Opening remarks from representatives of the three host organisations (UNICEF, OCHA and the IFRC) and US OFDA helped to reinforce the global institutional commitments to AAP and CCE, such as the IASC Commitments to Accountability to Affected People (CAAP) and how this is translated into regional strategies.

From the perspective of UNICEF, AAP and CCE reinforce the agency's commitment to respecting and promoting the human rights of vulnerable populations, in particular children and adolescents. This is reflected in UNICEF's Core Commitments to Children in Humanitarian Action (CCC) and its endorsement of the CHS. UNICEF has also made commitments under the Grand Bargain to support greater participation of communities in humanitarian actions and localization of aid efforts.

In the context of LAC, there are important challenges in the region and more efforts need to be made internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilizing collective resources to achieve better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly its experience in C4D, but more needs to be done to systematize this experience so that it is a regular part of programming.

In a region with high rates of marginalization and social exclusion of children and adolescents (as well as children with disabilities, indigenous, afro-descendent people), CCE and C4D offer a means to ensure their voices and perspectives are included in planning and development of humanitarian and development programmes.

In this sense, the workshop was an opportunity to promote the systematic integration of CCE and C4D into humanitarian responses and collective decision-making processes, such as clusters and Humanitarian Country Teams in a response. At the same time, as part of its localisation commitments, UNICEF is committed to working with national and local authorities, partners and communities to strengthen capacities for effective and accountable and sustainable responses. C4D and CCE are an important means to do this.

UN OCHA shared a similar perspective, highlighting the need for coordinated actions to strengthen communication and community engagement in order to better respect the rights of vulnerable and affected people, and implement humanitarian actions that are relevant and appropriate and effective at meeting their needs. Accountability is also the responsibility to listen and understand and adapt to local cultures and customs, communicate transparently with people, and avoid negative effects as a consequence of humanitarian action. In this regard, OCHA is committed to supporting coordinated actions that avoid duplication and gaps in the response, and using research and new communications technologies to allow greater participation of vulnerable communities in decision-making.

The IFRC emphasized for the Red Cross Red Crescent, humanitarian actions need to be based on the premise that communities have capacities and can solve many of the problems they face when given the right tools and support. Assessments and plans need to be calibrated to incorporate the views and voices of vulnerable people, and humanitarian actors need to manage this information to support empowering communities. Communication and community engagement should help amplify vulnerable people's voices, and build relationships of trust and confidence. But communication and community engagement should not be an end, but a means to improve accountability and operational efficiency and effectiveness. Transparency and respect should be part of the values that guide humanitarians.

Finally, OFDA offered the perspective of a donor government, highlighting OFDA's continued support to meeting the Grand Bargain commitments at the global level, as well as its support to the CCEI, through regional learning events like the one in Panama. From OFDA's perspective, the region presents very favourable conditions to advance the agenda around AAP and CCE. This is based on its long history of supporting C4D and participatory communication approaches, the strong collaboration and coordination between governments and humanitarian actors, and the absence of major chronic emergencies and conflicts that have undermined local capacities in many other contexts. In LAC, OFDA's regional strategy looks to support innovative use of two-way communication, social media, or new and emerging technologies, and for scaling up CCE in order to achieve more effective responses to crises and meet AAP commitments. As a donor, OFDA will continue to support CCE and AAP, and encourage aid organisations in the region to find common strategies and methodologies on how to consolidate this work in the future.
commitments. As a donor, OFDA will continue to support CCE and AAP, and encourage aid organisations to use new technologies, and for scaling up CCE in order to achieve more effective responses to crises and meet AAP commitments. This will involve improving the actual delivery and coordination of aid, and providing a more effective response to affected people, and implement humanitarian actions that are relevant and appropriate and effective at the local level.

Finally, OFDA shared a similar perspective, highlighting the need for global leaders, UN agencies, NGOs, and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, to develop strategies to include stakeholders with a shared agenda around participatory communication and community engagement, in order to better respect the rights of vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilising collective resources to achieve better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, and using research and new communications to ensure that this experience is systematized so that it is a regular part of the organization.

UN OCHA is committed to supporting coordinated actions to strengthen the CHS. UNICEF has also made commitments under the Grand Bargain to support greater participation of communities in humanitarian actions and localization of aid efforts. The IFRC emphasized for the Red Cross Red Crescent, humanitarian actions need to be based on the participation of communities. Communication and community engagement should help amplify vulnerable people's voices, and build relationships of trust and confidence. But communication and community engagement must not be an end, but a means to improve accountability and operational efficiency and effectiveness. UNICEF shared its experience in C4D, but more needs to be done to systematize this experience so that it is a regular part of the organization.

In the context of LAC, there are important challenges in the region and more efforts need to be made to prevent the negative consequences of humanitarian action. In this regard, OCHA is committed to supporting coordination and integration between governments and humanitarian actors, and the absence of major chronic emergencies and support to C4D and participatory communication approaches, the strong collaboration and coordination of programming, and the sharing of experiences among stakeholders with a shared agenda around participatory communication and community engagement. The opportunity to promote the systematic integration of CCE and C4D into humanitarian and development programmes should not be missed.

UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilising collective resources to achieve better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, and using research and new communications to ensure that this experience is systematized so that it is a regular part of the organization.
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In the context of LAC, there are important challenges in the region and more efforts need to be made internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilizing collective resources to achieve the better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly its experience in C4D, but more needs to be done to systematize this experience so that it is a regular part of programming.

In a region with high rates of marginalization and social exclusion of children and adolescents (as well as children with disabilities, indigenous, afro-descendent people), CCE and C4D offer a means to ensure their voices and perspectives are included in planning and development of humanitarian and development programmes.

In this sense, the workshop was an opportunity to promote the systematic integration of CCE and C4D into humanitarian responses and collective decision-making processes, such as clusters and Humanitarian Country Teams in a response. At the same time, as part of its localisation commitments, UNICEF is committed to working with national and local authorities, partners and communities to strengthen capacities for effective and accountable and sustainable responses. C4D and CCE are an important means to do this.

UN OCHA shared a similar perspective, highlighting the need for coordinated actions to strengthen communication and community engagement in order to better respect the rights of vulnerable and affected people, and implement humanitarian actions that are relevant and appropriate and effective at meeting their needs. Accountability is also the responsibility to listen and understand and adapt to local cultures and customs, communicate transparently with people, and avoid negative effects as a consequence of humanitarian action. In this regard, OCHA is committed to supporting coordinated actions that avoid duplication and gaps in the response, and using research and new communications technologies to allow greater participation of vulnerable communities in decision-making.

The IFRC emphasized for the Red Cross Red Crescent, humanitarian actions need to be based on the premise that communities have capacities and can solve many of the problems they face when given the right tools and support. Assessments and plans need to be calibrated to incorporate the views and voices of vulnerable people, and humanitarian actors need to manage this information to support empowering communities. Communication and community engagement should help amplify vulnerable people’s voices, and build relationships of trust and confidence. But communication and community engagement should not be an end, but a means to improve accountability and operational efficiency and effectiveness. Transparency and respect should be part of the values that guide humanitarians.

Finally, OFDA offered the perspective of a donor government, highlighting OFDA’s continued support to meeting the Grand Bargain commitments at the global level, as well as its support to the CCEI, through regional learning events like the one in Panama. From OFDA’s perspective, the region presents very favourable conditions to advance the agenda around AAP and CCE. This is based on its long history of supporting C4D and participatory communication approaches, the strong collaboration and coordination between governments and humanitarian actors, and the absence of major chronic emergencies and conflicts that have undermined local capacities in many other contexts. In LAC, OFDA’s regional strategy looks to support innovative use of two-way communication, social media, or new and emerging technologies, and for scaling up CCE in order to achieve more effective responses to crises and meet AAP commitments. As a donor, OFDA will continue to support CCE and AAP, and encourage aid organisations in the region to find common strategies and methodologies on how to consolidate this work in the future.
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In the context of LAC, there are important challenges in the region and more efforts need to be made internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilizing collective resources to achieve the better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly its experience in C4D, but more needs to be done to systematize this experience so that it is a regular part of programming.

In a region with high rates of marginalization and social exclusion of children and adolescents (as well as children with disabilities, indigenous, afro-descendent people), CCE and C4D offer a means to ensure their voices and perspectives are included in planning and development of humanitarian and development programmes.

In this sense, the workshop was an opportunity to promote the systematic integration of CCE and C4D into humanitarian responses and collective decision-making processes, such as clusters and Humanitarian Country Teams in a response. At the same time, as part of its localisation commitments, UNICEF is committed to working with national and local authorities, partners and communities to strengthen capacities for effective and accountable and sustainable responses. C4D and CCE are an important means to do this.

UN OCHA shared a similar perspective, highlighting the need for coordinated actions to strengthen communication and community engagement in order to better respect the rights of vulnerable and affected people, and implement humanitarian actions that are relevant and appropriate and effective at meeting their needs. Accountability is also the responsibility to listen and understand and adapt to local cultures and customs, communicate transparently with people, and avoid negative effects as a consequence of humanitarian action. In this regard, OCHA is committed to supporting coordinated actions that avoid duplication and gaps in the response, and using research and new communications technologies to allow greater participation of vulnerable communities in decision-making.

The IFRC emphasized for the Red Cross Red Crescent, humanitarian actions need to be based on the premise that communities have capacities and can solve many of the problems they face when given the right tools and support. Assessments and plans need to be calibrated to incorporate the views and voices of vulnerable people, and humanitarian actors need to manage this information to support empowering communities. Communication and community engagement should help amplify vulnerable people’s voices, and build relationships of trust and confidence. But communication and community engagement should not be an end, but a means to improve accountability and operational efficiency and effectiveness. Transparency and respect should be part of the values that guide humanitarians.

Finally, OFDA offered the perspective of a donor government, highlighting OFDA’s continued support to meeting the Grand Bargain commitments at the global level, as well as its support to the CCEI, through regional learning events like the one in Panama. From OFDA’s perspective, the region presents very favourable conditions to advance the agenda around AAP and CCE. This is based on its long history of supporting C4D and participatory communication approaches, the strong collaboration and coordination between governments and humanitarian actors, and the absence of major chronic emergencies and conflicts that have undermined local capacities in many other contexts. In LAC, OFDA’s regional strategy looks to support innovative use of two-way communication, social media, or new and emerging technologies, and for scaling up CCE in order to achieve more effective responses to crises and meet AAP commitments. As a donor, OFDA will continue to support CCE and AAP, and encourage aid organisations in the region to find common strategies and methodologies on how to consolidate this work in the future.
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As part of the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI), UNICEF, OCHA and the IFRC, with the financial support from the Office of United States Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) recently organized a Regional Learning Event in Panama “From Words to Action: Improving Communication, Community Engagement and Accountability to Affected People in Latin America and the Caribbean.”

The three-day workshop was held from October 30 to November 1, 2018, and brought together over 75 representatives from different governments, UN agencies, NGOs and other organizations to share experiences, good practices and strategies to support more effective humanitarian actions and improve Accountability to Affected People (AAP) by systematically integrating Communication for Development (C4D) and Communication and Community Engagement (CCE)* into the response to crises.

The specific objectives were to:

- Share good practices and innovative approaches to improve accountability through C4D and CCE strategies that can be replicated in other countries and crisis contexts.
- Identify collective capacities and existing resources in CCE and areas for improvement in the region.
- Support the integration of C4D/CCE approaches into humanitarian action through a CCE/AAP community of practice.
- Identify specific actions at the country and regional level to consolidate and scale-up coordinated approaches to C4D/CCE approaches, potentially with the support of the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI).

This report provides an overview of the key discussions and findings from the workshop, with a focus on strengthening and scaling up C4D/CCE approaches, particularly related to preparedness and response to natural and human-made disasters, population movements, and public health emergencies.

* Note: For the purposes of this workshop, CCE also refers to related work around Communication for Development (C4D) or Communication with Communities (CwC). The concepts, approaches and activities have similar aims and address similar issues: ensuring effective communication between aid organisations and vulnerable and crisis-affected people in order to achieve better results and outcomes for them, and meet commitments to Accountability to Affected People (AAP).
Background, Concepts and Institutional Commitments to AAP and CCE
Background

Recent evaluations and discussions around the response to humanitarian crises and public health emergencies show that the systematic integration of communication and community engagement approaches is vital for planning effective and accountable humanitarian actions. The outcomes of the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution and Localisation work streams, together with the IASC Commitments for the Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) or the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS), all emphasize the need for more coherent and coordinated approaches to provide information that will help save lives of vulnerable populations affected by the humanitarian crisis; to promote their safety; maintain healthy behaviours, strengthen local capabilities, and are actively involved in the response.¹

The Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI) aims to support meeting global commitments to CCE and AAP, by providing a platform for knowledge-sharing, technical assistance on how to better integrate of CCE into preparedness, response and recovery from humanitarian crises. Jointly supported by UNICEF, UN OCHA, the IFRC, the CDAC network and other partners, the CCEI seeks to strengthen the quality, accountability, and effectiveness of humanitarian responses by ensuring that the population at risk has access to critical life-saving information to take actions to protect themselves from risks, and can participate in the design and implementation of humanitarian responses and decisions that affect them.

