External Review of Misereor Partners Network in Pakistan

October 2008

For
Civil Society Human Institutional Development Programme (CHIP)

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

NGOs   Non-Government Organizations

AJK   Azad Jammu and Kashmir

NWFP   North Western Frontier Province

CHIP   Civil Society Human and Institutional Development Program

NRDP   Narowal Rural Development Program

MALC   Marie Adelaid Leprosy Centre

ADF   Alfalah Development Foundation

ERRA   Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority

PERRA   Provincial Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority

DRU   District Reconstruction Unit

PIU   Project implementation Unit

RDP   Rural Development Program

M&E   Monitoring and Evaluation

TOTs   Training of Trainers

RRN   Rural Reconstruction Network

SOPs   Standard Operating Procedures

HRD   Human Resources Development

MOU   Memorandum of Understanding

TORs   Terms of References

NRSP   Nation Rural Support Program

1. Introduction
1.2 Context

During the earthquake of October 8, 2005, Misereor a Germany based International NGO responded for both relief and rehabilitation efforts through some selected civil society organizations. The relief and rehabilitation interventions were initiated in Districts Muzafarabad (AJK), Mansehra, NWFP, (Pakistan). Misereor had the experience of working in countries affected by Tsunami and wish to replicate their experience in earthquake emergency.

Misereor conducted field visits to individual sites and interacted with individual organizations on one to one basis during debriefing sessions. The initial round of discussions with partner organizations highlighted need for mutual learning and coordination to increase synergies and impact of efforts being executed. In this regard two experience sharing meetings were conducted with partner organizations of Misereor to discuss the willingness of organizations for forming a network.

1.2 About the Network

The Network of partner organizations of Misereor was officially formed in November 2006. The network was mainly formed to:

- Provide a platform to the partner organizations of Misereor for mutual sharing of experiences and learning
- Provide opportunity to benefit from partner organizations expertise
- Address the generic and customized capacity building needs of the partner organizations

Civil Society Human and Institutional Development Programme (CHIP), was nominated as the secretariat of this Network. CHIP started facilitating partners through agreed activities under network proposal. The frequency of the activities in the proposal included two experience sharing meetings, one capacity building event and one exposure visit in a year. (The network proposal is attached as annex-1)

1.3 Premise of the Review

The earthquake relief and rehabilitation interventions have almost been completed and partners are now shifting their intervention more towards development phase. In this regard the last experience sharing meeting discussed the need to review the present context of earthquake relief and rehabilitation and assess need for adjusting interventions of network according to the changing context. The external review is proposed to confirm the above. The detailed objectives and process of review are explained below:

1.4 Objectives of Review

Following were the main objectives of the review:
- Analysis of accomplishment of planned activities of Network as per approved proposal and budget
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses of Network activities for its partners
- Identification of limitations of network members for active participation in the network activities
- Recommendations for future activities of network for the benefit of network members learning and mutual support and future potential of the network

1.5   Process/ Methodology
1.5.1   Review of Documents
As a first step, all the relevant documents provided by the Secretariat were reviewed. The documents that were mainly reviewed included Network proposal and reports of experience sharing meeting and exposure visits. The six monthly progress reports were also shared and reviewed.

1.5.2   Development of Checklist
After reviewing the documents, a detailed checklist was developed to address the objectives of the review. The checklist was shared with CHIP and their comments were integrated. The pre-testing was carried out with CHIP and the changes were incorporated to finalize the checklist. Final checklist is attached as annex-2.

1.5.3   Field Visits
All member organizations were visited and their key staff was interviewed. The visits to member organizations were carried out between September and October 2008.

1.5.5   Workshop
As part of the methodology, a workshop with all the member organization was conducted. The key findings of the review exercise were shared and validated by all the members and the secretariat of the Misereor Partners Network.

2.   Findings and Analysis
The review of the Network was planned according to the activities outlined in the Network proposal; Experience sharing meetings, capacity building events, exposure visits and advocacy related events. The members and the secretariat were explored around these activities; their frequency, quality and the practical usefulness.

In addition, members were explored about the frequency of communication, presence of data base with the Secretariat, role of members and the scope of the network.

2.1   Experience Sharing Meetings
The experience sharing meetings were planned with the following aims and objectives:
- Information sharing amongst partner members
- Problem sharing and finding a solution

In addition these meetings are used for planning exposure visits and prioritizing the capacity building needs of the member organizations.

