



2nd Practitioners' Roundtable on
Results-Based Protection
Analysis Report

PROTECTION OUTCOMES

Moving from theory to practice -- what will it take?

November 16-17, 2015

Washington, DC

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



I. Executive Summary

On November 16-17, 2015 over 40 practitioners met in Washington, DC to discuss and examine how to better achieve protection outcomes in humanitarian action. The **2nd Practitioners' Roundtable on Results-Based Protection, *Protection Outcomes: Moving from theory to practice—what will it take?*** was an opportunity to share progress made over the past three years, elaborate on specific elements that support a results-based approach in practice, and engage in a dialogue to help the humanitarian community think ambitiously about overcoming barriers to results-based approaches to protection.¹

This report is not a summary of the discussion, nor a detailed account of the two-day event. Rather, it examines core issues raised, critiques practical examples shared throughout the Roundtable, and highlights points of strength, opportunity, contention, and barriers that need to be addressed.

Four cross-cutting issues emerged throughout the two-day dialogue:

1. There is a need to **reframe “success and failure.”** This issue was raised repeatedly and included questions about how we define and measure a protection outcome, using a phased approach to protection analysis, and how we shift from merely gathering evidence to establishing a culture of sharing, learning, reflection, and adaptation. Using outcome-oriented methods may help us find clarity in complex protection issues and the complex contexts in which we work and, therefore, articulate and achieve incremental results along the way.
2. **Understanding multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary contributions to achieve protection outcomes and the need for an overall shift towards integrated protection** underpin an outcome-oriented approach. There is a tendency for humanitarian actors to operate in silos, working in our own sectors and expected to claim our own outcomes to measure progress. Reduction of risk cannot usually be achieved through stand-alone programming— complex problems require multi-faceted responses that address multiple drivers and types of risk, including violence, persecution, and deliberate deprivation. It's about reducing risk, stopping violence, ending persecution, preventing deliberate deprivation—it's the humanitarian imperative. To end human suffering—whether through prevention or as a response to violence occurring—requires contributions by multiple actors, using multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral efforts, to target various components of risk at multiple levels.
3. **Results-based protection can drive enhanced professional skill sets to navigate complex issues by analyzing, anticipating, and managing dynamic relationships within humanitarian action.** Achieving protection outcomes requires contributions by multiple actors across multiple disciplines and working at multiple levels. It requires addressing the behavior, policies and practices of perpetrators of harm, including those duty-bearers. We cannot ignore or dismiss the inevitable and complex social and professional dynamics—both good and bad— associated with such multi-faceted collaboration addressing extraordinarily complex issues. Relationships across people and organizations are always going to experience various dimensions of trust, ego, leadership style, cooperation, respect, and other social traits. This inevitably means navigating a diverse and likely complex web of actors and dynamic relationships. A results-based approach to protection seeks to find clarity within a complex system, including understanding individual

¹ See Annex for Agenda and Objectives for the 2nd Practitioners' Roundtable on Results-Based Protection: *Protection Outcomes: Moving from theory to practice—what will it take?*

actors as well as relationships among actors. By using a results-based approach we can better manage, anticipate, and monitor changes between relationships that have a direct impact on specific milestones to achieve protection outcomes. This should inform and enhance our professional skill set to achieve meaningful protection outcomes.

4. **Outcome-oriented methods** should frame how we analyze, design, implement, monitor, and evaluate any response for protection. There is consensus on the need to move away from checklists and pre-defined, activity-driven responses. We need to return to a problem-solving approach that empowers field staff to uphold principles and standards in order to make decisions with confidence, informed by context-specific analysis, and tap into community-driven protection mechanisms. Despite agreement on the need for a new approach, we continue to speak abstractly and rely on jargon terms. What is an outcome-oriented method? There is a clear need to keep it simple and articulate exactly what we mean.

II. Background and Purpose

InterAction’s Protection Working Group launched a program in 2012 to develop and promote results-based approaches to protection. Following the end of the first year that concluded with a successful Practitioners’ Roundtable,² the Results-Based Protection Program agreed on a strategy for a phased approach to further develop and test key elements that support a results-based approach to protection programming.

What is Results-Based Protection (RBP)?³

Results-based protection involves certain methods and approaches to reduce risk and achieve protection outcomes. Changes in behavior, attitudes, policies, knowledge, and practice are intermediate results that lead to comprehensive risk reduction.

A **protection outcome** looks at short, medium, and long-term outcomes, with comprehensive outcomes defined and measured by a reduction in risk. Changes in behavior, attitudes, policies, and practice are intermediate results that lead to comprehensive risk reduction.

The problems we are trying to solve are the risks people face in crises, manifested as violence, coercion, and deliberate deprivation. The starting point for solving a problem is to break it down into more specific—and measurable—pieces. By disaggregating specific threats, who is vulnerable to a specific threat and why, and what capacities can be brought to bear on these, we determine the parts of the problem that can be measured. This gives us a baseline to track whether the specific risk factors—and therefore the risks—are increasing or decreasing. The causal logic for our intervention sets out the pathway for changes in policy, practice, behavior, and attitudes needed to reduce threats as well as reduce the vulnerability and enhance the capacity vis-a-vis these threats. The results we seek to achieve and measure are changes in these risk factors and progress along the pathway towards reduced risk.

Over the past two years, the Results-Based Protection Program identified three key elements shown to be essential for the overall approach to results and protection outcomes:

- (1) Continuous Context-Specific Protection Analysis;

² See [Summary Report of the first Practitioners’ Roundtable on Results-Based Protection, 2013](#)

³ See the Practitioners’ Roundtable on Results-Based Protection Discussion Framers found here:

<https://protection.interaction.org/discussion-framer-2nd-practitioners-roundtable-on-results-based-protection/>

- (2) Outcome-Oriented Methods;
- (3) Design for Contribution.⁴

These key elements help us make informed decisions about measures to mitigate threats, reduce vulnerabilities, and enhance capacities in a timely manner while making course corrections along the way. The approach promotes stronger collaboration and complementarity among relevant actors to achieve comprehensive protection outcomes.

