



NGO and Donor Consultations on Results-Based Protection*

April 2013

*This InterAction program is generously supported by USAID/OFDA

Background

InterAction carried out a series of two-hour consultations from November 2012 to March 2013. The consultation process explored aspects of results based protection by engaging agencies in a discussion on how they understand and measure protection. A total of 26 consultations took place that included discussions with 23 NGOs (9 Field Staff from South Sudan and 16 HQ Staff based in DC, NY and London) and 3 governmental donor entities.

The following charts represent a collection of the findings from the consultations. The charts are divided into NGOs consultation findings and Donor consultation findings.

Consultations with NGOs

Commonly Identified Problems to Measure Results

Problems for **NGOs** were assessed and categorized in terms of affected population (external problems), Implementing Agencies (internal problems), Donors (influential to the problem), Universal (weakness/constraints to the problem). Each commonly identified problem is listed in order by the number of times it was mentioned by NGOs; ie the problem identified most often is listed at the top of each column. Problems highlighted in Red were the top 6 identified issues by NGOs and were mentioned in every consultation. Problems highlighted in green were listed among the top 15 issues among all NGOs.

Affected Population Environment (External Problems)	Implementing Agencies (Internal Problems)	Donors (Influential to the Problem)	Universal (Weakness/Constraints to the Problem)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sensitive issues make it difficult to report or share information ● Difficult to measure attitudes and behavior change ● Cultural issues/traditions affect program implementation ● Community involvement is paramount but we don't know how to effectively engage community participation so that it is meaningful and not tokenistic ● Limited access to communities prevents implementation ● Difficult to measure well-being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Poor staff retention; high turnover ● Poor staff capacity ● Limited time ● Acting on assumptions ● Lack of partners to support contextually appropriate and rapid response ● Lack of organizational commitment by Sr. Managers ● Use of tools that are untested ● Challenge of staff not understanding the protection problem ● Sharing information focuses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection programs under funded (affects design, implementation and overall response) ● Focus is on quantitative vs qualitative data; need for more narrative understanding of the issues vs numbers ● Data and stats can be manipulated to please the donor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Weak context knowledge ● Interpretation of data is weak/varies ● Weak baseline for measurement; no flexibility ● Too much focus on tracking output vs impact ● Program cycle is too short to measure impact ● Little to no evidence ● Mainstreaming protection remains weak ● We focus on addressing the problem vs strengthening the system to respond

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tendency to deal with community as one unit; data is not disaggregated • Power relations • Weak capacity of local population • Risks of stigma, isolation, breach of confidentiality when doing protection work • Individuals don't report issues • Situation is volatile-always starting over • Difficult to verify information provided • Information given is subjective 	<p>on success vs weaknesses/failures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always in "set-up" mode • Cookie-cutter approach to protection-little innovation • Focus is on measuring program effectiveness, not measuring the impact programs have on beneficiaries • Weak understanding of local knowledge • Protection becomes only about "training" • Little or no self-monitoring • High expectations • Lack of leadership in protection at organizational level • Disconnect between HQ and Field • Lack of resources 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disconnect between development and emergency • No flexibility (baseline, program design, objectives) • Difficult to measure direct vs indirect impact • Professionalization of protection is weak (capacity and competency) • Limited ability to contextualize standards • Poor analysis of data/assessments • Difficult to determine what Results will be at the start of the program
--	--	--	--

Commonly Recognized Implications of Not Being able to Measure Results

Implications for **NGOs** were assessed and categorized in terms of affected population (external Implications), Implementing Agencies (internal Implications), Donors (Influential Implications), Universal (Implications). Each commonly recognized implication is listed in order by the number of times it was mentioned by NGOs; ie the implication identified most often is listed at the top of each column. Implications highlighted in Red were the top 7 identified issues by NGOs and were mentioned in every consultation. Problems highlighted in green were listed among the top 15 issues among all NGOs.

Community/Population Environment (External Implications)	Implementing Agencies (Internal Implications)	Donors (Influential Implications)	Universal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create more harm ● Vulnerability of different groups is ignored or not identified ● Loss of access to populations if communities do not trust or see results ● Protection issues will not be reported ● Trust with community is not build ● Inaccurate reporting ● Harm to beneficiaries because of inappropriate or not context specific programs ● Cultural ramifications ● Cannot manage expectations of communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Loss of funding ● Programs poorly designed that lead to little impact ● Loss of organizational credibility/reputation ● Information conveyed incorrectly or interpreted differently changes results ● Motivation is lost ● Little innovation; cookie-cutter approach to programming ● Protection programs become all about "Training" ● Cannot scale up programs ● Difficulty to follow-up ● Programs unrealistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection is not funded, underfunded, or taken away ● Protection is not prioritized and not put on the agenda ● Focus is about numbers ● Longer term investment does not happen ● Donors focus on results but if evidence is not provided, programs are dropped too soon, not funded, or not piloted ● No long-term investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No evidence ● No impact ● Little or no linkage with other sectors due to misunderstanding or inability to address protection issues ● No flexibility ● Gap widens between theory and practice ● Organizations operate in silos competing for money/populations vs shared strategy to address the common problem ● Programs are not responsive to the issue ● Tools are irrelevant ● Lack of sharing information creates duplication of programs

