

## Session 4: Participatory Reflection & Gallery Walk

### Designing for Contribution: Moving from talk to action to results

- To list practical steps that can help individuals identify their entry point for influencing change
- To think critically about contribution by multiple actors, at multiple levels, using multiple actions through multidisciplinary means to achieve protection outcomes

*Facilitated by Jessica Lenz, InterAction*

---

#### **Identify problem – describe steps taken and how problem was mitigated/changed to support a positive outcome**

##### Past problem: Weak Coordination

###### *Successful response(s):*

- Lobbied co-leads
- Set up parallel system as interim
- Spoke with donors and asked them to apply pressure
- Facilitated a time-bound process to help a wide range of actors understand a particular threat
- Undertook a dedicated process to address the threat collectively
- Included coalition building, defining the threat, reporting responsibilities, utilizing power dynamics and lessons learned from other case examples

##### Past problem: Excess amount of committees create overlap and duplication of services

###### *Successful response(s):*

- Teamed up with other humanitarian actors and brought together all agencies across all levels to map and share what they are doing
- Increased the legitimacy and sustainability of committees as platforms to link communities to NGOs and service providers

##### Past problem: Poor relationship-building

###### *Successful response(s):*

- Established more one-on-one meetings to identify practical opportunities for cooperation
- Shared protection concerns observed from the field
- Actively engaged in joint guidance/tool development
- Regular participation in coordination meetings

##### Past problem: Working in silos

###### *Successful response(s):*

- Joint identification of food security and protection interlinkages with food association colleagues
- Gathered field-based evidence and performed joint missions
- Developing integrated programming guidance
- Promoted protection mainstreaming across sectors
- Used a systematic approach with WASH to enhance safety and dignity and to
- Encouraged greater buy-in by WASH Cluster to initiate safety and dignity improvements in the structures
- “IRC Safe Programming Working Group”
- “ECD Task Force CAR”
- “CTFMR Myanmar Workshop”

##### Past problem: Local and National partners unable to effectively engage

###### *Successful response(s):*

- Focused on institution-building of local/national university partners to contribute to the analysis need in-country
- Arranged for bilateral meetings
- Establishment of ‘hubs of learning’ with national universities
- Joint fundraising and methodological capacity-building

Past problem: Too much data, little analysis

*Successful response(s):*

- Redressing collection through the principle, 'collect for use'
- Selected and worked with existing data
- Emphasis on looking at trends and patterns rather than on numbers

Past problem: Lack of transparent processes

- (E.g. In strategy development and prioritization of projects)

*Successful response(s):*

- Established peer review group in cluster
- Discuss strategy and adjust based on feedback
- Develop and agree on prioritization
- Joint peer review of selection/prioritization of projects based on the criteria
- Increased resourcing/financing of protection projects

**Continuing challenge + one step to take to help address the problem (pink)**

**Problem + Recommendations for change (pink)**

Problem identified: Disconnect between the response and information/data collected to address the protection issue

- Child protection rapid assessments are undertaken regularly at the outset of emergencies, but regardless of their findings, responses are often pre-packaged, e.g. child-friendly spaces

*Possible next step(s):*

- Document more nuanced approaches that have grown out of assessments and then measure these and promote those that work

Problem identified: Local and national partners are unable to effectively engage

*Possible next step(s):*

- Simplify/clarify what protection is and share this with local partners
- Identify the capacities/strengths and weaknesses of local partners to decide which ways to best engage with them (and which types of activities)

Problem identified: Poor understanding of mandates

*Possible next step(s):*

- International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and Human Rights Law Trainings
- Explanation of role of Security Council i.e. General Assembly Resolutions
- Requirement of certification of professionals

Problem identified: Humanitarian responses do not always address primary protection concerns of affected population

*Possible next step(s):*

- Increase engagement of HCT and Donors with target populations
- Publish funding information

Problem identified: Causal logic for response, recovery, and transition for Ebola-affected communities influenced by institutional interests without clear link to context-specific patterns of risk

*Possible next step(s):*

- Recommend performing CP risk assessments
- Conduct Inter-agency analysis exercise

Problem identified: Lack of ownership in response strategies

*Possible next step(s):*

- Create a results-based mechanism for specific, shared visions
- Identify appropriate technical expertise to lead and guide strategy process

Problem identified: Different agendas & competing interests

*Possible next step(s):*

- Devote time to build and strengthen relationships
- Pull together significant actors to establish common ground

Problem identified: Working in isolated silos

*Possible next step(s):*

- Joint protection analysis with participation from more sector programs
- Proactively engage with the GBV + CP AoRs
- Identify actions each sector can take to contribute to reducing an identified risk

Problem identified: Too much data, little analysis

*Possible next step(s):*

- Meaningful, targeted defined purpose of data collection
- Enhance capacity to perform analysis
- Collect more qualitative data rather than quantitative
- Think in terms of the whole-process
- Invest in system to support easy collection, management and protection of information
- Support working groups (through the CORE group) to lead the analysis during coordination meetings as a collective exercise starting from the data that already exists
- Focus on right resource persons to foster more technical analysis