The second Practitioners' Roundtable on Results-Based Protection was an opportunity to assess these key elements and move from theory into action by examining outcome-oriented methods and practices while thinking ambitiously about systemic changes necessary to put results-based protection into practice. The Roundtable began with three underpinning questions:

- *Are we set up to collectively engage and respond to the reduction of risk (System, Organizations, Funding, Capacity, Coordination)?*
- *How should we monitor and measure results and the inter-relation between results along the way?*
- *What happens if we collectively do not agree with the pathway and/or priorities to reduce risk? How does this affect decision-making and funding to achieve a protection outcome?*

III. Topics of Discussion⁵

To capitalize and focus on the practice of results-based protection and move us away from theory, sessions were organized around methods, practical solutions for addressing challenges and obstacles, and small group activities to share problems and identify opportunities. The Roundtable explored the following discussion themes as they related to the three key elements of results-based protection:

1. **Thinking Ambitiously and Inspiring Change** headlined a plenary dialogue that helped to set the tone for the two days. The discussion, led by Rob Ricigliano, Systems and Complexity coach at the Omidyar Group, challenged practitioners to think about a systems practice as a way to find clarity in the complex. We used the analogy of “clocks” to explore the predictable aspects of humanitarian action which are more easily solved, and “clouds” to describe the infinite and unpredictable environment of crises, which require more complex problem-solving. The discussion helped us to reflect on whether we were using “clock” tools to solve “cloud” problems, resulting in ineffective approaches and limited impact, and how to better address complex issues while working in complex environments.
2. **Outcome-Oriented Methods** showcased two methods that support measurable results and protection outcomes: outcome-mapping and development of a causal logic as a foundation for intervention. These two approaches provided a taste of practical options to use results-based program design and strategy. Participants had the opportunity to explore both methods and other approaches from their own experience in a practical exercise that led to discussions on

⁴ To review a more detailed understanding of the key elements visit <https://protection.interaction.org> and download the Key Element two-pagers to learn how to apply these throughout the program cycle.

⁵ A detailed agenda and list of participants can be found in the Annex

feasibility, resource requirements, and necessary processes (e.g. coordination, policies, funding pools, and donor requirements).

3. **Designing for Contribution** examined how a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary approach is necessary to achieve a protection outcome. The session encouraged participants to look internally at solutions to problems (e.g. coordination, leadership, community engagement, etc.) they have led or supported that resulted in effective progress and opportunities for influencing change. Numerous practical examples were given that showcased the number of solution-oriented minds in the room.
4. **From Analysis to Action** helped participants agree that, despite challenges, analysis is understood as fundamental and a necessary driver for results. The humanitarian community will continue to identify tools and methods to improve protection analysis in practice, but a greater emphasis on improving means of measuring risk factors, results, and outcomes is needed in order to maximize the quality and use of analysis. This session also examined current perspectives on the role humanitarian actors can and do play to address the threats which drive risks people face during crises. Discussion included reflection on agency mandates, information sharing, and capacity to address different kinds of threats.
5. **Protection Information Management** opened up a discussion on how to shift towards a more deliberate and purposeful approach to information collection, analysis, and use. Although not all were in agreement about prescriptive approaches to information sharing, standards and principles should guide this conversation to identify commonalities and areas of agreement to strengthen information sharing.
6. **Organizational Culture** provided an opportunity to learn from each other through practical examples of how organizations have shifted towards outcome-oriented approaches. *ALNAP* helped participants consider what it takes to adopt a learning practice. *Saferworld* shared how to embed outcome monitoring and harvesting in M&E and learning efforts in order to connect to organizational-wide learning strategies. *Search for Common Ground* demonstrated that practicing an internal exercise using “reflection journals” and other methods to stimulate continuous analysis can empower staff to make decisions for better program design and adaption along the way. *International Rescue Committee* provided practical insight into how the organization has restructured globally using outcome mapping to undertake internal changes to better protection programming.
7. **Game Changers** was an opportunity to think big and collectively about systemic change needed to support results-based protection. Unfortunately, participants struggled with this topic, particularly in terms of addressing systemic barriers to efficacy within the humanitarian system beyond the power of individual organizations to influence. Although the discussion led to some interesting self-reflection and system-wide critique, the ideas that were generated did not tackle systemic problems in a meaningful way.

IV. Key Discussions

After a thorough analysis of the discussions during the Roundtable, this section highlights the key themes and issues that resonated throughout the dialogue.

1. Reframing “success and failure”

The theme of “success and failure” echoed throughout the two-day workshop. What would happen if we scrapped “success and failure” from our vocabulary when thinking about solving protection problems? Would we better address protection in complex environments and achieve protection outcomes with and for affected people?

The discussion led by Rob Ricigliano introduced participants to a systems practice, which is “a way of thinking, feeling, organizing, and acting, both individually and corporately (e.g. organizations, networks, teams), that constructively engages with complex, dynamic environments in ways that support learning and adaptation aimed at the production of sustainable systems change.”⁶

The approach begins by simplifying how we perceive problems. There are generally two types of systems: Clocks or Clouds. Systems that are finite, controllable, and predictable are described as “clocks.” Problems in a “clock” system can be solved using tools that are well defined, linear, time-bound, and manageable. For example, the use of logframes, standardized indicators, and checklists can be tools used to solve clock problems.

The second type of systems are more like “clouds”. They are chaotic, ever-changing, uncontrollable, and infinite. Tools that help to solve problems in a “cloud” system require iterative methods and processes that allow for flexibility, reflection, and adaptability.

To address protection issues using a “systems practice,” Ricigliano challenged participants to shift from thinking about “failing” to “failing smarter.” Part of this requires better understanding complexity. Humanitarian actors tend to attempt to solve complex—or “cloud”—issues using tools and approaches that are designed to respond to clock problems. This results in a continuous uphill battle, repeating the same mistakes over and over again, and sometimes creating more harm during the process.

Better solving for complexity involves a different combination of methods and tools. These methods need to help us become more reflective and open to shifts. Cloud problems—such as protection—are manageable if we focus on 1) clarity through the use of mapping and holistic and comprehensive analysis, 2) seeking empowerment of multiple actors and individuals to leverage opportunities for collective impact, and 3) using adaptability as a means to learn and drive incremental change.

The slide is titled "A Systems Practice: Why?" in orange text on a dark teal background. It is divided into two main sections by the word "and" in white. The left section features a pocket watch image and text: "Some aspects of protection work like **CLOCKS**: finite, mechanical, controllable, and predictable". The right section features a blue sky with white clouds image and text: "Some aspects of protection work like **CLOUDS**: infinite, always changing, hard to control and predict". At the bottom left, it says "*see Karl Popper, 'Of Clocks and Clouds'" and at the bottom right, there is a small speaker icon and the number "4".

⁶ Dynamical Systems Innovation Lab (July 20-25, 2014) *Institutionalizing a Systems Practice: Briefing Paper*, Honolulu, Hawaii; pg. 1

This entails refocusing our efforts to see through the “clouds” to find the key dynamics at work —such as slow- and fast-moving variables—where we can leverage opportunities for collective impact. We should focus not on whether we succeeded or failed, but how well we adapted in the face of dynamic social systems to reduce and prevent risk. The key elements that support a results-based approach to protection mirror a systems practice.

