

Results-Based Protection



June/July 2015

Dear Colleagues,

In this June Results-Based Protection Update:¹

1. RESULTS-BASED PROTECTION PROGRAM

- a. Summary and Analysis: Protection Strategy Webinar Series and Discussion Forum

2. Related Events

- a. STAIT WEBINAR: Where is the money? Is your operation well-funded? Donor reflections on efficiency and results
- b. STAIT WEBINAR: Prioritisation in humanitarian operations: How to prioritise when everything is a priority?

3. Sign Up for Results-Based Protection Updates

RESULTS-BASED PROTECTION PROGRAM

Protection Strategy Webinar Series and Discussion Forum

Throughout May and June, the InterAction Results-Based Protection Program carried out several interviews, hosted an online discussion forum, and held a series of webinars with guest speakers on the development of protection strategies across different contexts. A background paper on the interview findings and recordings of the introductory webinar and guest speaker series is now available:

[BACKGROUND PAPER](#) *This background paper describes the findings from several stakeholder interviews carried out with INGOs, In-Country NGO Coordination Bodies, and ProCap Officers. The geographical scope of the interviews covers the following countries: Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Central African Republic, Lebanon, Nigeria, South Sudan*



Introductory Webinar: What We Know So Far: Jessica Lenz – Senior Program Manager – Protection, leads on the Results-Based Protection Program, InterAction

[RECORDING NOW AVAILABLE](#)



Building From the Ground Up: Lea Krivchenia – Program Manager at Nonviolent Peaceforce, South Sudan

[RECORDING NOW AVAILABLE](#)



Protection Strategies through the lens of GBV: Kate Rougvié – Former Gender-based Violence & Protection Sector Advisor / GBV Sub-Cluster Co-Coordinator, Central African Republic

[RECORDING NOW AVAILABLE](#)



Content Matters: Exploring the Substance within a Protection Strategy: Caroline Masbouni – Protection coordinator/ GBV specialist, Danish Refugee Council, Lebanon
[RECORDING NOW AVAILABLE](#)



A Reflection on the Findings and Moving Beyond Obstacles: Louise Aubin – Global Protection Cluster Coordinator
[RECORDING NOW AVAILABLE](#)

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS REPORT

The consultation findings validated several key elements identified through the Results-Based Protection Program. Although the discussion was rich and provided an opportunity to reflect on the methods and quality of protection strategies, there is still a need to further unpack what it will take for protection strategies to help achieve results. Factors that may improve the strategic planning process include:

- 1. Agree what is meant by “protection” and “protection strategy” as a starting point to develop priorities and a collective vision for protective outcomes**
- 2. The quality of the methodological approach used to develop a protection strategy has significant bearing on whether or not protection outcomes can be measured and ultimately achieved.** The following components were identified as essential for strategic planning for protection:
 - *Invest in and undertake a context-specific protection analysis*
 - *A culture of inclusivity*
 - *Build from the ground up and identify community-based protection as the starting point for the response*
 - *Articulate how the desired protection outcome will be achieved*
 - *Methods and facilitation of the strategic planning process impact the quality, ownership, and uptake of the protection strategy*
 - *Regularly monitor the causal logic behind the protection strategy to identify shifts in the situation that may require adjustments in the response.*
- 3. Disaggregation of risk supports a problem-solving approach.** A protection strategy must begin by identifying and articulating the actual risks and describing the causal logic behind the necessary action

Although these consultations validated elements of results-based protection which have already been identified and could strengthen the quality of a protection strategy, it remains to be seen whether and how they may enable achievement of protection outcomes? The relationship of a protection strategy to program design and implementation needs to be further explored in order to assess the relevance of a protection strategy to measurably reduce risk. Some questions for further exploration include:

- 1. What should drive the prioritization of issues and the response? Does prioritization help with better results when it comes to measurable protection outcomes? ***
- 2. How should a protection strategy address the comparative advantage for humanitarian actors alongside other potential actors to address a protection issue?**
- 3. A protection strategy should reflect an agreed vision for addressing a protection issue. Given the need for multiple actors to contribute to the achievement of a protection outcome, what is**

needed to bring about a common vision? Does the absence of a common vision among actors impact the potential to achieve measurable results? How can a causal logic exercise within strategic planning processes capture the different assumptions and theories of change by multiple actors?

4. How are different actors, including donors, held accountable within the protection strategy?

*This question was addressed during two recent webinars hosted by the Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team (STAIT). Key points from those webinars that support a results-based approach to protection are included below.

