

CCCM Cluster Ethiopia

CCCM Training Report – May-Tsebri, Ethiopia

Type of training: CCCM Response and its Role in Community Engagement (Along with Community-led Initiatives), Localization

Date of training: 25th to 27th of August 2025

Location of training (city, country): May-Tsebri, Contested Area -2, Ethiopia

Name of facilitator(s): Bharat Kumar Adhikari and Awett Desta (with background support from Mamuney)

Number of participants: 32 participants (in-person)

Profile of participants (position, organizations): Community Leaders, Service Providing Partners, Command Post Representative and CCCM practitioners.

Background and objective(s) of the training

Provide information on training and framework of the training (ie. Part of the IASC guidelines etc.). Also provide detail on the objective of the training.

May-Tsebri is one of the areas in Ethiopia facing a complex humanitarian situation. Various forms of displacement are observed in this location. These include internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees who have come back from different parts of Amhara and Tigray, and communities that have been affected by displacement while continuously supporting both the IDPs and the returnees.

Due to the absence of a functioning civilian government, coordination mechanisms in the May-Tsebri area have remained weak. This has led to significant gaps in the humanitarian response. Stakeholders have struggled to uphold humanitarian principles, and affected communities have faced challenges in accessing services, managing risks, and coping with reduced humanitarian assistance.

Although OCHA has made efforts to streamline and strengthen coordination in the area, and the CCCM implementing agency has also contributed to coordination efforts, service duplication across sectors continues to be a major issue. Since the CCCM intervention began in 2021 and resumed in January 2025, there has been a noticeable gap in capacity building among key actors.

To address the ongoing coordination and information management challenges, the CCCM Cluster organized a training in May-Tsebri from August 25–27, 2025. The training focused on strengthening coordination efforts, enhancing community engagement in the humanitarian response, and building the capacity of government-appointed authorities, local communities, and service-providing partners so that collaborative and informed decision-making efforts in the humanitarian context could be streamlined and community-centred.

Objectives of the Training:

The primary objective of the training was to enhance stakeholders' understanding of CCCM and its essential role in contributing to an effective humanitarian response in principled ways, while also supporting the strengthening of the coordination forum, particularly in intersectoral service provision.

The other objectives were:

- Improving coordination and service delivery through the site management team.
- Promoting a shift in humanitarian support from status-based to vulnerability-based approaches through shared understanding and knowledge.
- Strengthening community participation and ownership, defining the role of the communities in humanitarian response.
- Fundamental parameters in understanding the CCCM's exit from the response,

- Strengthen local capacity for communities and government actors to respond sustainably to displacement and pursue durable solutions.

Training Methodologies:

The CCCM training in May-Tsebri used an interactive and participatory approach. Trainers and participants engaged in two-way discussions, creating a space for shared learning. The sessions were practical, with participants divided into groups to present their experiences, share knowledge, and propose actions. This method helped strengthen their skills through hands-on activities and real-time feedback.

The training focused on understanding humanitarian response in different contexts, making the content relevant to participants' experiences and immediately applicable. By the end of the training, participants developed action plans, showing their commitment to improving humanitarian coordination through community-centered approaches and localized capacity for self-resiliency with the support from the humanitarian community and existing government-appointed structure.

Selection of the Participants:

Since the capacity-building approach was new in May-Tsebri, the training was designed to be inclusive of all participants, regardless of their prior knowledge or experience in the CCCM sector and it included:

- **Command Post and Community Committees**, at May-Tsebri Area levels supporting in humanitarian response coordination and decision making.
- **Humanitarian staff from the agencies** – involved in humanitarian response in the area.
- **Site managers and CCCM Practitioners** working directly in May-Tsebri Area for humanitarian response.
- **Cluster and sub-cluster members** including CCCM and other sectoral coordination team engaged in coordination and planning.
- **Communities - Community Leaders** (including those appointed by the CCCM team in coordination with the government stakeholders and traditional community leaders).