A Systems Practice⁷	
Systems Practice	Results-Based Protection
<p><u>CLARITY: in a messy & dynamic environment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holistic analysis • Dynamic systems mapping 	<p><u>Key Element 1: Continuous Context-Specific Analysis:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding the context • Detailed disaggregation of risk patterns (threat, vulnerability, capacity) • Starts with the experience of the affected population
<p><u>EMPOWERMENT: for collective, high leverage impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage opportunities • Align fast and slow variables 	<p><u>Key Element 2: Design for Contribution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectoral collective action • Causal logic establishes the pathways to reduce risk and articulate roles and specific contributions required (identifies priorities, timeframes, sequencing of action) • Identify complementarity of actors and actions • Integrate diverse voices/perspectives
<p><u>ADAPTABILITY: through timely feedback & learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics for assessing effectiveness • Learning and adapt 	<p><u>Key Element 3: Outcome-Oriented Methods</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptation • Flexibility • Iterative • Learning

The formal architecture of the humanitarian community struggles with managing complexity, however, individually and collectively we are moving towards a more learning-informed culture. This is evident in new efforts by organizations to create learning units, adopt reflective practices, and refine their approach and methods on monitoring and evaluation.⁸ This shift reflects the first step towards reframing “success and failure.” Consistent with this shift towards a learning-informed culture, a results-based approach to protection applies a reflective practice throughout the program cycle. Continuous analysis in particular helps us to reflect and adapt when situations evolve and our assumptions need to be revised. Systematic use of results-based approaches to protection should be supported by organizations looking internally and making necessary changes to support policy, structures, processes, capacities, and resources that move beyond a binary approach to “success and failure” to a culture of learning and adaptation.

⁷ Adapted from Rob Ricigliano [PowerPoint](#) on A System’s Practice and Results-Based Protection, 2015

⁸ [See Session 7: Organizational Culture](#)

An important corollary to the learning process, however, is to not get too hung up on evidence itself, but rather, look at how evidence can be used and shared to make informed decisions in real time. One example that helps to influence the uptake of new evidence is professional networks (e.g. communities of practice, consortiums, and working groups) that can encourage discussion, test approaches, share results, and facilitate the internalization of new practices. Investing in professional networks helps to naturally shift “success and failure” towards a culture of learning where ideas are explored, used, and adapted to create a social environment where change is possible.

Regarding protection analysis, we should not over-emphasize comprehensive protection analysis per se, but rather get better at identifying what information can be used to act in a timely way, what type of interim response can be carried out while additional information is gathered, and how well we continuously learn from new information. Rather than evaluate our “success or failure” to do a protection analysis, we should use continuous analysis to maximize our ability to learn and adapt our methods, and ultimately get better at reducing risk. This is especially true in the context of armed conflict where risk patterns will continually change.

In support of protection analysis, investing in Protection Information Management (PIM) at the beginning is critical. PIM that is purposefully designed to support analysis and track the causal pathway to achieve a protection outcome helps us monitor changes in patterns towards actual risk reduction and adapt accordingly. Too often protection monitoring becomes an end in itself rather than recognized for the value it can have if purposefully designed on the front end to monitor patterns of risk.

Finally, reflective and iterative approaches are further supported by methods such as outcome mapping or establishing and tracking the causal logic of an intervention. These methods do not define success but rather help to clarify a complex series of actions by multiple actors geared towards solving a particular problem. They help us to question our assumptions, identify points of influence, highlight opportunities and challenges, and adapt our approach to account for incremental change and measurable milestones that lead towards a reduction in risk.

While discussions at the Roundtable examined different dimensions of “success and failure” they concluded with a need to undertake shifts in methods, institutional culture, and system-wide mindset to achieve protection outcomes. These shifts must be mirrored in what and how we measure progress towards protection outcomes. Investment in protection information management systems, professional networks, and outcome-oriented methods can help to adopt new practice. There is also a need to engage in a dialogue with donors on what reframing “success and failure” might look like in the face of donor requirements. Lastly, efforts should be explored how dropping the terminology of “success and failure” affects how we relate to and engage with affected populations.

2. Understanding multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary contributions to achieve protection outcomes and an overall shift towards integrated protection

The view that a diverse set of actors – including multiple sectors within the humanitarian system as well as those outside the humanitarian system (e.g. donors, development actors, peacebuilding and conflict resolution professionals, academics, peacekeepers, governments, civil society, etc.) – is often required to achieve a protection outcome was recognized and reiterated during every session of the two-day Roundtable. In practice, this demands a conscious approach to mobilize the relevant actors to address a given problem and cultivate complementarity between their roles. The complex and dynamic

relationships between humanitarian actors and other relevant stakeholders, including those with formal and informal roles to address the risk factors, must be acknowledged and considered.

A comprehensive contextual analysis and causal logic can help to identify the actors necessary to achieve measurable results and protection outcomes. For example, how can diplomatic actors, including donor governments, influence policy change or behaviors of parties to conflict? The contribution of other actors must go beyond recognition of their role to influence or support change in policy, practice, or behavior, but also encourage these relevant stakeholders to act and mobilize this influence.

The Roundtable provided a safe space for participants to reflect on their own roles in “the system,” challenging themselves to move away from a desire to overhaul the system to an acknowledgement that “we are the system.” In order to bring about change *to* the system we must transform ourselves first — unpacking power imbalances, confronting our reluctance or inability to engage with different or non-traditional actors, and identifying opportunities to build collaboration towards a common goal.

A good example of this was raised while examining how humanitarians address threats driving the risks people experience in crises. While some actors may not be positioned or have the capacity to respond to the threat directly, undertaking a comprehensive analysis and establishing the causal logic of an intervention can help to identify a diversity of possible actions to address threats and mobilize the actors that *are* positioned to address threats as part of a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral approach.

This triggers rethinking protection programming. Even a program addressing sexual violence requires engaging the support from other sectors like health, livelihoods, and shelter if it is to comprehensively reduce SGBV threats and the vulnerabilities and capacities *vis a vis* the threat. While no two contexts are exactly the same, meaningful risk reduction is likely to require the contribution of multiple actors from multiple sectors to solve a problem.

Several examples alluded to the idea that achieving a protection outcome supports the outcomes of other sectors. While this has yet to be studied, integrated protection programming has the potential to help reshape the discussion, for example, as the Centrality of Protection and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) protection strategies are operationalized.

There is still a need to further explore practical examples of integrated protection or multi-sectoral programming for protection, and what factors support this approach, but interest is high. As one participant pointed out, we’ve become too tied to who owns what outcome. For an individual caught in the chaos and turmoil of conflict, what matters most is that risk is comprehensively reduced in prevention and response. If integrated protection helps us do this, it is an area that needs greater attention and resources.

