Results-Based Protection · InterAction

Dear Colleagues,

In this May Results-Based Protection Update:[i]

1. **Field Missions**
   a. **Mission Report:** InterAction / PIM Joint Mission to Myanmar (May/ June 2017)
2. **Webinars and Call for Examples**
   a. **Webinar:** Continuous Context Specific Analysis – Collaborating with Protection, Security, and Peacebuilding Specialists to Support Informed Humanitarian Action
   b. **Call for Examples:** Tools, Methods, and Approaches for Continuous Protection Analysis
3. **Related Resources and Reports with Elements of Results-Based Protection**
   a. **Article:** Building Real Collaboration into Your Organization
   b. **Podcast:** Adapting for Better Development Results: Concluding our Podcast Series on CLA at USAID
   c. **Training Pack:** Responsible Data Management Training Pack for Humanitarian Organizations Managing Programme Data
4. **Sign Up for Results-Based Protection Updates**

1. Field Missions:

Mission Report: InterAction / PIM Joint Mission to Myanmar (May/ June 2017)

Strengthening humanitarian action to address protection issues in Rakhine, Myanmar: Human trafficking, a case example

Building off of InterAction's previous mission to Myanmar, which focused on NGO roles in relation to the overall protection leadership, coordination, and strategies within the country, the second mission, conducted jointly with the Protection Information Management (PIM) initiative (co-facilitated by the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and UNHCR) examined the methods and approaches actors use to achieve protection outcomes, using human trafficking in Rakhine state as a case example.

The Myanmar context illustrates the importance of designing for contribution, whereby the capacities of multiple actors working across multiple disciplines are leveraged to achieve a protection outcome. While there are positive examples of efforts to address change in policy, practice, and behavior related to human trafficking, there is a lack of awareness among actors about the collective roles they could play to reduce these risks. Developing their collective roles will require:

1) robust **context-specific protection analysis**;
2) **breaking out of operational silos**;
3) overcoming issues of **trust** across actors/disciplines; and
4) utilizing **Protection Information Management (PIM)** for data collection, analysis, sharing, and usage to enable evidence-informed action for quality protection outcomes.

Recommendations from the mission, intending to catalyze collaborative ways of working to achieve protection outcomes, include:

- Better **disaggregated analysis** is needed on a continuous basis to understand the community specific patterns of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities—particularly related to the **dimension of threats** and the drivers of human trafficking. This continuous analysis, accompanied by regular reflection, can thereby facilitate adaptive programming and strategic decision-making.

- The **methodologies for data collection** should be iteratively evaluated to whether they are **appropriately suited to the context** and working toward the intended purpose. As data analysis should be founded on the perspective of the affected population, the humanitarian community can learn from **participatory approaches** to data collection from other actors, such as peacebuilders and local civil society.

- **Protection Information Management (PIM**) can be used as a method to support the achievement of collective protection outcomes by helping organizations strengthen data collection, identifying information needs and gaps, promoting the sharing of relevant data and information in a safe manner, and conducting comprehensive analyses oriented towards supporting protection outcomes. The use of the PIM Matrix is an important tool that can support this process.

- There is a need for humanitarian actors to develop a **causal logic** underpinning any response strategy (including for human trafficking), which will allow actors to be more explicit in addressing risks by **mapping out the steps and milestones needed** to address a given issue. Developing a causal logic may help organizations identify the potential roles and contribution of multiple stakeholders, which will allow for collective approaches to problem-solving.

- There is a need for all actors to **recognize existing operational silos and identify ways to work collectively** to solve problems.   This should be **supported by systems and protocols to promote joint analysis and collaboration** amongst stakeholders. Inter-agency strategies should recognize and include the contribution of, and roles for, local civil society organizations, peacebuilding and development actors, and relevant government authorities.

The full report is available, here.

2. Webinars and Call for Examples

Webinar: Continuous Context Specific Analysis – Collaborating with Protection, Security, and Peacebuilding Specialists to Support Informed   Humanitarian Action

Supporting exploration of a key element of results-based protection, Interaction hosted a webinar to unpack how a diversity of actors are conducting **continuous context-specific analysis** of risk as a basis for strategy development, program design, management of security risks, and program implementation. This webinar discussion engaged practitioners from the security, protection, and peacebuilding spheres to explore how they monitor the components of risk (threat, vulnerability, capacity) on a continuous basis to help contextualize interventions and adapt responses in real time. The webinar examined different tools and methods used by these actors, how they track and continuously analyze the changes in specific risk patterns and situational dynamics, and how this analysis informs operational decision-making and organizational strategies.

