# Mainstreaming protection principles in Information Management & Analysis Activities

# Alarm clock outline2hr 30’

# Why does this session matter?

*We all (IMOs, DTM and Sectoral colleagues) must mainstream protection in our work, including in data, IM and analysis activities. This session is addressed to all humanitarian professionals, regardless of specific roles and expertise. The session brings together field experience and guidance from IASC and gives practical examples on how to mainstream the 4 protection principles when working with data and analysis.*

# Learning Objectives

At the end of this module, participants will be able to:

* Briefly explain how to adapt and Implement modalities to mainstream protection principles in IOM data and Analysis activities
* Guide your IM colleagues on how to mainstream protection principles in data and Analysis Activities

# Session Plan

[Intro (5’)](#_Introduction:_WELCOME,_OBJECTIVES)

1. What is protection Mainstreaming? Why should we mainstream protection principles also in IM /Data and Analysis activities?
2. How can we mainstream protection principles in data and analysis activities?
   * + Do no Harm
     + Help people get their rights
     + Impartial Access
     + Assist People to Recover
3. Questions and Comments

[Conclusions (5’)](#_Conclusions)

# ACTIVITIES

* Activities during the webinar:
  + Participants use of the chat to answer specific questions. Clarity of question is essential to enable participation. *The facilitator should decide whether or not to allow the use of the mic to answer those questions. Using the mic makes the experience more interactive, however it may be chaotic if the group is very large and if there is a lot of participation in the group.*
  + Mentimeter: one question What is Protection Mainstreaming? Alternatively, use the chat, Whiteboard or Mural or similar tool.
  + Activities that are done using the chat, you can prepare a Jamboard to make the activity more interactive (if the time allows)
  + There are video links throughout the ppt, that can be shown if needed
* Knowledge Test after the session
* Evaluation after the session

# Before the session

As part of preparation for the session, send email to the participants sharing the below listed resources/links. Make sure to share them at least one week before the session (or when the invitation is sent).

1. [DTM Do No Harm Checklist - DTM&Partners Toolkit](https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/field-companion-sectoral-questions-location-assessment) - *(Available in English, French, Spanish)*

https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/field-companion-sectoral-questions-location-assessment

1. IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility in Humanitarian Action- *(Available in English, French, Spanish)*

https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/operational-response/iasc-operational-guidance-data-responsibility-humanitarian-action

# Key Resource Documents

* ***DTM Do No Harm Checklist*** *- DTM&Partners Toolkit-* [*https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/field-companion-sectoral-questions-location-assessment*](https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/field-companion-sectoral-questions-location-assessment) *- (Available in English, French, Spanish)*
* *WeWorld CPA* [*https://cpainitiative.org*](https://cpainitiative.org/)
* ***Video: Voices from the field (3 min****) -* [*https://cpainitiative.org/jinan-sarsour/*](https://cpainitiative.org/jinan-sarsour/)
* ***CPA Community Empowerment Manual*** [*https://reliefweb.int/report/world/community-empowerment-manual*](https://reliefweb.int/report/world/community-empowerment-manual)*)*
* *OCHA/PIM* ***Framework for Data-Sharing in Practice****:* [*http://pim.guide/essential/a-framework-for-data-sharing-in-practice/*](http://pim.guide/essential/a-framework-for-data-sharing-in-practice/)***-*** *(Available in English, Spanish)*
* *30 min Recorded session “****Mainstreaming Protection in Information Management Activities in Humanitarian Context****”:* [*https://youtu.be/3dQc9YFJ0Qk*](https://youtu.be/3dQc9YFJ0Qk)
* ***Methods and Information Needs*** *and**DTM&Partners Toolkit-* [*https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/other-tools-0*](https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/other-tools-0)
* ***Mapping Information Needs-*** *https://displacement.iom.int/dtm-partners-toolkit/information-needs-and-data-users*
* *Video (47 min) Mainstreaming Protection in IM activities in Humanitarian Context- :* [*https://youtu.be/3dQc9YFJ0Qk*](https://youtu.be/3dQc9YFJ0Qk)
* *PAF* ***Video on Methods and Sources*** *(PAF training package) also available at:* [*https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1pnhR4N9QOHvUEOI6o5CVT0L\_98DFhvi4?usp=sharing*](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdrive.google.com%2Fdrive%2Ffolders%2F1pnhR4N9QOHvUEOI6o5CVT0L_98DFhvi4%3Fusp%3Dsharing&data=04%7C01%7Cdpavone%40iom.int%7C11b2e4488d3d4083398608d9efa9f04e%7C1588262d23fb43b4bd6ebce49c8e6186%7C1%7C0%7C637804335542948006%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=je66shK7rlwfMDw3TWR849tQAnXZN04kD%2FO%2BrPhpzQw%3D&reserved=0)

# CONTENT slide by slide

## Introduction: WELCOME, OBJECTIVES and AGENDA

Activity on slide 1: For Webinars/Virtual sessions:

* This slide remains on the screen while wating for the participants to join
* Remind that the session is recorded, and that they should write their name on the chat, with job title and location, as a means of introduction.
* Ground rules: if you have a question during the presentation, write it in the chat. Somebody will monitor the chat to ensure no question is missed. However, When the presenter gives you space to ask questions, you can unmute your mic and ask your question directly.

