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Why do we need a results-based approach to protection?

• A perception that protection can’t be measured

• Programme design and reporting focused on inputs and outputs. Little information on impact on people’s lives

• A “checklist approach” to guidance and tools
  – meant to be helpful for busy field staff, but doesn’t necessarily help solve problems

• Negative funding trends (and/or perception thereto) and, anecdotally, donors questioning programme quality (see GPC study on protection funding trends)

• Critique that protection has not informed overall humanitarian strategy in major crises (e.g. IRP report on Sri Lanka)
Phase I

• Collect and compile examples that demonstrate the key elements of a results-based approach to protection
• Conducted a series of consultations on how to measure protection
• A literature review of existing materials that promote good practice within protection programming
• Convened a Practitioners’ Roundtable to critically review key elements of a results-based approach and figure out what comes next
How do NGOs understand results?
(in terms of change to be brought about through protection programming)
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How do **Donors** understand Results?

(in terms of change to be brought about through protection programming)
Success factors and operational requirements
Success factors and operational requirements

- Measure **risk and resilient patterns** vs incidents
- Perspective of the affected population as the starting point for analysis priorities
- Very detailed, **granular analysis of threats, vulnerabilities, capacities and opportunities to respond**.
  - Not enough to generalise for entire communities or the type of problem being faced as different risk and resilient patterns demand different solutions.
Success factors and operational requirements

- **Disaggregated data** is an essential part of this – but not only gender, age and disability.
  - Vulnerability is also a function of location, activity, time of day or year, and political, social, ethnic, religious affiliation in a given context and *in relation to a specific threat*.
  - Vulnerabilities vis a vis specific threats may therefore shift over time.
  - A combination of *different kinds of quantitative and qualitative data and different collection methods* is required.
Success factors and operational requirements

• Diagnosis and problem-solving therefore needs to be context-specific.

• Historical and broader contextual analysis should also be undertaken to lend greater insight into the dynamics where people are at risk and protection programming is being undertaken.
Success factors and operational requirements

- **Close collaboration with affected individuals** during analysis enables their role in problem-solving and implementation.
- Changes in threats, vulnerabilities and capacities may require a **wide variety of sectoral / technical programme areas** as well as **different modes of action**, including but not limited to service provision and material assistance.
- More than one actor may be needed to bring about change. Programme design and implementation may depend on **complementarity between actors**. While not always possible, every effort should be made for collaboration from the start of initial protection analysis.


Success factors and operational requirements

• Meaningful impact and outcomes often necessitate a multi-year programme strategy.
• Continuous pursuit of a results-based approach requires organization-wide policies and their reinforcement in practice.
• It is important to know the donor’s approach and whether it is compatible with your own.
Some issues raised in Practitioners’ Roundtable

• Evidence-informed (rather than evidence-based)
• Must emphasize that its iterative, not linear
• Danger of “analysis paralysis”
• Time-consuming – how do we focus in on priorities?
• Community participation – important but not always possible in light of risks. Communities may also be unable to reflect on their own harmful practices.
• Must make conscious choices regarding “responsibilisation vs substitution”
• How to use this approach for inter-agency strategy?
Phase II

- Launching webpage (resources, tools, on-line discussion forum, blog)

- Established Learning and Steering Group
  - International Rescue Committee
  - Danish Refugee Council
  - Oxfam
  - Refugees International
  - Norwegian Refugee Council
  - Geneva Call
  - World Vision

- Pilot, document and learn
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