What is the CCEI?

The CCEI is a platform to share and consolidate experiences around communication and community engagement. The platform aims to support delivery of global commitments to AAP, and the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution through coordinated and collective approaches to CCE.

At the global level, the CCEI provides technical assistance to country programmes, promotes standards, best practices and quality benchmarks, and offers guidance, tools and best practice examples. The initiative also maintains standby capacities of trained specialists to support CCE preparedness and response activities at the country level and facilitates regional learning events like the workshop in Panama.

What does success look like?

For the CCEI, success is when:

- Are able to participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programming and have a voice in decisions that affect them.
- Know, have safe access to, trust and use formal and informal feedback mechanisms.

Aid organisations:
- Consistently use feedback and complaints data to adjust and improve service delivery programs.
- Demonstrate attitudes and behaviours that promote dialogue and relationships of mutual respect consistent with codes of conduct, humanitarian principles and AAP/PSEA.
- Use project feedback for collective decision-making (e.g. in HTCs, Clusters/HRP – Pooled Funds).

Affected communities:
- Have access to appropriate, timely and coordinated information needed to make informed decisions.

¹ For example, a recent study for UNICEF conducted by the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico reviewed various experience of applying C4D in emergencies in the region and found that affected people and families’ participation is crucial to promote protective and preventive behaviours; however, humanitarian coordination mechanisms could do more to promote coherent approaches to C4D in emergencies to have greater impact.
Communication and community engagement in the LAC context

Governments, humanitarian actors and civil society organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean have a long history and experience applying communication and community engagement (CCE) and Communication for Development (C4D) approaches to support the planning and implementation of humanitarian and development programs. This ranges from campaigns promoting community-based disaster preparedness and risk reduction programmes, to actions to provide life-saving information for disaster situations or health emergencies, as seen in the recent response to the Zika virus.

The response to major disasters such as Hurricane Mitch twenty years ago helped stimulate the development of much closer long-term cooperation and coordination between national, and local government national disaster management and public health authorities alongside national and international aid organizations. As examples, RedHum and CEPREDENAC are well-developed platforms that have strengthened regional information-sharing and coordination capacities to support emergency preparedness and response activities.

The positive experiences of CCE and C4D in the region provide a good foundation and an opportunity to consolidate and scale-up good practices and improve quality, effectiveness and accountability in humanitarian actions. Nevertheless, in general, this extensive history and experience has not been systematically captured or shared within countries or the region. This means organizations may spend time and resources duplicating efforts, and do not systematically integrate lessons learned and good practices into humanitarian actions.

In addition, the region has been somewhat isolated from wider discussions in the sector and recent developments around AAP, such as the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), or successful experiences around collective platforms and approaches to CCE such as in Nepal or the Philippines. As a result, there is lack of common understanding of AAP and the how this relates to existing CCE and C4D practices in the region. At the same time, many examples of good or innovative practices from the region have not been widely disseminated, meaning that other regions have missed out on valuable lessons to integrate AAP and CCE in other crises.

The workshop helped to address this by providing participants with a common understanding of key concepts around AAP and the relationship to CCE and C4D (and related approaches) and to share experiences from various crisis situations in the region and from around the world, with a emphasis on applying the learning from responses to disasters, population movements and public health emergencies.

---

2 REDHUM is platform providing daily updates and information from official sources on humanitarian issues in Spanish for the LAC region, and promotes information exchange between humanitarian actors with the aim of supporting more effective decision-making in disaster management [https://redhum.org/about]. CEPREDENAC is the Coordination Centre for Disaster Prevention in Central America and the Dominican Republic (Centro de Coordinación para la Prevención de los Desastres en América Central y República Dominicana). It is a regional inter-governmental organisation that is part of the Central American Integration System, SICA (Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana). It promotes and coordinates international cooperation, knowledge sharing, technical assistance and scientific research on disaster prevention, mitigation, response and management [http://www.cepredenac.org/].
Institutional commitments to AAP and CCE

Opening remarks from representatives of the three host organisations (UNICEF, OCHA and the IFRC) and US OFDA helped to reinforce the global institutional commitments to AAP and CCE, such as the IASC Commitments to Accountability to Affected People (CAAP) and how this is translated into regional strategies.

From the perspective of UNICEF, AAP and CCE reinforce the agency’s commitment to respecting and promoting the human rights of vulnerable populations, in particular children and adolescents. This is reflected in UNICEF’s Core Commitments to Children in Humanitarian Action (CCC) and its endorsement of the CHS. UNICEF has also made commitments under the Grand Bargain to support greater participation of communities in humanitarian actions and localization of aid efforts.

In the context of LAC, there are important challenges in the region and more efforts need to be made internally and within the sector to work in a coordinated way, mobilizing collective resources to achieve the better results for vulnerable people. UNICEF has many good examples of how to do this, particularly its experience in C4D, but more needs to be done to systematize this experience so that it is a regular part of programming. **In a region with high rates of marginalization and social exclusion of children and adolescents (as well as children with disabilities, indigenous, afro-descendent people), CCE and C4D offer a means to ensure their voices and perspectives are included in planning and development of humanitarian and development programmes.**

**What is the Grand Bargain?**

The Grand Bargain is a series of commitments made by many government donors and aid agencies towards greater transparency and funding to support localization of aid efforts, with more funding and support for local and national responders. The **Participation Revolution** is a commitment for greater engagement and participation of people receiving aid in the decisions that affect their lives. It also aims to increase the use of cash-based programming, and more flexibility in funding, along with reduced duplication and management costs. The Grand Bargain also aims to increase multi-year planning and funding, with clearer links between humanitarian and development work, and reduce earmarking of donor contributions.

See: [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc)

In this sense, the workshop was an opportunity to promote the systematic integration of CCE and C4D into humanitarian responses and collective decision-making processes, such as clusters and Humanitarian Country Teams in a response. At the same time, as part of its localization commitments, **UNICEF is committed to working with national and local authorities, partners and communities to strengthen capacities** for effective and accountable and sustainable responses. C4D and CCE are an important means to do this.

**UN OCHA** shared a similar perspective, highlighting the need for coordinated actions to strengthen communication and community engagement in order to better respect the rights of vulnerable and affected people, and implement humanitarian actions that are relevant and appropriate and effective at meeting their needs. Accountability is also the responsibility to listen and understand and adapt to local cultures and customs, communicate transparently with people, and avoid negative effects as a consequence of humanitarian action. In this regard, OCHA is committed to supporting coordinated actions that avoid duplication and gaps in the response, and using research and new communications technologies to allow greater participation of vulnerable communities in decision-making.
The IASC Principals agree to be held accountable for the progress on fulfilling these commitments.

Background: In 2011, the IASC principals agreed to five Commitments on Accountability to Affected Populations (CAAP) as part of a framework for engagement with communities. The revised version was developed and endorsed by the IASC Principals on the 20th of November 2017 to reflect essential developments such as the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), the work done by the IASC on Inter-Agency community based complaints mechanisms including PSEA and the importance of meaningful collaboration with local stakeholders, which came out as a priority recommendation from the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit and in the Grand Bargain.
Finally, **OFDA** offered the perspective of a donor government, highlighting OFDA’s continued support to meeting the Grand Bargain commitments at the global level, as well as its support to the CCEI, through regional learning events like the one in Panama. From OFDA’s perspective, the region presents very favourable conditions to advance the agenda around AAP and CCE. This is based on its long history of supporting C4D and participatory communication approaches, the strong collaboration and coordination between governments and humanitarian actors, and the absence of major chronic emergencies and conflicts that have undermined local capacities in many other contexts. In LAC, OFDA’s regional strategy looks to support innovative use of two-way communication, social media, or new and emerging technologies, and for scaling up CCE in order to achieve more effective responses to crises and meet AAP commitments. As a donor, OFDA will continue to support CCE and AAP, and encourage aid organisations in the region to find common strategies and methodologies on how to consolidate this work in the future.

**Key points**

- Reinforcing accountability to affected people and strengthening communication and community engagement is a strategic priority for UNICEF, UN OCHA, the IFRC and OFDA.
- Each organisation has reflected this in global policy commitments and in regional and national strategies and work plans.
- The workshop represents an opportunity to consolidate and scale-up collaboration and cooperation at the country and regional level around CCE and AAP issues.
- The aim is to support greater coordination and partnerships between all stakeholders to improve the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian actions, using communication and community engagement as an entry point for this at all levels.
III

Building a common understanding of Communication, Community Engagement and Accountability to Affected People
One of the key aims of the workshop was to strengthen understanding of how CCE (with a focus on feedback and response mechanisms), C4D (with a focus on programmatic aspects referred to engage communities and social and behaviour changes) and CwC (with a focus on access to information), all contribute to improving quality, effectiveness and accountability in humanitarian contexts. While approaches may be different, each share the same aims:

“To use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organizations seek to assist” and “putting communities and people at the centre of humanitarian action and promoting respect for their fundamental human rights underpinned by the right to life with dignity, and the right to protection and security as set forth in international law.”

Indeed, one of the main purposes of the CCEI is to look for synergies between these approaches and how they can be applied more consistently and systematically in humanitarian coordination and decision-making processes. The underlying motivation is that these approaches are essential to better understand and address the needs, priorities and expectations of people affected by crisis, and their rights to information, provide feedback and participate in decisions that affect them.

Key AAP concepts – Putting people at the centre

AAP is the responsibility of aid providers to protect and promote vulnerable peoples’ rights, and generate results that address their priority needs and expectations. This is best achieved through effective relationships based on trust, respect and transparent, two-way communication and engagement between aid providers and affected people. This is why integration of CCE and C4D are important for achieving effective and accountable humanitarian action.

The Core Humanitarian Standard for quality and accountability (CHS) offers a comprehensive framework to define and understand AAP. The CHS is based on nine inter-related commitments that describe what affected people can expect from aid providers in terms of quality, effective and accountable humanitarian actions. It reminds aid providers that people need to be at the centre of humanitarian action and that their needs have to be addressed holistically. The CHS stresses that from the perspective of affected people, what humanitarian actors do is just as important as how they do it.

CHS Commitments 1 and 2 stress the need to understand and address the different needs and priorities of all groups in the population, particularly groups that may be marginalized and vulnerable due to gender, age, disability or other social, economic, political or cultural factors. Commitment 3 underscores the need to reinforce local capacities and “Do No Harm” by minimizing potential negative effects of aid interventions on communities. Communication and community engagement are critical to gaining this understanding and adapting programmes to meeting these commitments.

---

2 This definition of AAP is adapted from UNICEF, but similar to definitions used by other organisations
Commitments 4 and 5 reinforce the rights of affected people to transparent information about aid organisations and access to assistance, to participate in decisions that affect them, and to provide complaints and feedback in safe, appropriate manners. These are the commitments most closely aligned to C4D and CCE efforts. However, the CHS challenges traditional, top-down and vertical communication approaches, where information is “extracted” from communities for the use of organization, or provided to communities with little transparency, engagement, inputs or feedback from communities on its relevance, appropriateness or usefulness at meeting their needs.

The remaining commitments (6-9) remind aid organizations of the need to coordinate efforts to maximize efficient use of resources, reduce duplication and invest in staff and human resource capacities in order to deliver effective, accountable and sustainable outcomes for affected people. This is equally relevant to C4D and CCE actions, as poor coordination around communication messages, or different approaches to engagement, participation and feedback, can limit the effectiveness aid efforts and undermine relationships with communities. At the same time, communication and community engagement strategies require investment of financial and human resources to contribute to effective humanitarian actions.

The CHS provides an integrated framework to orient humanitarian organisations on how to design and implement effective and accountable humanitarian actions. As noted in the workshop, it also provides organizations with a good means to explain how CCE can contributes to meeting each of the CHS’s nine AAP commitments. As such, it can be used to advocate for organisations to invest in and prioritise CCE and C4D as a means to meet AAP commitments to protect rights and improve results for the people humanitarian actions intend to serve.
Main components of communication and community engagement

Integrating CCE into humanitarian programming can be difficult without clarity on what it means in practice. Building on work done by the CCEI, the workshop presented a summary of the key components of CCE and how these reinforce putting people at the centre of humanitarian actions.