A total of six experience sharing meetings were conducted; three meetings were conducted before the formation of the Network while three meetings were conducted after the Network was formed in November 2006.

The pre-network meetings were test based experience sharing meetings in which a representative from Misereor also participated. The second meeting was specifically conducted to address the queries raised by the Misereor. The representative also met individually with all the network members.

2.1.1   Number and Frequency of Experience Sharing Meetings

In order to gauge the members involvement in the network activities, members were inquired about the total number of experience sharing meetings conducted so far, present frequency and recommended frequency of these meetings in future.

Findings and Analysis

In order to gauge the members involvement in the network activities, members were inquired about the total number of experience sharing meetings conducted so far, present frequency and recommended frequency of these meetings in future.

It is interesting to find out that a large majority of the member organization were not able to recall the correct number of experience sharing meetings conducted so far. Only one member organization correctly reported the total number of meetings.

Regarding the present frequency of these meetings, a majority mentioned that these meetings are being held on quarterly basis. One member organization reported these meetings once in a year while one shared that there is no exact time frame about the frequency, sometimes meet after the quarter and sometimes after six months.

It was felt by CHIP that the present frequency of the experience sharing meeting is satisfactory while other members suggested increasing the frequency of these meetings, on quarterly basis. Some felt that a big gap occurs when meet twice a year.

2.1.2   Issues Pertaining to Efficacy of Experience Sharing Meetings

The members and the Secretariat were asked whether to continue experience sharing meeting. In order to improve the efficacy of the experience sharing meetings, they were further explored about the issues responsible for the under utilization of this platform.

Findings and Analysis

All members and the Secretariat of the Network were of the view to continue experience sharing meetings. They indicated a number of pertinent issues hampering the efficacy of the Network.

The main issue identified by the member organizations and the secretariat is the absence of dedicated individual participating in the meeting from partner organizations. It was reported that sometimes irrelevant and very new individuals participate in the meetings from member organizations. This problem was shared in one of the meeting but the issue was not resolved so far.

Members also highlighted that the secretariat coordinator is working on 2-3 projects at one time while this position require a full time dedicated person

Other issues of concern highlighted by the member organizations were:
- Since relief and rehabilitation work is almost over, partners feel that they have nothing to share, this is also valid for the CHIP because their work is also finished.
- It was shared by the members that in the last meeting there was no agenda. As a result a resource person was invited as a guest speaker to provoke the participant interest
- It was shared that some meetings were conducted on six monthly basis while some occurred on quarterly basis. (one in six months and three in the remaining six months) should be discouraged.

- Members bring presentation on different formats which create confusion as all have different level of understanding.
- The agenda of the meeting should need to be revised as it has become the presentation forum for all members.
- In the meetings problems are discussed but not resolved. No follow up response from the secretariat, secretariat should conduct follow up.
- Suggestions given at the meetings are not properly documented
- Misereor representative rarely attended any meeting. Members expect Misereor to be more active in project related activities, at least meet once a year. Their visit can be combined with the exposure visit of any partner organization.

2.1.3 Agenda of Experience Sharing Meetings
Agenda is always shared with the network members; the purpose of sharing agenda before meeting is to enable network members to incorporate or suggest issue necessary to them. Secondly, as a first step of every meeting, agenda is verbally shared with the concluding sentence that if anybody wants to bring anything under discussion, can be suggest. During the debriefing in HAASHAR Office after exposure visit, members suggested that they can fix a template of agenda which should be with network members every time and if before every meeting any one didn't receive it, the template can be consulted Agenda of the experience sharing meetings was discussed by the member organizations. Following are suggested as the main agenda of the exposure sharing meetings:

- Network related issues
- Member organization's related issues
- Planning process for addressing gaps and problems raised by the member organizations
- Topic or information on innovative ideas should be shared; guest speakers can be invited or any member organization can share
- Improvements occurred at the grass root level should be shared in those meeting meetings rather than just sharing numbers
- Contents and agenda of the meeting should be revised and more focused.

2.1.4 Usefulness of the Experience Sharing Meetings
The member organizations and the Secretariat were explored about usefulness of these meetings and were asked to share any initiative taken to address any problems related to project activities adopted from these meetings.

