



## Protection Working Group Retreat 20 February 2019

### Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Following introductions, the UNHCR Assistant Representative (Protection) opened the meeting indicating that the Protection Working Group retreat presents an opportunity to look at the protection priorities for 2019 and forward, as well as the latest developments.

#### **INTRODUCTORY REMARKS** by UNHCR's Assistant Representative (Protection)

- Funding for the Protection sector remains a big concern, although it is considered good compared to other sectors. Therefore, it is important to reinforce collaboration with other sectors, specifically the development sectors.
- Efforts continue to integrate protection elements within other sectors, such as in the formulation of the desk formula which was one of the issues that UNHCR was able to achieve last year.
- UNHCR is in the middle of the 2020 country operational planning exercise, which is an opportunity – not only for protection, but also for other sectors – to discuss the main issues such as:
  - Registration activities (needed in term of targeting and knowing who receives services)
  - Desk formula for cash assistance
  - Working with PwSN such as children, women, and older persons.
- The main focus must be on continuously questioning the way of providing support and its impact on people's life, and on trying to demonstrate as much as possible the impact of protection activities.
- Other UNHCR highlights:
  - The importance of accountability mechanisms: There are studies about dignity in humanitarian assistance that are available for anyone.
  - Communication with refugees: Refugees usually don't know the changes in the situation, and that's why it's important to communicate with them about their Protection needs and the linkages with other sectors i.e. HLP as Protection issue, and what support shelter sector can provide
  - Do no harm: i.e. sometimes supporting refugees with cash for rent is for good potential but has a negative result on increasing the rental costs.
- Strategic direction for this year is similar to last year, to ensure dignity of people, monitor social tensions, inter-sector linkages and environmental activities, and their effects on Social Stability.
- Case management for children: there is a lot of work and effort in this domain and a big load of cases (only half of the children were targeted last year) which is becoming alarming as it means increased burnout and staff turnover, therefore a strategic planning have to be made in response to this issue
- Solutions: there is a need to look beyond the traditional way of solutions especially that the resettlement is becoming more restrictive with a lessened quota and try to identify the activities that involve the community and has a positive impact not only on refugees but also on the host community.
- Return: since 2017, the authorities have become more involved in organizing return activities, and increased return have been seen last year but the figures of returns still challenging as UNHCR is not facilitating the process, but respect the decision of refugees and accompany them as much as possible in a way not to be perceived as facilitating the process. The discussion of IA return plan started this year because important to be prepared in case more returns will occur.



## 2018 Protection Sector achievements

Brief overview of 2018 key achievements on the following priorities:

Protection mainstreaming: development of an action plan, presentation of Basic Assistance sector coordinator who explained how the sector mainstreamed protection during 2019 LCRP revision through doing a protection risk assessment at national level for the Basic Assistance sector, and a field-level assessment will be done and compiled in a one-month period. Some commitments were made in LCRP and were ranged from activities to outputs (looking at the most economically vulnerable including other vulnerabilities such as protection) and outcomes (M&E and looking at protection impact of the BA intervention).

Eviction: issuance of the national eviction guidance note, as well issuance of PWG recommendation on eviction individual cases.

Inter-Agency referral tracking system: the system allowed field PWG as well as other sectors to look at the response level to referral and to identify any bottleneck.

## INFORMAL DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE HUMANITARIAN/RESIDENT COORDINATOR AND SECTOR PARTNERS

An informal Q&A and discussion took place between the Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator and Protection sector partners, following the introductory notes of UNHCR's Assistant Representative and the Basic Assistance sector coordinator.