Pretraining Tasks:

Prior to the training, the training team developed a Terms of Reference (ToR) and set a clear agenda to ensure participants were well-informed about the training structure, including the schedule, key thematic areas, and opportunities for knowledge and experience sharing. Given the complex community dynamics in May-Tsebri, the team consulted relevant stakeholders to identify the most appropriate language for effective training delivery. Amharic, being the most widely understood and accessible language among participants, was selected as the primary medium of instruction. Where necessary, real-time translation into other preferred languages was provided to ensure inclusivity and comprehension.

Training Outline

Summarize the main points covered by the agenda.

The training was held at *Seti Hotel* in May-Tsebri town from Monday, 25th to Wednesday, 27th August 2025. While the original agenda included sessions on the transition, exit, and closure of CCCM, the focus was adjusted based on participants' preferences. Instead, the training emphasized community participation, collaborative efforts among service providers, the role of government-appointed authorities in decision-making, and community contributions to effective humanitarian response and cost recovery planning. As all the participants came to realize during the course of the training, that the CCCM approach is still in its early stages in the area, the training prioritized how CCCM could foster an enabling environment for coordinated humanitarian action and strengthening the capacity, rather than discussing its

transition or exit though the CCCM always focuses on transitioning and exiting from the beginning of its response.

Training Sessions:

1. Introduction to the CCCM:

After the welcome address and agenda briefing by ADHIKARI Bharat, the National CCCM Cluster Coordinator, he led the introductory session. Participants learned about the causes of displacement and how it occurs. The session covered global trends in displacement, emphasizing that people of all ages and backgrounds can be affected, with women, children, the elderly, and those with specific needs or disabilities being especially vulnerable. Different types of displacement sites and sites like settings (planned camps, spontaneous camps, collective centres, transit centres, evacuation centres and the dispersed settlements including in the host communities) and the profiles of the displaced populations; as refugees, IDPs, migrants, and asylum seekers, were explained. Real-life examples of contextual displacement scenarios were shown and explained practically that each displaced person has unique needs, and the basic support required was clarified. The CCCM's key functions were also outlined, including community participation, communication, following international laws and standards, monitoring services and protection risks, coordinating service delivery, and addressing GBV, all supported by a skilled technical team. The session also focused on the CCCM resources for capacity building, including the CCCM toolkit, Minimum Standards for Camp Management, the Sphere Handbook and other relevant documents/sources.

At the end of the session, the participants were able to know the CCCM's fundamental functions to address the displacement-affected populations' needs and protection issues, the typologies of the site and site-like settings along with the profiles of the displaced people and the assistance they require.

2. Humanitarian Principles (Including Code of Conduct – CoC and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse – PSEA):

This session was especially important in May-Tsebri, a contested area where applying humanitarian principles has been very difficult. Humanitarian partners and communities have faced challenges in coordinating efforts and accessing services based on actual needs and vulnerabilities.

Participants were given real-life examples of each humanitarian principles (Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Operational Independence and how the humanitarian communities should think and plan 'Do-No-Harm' in the response) to help them understand what humanitarian principles are and why they are essential. These examples showed how humanitarian actors must protect affected people from risks and support them in a respectful and dignified way. The session also highlighted how access issues, community profiles, and the involvement of government in conflict (despite it is unintentional) can make it inadvertently harder to follow these principles.

In the PSEA part of the session, participants participated in a role play by developing a scenario where a woman beneficiary was waiting for aid and a humanitarian worker tried to take advantage of her. This helped participants understand how exploitation can happen and discuss other similar situations. The facilitator then explained the importance of the Code of Conduct, which is a binding document for everyone involved in humanitarian work. It ensures that all actors behave responsibly, and any violation of it is treated with zero tolerance.