Findings and Analysis
Experience sharing meetings are considered expedient by a majority of the member organizations. According to the members, these meetings urge to think of new ideas to be incorporate in their own activities for improvement. This is also a learning platform for methodology, structures, implementation and process of member organizations. These meetings keep members updated about other member organizations activities.

While sharing the practical benefits gained form these meetings, members mentioned different instances:
- NRDP mentioned that Haashar had a program on poultry and livestock, the project was inspiring enough to replicate in the Narowal district. NRDP is currently working

on the proposal to increase the incomes of the households by providing them micro credit for household poultry business mainly aimed at working with women.

- MALC was only working with patients and had a totally different approach.
- While sharing examples of learning from meetings, ADF reported the other organizations shared their reports and documentation. They also learnt and improve documentation. ADF also developed a form for collecting information from the field and conducted a survey. The findings of the survey were published in the "Development Vision" Newsletter.
- Haashar learnt about ERRA in the experience sharing meetings. They were briefed about the ERRA, PERRA, DRU and their roles which were previously very confusing.
- MALC shared that they have learnt from Lok Sanjh. MALC was working in four districts of AJK; Rawalakot, Bagh, Muzafarabad and Neelum. They were initially planning to mange the project from their regional office in Rawalpindi. From the example shared by Lok Sanjh at one of the experience sharing meeting, MALC changed their plan and established Project Implementation Units (PIU) in all the 4 districts. They further shared that they also adopted their selection of beneficiary process through a committee comprised of three members, for one of their project.
- One main purpose of experience sharing meetings was exchange of expertise i.e. CHIP sent field staff from Balakot Office to NRSP and Lok Sanjh for a learning to design the EQ resistant structures.

2.2   Advocacy

Advocacy is one of the activities outlined in the Network proposal. The proposal defines advocacy as:

"Network will organize events for advocacy to influence policy e.g. any member can highlight the issue and Secretariat will facilitate its designing and execution"

2.2.1   Number and Nature of Advocacy Events

All the member organizations and the Secretariat were explored about the nature and number of advocacy events organized so far. They were further explored whether advocacy should remain part of the Network activity and if yes, what issues can be advocated.

Findings and Analysis

It was revealed that none of the advocacy event was organized by any member organization. One member shared that they are not aware that advocacy is part of the Network activity while another mentioned that few discussions took place during the last experience sharing meeting but no event was organized on advocacy. The Secretariat shared that there is no budget for any advocacy related issue in the financial proposal. However, all members were of the view that advocacy should remain part of the Network activity. One member organization was of the view that members should receive training on advocacy. It was also mentioned that advocacy can only be possible with large number of members; seven members cannot influence any policy. At present the network is more like a project rather than a network.

Regarding the issues to be advocated through this platform following suggestions were listed:
- Member organizations issues can be advocated through the network
- Strategy to promote relations of member organizations with donors in the form of continued support for the projects can be advocated

- Joint forest Management issues can be advocated
- Advocacy around laws, rules and regulations
- Advocacy on project based issues with line departments and Nazims
- Water and solid waste issues with line departments, MNA and Nazims
- Farmer rights
- Gender

2.3   Data Base
The proposal of the Network states that *"Network will collect and maintain a resource base including reports, books, resource persons and their addresses for sharing with members"*

2.3.1   Presence of Data Base
All the members and the Secretariat were inquired about the presence of any data base.

Findings and analysis
None of the members were aware of the presence of any data base with the Secretariat. The Secretariat has also reported not maintaining any data base.

2.4   Exposure visits
One exposure visit per year was planned for the member organizations and a maximum of two participants from each member organization was proposed to participate. One participant from the management and the other from the program staff proposed. The duration of the exposure visit would be for 3 days and the exposure visit report should be circulated amongst members with 7 days of the completion of visit.

A total of 2 exposure visits were organized so far; of Haashar association working in the Siran Valley of Mansehra district and RDP's work in Garhi Habibullah, district Mansehra. Hasahar Association was working on Livestock farming, orchids and shelter for livestock while RDP was working on goat farming. Although RDP was not part of the network, they participated in one of the meeting as guest speaker and CHIP suggested visiting RDP's work.