### Discussion notes:

- Overview of the Lebanese context: Never forget the context of being in the ninth year in the crisis, in a country hosting refugees in a ratio of 1 to 4 compared to the Lebanese population. Lebanon is a country with many challenges that need to be dealt with in empathy, as these challenges are affecting both host community and refugees.
- The discourse of the return will continue and it is very important to address misperceptions, because there is a hidden anxiety that the humanitarian community is preventing return, although this is not factual and the humanitarian community is respectful to the choice of refugees and the decision of the host country. Some people decided to return despite the prevailing conditions in Syria, but others have decided to stay in the host country despite the miserable conditions because they still do not trust that the conditions in Syria are suitable for return.
- Inter-sector linkages: the mentioned priorities are not only important for the Protection sector but must be for everyone and have an integrated approach. LCRP still very much humanitarian response while if talking about inclusion and social stability, we need to think how the humanitarian community contribute in the broader agenda.
- Communication, advocacy and data:
  - Be careful about how best to talk with communities and refugees, because the language used can mean everything or nothing. Anyone must be able to clearly understand.
  - Confidentiality is a means of supporting a goal and not an objective by itself. When talking about trends and data (without providing names), there is no reason to keep them confidential because collecting data without using it is causing more harm. Partners are requested to share data and of course respecting the identity of people
- Be aware of the environment and the sensitivity of issues, for example the number of unregistered children, which can cause concern, especially if shared with media without being explained.



## Protection Working Group 2019 Prioritization

### Group Discussion

#### 1. Protection mainstreaming

##### OBJECTIVES

- Review of protection mainstreaming commitments for the Protection Sector in LCRP 2019
- Discussion around key achievements, challenges and suggested recommendations moving forward
- Feedback to the group on concrete actions underway to mainstream protection within coordination structure through the Inter-Sector Road Map, and through the delivery of three Training of Trainers.

**Table: Summary of key achievements, challenges and suggested recommendations**

Protection commitment	Progress Made	Gaps/Challenges	Suggested Progress Areas
<p><b>Protection Analysis</b> needs to be strengthened and understanding of age, gender, diversity / inclusion</p> <p><b>Inclusion</b> (older persons + PWDs) during evictions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RIMS is being used for referral and collection of data for informed decision-making</li> <li>• Protection Information Management is on-going</li> <li>• Protection monitoring tools under-review</li> <li>• HI to provide capacity building on inclusion</li> <li>• WRF specifically support people with hearing and visual impairments</li> <li>• HI planning trainings on inclusion for NNGO/INGO staff</li> <li>• Many NGOs started to incorporate WGQ into their assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No AGD segregation of data during emergency responses (specifically in rapid assessments)</li> <li>• Protection assessments tools are not AGD segregated - there needs to be standardized protection indicators for collection</li> <li>• Information sharing of the protection analysis isn't good (either no data sharing or lack of trust in data related to lack of transparency in data collection, lack of standardized way &amp; tools to collect data for example VaSYR not aligned to WGQ.</li> <li>• Lack of local organisation engagement in coordination</li> <li>• Lack of trainings and knowledge on specific inclusion topics and reaching individuals</li> <li>• Lack of common understanding on what inclusion is, low numbers of staff trained on specific inclusion topics.</li> <li>• Lack of standardized tools for identification of PWDs</li> <li>• lack of sector engagement &amp; knowledge on how to design inclusive response plans</li> <li>• Lack of accessibility in all NGOs community centers / schools /</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Minimum standards on protection mainstreaming with focus on inclusion and AAP</b></li> <li>• <b>Localization</b> needs to revisit localization assessment conducted in 2018, and consult with NNGO/NNGO forum on needs of NNGO. <b>To improve local NGO leadership and engagement</b> within the protection sector</li> <li>• <b>Donor advocacy</b> – adapt the project proposal checklist on PM.</li> <li>• <b>Standardization of protection &amp; non-protection assessment tools</b> in terms of data captured on protection including AGD. <b>ie, include WGQ in VASYR</b></li> <li>• Ensure <b>sector log frames / AI reporting is disaggregated by AGD</b> and different types of disability</li> </ul>