3. Site Mangement, Coordination and Service Monitoring:

Mr. Awett Desta, a certified CCCM Trainer (ToT), led this session with a focus on group work. Participants were divided into three groups based on the CCCM's coordination framework: Camp Administration (CA), Camp Coordination (CC), and Camp Management (CM). Each group discussed and identified their specific roles and how they work together to support humanitarian response.

Through this exercise, participants learned what services for displacement-affected communities involve, and how each CCCM structure has both unique and shared responsibilities. The group discussions included open and respectful

debates about which roles belong to whom. This helped highlight the importance of collaboration across all three structures to ensure effective coordination.

The session also focused on site management and service monitoring. Participants explored how CCCM helps identify needs and gaps in services across different sectors, both in displacement sites and host communities. The training emphasized the importance of referring these needs to the right service providers and how CCCM can help create the right conditions for durable solutions. This includes understanding community profiles, preferences, and specific needs, and supporting them in a way that is community-driven and inclusive based on the standards and practices.

4. Monitoring Protection Risks and Mainstreaming the Actions Against GBV:

At the beginning of the session, the training team introduced an interactive activity to help participants understand the difference between sex and gender. They shared short stories about people in the community, each showing different characteristics or roles. For example, one story was about a neighbor's daughter who was hospitalized due to pregnancy. Another mentioned the Kebele Chairperson, Mr. Birhanu, who didn't attend a women-led meeting because he had other priorities. There were also stories like "My father has long hair," "Ms. Meseret always brings water from the river because she was assigned to bring water by her mother," "My brother's voice changed when he turned 15," and "My mom cooks delicious food." etc.

After hearing these stories, participants were asked to sort them into two groups: one showing **biological traits** (sex) and the other showing **social roles** (gender). Through this exercise, they learned that sex refers to biological differences like pregnancy or voice change, while gender refers to roles and responsibilities assigned by society, like cooking or fetching water. This helped them clearly understand the difference between sex and gender.

As the session continued, the participants discussed how people are sometimes treated unfairly because of their gender roles or identity. They learned that this is called gender discrimination. They also learned the definition of Gender-Based Violence (GBV), which is:

"Any harmful act that is done against someone's will and is based on socially assigned differences between males and females (IASC)."

The training also focused on the role of **CCCM actors** in situations where there are no protection or GBV actors available. Participants were divided into four groups and given real-life scenarios to discuss. These included: women being detained by security forces while collecting firewood, families getting separated while returning home, returnees facing problems in accessing their property, and vulnerable people especially women, children, and the elderly and the persons with disabilities being at risk due to lack of services.

Through group work and presentations, guided by the trainers, participants understood what CCCM actors can do in such situations. They learned that their primary role is to:

- Ensure the survivor's **immediate safety**,
- **Refer** the case to protection or GBV actors,
- **Keep the information confidential**, and
- **Inform** the survivor about available services nearby.

Importantly, they also learned that CCCM actors should **not interfere** with the survivor's decision. Support must be given respectfully, and the survivor's **choice** must always be honoured.

5. Community Participation, Governance and Accountability Including IM, Reporting:

The agenda was earlier set to have separate sessions on 'Community Participation, Governance and Accountability' and 'Information Management and Reporting – with Communities' Role Focused'. Considering that the both sessions were more emphasized in community participation, their strengths required for effective leadership in the humanitarian response and their role in managing precise IM which is the key for setting the humanitarian response based on the needs and gaps articulated by the communities, the sessions were combined within one but were thoroughly incorporated the whole components of two sessions.

During the session, the trainers used stories and case studies of different community participation activities to illustrate real-life humanitarian response scenarios. These stories helped participants understand several key concepts:

- The importance of community participation in humanitarian efforts.
- The roles and responsibilities of community leaders in supporting their communities.

- Effective communication with communities, including how to manage the Community Feedback Mechanism (CFM).
- Identifying and prioritizing vulnerable groups during humanitarian responses.
- Exploring opportunities to strengthen community engagement and resilience.

