

## The High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue Tanzania Workshops Report– October 2016

### Executive Summary

From October 17 to 21, 2016, representatives from InterAction and the Partnership Unit in UNHCR Headquarters in Geneva traveled to Tanzania to follow up on the implementation of the High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue on UNHCR-IFRC-NGO Partnerships. The goal of this mission was to learn how the dialogue is relevant to the context of Tanzania, discuss the state of UNHCR-NGO partnerships, and support actions for further partnership strengthening and complementarity. The mission team held a workshop at the UNHCR sub-office level in Kibondo and one at the UNHCR representation office level in Dar es Salaam.

### Observations

- Significant improvements in partnership have occurred in 2016 with the arrival of new UNHCR senior management and permanent staff.
- There is a need for clarity around expectations, roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities related to the functioning of the Refugee Coordination Model (RCM) with improved linkages within and between Dar es Salaam and field-level coordination structures.
- While 89% of participants stated that they were committed to strengthening UNHCR-NGO partnership, there was limited awareness prior to the workshops of the HC's Structured Dialogue, its recommendations to strengthen partnerships, and available guidance and tools although these were shared in advance of the mission.

### Key Recommendations

- UNHCR reporting and information requests should be mapped and streamlined as appropriate. UNHCR and all partners should consistently use the Burundi Situation Inter-Agency Information Sharing Portal<sup>1</sup> to share and access information.
- Coordination meetings should be fora for decision-making with clear terms of reference, defined roles and responsibilities for leads and co-leads, and clear expectations around meeting preparation (i.e. sharing information in advance, ensuring appropriate level of staff engagement relative the meeting agenda, action-oriented meeting minutes with clear accountability for follow-through).
- A joint advocacy approach and key messaging should be developed, utilized, and refined as needed at the Dar es Salaam and field level.
- Joint planning should be inclusive of all voices including refugees, and all actors within the response should transparently contribute effort and information to best identify gaps and plan for the future.
- A briefing package should be available via the portal to orient all response staff to the coordination structure, planning cycle, and other partnership mechanisms.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://data.unhcr.org/burundi/regional.php>

## Background

For decades, Tanzania has welcomed thousands of refugees fleeing conflict in neighboring countries of the Great Lakes Region. Northwest Tanzania is currently host to 245,083 refugees (Pre-Influx and Post April 2015). Due to the civil unrest in Burundi, Tanzania has experienced a growing influx of refugees fleeing violence, with 349 new arrivals recorded per day in September 2016. Currently, the three refugee camps are above or at their full capacity and the Burundi response is only 69% funded with a gap of \$23.1 million. Under the auspices of the Refugee Coordination Model (RCM), UNHCR leads and coordinates the response with partners<sup>2</sup>.

Over the past months, as new UNHCR senior management has arrived and partners have secured longer-term staff, partners expressed a desire to begin a dialogue on deepening and improving the UNHCR-NGO partnership. Given past partnership challenges during the initial scale-up period and the renewed energy to work better together, InterAction and UNHCR - in close consultation with the U.S. Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration - identified this as an opportunity to offer the structured dialogue workshops as a platform to strengthen the relationship.

The Tanzania workshops follow on the heels of successful missions to the Democratic Republic of Congo (2014), Pakistan (2014), Kenya (2015), Chad (2015), and Lebanon (2016). It is one of two country missions slated for 2016 in partnership with ICVA and UNHCR. Further information and lessons learned over the history of the project can be found in the recent report “Lessons Learned: Institutionalization of the HC's Structured Dialogue to Strengthen UNHCR-NGO Partnership.”<sup>3</sup>

The workshops were well attended with **62** UNHCR, international, and national NGO staff participating. The seniority of participants indicated that discussions were taken seriously by both UNHCR and partners. This included several country directors, UNHCR Tanzania Representative, Ms. Chansa Kapaya, and Head of Kibondo Sub-Office, Mr. Dost Yosefzai. Unfortunately the Deputy Representative, Senior Program Officer (Dar es Salaam) and Senior Protection Officer (Kibondo) were unavailable to participate in the workshops. Please see annex 1 for the full list of participants.<sup>4</sup>

In addition to the workshops, InterAction met bilaterally with UNHCR staff and local and international NGO staff to gain a deeper understanding of the operational context and the state of UNHCR-NGO partnership.