*Organizer Introduces facilitators*

Slide 2 includes all the training sessions, adapt and use the slide if giving more than one session, delete if you are giving only one session

Explain [WHEN APPLICABLE] that this webinar fits in the series we are conducting, the objective of the training and run through agenda

Slide 3 includes the self-study material included in the final exams, include if you are giving trainings for the whole series. Otherwise, move to resources

Handover to first Facilitator

## Part 1: What is protection Mainstreaming? Why should we mainstream protection principles also in IM /Data activities?

|  |
| --- |
| Slide 6: Let us first see what Protection Mainstreaming means.  Please, go to this link in the chat or go to menti.com and use this code: XXX. And answer the question, explain what PM is to you. [Copy and paste links in the chat] |
| Slide 7: Protection Mainstreaming means that “*The following elements must be taken into account in all humanitarian activities:* Do no Harm, Impartial Access, Assist People to Recover, Help people claim their rights”  Why should we mainstream protection principles also in IM, Data and analysis activities? *The following elements must be taken into account in all humanitarian activities.* *…Including Data and Analysis activities!*These elements are included in the SPHERE HANDBOOK, and in very similar language in the guidance of the Protection Cluster. |

## Part 2: How can we Mainstream protection principles in data and analysis activities?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Slide 8: Let us now look at practical ways to Mainstream protection principles in data and analysis activities | |
| Slide 9: We have tools and Guidance, and a very important guidance is the IASC [*Operational Guidance*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/operational-response/iasc-operational-guidance-data-responsibility-humanitarian-action) *on Data Responsibility in Humanitarian Action* was endorsed in Feb. 2021 It is the *first ever system-wide framework for data responsibility* in the humanitarian sector. It aims to support actors to take concrete steps for data responsibility by providing principles and actions. | |
| Slide 10: DR is defined as being the safe, ethical and effective management of personal and non-personal data for operational response, in accordance with established frameworks for personal data protection. - Then each of those three adjectives are defined (a bit like we did to define PIM as 'systematic, principled and collaborative’):   - Safety refers to data security as well as to human rights and other legal obligations, all in the spirit of do no harm,   - Ethical refers us to humanitarian ethics and data ethics,   - Effective refers to ensuring that our data activities achieve their intended purposes ,- The definition also helps to clarify that DR is about **both** personal and non-personal data -- while at the same time acknowledging that personal data is to be managed in accordance with established frameworks. | |
| Slide 11: HIDDEN: Principles for *Data Responsibility* in Humanitarian Action. 12 Principles for DR. The IASC Sub-Group did a review of existing principles for data management incl. PIM Principles. The goal of these DR principles is to provide a lens to guide humanitarian actors in their decisions about what they do and don’t do, with whom, when and how.  We want to reinforce the commitment to Do No Harm (as 1 of 4 Protection Principles), so we mitigate risks while maximizing benefits of data in humanitarian action, at all steps of data management.  You’ll have noticed there is a dedicated principle for Personal Data Protection, again to preserve the specificity of considerations related to personal data. | |
| Slide 12: The first element of protection mainstreaming is often called the Do No Harm principle. It is an ethical principle originally applied in the medical field: In front of an existing problem, it may be better to do nothing - even nothing - than doing something and risking doing more harm than good. | |
| Slide 13: Do no Harm does not refer to “Do not do something bad voluntarily”, but rather reminds us not to “Do something bad while trying to do something good”. | |
| Slide 14: This means that, despite any purpose or good intention, before intervening in a situation, it is necessary to **evaluate the consequences of this intervention**. It is necessary to accept that if the conditions do not allow, **the best solution could be not to intervene and do nothing**. | |
| Slide 15: **DO NO HARM is not instinctive,** quite the contrary the natural reaction is to do something no matter what. Example: *A friend feels bad, she has a headache. I want to help her; I have to do something. So, I take all the medicines I have and give them to her. Now my friend no longer has a headache, but she does have a stomachache and an allergic reaction.* Watch this *Video = how do you find this relates to do no harm?* <https://imgur.com/gallery/nNx93ax> | |
| Slide 16: Let us now look at how do we “Do No Harm” when collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data & analysis | |
| Slide 17: Ask the participant to use the chat to answer the following: **HOW** may we inadvertently expose people to increased danger or risk while collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data and analysis? **WHO** can we inadvertently expose to increased danger or risk? **WHEN** can we expose people to increased danger or risk? When we Collect data? When we Store data? When we Analyze data? Or when we Share or Use data and analysis? **WHAT** actions can we take to avoid doing harm?  Notes to the Facilitator:   * + Facilitator reads and comments the answers, giving some guidance and asking participants to explain some of their answers.   + This activity is done using the chat. However, you can prepare a Jamboard to make the activity more interactive (if the time allows) | |
| Slide 18: Let us now look at some examples of how we can try to do no harm: Primary data collection, especially when dealing with sensitive issues, can only be done if quality essential services referral mechanisms or procedures are in place. This means that data collection teams should be ready and informed on how to respond to a disclosure and refer the respondent to basic services such as psychological support or medical assistance. No one would ask another person if they were thirsty without having water to offer them. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how this can be done. | |
| Slide 19: When collecting data of sensitive nature, PRIVACY and SAFETY of respondent and Interviewer MUST be ensured. That also applies when Protection colleagues ask the questions. Use the chat or the mic to give an example of how you do that | |