3. Results-based protection can drive enhanced professional skill sets to navigate complex issues by analyzing, anticipating, and managing dynamic relationships within humanitarian action

Within every discussion of the Roundtable, human and social dimensions emerged as fundamental to the success and challenge of achieving a protection outcome. The professional skills of senior leaders, program managers, and coordinators set the tone for whether and how a response led to actual results. Across all contexts and issues, significant discussions arose around underlying themes of trust or skepticism, interpersonal relationship skills, staff empowerment or discouragement, effective or unproductive synchronization of actions and actors, strong or weak communication styles, and knowledge and competency of context-specific problem-solving techniques.

A lack of professional skills was repeatedly alluded to throughout the discussions. A results-based approach to protection provides two opportunities for addressing this challenge.

The first is using outcome-oriented methods to help navigate complex relationships and social dynamics as they arise. Through analysis and a causal logic, the complex and dynamic relationships—including the challenges and capacity levels of different actors—should surface. This should inform program design, especially to take advantage of potential complementarities between actors and address barriers to effective collaboration.

The second opportunity is that results-based protection can enhance and inform professional skill sets to achieve protection outcomes. Ensuring that program managers and their staff are applying outcome-oriented methods serves to strengthen their capacity to better analyze complex environments and relationships, anticipate potential challenges, recognize the need for shifts, and make better decisions towards achieving protection outcomes.

When programs do not achieve results we have a tendency to blame poor coordination, lack of trust and transparency, or weak leadership. The experience from Roundtable participants illustrated that we do have the professional skills among us to manage complex relationships, but we also fall back on these same excuses for why something does not work or lead to a protection outcome. If a results-based approach can help anticipate and plan for these challenges, how might this shift our overall response efforts, resources, and causal pathways towards achieving protection outcomes? What type of professional skill set would we look for when hiring humanitarian staff? How would we measure our effectiveness to address these issues as they relate to solving the bigger problem (risk) that our humanitarian program is designed to do?

Roundtable participants were asked to identify solutions they used to navigate the complex system of relationships within humanitarian action. The examples demonstrate different approaches to solve problems.

Weak Coordination

Successful response(s):

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

National partners unable to effectively engage

Successful response(s):

- Focused on institution-building of local/national university partners to contribute to the analysis needs in-country
- Establishment of 'hubs of learning' with national universities
- Joint fundraising and methodological capacity-building

Lack of transparent processes

Successful response(s):

- Established peer review group in cluster
- Joint peer review of selection/prioritization of projects based on criteria
- Increased resourcing/financing of protection projects

Using a results-based approach to protection can help bring people to a collective vision for protection outcomes and how they will be achieved. Results-based protection can also serve as a basis to build the professional skill set, including relevant methods and tools, to effectively build relationships and facilitate collaborative efforts.

4. Using outcome-oriented methods

There is a need to move away from pre-determined models and activities for addressing a protection problem. While certain activities such as case management, clinical management of rape, and registration and reunification of separated and unaccompanied children may entail specific activities, the structure, method, and design should be informed by the context and not by a formulaic response model or a checklist. Results-based protection should prompt humanitarian actors to question their models and pre-conceived ideas. While some standard activities may be useful as an interim response, a results-based approach to protection should help to transform these interim activities into measurable milestones towards the achievement of protection outcomes.

Outcome-oriented methods explored at the Roundtable included: 1) a discussion on outcome-mapping/harvesting, 2) the adoption of reflective practices throughout organizational management systems, and 3) undertaking causal logic exercises that help to disaggregate patterns of risk and identify pathways necessary to achieve protection outcomes.

Despite taking a practical look at some methods, it was clear that using outcome-oriented methods was still too complex and needed further clarification. Examples highlighted throughout the two days illustrated the tendency to fall back on organizational “best practice” models rather than solving specific problems by addressing specific risk factors. Child Friendly Spaces was an example given as an overused activity that often (even if used as an interim response) did not have a causal logic linking the intervention to the risk that needed to be reduced. The same was true with protection monitoring activities and women’s centers. Participants felt a need to better establish the value of outcome-oriented methods, demonstrate their use through examples, and promote the uptake of an outcome-oriented approach using clear and simple messaging.

There was consensus that a response should arise out of methods that inform the appropriate action to reduce risk, and not based on pre-defined activities or pre-determined vulnerabilities. With that said, there is a need to simplify and clearly articulate what is meant by outcome-oriented methods. Some methods are used across different contexts and by different actors, however, their use is scattered, often times inconsistently used even within one organization. There is no systematic use of outcome-oriented methods in practice. Exploring simpler ways to communicate results-based protection to humanitarian actors may help to inform and promote the use of more problem-solving methods.

V. Issues to Further Explore and Outstanding Questions

While the Roundtable created a rich discussion on the practice of results-based protection and illuminated specific challenges and issues facing the protection community, it was unable to fully explore every relevant topic. Several outstanding questions and issue areas need further exploration:

- **Measurement**

It was clear that measurement of protection outcomes was a significant area of concern for participants. Practitioners still grapple with the challenge of indicators, tools and methods for monitoring and evaluating results, and how the findings link to protection outcomes.

- **Early warning/preparedness and post-conflict environments**

Early warning and preparedness efforts have yet to be explored in relation to protection outcomes. The key elements of results-based protection may still be relevant, but it is worth exploring and demonstrating how the elements can be applied in both pre- and post-conflict environments.

- **Protection Information Management (PIM)**

While a full session was dedicated to protection information management, the discussion did not go far enough to fully demonstrate what is relevant about PIM in relation to a results-based approach to achieve protection outcomes. Further elaboration is needed to better understand how existing information management systems can support continuous protection analysis and monitoring to better inform protection strategies and implementation to achieve protection outcomes.

- **Demonstrating how achieving a protection outcome can support the achievement of other sector outcomes**

As discussed above in understanding integrated protection, further research is needed to explore whether or not achieving a protection outcome also enhances other sectoral outcomes. Can demonstrating this linkage support dialogue across sectors of humanitarian action particularly as it relates to the Centrality of Protection and HCT Protection Strategies? There is a need to collect examples of what this does or could look like.

VI. Next Steps and Opportunities

InterAction is moving into its third phase of the Results-Based Protection Program, which involves promoting and documenting the key elements in practice. This phase will help to build and promote the capacity of agencies to use the key elements of results-based protection, including by:

1. Convening and facilitating a learning network to act as a platform for peer exchange and to contribute to a body of practice on results-based protection.
2. Documenting and publishing field-based results-based protection case studies; and
3. Developing and disseminating results-based protection materials, including messages and information products designed for different audiences.

In addition, steps are now underway to develop a few recommendations and ideas that were generated as a result of the Roundtable. These include:

- The development of a “Tip Sheet” that would illustrate what a results-based approach to protection looks like within program design and proposal development. The “Tip Sheet” could guide practitioners through useful guidelines and considerations that should be included in a proposal; it would also assist donors in identifying key aspects of programming that are fundamental for achieving a protection outcome. A collaborative process will be initiated to engage individuals interested in helping to develop this guidance tool. For more information, contact Jessica Lenz at jlenz@interaction.org.

