From understanding to promoting change: making better security and justice programming happen

Date: 10 May, 9:00 - 18:30

Program Interactive Brainstorm: Making better security & justice programming happen


Introduction
The event aims to explore why the change that is needed for better security/justice programming is not happening despite the weight of evidence that is available and calling for it.

- Coffee, tea and croissants are available from 08:30hrs
- We will start the meeting at 09:00hrs and finish over the pleasure of some drinks between 17:45 and 18:30
- It would be great if you can dress informally, in line with how we plan to run the meeting

Useful documents

- The program (this document)
- The event’s concept note (please find this here or see attached with this document)
- A tentative participant lists (attached with this document)
- A logistics information sheet (attached with this document)
- An overview of suggested pre-reads (attached with this document)

Please turn to the next page for the program.

1 Lunch will be provided and the event will be closed with informal drinks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take 1</th>
<th>Take 2</th>
<th>Take 3</th>
<th>Take 4</th>
<th>Take 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why does the problem of poor security &amp; justice programming persist?</td>
<td>To what extent does donor accountability contribute to this persistence?</td>
<td>To what extent do skillsets for programs contribute to this persistence?</td>
<td>To what extent does bureaucratic inertia or resilience contribute to this persistence?</td>
<td>Sharing top-3 thoughts for improvement that are inspiring and feasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For discussion:
- What are the key elements of the problem?
- Are potential explanations missing?
- What are key accountability challenges?
- How can donor and local accountability be better connected?
- What are key skills deficits?
- What is a good skills/experience profile for a program manager, team or funder?
- What are key bureaucratic barriers?
- When do bureaucracies ‘overcome’ themselves?
- What new insights did you acquire today?
- Would you apply any of them to your programming involvement?
- How?

Pitches from:
Pilar Domingo (ODI), Wilma van Esch (NL MFA), Megan Price (Clingendael)
Sara Batmanglich (OECD), Nele Blommestein (Oxfam), Craig Valters (ODI)
Debra Ladner (The Asia Foundation), Nina Berg (Danish MFA), Nathalie den Breugom de Haas (NL MFA)
Gert Kampman (NL MFA), Rob Gouders (NL MoD), Hans Rouw (PAX), Björn Prevaas (Twijnstra Gudde)

Objective:
A shared understanding of what we are discussing
Identify characteristics and examples of realistic and adaptable forms of accountability
Develop ideas for how required skills can be promoted within particular institutions
Gather inspiration for how innovation in bureaucratic settings can be stimulated
A lively exchange of fresh thinking that the day inspired

Format:
Plenary pitches followed by mind maps and buzz groups
Plenary pitches followed by brainwriting and plenary discussion
Plenary pitches followed by small break out groups and plenary discussion
Plenary pitches followed by small break out groups
Stand up and grab a flipchart when you feel like it

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 09:30-10:30</td>
<td>c. 10:30-12:00</td>
<td>c. 13:00-14:30</td>
<td>c. 15:00-16:30</td>
<td>c. 17:00-17:45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>