## Workshop Methodology

Prior to the start of each workshop, the participants filled out a prequestionnaire to gauge awareness of the Structured Dialogue, level of improvement over the past year, and level of commitment to UNHCR-NGO partnership.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://data.unhcr.org/burundi/download.php?id=803>; <http://www.unhcr.org/afr/tanzania>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.interaction.org/document/institutionalization-high-commissioners-structured-dialogue-ngo-ifrc-unhcr-partnership>

<sup>4</sup>In Dar es Salaam, **11** INGO representatives, **6** local NGO representatives, and **11** UNHCR representatives attended for a total of **28** participants. In Kibondo, **11** international NGO representatives, **6** local NGO representatives, and **17** UNHCR representatives were present for a total of **34** participants. UNHCR staff from the Kasulu office were also present.

The agenda included an overview of the principles of partnership, an introduction to the Structured Dialogue, a brief review of the Structured Dialogue’s ten recommendations<sup>5</sup>, a plenary discussion on characteristics of the partnership within the operation, and small group discussions on areas for improvement and recommended actions.

To the extent possible, small groups included a balance of implementing partners, operational partners, and UNHCR staff. Participants were asked to identify two to three specific issues related to the selected theme and propose recommendations and suggested actions for improvement. The results of the discussions are outlined below.

## Kibondo Workshop

### Pre-workshop questionnaire

In advance of the workshop, only 28% of participants indicated full awareness of the Structured Dialogue. Participants were also asked to share whether they had experienced improvement in various aspects of the UNHCR-NGO partnership over the past year. The results were as follows:

**Information sharing:** 69% = improved, 24% = a little improved, 7% = no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Advocacy:** 24% = improved, 66% = a little improved, 10% = no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Planning:** 59% = improved, 31% = a little improved, 10% = no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Grant Management:** 46% = improved, 45% = a little improved, 10% = no improvement, .03%= worsened

### Introductory remarks

Mr. Dost Yousafzi, head of the UNHCR sub-office in Kibondo, opened the workshop by sharing his wish that more NGO partners had come to participate in the workshop, but expressed his hope that the workshop would serve as a catalyst to strengthen partnership at the field level. He recognized that the projected increase of refugees means that strong partnership between UNHCR and NGOs is more important than ever. Mr. Dost Yousafzi also thanked partners for their active engagement in coordination structures and noted that the response greatly benefited from NGO participation in contingency planning, the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP), and joint advocacy on education infrastructure.

### Plenary discussion

During preparatory bilateral meetings with both UNHCR and NGO staff, the need for a common understanding of roles, responsibilities, and expectations of each other emerged as an important prerequisite for collectively addressing specific aspects of partnership. As an example, some NGO partners noted that UNHCR’s roles as response lead, donor, and coordinator are often conflated, which can create a lack of clarity on which role UNHCR is playing when they make a specific request. This indicates that a clear separation of these roles should be emphasized and communicated internally to UNHCR staff as well as to partners.

---

<sup>5</sup> joint assessment, analysis, prioritization and strategic planning; information sharing; joint advocacy; IDPs; following up government pledges made on refugees and statelessness; strengthening capacities; urban settings; review of fora for collective dialogue; complaints mechanisms and a yearly report.

In order to address the above, the facilitators conducted a brief plenary exercise asking each participant to consider the following two questions: “what are your expectations of the other’s role in partnership?” and “what is your agency’s role within the coordination structure?”

### Partnership expectations

Regarding expectations within the partnership, UNHCR shared that they expected NGO partners to be transparent, collaborative, active, and reliable participants, and contributors to joint identification of goals. NGO partners expected UNHCR to be a leader, good manager, good listener, transparent, and conduct active and sustained information sharing.

### Coordination roles

Regarding perceptions of one’s own role within coordination, UNHCR identified their responsibility to conduct inclusive and transparent decision-making, lead, listen, convene and ensure collaboration among all actors, and sustain dialogue with partners. Partners identified their responsibility as being active co-leads within the coordination structure, responding to the emergency in collaboration with UNHCR, sharing information, and being honest with UNHCR around response concerns.

Participants found it encouraging that UNHCR and partners had similar perceptions of their own and each other’s roles and responsibilities. It was recognized too that the true test of these characteristics would come as both UNHCR and partners put them into practice within the response coordination structure.

### **Areas for improvement**

UNHCR and partners identified a few areas for improvement within the partnership and self-selected into small groups for discussion and to identify solutions. The topics were: **transparency, joint advocacy, joint planning, coordination, and information management and reporting**. The following is a brief summary of the identified challenges and proposed actions:

#### Transparency

First and foremost, the participants emphasized that transparency must be mutual and reciprocal in order for the partnership to function and would also require the creation of an environment where both UNHCR and partners can be vulnerable and honest with one another. For example, information sharing should not be delayed until there is a positive outcome to share; greater openness around challenges could facilitate collective problem-solving.