- The development of a package of outcome-oriented methods with links to tools and resources, including practical examples. The package will use simple language and clearly articulate problem-solving methods that are helpful in using a results-based approach to protection throughout the program cycle.
- InterAction will continue to send out RBP Updates and populate its website with relevant and emerging information, research, and methods. Several webinars will be organized throughout the year to further explore and elaborate on results-based approaches to protection.
- An informal Learning Group for Practitioners on Results-Based Protection is also currently being created. The NGO member group will hold conference calls periodically to explore RBP in practice. Colleagues implementing programs in the field are encouraged to participate. For further information, please contact Jessica Lenz at jlenz@interaction.org.
- InterAction will continue to work on simplifying the language used to explain and describe results-based methods. A simple and clear articulation of what is results-based protection will be a priority focus for the RBP website.

ANNEX

1. Agenda
2. Participant List
3. Links to PowerPoints and Presentation Material
 - a. [Roundtable Discussion Framers](#)
 - b. [Key Element Two-Pagers](#)
 - c. [Session 1: Prezi](#)
 - d. [Session 2: Rob Ricigliano—Systems and Complexity coach at the Omidyar Group, PowerPoint Presentation](#)
 - e. Session 3: Outcome Oriented Methods
 - i. [PowerPoint Oxfam on Outcome Mapping](#)
 - ii. [PowerPoint Results-Based Protection Program-Causal Logic](#)
 - iii. [Benefits and Challenges of Outcome-Oriented Methods](#)
 - f. [Session 4: Examples on Contribution](#)
 - g. [Session 5: PowerPoint on Protection Analysis](#)
 - h. [Session 6: PowerPoint on Information Management](#)
 - i. Session 7: Organizational Culture Handouts:
 - i. [Saferworld](#)
 - ii. [Search for Common Ground](#)
 - iii. [ALNAP](#)
 - iv. [IRC](#)
4. Questions and Answers from Participants

PROTECTION OUTCOMES

Moving from theory to practice -- what will it take?

Day 1

8:30-9:00	Registration & Breakfast
9:00-9:30	Welcome & Introductions
9:30-10:30	Session 1: <i>Where We Left Off and How Far We've Come</i>
10:30-11:00	Break
11:00-12:30	Session 2: <i>Thinking Ambitiously & Inspiring Change</i>
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-3:30	Session 3: <i>Outcome-Oriented Methods</i>
3:30-4:00	Break
4:00-5:15	Session 4: <i>Designing for Contribution</i>
5:15-5:30	Closing & Reminders
5:30-8:00	Cocktails at Dupont Circle Hotel

Day 2

9:00-9:15	Welcome Back
9:15-10:15	Session 5: <i>From Analysis to Action</i>
10:15-11:15	Session 6: <i>Protection Information Management</i>
11:15-11:30	Break
11:30-12:45	Session 7: <i>Organizational Culture</i>
12:45-1:45	Lunch
1:45-2:45	Session 8: <i>The Game Changers</i>
2:45-3:15	Break
3:15-4:15	Session 8: <i>The Game Changers (Continued)</i>
4:15-5:00	Closing and Evaluation

Objectives

- Share, through examples, findings on results-based protection and elaborate on specific key elements that support a results-based approach in practice
- Think ambitiously about how institutional culture and the system needs to change, and challenge ourselves to clearly articulate means to overcome barriers to results-based approaches
- Elaborate the next steps to operationalize results-based protection in 2016-2017, including (i) dissemination and promotion; (ii) field testing and/or documentation of results-based methods in practice
- Build up evidence on specific key elements and commit to using a results-based approach to protection by documenting the learning that emerges from these experiences.

Location: 1400 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Contact: Eileen McCarthy
emccarthy@interaction.org
Tel. +1 610-389-2257

DAY 1	
Time	Session
8:30-9:00am	REGISTRATION & BREAKFAST
9:00-9:30am	<p>Welcome & Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and discuss objectives and agenda Logistics Who's Who? <p><i>Jenny McAvoy, Director of Protection, InterAction</i></p> <p><i>Jessica Lenz, Senior Program Manager-Protection, InterAction</i></p> <p><i>Eileen McCarthy, Project Coordinator, Results-Based Protection, InterAction</i></p>
9:30-10:30am	<p>Session 1: Plenary</p> <p>Where we left off and how far we've come: Applying the key elements to achieve protection outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide an overview of the progress to date on results-based protection <p><i>Jessica Lenz, InterAction</i></p>
10:30-11:00am	BREAK
11:00-12:30pm	<p>Session2: Keynote Presentation</p> <p>Thinking Ambitiously & Inspiring Change</p> <p><i>Rob Ricigliano, Systems and Complexity coach at The Omidyar Group</i></p> <p><i>Facilitated by Jenny McAvoy, InterAction</i></p>
12:30-1:30pm	LUNCH
1:30-3:30pm	<p>Session 3: Case Example Presentations & Group Exercise</p> <p>Outcome-Oriented Methods: Methods that support measurable results and protection outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To share examples of two outcome-oriented methods that may support the development of protection strategies and program design To explore, through context-specific scenarios, steps that could support results-based methods <p><u>Outcome Mapping within the DRC—Shaping Program Design</u> <i>Richard Nunn, Regional Protection Advisor in Horn, East and Central Africa, Oxfam</i></p> <p><u>Lebanon: A field example of the benefits and challenges of using a causal logic exercise to support protection strategies and program design</u> <i>Jessica Lenz, Senior Program Manager-Protection, InterAction</i></p>

	<p>Facilitated by <i>Katrien Ringele, Technical Advisor, Protection and Rule of Law, International Rescue Committee</i></p> <p><u>Q/A followed by a Group Exercise</u></p>
3:30-4:00pm	BREAK
4:00-5:15pm	<p>Session 4: Participatory Reflection & Gallery Walk</p> <p>Designing for Contribution: Moving from talk to action to results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p><i>Facilitated by Jessica Lenz, InterAction</i></p>
5:15-5:30pm	CLOSING & REMINDERS
5:30-8:00pm	<p>Cocktails</p> <p>Dupont Circle Hotel 1500 New Hampshire Ave NW, Washington, DC 20036 – 9th Floor</p>