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to explain to beneficiaries what we are doing • Measuring things important to NGOs and not to people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection programs become “Cheap”; forced to program economically vs effectively with sufficient resources • Tools not relevant • Advocacy initiatives are weak • Lack of funding and investment impacts strategy to address protection concerns • High staff turnover • Weak capacity leads to few qualified staff to implement program • Always in resource mode and never able to look at the bigger picture • Not self-reflective • No exit strategy is created • Response rate is low 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response is based on assumptions • Cannot address root causes • Poor programming undermines other issues
---	--	--	--

What is Needed to Improve Results-Based Programming and How Do we Do This?

The needs for **NGOs** to address better practices and support better results were assessed and categorized in terms of the affected population (external needs), Implementing Agencies (Internal needs), Donors (Influential needs), Universal needs. The list below describes the total of all needs and methods to improve better programming listed by all agencies.

Community/Population Environment (External Needs with or for Community)	Implementing Agencies (Internal Needs)	Donors (Influential Needs)	Universal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better community-based programming (understanding community protection mechanisms, community participation, ownership, and empowerment) • Better methods to gather information from beneficiaries that is reliable and not influenced • Better relationship building tools • Integrate community participation into all aspects of programming (Assessment, analysis, design, implementation, M&E) • Strengthen commitment and responsibility to share with community results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger linkages between organizational policies and programs and national policies and services—system strengthening • Strengthen information sharing and dialogue between all stakeholders • Address staff turnover • Build better staff capacity; ie the right competency • Move away from assumptions • Increase resources (funding, human, tools) • Improve the use of logframes (NGOs primarily use them for the donor; there is a need for a strengthening the logframe so it can be used during implementation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish an open dialogue with donors • Create a narrative of the problem and not rely only on quantitative figures • Establish and uphold commitments from donors to invest in evaluations and impact evaluations • Donors to invest in longitudinal studies • Donors should be open to long-term programming during emergencies • Increase funding for protection • Invest and develop better tools that are offered in a variety of languages • Communicate to donors about 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professionalize protection through certification/accredited degrees • Establish flexible baselines • Improve M&E tools • Create global indicators but to provide tools that can contextualize these indicators • Be more specific and transparent about the numbers we have on protection trends • Improve data collection that meet ethical standards • Establish an ethics review board • Be more innovative and not fear trying new approaches even when there is no evidence • Create a stronger linkage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop organizational policies and frameworks in order that protection is prioritized • Establish a common voice among NGOs • Look internally beyond just reporting to the donor • Improve staff care and management • Look at protection programming beyond just “training” what are alternative means for raising awareness and changing behavior? • Improve conflict analysis tools • Document failures and weaknesses 	<p>the difficulty of measuring protection, adjust our expectations and be realistic as to what can be achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in better technology (communication, tracking, reporting, sharing data, mapping) 	<p>between development and transition initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish stronger links with academia • Strengthen interagency approach/strategy to address protection issues in each context • Improve entry points for protection mainstreaming • Prioritize protection • Rethink protection—is our process TO PROTECT or is the outcome protective? • Develop tools to support the need to contextualize minimum standards • Develop tools for self-evaluations/monitoring • Explore methodologies and approaches on Theory of Change
--	--	--	--

Consultations with Donors

Identified Problems to Measure Results

Problems for **Donors** were assessed and categorized in terms of the affected population (external problems), Implementing Agencies (internal problems), Donors (influential to the problem), Universal (weakness/constraints to the problem). The list of problems are not in any particular order of importance.

Community/Population Environment (External Problems)	Implementing Agencies	Donors	Universal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population size is difficult to determine • Difficulty to reach (unable to define borders) • Difficult to extract information from affected population (trauma manifested differently) • Difficult to measure attitude and behavior change in the population • Movement of the population • Self-Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case workers have limited time to engage with individuals • Staff implications in having to verify information • Trying to be perfect gets in the way of progress • Great distance between evaluation and implementation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliable data • Lack of indicators • Difficulty in comparing across contexts when different measurement is used • Not getting the entire picture when only quantitative data is gathered • Difficult to measure behavior change in the short term • Difficult to know what really changed policy...what influenced it, is data driving the decision or is it linked to something else (power, self-interest, etc)

Identified Implications to Measure Results

Implications for **Donors** were assessed and categorized in terms of affected population (external Implications), Implementing Agencies (internal Implications), Donors (Influential Implications), Universal (Implications). The list of problems are not in any particular order of importance.