The following panelists were invited to speak to their organization's approach to analysis, touching on key themes of participatory methods and tools for conducting continuous context-specific analysis, use of analysis to inform strategy and adaptive management, and resources and capacities required to conduct continuous analysis.

- **Nic Lee**, Executive Director, International NGO Safety Organization (INSO)
  - introduced INSO's approach[ii] to real-time analysis of conflict dynamics
- **Hani Mansourian**, Coordinator, Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action
  - introduced the Situation and Response Monitoring Toolkit[iii]
- **Tyler Rundel**, Global Analyst, Action Against Hunger (ACF)
  - introduced ACF's Analysis Toolkit and the Interagency Regional Analyst Network (IARAN)[iv]
- **Joseph Bubman**, Acting Peace and Conflict Director, Mercy Corps
  - introduced the Context, Conflict, and Do No Harm Analysis tool and Seven Elements Preparation Tool for Negotiations with Armed Groups[v]
- **Adelicia Fairbanks**, Research Advisor, European Interagency Security Forum (EISF)
  - introduced EISF's security network sharing mechanisms[vi]

Some **key discussion points** raised relevant to results-based protection include:

Building analysis from the perspective of affected people: From design of methodology to data collection to interpreting data there is room for participation from affected communities. Through community-based primary data collection, the [Situation and Response Monitoring toolkit](#) engaged individuals in the community who serve a protective role as the ones who provide data or analysis, which is then validated in the analysis phase where local organizations and community members interpret what the data actually means. This approach can ensure that a response is grounded in the experience of people affected and continuous feedback promotes relationship building and iterative adaptation.

Disaggregating risk patterns: Disaggregating risk patterns based on sex, age, gender, ethnicity, political affiliation, religion, disability, economic status, and other demographic characteristics is important to understanding who is exposed to threat and what their vulnerabilities and capacities are. Moreover, this disaggregated analysis should be considered with respect to systems to better understand threats, vulnerabilities, and capacities. By analyzing the context, grievance, resilience capacities, key mobilizers, and trends and triggers to the conflict across political, economic, ecological, and social spheres -- considering the perspective of men, women, young males, young females, and people with special needs (elderly, children, disabled, sick, families at risk, etc.) – Mercy Corps' was able to analyze the conflict and explore the possible impact of an intervention to help people (disaggregated by sex and age) within those context and conflict dynamics.

Opportunities for Collaboration: From the onset, organizations should identify mechanisms for information sharing that already exist, to avoid introducing parallel structures, understand existing data and information, and identify which stakeholders have expertise and leverage points that can be employed to tackle reducing risk. Through consulting with other stakeholders from the design phase, the Situation and Response Monitoring project was able to generate buy-in early on, allowing stakeholders to feel a part of the process enabling a receptive environment to joint analysis. Reporting procedures should be designed in a way that avoids blaming and shaming actors, which may dissuade actors from participating. Both INSO and EISF stressed that while it is important to look for opportunities to share information with other actors and disciplines to collectively reduce risk, data privacy standards[vii] should be respected to ensure that information shared upholds the rights of respondents.

Reflection: Regular reflection within the organization (informed by communities) can not only help organizations understand the changing nature of the threat environment and the shifting vulnerabilities and capacities of those affected, but it can also mitigate inadvertent effects of the response which may

escalate the threat or introduce new problems. Mercy Corps' Context, Conflict, and Do No Harm Analysis tool enabled organizations to frequently revisit key questions to understand what effects (intended or unintended) their programming was having.

Resources Required for Continuous Analysis: Providing quality analysis (on a fixed or continuous basis) requires time, capacity, financial commitment, and organizational support. ACF offered insight from the IARAN operating model, designed to create an analytical capacity in humanitarian organizations to drive strategic foresight for the sector, to understand what is required to support quality analysis. Some key points include: the need for organizations to dedicate staff for analysis, building analysis into the design and resource mobilization phase of the project cycle, and having a receptive culture to iterating and using the data to serve strategic and operational needs.

For more information on the tools and approaches presented, the full webinar recording is available, **here**.

Call for Examples: Tools, Methods, and Approaches for Continuous Protection Analysis

InterAction is seeking examples of **tools, methods, and approaches to collect and analyze data and measure changes in protection risks and protection outcomes**. Of particular interest are *participatory methods and tools* which engage the affected population in the response design, data collection, and analysis of protection issues. This call for examples is part of an InterAction-led initiative to develop and promote results-based protection.