One issue the group raised was performance management between UNHCR and implementing partners. UNHCR requested that partners share anticipated funding from other sources with UNHCR so a fuller picture of funding gaps can be achieved and plans for the response can be more strategic. Partners requested for UNHCR to be more transparent about why information is requested and what information is utilized for, inclusive of UNHCR’s donor reports. They encouraged UNHCR to treat reporting and information sharing as a mutual responsibility and joint activity.

Another area for attention was the need for mutual decision-making on findings and learning. Some NGO partners felt that they were not involved in key response decisions. While UNHCR staff recognized that inclusive decision-making would benefit the response, they emphasized that a forum exists for collaborative decision-making: the Inter-Agency Working Group. For example, while partners raised concerns over lack of transparency regarding the decision to increase the expected caseload of Burundian refugees for 2017, UNHCR noted that this decision was discussed collectively in the Inter-Agency meeting. As such, information sharing from UNHCR post-discussion, as well as internal information sharing within NGOs could be improved to address this. This topic will be explored further below.

#### Proposed actions:

- UNHCR and partners should create consensus on what information is collectively valuable through the **development of an agreed MOU on what information each party is to share and the frequency of sharing.**
- A platform **should be created for both parties to voice their concerns** in a transparent, safe way.
- **Partners should notify UNHCR of their anticipated funding from other sources** and what gaps in the response they will subsequently be able to address.
- UNHCR should **share with partners the report that is submitted to donors** and **build the capacity of partners** to best feed in programming information.

#### Joint Advocacy

Another area discussed for strengthening was joint advocacy. Participants noted that both UNHCR and partners regularly advocate with key government targets, but it is not sufficiently linked up. While partners are confident that UNHCR is in talks with the government advocating on issues critical to the response, there is limited feedback and information shared with partners on what advocacy meetings are taking place and what the outcomes are. Additionally, both UNHCR and partner colleagues emphasized that the response lacks a strategic approach to advocacy at the sub-office level. They noted that some messages and priorities could be pushed with local authorities and visiting donors, as well as with the usual interlocutors at the Dar es Salaam level. The participants agreed that while developing a detailed advocacy strategy may not be necessary, it would be helpful to jointly develop key messages to guide advocacy at the country office and sub-office level. The facilitators also suggested the Guidance Note on Joint Advocacy<sup>6</sup> - a document developed through the global partnership consultations - as helpful tool toward this objective. Key content the group identified for the key messages document

---

<sup>6</sup>For NGO partners: <http://www.unhcr.org/partners/partners/57348bc57/guidance-note-partnership-advocacy-protection.html>  
For UNHCR staff: [https://intranet.unhcr.org/content/intranet/unhcr/en/home/support\\_services/partnerships\\_-\\_bilateral-and-multilateral-relations/relations-with-ngos/the-high-commissioner-s-structured-dialogue-on-ngo---unhcr-partn/\\_jcr\\_content/mainpar/multidownload\\_1/multidownloadItems/multidownloadfile\\_0/file.res/Guidance%20note%20on%20partnership%20in%20advocacyFINAL.pdf](https://intranet.unhcr.org/content/intranet/unhcr/en/home/support_services/partnerships_-_bilateral-and-multilateral-relations/relations-with-ngos/the-high-commissioner-s-structured-dialogue-on-ngo---unhcr-partn/_jcr_content/mainpar/multidownload_1/multidownloadItems/multidownloadfile_0/file.res/Guidance%20note%20on%20partnership%20in%20advocacyFINAL.pdf)

includes: land, the encampment policy, education curriculum, support to local communities, and infrastructure within the camps.

**Proposed actions:**

- UNHCR and partners should **develop a key advocacy messages document** for use in collective and individual advocacy at the Dar es Salaam and field level. This should be a living document to be revisited as changes in the operational context require shifts in messaging.
- UNHCR and NGO colleagues at the Dar es Salaam level should **share minutes and outcomes of advocacy meetings** with the field and vice versa as relevant.

**Joint Planning**

Regarding joint planning, participants recognized that UNHCR consulted partners through the coordination structure. In fact, the 2017 planning process was currently underway at the timing of the mission. However, the group recognized that the response would benefit from more regular engagement throughout the year to collectively review plans and targets. They also noted that information sharing could be improved at “critical moments” that require a joint or representative consultation, for example when determining the projected case load of Burundian refugees for 2017.