These include:

- **Community Participation**: providing opportunities for affected people to participate in decision-making processes around the design, implementation monitoring and management of aid activities.
- **Two-way Communication**: Systematically promoting two-way communication channels between aid providers and communities.
- **Feedback and Complaints Mechanisms**: Implementing safe, appropriate means for affected people to express opinions and complaints, and for aid providers to respond and take timely corrective actions when needed.
- **Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse**: Incorporating measures to minimize risks and respond to protection issues, including sexual exploitation and abuse, gender-based violence.
- **Coordination**: Ensuring coordinated approaches to communication, feedback and engagement to support more efficient and effective outcomes.
- **Strengthening Local Capacities**: using aid programming and resources to promote, strengthen and prioritise local capacities and knowledge and generate sustainable outcomes for affected people.
- **Evidence-based Advocacy**: Advocating to on behalf and with the participation of affected people based on data and evidence of their own expressed needs, priorities and preferences and how well aid efforts are addressing them.

Underlying all of these components is the need for continuous monitoring in order to adapt and adjust programmes based on consultation with and feedback from affected people and other changes in the context. **Applying these components of CCE consistently and systematically improves the likelihood that aid providers deliver useful, relevant, appropriate and effective programmes and services, and are meeting their commitments to accountability to affected people.**
Mainstreaming Gender into CCE and AAP

The workshop also included a session on the importance of mainstreaming gender into humanitarian actions, and specifically, ensuring gender is considered as part of CCE and AAP related activities. While there has been important progress in terms of global commitments to gender in emergencies, there are still too persistent gaps and challenges to fully mainstreaming gender into preparedness and responses.

One of the main challenges to mainstreaming gender is that the policy commitments such as the Grand Bargain are “gender-blind” and concepts remain vague, with little concrete details on what leadership and management teams can do to integrate gender into programming. This helps perpetuate attitudes and perceptions that minimise the importance of gender as a critical component of good programme management.

Examples of these attitudes and perceptions include:

- Gender is only about women, female adolescents and girls, without considering of how crises can also put men, male adolescents and boys at risk.
- Gender is equated with vulnerability of women, implying that they have no capacities, and are always at a disadvantage and facing harm or injustice.
- Humanitarian actions are about saving lives and rapid responses: gender can only be considered if there are time and resources available.
- Gender is an issue that requires specific technical expertise, and therefore not part of the responsibilities of managers or other technical staff.
- Organisations that do not directly implement programmes and work through partners have no direct responsibility for gender issues.
- Gender is about making wider transformations in society and power relationships, and not the responsibility of humanitarian actors.

These attitudes and perceptions directly impact the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian actions. The lack of full integration of gender in humanitarian actions means aid providers may not be meeting their responsibilities to provide assistance impartially and without discrimination to addresses the specific the needs and priorities of all groups in the population: women, men, girls and boys of different ages and abilities.

Integrating a gender perspective into communication and community engagement strategies helps increase the effectiveness of those strategies, and in turn, helps ensure programmes are designed and implemented more effectively. Seen from this perspective, gender (along with age and disabilities) is the cornerstone to meeting AAP commitments around affected people’s rights and results.

Gender analysis is a practical tool that helps to improve accountability by understanding structural inequities and the differential impacts of a crisis on different groups of the population. Without an adequate gender analysis, including feedback from all groups of the population, aid providers are unlikely to know if interventions are timely, relevant, and appropriate at addressing the needs and priorities of different groups, and if aid is accentuating risks and vulnerabilities of different groups in the population.

An effective gender analysis at a minimum includes the use of sex and age disaggregated data (SADD) in order to identify different needs and priorities and adapt responses to meet those needs. The analysis should go beyond SADD in order to understand the differential impact of crisis events and
understand the existing structural inequities and dynamics within a community. The analysis should also help prevent and mitigate gender-based violence and support better strategies for protection against sexual exploitation and abuse.

### Seven practical steps to mainstream gender into humanitarian responses and CCE activities:

A) Conduct separate consultations with groups of women and men of different age groups to identify different needs, priorities and preferences for delivery of assistance.

B) Collect and disaggregate data based on sex, age and ability (SADD) in all needs assessments and monitoring activities and ensure adequate representation of all groups of the population.

C) Use assessment and monitoring data and gender analysis to inform design, implement and adapt programmes and activities.

D) Design programmes to ensure safe and equitable access to assistance and services for all groups of the affected and vulnerable populations.

E) Designing feedback and complaints mechanisms that are safe and accessible to all groups of the affected and vulnerable populations.

F) Test and validate that communication channels and messages are accessible, appropriate and useful for the intended audiences.

G) Regularly review and update strategies based on a gender analysis in order to cover.

### Key points

- While there are subtle differences between CCE, C4D and CwC (CCE focus on participation on key actors, CwC greater focus on feedback and C4D on programatic response) they share a common aim of improving AAP and “putting people at the centre” through more systematic use of communication and participation mechanisms in humanitarian actions.

- Gender, CCE and AAP are not stand-alone areas of work; they need to be integrated into all programming to improve quality and effectiveness.

- Aid organisations need to systematically collect, analyse and respond to feedback and use two-way communication to ensure aid efforts are meeting affected people’s needs and priorities.

- SADD and gender analysis are critical to achieving effective and accountable humanitarian actions.

- Coordination and collective actions are key to scaling up effective AAP/CCE approaches and achieving more sustainable, effective outcomes.
Experiences from the LAC region: Challenges and solutions
1. Integrating CCE in the response to disasters

The LAC region is subject to frequent humanitarian crises as a result of natural and human-made disasters. Recent examples include Hurricanes (Irma, Maria, Matthew…), earthquakes and volcanic eruptions (Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador), floods and/or droughts (Colombia, Peru). The effects of these disasters are often increased due to phenomena like El Niño/La Niña, climate change, poverty, poor urban and land use planning, infrastructure, etc. Some population groups are particularly vulnerable due to poverty, social marginalisation and discrimination, such as people with disabilities and indigenous and ethnic groups. Youth and children are especially vulnerable in crisis situations due to lack of social protection mechanisms.

PRACTICAL EXAMPLES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FIELD

Using participatory video as a feedback mechanism in Peru

UN OCHA successfully used participatory video as a component in the response to the “Niño Costero” drought phenomenon in Peru. This was a relatively simple and inexpensive means to capture the voices of communities about their experiences and the challenges they faced dealing with the drought. It was also a good means to collect their views on the response. Participatory video allowed communities to express their concerns about the lack access to water, where to locate services for populations that had been displaced, the timing of response activities and other suggestions on how to organise the response. The videos also helped uncover other unanticipated needs of the community, such as the lack of clear information about the response and aid providers. This was a priority need for communities, but not necessarily captured through needs assessment processes by aid providers.

The videos became a powerful advocacy tool to help decision-makers better understand and respond to the needs and priorities of communities. It also allowed specific groups in the community that are often forgotten or ignored, such as women, children and youth, to express their views and opinions. Because of the accessibility and simplicity of participatory video, the project was also able to...
strengthen the capacities of youth by teaching them how to use video as a tool in their own communities.

As for lessons learned, the experience shows that many times, response plans are not aligned to people's priorities or needs. At times, assistance is not delivered at the right times, when people want or need it most, or line with their preferences. Participatory video using people's own words to express their needs was a powerful way to get feedback on the response, and help decision-makers to adjust plans. However, developing trust with communities takes time, and feedback mechanisms should not be mechanical, but the basis for an ongoing dialogue and relationship with communities.

Using child-friendly participatory approaches in Peru
The Ministry of Women and Affected Populations in Peru also used CCE approaches to support child protection efforts in the face of an emergency or disaster. In this case, the “Smile and Let's Play” programme was developed to address the lack of information or understanding of parents and caregivers about the psychological reactions of girls and boys to the “Niño Costero” emergency. One of the consequences of crises is the decrease of child-friendly safe spaces for socialization, learning and recreation such as schools, either because they have been destroyed or are being used for emergency or disaster operations or shelters.

From a communication and community participation perspective, the project promotes girls and boys as the centre of attention and priority in all interventions developed by public or private institutions. To achieve this, regular meetings with families were held to inform them of problems presented by children and track their recovery progress after participating in playgroups. Community meetings were used to gather inputs on the location and activities and engage them in the project. This allowed project teams to share information and key messages to families, caregivers and the community about the consequences of El Niño Costero phenomenon on their children and how they should act in this situation to minimize its effects.

It also allowed the project to strengthen the capacity of local authorities and community networks to identify protection risks, behavioural problems and refer cases of violations of children's rights. For the children participating, their active participation in using participatory methodologies helped strengthen their self-protection capacities. As a result, the project was able to reduce incidences of psychosocial issues and strengthen community capacities for child protection and recovery.

Integrated CCE approaches to prevent family separations and violence against children in Haiti
In Haiti, the government’s Institute of Social Welfare and Research used a variety of community engagement methods to respond to child protection and family separation issues in the Grand 'Anse department following Hurricane Matthew. The difficult conditions following the hurricane forced many
families to leave their children in the community in search of better opportunities elsewhere. Working with partners, the government developed a series of engagement strategies to provide assistance to vulnerable children, strengthen parents’ capacities and promote social protection strategies at the community level.

An integrated CCE approach was successfully used to support the project objectives. This included:

- A parental education programme to reach vulnerable families with key messages.
- Mothers’ clubs to train mothers on essential family practices and to carry out community screening for child malnutrition.
- Establishing a network of child protection committees to identify and monitor protection risks.
- Community meetings and ongoing discussions with grassroots organisations and local authorities to explain the project’s aims and generate inputs of local communities in family selection criteria and validation.
- Complaints boxes installed in health centres, with follow-up of relevant complaints discussed in community meetings.

There were some challenges however. While the project was successful at building trust in the community, it was difficult to overcome the culture of silence and resignation, and encourage people to share complaints about the quality of services. Also, the high rate of illiteracy in remote localities meant that suggestion boxes were not utilised as planned. This was addressed through using complementary methods such as telephone complaints lines. However, as complaints received were anonymous, it had the disadvantage of not allowing for tracking and follow-up on specific complaints.

Some lessons learned are that integrated CCE approaches enabled the government and partners to assess beneficiaries’ satisfaction from different feedback sources, and take corrective actions to improve quality of the services offered. Communities were able to see that their feedback was listened to, and the ongoing dialogue and transparency reinforced trust and mutual respect. Working in coordination with partners and community groups facilitated their engagement and participation in a social change process and strengthened development of local capacities. As a longer-term outcome, the experience contributed to the creation of other mechanisms to extend access to services and assisted in guiding planning and implementation of future projects.

Using CCE strategies to build community resilience in Nepal

Workshop participants also had the opportunity to learn of positive CCE experiences in other regions. In Nepal, UNICEF and partners used a variety of CCE approaches following devastating earthquakes in 2015. In this situation, much of the communications and transportation infrastructure were damaged or destroyed, making access to assistance and information extremely difficult for affected people.

One of the first priorities was to re-establish functional media channels in order to reach affected communities with life-saving information and other support. Training and support was provided for
local technicians to repair damages at local radio stations as well as individual radio sets of community members. This was a unique approach, as in many situations, communications infrastructure is not prioritised in relief efforts.

Feedback from affected population identified a need for psychosocial support and counselling. Given the difficulties of access and resources, the “Bhandai Sundai” radio programme was developed to provide on-air psychosocial counselling sessions. Specific segments were designed to target different audiences such as children, women and families and expand the coverage to people who were otherwise outside the immediate reach of direct counselling services.

Another radio programme, “Milan Chowk”, used edutainment radio drama format to increase family and community resilience and preparedness. The programme takes place in an imaginary village location, where messages on health, nutrition, sanitation, education and protection could be integrated into different episodes.

Audience feedback was generated through focus group discussions and key informant interviews with people from the community, with the results then fed back into the content of the radio drama series. The experience was also adapted to mobile edutainment shows and face-to-face community mobilization by a youth-led organization.

Some of the challenges included the difficulty of understanding and applying the concept of “resilience” in practical terms, both in terms of messages for local communities, but also within aid organisations themselves. This meant that senior leadership often needed to be convinced of the value of promoting common community engagement strategies around resilience, and incorporating this into response plans. Inter-agency cooperation and collaboration was also a challenge, with different views on recovery priorities, key messages, and how to integrate resilience throughout all programming cycle, including preparedness.

Using community radio to reinforce positive behaviour in Guatemala

Following the Volcán de Fuego eruption in Guatemala in 2018, Ministry of Public Health and Social Assistance worked with multiple partners and community radio stations to reinforce positive messages and behaviours in health, nutrition, hygiene, water and sanitation and protection against violence. The project carried out a baseline Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) study in shelters and affected communities and a mapping of existing and preferred communication channels, using two-way communication and participatory methods.

This then allowed teams to define specific gaps in knowledge and information, and incorporate this into a radio programme “Informed we are..."
stronger”. The programme is directed to indigenous communities, using local languages, and provides listeners with key information adapted to the local situation and context. This was supported with brigades of nutritionists and psychologists to assist the population.

Some of the lessons from this experience include the importance of integrating leaders of affected people and indigenous communities, together with local radios to produce the messages. This helped ensure messages were culturally appropriate and relevant, and that they were transmitted through a trusted source.

