# Results-Based Protection    InterAction

Dear Colleagues,

In this March Results-Based Protection Update:

1. **Upcoming Events**
    a. **Event:** Practicing Safe Data: A Roundtable Discussion
2. **Related Resources and Reports with Elements of Results-Based Protection**
    a. **Discussion Note:** Advancing knowledge on the role of civilians in preventing and mitigating mass atrocities
    b. **Tool:** Building Collaborative Readiness: Mapping Community Resources
    c. **Article:** Local constructions of gender-based violence amongst IDPs in northern Uganda: analysis of archival data collected using a gender- and age-segmented participatory ranking methodology
    d. **Tool:** Facilitating Intentional Group Learning
3. **Sign Up for Results-Based Protection Updates**

## 1.  Upcoming Events

**Event:** Practicing Safe Data: A Roundtable Discussion

InterAction

With new technologies enabling faster data collection and information management, there are opportunities for these technologies to be harnessed for continuous context-specific analysis in support of protection outcomes; however, if not handled responsibly, they can also expose individuals to additional risk. There has been a major shift in recent years in how development and humanitarian actors think about the ethical use of data, and many organizations and institutions have been at the forefront of establishing industry standards and best practices. Given this growing emphasis on data protection and the responsible use of data, InterAction will host **Practicing Safe Data: A Roundtable Discussion** to delve deeper into these topics.

At this roundtable discussion we will explore the frontier of responsible data, data protection, and compliance with data regulation, including the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The roundtable will be moderated by **Linda Raftree**, lead organizer of MERL Tech and co-founder of Technology Salon.

Whether you work in Information Technology, risk management, protection, Monitoring and Evaluation, or simply want to learn more, we hope you'll join us and lend your perspective to this exciting and critical discussion.

The roundtable is scheduled for **Thursday, April 5th** from **10:00am – 12:00pm ET** at InterAction. If you are interested in joining, please **RSVP here**. A call-in option will be available for remote participants.

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

**Discussion Note:** Advancing knowledge on the role of civilians in preventing and mitigating mass atrocities
*InterAction from U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Simon Skjodt Center for the Prevention of Genocide Roundtable Discussion, 5 March 2018*

On March 5th, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum convened a group of academics, practitioners, and policy-makers to take stock of existing knowledge on the role of civil society and civilian self-protection mechanisms in preventing and mitigating violence and mass atrocities, as well as identify gaps in knowledge and areas of future inquiry and research.

In bringing together a diverse range of actors, the event highlighted several aspects of <u>Designing for Contribution</u> and the opportunities and challenges therewith, namely that intentional investment is needed in providing the time, space, and facilitation (for more on this <u>see below</u>!) to understand the different vocabulary  that various groups use to frame "protection" be it through the lenses of resilience, social movements, governance, peace, etc. and achieve a shared vision.

This note summarizes the key points of group discussion, as they relate to RBP, distilling key contributions, questions, and considerations for further research on the role of civilians in preventing and mitigating risk in armed conflict.

### Civil society and civilian self-protection strategies
There are a wide range of strategies used by civil society actors and affected populations themselves (that are highly contextualized for adapting to changing space, actors, and tactics). Moreover, *civil society prevention/protection activities are not siloed* – strategies may involve health, livelihoods, resilience, etc.

Given that *context is key*, the group discussed the difficulty of appreciating the nuances of strategies using a broad country-level unit of analysis, and that a local micro-level would have greater explanatory power. Strategies also change as the threat environment changes; therefore, a <u>continuous context-specific analysis</u> at a local level would help understand the triggers for change and the relationships that exist between civil society and perpetrators of violence. The group discussed that importance for external actors to invest in such analysis (as far as possible <u>from the perspective of the affected population</u>) to fully understand the self-protection landscape and avoid creating parallel systems or undermining the self-protection mechanisms at work. This would then inform <u>a causal logic</u> for tackling those protection issues and supporting civil society and civilian response mechanisms – be it through advocacy or amplifying messaging, providing diplomatic assistance, using convening authority, offering technical expertise, providing funding, etc.

Acknowledging that meaningful 2-way communication is foundational to understanding the risk environment from the perspective of the affected population, participants discussed that investing in <u>communicating with communities</u> is essential and helps dismantle barriers that exist for meaningful collaboration with people affected and local actors (whether this is jargon and terminology, information sharing mechanisms, formal/rigid structures, policies and processes, etc.) as well as shifting the overall power dynamic between local and external actors.