There is growing interest in using results-based approaches to achieve protection outcomes and a need to gather and document good practice in this regard. Monitoring violence, coercion and deliberate deprivation – and the threats, vulnerabilities and capacities that underlie these risk patterns -- throughout the program cycle is the basis for continuous context-specific protection analysis.

Continuous analysis, along with program monitoring, helps to determine whether the response measurably reduces risk and allows for continual adaptation of efforts to this end. In addition, ensuring protection information management (PIM) processes and systems are in place which support continuous analysis allows for evidence-informed decision-making and adaptive responses to contribute to protection outcomes. As described in the [*IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action*](IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action), "*Insofar as mandates, expertise and confidentiality protocols permit, humanitarian actors must endeavour to collect and share data and information that is relevant to the protection of affected persons. In doing so, humanitarian actors provide the necessary evidence-base for analysis, programming and advocacy […] in support of protection outcomes.*"

Useful methods and approaches to continuously analyze and measure change in people's lives may come from a range of actors and disciplines addressing the causes, effects, and dynamics of armed conflict and other situations of violence – including humanitarian, development, security, and peacebuilding specialists [***For more information on how some of these actors approach analysis, see the InterAction webinar recording on Continuous Context-Specific Analysis***]. These actors may also use approaches which engage affected people in identifying risks patterns and informing prioritization, as well as to develop a nuanced and appropriate response. For example, an organization may utilize tools for conducting community mapping exercises, adapting participatory appraisal tools [i]to identify specific threats and vulnerabilities to be addressed, and relevant capacities to do so.

Other examples of the types of materials sought include:

- M&E plans or M&E frameworks;
- Data collection tools (at process, output, and outcome/ impact levels; e.g. focus group discussion guides, interview guides, field checklists, listening, observation and mapping tools, survey questionnaires – especially for mobile phones or other electronic technologies, etc.);
- Guidebooks, handouts, tip sheets for field practitioners;
- Assessment, diagnostic and analytical tools;
- Outcome mapping or outcome harvesting tools;
- Reports, reviews, summaries of protection programming changes and lessons learned, informed by evidence generated from the relevant tools, methods, or approaches.

Examples will be analyzed to understand what tools are being used, by whom and how, and to identify trends, key elements, and gaps related to results-based approaches for protection outcomes. Upon review, InterAction will share findings from the exercise with an aim to support practitioners in continuous protection analysis to facilitate adaptive management and ultimately contribute to protection outcomes.

The deadline for the first round of submissions is August 11th. To submit examples, send materials and accompanying [template](#) to Katie Grant, Project Coordinator – Protection, at kgrant@interaction.org

Please feel free to circulate amongst your networks and with field-based colleagues!

3. Related Resources and Reports with Elements of Results-Based Protection:

Article: [Building Real Collaboration into Your Organization](#)
Stanford Social Innovation Review, Pratichi Shah, May 2017

This article responds to the growing appreciation of collaboration in terms of achieving organizational "success", and for results-based protection – achieving protection outcomes. While collaboration is frequently heralded as a critical precondition for success, collaboration often stagnates with organizations merely listing it as a value. This article examines the three pillars of collaboration: *culture, people, and leadership* to demonstrate how organizations can put collaboration into practice.

To establish collaboration as an operational culture rather than simply an organizational value, leaders should identify and model the kinds of collaborative practices that may further the organization's mission and encourage exploration in all departments as a regular way of approaching work. Consistent with [Outcome-Oriented Methods,](#) this article emphasized the importance of analyzing what kinds of relationships do and do not add value to the organization. Identifying where the organization can exchange or combine resources results will better inform who to talk to in order to achieve greater results.

- By talking about collaboration from the start (staff recruitment and onboarding), an organization is able to position itself for meaningful and sustained collaboration amongst staff. Because *[it takes more than one actor to solve a problem,](#)* collaboration should be integrated into all processes that affect all staff, **regardless of their role**. If we are looking to add curious, flexible, team players to our organizations, these qualities can be integrated into HR recruitment and hiring assessments. Furthermore, rewarding team members who help foster collaboration internally and externally can help build momentum.

- In order to be successful, **all levels of leadership should align around the value of collaboration.** Leaders set the tone for an organization, and mixed messages can be sent if leadership does not dedicate the time and resources necessary for staff to be able to effectively collaborate. A good leader is consistent in prioritizing collaboration amongst staff and with external partners, and empowers everyone – from intern to board member – to further the mission of collaboration.

Podcast: [Adapting for Better Development Results](#)
USAID Learning Lab, Amy Leo, June 2015

This podcast focuses on the adaptation component of CLA at the project and organizational levels.