Through the presentations, participants learned about the different stages of community participation. They understood how communities play a vital role in:

- Understanding humanitarian programmes,
- Making informed decisions so that everyone feels represented including different vulnerable groups in the communities and persons with disabilities,
- Executing activities effectively,
- Utilizing resources wisely, and
- Setting priorities to address critical needs and gaps.

Participants also reflected on their own roles in strengthening community-level decision-making and promoting their ownership.

In addition, the session emphasized the importance of managing accurate and timely information. Participants discussed how to report relevant data to CCCM teams and other stakeholders, with support from CCCM actors when needed.

An open discussion followed, focusing on potential challenges in humanitarian settings. Participants explored how communities and their leaders can help manage and report precise information, such as:

- Headcounts and demographic data,
- Incident tracking and reporting,
- Maintaining confidentiality,
- Information about the available services, and involved different stakeholders in humanitarian response, and
- Understanding the value of accurate data for planning and delivering effective humanitarian responses.

6. Localization in CCCM:

In May-Tsebri, the humanitarian situation is complex. The area faces multiple challenges: displaced people returning home, IDPs, host communities, absence of civilian government functioning, and limited access for UN agencies and international organizations. Because of this, local actors have become essential in leading and sustaining humanitarian efforts.

Understanding this, the CCCM trainers made localization a key topic for the session. They focused on how CCCM programs can be adapted and led by communities themselves, both those affected by displacement and those supporting them.

The trainers explained localization in a straightforward way. It is not just about hiring national staff or buying supplies locally. True localization means giving local responders the power to lead, deliver, and maintain humanitarian services. It is about building strong partnerships, supporting local leadership, and ensuring resources are mobilized in a coordinated way. This includes community groups, local organizations, and any recognized local structures or entities. They also addressed common misunderstandings. For example, having UN agencies with national staff or international NGOs registering as local entities does not automatically mean localization. What matters is whether local actors can provide accountable, efficient, and culturally appropriate responses that reflect the realities of their communities and have the capacity to respond to hard-to-reach areas.

By the end of the session, participants had a better understanding of how localization strengthens humanitarian work. It builds ownership, improves coordination, and ensures that responses are relevant and sustainable. The participants felt empowered and committed to taking ownership of the response in May-Tsebri, based on the needs and preferences of their communities.

7. Cost Recovery Plan in Humanitarian Response:

Over the past few years, many efforts have been made to support communities affected by displacement. However, there has been little real improvement in their living conditions. At the same time, humanitarian organizations are facing serious challenges, especially due to limited or no additional funding. This has made it harder to continue providing support in a way that helps communities become self-reliant.

One of the biggest concerns over the past years is that continued humanitarian aid has increased dependency in comparison to addressing the communities' real needs and paving the pathways to solutions. Many community members now expect ongoing support, which has weakened their own ability to cope with challenges and rebuild their lives independently.

To address this, the CCCM Cluster introduced a new idea to be included in training sessions. The idea was to bring together community members, humanitarian partners, and other relevant stakeholders in a shared space for open discussion on **'Cost Recovery Plan through the Community Engagement in Humanitarian Response'**. These conversations aimed to identify the real barriers that were stopping communities from becoming more resilient.

The CCCM cluster team emphasized this session with the participants to shift the focus from short-term aid to long-term solutions. This meant empowering communities to take more responsibility for their own recovery, with minimal but strategic support from humanitarian actors.

The trainer provided an overview of a few community-led initiatives that exemplify cost recovery and participatory approaches in camp management. First, participants were briefed on the [Donkey Ambulance for Women's Health Benefits](#) project implemented by the Camp Management Team in South Sudan, where communities played a central role in both implementation and sustainability. Next, the trainer highlighted the **market expansion initiative by community engagement in Iraq's Hammam al-Alil camps**, where communities initially received support to construct market stalls and later mobilized resources independently by collecting contributions from shopkeepers to expand the market further. Finally, the trainer shared an example from **Qoloji camps in Ethiopia's Somali region**, where **community participation** was instrumental in gathering stones for flood mitigation efforts.