| Slide 20: Any data collection must avoid causing the respondent to recall their trauma. That also applies when there are adequate services and referral procedures. Questions should never be asked about sensitive issues directly, but rather that this type of information should be collected, as far as possible, using indirect indicators, and that respondents should not be encouraged to speak openly about your negative experiences only because it is beneficial to the investigation. Give us an example of a proxy you have used. | |
| Slide 21: Being seen talking to a person wearing a UN or NGO vest may compromise the respondent's safety. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm | |
| Slide 22: Carrying out successive evaluations on the same population generates fatigue and frustration among the respondents, especially if expectations are not managed. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm. | |
| Slide 23: In some contexts, the police, military, or local or de facto authorities may view the subject on which data and information is to be collected as sensitive. For example, if enumerators are found to be collecting information on a topic that is considered sensitive, their security could be compromised. Or it could trigger the suspension of other humanitarian activities in that area by other organizations. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm. | |
| Slide 24: In some contexts, the publication of a report may cause a reaction from the authorities, if the investigation touches on a sensitive issue. As a consequence, the authorities could impede the activities of humanitarian organizations. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm | |
| Slide 25: Collecting information that may be later requested by authorities and used against the interest of the people. For example, asking people about their immigration status together with Personally Identifiable Information (e.g., Name, Phone number, profession, nationality, address…) As a consequence, the authorities could use that information to deport some people. Use the chat or the mic to give an example and tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm. | |
| Slide 26: Sensitive data should not be made publicly available in detail, including personal data and other sensitive data such as the number of unaccompanied minors or female-headed households broken down by location. *Note: Personal data includes* ***any information that can be used to identify an individual*** *and very little information is needed to do so. For example, if certain basic combinations are used, such as gender and a physical characteristic (a scar, eye or hair color), or date of birth and country of origin, or employment and name, one can easily identify a person.* The colleagues designing the data collection should work closely with protection and with context experts to determine what information can be considered “sensitive” in the contexts in which they work.Give us an example for your experience. | |
| Slide 27: When writing a report, authors must take responsibility not only for what they write, but also for what the public might understand and how that information might be manipulated under the original UN or NGO logo. For example, a report that includes a very small convenience sample of cases or that only takes into account the small areas that have been accessible could, despite including a warning that the conclusions are not generalizable, mislead the readers and offer a distorted image of a situation. Use the chat or the mic to tell us how to mitigate the risk of harm | |
| Slide 28: so, in summary, HOW do we Do No Harm when collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data? *Thinking before doing can go a long way in preventing harm and helping people.* | |
| Slide 29: and always remember the golden rule: *The interest and well-being of all the people involved must prevail over the objective of the information management process.*  Before initiating any information management activity, humanitarian actors should determine the types and levels of risk that various stakeholders might face – for example, survey respondents, enumerators, experts in information management, organizations, communities, and third-party organizations—during the different stages of the information management process. | |
| Slide 30: Let us see how in practice we do this: Avoiding questions that may expose people to risk . *Data and information activities must include a risk assessment and take steps, if necessary, to mitigate identified risks.* ***The risk assessment must look at negative consequences*** *that may result from data collection and subsequent actions or service delivery for as long as the data and information activity is carried out.* | |
| Slide 31: We have one easy and convenient tool to do that, called the DTM DO No Harm Checklist, this the table in the slide. For each question that we want to include in a questionnaire we must ask ourselves: can this question do harm To Enumerators, Respondents, Communities or to the organization itself? These are the groups on the left column. And can this question or the resulting data do harm when we collect them, when we store then, when we share them or when we analyze them? This is the row on top.  Let us use the DTM Do No Harm Checklist for our practice! Consider the following examples from the field and identify who we expose to risk of harm and when.   1. Example 1: We are interviewing individuals on the move, going through a border, and we ask questions about violence they may have experienced. Some of the survivors of violent attacks relive their violent experiences without any possibility to receive help at that moment or in the near future.   We also ask questions about trafficking to people that are moving through a border area, and some people are in the process of being trafficked. In addition, their traffickers are with them. The traffickers become suspicious, seeing that some people are approached by our enumerators and asked such questions, while others are not. The traffickers start wondering why we approached those specific individuals. Did these persons say anything? Did they ask for help in some way? The traffickers decide that the people we interview should be punished to give an example to others Not to talk!  *In these examples, who would you say that we are exposing to harm? and at which step of the Information Management process? Are we putting the enumerators at risk of harm? Or the respondents? Or the communities? Or the organization? And are we doing this because of data collection? Or because of data storage? Or because of data analysis? Or when we share data or reports?*   1. Example 2: we are asked to send information to the GBV working group about how many beneficiaries we have, and we share the file with 2 pages/sheets: one with aggregated numbers by age and sex, the second page with the entire list of beneficiaries, with names of each family, locations, and what support they received. That information was not needed by the Working Group, we just forgot to only send the aggregate number… we were tired, and we made a mistake. Also, the excel file was not password-protected and the IMO of the Working Group shared it further with other organizations, without realizing that there was a list on the second page. The list then got in the wrong hands and some of the beneficiaries were shamed, ostracized, and threatened with more violence.   *In this example, who would you say that we are exposing to harm? and at which step of the Information Management process? Are we putting the enumerators at risk of harm? Or the respondents? Or the communities? Or the organization? And are we doing this because of data collection? Or because of data storage? Or because of data analysis? Or when we share data or reports?*   1. Example 3: While working in a country invaded by a western army, we hired a number of local staff for our humanitarian activities. They work keeping a low profile and keep their link with us a secret from most people. This is because the other warrying party considers as traitors anybody who works with western aid organizations. As we cross a checkpoint, our laptops get taken. The personal details of our local colleagues are on the laptops. The files are not encrypted and one of the laptops was not password protected. This will lead to threats and violence towards our local colleagues, who may be forced to flee their homes.   *In this example, who would you say that we are exposing to harm? and at which step of the Information Management process? Are we putting the enumerators at risk of harm? Or the respondents? Or the communities? Or the organization? And are we doing this because of data collection? Or because of data storage? Or because of data analysis? Or when we share data or reports?*   1. Example 4: We have conducted a rapid assessment in a country, to identify the main sectors of need in each location. We asked if people need protection support, but the respondents did not understand what we meant by “protection”, so nobody answered that their community was facing protection risks, even if displacement, family separation, GBV, violence and evictions were rampant. Our analysis did not consider this and simply listed the responses of each community. Donors saw that protection activities were not among the top needs, and decided to reduce finding for protection, GBV and CP.   *In this example, who would you say that we are exposing to harm? and at which step of the Information Management process? Are we putting the enumerators at risk of harm? Or the respondents? Or the communities? Or the organization? And are we doing this because of data collection? Or because of data storage? Or because of data analysis? Or when we share data or reports?* | |
| Slide 32: What do we do if the question puts them at risk? We change question and reassess! Over and over again, until we have questions that give us the info we need without putting people in danger. | |
| Slide 33: Another way to do no harm is Explaining to respondents how their data will be used/published/shared, and asking for consent. | |
| Slide 34: Remember that: Ask the respondent permission to share their data with **SPECIFIC ACTORS** (no blanket consent), If you did not ask, **DO NOT SHARE** - Aggregate results, so that people or locations cannot be identified, Share information **CONFIDENTIALLY** (IOM Data Access Requests) only with actors who will act for the benefit of the assessed communities, Remember that people are **DATA OWNERS**: as you own your personal data, so do all people. People are the **ULTIMATE JUDGES** of the risk they may face when their data is shared. | |
| Slide 35: Another way to do no harm is Conducting a data-sharing risk analysis (which data can be shared with who and how) | |
| Slide 36: – Remember we can do harm, put people at risk when we manage, use and share data without safeguards, but also if we do not share / use our data. For example, people who need support may not receive it. Aid will be delayed, people will die. A good tool for Data Sharing specifically is the Framework for Data Sharing in Practice, developed in an interagency effort organized by PIM and OCHA. The framework includes some practical suggestions on what to do and how to do it. In particular:   * Define the purpose and potential outcomes of the data sharing exercise * Articulate reasons to share * Work with stakeholders within the context of a trust framework (professional competence) * Understand skills and capacities of who we share with to safely manage data * Understand the nature of the data being shared from a data protection perspective (can this put people in danger?) * Assess current and potential future context * Review data collection processes & informed consent * Establish data sharing arrangements and processes * Ensure responders have the information they need. If they do not have the info, they will not search for available data, but rather ask for another exercise to collect data you already have collected. | |
| Slide 37: Another way to reduce the risk of harm is to use secondary data, before collecting primary data. Secondary data should be reviewed and analyzed before considering potentially repetitive **primary data collection** activities. **Primary data is not in itself better than secondary data**.  **\*Primary Data:** Data collected by the organization/researcher undertaking an information management activity to directly address the set objectives and research questions  **\*Secondary Data:** These are not “low quality” data. Secondary data is data that is collected for another research project or to study a different research topic.  Safe data sharing contributes to reducing the need for primary data collection, and therefore the risk of doing harm by using secondary data, already available, for quicker response, fewer risk for enumerators and respondents in the field. | |
| Slide 38: Starting from Use and Information needs, not from question also reduces the risk of harm. This also ensures the link between the use of the information and the data we collect, and therefore increases use of data. | |
| Slide 39: In order to ensure we always keep the link between the use of an information and the data we collect, we walk backwards, starting not from the questions in a questionnaire, but rather from the use, the decisions to be made, and then we look at the information needed to make such decisions, that the data users do not have. Only at that point we consider the right method and source of the data and design the questions for the questionnaire. [Click when mentioning each step] | |
| Slide 40: You can find more info on this video | |
| Slide 41: Let us see what it means to walk backwards. As you remember from a previous session, there are three types of decisions we make in our work: strategic, programmatic and operational. Let us take for example one of the most common STRATEGIC DECISIONS: Where should we work? What areas should we prioritize for our response? | |