Purpose of inviting resource person from RDP and exposure visit to their project sites was that RDP started their work in EQ stricken areas immediately after the earthquake. They started from relief activity and continued till rehabilitation and later entered into the development phase. A variety of learning for the members was anticipated as RDP has been through every phase i.e. relief, rehabilitation and then development. Most of the members working in earthquake areas existed till relief or maximum rehabilitation stage. It was time to learn the transformation from rehabilitation to developmental phase. Therefore, the exposure visit was planned for the activity.

2.4.1   Implementation of the Exposure Visits
The member organizations were explored about the planning and implementation of the exposure visits.

Findings and Analysis
According to all members, first visit was very well planned. However, three members shared that the second was not very well planned as informed very late.

2.4.2 Usefulness of the Exposure Visits

The views of the member organizations were sought regarding the continuity of exposure visits and reasons for that. They were further asked to elaborate any initiative taken as the result of the learning gained form exposure visits.

Findings and Analysis

All the members wished to continue the exposure visits because this enhances their knowledge and gives more clarity of the activities of the organizations. Most of the them shared that individuals participating in the exposure visits should be given the task to bring the benefits to the organizations. The findings form the visits should be shared at the organizational level. One member suggested an output based plan for the exposure visits with proper follow up mechanism.

However, it is important to note that majority were not able to expound the usefulness of exposure visit. Only two member organizations were able to expound the usefulness of the exposure visits. They shared examples of their learning from these visits and their implementation. NRDP shared that during visit to Haashar Association office, they observed a desk specified for reading daily newspaper. All staff members were only allowed to read the newspaper at that desk and were not allowed to take newspaper to other rooms. NRDP immediately adopted the practice in their office.

NRDP also shared learning the idea of backyard poultry farming from Haashar Association. They have modified it to suit their own need by adding poultry shed through community contribution.

Caritas shared that committees formed by RDP were monitoring and implementing the project at the village level in their respective areas. This was learnt during the visit that those committees were independent and more effective and sustainable. NRDP proposed to replicate in one of their project in Narowal district.

According to one member organization, there was nothing that can be replicated although the project activities were more or less similar across member organizations.

2.5 Communication

One of the important roles of the Secretariat is in its capacity as communicator:
"The Secretariat is responsible for communicating timely information of Network activities, technical information, documents events in the form of reports and minutes and disseminate to members"
Network members are responsible for:
"Responding to queries, comments and communication of the Secretariat"

This clearly shows that both the members and the secretariat have the responsibility regarding communication between them.

2.5.1 Channels and Frequency of Communication

Member organizations were inquired about the channels mostly used to communicate regarding network activities and what is the frequency of communication between members and the Secretariat.

Findings and Analysis
Members mostly receive network activities information through email and telephone while some documents are received via surface mail also. One member shared secretariat informs about the meeting at the last minute mainly through phone and emails are used very rarely. Secretariat shared that some member organizations have personal internet IDs that are creating information gaps between the secretariat and members.

Regarding the frequency of the communication, 4 members replied that it is event based and other wise very limited communication. According to two members, the frequency is once in a month while one mentioned once in three months.

2.5.2 Documents Received
Members and Secretariat were asked to list the documents they have received and circulated respectively.

Findings and analysis
Member organizations mentioned receiving following documents:
- ERRA safety guidelines
- Reports on experience sharing meetings
- Exposure visit reports

However, the Secretariat mentioned more documents shared with the members. It was mentioned that majority of the report come in soft via emails and some reports come in hard copies via surface mail. It is interesting to find out that none of the member organizations maintained any hard file record of the network activities or documents received. Almost all shared that they have soft folders in their computers.

One important activity that started right in the beginning of this networking experience is still not completed. According to the reports of the experience sharing meetings, member organizations were requested to send their organizational profiles for the purpose of documentation. This task is still not completed mainly due to the some member organizations not sending their profiles.

One organization mentioned that the report of exposure visit to RDP was shared with them. It was also shared that information is usually received on time but the agenda of the meeting is some time not clear e.g. secretariat asked to give presentation but not cleared on what; NGOs project or Misereor project, as a result every member came up with a different presentation. All member organizations were asked if they have received the Network proposal. It was revealed that none of the member organizations received the proposal.