The trainer then mentioned that there is a very high need to work in the same way through the communities with the minimum support from the service providers particularly in the context of lack of funding and increased displacement-affected communities' dependency on humanitarian aid.

Upon briefing on the different contextual scenarios and practices, the participants realized the importance of community participation more than ever.

Then to begin the session for open discussions, the training team grouped the participants into three categories:

1. **Community leaders** representing the affected communities.
2. **Humanitarian partners** working in the May-Tsebri area.
3. **Cluster (Including training team) and local authorities** responsible for coordination and decision-making.

Everyone sat in a circle to ensure clear communication and mutual understanding. The trainers explained the purpose of the open discussion in the agenda. Before starting, the group agreed on a few basic rules:

- **Communities would speak first**, sharing the main issues they face and suggesting possible solutions, as they know their situation best.
- **Only one person speaks at a time**, and others must listen carefully.
- **No repetition of issues** already mentioned, to save time and allow space for other concerns.
- **Focus on the most urgent problems**, since not all sectors or service providers were present. This way, the group could work together to find practical solutions and take action on at least a few key points.

Everyone agreed on the rules set and the most crucial topic chosen was WASH.

Communities' Voices:

During the consultation, community members shared their concerns regarding water supply. They clarified that water resources are available in May-Tsebri, but the main challenge is poor management and lack of sustainable supply. Many water points were damaged during the conflict and have not been repaired. Instead of restoring these facilities,

WASH partners are relying on water trucking, which mainly serves displacement sites. In host communities, very few water points with limited capacity are sustaining the services. However, during the scarcity of water, water is supplied by private donkey cart and tanker owners, and residents are forced to purchase it. In some areas, water is physically available but not accessible to internally displaced persons (IDPs) and returnees. This inaccessibility is reportedly due to rumors and occasional incidents of theft which has increased the tensions between the IDPs/returnees and the host communities.

Community members exclusively highlighted that water trucking is never insufficient to meet their needs and it is also not a solution. However, as there are no options, the communities are often forced to purchase water at a cost of 20 birr per jerrycan. While water trucking remains a temporary lifeline, communities emphasized the need for WASH partners to prioritize the rehabilitation of damaged water facilities and to establish a sustainable water supply system in May-Tsebri. If this issue is not addressed, it may further increase tensions between among the IDPs, returnees, and the host communities.

The participants from the communities also highlighted that the partners usually bring the contractor/vendor to work and they do not necessarily engage the communities and mobilize them in proper ways which actually compromises the quality and lacks community ownership.

Female community members raised serious protection concerns related to water access. They reported that the nearby water sources are not clean or sufficient, and sharing water among the communities is often an issue, so they mostly go to a stream where the water is cleaner. However, accessing this stream exposes them to risks such as looting (with some cases of looting women's mobiles), harassment, and other forms of GBV. These incidents mostly occur early in the morning or late in the evening, which are the only times available for women to fetch water due to their daytime responsibilities. They reported that perpetrators are aware of the times when women and girls usually go to fetch water. These individuals take advantage of those moments to find women and girls and subject them to exploitation and abuse. Women from female-headed households, single women, and girls face greater insecurity and feel unprotected compared to those with male family members in their families, because the presence of men in the household is perceived at the community level as a form of protection itself.

Female participants expressed that the current cost of 20 birr per jerrycan is too high and unaffordable. Consequently, there are many issues related to sanitation and lack of water are reported. They shared a willingness to contribute a small, fixed amount on a regular basis or offer free labour if it would help establish a sustainable and reliable water supply system. They emphasized that such a solution would relieve the daily stress of securing water and compromising their safety, security and protection they have been facing. Safe access to water would allow them to focus on other essential needs without compromising their safety or financial stability.