DAY 2	
Time	Session
8:30-9:00am	BREAKFAST
9:00-9:15am	Welcome back
9:15-10:15am	<p>Session 5: Presentation From Analysis to Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To examine how current tools and guidance for protection analysis support or limit a results-based approach to protection As highlighted in the Whole of System Review, to examine current perspectives on how humanitarians can and do play a significant role in addressing the threat <p><u>A Review of protection analysis tools through the lens of results-based protection</u> <i>Jessica Lenz, InterAction</i></p> <p><u>How do – and should – we address threats?</u> <i>Jenny McAvoy, InterAction</i></p>
10:15-11:15am	<p>Session 6: Case Examples Protection Information Management: Shifting towards a deliberate and purposeful approach to information collection, analysis, and use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To discuss how to better support more purposeful protection information management that can help facilitate results-based approaches and protection outcomes <p><i>Kathrine Starup, Global Protection & Policy Advisor, Danish Refugee Council (DRC)</i></p>
11:15-11:30	BREAK
11:30-12:45pm	<p>Session 7: A Market Place & Panel Discussion Organizational Culture Flexibility + Reflection + Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To demonstrate through practical examples organizational efforts to shift towards a more outcome-oriented approach <p><u>Adopting a Learning Practice:</u> ALNAP will discuss change in humanitarian organizations more generally, and specifically how organizations can orient themselves to use evaluation results more often and more effectively. <i>Paul Knox-Clarke, Head of Research and Communications, ALNAP</i></p> <p><u>Rethinking M&E:</u> Saferworld will share how they have embedded outcome monitoring and harvesting in their monitoring, evaluation and learning efforts, and connected it into other learning strategies. <i>Madeline Church, Head of Organisational Development Unit, Saferworld</i></p> <p><u>Practicing Reflection:</u> Search For Common Ground will share how they adopted a practice of reflection and how this has been used to empower</p>

	<p>staff to make decisions, support better program design, and adaptation along the way. <i>Elisa Dari, Country Director, Lebanon, Search For Common Ground</i></p> <p><u>Global Restructuring through Outcome Mapping</u>: IRC will share how they have started to restructure their organization globally, using outcome mapping to better understand the internal changes needed to better program for protection. <i>Rick Bartoldus; Evidence to Action Manager, International Rescue Committee</i> <i>Katrien Ringele; Technical Advisor, Protection and Rule of Law, International Rescue Committee</i></p> <p><i>Following the “Market Place” Presentations, a panel discussion will be moderated by Patrick Sooma; Humanitarian Protection Specialist, World Vision International</i></p>
12:45-1:45pm	LUNCH
1:45-2:45pm	<p>Session 8: Participatory Discussions The Game Changers: RBP Next Steps and Collective Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify big game-changers and practical next steps for the future • To provide a space for participants to articulate their own role for results-based protection <p><i>Facilitated by Jenny McAvoy, InterAction</i></p>
2:45-3:15pm	BREAK
3:15-4:15pm	<p>Session 8: Pulling it altogether The Game Changers: Continued</p> <p><i>Facilitated by Jenny McAvoy, InterAction</i></p>
4:15-5:00pm	<p>Closing + Evaluation Closing Remarks</p> <p><i>Anne-Sophie Laenholm, Global Thematic Coordinator – Protection, ECHO</i> <i>Elizabeth Pender, Humanitarian GBV/Protection Advisor, USAID/OFDA</i> <i>Jenny McAvoy, and Jessica Lenz, InterAction</i></p>

PROTECTION OUTCOMES

Moving from theory to practice -- what will it take?



Rick Bartoldus

Evidence to Action Manager, International Rescue Committee

Rick Bartoldus joined the IRC in 2014 as an Evidence Assessment Assistant. In his current position, he manages the production and quality assurance of the IRC's 'Gap Maps', which are a resource that aims to make high-quality and relevant research evidence more accessible for humanitarian practitioners. He is currently a M.A. candidate in Development Economics with a specialization in gender analysis at American University, and holds a B.A. in International Service from American University. Prior to joining the IRC in 2014, Rick gained a variety of internship experiences from non-profit and government offices.



Madeline Church

Head of Organisational Development Unit, Saferworld

Madeline joined Saferworld in 2011 to strengthen the Organisational Development Unit. She has 15 years experience in conflict resolution, policy/advocacy on human rights, evaluation, and network management. She has had a varied career combining working for not-for-profit organisations, and working independently as a consultant for many small and medium sized charities, particularly networks, helping them with strategic planning, governance systems, and evaluation. She ran the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development for three years, and is currently a Trustee for the Association of Visitors to Immigration Detainees. Madeline holds a doctorate from the Centre for Action Research in Professional Practice at Bath University, and an MA in Latin American Studies.



Elisa Dari

Country Director, Lebanon, Search For Common Ground (SFCG)

Elisa Dari is the Country Director of SFCG office in Lebanon where she has been working in various capacities since 2012. As part of the Lebanon team, Elisa contributed to the shaping of the Lebanon office strategic vision and implementation vis-a-vis the emerging Syrian refugee crisis. During this time of growth and expansion she worked closely with the DME team to set up learning systems to ensure continuous adjustment of everyday implementation against expected change and results. Before joining Search, Elisa worked on policy oriented research as part of the Conflict Research Unit of the Clingendael Institute in The Hague focusing on governance in fragile states as well as at the evaluation systems of the EU CSDP missions. Elisa holds a Master in Peace and Conflict studies at the University of St Andrews in Scotland.



Siri Elverland

Protection Adviser for Field Operations, Norwegian Refugee Council

Siri Elverland is Protection Adviser for Field Operations at the Norwegian Refugee Council's head office in Oslo, where she focuses on mainstreaming and integration of protection approaches in field programmes, and systems such as monitoring and evaluation. Siri also has experience from protection policy and advocacy work, and from protection cluster coordination. She has varied field experience from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Member of the Learning and Steering Group for the Results-Based Protection Program.



Paul Knox-Clarke

Head of Research and Communications, ALNAP

Paul Knox Clarke joined ALNAP at the beginning of 2011. He supports all of the ALNAP research and communication work, and is particularly engaged with issues of accountability, humanitarian effectiveness, urban response and leadership.

Before joining ALNAP, Paul was the director of a consulting company specialising in organisational effectiveness in international organisations. Paul has also worked for World Food Programme (WFP), where he established the UN's food security monitoring unit for

Afghanistan before working on issues of policy (and particularly policy related to accountability and participation) and organisational effectiveness at WFP's HQ. He has a background in anthropology and began his career with Save the Children UK, where he worked on food security issues in several SC (UK) programmes.



Rachel Hastie

Protection Adviser, Oxfam GB

Rachel has worked for Oxfam GB for 16 years in field and headquarter posts implementing and supporting humanitarian programmes. Since 2006 she has been the Global Protection Adviser leading Oxfam's programme strategy for protection work.

Specific areas of interest are civilian protection, gender and conflict, preventing and responding to sexual violence, safer livelihoods in conflict and supporting durable solutions to displacement. Rachel also sits of the Editorial Advisory Board of Forced Migration Review.

Member of the Learning and Steering Group for the Results-Based Protection Program.