2.6 Capacity Building
2.6.1 Assessment of Capacity Building Needs
Members were asked to share how their capacity building needs were assessed, whether their capacity building needs are addressed so far and what are their future needs. They were also inquired to list down the capacity building tools other than trainings

Findings and Analysis
It was reported by all member organizations that their capacity building needs were assessed and prioritize in the experience sharing meetings. All members actively participated in the process and were satisfied with the selection of the capacity building activity.

They further shared that their capacity building needs were addressed by the Network to some extent. The trainings so far conducted were very relevant and effective. The mentioned two trainings; Disaster Preparedness and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. However, most of the members as well as the Secretariat were of the view that one training per year is not enough to address the needs of the member organizations.

Regarding the trainings conducted, majority shared that a follow up of the M&E training is required for increased learning and proper use. They identified following trainings to enhance their capacity:
- Social Mobilization
- Report Writing Skills
- Institutional Certification ISO9002
- TOTs
- Natural Resource Management
- Financial Management Education and Health
- Organizational Management

For a majority of the member capacity building tools other than trainings are exposure visits and Internship that implies exchange of skills between member organizations.
It was shared by the secretariat that member organizations are not keen to improve their management standards, as the trainings identified by the partners were mainly revolved around the project management. Most of the organizations lack organizational management planning, human resources management and financial management. In addition Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) do not exist for most of the partners.

2.6.2 Utilization of the training
Member organizations were explored about the usefulness of the trainings received so far. They were asked to share examples where the learning from the training was brought into use by any member organization.

Findings and Analysis
It is evident from the responses of member organizations that they were able to put into use the training on M&E to some extent but none of them shared any example of the practical use of training on Disaster Management.

NRDP shared that as a result of the M&E training, the Planning Monitoring Evaluation and Research Unit of NRDP became more efficient. They stared developing monitoring indicators which was the key learning from the training.

Lok Sanjh shared the M&E training has helped them to enhance the selection process for material distribution in one of their project in Bagh, AJK. They developed Rural Reconstruction Network (RRN) which included the key stakeholders including Nazims and local activists. They also shared adopting monitoring formats and planning tools (matrix) for their regular projects.

According to Caritas, the M&E training helped in improving M&E indicators for their projects. While MALC shared that their reporting has improved after the M&E training.

Some reported not utilizing the learning from the trainings. CHIP shared that the person who received training from CHIP left the organization and therefore, the training was not utilized.

Although the person selected for the training was from the training department, so the training can be eventually repeated by the CHIP.

2.7 Membership

The membership criteria and the possibilities of the expansion of membership were discussed in two experience sharing meetings and also in the proposal of the Network.

Report of the first experience sharing meetings commented on the possible members of the Network as

"all members of the Network must have partnership with Misereor for implementing relief and rehabilitation or development project"

The report of the second experience sharing meeting states *"any existing member can nominate a potential new member. Its membership will be approved or decided mutually"*

However, the proposal of the Network Secretariat of November 2006 commented on membership criteria as *"the Network will comprise of different types of members; civil society organizations funded by Misereor, other civil society organizations implementing development projects and technical support organizations"*

2.7.1 Expansion of Membership

One of the key questions of the review related to membership expansion of the network.

Views of the member organizations were sought on the possibilities of expansion of the membership. They were also explored about the types of organization to be included in the network.

Findings and analysis

A majority of the member organizations were positive about the expansion of the membership. They were of the view that an expansion can be build on this networking experience. Responding on the type of organizations to be included, following were the options indicated:

- Technical experts/resource persons can be members with incentive based membership as voluntary membership would not be very useful or active.
- Issue based management experts can become members
- Involve organizations working on similar issues.
- Membership fee can be imposed in shape if contribution to increase the sense of ownership amongst members.
- All priority areas of Misereor and NGOs working on those issues can be included in the network.

Of those not willing to expand the membership, had following views:

- The network is not very strong and expansion should be at the stage when we have learnt something. Expanding network is a possibility at the later stage
- Since Misereor is funding it can be decided by the Misereor
- Not sure because this network is one donor funded network
- We should expand but see what is the interest

2.7.2 Scope of the Network

Member organizations as well as the Secretariat were explored about the scope of the Network in future.

Findings and analysis

For a majority of the member organizations Network should work on both policies and grass root level initiatives. For some the network should be beyond project related and should be geared towards institutional strengthening of member organizations. One shared that this platform should be used to address common issues of member organizations. In addition, information on relevant trainings can be informed through the Network, including vacancies, events, and other trainings.

