Managing and Implementing Resilience Programs

***Number of participants***: 13

Discussion highlights and conclusions

* Appreciation and Partnership
	+ What is USAID doing well to manage and implement resilience programming?
		- With Sabal is involving of the partner in the program, is open for dialogue and discussion.
			* Field visits are effective
		- Lots of information given to make effective decisions
		- Most of the time USAID is very supportive of the process and helps facilitate discussion with HQ
		- Very good communication and reaching out, especially in the Rural areas
		- Constructive feedback
		- Supportive in targeting most vulnerable
		- Have tried to carve out a space/platform for resilience learning
			* Lots of good will in exploring what resilience means, esp. in the Nepal context
		- Involved in the ToC review process, thoughtful interventions and engaged
	+ What are the implementers doing well to manage and implement resilience programming?
		- Putting effort forward at the different levels and working to understand the different process, layering
		- Testing different approaches, whether new or existing groups, and trying to uncover what that means in regards to resilience
		- Looking at community based approaches and linking with systems
		- Constantly reflected and improved on what resilience means
		- Started to implement true reflection meetings on a quarterly basis,
		- Created a true partnership (not a contract) it is open and a good discussion
	+ What do *we* need from USAID still to be effective implementers?
		- Simplify and speed up some of the approval processes
		- Related to M&E systems developing/implementing more useful data in the decision making process (the indicators are not effective at monitoring resilience)
		- Unfortunately the data gathered (monitoring) is not used to messaging and understanding (data is going to a database, but there is not findings or story telling around this data) across all the DFSAs
		- Data vs stories (may use small communities to illustrate a point, which may not represent the whole data)
			* The story whats the right message, need to be what we need to show and share based strongly in qualitative and quantitative
		- Feedback from USAID HQ to IPS
	+ What do we need, reflecting on your own work, as implementing partners?
		- There are still struggling with monitoring tools, esp. with resilience
		- Translating design to execution for resilience and integration of activities
		- Holisitic approach to targeting
		- Adaptive implementation
			* Feedback to design
		- However, need to work on documentation and sharing of these true reflection meetings
		- Still need to come up with our own indicators. So IPS end up coming up with own tools
		- Explore consortium partner management
			* Two different levels of consortium partners (government, IP, USAID is one, then one across IPs)
* Recommendations
	+ Knowledge Hubs/ Backbone Support
		- Incentive structure for IPs and how they work together, on the workplan with the budget
			* Having IDEAL to help facilitate the discussion and support around the CLAs and the backbone support
		- Joint processes and onboarding of new partners can strengthen collaboration and communication (needs to happen at the beginning of design)
	+ Flexibility for adaptive management
		- IP and FFP (both sides need to be flexible)
		- IDEAL could host a conversation about what adaptive management means throughout the program cycle
		- Set up experience/observations with IP/USAID that allows us to change based on what we are seeing on the ground
		- What as IPs are we doing internally to keep our systems flexible (budget/finance)
	+ Create an agreed upon, simplified vision for what success looks like (ToC? Indicators)
		- What do we need to know? What do we need to share? What are the right measures?
		- Creating that trust, so if the IP tells USAID it is doing something there is the trust to move forward
		- Willingness to try new approaches
		- Learning Agenda
			* As early as possible
	+ Monitoring and Evaluation
		- Joint engagement with IPs about baseline/midline/endline
		- USAID should give feedback to IPs
		- Data should be linked to what information we need linke to TC and build in info on shocks and stresses
		- Lead us to a better and smaller set of indicators
		- Set up pause and reflect to really prioritize
		- Annual data call, clarity in what we need to provide the right message to the right audience
	+ Consortium Management
		- The bigger the consortium the more likely you will work in silos. Not having so many large international partners and large amounts of local partners
		- Language in sub-awards to change so partners are involved outside of their tech areas of expertise. May need also time and budget to do so.
		- Criteria for selecting bids around efficiency of partnerships rather than trying to cover all potential needs to be competitive
			* Capacity building of local partners also needs to be planned and budgeted
			* Regular assessment of partnership
			* Exit strategy for international NGO to hang over to national NGO
				+ Phased approach to this