Jessica Lenz

Senior Program Manager, Protection, InterAction

Jessica Lenz is the Senior Program Manager for Protection at InterAction. She leads the Results-Based Protection Program and the work on Gender-Based Violence. Jessica has over 17 years of experience working in Child Protection in Emergencies in contexts such as N. Uganda, Sudan, Liberia, The Gambia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Cambodia, The Philippines, Egypt, Ecuador and the Caribbean among other locations. As an independent expert for the majority of her career, Jessica has worked with countless INGOs, UN agencies, and donors focused on child protection. Her expertise lies within the prevention, response, and reintegration of children forced into armed groups. She brings a resilience perspective to her work and challenges actors to better understand and support locally-driven protection mechanisms to foster empowerment and change. Jessica is the co-founder of the community-based organization Empowering Hands (a female-led NGO in N. Uganda that supports the reintegration and psychosocial support of children affected by conflict). She is the author of numerous studies, tools, and guidance on child protection and most recently, a contributing author in the soon to be released book, **Working with Children affected by Armed Violence: Theory, Method, Practice**. Jessica holds a BA from the American University of Paris, and received a joint MSc Magna Cum Laude through Oxford, Oxford Brookes University, and Summa Cum Laude through the International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam. Jessica is also an artist and a certified Birth Doula. She has a passion for lemurs and is kept in constant reflection and mindfulness as she raises her quite empowered and spirited 5 year old daughter.



Jenny McAvoy

Director of Protection, InterAction

Jenny McAvoy is InterAction's Director of Protection, responsible for developing and leading collaborative efforts of InterAction's members and other inter-agency fora to enhance humanitarian protection. Her expertise and current focus encompasses policy and programming, which support results-based approaches to protection; strengthening compliance with IHL and human rights law through humanitarian action; humanitarian access, negotiation, and adherence to humanitarian principles; UN integration; and the protection of civilians in armed conflict, including in relation to the roles of UN political and peacekeeping missions.

Prior to joining InterAction, Jenny worked with the OCHA Policy Branch Protection and Displacement Section, focusing on analysis of trends in humanitarian access, the Security Council's protection of civilians agenda, protection mandates of peacekeeping operations, and guidance on negotiations with parties to conflict on the protection of civilians and humanitarian access.

Jenny previously worked for thirteen years with local, national and international NGOs in field operations primarily in Southeast Asia and in Sudan, including several years were with Oxfam GB, as Humanitarian Coordinator in Indonesia, Southeast Asia focal point for Arms Trade Treaty campaign, and Oxfam's first Humanitarian Protection Advisor. Jenny pioneered Oxfam's work on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, including the development of analytical, planning and training tools to enhance humanitarian programming and policy on protection.



Richard Nunn

Regional Protection Advisor in Horn, East and Central Africa, Oxfam

Richard Nunn is the Regional Protection Advisor for Oxfam in Horn, East and Central Africa. He has worked in the humanitarian sector in the region for eight years, with a specific focus on Protection since 2011.

Specific focus areas during this time have been: community based protection, mainstreaming, capacity building, partnerships, emergency protection responses, programming for resilience and safer livelihoods in conflict.



Robert Ricigliano

Robert Ricigliano is a systems and complexity coach at The Omidyar Group where he supports and guides teams within organizations and initiatives in efforts to better understand and effectively engage with dynamic systems. The systems practice at The Omidyar Group is built on Robert's pioneering work using systems and complexity tools in peacebuilding and social change. This foundational work is captured in his recently published book, *Making Peace Last: a systemic approach to sustainable peacebuilding* (2012).

Prior to joining The Omidyar Group, Robert served as an adjunct professor and co-director of the master of sustainable peacebuilding degree program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM), a non-resident fellow at the Foreign Policy Institute of Johns Hopkins University, and consulted on peacebuilding in complex environments. He has worked with the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, and the Department of State, as well as with non-governmental organizations, foundations, leaders of armed groups, and political parties in the U.S. and in conflict zones around the world. Today he serves as chair of the board of directors for the Alliance for Peacebuilding.



Katrien Ringele

Technical Advisor, Protection and Rule of Law, International Rescue Committee

Katrien Ringelé joined the IRC in 2015 as Technical Advisor Protection and Rule of Law based at the IRC's HQ in New York. In this position, she is responsible to provide technical assistance to countries that are implementing programs that protect human rights, increase access to justice, and mainstream protection principles into IRC's, as well guide and support the development of program tools and methodologies for IRC Protection/Rule of Law programs and promote the IRC's protection work to external audiences with a view to influence policy, practice and advocacy agendas. Before that, Katrien worked as Protection and Rule of Law Coordinator and Deputy Director of Program for the IRC in South Sudan from 2011. Katrien has also worked for UNHCR, the Red Cross and the International

Catholic Migration Commission in various contexts. Member of the Learning and Steering Group for the Results-Based Protection Program.



Kathrine Starup

Global Protection & Policy Advisor at the Danish Refugee Council (DRC)

Kathrine Starup is the Global Protection Advisor at the **Danish Refugee Council (DRC)** and has more than 20 years of experience with humanitarian work. *Kathrine* has specialised in *protection, mixed migration and displacement solutions*. *Kathrine* has worked with CBOs, the UN and NGOs in the field and at headquarters and has field experience from Africa and Asia. Prior to her employment with DRC, *Kathrine* worked with UNHCR in Ethiopia. Member of the Learning and Steering Group for the Results-Based Protection Program.



Patrick Sooma

Humanitarian Protection Specialist, World Vision International

Patrick Sooma is a holder of a Bachelor's degree in Law and MA in Peace and Armed conflict. He currently holds the position of Humanitarian Protection advisor for World Vision International, Based in Nairobi Kenya.

Patrick has a special interest in Forced Migration with a Specialty in Emergency Response, Humanitarian Protection including, GBV, Child Protection and Humanitarian Accountability. He has a extensive experience in Humanitarian emergency response, having worked in North Uganda, Darfur, South Sudan, Haiti, Pakistan and Most recently the Haiyan Response in the Philippines. Patrick represents World Vision at the Global Protection Cluster and is a member of the Protection Mainstreaming Task Team, Task team on Learning and member of the Learning and Steering Group for the Results-Based Protection Program.

PROTECTION OUTCOMES

Moving from theory to practice -- what will it take?