Upon the question/ask of the CCCM cluster and training team if the communities would be able to contribute anything that they could – to work for the sustainable supply of water in May-Tsebri. Also the training team asked follow up question what they would be able to contribute. These questions were asked to streamline the communities' energy into the action to solve the WASH issues.

Community participants expressed their readiness to support efforts aimed at ensuring a sustainable water supply in May-Tsebri. Specifically, they committed to:

- Collaborating with the command post to help maintain safety and security, particularly in preventing theft and damage to water pipelines within the town. They also offered to support awareness-raising efforts within the community.
- Contributing free labor for activities such as concealing pipelines and other related tasks necessary to maintain regular water supply. The community with the support from the CCCM could determine who is able to participate in these efforts.
- Community members acknowledged that they are unable to take responsibility for protecting the water pipeline and related infrastructure located outside the town. They emphasized that this issue is beyond their control and requested strong support from the command post and relevant coordinating bodies to ensure the safety and security of these critical areas.

- Community members (participants) stated that once a regular and sustainable water supply is established, they are willing to consult among themselves to agree on a small, regular contribution. This would help cover maintenance and recovery costs and support the continued operation of the water system.

These problems were then referred to the Humanitarian Service Providing Partners:

Participants from Humanitarian Service Providing Partners (Agencies):

Partners all acknowledged the issues faced by the communities. Although WASH was a representative sector the problems faced by the communities as well as by the partners are also immense. The partners' issues are mainly at the coordination level and in decision making level.

During the discussions, WASH partners and cluster focal points shared key updates and challenges regarding their operations in selected Kebeles. They have initiated efforts to rehabilitate water points, intending for these to be managed by the communities themselves. However, theft and looting of WASH items have emerged as major obstacles to sustainability.

Partners acknowledged that community engagement prior to implementation has been insufficient and emphasized the need for improvement. Although sectoral committees exist within each sector, they are not effectively linked with the community structures coordinated by CCCM agencies. This disconnect has hindered coordinated action and sustainable outcomes.

Partners expressed concern that current coordination meetings are **too broad and rushed**, often covering multiple issues without yielding clear action points or shared responsibilities. As a result, they recommended that CCCM take a more active role in:

- **Facilitating regular meetings** between community leaders, sectoral committees, and relevant partners.
- **Ensuring timely decision-making** and clear responsibilities that come from different site and area coordination meetings.
- **Keeping stakeholders informed** about progress, challenges, and decisions.

The WASH partners appreciated the CCCM cluster's training team for organizing forums that helped capture community perceptions. They noted that while sectoral coordination exists, community ownership remains weak, limiting the sustainability and resilience of interventions.

Partners expressed willingness to work closely with communities to implement activities that foster local ownership. However, they requested support from CCCM and the command post to strengthen coordination and ensure timely, informed decisions. With improved leadership and integration, sectoral partners believed they could deliver meaningful and lasting change in the lives of affected communities.

The CCCM cluster and the Command Post's Briefing:

The CCCM Cluster Coordinator reiterated the importance of **community engagement** and encouraged community-led project management for all activities.

As the key focal point from the command post was unavailable due to other priorities, the CCCM Cluster and training team committed to channeling concerns, challenges, and required decisions through OCHA. They will ensure that all stakeholders are regularly updated on progress, shared responsibilities, and sectoral coordination efforts with the communities.

As the partners and communities found the open discussion on WASH issues were very fruitful, the whole participants then agreed to develop the WASH response related action items as linked in the below **annex**.