However, one challenge faced was that government and public institutions have different approaches to C4D and humanitarian response, often with a top-down concept of communication, while local organisations and community radio stations are more familiar with two-way communication and participatory approaches. When talking about communication with communities it also requires strategies to raise awareness and overcome resistance from public institutions. Also, it is important to have engagement and follow-up from local and national authorities throughout the process, not just at the beginning, so that they can also understand and see the results.

Key points

- Natural disasters present challenges to CCE/AAP related to limited access to populations, damaged or destroyed communication infrastructure, and the need to balance life saving with community participation and engagement.
- Preparedness work before a crisis to map resources and capacities, pre-test basic messages, and most importantly, define how CCE/AAP will be integrated into design and decision-making processes is critical.
- Examples from the region show there are many different ways to integrate CCE/AAP approaches into the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC) and humanitarian coordination mechanisms – this provides a good foundation to build and adapt to other contexts.
- Mixed CCE/AAP methods used in combination with other assessment and monitoring tools increases the quality and effectiveness of activities – but unless these are systematically integrated into management and decision-making process, improvements may be limited.

2. Integrating CCE in the response to population movements and refugee and migration flows

Population movements are another common humanitarian issue facing the LAC region. Poverty, disasters, conflict and political and economic upheaval all contribute to displacement of thousands of people each year. The crisis in Venezuela and the Central American Migrant Caravan are two recent examples of this. The cross-border nature of these crises, and the informal nature of these population movements, makes coordinated responses a challenge for all actors. As with disasters, some population groups are particularly vulnerable such a youth and children. Clearly identifying the needs of groups at risk or affected is also a challenge due to their mobility, and mistrust and concerns around safety, security
and confidentiality. Longer-term solutions are often outside the scope of humanitarian actors’ mandates or capacities.

**PRACTICAL EXAMPLES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FIELD**

**Inter-Agency Platform to support CCE in the Venezuela Migration Crisis**

As part of the response to the Venezuela migration crisis, ten agencies (UNICEF, UNHCR, IOM, IFRC, UNESCO, UNAIDS, WFP, Save the Children and Plan International) joined forces to establish a common platform to support and coordinate joint CCE, CwC and C4D activities. The aims of the platform are to avoid duplication and maximise the reach and impact of CCE and C4D activities by moving from individual projects to a more collective, harmonised and strategic approach.

The platform is a space to share experiences, develop common tools, methodologies and messaging directed to vulnerable and affected people. It also serves as means to promote and integrate CCE and C4D issues into response plans for 2019, linking to protection, health, nutrition, WASH, APS, education and other cross-cutting issues.

The creation of the platform is particularly important, as the nature of this crisis means that families are uprooted from their normal social safety nets and practices, and often prioritise other needs, over the need to apply good practices in health, water and sanitation, and protection of their children. The platform provides a means to ensure more consistent information and messaging on healthy behaviours, as well as providing information on access to assistance and services such as maternal-child health care.

At the same time, the platform can respond to issues around the access to information about migrants and refugees rights, access to assistance, counselling and other services, or misinformation and rumours. Another area of work is raising awareness of migrants, refugees and host communities and local authorities around xenophobia, discrimination and stigma in general, but also specific vulnerable groups in the migrant or refugee population.

While still in its early stages, the platform is developing and sharing technical notes to orient CCE work of all actors, as well as common approaches and methodologies to gathering and responding to feedback and complaints, rumour tracking, and promoting social mobilisation strategies to adopt positive behaviours and practices amongst migrants and refugees.

**Operation Welcome: Successful Inter-Agency Coordination to Population Movements in Brazil**

In Roraima, Brazil, **federal, state and municipal authorities** have come together along with dozens of local and international NGOs, UN agencies and civil society organisations to provide a coordinated response address the needs of immigrants (residents and refugees) from Venezuela. “Operation Acolhida” has shown the value of inter-agency coordination, where individual agencies set aside their own objectives and approaches to focus on a common objective to support displaced populations.
The operation takes an integrated approach to addressing the needs of displaced Venezuelans. This includes providing assistance to help contact families and relatives, informing them of the different assistance and options available to them and listening to their needs, supporting them in terms of integrating into temporary camps or other relocation.

Some of the lessons learned from the operation highlight the importance of transparency and respect with the affected populations, but also amongst partners. One critical element was to prioritise the use national and local capacities and resources, such as the military, and look for synergies where other actors could also contribute based on their strengths. Still, coordination is a challenge, and additional support is needed to ensure effective coordination and communication between international, national and local actors.

Using technology to support two-way communication and feedback channels with people on the move

IOM is also supporting the response to population movements in the LAC region. The organisation is applying its experience from other crises by implementing multiple communication and feedback channels to reach migrant and refugee populations.

Some examples of communication and feedback channels used are SMS and voice responses using mobile phones, face-to-face interviews, radio, surveys, social media tracking and other tools. This approach helps ensure marginalised and vulnerable groups are identified, have access to information, and their needs adequately supported. This in turn helps to reduce safety and security risks, as well as empowers them to make informed choices about their options available to them.
Collecting feedback data is just the first step. IOM has invested in the use of information technologies to compile and analyse feedback data from multiple sources, and use this to map the locations and kinds of feedback received. For example, Community Response Maps (www.communityresponse-map.org) helps visualise community feedback in real-time, tracking feedback themes, satisfaction with support and assistance, and with a breakdown by gender, age, location, etc. This allows the data to be easily accessed and understood by decision-makers, and supports adapting programmes quickly to achieve the best results.

IOM is also testing information campaigns where migrants are the messengers. This is where key messages and stories are defined and delivered by migrant and vulnerable people to others in similar situations. The project aims to provide solid evidence around the credibility, trust and impact of messages from communities themselves. Additionally, the organisation is using a mobile phone application to allow field staff to gather interviews and feedback from people. An important consideration on all these tools and approaches is to get informed consent from vulnerable and affected people to collect and use their feedback. This is an important component of AAP that is often forgotten and neglected in CCE and C4D strategies.

**Leveraging social media for CCE in Central America and Mexico**

UNHCR is another agency that has adopted successful CCE strategies to support population movements and forced displacement. One of the challenges in the LAC region is protection of refugees. There is a general lack of information for both migrants and local authorities on the right to international protection and how to access refugee and asylum procedures, as well as the right to self-identify as a refugee.

Meeting this challenge in the current context has led UNHCR to explore new and innovative methods to communicate key messages and vital information to refugees. In the case of Central America, a mapping of the preferred communication channels used by displaced populations and refugees showed that FaceBook was one of the most common channels to share information and raise questions or concerns.

Accordingly, UNHCR created a FaceBook account and page called the “Jaguar” to provide guidance and information for refugees and immigrants. It has become a digital information network for refugees, including those who identify themselves as migrants. The page is adapted to the culture and context of the region. It deliberately minimises the profile and visibility of UNHCR in order to be more accessible to populations who already concerned about their safety and status. By responding to
organisations and community radio stations are more familiar with two-way communication and ensure messages were culturally appropriate and relevant, and that they were transmitted through a stronger”. The programme is directed to indigenous communities, using local languages, and provides accessible to populations who already concerned about their safety and status. By responding to and information for refugees and immigrants. It has become a digital information network for questions or concerns.

Youth and children, have capacities and are often very involved in providing support and assistance to each other. In the camps, community volunteers became the cornerstone of the CCE approach. In the case of Central America, a UNHCR

Integrated CCE mechanisms to support the Rohingya refugee crisis in Bangladesh
The response to the Rohingya refugee crisis in Cox's Bazaar, Bangladesh is an example where UNICEF is using a comprehensive approach to communication and community engagement to support meeting refugees information needs. Refugee populations in camps had limited knowledge and awareness of health, water and sanitation and other issues. At the same time, aid organisations had challenges coordinating engagement with communities around providing consistent and coherent information, and gathering feedback and complaints. One challenge was a persistent attitude that communities affected by the crisis are too shocked and helpless to take on responsibilities. This tends to reinforce the use of top-down communication approaches.

To resolve this, UNICEF and partners used a variety of mechanisms to facilitate better communication

We finally got there….C4D/CCE/AAP in action
and engagement with refugees. One of the first steps was recognising that communities, and even children, have capacities and are often very involved in providing support and assistance to each other. In the camps, community volunteers became the cornerstone of the CCE approach.

Trained volunteers (mostly women) were the contact point for 50 households, meeting regularly with them to provide life-saving and behaviour change information, collect their views and opinions and channel this information to the appropriate agencies. Information and feedback hubs in the camps provided a space to share information, train community members on healthy practices, and collect feedback. Radio listeners clubs, “model mothers” and youth mobilisers were also used to disseminate information and demonstrate good practices, another way of reaching different groups in the population, particularly those with low literacy or in local languages.

Part of the lessons learned is to start planning early, consolidating and building on previous experiences in the preparedness phase when possible. This helps avoid duplication and inefficient use of time and resources. Coordination remains a challenge, particularly when different agencies and CCE mechanisms are used, so establishing clear agreements on role, responsibilities, competencies and messaging is important. However, perhaps the most important lesson is to look first to mobilising communities and existing local capacities as the basis for a coherent and effective CCE strategy.

**Good practices in AAP through use of local media**

*Internews* shared its experiences in working with affected populations to resolve their information needs in a crisis situation. The organisation works to “end news and information darkness” by finding ways to understand the “information ecosystem” – what information is available, including misinformation and rumours, determine who has or does not have access to that information, and take measures to ensure full access and inclusion, so that the voices of all groups of the affected populations are considered in planning aid interventions. *Internews* works to provide the best local content on critical issues, so that audiences are informed and able to participate more actively in decisions that affect them. Tracking rumours and facilitating closing the feedback loop are also part of this approach. This allows the organization to implement the right solutions in the right context across a broad spectrum of challenges, built on a relationship of trust and informed communities.
Some of the lessons learned for Internews revolve around the importance of coordinating communication approaches and prioritising the use of locally-produced content. There is a need to link humanitarian information needs with other information needs, such as around environmental issues, governance and transparency, Internet freedom, and access for women and youth voices. Some other challenges are finding ways to expand private sector investment in CCE, dealing with information overload, and breakneck technology disruption.
3. Integrating CCE in the response to health emergencies

Over the past twenty years, the LAC as a region has made steady improvements in terms of overall health indicators. However, poverty, income inequality, and uneven investments in public health care systems translates to limited access to health care for many marginalised and vulnerable groups in the population. Disasters, conflicts and disease outbreaks only make the situation worse, with the consequences felt by the most vulnerable. While national Ministries of Health (MoH) and the WHO have overall responsibilities for responses to health emergencies, UNICEF lead the CCE component in coordination with IFRC and other organizations. The response to the Zika virus, which affected many countries in the region, underscores the importance of coordinated approaches communication and community engagement at the regional and national level as a component of the overall response.

PRACTICAL EXAMPLES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FIELD

Community Action against Zika
The IFRC and Save the Children worked together on a regional response to reduce the transmission of the Zika virus. The project covers five countries: Colombia, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras and Dominican Republic, with a focus on mobilising community volunteers as the key entry point to reach the maximum number of vulnerable and at-risk women and families possible.

The first stage of the project was conducting a detailed baseline for each country that explored existing knowledge, attitudes and practices around the Zika virus. Common misunderstandings, rumours and beliefs were identified, along with barriers to adopting behaviours to reducing the risk from the virus. The baseline included information on trusted and preferred communication channels (radio, TV, social media, health care workers, etc.). This detailed information allowed project teams in each country to develop a context-specific plan, while maintaining a coherent approach between countries using existing technical information and good practices around the virus.

The CCE component of the project relied on community level participation and engagement in activities such as community based epidemiological monitoring and surveillance (household visits and
interviews, traps for mosquito eggs, etc.), cleaning campaigns, information and psychosocial support clubs for pregnant women and mothers, and educational campaigns in schools using children as change agents.

Workshops in each of the countries helped define key messages to promote behaviour change. One critical aspect was testing and validating information and education materials with communities themselves. This ensured that materials were adapted to the cultural context, and at the same time, strengthened community engagement and ownership of the project.

Using evidence to orient Zika C4D Strategies

UNICEF is also supporting the response to Zika, using evidence-based approaches to guide the design of CCE and C4D strategies. By investing in research around knowledge, attitudes and practices, UNICEF has been able to develop more precise information sharing and behaviours change campaigns. This has been aligned to developments in medical research around the virus transmission and its effects on children.

The WHO declared Zika as a public health emergency in February 2016, but by the end of the year, the alert had been deactivated. One of the consequences is that the perception of risks and importance of the Zika virus has decreased amongst the media and public. But the risks are still here, and the effects are long-term. Misunderstanding of the transmission of the virus through mosquitoes persists, and there is limited awareness that it can also be transmitted through sex. Stigma and discrimination against mothers and children affected are still common, and community leaders, teachers and caregivers are often unaware of key information about the virus. This makes continuing CCE and C4D efforts even more important.