| Slide 42: Once we identify the decision we need to make, THEN we identify what information we need but do not have to make those decisions. What information do I need in order to decide what areas GBV response will prioritize? This can be difficult, as I cannot prioritize locations based on number of reported incidents (do we all agree on that?). So how can I do it? [ask participants for ideas]: Use the chat or mic to suggest what information we need. [Click after some participants have provided some ideas]  We can consider risk: For example, I need to know Factors that increase the risk of GBV and GBV incidents. And where these factors are present, in what locations. These will be the locations to prioritize, as their risk is higher. | |
| Slide 43: When I know the information I need, I can look at what is the most appropriate method and source to collect that information. In our example, we will find the most appropriate method and source to identify factors of risk. [ask participants for ideas]: Use the chat or mic to suggest what method and source we can use. [Click after some participants have provided some ideas]. A good method to get factors that impact risks in a specific context is **GBV colleagues conduct EXPERT INTERVIEWS** with NGOs specialized on GBV and CP, Social workers, Health workers and GBV staff in the field. Alternatively, if we have more time, GBV colleagues could also conduct Focus Group Discussions with women, girls and boys.  And then what method and source is most appropriate to identify in what locations these factors are present? (Second information we need). [ask participants for ideas]: Use the chat or mic to suggest what method and source we can use. [Click after some participants have provided some ideas]. For this, we can use Key Informants Interviews with non-specialized key informants) as we are not asking anything specific to GBV. Enumerators conduct Key Informant Interviews in all locations to identify in which locations these factors and actors are present. This method is often used by DTM and called Village assessment, site assessment, MSLA. | |
| Slide 44: ON this slide You can see some examples of Factors increasing GBV risk, proxy indicators for risk. As you see, none of them mentions GBV directly, and they all relate to other sectors (WASH, Shelter, Health…) these and more are in the DTM Field Companions, that you find in the DTM&Partners toolkit, at the link on the slide. | |
| Slide 45: What do we do once we have the results of these questions for all locations? We analyze the information, mapping all the locations that present risk factors, and identify what locations or areas have higher risks and should be prioritized for GBV intervention | |
| Slide 46: Another important way of reducing harm, by collecting the data we need and not data we will not sue is to make an Analysis Plan before starting data collection. Remember that you would never start building a house without knowing what the end result will look like. | |
| Slide 47: Mock-ups help save money, time and get the data you need. Check the mock up to see if the data is indeed what you need for your decision-making. If it is not, change the questions and re-check. Only at that point we can start collecting data | |
| Slide 48: Let us now look at other ways to mainstream protection principles: they are all related to the Data Responsibility principle of “Transparency”. 1)Accompany the data and reports with a detailed and transparent methodology document/ chapter and 2) Sharing the questionnaire with the datasets and report so that the user does not misunderstand our data and does harm. A transparent and detailed methodology and the questionnaire are the keys to understanding the data. | |
| Slide 49: Why should we share the methodology? Because data have no way of speaking for themselves, we speak for them. We imbue them with meaning. Consider when you read an article or a study: they tell you something that affects your life: for example, that stopping to smoke or exercising 2 hours each day or avoiding eating meat will help you live 35% longer and reduce your risk of respiratory and heart problems of 50%. Don’t you want to know how the study was done, before you stop smoking, become vegetarian or sign up to the gym?  A methodology that is transparent and detailed helps the users understand what the results mean, and guides them to use the information correctly, and avoid doing harm by misunderstanding the real meaning of the data. This is true for Data Collection and also for Analysis. In your reports, you must provide the rationale of how the analysis was done. On what basis you are giving this information.  Why share the questionnaire? Simply, if the data user does not know the exact questions that were asked, they cannot really make the data speak. They will be confused about the answers and may give them the wrong meaning. This has a high potential to lead to harm: missed opportunities to support, providing the wrong support, not going to work in the places where need is the highest, supporting some groups rather than those with fewer resources. An example from experience: forgetting to explain how data on protection cases were obtained, created the false understanding in donors that Protection was not a problem in a country, and therefore no additional funding was given for protection. | |
| Slide 50: You can find the checklist on what to include in datasets and reports on the DTM&Partners toolkit online. | |
| Slide 51: We have seen how to implement in practice the Do No Harm principle. Let us now look at How we can “Ensure people’s access to assistance without discrimination” when collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data & analysis. | |
| Slide 52: The first way to do that is by “collecting data through the appropriate method and source”. Why is this important? We obtain a complete picture, where all the groups have had the opportunity to voice their needs, priorities and resources only when we use appropriate methods and ask the appropriate source. As shown in the data house, methods and sources are complementary and necessary to obtain an understanding of the situation, as different methods and sources will be useful for different types of information. We need many bricks to build the data house. Data collectors should Use methods and sources appropriate to the type of information needed; Data Users should Use data from appropriate method and source to understand the needs of all groups | |
| Slide 53: A second way to Ensure people’s access to assistance according to need and without discrimination when working with data and analysis is using the right languages. We must listen to all groups, not just the majority or the ones with more education and power: we have to plan for people of non-mainstream language have the opportunity to share their need. Using only the main language will include a bias in the data collected as only people who speak those language will answer the questions and have a voice. The other groups, often coinciding with minorities and being more vulnerable, will not have a voice.  This means for example that one of those «INTERSECTORAL» info that all actors need are *the languages understood and spoken in each community*. DTM worked with Translators without Borders (Now *Clearglobal*) and the DTM field companion now has examples of how to collect info on the used language. Translators without Boarders (TwB) have a number of datasets on spoken languages at admin level 2 (district) and language maps that can be useful to design questionnaires about languages. TwB and DTM identified more than 10 Primary Languages only in North East Nigeria and 12 in Ethiopia… only considering main languages! | |