Partners requested that UNHCR make the annual planning cycle better known and understood to all relevant actors and improve relevant information sharing by utilizing centralized systems for assessments and conducting technical desk reviews of monthly reports to provide a synthesized and cohesive overview of the relevant information points.

It was also noted that refugees were not sufficiently involved in planning and that it would be beneficial to utilize an improved feedback and consultation mechanism throughout the planning cycle. For example, an effort could be made to regularly conduct joint UNHCR-partner monitoring visits to the field.

**Proposed actions:**

- UNHCR and partners should hold a **short workshop mid-year to review progress** against the plan to identify gaps and adjust planning as necessary.
- UNHCR and partners should conduct structured, **joint monitoring visits** to the field.
- UNHCR technical staff should conduct regular **desk reviews of monthly reports** which are shared with all actors via the portal.
- The current participatory assessment structure should be strengthened and a **central reporting system** - ideally through the portal - should be utilized to share individual assessments carried out by UNHCR or individual partners.

## Coordination

A critical component the group identified for improving coordination within the response was improved linkages between the Dar es Salaam level coordination structure and the field level. It was emphasized that there needed to be a clear delineation of which issues would be addressed in each fora. In order to facilitate the operationalization of this approach, participants noted that having complementary terms of reference (TORs) for each group that are shared widely would provide further clarity. They also recognized that a contributing factor to the success of this approach would be appropriate partner representation in coordination meetings.

The group also discussed leadership and participation as an area for attention within the sub-office level coordination. They noted that clarity on the roles and responsibilities of working group leads and co-leads would foster a shared leadership approach that is implementable. The group also emphasized that selection of agencies to lead sector working groups should be based on expertise in order to improve the quality of leadership and discussion within the meetings.

In order to move to a more actionable, decision-making structure, a number of information sharing and meeting management protocols could be implemented in order to elevate the functionality of the structure. Specific suggestions from the group are highlighted below.

### **Proposed actions:**

- All relevant **coordination materials** such as the sector lead table, working group TORs, UNHCR and partner focal point contacts, the meeting schedule, and meeting agendas should be **regularly updated, shared in a timely manner, and proactively accessed by partners via the portal.**
- Coordination **meeting minutes should be brief and action-oriented** and should be **shared in a timely manner** with actors at the field and Dar es Salaam level. Individuals or agencies should be assigned responsibility for **follow-through on implementation.**
- Partners should send **appropriate representation for coordination meetings** (i.e. staff who have authority to make operational decisions when meetings require decision-making, technical staff for technical conversations).
- In order to problem-solve and increase engagement across sectors, a mechanism should be developed collectively to **improve horizontal information sharing and joint action across the sector working groups.** It was noted that increased support to the CCCM sector was particularly critical given the nature of the response.

## Reporting and Information Management

Among partners there was an expressed desire for clarity on the modalities of reporting requests. Implementing partners were often unclear whether a request for information was coming from UNHCR as their donor or UNHCR as the response coordinator. As such, partners noted that it would be helpful to have clarity on the purpose of the request, frequency of reporting, and appropriate communications channels on both sides.

Partners requested that UNHCR undertake an internal mapping of all reporting requirements and assess whether there may be a way to harmonize and streamline the requests to partners to reduce duplicative efforts.

It was also highlighted that some information bottlenecks exist which UNHCR could address. This includes lack of consistent information sharing of consolidated products from UNHCR back to partners—particularly operational partners, lack of information flow between the field and Dar es Salaam level, and limited understanding of who the current focal points are within UNHCR and partner organizations.

#### Proposed actions:

- UNHCR should **internally map reporting requirements** and **work toward a streamlined and consolidated reporting mechanism**. UNHCR should then conduct a half day briefing for partners on the way forward.
- Partners and UNHCR should update their mailing lists with appropriate and current contacts to better facilitate information flow.
- UNHCR and partners should **consistently utilize the Burundi Inter-agency Information Sharing portal**.
- UNHCR and partners should improve information flow with Dar es Salaam level coordination bodies and internal staff.

