Do you know what problem you are trying to solve?

Why?
Detailed understanding of the risk patterns people experience, as far as possible from their own perspective, is the basis for targeted efforts to measurably reduce risk and avoid interventions based on generalizations.

How?
- Start with the experience of the affected population to identify specific threats, who is vulnerable to these threats, and why. Avoid pre-defining “most vulnerable” criteria, groups, or individuals.
- Identify what capacities people can bring to bear to reduce the threat and/or their vulnerability to a threat. Engage the affected population as far as is safely possible. Identify what community-based solutions and coping mechanisms already exist.
- Disaggregate the risk patterns beyond sex and age to include gender, ethnicity, time, location, political affiliation, religion, disability, economic status, and other factors which have implications for exposure to threats.
- Identify the relevant protection laws and practices to help establish a benchmark for reducing risks. These include national law, international humanitarian law, human rights law, and refugee law as well social, cultural, and religious practices which may be protective.
- Examine the policies, practices, motivations, behaviors, attitudes, ideas, and beliefs that drive those responsible for the threats, and at what level, and their knowledge of and ability to comply with fundamental legal obligations and practices. A similar examination should explore these same drivers for a person’s vulnerability and capacity in relation to a particular threat.
- Contextualize analysis of the risk patterns identified based on the historical and cultural environment.
- Engage multiple actors (within and outside of the humanitarian community) to contribute to data collection and analysis from multiple disciplines and perspectives.
- Use existing knowledge and experience to establish assumptions and then continuously examine and revise assumptions as more information emerges.
- Analyze on a continuous basis to inform strategy development, program design, implementation, and M&E. Analysis should inform program, funding, and reporting cycles, but should be independent and not constrained by those cycles.
- Purposefully design information management systems to enable continuous analysis, including monitoring disaggregated risk factors and tracking critical milestones in the causal logic underpinning the intervention.
- Recognizing that a comprehensive analysis takes time, use initial or interim response activities to deepen analysis and inform appropriate pathways within program design. These could include, for example, capacity building exercises, dialogue with local actors, a one-off distribution, a community mobilization activity, etc.
- Adapt existing tools used for assessment or other information-gathering initiatives for continuous analysis. For example, an organization may adapt participatory appraisal tools, such as a community mapping exercise, to routinely reassess specific threats and vulnerabilities to be addressed, and relevant capacities to do so.

Build and promote a culture of analysis, which prioritizes continuous analysis, not just data collection.
Continuous context-specific protection analysis

In Sierra Leone, IRC’s field teams systematically reviewed the project’s progress toward goals, challenges encountered, and identified solutions and best practices in consultation with community stakeholders. These reflection sessions occurred on a weekly and monthly basis, initially established by the field-based project manager as a way to encourage staff to openly reflect upon successes, obstacles, and ways to mitigate problems. The iterative approach to project learning, alongside management’s efforts to empower and mentor staff, has created an environment where field staff and the affected population have great ownership over the project.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Oxfam worked closely with community-level protection committees in a context of ongoing armed conflict. The committees served as an entry point to identify and address protection issues. When populations were displaced and dispersed as a result of armed clashes and attacks on civilians in their villages, the committee structures were able to regroup and network with other members. This created conditions for affected populations to mobilize, update and inform the protection analysis, and adapt programming to address prioritized protection issues.

The South and Central Syria program’s “Humanitarian Access Team” (HAT) is composed of five analysts who leverage their networks, including through the program’s partners, to supply the program with conflict analysis and forecasting across the response region. HAT draws on informant networks within Syria, social media reports, the knowledge of Syrian staff on the team, and observations of implementing partners to inform response design and adaptation. Having staff dedicated to continuous analysis has supported a shift away from reactive programming toward a more anticipatory approach.

In Myanmar, IARAN’s regional analytical unit is comprised of dedicated analysts tasked with exploring transnational issues like human trafficking. Following the collection of findings, analysts engage country-teams with a scenario-based workshop to consider the issue’s strategic implications for programs and across the organization’s core sector areas. While human trafficking is not an issue this organization typically addresses, the significance of human trafficking in the regional findings caused the organization to reflect and consider its strategic contribution, alongside others, towards reducing this risk.

UNHCR and the Danish Refugee Council has developed a reference group on protection information management (PIM). This global initiative is an example of an effort to better use protection information management to inform continuous analysis and mobilize collective efforts towards the purposeful use of information to monitor disaggregated risk factors and track critical milestones.