Network should also provide general facilitation, increases linkages (concerns with line departments. In addition, donor hunting should also be carried out by the Secretariat; this will add value to the network.

According to the Secretariat, the scope of the Network should include common interest related to program, organizations, financial management and external factors (resource mobilization, insecurities and advocacy). They further shared that small NGOs are more focused on program related issues.

2.7.3   Role of Members
The role of member organizations in the Network was discussed with all members at length. They were inquired if they are satisfied with their present role or what are the suggestions for future.

Findings and Analysis
Role of members is generally seen as passive and more oriented towards receiving end. Member organizations were of the view that they should be involved in the planning process and their feedback should be included. Some members agreed their role is very important and as well as their contribution and participation. Members should also contribute financially and in kind. NRDP shared that resources without any cost should be shared at the network level. It was shared that NRDP provided their vehicle free of cost for the travel of members from Islamabad to Mansehra for the first exposure visit to Haashar organization. One organization suggested revising member's performance on yearly basis. Following should be the responsibilities of the members:
- Member organizations are responsible for sending decent/relevant member in the meetings
- Should positively support the secretariat
- Provide timely response to the queries of the secretariat and members

Secretariat should be responsible to:
- Take members into confidence as both should be accountable to each other
- Share the plans of the secretariat (both financial and technical)
- Plans should be finalized with the agreement of all members

3.   Conclusions and Recommendations
This section summarizes main conclusions drawn from the previous section and recommendations mainly drawn from the discussions with the member organizations and the Secretariat. In addition, the draft report was shared at the validation workshop and the recommendation and comments provided by members and well as Secretariat are incorporated in this section.

3.1 Experience Sharing Meetings

Conclusions

Member organizations wish to continue experience sharing meetings. They were able to highlight the issues responsible for the under utilization of this activity, clearly showing their intention for improvement.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the member organizations involvement need more commitment on their behalf. Not being able to correctly recall the total number of experience sharing meetings is one indicator that elaborates their attitude towards the Network as a whole and experience sharing meetings in general.

It is obvious that more commitment is required from both the secretariat and the member organizations. Nominating a senior staff to participate in the meetings is the main solution to increased commitment and the resultant improvement in the quality from members. While nominating a full time dedicated coordinator is the solution for the secretariat in the second phase of the Network beyond 2009.

There is a need to review the agenda of the meeting involving all the member organizations. To keep the interest of the members alive, meeting agenda can be more interesting and more geared towards offering a solution for the issues raised by the members.

There is no doubt that experience sharing meetings are an important tool for enhancing knowledge and increased learning. Member organizations were able to make use of this platform in their project activities.

Recommendations

Keeping in view the shift in the objectives of the experience sharing meetings, the members suggested that this platform should be renamed as Networking Meeting. This platform should be used for planning, discussing financial matters and other network issues as well. It was agreed that member organizations are resource for the Network. Finances should also be shared with the network members.

Instead of 2 meetings per year, members suggested 4 meetings per year (one in each quarter). Members also decided to rotate the venue of these meetings between member organizations. It was initially suggested by the member to combine the meetings and exposure visits making it more cost effective, however, during the validation workshop members argued on this and after great discussion member decided to keep the activities separate. Only the first Network Meeting in February 2009 will be combined with exposure visit.

Individuals participating in the meeting should be a responsible person for example Chief Executives, mangers and other senior staff. They should have the position and capacity to implement the learning in their respective organizations and can contribute to the network. New staff should be discouraged to participate in these meetings. It is suggested that two members should participate in the meeting as a replacement to each other. Members strongly suggested that these meetings should be shared at the member organizational level. Participants should be responsible to disseminate the information in their respective organizations in any regular office meeting. This will increase the Network recognition within the ember organizations.

The members suggested increasing the duration of the experience sharing meetings. One day for the meeting is not enough; it happened many times that due to little time the issues that were in the agenda were not completed. However, responding to this issue in the workshop, member organizations suggested to keep one day for the meeting but should start early and utilize the time more efficiently.

The agenda of the meeting was extensively discussed in the validation workshop. The agenda of the Network meeting should include lesson learnt and challenges from projects other than Misereor. Network can help in providing the solutions and recommendations for the challenges shared by member organizations. In addition, approaches adopted by partner organizations in terms of delivery of projects can be shared with member organizations at these meetings.