## Dar es Salaam Workshop

### Pre-workshop questionnaire

Before the workshop, only 13% of participants indicated full awareness of the Structured Dialogue. Participants were also asked to share whether they had experienced improvement in various aspects of the UNHCR-NGO partnership over the past year. The results were as follows:

**Information sharing:** 79% = improved, 14% = a little improved, 7% no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Advocacy:** 32% = improved, 57% = a little improved, 11% = no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Planning:** 50% = improved, 43% = a little improved, 7% = no improvement, 0%= worsened  
**Grant Management:** 39% = improved, 54% = a little improved, 7% = no improvement, 0%= worsened

### Introductory remarks

UNHCR Representative Ms. Chansa Kapaya, opened the meeting with recognition that, like all relationships, UNHCR-NGO partnership requires work, trust, honesty, and mutual understanding of collective goals. She emphasized that despite operating within a resource constrained response, UNHCR and partners have worked well together over the previous seven months and have proactively addressed issues collectively. Kapaya remarked that the structured dialogue mission was timely and allowed UNHCR to be responsive to recent areas already identified, together at various forums, as in need of further strengthening. She emphasized that the workshop would serve as a valuable brainstorming exercise and starting point to move the conversation on strengthening partnership forward. In conclusion, while



renewing UNHCR's commitment to ensure a transparent, open, and inclusive decision making process on critical decisions, Kapaya trusted that commonly identified next steps and follow up actions ensuing from the discussion would result in practical and positive improvements for the partnership.

### Plenary Discussion

The workshop began with a facilitated SWOT analysis exercise in which participants identified the following: **strengths** within the partnership, **weaknesses** within the partnership, **opportunities** for action, and the perceived **threats** to partnership (external factors that negatively impact the relationship).

In a plenary discussion, the participants shared what was working well within the partnership. The strengths identified included: coordination, information sharing, communication, and commitment to dialogue and partnership. They also noted the perceived threats to the partnership, or elements that affect partnership but are not in the direct control of UNHCR or partners, including: the government of Tanzania's policies and practices, scale and complexity of the response, limited funding and competition over resources, and staff turnover.

Next, the group identified the weaknesses within the partnership, which served as the basis for the small group discussions.

### Areas for improvement

Small groups formed to discuss the following topics: **joint advocacy, communication and information sharing; coordination, decision-making, and transparency; and joint planning.** Below is a brief summary of the challenges and proposed actions:

#### Joint Advocacy, Communication, and Information Sharing

Regarding advocacy, the group recognized that advocacy does not necessarily need to be joint, but there should be joint identification of the most complimentary approach and follow-up.

The two main challenges to effective communication and information sharing identified by the group were lack of timely communication and limited utilization of the Burundi Inter-agency Information Sharing Portal. Similarly to the group in Kibondo, using the information sharing portal was identified as an important way forward.

There was also a discussion on best practices for internal as well as external information sharing. Regarding external communication, a key issue was previous poor experiences with media visits. While UNHCR emphasized that they do not intend to limit or refuse visits from journalists, they did request that NGO partner staff communicate in advance to UNHCR regarding any media visits so as to organize joint briefing and address queries in a joint and accurate manner. Reference was made to the recently produced and disseminated "Guidelines for Media" document by UNHCR. Although UNHCR suggested partners to share this document with media requesting to adhere to it, this would not substitute the need to inform each other and collaborate jointly on any media visits as any possible misunderstanding or inaccuracy may affect the whole operation.

One participant raised an additional area for consideration in response to the small group presentation: the need to better capture the voices of refugees with information sharing and to improve information flow to beneficiaries by giving clear and consistent feedback. While this area was not further explored in this workshop, it is an area for further attention and action.

**Proposed actions:**

- UNHCR and partners should jointly **agree on key advocacy messages and modalities for delivery.**
- UNHCR should consider **conducting trainings** for new and existing partners on **the information sharing portal** and all parties should **commit to using the portal** as the primary mechanism for information sharing.
- UNHCR and partners should **improve internal communication flows** between field and capital level.
- UNHCR should consider **holding trainings** in Dar es Salaam and Kibondo for UNHCR staff and NGO partner staff on the **protocols for visits from the media.**
- NGO partners should **share success stories** and response priorities with UNHCR **via social media.**

**Coordination, Decision-Making, and Transparency**

As in the workshop in Kibondo, colleagues noted the decision-making disconnect and limited information flow between Dar es Salaam and the field. This was evidenced in the fact that field-level operational conversations are duplicated at the country office level and in the Refugee Operations Working Group. To address this, participants proposed filtering actions requiring a strategic approach from the field level for resolution by colleagues at the Dar es Salaam level. They also agreed that the coordination modalities within the Refugee Operations Working Group taking place at the Dar es Salaam level lacked strategy and would benefit from a more action-oriented approach. As the Refugee Operations Working Group is co-chaired by UNHCR and the Ministry of Home Affairs, an additional factor for discussion was the effect of having government officials present in the Refugee Operations Working Group meetings. While there was recognition that it was beneficial to have Ministry of Home Affairs representation attend to promote a mutual understanding of the challenges and deliver advocacy messages, it was also recognized that it would be beneficial to have dedicated meetings between UNHCR and NGOs partners beforehand.