The group questioned some assumptions about "civil society"; namely that:

- Civil society encapsulates more than NGOs – it can be a range of informal groups and networks, from religious organizations to committees to women's groups to kinship networks to clandestine networks (constellation of groups and relationships constantly forming and reforming, visibly or covertly, to counter tactics of perpetrators). Specificity in research design can help yield more information about the success factors for certain civil society strategies; however, researchers should also be mindful of how they act as external actors and consider the repercussions of making the less visible strategies visible.
- In polarized environments, certain civil society actors may, in fact, be "externally leveled" by communities apprehensive of others from "the outside" (i.e. civil society organizations based in the capital who may have a different demographic composition than the target community, as opposed to members of the same village, tribe, ethnicity, religion, etc.) This point additionally emphasizes the importance of investing in communicating with communities to establish trust and maintain genuine and reciprocal dialogue.

### *Conclusions/ Way Forward:*

A deeper dive would be useful for pinpointing the success factors in several country contexts which could stimulate additional case studies and contribute to a growing body of research. Generalization can only happen at a much later stage after we have shared definitions and an appreciation of success factors in a variety of contexts. Specific information gaps and identified research themes included:

- *Features of Perpetrators of Violence:* what mobilizes violent behavior and attitudes and what are effective strategies to change those attitudes and behaviors?
    - Why do armed actors target certain communities or sites? How do armed actors view civilians?
    - How do relationships between combatants and civilians change over time? What are relationships or connect points that may make certain self-protection strategies viable?
    - What are the preconditions for community negotiations with parties to conflict? How can communities effectively negotiate for themselves in contexts where they are geographically removed – what can other actors do to support them?
- *Engaging Affected Populations:* How are external actors investing in communicating with communities to ensure their perspective is brought to bear at all stages in an intervention and that they are leading the analysis learning and strategy design?
- *Nonviolent Social Movements*: What is the role of nonviolent social movements for atrocity prevention (e.g. as a link between the state and civil society)?
- *Funding*: What is the role of impact investing in preventing future atrocities? What are the effects of strong donors in determining civil society strategies and priorities (i.e. power dynamics that come with donor – recipient relationships)?

Participants also discussed the value of research on instances where civil society organized on their own, without external actors, as an important contribution to the body of evidence on how external actors can best support self-protection strategies. Furthermore, the group highlighted that research should be useful not only for policy-makers and practitioners but should address the questions to which local communities themselves want answers. Moreover, the research process should seek to incorporate affected populations at all stages, to ensure the analysis is grounded in the perspective of the affected population, and that evidence generated is meaningful.

**Tool:** Building Collaborative Readiness: Mapping Community Resources
*Tamarack Institute, Liz Weaver, February 2018*

A frequent refrain amongst humanitarian actors is the limited time and financial resources available to support their work. This resource from the Tamarack Institute (drawing on the work of the Ontario Health Communities Coalition) highlights how communities have a range of investments, assets and resources, which can be tapped to support collaborative efforts to achieve collective results. Building from Kretzmann and McKnight's work to transform traditional thinking and assumptions around low-income neighborhoods as places of problems and deficits to places of existing assets, the Ontario Health Communities Coalition (OHCC) has developed a tool for communities to map community assets.

Their tool lays out 5-steps to map community assets:
1. Map individual capacity by identifying resources available in the community such as skills, historical knowledge, physical structures, natural resources, interests, and connections between people;
2. Create an inventory of groups and organizations that work in or support the community. Mindful of the diverse range of actors and capabilities needed to solving complex problems, the inventory should be broad to capture resources that may be coming from the voluntary sector, faith community, private business, and others;
3. Create the community map and identifying the problem that you are trying to solve;
4. Use the mapped community assets to address challenges and needs;
5. Strengthen existing relationships and identify potential new partnerships.

The community assets map can be useful for continuous analysis of the vulnerabilities, threats, and capacities within the community to track positive and negative changes over time. It can also serve as a participatory method to engage affected populations throughout the design and implementation of interventions to respond to identified threats and vulnerabilities, and thereby strengthen trust and relationships between communities and external actors. Furthermore, it may serve as an effective advocacy tool to effect changes in the community at a policy-level.