NRDP suggested that agenda for the forthcoming meeting should be finalized in the Network Meeting so that the things decided for follow up can automatically be covered in the agenda of next meeting.

3.2   Advocacy
Conclusions
It is obvious from the discussion above that advocacy was not addressed as an activity so far. However, member wish to continue advocacy related activity in the Network.

Recommendation
Since advocacy was included in the proposal, it is suggested to focus on advocacy related activities during the next year. However, during the validation workshop members decided to have one session on advocacy in any experience sharing meeting. All member organization will share advocacy tools they have been using in their projects for increased learning of the members. This was decided because advocacy is an unbudgeted activity and for the next year, this will be the first step towards working on advocacy.

3.3   Data Base
Conclusions
Secretariat need to respond to this activity as it would add value to the Network and also maintain the interest of the member organizations.

Members in the validation workshop recommended developing a web page for the Network. The web page should include the profiles of the network members, reports of the meetings and exposure visits. Progress reports of the member organizations as well as any event, training organized can also be posted on the web page. The secretariat can also post any information of the web page. This will enable the Network members to keep updated and can download any report, minutes whenever they require. This will also increase the Netwrok recognition as well as member organization promotion amongst other Networks and Organizations.

3.4   Exposure visits
Conclusions
It can be concluded that Exposure visit is an important tool of capacity building and should be continued. The selection of the organization to be visited should be reviewed for the next phase of the Network beyond 2009.

Recommendation
It is suggested that first member organization should be visited and then other options can be explored. Combining experience sharing meetings with exposure visits is one suggestion that would be more cost effective, efficient and useful. However, during discussion in the validation workshop, it was decided to keep both events separate mainly because senior management staff is required to participate in the meetings while project staff should participate in exposure visit. By combining both, the number of delegates will increase which are not manageable.

The number of exposure visits was also increased from 1 to 2 visits per year, as decided by the member organizations in the validation workshop. It was discussed that 2 exposure visits with low and with more contribution from members can be conducted. It was highlighted that as network member, member organizations must bring resources to the network through increased contribution.

3.5   Communication

Conclusions
Internet is the most frequent channel used for communication followed by telephone. The frequency of the communication is event based thus not satisfactory.

Recommendations
Using organizational Internet IDs and avoiding personal IDs is one option for effective communication. During the validation workshop member suggested to have both the IDs (institutional as well as personal) and the information should be sent on both the IDs. More frequent communication through internet is suggested for better Networking. Communication through telephone should be discouraged as it is more expensive. Members should show their commitment through improved frequency. The substance for the improved frequency is discussed in the Network Meetings recommendations.

During visits for the purpose of review to member organizations and also at the validation workshop, it was felt that there is hardly any communication between member organizations. This area also needs improvement; members should think themselves as *One Network*, exchange of ideas, successes, events should also be carried out between members promoting more collaborative and supportive relations between members.

The possibility of establishing a Yahoo group was under discussion and consideration since the first experience sharing meeting. It is the time to finalize the details and established an effective internet group. There are examples of other internet based networking groups at the national as well as international level.

There is an absolute need to maintain hard copied of all the Network related activities with all member organizations. Keeping only some details on the computer shows their lack of interest in the Network. The validation workshop also confirmed that all members should maintain hard files of Network activities.

Starting a newsletter for the network was another activity that was under consideration from the very beginning but still not materialized. It is suggested to publish a newsletter that can be distributed to other organizations and networks. The success stories or achievements of the member organizations can be part of the newsletter for sharing. However, in the validation

workshop members decided to develop a web page and the Newsletter can be part of the web page.

3.6 Capacity Building

Conclusions

Capacity building needs are assessed with the participation of all member organizations. However, one training per year is not sufficient to address the capacity building needs of all members. Training on Monitoring and Evaluation was utilized to some extent by member organizations but none of the member was able to report the utilization of first training on Disaster Preparedness.

Recommendations

During the validation workshop, the overall focus of the capacity building tools remained on institutional strengthening of the member organizations. The members stressed the need of institutional strengthening through enhanced management in administration, human resources and finance. Members in the validation workshop highlighted the trainings in above mentioned management topics. In addition, they indicated for more practical trainings with less focus on theories. The duration of the trainings should also be increased (at least 5 days) as suggested during the workshop. Trainings should be planned on output basis to ensure their implementation.