**Proposed actions:**

- Dar es Salaam-level UNHCR and partner staff should **proactively seek issues from the Inter-Agency Working Group in Kibondo** which require assistance from the capital level.
- A **clear TOR for the Dar es Salaam Refugee Operations Working Group body** should be developed and shared widely.
- NGO partners should send **senior-level staff with decision-making authority** to the above coordination meeting at the Dar es Salaam level.

- **Meeting minutes** should be **action-oriented** and shared in a **timely** manner with colleagues in Dar es Salaam and the field.
- UNHCR should **convene pre-meetings** as needed to discuss NGO-UNHCR priorities and alignment.

### Joint planning

The group identified a lack of clarity on mutual priorities as the key challenge to effective joint planning. The participants emphasized the need for an open, inclusive dialogue to discuss priorities in order to allow for the optimization of limited resources within the funding constrained response. In order for this to occur, improved information sharing was identified as a key factor. It was also suggested that an orientation package for new partners would be beneficial.

There was a conversation centered on equality and transparency within the partnership. Regarding equality, participants recognized that a key element of successful joint planning is respect for partner contributions. There was also the sense that national partners who depend 100% on UNHCR for funding feel constrained in their ability to voice concerns and that operational partners engage in coordination and collective decision-making inconsistently. Some national partners noted that they do not have the same capacity as INGOs to expedite their contractual relationship with UNHCR and sometimes do not have the staffing to attend the various coordination meetings. This results in a negative perception that national NGOs are not able to deliver as well as international NGOs. UNHCR emphasized that the official position of the agency is equality with partners and not a “boss and subordinate relationship” although there was recognition that some individuals may not reflect this approach.

Regarding transparency, UNHCR requested that partners share information regarding anticipated funding from other sources in order to improve the joint planning process. UNHCR noted that partners’ approach to partnership with UNHCR should not be determined by the amount of funding received from UNHCR. There remains concern amongst partners that if they share what funds may come in from other sources that their allocation from UNHCR may reduce. Moreover there was an expectation that operational partners should participate in joint planning, coordination, information sharing, and other collaborative efforts even though they are independently funded.

### **Proposed actions:**

- UNHCR should consider **creating a briefing package for partners** orienting them to the coordination structure, joint planning cycle, and other key partnership mechanisms.
- NGO partners, particularly **operational partners**, should **actively participate** in coordination, joint planning, and information sharing.
- UNHCR, and INGOs as appropriate, should **build the capacity of local and national NGOs** to manage their contractual relationship with UNHCR.

- UNHCR and partners should pursue opportunities to **include all voices in planning discussions** and **foster open dialogue** and **equality** within the partnership.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

After participating in the workshops, 98% of participants indicated they felt more knowledgeable about the Structured Dialogue. Also, 100% of attendees reported that they were more committed to improved UNHCR- NGO partnership.

In order to guide follow up and implementation of the proposed actions identified by the group, this report will be shared with UNHCR and NGOs in the Tanzania operation. Additionally, the report will be shared with the Partnership Unit and the Implementing Partner Management Service (IPMS) within UNHCR Geneva, UNHCR's Africa Regional Bureau, and NGO Headquarters staff.

InterAction and UNHCR Geneva will consult with NGOs and the UNHCR office in Dar es Salaam to determine the most appropriate method of workshop follow up from the facilitators, which will most likely be either a teleconference or a survey in early 2017.

## Annex 1: Participants (Kibondo)

Akello, Carolyne  
UNHCR  
Connectivity Coordinator

Alshazaheh, Mary  
UNHCR  
Associate Admin/Finance  
Officer

Angelo, Philidorius  
Community  
Environmental  
Management and  
Development  
Organization (CEMDO)  
Environmental Officer

Babikir, Abdulelah  
UNHCR  
Associate Supply Officer

Bekele, Tesfaye  
UNHCR  
Programme Officer

Bjork, Mariann  
IFRC/TRCS  
Health Delegate

Brewah, Charlie  
UNHCR  
Field Officer

Bwahama, Anitha  
UNHCR  
Shelter Associate

Colijn, Yasmine  
Danish Refugee Council  
CCCM Technical  
Coordinator

Collins Okello, Paul  
HelpAge International  
Programme Manager

Corcoran, Donna  
UNHCR  
Reporting Officer

Ekutshu, Marie Claire  
UNHCR  
Programme Officer

Faciann, Jallah  
UNHCR  
Registration Officer

Gwamagobe, Nyinisaeli  
Relief to Development  
Society (REDESO)  
Project Coordinator