For the full article, see here. For additional resources, see:
- Access Using Asset Mapping for Asset-Based Community Development
- Check out the Tool: Mapping Your Community Assets from the Ontario Healthy Communities Coalition
- Take a look at Participatory Asset Mapping – A Community Research Lab Tool Kit

**Abstract**

**Background:** Gender-based violence (GBV) is a significant problem in conflict-affected settings. Understanding local constructions of such violence is crucial to developing preventive and responsive interventions to address this issue.

**Methods:** This study reports on a secondary analysis of archival data collected as part of formative qualitative work – using a group participatory ranking methodology (PRM) – informing research on the prevalence of GBV amongst IDPs in northern Uganda in 2006. Sixty-four PRM group discussions were held with women, with men, with girls (aged 14 to 18 years), and with boys (aged 14 to 18 years) selected on a randomized basis across four internally displaced persons (IDP) camps in Lira District. Discussions elicited problems facing women in the camps, and – through structured participatory methods – consensus ranking of their importance and narrative accounts explaining these judgments.

**Results:** Amongst forms of GBV faced by women, rape was ranked as the greatest concern amongst participants (with a mean problem rank of 3.4), followed by marital rape (mean problem rank of 4.5) and intimate partner violence (mean problem rank of 4.9). Girls ranked all forms of GBV as higher priority concerns than other participants. Discussions indicated that these forms of GBV were generally considered normalized within the camp. Gender roles and power, economic deprivation, and physical and social characteristics of the camp setting emerged as key explanatory factors in accounts of GBV prevalence, although these played out in different ways with respect to differing forms of violence.

**Conclusions:** All groups acknowledged GBV to represent a significant threat – among other major concerns such as transportation, water, shelter, food and security – for women residing in the camps. Given evidence of the significantly higher risk in the camp of intimate partner violence and marital rape, the relative prominence of the issue of rape in all rankings suggests normalization of violence within the home. Programs targeting reduction in GBV need to address community-identified root causes such as economic deprivation and social norms related to gender roles. More generally, PRM appears to offer an efficient means of identifying local constructions of prevailing challenges in a manner that can inform programming.

**Keywords:** Uganda, Gender-based violence, Marital rape, Rape, Intimate partner violence, Participant ranking methodology (PRM), Internally displaced person (IDP), Social norms

* Correspondence: aager@qmu.ac.uk
[1] Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, USA
[2] Institute for Global Health and Development, Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh, UK

 **Article:** Local constructions of gender-based violence amongst IDPs in northern Uganda: analysis of archival data collected using a gender- and age-segmented participatory ranking methodology
*Alastair Ager, Carolyn Bancroft, Elizabeth Berger, and Lindsay Stark, 7 February 2018*

When developing interventions aimed at preventing and responding to Gender Based Violence (GBV), having a context-specific understanding of constructions of GBV is key.  This article, published in *BMC Conflict and Health* reports on a secondary analysis of archived data collected as part of formative qualitative work – using a group participatory ranking methodology (PRM) – informing research on the prevalence of GBV amongst internally displaced people (IDPs) in four camps in northern Uganda in 2006. This participatory research aimed to unpack local construction of GBV experienced by camp residents, explicitly seeking the understandings not only of women but also of men and, acknowledging the potential of perceived norms in shaping future behavior, of girls and boys. Structured participatory methods yielded candid conversation on the overall risk environment and specific problems they face, consensus ranking of the importance of each problem, and personal narratives explaining these judgements. GBV was acknowledged as a significant threat, and PRM appears to offer an efficient means of identifying local constructions of prevailing challenges in a manner that can inform programming.

The findings revealed that within the range of GBV concerns mentioned by women participants, rape was ranked as the greatest concern amongst participants (with a mean problem rank of 3.4), followed by marital rape (mean problem rank of 4.5) and intimate partner violence (mean problem rank of 4.9). Girls ranked all forms of GBV as higher priority concerns than other participants. Discussions indicated that these forms of GBV were considered largely as "norms" within the camps. In explaining GBV prevalence and normalization, participants discussed gender roles and power disparities, economic deprivation, and physical and social characteristics of the camp setting as enabling factors; however, these played out in different ways with respect to differing forms of violence.

The PRM analysis results provide important recommendations for tailoring interventions to meet the specific needs of residents of the camp rather than "one-size fits all" GBV interventions. In this case, provided the evidence of the significantly higher risk in the camp of intimate partner violence and marital rape and the suggestion of normalization of violence within the home, there was a need for programming directed at shifting attitudes and behavior around IPV within the household unit. Simultaneously, programs targeting reduction in GBV need to address community-identified root causes such as economic deprivation and social norms related to gender roles, which may involve a wide range of stakeholders across sectors. More generally, PRM appears to offer an efficient means of identifying local constructions of prevailing threats and risks which can enable more appropriate and effective responses to protection issues.