| Slide 54: As it is crucial to learn to use the right methods and sources for each type inf information, let us look at two methods/sources, commonly used in humanitarian assessments. First, Interviews with Key Informant. When we talk about KII, we mean people who are informed about the community, but who are not sectoral experts. This is the method and source often used by the DTM Multi-Sectoral Location Assessment (MSLA). Let us start with what KII cannot collect. Here are some examples of what cannot be collected through KII: Prevalence data on protection incidents /issues (How many incidents? How many children are married? How many persons with disabilities), Dynamics of protection risks = Use Qualitative information from experts, or FGD, What Groups are most at risk = Use Qualitative information from experts, or FGD, What Factors increase and reduce risks = Use Qualitative information from experts, FGD, Quality, access and appropriateness of protection and Healthcare Services = Use Qualitative information from sectoral experts, or FGD. Remember that the key is to always Think of who you are asking: their knowledge, their interests and their concerns! | |
| Slide 55: What are some examples of information that be collected through KII who are not sectoral experts?  **Presence of Groups most at risk by location (estimates)**:  IDP numbers, IDP % over local population, Sex and Age estimates  **Presence of factors increasing or reducing risks by location:** Presence of security actor, Land ownership and eviction threats, Obstacles to personal identification documents, Infrastructure: lights on paths, locks on doors, separate latrines, Presence of fighting, armed groups, and Explosive Ordnance (EOs-for example, Mines or cluster munitions)  **Availability of protection, healthcare and other types of services** (not the quality or the use but the existence) | |
| Slide 56: Let us now consider the other commonly used method = Interviews with Households: These are interviews with one person in the Household, often with other people present, who is answering on behalf of the whole household, using a closed questionnaire. This is often conducted on a random sample and resulting percentages may be generalizable to the entire population (e.g., MSNA). What are some examples of information that cannot be collected through interviews with HH? You cannot collect: Information that are part of a specific discipline or expertise, for example the legal framework on a country, Prevalence data of violence (How many GBV incidents? E.g., It will exclude those in the family), Dynamics of protection risks. As said before, such questions can even put some people at higher risks = Use Qualitative information from experts, or FGD. **Let us remember that we cannot collect prevalence data on violence: Think of who you are asking: their knowledge, their interests and their concerns!** | |
| Slide 57: However, you can collect useful info with HH-level and individual level interviews, for example: Signs of stress in family members or children, Food insecurity, poverty, Sex and Age and Disability Disaggregated Data, Intentions (destination, returns…), Use, Access, Awareness and quality of goods and services by group, Barriers to freedom of movement, Reasons for movement/displacement, Coping mechanism (positive and negative) | |
| Slide 58: Let us now play a small quiz: Use the chat to tell us: If you need to know where girls or boys feel unsafe, or main concerns of a specific group, what method would you use? And WHY? *Household structured Interviews? Focus Group Discussions? Non-Specialized Key Informants interviews? Observation by DTM enumerators?*  Can you collect it through asking three non-specialist key informants per location? Will a man be able to tell you where girls and women feel unsafe? Would a woman member of the ethnic majority be able to tell you about the concerns and difficulties of the minority group?  Would the observation by enumerators, who are in the location for a limited time be able to provide the same information?  Would interviews with Households, where respondents are usually the Head of Household, or other members speaking in front of the rest of HH, be able to tell you about domestic violence?  Likely not. This is why you could use here FGD, which are semi-structured discussions with specific groups-separately from other groups, not simply a group of people from the community. For example, women alone, children alone, elderly alone,…  This is because a group, for example, Women, may not speak in front of men /other group as much as they would when they are amongst other women.  Using the wrong method and source, as in the examples above, will result in misleading data, that will not be able to provide necessary support, thus doing harm. Using some methods, like HH interviews to ask questions related to domestic violence, can actually cause harm to the victims of violence, if perpetrators become suspicious of the reasons behind the questions. | |
| Slide 59: Another quiz for you: How do we collect Prevalence Data on Incidents of Violence? For example, if we want to know How many people have been victims/survivors of protection, CP, GBV incidents, have experienced violence in a place/country in a specific period of time? What method and source do we use? Key Informants interviews (non-protection experts)? Experts Interviews and service providers personnel (protection, GBV, CP…)? Official government statistics & Police records? Case Management Data from GBV, CP and Protection actors? Interviews with Household representatives? Interviews with individuals (specifically with women and children)? …. others?  You probably noticed that we indicated that both Interviews with KI, with HH or Individuals cannot provide prevalence data for violence. UASC may be possible to collect, incidents of Child Marriage may also be carefully collected, but how many children, women or men have been raped, maltreated, trafficked, involved in hard labor... and other such information are not going to be collected in most of the contexts where we work, regardless of the method and source used.  The reason is that these phenomena are hidden, taboo and crimes: the people interviewed will not be able to answer honestly or openly or with precise information because they either do not know or do not dare to respond. So even if we consider the police records or the cases of service providers, we can only know the number of cases that were reported, which are far fewer than the actual cases. If we communicate reported cases and donors interpret them as prevalence, we can also contribute to lower funding for protection programs. | |