<b>Accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complaint &amp; feedback mechanisms (CFM) through hotlines, Satisfaction forms Focus Group Discussions, Pre-post tools, Complaint boxes</li> <li>Staffs deployed for complaints per type (DRC) - <i>If something related to programs</i> - M&amp;E gives recommendations</li> <li>Post Distribution monitoring Home visits teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General absence / poor quality of CFM in NNGO/INGO reported</li> <li>Lack of inclusivity of CFM channels</li> <li>CFM set-up has responsibility at senior level in organisation</li> <li>Donor regulations can prohibit ensuring a full participation &amp; empowerment approach</li> <li>Lack of awareness of humanitarian staff as to what a participatory approach looks like in practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to <b>improve / support partners to establish or strengthen current CFM.</b> <i>(possible development of a guidance, and/or specific training package)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Referral</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion of RIMS</li> <li>Training of staffs on referrals (DRC, SHIELD, HI, IRC, Save, INTERSOS, TDH)</li> <li>Caritas training of GSO staffs on safe identification and referral</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referral pathways are not clear, updated or periodically shared</li> <li>Service mapping &amp; referral pathways not updated regularly and not shared regularly</li> <li>Training of safe identification &amp; referral methodology isn't sufficient, on-the-job coaching is needed</li> <li>lack of accountability at organizational level for feedback and follow up on referrals</li> <li>lack of community awareness on services &amp; poor self-referral capacities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Explore options to move beyond training of safe identification &amp; referral</b> to opportunities for local NGO mentorship or coaching and/or other methods for follow up</li> <li>Explore ways to ensure <b>greater predictability in updating referral pathway and service mapping</b> &amp; ensure comprehensive coverage of local service providers</li> </ul>

### NEXT STEPS

- To review the suggested protection mainstreaming recommendations with the protection core group in order to develop and incorporate priority activities into the protection sector action plan;
- Complete protection mainstreaming action plan by 15 April
- To discuss division of responsibilities with the protection core group

### EXPECTATIONS

- Humanity and Inclusion – Commitment to ensure better access of persons with disabilities to WASH, shelter and other responses. After Istanbul 2016 summit, all UN agencies and coordination bodies endorsed a chapter on inclusion of PWDs in humanitarian response, mainly about non-discrimination, inclusion policies and equality.
- PU- AMI – Two non-protection projects/initiatives have started by training staff from different departments to identify and refer cases. Plans to allocate some quota for protection cases.
- JRS – Internal plan to recruit protection staff. Need to understand how to maximize the impact of referrals to protection services and the main principles and integration into the projects (education and MHPSS). Understand better protection mainstreaming and its relation to the host communities, and have a referral pathway and a tracking system.
- SHEILD – Building internal capacities to understand how to improve the interventions under WFP, Livelihoods.



- Dorcas – Basic needs, social stability and protection projects. Plan to increase capacities of staff and enhance and capacitate their local partner CBOs.
- DRC – Deliver trainings on inclusion of PWSNs and protection mainstreaming.
- INTERSOS – As a multi-sectoral agency, there is a need to mainstream protection across different non-protection projects and to strengthen interventions and initiatives that started in 2018.

## 2. Linkages between subsectors

### OBJECTIVES

- An effort to bring together SGBV/CP/legal and other protection actors together and to strengthen linkages between the sectorial works
- Discussion of pre-defined thematic issues that are of common interest to all the sub-sectors:
  - Child labour
  - Child marriage
  - PWSN
  - Civil documentation and Legal residency

### DISCUSSION POINTS

- How to reinforce existing referral pathways – field teams to be better equipped, make sure to do a proper referral
- Training and sensitization activities amongst the various sub-sectors either for improved referral or field teams have an understanding and focus on advocacy efforts and improve information sharing between the various sub-sectors
- Protection monitoring: specific issues, such as child marriage and child labour and needs of PWSN, could be better reflected in protection monitoring, and thus collectively benefit from improved protection analysis.

### ACTION POINTS

- Create a Joint TF (with mixed membership of Child Protection, SGBV, Legal and other Protection actors) to take this initiative forward: mix of developing and reviewing training material, organizing joint materials and activities.
- Monitor if this commitment have an impact i.e. the numbers of referrals and assistance provided
- Deadline for legal partners to volunteer to the TF is set on Friday 22 Feb (4 spots available for protection - to initiate the discussion in mid-march (PWSN and legal)

## 3. Protection Trends Analysis

### OBJECTIVES OF THE GROUP SESSIONS

- Discuss the need for and purpose of protection trends analysis
- Identify current gaps in terms of protection trends analysis
- Define key protection indicators reported to and by the PWG

### OVERALL COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS

- The availability of protection trends for the other sectors is instrumental for the humanitarian response;
- LCRP could have been stronger if protection risks and threats were more evidence-based;



- This protection trends analysis could inform the VASyR workshop to ensure adjustments in terms of topics to be looked at;
- Summary of the trends from the Participatory assessment and VASyR are very informative; however, as VASyR and Participatory Assessments are done on a yearly basis, we need to ensure that developments are captured in the meantime;
- Much information is available, but the presentation/packaging/summary needs to be improved to facilitate common understanding and analysis;
- The objective is not to create a protection monitoring programme to be implemented by PWG members, but rather to standardize the collection and reporting of information on key indicators (to be defined), with the understanding that this information is already available to partners through their current activities.
- Close collaboration between the Social Stability and Protection working groups needs to continue and be improved.

### RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION PLAN

- **Enhance information-sharing** between sectors and agencies **by creating clear channels** for information-sharing to the Protection Working Group.
- Methodology of data collection should be harmonized by developing **clear guidance on definition of protection categories/ of the indicators**.
- Better linkages should be made between **PWG advocacy objectives and protection trends** which are monitored and presented.
- Indicators should be linked to the one included in the **PWG Logical Framework** to ensure funding and capacities.
- The situation and data available with regard to the **PRS and other nationalities should be mainstreamed** in any protection trends analysis and specific indicators for these categories should be developed.
- When selecting the indicators, we need to **define clearly the end goals** of these protection trends – *advocacy, response etc.*
- Circulate the list of suggested key indicators to partners to **identify what information could be provided and by who**.
- How do we link this list of indicators with what has been built in terms of **Information Management Platform for the PWG. Extract from ActivityInfo on a quarterly basis** protection trends according to the key indicators aiming at producing a small report;
- Ensure that protection trends are also **analyzed from a location lens and not only from the incident angle**;
- The PWG set integration priorities for 2019; some indicators should, therefore, ensure to **monitor trends related to child labour, early marriage and PwSN**.
- Developing protection trends at the national level **requires a lot of work and appropriate capacities. The Joint Working Group between social stability and protection was identified by participants as the right forum** to lead this initiative and conduct this type of analysis, as “joint analysis” is part of their ToRs.
  - ❖ A mapping of available data should be conducted as a requirement to better assess gaps, needs for methodology harmonization and frequency of analysis;
  - ❖ This Joint Working Group would be the forum for analyzing data; other experts could be part of the session to have a collective analysis of data;
  - ❖ The momentum for specific protection issues must be maintained and other sectors should be provided with relevant protection analysis;
  - ❖ The Joint Working Group should develop a clear action plan.



- It was highlighted that the Joint Working Group would currently not have the capacity to implement all these activities. Either external support should be sought, like for PRT Mainstreaming, or the objectives should be limited to what is realistically achievable by current Joint Working Group members: e.g. only to do the analysis corresponding to the key indicators selected.

## SUGGESTED KEY INDICATORS

- ⇒ **Evolution of restrictive measures:** *We need to ensure close collaboration with the social stability group on this topic to ensure common definitions for restrictive measures.*
  - **Curfews in place per area:** Different methodologies for this specific indicator between the different sectors. Social Stability conducts key informant interviews with mayors, cross-checked with protection data and VASyR data. It would be interesting to have data related to each municipality and not only at the regional level. It would also be important to share good practices related to curfews. (prioritized)
  - **ID confiscation:** This indicator needs to be better defined. Confiscation of IDs by landlords, shop owners, hospitals? It was also mentioned that this indicator might be too specific for the sector to collect information as this is at the individual level. (not prioritized)
  - **Vehicle confiscation:** Similarly, it was mentioned that this indicator might be too specific for the sector to collect information as this is at the individual level. (not prioritized)
  - **Closure of shops** (prioritized)
  - **Raids:** Increase, decrease, reasons. Data could be cross-checked with the ARK Survey. (prioritized)
  - **Taxes applied at the local level (municipality level)** (not prioritized)
  - **Humanitarian access restrictions:** At community and individual level. In terms of trends, it should only be reported at community level. Individuals deprived of access to humanitarian assistance will be addressed as a protection incident through case-level response. It would be interesting to link with the “Access Taskforce”. (prioritized, at community level)
  - **Collective evictions (number, type, # of affected individuals):** Protection categories between the different type of evictions should be clarified to ensure harmonized reporting of data. Individual evictions should be addressed through case management in so far possible. (prioritized, for collective evictions)
  - **Arrests** (within Lebanon & while trying to enter the territory). This will likely be challenging to report on, have access and avoid duplications. (probably not prioritized, but to be further discussed)
  - **Presence of and ‘restrictive interventions’ by non-state security groups** (prioritized)
- ⇒ **Movement dynamics:**<sup>1</sup>
  - The scope of this indicator needs to be refined. What do we include there (return? relocation? new entries? third country movements?)? Participants mentioned that all type of movements would be key; however, practical challenges were mentioned as a constraint in monitoring these trends, namely at the individual level. (not prioritized)
  - Key drivers of movements were, however, mentioned as key information for partners. This type of information could be collected through protection monitoring stakeholders. (prioritized, if better defined)

