KEY ELEMENTS OF RESULTS-BASED PROTECTION

A key element is a necessary action to achieve measurable results.

It takes more than one actor to solve a problem

Why?
Achieving protection outcomes often requires multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral efforts targeting various components of risk at multiple levels. This demands an intentional approach to mobilize relevant actors to cultivate complementarity between their roles. The relationships, boundaries, and synergies between humanitarian actors and other relevant stakeholders, including those with formal and informal roles to address the risk factors, must be acknowledged and considered.

How?
• Begin by recognizing that understanding the problem requires a comprehensive analysis seen through the lens of multiple disciplines.
• Engage with organizations and individuals inside and outside of the humanitarian community to understand their values and perspectives, organizational culture and relevance of their mandates and capacities to address identified risk factors. Beyond the affected population, this includes national and sub-national state and non-state authorities, national and local civil society, host communities, human rights and development actors, donor governments and the broader diplomatic community, peacekeeping and political missions, and others.
• Collaborate strategically and intentionally by identifying those stakeholders who have the greatest impact on achieving a protection outcome and deciding what form of collaboration should take place. Collaboration between stakeholders often requires a level of trust between actors; therefore it is necessary to invest in relationships with partners throughout a sustained period of time.
• Analyze and differentiate between the levels of responsibility of various actors to collectively address a protection issue. Determine the specific leverage points to influence and take up action.
• Establish incentives for collaborative and coordinated efforts to comprehensively reduce risk.
• Use a causal logic to establish the pathways to reduce risk and articulate the roles and specific contributions required by different actors to address the various risk factors identified in the protection analysis. For example, some of those roles might be convener, capacity builder, negotiator, facilitator, service provider, etc.
• Establish the sequencing of actions by different contributing actors at each stage of the program cycle.
• Determine the level of engagement (individual, family, community, national, regional, international) needed by various actors in order to reduce risk, taking into account how the level of engagement is complemented or challenged by the actions of others.
• Monitor the assumptions articulated in the causal logic with a view to adjusting the roles and contributions of different actors over time to achieve the desired protection outcome.
• Elaborate how the contributions of different actors are tracked in relation to other contributing factors (by other actors, decisions, events) which are necessary to address the risk.

To find out more about the Results-Based Protection Program visit us at: https://protection.interaction.org/
One INGO is undergoing a process to **shift its organizational culture** to adopt a **learning practice** across sectors. In this case, the multi-sectoral organization is looking at how outcome mapping may help to unify different sectors on pathways towards change. This would link to tracking progress towards achieving protection outcomes. By linking progress across sectors towards achieving outcomes, the organization will be able to build up an evidence base for results.

In Myanmar, the Protection Cluster initiated a comprehensive protection analysis across two conflict-affected areas. The process began with a series of meetings to **engage multiple stakeholders** from other sectors to participate in structured dialogue about the risk affecting communities. **Engagement with local actors, including national NGO consortia,** was necessary to identify the perspective and patterns of risk from different vantage points. The Protection Cluster mapped out existing, historical information and identified where gaps within the analysis remained. This allowed actors to identify and bring to the table additional organizations and academia to feed into the overall picture and disaggregate the risk patterns.

An INGO hosts “awareness raising” workshops, which convene civil society actors and others with important influence and various entry points to address risks in the community. During the workshops, participants are afforded the space to **look for synergies and opportunities** and identify interventions that **leverage existing structures and capacities.** The host organization would then support the identified initiatives with resources (funding, technical expertise, connecting stakeholders, etc.).

In 2014, the **Global Ebola Fund** wanted to incorporate more community-based organizations (CBOs) in the Ebola response that could respond quickly and had a great deal of knowledge about the local context. To enable them to engage more of these CBOs, they developed a grant management process that was designed to take just eight days. The proposal requirements additionally recommended a stronger emphasis on monitoring than reporting (providing the **flexibility** for an iterative approach).

In light of an ever-changing security context and challenging operational environment in Niger, the **IRC** assembled a network of informants that became a **real-time reporting mechanism** to inform rapid programmatic responses as populations moved or new needs arose. Provided few agencies had as much on-the-ground presence and often lack updated information on population movements and needs, the organization was able to share information gleaned from the informal network with other stakeholders and clusters through daily situation reports during the peak of the crisis.