| Slide 60: The good news is that the usefulness of this type of data - prevalence data - is deeply overestimated:  We do not need to know how many cases of violence there are in a community to decide to open a service to help survivors. There is an agreement in the humanitarian community, written in the 2015 Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Gender-Based Violence (GBV), which states this, saying: “all humanitarian personnel ought to assume GBV is occurring and threatening affected populations; treat it as a serious and life-threatening problem; and **take actions based on sector recommendations in these Guidelines, regardless of the presence or absence of concrete ‘evidence**’.” So, let's learn to program, work and survive without prevalence data, and collect the data we really need.  Think of what you want to decide and consider whether or not you need to know the total number of incidents: you will quickly find out that you don’t. You need other types of information for your decisions on where to work, what do and how to implement. Don’t you?  For example, we can use Focus Groups and interviews with experts to understand common patterns of protection incidents, which groups are most at risk for each type of violence, and which elements increase or decrease the risk of violence for each group.  As another example, the number of reported cases can help us estimate how many social workers we need to hire and how much money we need. However, these are NOT prevalence data: they are reported cases, a much smaller sub-set of the actual incidents. | |
| Slide 61: remember: When we do not use the appropriate method and source, we risk DOING HARM! We collect the wrong information; we miss crucial needs of specific groups, and we will likely do harm in our response. | |
| Slide 62: We saw some examples of methods and information they can and cannot collect, but there is much more. A simple tool that can help in identifying the appropriate method and source is this two-pager, on the DTM&Partners toolkit, available online at the link on the slide, as well as a video on methods and sources linked in the Resources folder to this session. | |
| Slide 63: You will find more information in this short video Sources and methods for Primary Data Collection | |
| Slide 64: We said that we work together, identify information needs and then methods and sources to get the information. There is a simple tool in the DTM and Partners toolbox that helps Data providers (IM or DTM) and Data Users (those who respond to the needs of people) work together. You see on the slide an image of the tool called "Map information needs and methods". How do we use it? Information Management colleagues ask protection colleagues what information they need and for what purpose (do you remember? We have just talked about the purpose defined for each piece of information). So, we write them in the first columns (Decisions or use and Information Needs). Then, the Information Management colleagues explain which methods and sources they can use for each information and color the corresponding cells. This tool helps colleagues from Information Management to understand what information they can collect with their exercise and helps colleagues from Protection to know what information they have to find in another way or from other sources. | |
| Slide 65: We say how to do no harm and ensure access, now let us look at How we “Assist People to Recover” when collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data & analysis. | |
| Slide 66: We are not all protection specialists, but we all need to have minimum understanding of what a protection risk (defined as effects of *threatened or actual violence, coercion or deliberate deprivation. Work with data and information with the purpose of taking action! (whether you if you have the expertise or referring to other sectoral colleagues, internal or external). There are three main things we can do:*  Collecting the necessary data, analyzing data and using them for action (*to assist people recover*…), identify and share Data for urgent action – set up a system with DTM or other collector, so that urgent action data are sent to PROTECION (or other sectors/colleagues in IOM) for IMMEDIATE ACTION, Train our enumerators on safely respond to any Incidents Disclosure they may receive. We all have a responsibility to act SAFELY: *Limitations and specific role of enumerators, non-Protection specialists, Essential role of Protection colleagues in ensuring the services are accessible and that there is a referral mechanism, Essential role of Protection colleagues in enabling the enumerators to appropriately refer cases to protection specialists and services.* There is also a specific session on this in this training series “Safely Managing Incidents Disclosures in IM activities” | |
| Slide 67: More information on how to safely respond to a Disclosure of a GBV Incident in this video. | |
| Slide 68: And finally, the fourth principle of protection mainstreaming: How do we “Help people claim their rights” when collecting, storing, analyzing, sharing and using data & analysis?  We conduct ourselves and design our interventions with a view to not only address needs and fill in / substitute, but at the same time work with / support / empower people and communities, agency, supporting people in accessing and claiming their rights. In data & analysis, Data Responsibility principle of People-Centered and Inclusive, involving affected people and communities throughout the process of data and IM. | |
| Slide 69: We are providing here an excellent example of how an NGO implements this in practice in their IM and analysis work. This NGO is called WeWorld and the approach they use is called CPA (Community Protection Approach) | |
| Slide 70: In their protection interventions, they start with Gathering evidence, but they do it Placing People at the Centre: they collect Quantitative and qualitative data and triangulate, then BRING back data to communities to verify the information, and Periodically monitor changes with the community. | |
| Slide 71: They work with community’s groups to understand with them what the obtained information means to them. | |
| Slide 72: We World then reflects back with communities on how they face the main needs and risks, and what actions they suggest to address these risks and needs | |
| Slide 73: And finally, at the end of each cycle of analysis and planning, the communities become **owners of their own process and outcomes,** as they have control of the data, information, planned and implemented activities: Analysis Reports are printed and given to the communities – in the right language(s). When a new actor approaches the community for assessments, the community is able to show them the analysis and explain the actions needed. No need for another assessment. | |
| Slide 74: You can watch this video to see an example of how this worked in Palestine: To download: http://cpainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Jinan-Sarsour-1.m4v?\_=1 | |