The first segment of the episode follows a program focused on capacity building of local staff. Real-time monitoring and [continuous analysis](#) of the project achievements against targets/ objectives enabled timely decision-making and pivoting the approach from a traditional training model to one that matched local consultants with local companies. Critical to this adaptation was the trust between the donor and implementing partner which provided the implementing partner the flexibility to change course when the project results were not meeting expectations.

The second segment focused on how processes and [ensuring feedback loops](#) can facilitate adaptation. Though the design of the "Jordan Gender Programme" was centered on providing the space for social dialogue around gender issues within the community, with the notion that the community would then implement solutions emanating from the discussions, community feedback showed this approach was not successful. In response, the organization adapted in two ways:

- Firstly, the implementing partner adjusted their activities themselves to better engage the affected people themselves in identifying the threats, vulnerabilities, and capacities which exist within the community. By restructuring the approach that the organization used to solicit feedback and concerns from the affected people, the analysis revealed that women did not have access to safe transportation, making economic participation impossible. By disaggregating risk patterns, the project was able to create a campaign to address the needs of the population.
- Secondly, based on needs prioritization from community members, the organization integrated grantmaking into their program design and resource mobilization efforts. The integration of grantmaking by offering opportunities for small grants to fund community initiatives undertaken by CBOs enables a [design for contribution](#) approach, whereby a multitude of actors at different levels can leverage their relevant capacities and entry points to solve the identified protection concerns.

The final segment follows a resilience project in the Sahel that intentionally planned adaptive activities from the outset of the project. By bringing partners implementing complementary resilience projects together to look at existing resilience best practices accompanied by coordinated joint site visits, the project was able to create a space for peer to peer learning and find new ways to collaborate. Some key takeaways relevant to RBP include:

- A focus on adaptation from the outset, ensuring that flexibility and adaptability underpin every aspect of the response, demonstrates a focus on [outcome-oriented methods](#).

- [Designing for contribution](#) is emphasized by allowing for constant adaptation and thus demonstrating a conscious effort to cultivate complementarity between all relevant actors.

Finally, as a running thread across the examples cited, trust amongst partners, donors, and community members was key to the adaptation. Whether through funding requirements, or mapping stakeholder contributions and resources, or building relationships with affected communities themselves at the foundation – trust is a precondition to developing an agile response suitable for the context.

Training Pack: [Responsible Data Management](#)
Oxfam, Hastie, R. and O'Donnell, A. March 2017

With respect to developing [outcome-oriented methods](#) in service of reducing risk in crisis environments, new technologies are enabling faster data collection which can help organizations and the protection community better [understand the changing needs and behaviors of affected people](#); however, these new technologies also present additional challenges -- whereby affected populations may be exposed to security and privacy risks. This interactive training pack from Oxfam provides guidance for those handling, sharing, or accessing program data to ensure data is managed responsibly throughout the data lifecycle.

While much focus is being placed on international laws, policies, and standards of data protection and data security, policy alone is not enough. This training pack recognizes the need to practice responsible data management (RDM), and in many cases, change our organizational culture, individual attitudes, and behavior as to how we handle data.

RDM is about treating the data that we collect with respect, and upholding the rights and dignities of respondents providing the information. Managing data responsibly can enhance and bring about meaningful contribution to achieving collective outcomes.

4. Sign Up for Results-Based Protection Updates:

This update letter is 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 Protection platform (http://protection.interaction.org/all-resources/).

---

[i] The Results-Based Protection Program is funded by USAID/OFDA.
[ii] www.ngosafety.org/
[iii] https://alliancecpha.org/assessment-and-measurement-working-group/; http://elearning.easygenerator.com/35a4ae71-2747-4abb-a0b1-34e2679be9a7/#login
[iv] http://www.iris-france.org/iaran/; https://www.actionagainsthunger.org.uk/author/interagency-ran
[v] https://www.mercycorps.org/research/peace-and-conflict
[vi] https://www.eisf.eu/theme/other-coordination-mechanisms/; https://www.eisf.eu/theme/aid-in-danger-digests/; https://aidworkersecurity.org/about
[vii] The PIM principles take into consideration the 'Principles of Humanitarian Information Management and Exchange', endorsed by the Global Symposium +5 in Geneva (2007) and the 'Professional Standards for Protection Work, Managing Sensitive Protection Data', Chapter 6 (2013).

[i] For example, FAO's PRA [toolbox](#) or Save the Children's [Guidance](#)