Member organizations in the validation workshop highlighted that exposure visits are an important capacity building tool as well as the exchange of staff between the member organizations.

Member organizations were of the view that the extension phase of the Network (beyond 2009) should focus on institutional strengthening and development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for member organizations. They suggested developing a separate proposal for this activity to be submitted to Misereor for funding.

3.7 Membership

Conclusions

Expanding the membership base is possible as indicated by most of the member organizations; however, this is only possible in the extension phase of the Network.

Recommendations

The validation workshop also extensively discussed membership issue; it was agreed that if any member organization is not present in two meetings, its membership will be cancelled. Written document (MoU/TORs) for the network members should be developed and dully signed by the secretariat and members to make them more responsible towards the Netwrok.

Members should play a more active role in future and contribute to the Network. This will lead to the increased sense of ownership of the Network. Members are seen as the resource to the Network and their commitment will lead to sustainability and effectiveness of the Network. NRDP shared that they are also a member of another Network where all member organizations contributed 20,000/year for the network event as no donor is supporting the network.

3.8 Scope of the Network

Conclusions

The future scope of the Network is seen as both policy oriented as well as project based.

Recommendations

Network should facilitate member organizations in donor hunting and provide information on other opportunities of training, events etc. This would add value to the Network. Network should be treated as a Network and not a project.

3.9 Planning for Year 2009

The workshop was conducted to validate the findings of the review as well as the planning third year of the Network. Members were asked to list down the activities they wish to continue in year three and review the objectives of selected activities, define role of the Secretariat and members and estimate the cost for that activity.

Foy year three of the Network starting from November 2008 to November 2009, member organizations selected following activities:

3.9.1 Experience Sharing Meetings

The experience sharing meetings should be renamed as *network meeting* to be organized on quarterly basis and the venue to be rotated amongst member organizations.

Network Meetings	
Objectives and focus	platform for resolving the issues of partner organizations and planning for future activities and role of network in development
Role of Secretariat	To coordinate and follow up for timely implementation of decisions made in the meeting
Role of members	Ensure effective implementation and participation of decisions of network
Estimated cost	Rs 150,000 for 4 exposure visits
Means of verification	Minutes, pictures, attendance sheet and receipt

3.9.2 Exposure visits

Two exposure visits of the member organizations were decided with following details:

Exposure Visits	
Objectives and focus	Learning and sharing of experiences and best practices, skills development (micro-credit) and identification of benefit opportunities from member organizations Focus on organizational policies, systems and procedures, organizational structure, organizational programs, approaches and working methodology, organizational lessons learnt and experiences
Role of Secretariat	Facilitation and coordination
Role of members	Participation, cooperation, contribution, of expertise, inputs, resources
Estimated cost	Rs 150,000 for two visits
Means of verification	Minutes, pictures, attendance sheet and receipt

3.9.3 Capacity building
One training to be selected from human resources, financial, administration management

Capacity building	
Objectives and focus	Institutional Building Focus on exposure visit, practical demo, appreciative support, trainings, HRD, system support and innovations, financial management
Role of Secretariat	coordination and facilitation
Role of members	relevant participation and facilitation support
Estimated cost	Rs 150,000 for one training
Means of verification	photos, attendance sheet, press coverage, and visit reports, expenditure incurred

3.9.4 Advocacy;
Member organizations should share their advocacy tools in any network meeting

3.9.5 Web page
The web page should be developed for the network.

3.10 Network Beyond 2009
Both members and the Secretariat should explore for future funding possibilities for the Network. They discussed of preparing a proposal jointly by all members and Secretariat to be submitted to potential donors; Misereor can also continue funding this Network. Members strongly willing to continue this networking experience beyond 2009 and hope that this Network emerges as one of the strongest networks in Pakistan.

The membership base is also proposed to be expanded to include other organizations in the development sectors working on similar issues. Advocacy should be the main focus of the Network beyond 2009 and this can only be achieved with broad membership base.

Secretariat should revolve between member organizations and the duration should be discussed mutually. A network office can be established to be based in Islamabad or can be hosted by member organizations. The members were of the view that Secretariat should be located at a strategic place i.e. Islamabad. The coordinator can be selected from any member organization and the coordinator ship should revolve amongst members.