Beyond the issue of prevention, UNICEF is also focusing on the impact of Zika on families. Thousands of families face an enormous emotional, social and economic impact from Zika. UNICEF has carried
out several qualitative studies in Brazil to help provide evidence of the impact on children, parents and families, and highlight the lack of social services, support networks and other means to help deal with the long-term consequences of Zika.

Using tools like U-report and social media listening to collect feedback, establishing support groups and community participation in the design of prevention and support activities are some of the ways UNICEF has tried to incorporate CCE strategies into the response. Another innovative approach is developing a university diploma programme focused on communication around Zika in Guatemala as a means to build local capacity, but also consolidate C4D learning and research.

Mobilising children and youth in the prevention of Zika

In Honduras, the Ministry of Education has taken a key role in the prevention of Zika, through its “Unidos contra el Zika” programme. The approach leverages the existing capacities and infrastructure of the public school system, and uses children and youth as change agents in the community. The low level of awareness about the risks of Zika made schools an ideal vehicle for behaviour change and social mobilisation at the family and community level.

Information about the Zika virus was incorporated into the educational curriculum, and teachers were provided with training and online courses to help them integrate this into their teaching. This was accompanied by distribution of educational materials aimed at children and families, along with participatory activities at the school and community level, such having children develop murals and other educational materials, quizzes and competitions and household visits.

As a result of this integrated campaign, knowledge and awareness about Zika has significantly increased amongst all age groups. In addition, as this in now integrated into the school system curriculum for the coming years, there is a greater opportunity to achieve sustainable changes in knowledge and practices over a longer time. However, due to the cultural barriers and taboos, it has been difficult to raised awareness of the possibility of sexual transmission of Zika. Another lesson learned is to look for better coordination with the Ministry of Health, and to adapt the approaches to different regions and contexts, particularly in areas with issues of violence and protection, where community mobilisation is more difficult.

Community engagement and feedback in the response to Ebola

The recent Ebola outbreak in North Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) was presented as an example of how communication and community engagement are essential in health emergencies. In this case, UNICEF and other actors used a three-pronged approach built around community engagement, community dialogue and feedback, and mass communications. Despite recent efforts to expand the outbreak. These include myths and misinformation, and fear and mistrust in the community. The key learning coming from this experience is that preparedness is essential. Even if there was extensive knowledge and experience with Ebola in the region, better preparedness could have saved lives and prevented the spread of the disease. The key lessons from this experience include the importance of community engagement, feedback mechanisms, and the need for ongoing involvement of community members in the response. As Arctic and other areas become more difficult to reach, a greater focus on families is crucial to prevent the spread of the disease and ensure that people have access to the support they need.
engagement, community dialogue and feedback, and mass communications. Despite recent experiences with Ebola in other countries, many of the lessons learned needed to be adapted to the DRC context, as the outbreak coincided in an area with ongoing conflict and insecurity.

In the context of DRC, the political situation has created overall mistrust with the government, health care workers, the military, UN agencies, etc. There has been a widespread belief that the outbreak and response has been politicised to derail the elections. Attacks on aid workers and insecurity have severely hampered response activities.

A series of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices surveys were conducted to identify the specific gaps in information and beliefs that contributed to expanding the outbreak. These include myths and perceptions that the virus was transmitted through bananas or bats, or was manufactured in labs and released against populations. Traditional medicines and treatments offered by non-medical professionals, and ongoing questions about burial practices, also undermine an effective response.

Based on this reality, aid organisations have worked at multiple entry points to engage with front line aid workers, community leaders and affected populations. This includes engaging around community surveillance, patient care, psychosocial support and campaigns against stigma and discrimination of survivors, promoting safe and dignified burials and disseminating key messages through appropriate media channels such as radio.

The key learning coming from this experience is that preparedness is essential. Even if there was extensive knowledge and experience with Ebola in the region, better preparedness could have saved time to research and understand the behaviours and beliefs of communities, and develop CCE strategies before the outbreak. At the same time, access, safety and exposure to the virus severely limit the opportunities for direct engagement with communities. Other means to incorporate community engagement and feedback mechanisms are needed. Another area to explore is to incorporate CCE strategies around building peace building and reconciliation with youth and armed groups, not only focusing exclusively on health communication.
4. Knowledge-sharing fair – CCE tools, methodologies and experiences

The workshop included a knowledge fair/marketplace where participants shared learning and experiences on successfully integrating CCE approaches in different crisis responses. Presenters explained tools, methodologies and approaches, as well as offering practical tips and suggestions on how they could be adapted and implemented by other organisations and in other crisis responses. The table below provides a summary description of the presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter / CCE Tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>For more information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IFRC</strong>&lt;br&gt; KAP baseline to design CCE to respond Zika based on evidence.</td>
<td>The Video Tutorial to build a Baseline using LQAS methodology is a step by step animated and user friendly video that is available online in two versions: Spanish and with English subtitles.</td>
<td>The Video tutorial will allow organizations and program/project implementers to have the basic instructions of how to design, implement and operationalise a Baseline survey. The video is divided in chapters to enable users to access directly to specific content. It also can help community volunteers to understand the importance of integrating a baseline prior to designing activities.</td>
<td><a href="http://cruzroja-zika.org/tutorial/">http://cruzroja-zika.org/tutorial/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN OCHA</strong>&lt;br&gt; KoBo mobile phone applications for data and feedback collection.</td>
<td>KoBo is a data collection toolbox that allows aid providers to quickly design and implement feedback tools like surveys using mobile phones, even when there is no internet or cell network coverage.</td>
<td>KoBo allow aid providers to take advantage of the increasing use of mobile phones amongst affected populations, and is flexible and adaptable to different survey and feedback questions. It also allows organisations to visualise where information is coming from through geo-tagging and graphics, supporting better data analysis and decision-making.</td>
<td><a href="https://bit.ly/2AcduCd">https://bit.ly/2AcduCd</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN OCHA</strong>&lt;br&gt; Participatory Community Video.</td>
<td>Participatory community videos are a simple feedback tool that can capture the voices and experiences of vulnerable and affected people, and use this to advocate to decision-makers to find solutions to their needs.</td>
<td>Participatory video can be very useful to get the voices of marginalised groups or ones that are not often included in formal CCE and feedback mechanisms, like children and youth. Video is an easy and accessible tool, and can be used to build communication capacities of communities to share and disseminate local knowledge, experience and perspectives</td>
<td><a href="https://vimeo.com/300142533">https://vimeo.com/300142533</a> <a href="https://adobe.ly/2zHHFwo">https://adobe.ly/2zHHFwo</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter / CCE Tools</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>For more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF LACRO/HQ</strong></td>
<td>U-Report is a free social messaging tool that amplifies the voice of youth. Young people and communities can speak out on issues that affect them, and their opinions are aggregated in real time and published on a website. Humanitarian actors can send life-saving information before, during and after a crisis hits to promote desired behaviours to keep people safe.</td>
<td>U-Report compliments other monitoring and two-way communication tools, by providing a mechanism for real-time feedback on issues, tailored real-time information to affected populations and a way to capture the voices of youth and other groups in the community.</td>
<td><a href="https://ureport.in">https://ureport.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCCAC Latin America/ Multimedia wave for peace.</strong></td>
<td>The project uses communications media to give youth opportunities to tell their own stories, share their dreams and aspirations, and advocate for the peaceful resolution of conflicts in their schools and neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>Youth were supported to design and implement media messages and radio programmes, and through this contribute to peace building and reconciliation in a region with a history of conflict. By giving youth a space to envision the future they wanted, it gave them an opportunity to imagine a life outside of a context of armed conflict. The interactions between different groups in the community (including students, ex-combatants, indigenous peoples, etc.) were important to build mutual trust and respect. It also reinforced self-esteem, confidence and communication skills for groups that previously were unfamiliar with or uncomfortable about sharing their views and perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNINORTE</strong></td>
<td>This is an example of using the capacities of universities to compile and synthesise research in order to ensure interventions are evidence-based and based on good practices.</td>
<td>Short briefing papers can be extremely useful for aid providers who may not have the time to research an issue, or are unfamiliar with a specific technical issue such as Zika. The collaboration with academic and research institutions can be extended to other areas, such as using sociological and anthropological expertise to better understand local cultures and organisational structures.</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/2E5jlvk">http://bit.ly/2E5jlvk</a> <a href="http://bit.ly/2Pmxbvj">http://bit.ly/2Pmxbvj</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter / CCE Tools</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>For more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internews</strong></td>
<td>Internews Humanitarian Information Services (HIS) establishes two-way communication channels between local media, aid providers and local people and identify shortcomings in the response.</td>
<td>These feedback loops provide valuable data that reflects the information environment during crisis and response, identifies rumours and misinformation, and provides humanitarians with real time information about gaps and areas for improvement.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.internews.org/">https://www.internews.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF Mexico</strong></td>
<td>This initiative provides child-friendly information to Spanish-speaking refugees and migrants on access to psychosocial support and services, as well as strengthening capacities of public and private shelters along the migration route in Mexico.</td>
<td>This initiative uses participatory approaches with affected populations and organisations providing protection information, psychosocial support and integral care for migrant children in Mexico.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.unicef.org/mexico/spanish/38157_38310.html">https://www.unicef.org/mexico/spanish/38157_38310.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF ECA</strong></td>
<td>The experience shows the results of a gender sensitive rapid qualitative assessment developed to inform culturally appropriate C4D strategy for migrant populations in Trinidad and Tobago.</td>
<td>The focus groups developed allowed better understanding from a gendered perspective of the affected community’s culture, norms, values, perceptions issues and behaviours that put them at risk for health concerns or violence The development of a C4D strategy that was tailored to their realities.</td>
<td><strong>UNICEF ECA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This methodology was quick and cost-effective way of getting information, this entailed to collect information from girls, women, boys and men in a separated way and understand their values, perceptions and issues. The study’s results provided insights for fining tune the C4D strategy.
## Presentation: A Participatory Consultation Process

A participatory consultation process was used in regions most affected by the impact of the El Niño Costero Phenomenon, with the aim of identifying rehabilitation and reconstruction priorities, based on the opinions and proposals of civil society organisations and affected people. The consultation process also helped to identify and make visible problems that are not usually considered by the authorities when establishing reconstruction plans or response actions.

## Approach

The approach used a “ballot card” designed according to 16 issues identified as key to the recovery and reconstruction process. This was linked to the Sustainable Development Goals and a rights-based approach. Participants were given the option to select priorities and focus groups and community discussions allowed for an exchange of ideas and concerns, and a consensus on what to prioritise. Photography was also used to provide a visual record of both the damages of El Niño Costero, and relief efforts.

## UNHCR - “Panas in Colombia”

“Panas in Colombia” is a communication campaign to reduce xenophobia against migrants and promote solidarity. Radio, digital means, press and community events were involved. The campaign led by UNHCR have promoted partnerships with government institutions, UN agencies, private sector and local organizations. Campaign reached more than 35 millions of persons, more than 300 journalists were trained and also opinion leaders. Campaign’s effects continuous rising and is envisage to sensitize through story telling, socialize tools that allow to act against xenophobia and also connect Venezuelans’s needs with concret citizen solutions.

## OIM - “Holding On”

Holding On is a virtual reality exhibition showcases the stories of internally displaced people (IDPs). It was developed as a communication tool to create empathy with IDPs and to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (GP20). The exhibition is a unique experience as it combines authentic journalistic storytelling with cutting edge virtual reality technology. Also, it allows participants to visit and hear firsthand stories from places that they will likely never visit in real life.

IDPs have same emotions and needs as each one of us. One of the most basic needs is to retain links to their place of origin and they will go to

The results of this exhibition include: strengthening the voice of IDPs and understanding of the realities of internal displacement among governmental leaders and policymakers, psychosocial support to IDPs participating in the campaign through the retelling and sharing of their story.