Community/Population Environment (External Problems)	Implementing Agencies	Donors	Universal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy and reliability of individuals when completing surveys • Trust is not built • Lies • Our programs can create animosity between community members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constantly redefining indicators for each program • Identifying who and where your target population is • Research methods used by NGOs are not standardized or based on technical expertise; very ad hoc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to ensure resources we have available are well spent • Difficult to make the case for more resources (<i>How do we demonstrate the importance of this program if there is no evidence showing significant results?!</i>) • Do no harm—we end up promoting harmful practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination • No reliable data • Double reporting • Last of methods to measure attitude change • Lack of standardized indicators • Too many assumptions • Unable to really solve the problem

What is Needed to Improve Results-Based Programming towards and How Do We Do This?

The needs for **Donors** to address better practices and support better results were assessed and categorized in terms of the affected population (external needs), Implementing Agencies (Internal needs), Donors (Influential needs), Universal needs. The list below describes the total of all needs and methods to improve better programming listed by all donors.

Community/Population Environment (External Problems)	Implementing Agencies	Donors	Universal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen local expertise in GBV and other difficult protection issues • Develop methods to better report back to community and increase their engagement throughout the program cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better guidance for handover during/after cluster systems close (managing cases in process) • Senior buy-in • Increase and improve evaluations • Guidelines for working with partner agencies • Enhanced coordination (Multiple definitions, referral systems— need for better streamlining) • Interventions need to be anchored in analysis • More self-evaluations • Strengthen understanding of baselines and the desired impact at the outset of an emergency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstream protection to measure change more robustly • Invest more in long-term coordination to receive reports and impact of programs after program completion. • Require evaluations as part of protection programs • Monitoring practice of donors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information sharing of experiences, good practice, weaknesses, failures • Create a common set of tools and standards to allow for continuity in order to compare results across contexts • Independent monitoring • Stronger dialogue between humanitarian and development actors at all levels • Stronger mechanisms in place to build trust among agencies and the cluster system • Transparency • Move away from being dependent on personalities and understand competencies better • Have better triangulation of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improve data collection		<p>different data sets to understand full picture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better mix of qualitative and quantitative data• Develop an evidence-based model to show the repercussions of implementation and how this affects policy• Improve ways to measure GBV
--	---	--	---

Consultations with NGOs and Donors

What tools within the program cycle would support better results?

The consultations with NGOs and Donors asked what tools and resources are currently used that support results based programming and what tools were needed to better results. The chart below lists all types of tools/resources used and needed according to the program cycle.

Needed				Used			
Program Cycle				Program Cycle			
Assessment and Analysis	Design, Development, Implementation	Monitoring and Evaluation	Additional	Assessment and Analysis	Design, Development, Implementation	Monitoring and Evaluation	Additional
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment tools that support and focus on context Multi-sectoral assessment tools Tools to bridge the gap between assessments and program design (How do you link from one to the next) Stronger analysis tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for implementing partners on how to write proposals that support strong protection programming Good logframe templates that can be both used when designing programs but also used when implementing programs Implementation tools for the theories on Protection, Change, Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools to measure impact of coordination Need global impact indicators for protection Better Evaluation tools and guidance on protection Rethinking randomized control groups when measuring change for protection Interagency guidelines on how to evaluate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity/Training for local partners on protection Negotiation and Advocacy tools on protection to be used/adapted with communities/local context Need to do more networking and coordination to better share a common strategy and approach to protection A need for recognition that protection work is different than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GBV IMS Tools CP IMS Tools Ethical Guidelines on how to collect data/information Interagency Guidelines for GBV in Humanitarian Emergencies Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice assessment Tools ICRW Baseline Tool for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFID Logframe GBV IMS Tools CP IMS Tools Professional Minimum Standards (CPiE, Sphere, EiE) Internal Logic Module (Agency specific) Global indicators used by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency specific M&E Tools Activity Reports and Results Captured Forms for Programming Ethical Guidelines on how to collect data/information PRM Protection Monitoring Toolkit Social media & new technologies for monitoring Program effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection Surveys looking at advocacy and attribution (agency specific) Keeping Children Safe—Safeguarding Toolkit

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guides/Tools that support flexible baselines (how to get them, how to use them, how to change them, how to measure against them) • Better guidance on risk mapping • System mapping tools for emergencies • Risk assessments, risk management guidelines and program planning tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools to implement professional standards within a given context • Tools for transition planning 	<p>good practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator/Output tracker • Tools for measuring advocacy impact • Regular reviews of and documentation of advocacy efforts 	<p>Shelter, WASH, Health, etc and therefore we need different tools/methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many tools and guidelines but these need to be streamlined better to support staff to better make use of them, to decide which are best to use and when • Best practices and tools in confidentiality • Tools and guidelines for congressional delegations • Tools for senior management buy-in to prioritize specific issues, including M&E • Protection Conference • Protection framework 	<p>Bangladesh</p>	<p>various agencies (agency specific)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interagency Guidelines for GBV in Humanitarian Emergencies 	<p>framework (agency specific)</p>	
--	---	--	--	-------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