	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Email</u>
1.	Abou Samra	Dina	Policy Advice and Planning Section Policy Development and Studies Branch	OCHA	Geneva, Switzerland	(+41) 22 917 2296	abousamrad@un.org
2.	Bartoldus	Rick	Evidence Assessment Assistant	International Rescue Committee	Washington, DC	202-507-5405	Rick.Bartoldus@rescue.org
3.	Bleisch	Charlotte	First Secretary, Political Affairs	Embassy of Switzerland in the United States of America	Washington, DC	+1 (202) 745 7926	charlotte.bleisch@eda.admin.ch
4.	Brouwer	Jan Gerrit Brouwer	Child Protection Specialist, Child Protection in Emergencies	UNICEF	New York, NY	+1.212.824.7692	jgbrouwer@unicef.org
5.	Canavera	Mark	Associate Director, CPC Learning Network	Columbia University, CPC Learning Network	New York, NY	+1 212 470 7915	mc3718@cumc.columbia.edu
6.	Church	Madeline	Head of Organisational Development Unit	Saferworld	London, UK	+44 (0) 20 7324 4646	mchurch@saferworld.org.uk
7.	Dari	Elisa	Country Director, Lebanon	Search for Common Ground	Beirut, Lebanon	+961 1 219 597	edari@sfcg.org
8.	de la Puente Forte	Devana	Regional Emergency GBV Advisor (REGA) Asia and the Pacific	IASC GBV AoR, hosted with UNFPA	Bangkok, Thailand	+66 898976984	delapuenteforte@unfpa.org
9.	Der Kinderen	Sebastiaan	Senior Technical Adviser Protection and Rule of Law	International Rescue Committee	Geneva, Switzerland	+324 97544589	Sebastiaan.DerKinderen@rescue.org
10.	Elverland	Siri	Thematic Adviser Gender and Protection	Norwegian Refugee Council	Oslo, Norway	+47 93 21 82 19	siri.elverland@nrc.no

11.	Groves	Jennifer	Child Protection Advisor	USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)	Washington, DC	202-712-4335	jgroves@uasid.gov
12.	Gulbrandson	Jennifer	Protection Coordinator	Danish Refugee Council	Amman, Jordan	+962 (0) 78 911 1208	jennifer.gulbrandson@drc-Jordan.org
13.	Hameed	Sadia	Program Officer, Atrocities Prevention & Response Program	Wellspring Advisors, LLC	Washington, DC	+1-202-470-1443	shameed@wellspringadvisors.com
14.	Hastie	Rachel	Protection Adviser	Oxfam GB	Oxford, UK	+44 (0)1865 473958	rhastie@Oxfam.org.uk
15.	Horn	Melissa	Humanitarian and Protection Advisor	USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)	Washington, DC		jgroves@usaid.gov
16.	Knapp	Jason	Humanitarian and Protection Advisor	Church World Service	Washington, DC	202-481-6938	jknapp@cwsglobal.org
17.	Knox-Clarke	Paul	Head of Research and Communications	ALNAP	London, UK	+ 44 (0) 20 7922 0336	p.knox-clarke@alnap.org
18.	Laenkholm	Anne-Sophie	Global Thematic Coordinator on Protection	European Commission's Humanitarian aid and Civil Protection department (ECHO)	Amman, Jordan	+ 962 646 07000 (ext.138)	Anne-Sophie.Laenkholm@echofield.eu
19.	Lauten	Brooke	Protection and Advocacy Adviser/Democratic Republic of the Congo	Norwegian Refugee Council	Geneva, Switzerland	+243 (0) 99 98 38 262	brooke.lauten@nrc.no
20.	Lungarotti	Laura	Policy Officer (Protection), Department of Operations and Emergencies	IOM	Geneva, Switzerland	+41 22 717 94 60	LLUNGAROTTI@iom.int
21.	McNulty	Kevin	Senior Advisor on Protection	Mercy Corps	Portland, Oregon		kmcnulty@mercycorps.org
22.	Nunn	Richard	Regional Protection Advisor Horn, East and Central Africa	Oxfam GB	Nairobi, Kenya	+254 (0) 733 610669	rnunn@oxfam.org.uk
23.	Pender	Liz	Humanitarian GBV/Protection Advsiors	USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)	Washington DC	+1 703 395 0153	epender@usaid.gov
24.	Putzeys	Claire	Policy Officer	Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM)	Washington DC	202-453-9230	PutzeysC@state.gov
25.	Ravier	Guilhem	Head of Unit, Protection of Civilian Population	ICRC	Geneva, Switzerland	+41 22 730 36 99	gravier@icrc.org
26.	Richardson	Nicole	Senior Specialist, Child Protection, Department of Education and Child	Save the Children	Washington, DC	+1 202.640.6699	Nrichardson@savechildren.org

			Protection				
27.	Riddley	Krista	Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor	USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)	Washington, DC	202-661-3587	kriddley@ofda.gov
28.	Ringele	Katrien	Technical Advisor, Protection and Rule of Law	International Rescue Committee	New York, NY	+1 212 551 0962	katrien.ringele@rescue.org
29.	Rivelli	Francesca	GBV IM Specialist	UNFPA		914-498-3987	rivelli@unfpa.org
30.	Rolland	Eduardo	Child Protection Specialist, Child Protection in Emergencies	UNICEF	New York, NY	+1 917 265 4546	erolland@unicef.org
31.	Rooney	Patrick	Humanitarian Action Unit Emergency Response Section Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division	OHCHR	Geneva, Switzerland	+41 229 289 213	prooney@ohchr.org
32.	Russell	Simon	Senior Protection Officer	Global Protection Cluster Support Cell; ProCap	Geneva, Switzerland	+41 22 739 81 20	russell@unhcr.org
33.	Saavedra	Mauricio	Strategic Information Specialist	UNFPA	New York, NY	212-297-2623	saavedra@unfpa.org
34.	Schnabel	Jessica	Information Management Officer	UNHCR	Washington /Geneva	+1 - 571-263-3921	schnabel@unhcr.org
35.	Sooma	Patrick	Humanitarian Protection Specialist	World Vision International	Nairobi, Kenya	+254 738 188 977	Patrick_Sooma@wvi.org
36.	Starup	Kathrine	Global Protection and Policy Advisor	Danish Refugee Council	Copenhagen Denmark	+45 3373 5033	kathrine.starup@drc.dk
37.	Zraly	Maggie	Child Protection Advisor	ChildFund International	Washington, DC	804.756.2700 x. 2445	mzraly@childfund.org
38.	Bloomfield	Liz	Program Manager - Protection, Humanitarian Policy & Practice	InterAction	Washington DC	+1 202-552-6566	lbloomfield@interaction.org
39.	Hampton	Kelsey	Senior Program Associate, Humanitarian Policy & Practice	InterAction	Washington DC	+1 202-552-6525	khampton@interaction.org
40.	Lenz	Jessica	Senior Program Manager - Protection	InterAction	Washington DC	+1 202 729 6793	jlenz@interaction.org
41.	McAvoy	Jenny	Director of Protection	InterAction	Washington DC	+1 202 552 6527	jmcavoy@interaction.org
42.	McCarthy	Eileen	Project Coordinator, Results-Based Protection	InterAction	Washington DC	+1 202 552 6539	emccarthy@interaction.org