Miscellaneous:

Though the discussion was focused on only WASH sector, there were few concerns and wishes raised by the communities as:

- **Uncoordinated Cash Distribution**
Several agencies have distributed cash without harmonizing the amounts, selection criteria, or target groups, with some families receiving up to ETB 27,000, while others have been excluded since the response began in May-Tsebri. This has led to community tensions and misuse of funds, as the cash was not always spent on intended needs.
- **Irregular and Uncoordinated Partner Support**
Many partners provide one-time support and then leave without returning or informing the community or CCCM agencies. This lack of communication and continuity has further contributed to frustration and confusion at the community level.
- **Lack of Transparency in Partners' Activities**
Communities have observed partners moving frequently in vehicles but have not received clear information about their activities or any direct support. This has created distrust and uncertainty among community members.
- **Community Preferences for Self-Reliance**
In response to inquiries from the CCCM Cluster and training team, communities expressed interest in vocational training and small business support. They emphasized that even without daily subsistence allowances (DSA), they are willing to participate in skill development activities. With proper support for employment or petty trade, communities believe they can reduce dependency on humanitarian aid.
- **Request for Livelihood and Durable Solutions Engagement**
Communities requested the CCCM Cluster to engage livelihood and durable solutions actors to support initiatives that promote self-reliance and long-term resilience.

The above mentioned communities' concerns and wishes have also been incorporated in the action planning (Annex below).

Main Feedback from the Participants:

The recent training session was widely appreciated by participants for its relevance, practicality, and alignment with key themes such as **localization**, **durable solutions**, and **community-led recovery**. Many described it as one of the most valuable sessions they have attended, citing the trainers' deep knowledge and engaging facilitation style. The interactive nature of the training, with minimal reliance on slides or presentations and a strong focus on real-world application, was particularly praised.

However, several concerns were raised that warrant attention:

- **Time Management:** The training schedule was not consistently respected, with skipped tea breaks and delayed lunch on the first day. Participants also noted late starts due to poor timekeeping.
- **Humanitarian Representation:** Despite the presence of many partners operating in the area, attendance from the humanitarian sector was notably low.
- **Logistics:** Refreshments and lunch arrangements were subpar on the first day, though they improved significantly in subsequent sessions.
- **Role Clarity:** Initial confusion regarding the roles of **OCHA** and the **CCCM Cluster/actors** was raised. However, this was effectively clarified during the training:
 - **OCHA** was explained as the coordination body responsible for facilitating humanitarian response, ensuring strategic planning, and mobilizing resources.
 - **CCCM Cluster/actors** were described as those directly involved in site management, community engagement, and service delivery within displacement settings. This distinction helped participants better understand their respective mandates and how they complement each other in the field.
- **Scalability:** Participants strongly recommended that the training be **scaled down to the Kebele level** to ensure broader stakeholder understanding and action.

Beyond the training-specific feedback, participants highlighted several **programmatic challenges**:

- **Community Perception:** There is a mixed view of the humanitarian response, with concerns about gaps in coordination and delivery.

- **Needs and Gaps:** Communities continue to face unmet needs, and there is a call for more inclusive and responsive programming.
- **Local Efforts:** Communities, partners, and stakeholders have made commendable efforts, but these need to be better supported and recognized.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** There was a clear demand for **stronger and more consistent engagement** from all stakeholders to address systemic issues and ensure sustainable impact.

Participants also expressed interest in a **follow-up session** to review progress on the actions identified during the training and to maintain momentum toward practical implementation.

Main Feedback from Facilitators and the CCCM Cluster Team:

This section should include main observation from the side of the facilitator(s) while delivering the training. This can include information related to the dynamics of the session, challenges faced covering certain topics, noticeable conflict or buy-in from participants, etc. It can also include some preliminary analysis of participants' understanding and perception. Add references to any adaptation to the training material or feedback on the use of the material itself.

Overall, the training went well. All the participants were engaged and willing to ask questions and share their challenges, including proposing possible ways to address the issues by referring to specific cases as well as best practices in the contextualized scenarios. Doing the training in a field location with the direct involvement of the communities, partners and the relevant stakeholders was a great advantage as it allowed participants to also see in practice how the CCCM cluster and operational agencies' response mechanism looks like and what the crucial mandates and roles they have in engaging every stakeholder throughout the CCCM's lifecycle. It was the first time that the CCCM had provided an opportunity to the participants to have first-hand experience of knowledge sharing of the CCCM on what they had limitation in learning before.