---

### Presenter / CCE Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter / CCE Tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>For more information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable to Fight Against Poverty, Peru</td>
<td>A participatory consultation process was used in regions most affected by the impact of the El Niño Costero Phenomenon, with the aim of identifying rehabilitation and reconstruction priorities, based on the opinions and proposals of civil society organisations and affected people. The consultation process also helped to identify and make visible problems that are not usually considered by the authorities when establishing reconstruction plans or response actions.</td>
<td>The approach used a “ballot card” designed according to 16 issues identified as key to the recovery and reconstruction process. This was linked to the Sustainable Development Goals and a rights-based approach. Participants were given the option to select priorities and focus groups and community discussions allowed for an exchange of ideas and concerns, and a consensus on what to prioritise. Photography was also used to provide a visual record of both the damages of El Niño Costero, and relief efforts.</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/2Po2Egw">http://bit.ly/2Po2Egw</a> <a href="http://bit.ly/2KZiWw5">http://bit.ly/2KZiWw5</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR - “Panas in Colombia”</td>
<td>“Panas in Colombia” is a communication campaign to reduce xenophobia against migrants and promote solidarity. Radio, digital means, press and community events were involved.</td>
<td>The campaign led by UNHCR have promoted partnerships with government institutions, UN agencies, private sector and local organizations. Campaign reached more than 35 millions of persons, more than 300 journalists were trained and also opinion leaders. Campaign’s effects continuous rising and is envisage to sensitize through story telling, socialize tools that allow to act against xenophobia and also connect Venezuelans’s needs with concret citizen solutions.</td>
<td><a href="https://somospanascolombia.com/">https://somospanascolombia.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIM - “Holding On”</td>
<td>Holding On is a virtual reality exhibition showcases the stories of internally displaced people (IDPs). It was developed as a communication tool to create empathy with IDPs and to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (GP20).</td>
<td>The exhibition is a unique experience as it combines authentic journalistic storytelling with cutting edge virtual reality technology. Also, it allows participants to visit and hear firsthand stories from places that they will likely never visit in real life. IDPs have same emotions and needs as each one of us. One of the most basic needs is to retain links to their place of origin and they will go to The results of this exhibition include: strengthening the voice of IDPs and understanding of the realities of internal displacement among governmental leaders and policymakers, psychosocial support to IDPs participating in the campaign through the retelling and sharing of their story.</td>
<td><a href="http://holding-on.io">http://holding-on.io</a> <a href="http://om.int/es/about-us">http://om.int/es/about-us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several other resources were highlighted throughout the workshop. Of particular interest is the CDAC Network, which compiles tools, resources and reports around communication and community engagement with affected people, such as media landscape mapping, message libraries, and more (http://www.cdacnetwork.org/tools-and-resources/).

The Communication Initiative is another important platform for research knowledge-sharing resources, with an emphasis on effectively using communication to support social and behaviour change in development and humanitarian programmes. The initiative also hosts a LAC regional page for Latin American and the Caribbean (http://www.comminit.com/global/category/sites/global).

Participants were encouraged to make use of these resources, and use the platforms to share information, tools and guidelines from the LAC region as part of efforts to create a regional community of practice on CCE issues.

Key points

• There is a rich body of experience and resources already available in the region to support CCE and AAP into humanitarian responses.

• Lack of information and knowledge is not the problem – efforts are need to share good practices and systematically apply them in all programmes.

• Ongoing knowledge sharing and establishing a community of practices should be supported to consolidate and scale up CCE efforts in the region.

• Any process aimed at generating changes at the individual, community or organisational level requires sustained long-term commitment and efforts – change will not happen overnight.

• Including CCE in preparedness, response, recovery and making a transition to development programming can help sustain positive changes.

• At the organisational level, sustained leadership commitment and support from technical programming areas is vital – CCE approaches need to show they add value and improve quality and effectiveness of aid programming.

• Documenting the experience and regularly monitoring how CCE meets affected people's needs and priorities can help consolidate efforts and build support for CCE.
5. Scaling-up and accelerating CCE in humanitarian actions – leveraging existing knowledge and learning to overcome barriers and obstacles

Challenges to incorporating CCE/AAP approaches in humanitarian responses

Presentations, working group sessions and the knowledge fair helped to show that most participants already had some understanding and practical experiences applying CCE concepts and tools in their work in support of AAP. However, much of this experience is limited to individual projects and not systematically applied throughout all programmes, much less at the inter-agency level.

Workshop participants reflected on the obstacles and barriers to applying CCE in humanitarian programming, with a view to sharing learning and finding common strategies and solutions to these problems.

INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES

Amongst the main institutional barriers, participants listed:

A. Internal resistance
   - A general perception that CCE and AAP were not directly related to life-saving work in an emergency.
   - The lack of understanding and support for CCE of senior leadership within their organisations on the role and contribution of CCE to AAP and better results and outcomes.
   - Resistance from technical or thematic experts, who often fail to see the value of CCE/AAP to improve results.
   - Perceptions that CCE and AAP are technical specialisations and stand-alone activities that are separate from traditional programming areas.
   - Reluctance to engage with communities and collect and respond to potentially negative feedback.
   - Silo approaches, where there is little sharing of information and joint programming across sectors and thematic areas.

B. Lack of funding and resources
   - Many participants mentioned the difficulties of including CCE and AAP activities into plans and budgets, especially when “life-saving” activities are prioritised.
   - Donor policies and priorities that do not recognise the importance of CCE and AAP, and do not provide flexibility to adapt programmes based on feedback from affected people.
   - Challenges of mobilising resources in contexts where organisations, partners and community capacities are also affected by the event.

C. Constraints due to the crisis context
   - Limited time to consult with and collaborate with communities due to urgent project deadlines / timelines.
   - Limited consultation with government and lack of capacity building within communities as part of preparedness work and in the midst of a response.
   - Lack of access to communities due to physical barriers, health and security issues or because of affected population displacement or movements.
   - Physical damage to communications infrastructure.

D. Outdated models for communication and community engagement
   - The predominance of traditional model of vertical communication model where communities are seen as victims, without any local knowledge or capacities.
   - Using CCE only as a one-way instrument to gather information of interest to the aid providers, without feedback and validation with communities.
   - View of many aid providers that they are the experts, working without consulting communities and not adapting to local context when implementing a response.
- Focusing on traditional community leaders and “easy to reach” people, while neglecting measures to listen to the views of vulnerable and excluded groups (such as children) and finding ways for them to participate and engage.
- Challenges to develop a relationship of trust with the affected community and managing political sensibility in contexts where there is a lack of political will, perception of corruption, or conflicts.

Operational challenges – integrating CCE into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle
Beyond these general issues, working groups identified a number of obstacles and barriers to effectively applying CCE measures at key moments of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle: needs assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian actions. All working groups stressed the importance of strengthening CCE capacities as part of planning and preparedness measures to avoid reactive and ad hoc approaches to CCE in responses. Strengthening CCE elements in humanitarian coordination and decision-making processes was also seen as a priority, and should be included in performance monitoring and management processes.

The following table summarise the working group outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Obstacles to CCE/AAP</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessments</td>
<td>Lack of physical access to affected populations (security, population movements, health epidemic, etc.) makes it difficult to engage with them in needs assessments.</td>
<td>- Look for using information from local radio, monitor social media, and use SMS or other tools to gather information on needs remotely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mistrust of affected people with aid organisations (including mistrust of host communities and local authorities).</td>
<td>- Share information about aid organisation working in the area, their objectives, and their accountability commitments, particularly around listening to and considering communities' needs and opinions, and their safety, protection and confidentiality. - Include local authorities in needs assessment processes, and consult with communities and/or people not targeted for assistance to ensure assistance does not create tensions or risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing social structures and networks are disrupted, affected people are often dispersed and there is no internal organisation or cohesion, making it difficult to identify their needs.</td>
<td>- Consult with affected people on their preferences in terms of engagement and communication. - Use interviews and focus group sessions to identify needs. - Revise and update needs assessments as communities themselves re-establish internal support networks (formal and informal) to adapt to the new situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTEGRATING CCE INTO THE HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME CYCLE

### Needs Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Obstacles to CCE/AAP</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of physical access to affected populations (security, population movements, health epidemic, etc.) makes it difficult to engage with them in needs assessments.</td>
<td>- Look for using information from local radio, monitor social media, and use SMS or other tools to gather information on needs remotely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Mistrust of affected people with aid organisations (including mistrust of host communities and local authorities). | - Share information about aid organisation working in the area, their objectives, and their accountability commitments, particularly around listening to and considering communities’ needs and opinions, and their safety, protection and confidentiality.  
- Include local authorities in needs assessment processes, and consult with communities and/or people not targeted for assistance to ensure assistance does not create tensions or risks. |
|       | Little understanding of the social, political and gender dynamics of affected populations. | - Include a social and gender analysis into the needs assessment process, using focus group discussions, key informant interviews or other techniques.  
- Include experts on the local culture (social scientists, teachers or health care workers, community leaders, etc.) as part of assessment teams.  
- Mobilise CCE and/or gender specialists if needed to support.  
- Review or refer to existing information and analysis from other sources or from previous crises. |
|       | Misinformation, rumours and unrealistic expectations. | - Get informed consent from affected people to collect and use their feedback and protect their confidentiality.  
- Share transparent, accurate information with communities on how information will be used, what kinds of interventions are anticipated, and how unmet needs will be communicated and advocated to relevant actors. |
|       | Lack of support for CCE approaches from local or national authorities and/or senior management in aid organisations and donors. | - Advocate with authorities and donors of the added value and the need to invest in CCE approaches to have better evidence of needs, and a more efficient and effective intervention strategies.  
- Consider the agenda of local authorities too and do not impose agendas from the central or international level.  
- Use the voices of affected people themselves to express and advocate for their needs through testimonials, participatory videos, or other tools to ensure their perspectives are represented in decision-making. |
|       | Lack of knowledge and experience using CCE approaches in needs assessments. | - Invest in training and develop CCE tools for needs assessments.  
- If needed, find external technical assistance to integrate CCE into needs assessments, such as deployments of CCE/AAP experts. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Obstacles to CCE/AAP</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Needs Assessments | Duplication of needs assessments, and little consideration of affected people’s views and preferences. | - Propose coordinated needs assessments with engagement of all actors to build joint ownership and reduce duplication.  
- Modify MIRA to incorporate participatory assessment methods, using the IASC suggested AAP questions.  
- Develop common questions around affected people’s needs, priorities and preferences for surveys, focus groups and interviews.  
- Use tools like media landscape mapping to determine most appropriate and trusted channels for communication and information sharing. |
|                | Lack of permanent budget to preparedness and response planning.                      | - Advocate with decision-makers at all levels (government, UN, NGOs) to set aside funding to support contingency and preparedness planning, including budget for CCE capacity building.  
- Include budgets to and integrate community-level preparedness into response and recovery programmes. |
|                | People with disabilities are left out of the planning of emergency response.          | - Include people with disabilities in the planning, not as beneficiaries but as participants in the processes with their own experiences.  
- Make use of existing standards and guidelines to orient response planning.  
- Advocate that the aid providers have sufficient capacity and resources to respond to people with different types of disabilities. |
| Planning       | Assistance and protection needs and priorities of specific vulnerable and/or marginalised groups are not considered in planning. | - Collect sex, age and disability disaggregated data (SADD) and carry out a gender analysis to inform planning and prioritisation.  
- Consult with specific vulnerable groups to ensure their needs are identified and delivery preferences are incorporated into the response.  
- Carry out a protection risk assessment with participation of communities to identify and minimise risks. |
|                | Little opportunities for affected people to directly engage in planning and implementation of responses. | - Consult with affected people on how they want to be engaged in the planning of response activities.  
- Develop a communication and community engagement plan to define how affected people can share feedback, participate in decision-making and raise concerns and complaints about the response or aid providers. |
<p>|                | Plans do not match the priorities and preferences of affected people, or are not appropriate to the culture or context. | - Consult with affected people to validate the proposed plans and activities and adapt when necessary. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Obstacles to CCE/AAP</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Implementation  | Lack of clear responsibilities for leading and coordinating CCE in the response, and ensuring feedback mechanisms are used systematically to inform decision-making. | - Ensure there is a focal point in senior management of aid organisations, local and national authorities and the HCT with clear responsibilities and leadership for CCE and AAP.  
- Define clear procedures for integrating feedback into management and monitoring processes, such as having CCE and AAP as a regular agenda item in management meetings, and regular reports and updates on how feedback is being used to adapt responses. |
|                 | Little transparency around what assistance is available, who receives it, and the outcomes and results, along with misinformation, rumours and perceptions of corruption. | - Regularly share information in transparent, appropriate and accessible means with communities, and ensure they have means to provide feedback and opinions of their satisfaction with the assistance delivered, or report issues of mismanagement, corruption, etc.  
- Ensure feedback and response mechanisms are safe and confidential for sensitive issues. |
|                 | Problems in the ability of affected people to access and use the information that reaches them, and perceptions that their views are not considered in the response. | - Insist that all projects have a CCE plan (and budget) that defines who information will be shared, how communities will be engaged and consulted with during projects, and how feedback will be collected and used.  
- Explain and validate these plans with communities to ensure they are accessible and used. |
|                 | Feedback and participation is top-down, and used to meet aid organisations’ needs, not those of affected people. | - Consider finding appropriate mechanisms such as community management committees or other mechanisms to directly participate in and manage response activities. |
|                 | Too much bureaucracy in the response, where normal administrative procedures are not adapted to the crisis context, and do not facilitate CCE. | - Review and adapt existing procedures or develop new ones to ensure CCE is integrated into organisations’ and donors’ plans have flexibility to adapt activities based on feedback from affected people. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Assistance does not meet the expectations of people. | - Work with communities to share information transparently and set clear objectives on what can be realistically achieved and how gaps will be addressed or advocated to other actors.  
- Promote direct engagement of affected people in monitoring the response so they can see where and how aid resources are used, and provide inputs on the timeliness, relevance and quality of assistance. |
|                 | Lack of use of monitoring and feedback results to adjust plans and interventions. | - Ensure monitoring plans include CCE approaches to gather feedback and opinions of affected people.  
- Establish and define indicators around quality and satisfaction from the perspective of affected people, such as degree of satisfaction with the relevance and appropriateness of activities.  
- Ensure management plans and donor funding is flexible to allow for adjustments based on results and feedback from affected people. |
Little use of participatory monitoring and evaluation methods, and sometimes too focused on technical issues and indicators.