Haldorsen, Jorgen  
Plan International  
Country Director

Khokhar, Mariam  
UNHCR  
Associate Field Officer

Lee, HyeonGeun  
Good Neighbors Tanzania  
Field Coordinator

Lomas, Peter  
IFRC  
Operations Manager

Lozinsk, Filip  
Norwegian Refugee  
Council  
Emergency Response  
Team Leader

Meutia, Gina  
UNHCR  
Associate External  
Relations Officer

Mgata, Melchior  
International Rescue  
Committee Kibondo  
Field Coordinator

Misama, Hamiton  
Community  
Environmental  
Management and  
Development  
Organization (CEMDO)  
Project Manager

Mwangoka, Agnes  
UNHCR  
External Relations  
Associate

Mwebe, Timothy  
International Rescue  
Committee  
Head of Office

Onyango, James  
UNHCR  
Education Officer

Rae, Timothy  
Danish Refugee Council  
Head of Programme

Rankho, Kanali  
UNHCR  
External Relations  
Associate

Sandison, Richard  
Plan International  
Emergency Response  
Manager

Santoni, Daria  
UNHCR  
External Relations Officer

Tarimo, Arnold  
Tanzania Red Cross  
Team Leader

Taye, Awoke  
African Initiatives for  
Relief & Development  
(AIRD)  
Sub Office Manager

Tewodros, Amleset  
HelpAge International  
Country Director

Widell, Yesper  
UNHCR  
Associate Protection  
Officer

Yousafzai, Dost  
UNHCR  
Head of Sub Office

## Annex 1: Participants (Dar es Salaam)

Babirye, Sylvia Relief to Development Society (Aird) Acting Programme Country Director	Kifikilo, Godlove UNHCR Associate Protection Officer	Mushi, Anna UNHCR Associate Protection Officer
Faedo, Giorgio International Rescue Committee Deputy Country Director for Programs	Kimu, Martin UNHCR Associate Protection Officer	Miller, Emilie UNHCR Associate Protection Officer
Foster, Jane Oxfam Country Director	Kinyanjui, Mwihaki UNHCR Protection Officer	Nash, David MSF-CH Head of Mission
Haldorsen, Jorgen Plan International Country Director	Konneh, Musa UNHCR Associate Field Officer	Nginila, Revocatus Relief to Development Society (Redeso) Programme Manager
Hussein, Rehema Women's Legal Aide Centre Acting Executive Director	Lange, Unni Norwegian Refugee Council Area Manager	Prata, Davide Church World Service Emergency Livelihood Coordinator
Kaleb, Jasna UNHCR Supply Officer	Lukatiye, Teleshory Tanzania Water & Environmental Sanitation Country Director	Santoni, Daria UNHCR External Relations Officer
Kapaya, Chansa UNHCR Representative	Manongi, Grace Adventist Development and Relief Agency Assistant Programs Director	Shangweli, Emmanuel Tanganyika Christian Refugee Services Country Director
Kaziboni, Stanlake World Vision International Business Development & Quality Assurance Director	Mkaruka, Renatus Tanzania Red Cross Disaster Preparedness Manager	Smart, Daniel Help Age International Assistant Country Director
Kejo, Julius Tanzania Red Cross AG. Secretary General		Thapa, Lilu Danish Refugee Council Country Director
		Triboulet, Anne UNHCR Senior Protection Officer

## Annex 2: Pre-Workshop Questionnaire

Total Respondents: 34					Total Respondents: 28						
Kibondo (October 18, 2016)					Dar es Salaam (October 21, 2016)						
<b>Are you aware of the HC's Structured Dialogue?</b>											
Yes – 8 (28%)		A little – 14 (28%)		No – 7 (24%)		Yes – 13 (46%)		A little – 10 (36%)		No – 5 (18%)	
<b>Have you experienced improvements in the partnership between UNHCR and NGO partners over the past year? In what areas?</b>											
	<i>Information Sharing</i>	<i>Advocacy</i>	<i>Planning</i>	<i>Grant Management</i>		<i>Information Sharing</i>	<i>Advocacy</i>	<i>Planning</i>	<i>Grant Management</i>		
<i>Yes</i>	20 (69%)	7 (24%)	17 (59%)	12 (46%)	<i>Yes</i>	22 (79%)	9 (32%)	14 (50%)	11 (39%)		
<i>A little</i>	7 (24%)	19 (66%)	9 (31%)	13 (45%)	<i>A little</i>	4 (14%)	16 (57%)	12 (43%)	15 (54%)		
<i>No</i>	2 (7%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	<i>No</i>	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)		
<i>Worsened</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.03%)	<i>Worsened</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
<b>Do you feel committed to better UNHCR-NGO partnership processes? (COP participation, information sharing, joint advocacy, protocols, etc.)</b>											
Yes – 25 (86%)		A little – 4 (14%)		No – 0		Yes – 25 (89%)		A little – 3 (11%)		No – 0	
<b>General Comments</b>											
The partnership initiative from the UNHCR side is progressing well. There still needs to be more done in relation to grant management and information sharing from the partners' side.											



