently it is highly recommended that leadership is explored at ICWG and agreed in the coming weeks; to move the integrated programming agenda forward in a strategic rather than ad hoc fashion.

- Ensure that integration is routinely substantively included at the national level ICWG quarterly meeting, to include overview of progress on integrated programming against plans and discussion on key issues and challenges and steps to mitigate against challenges.

- Identification of champions for integration will facilitate with advocacy in all aspects of integration and should be addressed in coming weeks along with leadership.

- Documentation of current integration experience is essential for
  - understanding current status of integrated programming in South Sudan,
  - sharing of best practice across South Sudan and subsequently,
  - enhancing expansion of effective integrated programming across South Sudan in a strategic fashion.
  - This activity could be undertaken by existing cluster coordination and/or programme staff in country. Alternatively, if suitably skilled personnel in country do not have the required time to carry out this work a consultant could be contracted.

- Joint supervisory visits to state and county levels are highly recommended.

- Capacity building of coordinators and partners at subnational level is necessary for effective integrated programming and hence cascading of orientation / training workshops is recommended. These workshops should be carried out at state and county level by national level cluster coordinators, and potentially with support of consultant(s).
o Finalisation of partially developed harmonised behaviour change messages and subsequent roll out is a task that could be carried out relatively easily and hence is recommended as a priority action.

o Support for establishment of effective cross cluster referral mechanisms at operational level is a vital aspect of effective integration and hence recommended as a high priority action.

3.1.2. State Level actions - State cluster coordinators, state ICWG and the Solutions Working Groups based at state level are well placed to support this work

1) State ICWG and cluster coordination meetings to include integrated programming as a standing item on agenda (overview of progress on integrated programming against plans; and discussion on key issues and challenges and steps to mitigate against challenges).

2) Agree simple strategies to promote integration (eg harmonised behaviour change messages and strategies and cross cluster referral mechanisms)

3) Enhance understanding across clusters with support from national level
   - Each cluster to produce a one-page fact sheet outlining
     o strategy and activities, and
     o specific entry points for each of the other clusters
   - Cluster coordinators to conduct sensitization and orientation sessions for other cluster(s)

4) Cluster coordinators to attend meetings of other clusters for information sharing and to contribute to discussion on integrated programming (point 1)

5) Reinforce the importance of multi sector assessment on need/ crisis event basis

6) Ensure clusters do analysis together after assessment

7) Identify how data from other each sector can assist other sectors and share relevant data
   1) Produce multi-cluster maps of presence of operational partners at country and state level, with national support
   2) Monitor if Integrated programming is happening - conduct integration gap analysis and promote / advocate for integrated programming where not currently happening
   3) Ensure good information flow between state and counties on integration issues (progress and problems)

4) National level OCHA representatives and Cluster Coordinator support visits are requested to State and also as is possible/viable to County level, especially identified priority counties
3.1.3 County level Actions - OCHA county coordinators would be well placed to support this work in the 25 counties where they are located, however operational agencies would be responsible to establish linkages and promote integration at operational locations.

1) Strengthen existing coordination mechanisms to support integrated programming
   - Linking with local authorities
   - Linking with state coordination mechanisms
   - County coordination meetings to include integrated programming as a standing item on agenda (could include overview of progress on integrated programming against joint workplan, discussion on key issues and challenges in implementation of integrated programming and step to mitigate against challenges)
   - Capacity building of county and operational level actors on integration; with support from state and national level

2) Strengthen joint planning
   - Review current / existing planning process and see how to enhance joint planning

3) Map operational actors from all clusters
   - Review / revise 4/5W sheets and present agency presence and sectoral focus on a visual map; with support from state and national level

4) Conduct joint monitoring and evaluation
   - Develop integrated M+E tools/guidance; with support from state and national level. This would include tools/guidance for use by country coordination team to conduct joint M+E activity and also for operational agencies as they conduct M+E in the areas where they are
5) Establish inter-cluster structures
   - Develop operational two-way referral mechanisms between each of the clusters, with guidance from state and national levels

3.2. Proposed priority actions to improve integration, to be implemented within existing resources base: identified by education, food security, health nutrition, protection and WASH clusters

There was a high level of commonality across all six clusters in terms of priority actions to improve integration – see below

3.2.1. Proposed priority actions to improve integration identified by all of the six clusters

3.2.1.a Conduct cross cluster sensitisation / orientation – This includes
   - each cluster developing a fact sheet outlining cluster strategies and activities, and entry points for each cluster – a simple template should be developed to facilitate this being carried out in a uniform way
   - cluster coordinators attending meetings of other clusters for sensitization/orientation (see section below)
   - cascade sensitisation/orientation to sub-national level clusters and operational partners

3.2.1.b Support existing multisector assessment and analysis – both for the purpose of the HRP and following any humanitarian events, ensuring that initial rapid needs assessment (IRNA) and analysis is conducted jointly and forms the basis for multi sector/cluster response.