Read the article here.

**Tool:** Facilitating Intentional Group Learning: A Practical Guide to 21 Activities
*FSG, Hallie Preskill, Efraín Gutiérrez, Katelyn Mack, January 2017*

To develop an organizational culture that supports iterative reflection and learning, individuals need opportunities to share data, insights, and experiences with others. The way that learning and reflection sessions are designed and implemented can enable or inhibit the meaningful sharing of ideas and collective problem-solving. From quick informal 20-minute activities (i.e Mental Model Drawings and Think-Pair-Share) to systems-thinking and participatory methods for learning (i.e. Timeline Mapping, Actor Mapping, and Appreciative Inquiry), this guide highlights several approaches for designing and facilitating high-energy, inclusive, and meaningful reflection sessions.

Some connection points to RBP include:

- Learning opportunities can be incorporated into already established meetings and gatherings; taking time for intentional learning doesn't have to be time consuming or costly. **It's about allocating the time and space and creating habits!**
- To ensure that the habits of continuous reflection and good learning practice are solidified, it is important to **establish and communicate a clear goal** to all participants so that they understand how practice/ exercises are contributing to objectives and set expectations.
- Aside from primary learning objectives, many of the activities outlined in this guide have secondary benefits which may include developing or strengthening relationships through **building group cohesion, norms, trust, and collaboration**. Others may strengthen data analysis, active listening, critical thinking, etc. Good facilitators are key to enabling this – being mindful of accessibility needs, the dominant culture and what may be required for less vocal perspectives to be brought to bear, setting an appropriate pace, and adjusting and adapting the approach as necessary.
- Embedded in all activities is the notion that open and continuous reflection on the barriers and challenges facing teams, organizations, and partnerships, actually moves us away from "success/ failure" thinking and helps build trust to further the cycle of sharing, learning, and adaptation.

| ACTIVITY | PEOPLE Ideal number of participants | TIME Approximate time needed | GOALS Promote greater awareness & understanding | Generate new ideas and/or solutions | Make a decision | OTHER CRITERIA Involves the use of quantitative and/or qualitative data | Can be used when participants are in different locations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Quick Learning Activities** | | | | | | | |
| 1. One Question | 4-25 | (clock) | ✓ | ✓ | | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 2. Mental Model Drawings | 4-25 | (clock) | ✓ | | | NO | YES |
| 3. One Data Point | 4-100 | (clock) | ✓ | ✓ | | YES | YES |
| 4. Think-Pair-Share | 6-100 | (clock) | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | NO |
| **Detailed Learning Activities** | | | | | | | |
| 5. Data Placemats | 2-10 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | YES | YES |
| 6. Before and After Action Reviews | 3-10 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 7. Chalk Talk | 5-10 | | ✓ | ✓ | | OPTIONAL | NO |
| 8. Virtual Idea Generation | 5-20 | | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | YES |
| 9. Conversational Moves | 6-12 | | ✓ | | | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 10. Gradients of Agreement | 6-50 | | ✓ | | ✓ | NO | YES |
| 11. What's on Your Mind? | 8-30 | | ✓ | | | NO | NO |
| 12. What? So What? Now What? | 8-100 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 13. Collective Story Harvest | 10-50 | | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | NO |
| 14. Four Corners Perspective Change | 10-50 | | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | NO |
| 15. Data Gallery | 10-100 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | YES | NO |
| **Systems-Thinking Learning Activities** | | | | | | | |
| 16. Timeline Mapping | 3-10 | | ✓ | | | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 17. Trend Mapping | 5-15 | | ✓ | ✓ | | OPTIONAL | YES |
| 18. Ecocycle Mapping | 10-12 | | ✓ | | ✓ | NO | YES |
| 19. Actor Mapping | 10-25 | | ✓ | | | NO | NO |
| 20. World Café | 20-100 | | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | NO |
| 21. Appreciative Inquiry | 20-100 | | ✓ | ✓ | | NO | NO |

For the full post, please see here, and for more resources on iterative reflection and learning, see our Resource Repository.

## 3. 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 (https://protection.interaction.org/resources/).

For questions, feedback, or more information on results-based protection, please contact Katie Grant.