### Annex 3: Workshop Evaluation Results

Kibondo, October 18, 2016 (20 respondents)			Dar es Salaam, October 21, 2016 (25 respondents)		
<b>Do you feel more knowledgeable about the HC's Structured Dialogue?</b>					
Yes – 17 (85%)	A little – 2 (10%)	No – 1 (5%)	Yes – 21 (84%)	A little – 4 (16%)	No – 0
<b>What is the most useful thing you learned in this workshop?</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of coordination between partner agencies when carrying out similar activities</li> <li>• How to strengthen partnership between UNHCR and partners</li> <li>• How leadership intersects with coordination</li> <li>• Beyond Information sharing, participatory approaches to advocacy</li> <li>• Perceptions from UNHCR colleagues</li> <li>• The need for regular discussion on this topic</li> <li>• Was able to see the willingness on the part of UNHCR to improve partnership</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire from all participants to continue this dialogue on partnership</li> <li>• UNHCR is open to improving partnership with NGOs</li> <li>• Similar challenges are faced by other partners</li> <li>• Communicate key areas of concern and how to overcome them</li> <li>• A need for periodical and structured reflection on the effectiveness of our partnership</li> <li>• Action items were agreed on for issues raised</li> </ul>		
<b>Moving forward, what will you apply from this workshop in your partnership with UNHCR/NGO partners?</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve on highlighted areas of weakness</li> <li>• Improve openness to information sharing</li> <li>• Transparency</li> <li>• Mutual respect and dialogue</li> <li>• Cooperation and joint planning</li> <li>• Apply decision-making in sector working groups</li> <li>• Having an open/honest partnership with UNHCR</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More transparency is needed on funding availability</li> <li>• Accountability and commitment to partnership from both sides</li> <li>• Emphasis on joint advocacy</li> <li>• Effective communication is key to deliver on assigned objectives</li> <li>• Focus efforts on capacity building/development</li> <li>• Adapt UNHCR coordination model to make meetings more strategic</li> </ul>		
<b>Do you feel more committed to better UNHCR-NGO partnership processes?</b>					
Yes – 19 (95%)	A little – 1 (5%)	No – 0	Yes – 24 (96%)	A little – 1 (4%)	No – 0
No response – 0			No response – 0		
<b>What could have been better?</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To discuss further areas of engagement at local level</li> <li>• Information sharing</li> <li>• Better balance between UNHCR and NGO representation</li> <li>• More time for discussion (detailed aspect of partnership)</li> <li>• More time would have been ideal</li> <li>• More openness from participants</li> <li>• Beneficial to start workshop with a SWOT analysis</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issues raised could have been communicated earlier to receive inputs/comments from specific teams working within NGOs</li> <li>• Empowering partners</li> <li>• Fostering a more open environment - partners seemed reluctant to speak out on difficult issues</li> <li>• Since participants were shy, maybe some icebreakers would have helped ease the discussion</li> </ul>		
<b>Did you like the format of this workshop?</b>					
Yes – 15 (75%)	OK – 2 (10%)	No – 3 (15%)	Yes – 22 (88%)	OK – 3 (12%)	No – 0
<b>Additional comments</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you for the opportunity</li> <li>• Having two sessions in Kibondo and Dar seems to only reinforce the separation</li> <li>• Groups should be smaller</li> <li>• Everything was well organized and coordinated</li> <li>• Let's keep up this dialogue</li> <li>• Looking forward to report/outcomes</li> <li>• Should include field staff</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please share group feedback with participants</li> <li>• More events appreciated</li> <li>• This doesn't seem to be the correct forum for discussing operational partners' relationships with UNHCR. Needs to be bilateral</li> <li>• Effective partnership demands commitment by all partners to deliver on their promises</li> <li>• The workshop was highly interactive by Tanzanian standards</li> </ul>		