- Humanize the issue of indicators and monitoring tools, making them more accessible to the community (for example, the participatory video).
- Close the feedback loop by sharing the data and analysis from feedback mechanisms and other monitoring data, and discuss and validate the findings with communities.

Lack of confidence in the system and in the government, especially in the use of resources.

- Find ways for affected people to participate in the implementation, management and monitoring of responses, so that they can see for themselves how resources are used and how it contributes to meeting their needs.
- Consider using third party monitoring or peer reviews to build trust in the process and allow more honest feedback on sensitive issues from communities.
Ideas and solutions for the LAC region
Panels and working group discussions looked at providing ideas and solutions to some of the institutional, cultural and operational barriers to scaling up CCE in the region. There was a rich discussion on how to take advantage of the existing knowledge and experience in the region, and suggestions on what was required to more systematically integrate CCE into the work of individual organisations, as well as working together collectively to coordinate CCE in existing and future crisis responses. Here are some of the main ideas emerging from these discussions.

**Build equitable relationships with vulnerable and affected people**

- The most important thing is to build a relationship of trust with communities. This requires aid organisations to first listen carefully to all groups, analyse what can be done, take actions and report back to them how their views have been considered.

- Aid providers also need to demonstrate their trust in communities by sharing information transparently and offering meaningful opportunities for two-way communication and to participate in design, management and monitoring of response activities. Communities need to see evidence that their feedback, opinions and suggestions are considered in making decisions about programme interventions.

- Empowering communities involves a shift in thinking to accept and prioritise their knowledge and capacities, and give them more equitable participation in decision-making. When aid organisations don’t do this, it disenfranchises affected people, and shows a lack of respect towards them.

- This is the same for community organisations and local and national authorities. Showing that the views and opinions of affected people are important also helps reinforce the message that all aid actors, including governments, are accountable for being more transparent, timely, efficient and effective in their interventions, and generate meaningful results for them.

- Underlying all experiences explored in the workshop is a paradigm shift in how aid organisations plan interventions and conceptualise and manage risks. Rather than see affected people as powerless victims, AAP demands that aid providers make them active subjects in their own recovery. This means rethinking the power dynamics and relationship between aid providers and communities, and being able to yield control over decision-making and resources.

**Overcoming structural and political barriers to CCE**

- Current aid approaches have many structural deficiencies that need to be addressed to move towards a new model. Long-term organisational changes are needed, moving away from silo approaches and individual project and organisations, to inter-sectoral and collective, coordinated approaches. This requires greater collaboration internally and between aid organisations, relations with civil society, governments, the military, private sector and academics, etc. It also requires more long-term flexible funding, and investment in new approaches like CCE. There needs to be greater involvement of people outside the sector who have knowledge and abilities, and not just in crisis events. Greater links between humanitarian and development actors are needed.

- There is a real challenge to systematise learning and generate evidence, while allowing for differential approaches and flexibility to adapt to different contexts. The research and academic community should be more connected to the communities, and help to share contextual and technical knowledge with aid...
organisations. More work needs to be done to equip humanitarian actors with the skills for cross-cultural and gender analysis, testing and improving techniques, more equitable participation of communities in the internal process of aid organisations. Aid organisations also need to examine their own internal culture and power dynamics if they are serious about changing.

The need for collective leadership and coordination

- Coordination it is not optional, it is essential. However, while there are always call for greater coordination, few organisations are willing to fully concede their power and work in collaboration and cooperation with others. The time for institutional flag-waving needs to end. Putting people at the centre requires aid organisations to look for coordinated and collective approaches to address needs, not work in isolation. Vulnerable and affected people need to be represented and respected in coordination mechanisms.

- Coordination requires a strong leadership commitment to working together collectively and effectively, with a focus on results for affected people and their rights. This is at all levels, from headquarters down to the project level. Simply asking how an intervention could be done jointly, or if it duplicates existing efforts without any radical improvement is one way of doing this. A classic example is the Philippines, where over 17 telephone hotlines were established for families to report on different issues. Clearly this is inefficient, and leadership is needed to look for more creative and efficient solutions.

- The example of the regional platform for CCE in the response to the Venezuela migrant crisis shows the value of coordinated actions. But the temporary nature of the platform reinforces the need for institutionalization of CCE as a permanent element in existing humanitarian preparedness and coordination mechanisms. The CCEI is a good first step to raising the profile and showing the value of coordinated and collective CCE approaches in responses. Nevertheless, it has also highlighted ongoing challenges to ensuring optimal coordination and investing in capacities to support more effective and predictable responses.

Strengthen knowledge sharing and build stronger evidence on the value of CCE approaches

- Capacity-building strategies are needed to increase knowledge and awareness of the wealth of tools and experiences already available in the region. This could include training, coaching, and practical workshops on how to use and adapt tools, or coaching and peer-to-peer learning at the project and community level.

- Aid organisations also need consider how to build trust, familiarity and more consistent use of CCE and feedback mechanisms at the community level. While these mechanisms can help improve quality and effectiveness, they should not be imposed on communities. Aid organisations will need to look for multiple means to collect and interpret what communities want and need. Communities may only see the value when aid organisations can show that they are listening to and acting on affected people’s concerns.

- More should be done to improve the exchange of information at the country and regional level. Resources need to be documented, compiled and disseminated more widely, making use of existing platforms. Workshops and learning events can help build a strong CCE community of practice in the region. However, the learning also has to be shared with other members of teams, not just with C4D and CCE experts.
The region needs to invest into more research and evidence on the role and added value of CCE in humanitarian responses, and explore the links to learning from the development sector. Joint research, or to joint efforts to design and implement common, collective feedback platforms could be used to test, validate and document learning. More collaboration and exchanges of experiences with other regions would also help.

**Key points**

- There is a lot of institutional words of commitment to CCE, AAP and people-centred approaches – now it time to translate this into actions and changes in our ways of working.

- Gaining internal support for CCE/AAP requires different messaging for different audiences – the key message is the shared accountability to generate meaningful results for affected people and protect their rights, and that this is impossible without effective CCE strategies.

- Sustained leadership commitment at all levels – not just directors and managers, but also technical and programme staff - is needed to drive changes in organisational cultures and systems - Requires internal champions and leadership.

- Examples and evidence of the added value of CCE/AAP will help support arguments to invest and prioritise CCE actions.

- Organisational changes takes time – important to look for quick wins but also consider the long-term change objectives and the time and resources.

- Working in collaboration with peer organisations and partners on programming can help reinforce shared commitments and learning.

- It can help build a community of practice around how to overcome internal and external obstacles and promote institutional changes.
Conclusions
The workshop brought together for the first time representatives and experts in communication, community engagement and accountability from over a dozen countries and organisations, each with unique perspectives and experiences to share, but with a common commitment to improving the quality, effectiveness and accountability of humanitarian actions in the LAC region.

The event contributed to creating a shared understanding of what Accountability to Affected People (AAP) means, and how communication and community engagement (CCE) supports meeting key global commitments such as the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), IASC Commitments to Accountability to Affected People (CAAP and the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution. There was wide agreement that while individual organisations may use different terminology such as C4D or CwC, the core concepts and aims of AAP and CCE are the same: putting people at the centre of humanitarian actions and ensuring their rights and needs are addressed.

As evident throughout the three days, there is a rich body of knowledge and experience at the country and regional level that can be leveraged and applied to existing and future humanitarian crises. The region has particular strengths in the response to disasters, population movements and public health emergencies. Dozens of examples of innovative and good practices in CCE were discussed, offering participants new tools and approaches that can be adapted and applied in their own country contexts. Indeed, many organisations are already exploring collaboration and sharing as an outcome of the workshop.

Reflecting on the wealth of experiences within and outside the region, it is evident that the problem is not a lack of knowledge or tools, but more about addressing the institutional and operational barriers to systemically applying CCE in preparedness and responses. Scaling up and accelerating CCE approaches in the region requires work at all levels.

At the institutional level, sustained leadership commitments are required to change perceptions and attitudes about CCE and AAP as optional activities, to seeing them as an essential component of good management practices. This needs to happen at the level of individual organisations as well as at the level of the existing humanitarian architecture, and especially humanitarian coordination mechanisms. The examples from the response to disasters, population movements and public health emergencies in the LAC region highlight the enormous potential gains that CCE can bring to response in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability to affected people. However, if this is not institutionalised much of this potential will be unrealised, at the expense of better results for affected people.

This is also about changing the nature of the relationships between aid providers and affected communities, providing meaningful and equitable ways to participate in the decisions that affect them, and how aid resources will be used and prioritised to meet their needs and expectations. This requires an investment at all levels to raise awareness of the importance of CCE for AAP and effective results and outcomes, build capacities and to adapt systems and processes to facilitate this.

At the operational level, participants also identified potential solutions to better using CCE approaches in needs assessments, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of responses. These solutions build on the practical examples and experiences of participants at the country level. However, it is also evident that there is no single solution, applicable to every crisis or context. Aid organisations must understand the context, and engage with affected people to identify their priority needs and preferences. Tools and approaches need to be adapted to facilitate meeting their needs, and not what is simply convenient for aid organisations. Therefore, it is very important to incorporate an analysis of gender, age and disabilities to design coherent strategies adapted to the context.
At the collective level, the main challenge remains to move from isolated and fragmented actions, to a common and coordinated front so that the capacities, perspectives and preferences of affected and affected people are considered in decision-making and all phases of emergency. Collective and intersectoral actions are needed to achieve greater outcomes and impacts for affected people. Inter-agency cooperation and collective efforts are needed to apply CCE consistently and coherently in responses. This also requires an investment in preparedness, capacity building of partners, including governments, local organisations and adapting humanitarian coordination tools, processes and mechanisms to facilitate CCE.

**NEXT STEPS**

Despite the challenges, the existing capacities and conditions in the region show that is possible to achieve more. There is a strong commitment and ambition amongst participating organisations to do so. In particular, participants identified four areas for continued engagement and collaboration over the coming year:

1. Reinforce understanding and awareness of CCE as a key component of AAP and effective and accountable responses within their organisations and in the region.

2. Build a stronger research agenda to support effective, evidence-based CCE strategies to address humanitarian crises in the region and globally.

3. Implement common platforms and collective approaches to community feedback and response, particularly around population movements.

4. Consolidate the knowledge-sharing and exchanges of participants through a regional CCE community of practice.

5. Further strengthen institutionalization and formal integration of CCE in humanitarian architecture.

These priorities are reflected in country and regional plans that set out follow-up actions that can be taken to ensure that CCE and AAP capacities and learning are consolidated and expanded (see Annex 1).

Participants left the workshop with a final reflection: Are we prepared to give power to affected people, so they can define and decide how we do humanitarian action? The time has come to move from words to actions.
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Annex 1: Country and Regional Follow-up Actions

In keeping with the learning event’s title, “From Words to Action” working groups identified a set of initial follow-up actions to strengthen and scale-up CCE and AAP at the country and regional level, and apply the learning to current and future crisis responses. The main points are summarised below.

Brazil

• Ask for OCHA participation to create a social network to support migrants.

ECA/Trinidad and Tobago

Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:
• Establish an interagency CCE working group.
• Conduct training and capacity building activities to enhance CCE, C4D and AAP activities.
• Adapt and incorporate new tools and information material based on the learning from the workshop, such as Rumour Tracking, Migrants as Messengers, Community Response AAP, KoBo, and other feedback mechanisms.
• Increase use of community engagement and participation through capacity building of community leaders, youth and children.
• Promote use of feedback mechanisms and information centres into existing programmes.

