Guidance on Protection Risk Analysis/ Protection Mainstreaming in 2019 SCHF Submissions

“We are aware that attempts to provide humanitarian assistance may sometimes have unintended adverse effects. In collaboration with affected communities and authorities, we aim to minimize any negative effects of humanitarian action on the local community or on the environment.

Background

This note provides guidance to all submitting organizations (hereafter referred to as ‘project owners’) for the 2019 Turkey Humanitarian Fund first standard allocation. This guidance is intended to support their Protection Risk Analysis/ Protection Mainstreaming efforts during the design, implementation and monitoring of projects.

During preparation for the 2019 Humanitarian Response Plan, all sectors/clusters conducted a PRA based on their prioritized activities, identifying protection risks (including risk of gender-based violence) and sexual exploitation and abuse, as well as strategies to mitigate these risks. These pre-analysed protection risks and mitigation measures should be used as guidance, with submitting organizations contextualizing the risks to their areas of operation, based on field-level knowledge.

In addition to referencing the relevant sector-specific PRAs (available here for each cluster: 2019 PRA matrices), project owners are reminded of the four protection mainstreaming principles, which underpin all humanitarian work to ensure people, their needs, and diversity of risks and needs remain at the center of our work.

1. Prioritizing the safety and dignity of beneficiaries and avoid causing harm: Concern for the safety and dignity of individuals and avoiding causing further harm is central to mainstreaming protection. The safety of beneficiaries should be the primary consideration in humanitarian action. But being safe is not enough if people do not have their dignity: people need to feel valued, have a sense of self-respect and feel they have some control over their lives. Prioritizing safety and dignity can also help to prevent or minimize the possible unintended negative effects that our interventions can cause for beneficiaries.

2. Ensuring meaningful access to assistance and services: Recognized as a crucial component of all humanitarian interventions, we all must seek to ensure that people have a meaningful opportunity to attain their rights by accessing available services and assistance. Conflict and divisions within society often emerge from discrimination resulting in individuals or groups being unable to access services. Barriers to access can exist in different forms, including logistical and social/cultural factors, insecurity and a lack of information on available assistance and services.

3. Accountability: Setting-up appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can measure the adequacy of interventions, and address concerns and complaints. Mechanisms for collecting feedback should use a combination of channels. Channels include active channels, where client perspectives are deliberately and systematically solicited (such as focus groups); reactive channels, where clients have more control over when and how they share perspectives (such as complaint lines); and finally, ‘open channels’ where feedback is solicited in an ad hoc manner, through ongoing interaction during implementation.

4. Participation and empowerment: The humanitarian community should strive to put affected populations at the center of decision-making processes that affect their lives so that services are choice-driven and client-focused. Special attention should also be paid to ensuring the participation of, and consultation with, the most at-risk and/or marginalized members of society whose voices may not otherwise be heard. Humanitarian programming should also seek to support the development of self-protection capacities and assist people to claim their rights, including (not exclusively) the rights to shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, and education.

1 This analysis is concerned with risks that have a direct impact on the person in need. While relevant to the response generally, this analysis is not concerned with operational/compliance/financial-related (e.g. procurement/transportation) risks.
Process for project design

- Project owners must demonstrate evidence of their reflection upon protection risks and protection mainstreaming in their design, and what practical and measurable inputs they will ensure to reduce and mitigate risks during implementation. Each project will be required to include in its narrative (in the protection mainstreaming section) key protection risks and mitigating measures needed/planned in implementing their specific project, and ways to monitor them.
- While completing the PRA, in highlighting key protection risks and mitigation measures needed/planned in implementing the project, project owners must specifically ask themselves:
  o Were women and girls an integral part of the design in terms of consultation of activities? How were the vulnerabilities/risks particular to women and girls taken into account?
  o Were older persons and persons with a disability (PWD) part of the design in terms of consultation of activities? How were the vulnerabilities/risks particular to older persons and PWDs taken into account?
  o Was the situation of communities and the dynamics of IDPs, host communities and returnees taken into consideration?
  o Describe how the project addressed GBV risk mitigation activities/interventions (referral to GBV service and/or GBV survivors part of a selection criteria);
  o What activities addressed PSEA and accountability to populations we serve? (e.g. PSEA complaint form developed for staff and beneficiaries)
- Mitigations measures formulated during the PRA should be monitored and included in projects reports.

Examples of constructive and non-constructive PRAs

| Protection risk: There is a risk of discrimination or perceptions of discrimination if a service is provided to specific groups or individuals at the exclusion of others. Likelihood: Medium. Impact: High Mitigating measures: 1. Ensure a comprehensive service mapping is undertaken so that risk mitigation and communication with communities can be proactive and informed; 2. Ensure consultation with communities related to location of WASH services to understand relevant community perspectives; 3. Carry out safety audits for beneficiaries’ access to site locations. | Our Organization gives a main concern on applying and committing to Do No Harm principles through all project design, activities and results. Our Organization will save no efforts on follow these principles and mainstream the protection through this project life cycle, including consulting the stockholders, coordinating with partners and cluster, ensure safe and productive environment, providing equitable access to project services without discrimination and promoting the social cohesion. |
| Protection risk: The risks of GBV can be compounded by overcrowding and lack of privacy. In multi-family tents and multi-household dwellings, lack of doors and partitions for sleeping and changing clothes can increase exposure to sexual harassment and assault. Tensions linked to overcrowding may lead to an escalation of intimate partner violence and other forms of domestic violence. Where situational and risk analyses are not systematically conducted, these risks might not be identified and rectified. Likelihood: Medium. Impact: High Mitigating measures: a) advocate for appropriate and adequate assistance to be provided. We will include women, girls and other at-risk groups to determine such things as if systems/criteria are in place to determine how shelters are being allocated; if they | Our Organization will establish shelters in consultation with stakeholders and we will coordinate with relevant partners to ensure do no harm. |
Additional resources

Prior to carrying out the analysis, all project owners are advised to review the (two page) Sphere Project Guidance on this exercise. These two pages alone, along with your knowledge of the operational and sectoral context, provide sufficient guidance and prompts for carrying out the analysis. The guidance can be found at: http://www.spherehandbook.org/en/protection-principle-1-avoid-exposing-people-to-further-harm-as-a-result-of-your-actions/

For project owners seeking more guidance, the Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons also provides specific and brief sections on protection risks related to: Food, Nutrition, WASH, Health, Education, and Livelihoods. (See relevant sections of Part IV of the Handbook which can be found at: http://www.unhcr.org/protection/idps/4c2355229/handbook-protection-internally-displaced-persons.html). Sectors and members are, of course, invited to contact the Protection sector with any questions or for further advice.

The IASC Guidelines for integrating Gender Based Violence interventions in humanitarian action include specific actions that the FSL, Nutrition, WASH, Health, Education, and Livelihoods, child protection, mine action, shelter/NFI, CCCM sectors can take throughout the HPC to mitigate and reduce the risks of GBV. (The guidelines can be found at www.gbvguidelines.org)