Related Events:

Where is the money? Is your operation well-funded? Donor reflections on efficiency and results



Transformative Agenda Webinar Series
Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team

A full description of the webinar, background documents and recording are available [here](#).

While the session did not focus specifically on protection, the panelists underscored some important elements for results-based protection.

- **Better analysis and coherent articulation of needs, coverage, and gaps** across the whole system – donors will put money where a coherent gap and response is proposed. With the current system, donors expressed dissatisfaction at the presentation of coherent and collective analysis and strategic responses.
- **Strategic, needs-based prioritization** – In the current state of the world it is recognized that appeals are unlikely to be fully funded. With that in mind, donors struggle with appeals where everything is conveyed as equal priority. They recognize the challenges of prioritization but highlighted the efforts made at the field level in Iraq and the tough decisions that were made as a useful guide for donors to make decisions on where to spend their money.
- **Engaging with affected populations from the start.** Ensuring that affected populations are not only involved in feedback processes during implementation, but meaningfully engaged in the processes of analysis, strategic planning, and program design.
- **Flexible and adaptable programming** – particularly as it relates to better adapting programming based on feedback from affected populations
- Identifying the **contributions of different actors**, particularly from the development realm, where collective initiatives and common interests can address protection outcomes. For this to be successful, however, diverse actors must buy-in and share ownership of a collective analysis and strategy.
- **Commitment to the Centrality of Protection** including among senior leadership of donors and humanitarians

Prioritisation in humanitarian operations: How to prioritise when everything is a priority?

Transformative Agenda Webinar Series
Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team

A full description of the webinar is available [here](#). A recording of the webinar is available [here](#).

The panelists unpacked some of the different ways that prioritization has been done, shared good practices from the field and looked at what an ideal model of prioritization might look like. **While the session did not focus specifically on protection, several of the panelists addressed some important considerations which have a bearing on results-based protection:**

- **Distinguishing between boundary-setting and establishing priorities** within a strategic plan
 - Set boundaries – determine what is included in the collective response plan; define what needs to be done to achieve agreed objectives/outcomes
 - Set prioritization criteria – flexibility in how criteria is determined but should be context-specific, through an objective and transparent process, and reviewed and prioritized as required
- Reconfirming the **international standard** of support – *(for protection, relevant standards include norms that need to be fulfilled to reduce risk including national law, international humanitarian law, human rights law, and refugee law, as well as protective social, cultural, and religious norms)*
- **Sequencing** to determine what should be included in a first or second line versus a full response; recognizing that sequencing may not be a reflection of prioritization but rather the sequence of events necessary to address those priorities
- Innovative processes of **peer review** to challenge and push for prioritization, including the minimum standards, minimum activities, and sequencing
- When **donors** prioritize specific issues (e.g. women and girls, economic empowerment, or resilience) how does this impact needs-based prioritization of the humanitarian response?
- How can the **flexibility** of some donors, for example, DFID’s flexibility in funding from humanitarian and/or development accounts, create opportunities for a flexible approach to protection programming?
- Start with the **affected population** and involve them directly in the process to identify criteria for prioritization. Recognize the **contribution necessary by different actors**, including national and host governments. Engagement of the government to the extent possible helps to responsabilize actions of the government and promote ownership and sustainability.
- **Monitoring** should include regularly assessing the priorities set within the strategic plan to determine their **continued relevance and level of significance within the humanitarian response**.
- In contexts where there is limited data to support an evidence-informed approach, need to recognize gaps and ensure **an iterative process of prioritization** to incorporate new data into the analysis. Use the evidence that does exist (e.g. pre-crisis data) and triangulate data to identify flaws and inconsistencies.
- Willingness of all actors to **work together towards a common vision** in order to ensure that the process is credible and limits an “entitlement approach” whereby certain agencies may expect to receive priority
- Protection is deliberately highlighted as the first priority within a strategy to convey a clear message to all sectors and actors the significance and commitment towards the **Centrality of Protection**

Sign Up for Results-Based Protection Updates

This update letter will be published regularly to bring to your attention new materials available and upcoming events for the Results-Based Protection Program. To sign up, visit the Results-Based Protection platform (<http://protection.interaction.org>) and submit your name and email.

Each update letter will also be posted to the Resources section of the Results-Based Platform (<http://protection.interaction.org/all-resources/>).

Results-Based Protection InterAction

SIGN UP HERE

Get Updates

First Name

Last Name

Email Address

ⁱⁱ The Results-Based Protection Program is funded by ECHO and USAID/OFDA