Guatemala

Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:
• Disseminate the Core Humanitarian Standard and raise awareness of the importance of community participation in prevention and response with stakeholders in Guatemala.
• Develop a roadmap to prepare conditions for community participation in future crises.
• Promote the inclusion of people with disabilities in prevention and response.
• Provide staff training on C4D and CCE, and the importance of integrating and using feedback in emergency situations (Radio Qawinaqel).
• Liaise with different key stakeholders in the country to build better links to communications media and identify spaces for disseminating information (CONARED).
• Disseminate the CHS with programme teams, and raise awareness of the importance of incorporating CCE into preparedness and response planning (UNICEF).
• Map existing experiences around CCE and community participation in the country (UNICEF).
• Review the tools and methodologies discussed in the workshop to identify which ones could be adapted and integrated into response strategies (PROEDUSA/MSPAS).
• Replicate the use of participatory video for health topics and link to the Friendly Spaces strategy used in Nicaragua by Meeting Points.

Haiti

Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:
• Develop a concept note and a check list on CCE and AAP to share with partners.
• Organize awareness-raising sessions on CCE and AAP in emergencies with DPC (Directorate of Civil Protection).
• Elaborate a monitoring plan to help humanitarian actors implement and track CCE actions.
• Develop and adapt technical tools and documents based on the workshop learning to the Haiti context.

Honduras

Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:
• Incorporate CCE and C4D into the communication strategy that will be developed by the country’s humanitarian team for 2019.
• Develop a joint crisis preparedness plan, based on a full situation analysis and evidence, including around CCE issues.
• Promote greater transparency and accountability by collecting feedback from affected people assisted on the relevance and effectiveness of support and services.
• Establish feedback and complaints mechanisms adapted to the context and crisis type for new crises.
• Review the CCE strategies planned for 2019, and strengthen the actions based on learning from the workshop (Secretary of Education/COPECO).

**Mexico**

**Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:**
• Hold a follow-up meeting to prepare a pilot C4D-community participation-accountability plan in Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas that can be replicated in other locations and contexts.
• Design a joint needs assessment consultation process to identify health / nutrition, protection and WASH needs with migrant children, adolescents and families (using for example the KOBO tool), together with other relevant actors: UNHCR / IOM, CSOs, etc.
• With the support from UNICEF and the Mexican Red Cross volunteers, install bulletin boards at Caravan arrival points with messages around protection and security, rights of children, asylum, health, nutrition, etc. and promoting use of the Jaguar Face Book platform and other online resources.
• Also look to set up feedback mechanisms such as a suggestion/complaints box, and try to collect disaggregated information by sex, age, disability, how many families, and number of children.
• Identify and promote the use of two-way communication apps such as WhatsApp, ideally without requiring Wi-Fi, so that families can share information during their journey.
• Ensure the accompaniment of health personnel (Mexican Red Cross) to the caravan to monitor and assist the migrant population and especially pregnant women, babies and children and adolescents.
• Identify youth and adolescents within the caravans who might volunteer as change agents/communicators using U-report or other approaches (with due consideration for safety and confidentiality).

**Peru**

**Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:**
• Continue technical support to communication offices and specialized areas related to the humanitarian approach of the government, incorporating CCE and AAP elements.
• Coordinate with actors involved in the SINADIS Development and Social Inclusion System to incorporate CCE and C4D into the communication strategy.
• Strengthen existing CCE activities to make them more effective, building on the learning and experiences from the workshop.

**Regional level actions**

Representatives from organisations working at the regional and global level (UNICEF, OCHA, IFRC, IOM, UNCHR and Internews) discussed ways to continue to support CCE work at the country level over the next six months. This includes strengthening capacity-building support and technical assistance that can be mobilised to support specific crisis situations such as the refugee and migrant population movements in Venezuela and Central America.

**Follow-up actions for the next 6-12 months:**
• Design, validate and implement a Training of Trainers (ToT) package on APP (Accountability of Affected Populations) targeting members of national platforms or interagency groups. Activity includes an individual consultancy and regional training.
Design a Regional Guide to conduct qualitative assessment and base and endline studies to monitor and evaluate the activities under the CwC and measure the impact in the countries under the Venezuela situation. Roll out of the Guide includes capacity building of key actors working in CwC in the region.

- Develop inter-agency accountability mechanisms and tools at the regional level, to provide refugees and migrants with access to information, feedback and complaints platform and a real-time monitoring system for people on the move.

- Conduct outreach and advocacy on CCE and AAP issues through regional platforms.

- Explore the possibility of establishing a common and collective feedback and response platform for population movements as part of the CCEI:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Juliana Quintero</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Regional Media and Communication Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juquintero@iom.int">juquintero@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Luisa Dietrich</td>
<td>Transition International</td>
<td>Gender Desk Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ld@gender.consulting">ld@gender.consulting</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Lisa McLean</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmcclentrotman@unicef.org">lmcclentrotman@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Candice Wallace</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwallace@unicef.org">cwallace@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Sheniah Armstrong</td>
<td>Department of Disaster Management</td>
<td>Planning and Preparedness Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarmstrong@gov.vi">sarmstrong@gov.vi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Fernanda Baumhard-Grojean</td>
<td>OCHA RO LAC</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fernanda.baumhardt@commwithcommunities.com">fernanda.baumhardt@commwithcommunities.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Coronel Georges Feres Kanaan</td>
<td>Welcome Operation - Brazilian Government</td>
<td>Adjunct Operational Coordinator of the Humanitarian Logistics Task Force in the state of Roraima.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gfkanaan@hotmail.com">gfkanaan@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Ida Pietricovsky de Oliveira</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Specialist for Amazonian Territory</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ipoliveira@unicef.org">ipoliveira@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Maria do Socorro Tabosa Mota</td>
<td>Brazilian Presidency Civil House</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Social Policy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Socorro.tabosa@presidencia.gov.br">Socorro.tabosa@presidencia.gov.br</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Fabio Mattos</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Field coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mettola@unhcr.org">mettola@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Marcela Bonvicini</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Field coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonvicini@unfpa.org">bonvicini@unfpa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Yssyssay Rodrigues</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Field coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yrodriguez@iom.int">yrodriguez@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Fabio Salles</td>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td>National Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fabio.salles@adra.org.br">fabio.salles@adra.org.br</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Philip Lee</td>
<td>WACC Global</td>
<td>Global Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PL@waccglobal.org">PL@waccglobal.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Warren Feek</td>
<td>The Communication Initiative</td>
<td>Global Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wfeek@comminit.com">wfeek@comminit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Alma Montoya</td>
<td>Grupo Comunicarte / WACC</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alma@colnodo.org.co">alma@colnodo.org.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Jair Vega</td>
<td>UNINORTE</td>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvega@uninorte.edu.co">jvega@uninorte.edu.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Rocío Castañeda Cisneros</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Public Information Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:castaner@unhcr.org">castaner@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Margarida Luoureiro</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Senior Inter-Agency Coordination Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loureiro@unhcr.org">loureiro@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Adelaida Trujillo</td>
<td>Fundacion Imaginario</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atrujillo@cituma.com.co">atrujillo@cituma.com.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Participant</td>
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<td>Title</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Dora Miranda</td>
<td>The Global Child Protection Area of Responsibility, UNICEF HQ</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmiranda@unicef.org">dmiranda@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Ramiro Quezada</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Health and Nutrition Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rquezada@unicef.org">rquezada@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Eduardo Gularte</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:egularte@unicef.org">egularte@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>David De Leon</td>
<td>CONRED</td>
<td>Social Communication Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddleon@conred.org.gt">ddleon@conred.org.gt</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Erick Revolorio Hernández</td>
<td>Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social- PROEDUSA</td>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alejandrorevelorio@gmail.com">alejandrorevelorio@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Manuel García</td>
<td>Radio Gawinaquel</td>
<td>Social Communicator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:manuel.f.alaros@gmail.com">manuel.f.alaros@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Monica Vaquez</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Mass Communication Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vasquezm@unhcr.org">vasquezm@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Marie Garlène Dupoux</td>
<td>IBESR</td>
<td>Coordinator for Grande-Anse Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Ruth Réné</td>
<td>IDEETTE</td>
<td>Community Mobilisation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Ganddey Milorme</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmilorme@unicef.org">gmilorme@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Bérangère Antoine</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Emergency Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bantoine@unicef.org">bantoine@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Elizabeth Pérez</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eperez@unicef.org">eperez@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Arely Argueta</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Head of Communication and Enviromental Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rquetarely05@Mil.com">rquetarely05@Mil.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Vanessa Morales</td>
<td>COPECO</td>
<td>Head of Public Relations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yochy_mora24@yahoo.com">yochy_mora24@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Erlín Palma</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Country Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:palmae@un.org">palmae@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Andrés Ramírez</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aramirez@unicef.org">aramirez@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Matthias Sachse</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Nutrition Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmsachte@unicef.org">mmsachte@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Sonia del Carmen Fernandez</td>
<td>CAMEF Nuevo Laredo</td>
<td>Psicologa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lic.fernandezkolchufe@yahoo.com">lic.fernandezkolchufe@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Sebastián Gutierrez Gómez</td>
<td>Cruz Roja Mexicana de la Juventud</td>
<td>Humanitarian National Programs Commissioner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.gutierrez@cruzrojamexicanana.org.mx">s.gutierrez@cruzrojamexicanana.org.mx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Fernando Carcache</td>
<td>Fundación Puntos de Encuentro</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fernando.carcache@puntoadencuentro.org">fernando.carcache@puntoadencuentro.org</a></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Vicente Riamundo</td>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>Jefe de la Oficina Regional</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vicente.riamundo@echofield.du">vicente.riamundo@echofield.du</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noruega</td>
<td>Anne K. Hasset</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.haseth@nrc.no">anne.haseth@nrc.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noruega</td>
<td>Asies Peña</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asies.ituria@nrc.no">asies.ituria@nrc.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Ysabel Limache de Arana</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ylimachedearana@unicef.org">ylimachedearana@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Antonio Torres Trujillo</td>
<td>Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>Director of Local Systems</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atorres@ming.gog.pe">atorres@ming.gog.pe</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Martha Elena Giraldo Limo</td>
<td>Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>Head of Security Office and National Defense</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgiraldo@mides.gob.pe">mgiraldo@mides.gob.pe</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Verónica Sáez</td>
<td>The Round Table for the Fight Against Poverty, Peru</td>
<td>Communication Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vsaenz@mesadeconcertacion.org">vsaenz@mesadeconcertacion.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Wbeimar Sanchez</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>Health Public Delegate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wbeimar.sanchez@ifrc.org">wbeimar.sanchez@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Alban Nouvellon</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>WASH Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anovellon@unicef.org">anovellon@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Isabel Suarez</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Emergency Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsuarez@unicef.org">jsuarez@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Lilian Reyes</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Emergency Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lreyes@unicef.org">lreyes@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Alvaro Arroyo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Health Emergencies Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aarroyo@unicef.org">aarroyo@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Brijan Breman</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbreman@iom.int">bbreman@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Philip Gelman</td>
<td>USAID/OFDA</td>
<td>Regional Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pgelman@ofda.gov">pgelman@ofda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Amy Rhoades</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Community Engagement Programme Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arhoades@iom.int">arhoades@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Justus Olielo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Communication and Communication Engagement - AAP Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jolielo@unicef.org">jolielo@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Blair Gopeechan</td>
<td>Ministry for Migrants and Refugees Living Water Community</td>
<td>Senior Program Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blair.gopeechan@gmail.com">blair.gopeechan@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA/Washington</td>
<td>María Fernandez García</td>
<td>Internews</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mfernandez@internews.org">mfernandez@internews.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA NYHQ</td>
<td>Nicole Foster</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Digital Communication Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfoster@unicef.org">nfoster@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA NYHQ</td>
<td>Naureen Naqvi</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>C4D Emergency Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nnaqvi@unicef.org">nnaqvi@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Otto Manzariega</td>
<td>RIADIS</td>
<td>Tesorero de la Junta Directiva de la Red Latinoamericana de Personas con Discapacidad y sus Familia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vicepresidencia@riadis.org">vicepresidencia@riadis.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Workshop Organizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Philip Tamminga</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>AAP and Comunication International Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lopez20@un.org">Lopez20@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Amaia López Castelo</td>
<td>OCHA RO LAC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Affairs Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:silvar@un.org">silvar@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Rogerio Mobilia</td>
<td>OCHA RO LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:monica.posada@ifrc.org">monica.posada@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Monica Posada</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>Community Engagement and Accountability Delegate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diana.medina@ifrc.org">diana.medina@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Diana Medina</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>Communication General Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diana.medina@ifrc.org">diana.medina@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Dennis Christian Larsen</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>C4D Regional Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dlarsen@unicef.org">dlarsen@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Giovanna Nuñez</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>Senior C4D International Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rgnunez@unicef.org">rgnunez@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Luca Solimeo</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>C4D Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsolimeo@unicef.org">lsolimeo@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>José David Lainez</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>C4D Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlainez@unicef.org">jlainez@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Marath Ibarra</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mibarra@unicef.org">mibarra@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Victoria Maskell</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>Innovation in Health Public Emergencies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vmaskell@unicef.org">vmaskell@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Douglas Riemer</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>Emergency Regional Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dreimer@unicef.org">dreimer@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>David Simón</td>
<td>UNICEF LAC RO</td>
<td>WASH Specialist</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsimon@unicef.org">dsimon@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>