Problem identified: Gaining agreement within the humanitarian community that certain sets of protection data can be shared

*Possible next step(s):*

- Set the parameter for this while also understanding the timing and coordination needed to achieve this
- Identification on minimum sets of specific data that everyone needs (ex. Population data)

Problem identified: Weak coordination structure

*Possible next step(s):*

- Single 'hattedness' in coordination processes
- Actors should insist on analysis rather than incident responses/updates
- Pressure to recruit qualified staff
- Flexibility to adapt structure to context despite agency mandates
- Maintain separation of agency priorities from group activities
- Shift from top-down to bottom-up
- Group needs to be grounded in reality-oriented, practical action

Problem identified: Little time dedicated to problem-solving

*Possible next step(s):*

- Establish opportunity to review the process and requirements
- Prioritize the findings from the review

**Combined list of success factors + concrete recommendations to address unresolved challenge**

- Change **language** – relative; Consistent presence
- Getting people to take **ownership**
  - Looking at why not, addressing that
  - De-technical
  - Getting young – before attitudes established
  - Use opportunities
- Progressive approach; demystifying protection; using opportunities to build practice; making scope of collaboration clear; structuring decision making; giving people time to consider

- Find one good example of **evidence-informed programming** and document that; emphasis on **good quality data** that can be analyzed
- Competition; disobedience/non-compliance; using donors to apply pressure
- Addressed the needs and treated the women with respect; supported something initiated by them; offered knowledge; success!
- Listening to what **local and national actors** want, hear their story; **build rapport and trust** – bilateral relationship
- **Joint protection analysis** – broader analysis – contextual; select and prioritize risks; identify how to address the risks; contributions from other actors; defined purpose/targeted data collection; think through all steps ahead; capacity to do analysis
- Bringing together relevant people; **convener** not being they typical convener (in our cases neither were UN Agencies) helped with creating greater buy-in as it wasn't a standard meeting
- Creating a **joint forum/space** for discussion and openness of issues
- Working on the basis of **evidence** in the analysis
- Language/translation; flexibility; coalition building; new flexible funding mechanisms; coordination with government and national actors; practical logistical arrangements; bridging understanding across contexts and type of organization; accomplished over time (eg. 6 mos); with other organizations; trust building
- Tangible actions; concrete; demonstrated the value add/benefit; very realistic solution
- Analysis of collected data, leading to changes in response
- Analysis leading to (better) **prioritization** with clear criteria for prioritization; peer group, collaborative approach
- Transparency; sharing; clear objectives – what to expect and when to expect it; minimum commitments to quality standards for data and info-sharing and understanding of mandates
- **Policy coherence** in response and emphasize policy coherence in analysis; learn from successes in other contexts and org to influence internal policy & practice
- Culture eats strategy; it's easier to get forgiveness than it is to get permission
- Building **trust**; information sharing; education – capacity building
- Regular meetings where trust is built; contributing to joint activities
- **Leadership**/taking initiative; seeking opportunities across programs; holistic perspective of families' and communities' needs; **openness to look beyond sector**; outside facilitator; create safe space to share messages/lessons learned; workshop/learning environment
- Improve communication and proactive outreach; clarifying roles and agree on areas of field; clear process and procedure on maintenance and management of the system
- Building trust and regular meetings; promoting joint common activities; simplify analysis process and tools; finding allies in other sectors
- Taking the first step; showing leadership; building relationships with all participants – spending time with each; use time when face-to-face to address the important issues you can only do face-to-face; encourage people to **step outside of institutional hats by using processes to enable people to see the bigger picture**; bring in affected people, they are part of the solution; make it useful for busy people – they want to see there – make them see value

### Collective Problem + Collective Solutions

- Silos and ownership + Absence of analysis (numbers ≠ data)
  - Tangible actions (focus on trends not numbers; use their language; demystifying protection; bring sectors together to talk)
  - Involvement of communities
  - Demonstrated value + benefit
- Local and national partners are unable to engage
  - Building trust
  - Creating a space for open communication and dialogue
  - Improve practical arrangements (location meetings, language, reaching out to organization)
  - Promoting humility among international coordinators
  - Outreach and proactively engaging national actors
  - Create coalition between national actors for funding and common advocacy

- Working in silos
  - Building trust
  - Simplifying language
  - Be pragmatic
- Too much wrong data; too little analysis
  - BURN database
  - Collective analysis during meetings
- Ownership of responsive strategy
  - Simple language
  - Build capacities of future leaders
- Weak Coordination Structures/processes
  - Move from successful informal mechanisms to formal ones to keep best practices going
  - Influencing ToRs to reflect these
- Little to no ownership in response strategies
- Too much data, very little analysis
  - Prioritize key data
  - Use more rigorous data collection methods
  - Interagency protocol for data sharing and analysis
- Success factors
  - Support multi-stakeholder consults/joint efforts throughout
  - Getting donors to apply pressure
  - Reduce competition (for money, visibility, interests)
  - Leadership/followership
  - Understanding:
    - See things from their perspective
    - Overcome 'culture of complaint'
    - See opportunities, know to ask ID commonalities