3.2.1.c Share information and key reports between clusters, currently there is in existence the inter-cluster needs analysis working group which meets fortnightly and a four-famine cluster information management working group (established following development of minimum package) with REACH, which is specialist in data collection and analysis for mapping convergence of risk, outbreaks, and indicators.

It is important that the work of these two groups is continued and enhanced: that all clusters input relevant information / and reports into the groups, and that the findings / analysis of the two working groups are circulated across the clusters at national level and sub national levels.

3.2.1.e Establish two-way referral mechanisms between clusters, this includes identification of
   - criteria for (each) referral and
   - specific process/mechanism for (each) referral.
Eg Each cluster to work bi-laterally with all other clusters to identify, clearly defined criteria and specific processes for two-way referral with each of the clusters as appropriate.

3.2.1.f Implement harmonised behaviour change activities - This includes development of harmonised behaviour change messages, platforms and approaches to be used at household, community and facility levels. It was reported that while some significant work has already been carried out on development of harmonised messages this work has not been finalised / and is not in use – so the existing partially developed materials would be a good starting point to move this aspect of work forward. This would include development of harmonized messages about protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points highlighted during the workshop in relation to harmonised behaviour change activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition sensitive messages and protection messages should be mainstreamed into community based structured used by all sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials designed to address the various key messages in relation to optimal health and nutrition and protection to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility staff, community volunteers and extension workers from all sectors/cluster to use the same or certainly complimentary messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated IEC massages should be posted in public places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated multi cluster/sector community awareness campaigns should be carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination platforms for use by all clusters should be established at community level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1.g Develop cross mapping of actors from each cluster – Currently maps are produced by the various clusters illustrating cluster specific partner presence across South Sudan, however, there is no mapping service currently which illustrates the presence of partners from all clusters on one map. The workshop participants identified the production of maps illustrating operational presence of partners from all clusters, as an important factor in improving integration. These maps would show cluster presence, geographical convergence and gaps at operational level at state level and at county level for priority counties. It is suggested that the IMWG attempt to do this at county level in a few priority locations initially to see what is feasible.

3.2.1.h Conduct joint cluster targeting of vulnerable communities / families – through joint assessment and analysis to identify vulnerable communities and jointly establishing criteria for identification of extremely vulnerable families, e.g. FSL to
potentially consider households with children with acute malnutrition to be part of a broader targeting criteria.

3.2.1.i Conduct joint cluster supervision and monitoring of response

- **Supervision at community and facility level** - this includes OCHA and cluster coordinators from national, state and county level making joint supervisory visits at community and facility levels. It also includes operational partners from various clusters making joint supervisory visits at community and operational locations where they are providing services. Simple integrated supervisory tools should be developed to support this work, for both coordination teams and operational partners.

- **Monitoring** – currently monthly reports are submitted by operational partners to each cluster and analysed at cluster level. However joint monitoring and analysis of response activities should also be carried out on a periodic basis - this could be through the ICWG, however relevant clusters should also get together to review reports and analyse the response jointly. This joint monitoring could potentially be carried out on a quarterly basis initially.

3.2.2. Proposed actions identified by Food Security, Nutrition and Education Cluster

Collaboration on **use of nutrition kitchen gardens and cooking demonstration sites**, to focus on production of local nutritious foods and food preparation (FS and Nut).

Collaboration on **establishment of school gardens** to focus on production of local nutritious foods (FSL, Nut & Ed).

Collaboration on **establishment of agriculture clubs and agroforestry clubs** (FSL and Ed).

3.2.3. Cluster specific proposed actions in addition to those identified in the section above

**Education**

- Work with Protection Cluster to provide psycho – social support for children, teachers and parent teacher associations (PTA)
- Work with WASH Cluster to develop and provide WASH minimum package in schools
- With protection – introduction and training of teachers and PTAs on code of conduct and prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA); formation of child rights clubs and establishment of gender segregated washrooms.
- With WASH - training on child hygiene and sanitation transformation (CHAST) and menstrual hygiene management (MHM)
- With Food Security – school feeding
- With Health – deworming and immunization campaigns

**Food Security**
• Use cash transfer programming to improve health nutritional status
  - Link cash transfers with specific services
  - Link cash transfers with production of highly nutritious foods
• Use food for assets programming to improve nutrition
  - Support intercropping
  - Support improved farming processes practises
• Support production of micronutrient rich foods
• Support diversification of household income sources through income generation activities, such as poultry keeping, fish farming, pig farming and marketing, honey and ground-nut production and marketing and marketing of gum arabic