The training created a valuable space for community members to openly share their concerns about the quality of the ongoing humanitarian response. It allowed them to voice whether their actual needs were being met and how well the response aligned with those needs. At the same time, it gave humanitarian partners a chance to actively listen and understand the priorities that communities themselves were highlighting.

This open and honest dialogue helped both communities and partners recognize that meaningful progress requires shared responsibility. It became clear that working together is essential not just to meet immediate needs, but to explore long-term solutions that strengthen local capacity and reduce reliance on humanitarian aid.

Partners also saw the importance of placing communities at the center of the response. By strategically aligning resources with community priorities, they can make a lasting impact and support more sustainable development approaches. This shift: from delivering aid to empowering communities related conversation marked a critical step toward resilience and self-reliance through the training.

One of the main concerns raised during the training was that communities are only receiving short-term humanitarian aid, without any support aimed at building long-term resilience. Participants, particularly the community members (leaders), stressed that without collaboration between humanitarian actors and those working on durable solutions, it will be difficult to strengthen community capacity or find sustainable outcomes.

In some areas, conflict and displacement continue to happen repeatedly. In others, humanitarian partners face funding shortages and can only provide limited support for a short time. Despite these challenges, the strong commitment shown by communities to contribute to recovery efforts and work toward self-reliance was truly inspiring.

The three-day training was well-structured and productive. However, one major gap was observed: there were no platforms or forums where communities and sectoral partners could directly engage with each other as the participants reported. This limited the opportunity to identify challenges and understand the constraints both sides face in meeting urgent needs and building community resilience.

one of the key concerns and challenges observed was to gather female participants in the coordination forums and workshops. Despite the wide circulation of the invitation and prior consultation, only 4 female community members attended the workshop. Therefore, the training was less inclusive in articulating the communities' needs and response. It is recommended particularly to the CMA to work on inclusivity in participatory approaches of the programmes for the future.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

This part should be based on an analysis of the abovementioned aspects by the facilitator(s) to reach findings on the main conclusions and recommendations. These can include future capacity building efforts for specific participants, revisio of the training material or approaches, etc. Formulation on recommendations should be as specific as possible in order to enable actions from recipients of the reports (ie. Who, what, when, how).

Overall, the training successfully achieved its goals and contributed to long-term outcomes. Participants were actively engaged they showed interest in learning, openly shared challenges, and proposed practical actions. They also expressed a strong commitment to supporting both immediate needs and long-term solutions for their communities.

Overall recommendations and the action items have been attached in the link in annex below. However, there were some crucial recommendations received from the participants and facilitators as follows:

It was recommended that site-level coordination meetings, led by the Camp Management Agency (CMA), should bring together all key stakeholders in one forum, rather than holding separate meetings with community leaders at each site. This approach would help ensure broader participation and more inclusive discussions.

Additionally, it was suggested that CCCM actor should help connect sectoral committees established by the different sectors with the CCCM-established community committees and the relevant stakeholders. This would allow information from community-level discussions to be shared more widely, helping everyone understand the challenges, opportunities, and the shared responsibilities in sustaining the response and assistance efforts.

For future trainings of this kind, it is strongly recommended to continue including dedicated sessions that bring together communities and stakeholders from different sectors. These discussions would allow them to jointly explore issues, share perspectives, and find ways to collaborate more effectively.

Due to limited time, the open discussion during the training mainly focused on general strategies for community engagement. Unfortunately, there was not enough time to dive into specific challenges across the sectors or explore how communities and sectoral actors could work together to address them and strengthen resilience. Therefore, it was also recommended to consider such aspects in the future capacity building and follow up workshops.

Annexes:

Please provide a list of annexes to the report.

Below are some links to specific annexes:

1. Training Attendance:
2. [Agenda:](#)
3. [Action Planning Sheet developed by the participants and facilitators \(along with the responsibilities\)](#)
4. [Photos](#)