## Part 3: Conclusion, questions and discussion

|  |
| --- |
| Slide 75: Let us now summarize the main points before we open to questions and discussion.   1. Avoiding questions that may expose people to risk 2. Explaining to respondents how their data will be used/published/shared, and asking for consent 3. Conducting a data-sharing risk analysis (which data can be shared with who and how) 4. Starting from Use and Information needs, not from question (DEFINED PURPOSE for each question) 5. Accompanying the data and reports with a detailed and transparent methodology chapter & Sharing the questionnaire together with the datasets / report to reduce the likelihood of the user doing harm 6. Help people claim their rights (verify analysis, plan response with communities, give them back their action plans) 7. Know what LANGUAGES people speak 8. COLLECT data using the appropriate method and source to identify the real needs of all groups in need 9. Use available data for analysis and respond 10. Ensure SAFE FOLLOW UP to incidents disclosures |
| Slide 76: Did we reach our Objectives? Check with participants if, at the end of this module, they feel able to:   * Briefly explain how to adapt and Implement modalities to mainstream protection principles in IOM data and Analysis activities * Guide your IM colleagues on how to mainstream protection principles in data and Analysis Activities |
| Slide 77: And remember, mainstreaming protection principles in your work is your role! |
| Slide 78: Take questions from the group, encourage discussion and answers from the participants before giving an answer. |
| Slide 79: contact details [include those of the facilitators] |
| Slide 80: Resources available for you |
| Slide 81: Now, it is reflection time: Provide your feedback in the **EVALUATION** and do the knowledge test |
| Slide 82: Goodbye, see you at the next webinar, on XXX, on this date (XXX) |