Health
• Share early warning, alert and response system reports with inter-cluster needs analysis working group and the famine related four cluster IM working group
• Incorporate MUAC screening and referral of malnourished children to nutrition services into
  - all childhood vaccination activity – this includes house to house immunisation, national immunisation days and routine immunisation at health facilities
  - integrated community case management (community level) and sick child consultation (facility level)
• Build capacity of facility-based health workers on nutrition
• Build capacity of community health volunteers to respond to nutrition issues
• Incorporate nutrition into follow up visits at household level
• Incorporate nutrition into health management information systems
• Instigate monthly multi-sectoral facility meetings

Nutrition
Support Mid upper arm Circumference (MUAC) screening and referral by other clusters at key entry point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry points identified by the Nutrition Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Health (for nutrition education, micronutrient supplementation and referral for treatment of acute malnutrition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ante natal clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out-patient department (sick child consultations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National immunisation days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded programme of immunisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inpatient ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With WASH (for behaviour change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nutrition facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early childhood development (pre-school) MUAC screening and referral to nutrition services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary and secondary schools – (for behaviour change and nutrition education of pupils &amp; training of teachers and school gardening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-food Item (NFI) distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General food distributions (GFD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With FSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General food distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nutrition service facilities (for cooking demonstrations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protection

- Immediately share operational presence at county level to start process of synergy and to establish referral pathways for gender-based violence (GBV), child protection (CP) and general protection issues at state, county and sub-county levels. The ICWG is well placed to facilitate sharing this information and encouraging discussion between protection and other clusters.
- Attend coordination meetings held by other clusters and invite other clusters to attend protection cluster coordination meetings

WASH
- Work with other clusters to develop and provide minimum WASH package at
  - health and nutrition facilities,
  - schools and
  - food security locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry points identified by WASH Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Joint assessments with other clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nutrition facilities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health facilities, Primary Health Care Clinics and Primary Health Care Units (PHCC/U) and mobile clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child friendly spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Food distribution points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section above summarises priority actions identified by the participants during day three. Additional opportunities for integration that could be considered when developing operational plans discussed during presentation and groups work sessions in days one and two are summarised in a matrix.

**See Annex Five – Opportunities for integrated programming that clusters could consider when developing operational plans.**
4. Participant evaluation of workshop

20 participants submitted the workshop evaluation questionnaire at the end of day three.

Analysis of evaluation responses showed overall a very positive feedback from the respondents: all respondents indicated that attending the training was a good use of their time, the training was helpful, teaching methods were appropriate, that respondents would be able to use what they had learnt, that respondents had learned from others in the group, and that they would recommend the training for other.

There was some less positive feedback, primarily related to insufficient time being allocated for the training and information not being shared on time in advance of the workshop.

All 20 respondents agreed that the training objective had been achieved (12 strongly agree 8 agree). 16 respondents agreed that enough time was allocated (6 strongly agree, 10 agree), while 4 respondents indicated that more time was required for the workshop.

All 20 respondents gave positive feedback on the training methodologies

- There were enough practical exercises included in the training (12 strongly agree 8 agree)
- There were enough real-life examples (13 strongly agree 7 agree)
- The teaching methods were appropriate (12 strongly agree, 8 agree)
- Participants able to share my experiences (8 strongly agree, 12 agree)
- Participants received answers to questions (12 strongly agree, 8 agree)
- Participants felt input was valued (14 strongly agreed, 6 agreed)

“The workshop was participatory and very interactive”

All respondents indicated that the training was well organised (11 strongly agree, 9 agree), that the training room was appropriate (13 strongly agree, 7 agree), and meals and snacks were adequate (12 strongly agree, 8 agree). The majority of respondents indicated that they received information about the workshop on time (6 strongly agree, 10 agree), however 4 participants disagreed with this – ie they did not receive information about the workshop on time.

“Overall the workshop was well organized and arranged”

“I got the information about the training late from my cluster and the venue for the training was not informed in advance”

All respondent indicated the training was helpful for them (17 strongly agree, 3 agree), and that this training was at the right level for the individuals (14 strongly agree, 6 agree). All respondents indicated they would be able to use what they had learnt (13 strongly agree, 7 agree), and all agreed that would recommend the training to others (19 strongly agree, 1 agree).
All respondents agree that the training was a good use of (their) time (13 strongly agree, 7 agree), and that they learned from others in the group (15 strongly agree and 5 agree). All respondents indicated that the training was at the right level for the group (13 strongly agree, 7 agree), 19 respondents indicated the group was the right size (14 strongly agree, 5 agree), while 1 participant disagrees with this; 19 respondents indicated that the group had the right range of experience/background (13 strongly agree, 6 agree) while 1 respondent disagrees with this.

“I strongly recommend this training be organized again to strengthen capacity of those not attending this training”

“The training would be valuable to implementing partners instead of the clusters and coordination teams. Need to facilitate for people in the field”
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