---

<sup>1</sup> Explore ways of data collection used by IOM to inspire new ways of tracking these movement at the national level.



- **Official offer for return to refugees**: Increase, decrease, including for PRS. (prioritized)

⇒ **Barriers to legal protection:**

- **Access to civil documentation (specific focus on birth registration)**: What works? What is not working? Important but this relates to project monitoring, not protection trends. (not prioritized)
- **Evolution of legal practices related to legal residency (priority, but unclear if it can be monitored in this context, to be further discussed))**.

## 4. Community-based interventions

### OBJECTIVES OF THE GROUP SESSIONS

- Discuss developing minimum standards for community-based interventions
- Identify linkages between Protection and Social Stability groups
- Explore engagement of community in prevention, response, implementation and M&E

### KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

#### a- **Understanding of community-based interventions (CBI)**

- CBI is not about outcomes alone, but about the process of engaging communities in their own protection. . It includes feedback to communities. It builds trust with communities.
- It helps create direct interaction with host communities and refugees
- It includes ensuring linkage between community groups in addressing protection issues.
- A process that includes situation analysis, participation, capacity-building and feedback mechanisms. It also ensures sustainability... and promotes resilience and community capacities to achieve protection goals.
- Can benefit the both communities and individuals
- Bottom-top (community or refugee-centered) and rights-based approach
- Community has a role in assessment, design, response, implementation and M&E

#### b- **Non-exhaustive list of minimum standards for community-based interventions and good practices:**

- Understand existing groups/mapping in the current response
- Ensure gender balance and participation of other diverse groups such as older persons and persons with disability within interventions, as well as clear roles and responsibilities
- Ensure proper inclusion and participation
- Understand the larger communities in terms of power dynamics and points of influence
- Build on/complement existing systems and capacity levels, towards “balanced empowerment”
- Maintain pragmatic understanding of intervention’s to ensure adaptability to community inputs and feedback
- Ensuring community access to necessary and immediate information, using multiple communication channels
- Do no harm
- Diversify points of engagement in the community
- Right level of human resources and staff capacity required, in terms of numbers and technical knowledge
- Measurable progress against objectives (work plan, timelines, milestones...)



- Clear and well managed expectations between the community and humanitarian actors
  - Community-level checks and balances
  - Management of responsibilities
  - Clear monitoring and evaluation plan, including community engagement in M&E
  - Accountability is key such as through triangulation of feedback, making adjustments to activities, can include day to day observation, incorporation of good practices from different organizations
- c- **CBI should include identifying protection risks** in general (including SEA), as well of persons at risk and marginalized group and issues or constraints of access to services and information. It also includes supporting community-led actions to address or prevent these issues. How:
- Community-based action planning
  - Safe identification and referral/ information dissemination
  - Sensitization of key community members on protection issues, including formal structures such as PHCs, SDCs, local NGOs and CBOs
  - Training/systematic coaching
  - Building on existing community initiatives
  - Linkages with subsectors linkages such as CP/GBV, as well as legal protection
  - Strengthening role of community in M&E
- d- **Linkage between groups especially social stability :**
- It was agreed to liaise with SoST groups and protection groups to identify areas of collaboration, while keeping it informal. Linkages between refugee groups and SoST's municipality-linked community groups (which are Lebanese) would only be done on a case by case basis to prevent harm. This would take into consideration aspects such as, but not limited to, the protection environment, social stability, municipality support and municipal practices.

**Steps that need to be done:**

- **Protection groups:**
  - Linkages between the different groups under the protection sector to expand on resources (community level, funding, responses etc.)
  - Joint capacity building/trainings
  - Mapping TORs
- **Social Stability groups (conflict mitigation mechanisms):**
  - Have a better understanding of the conflict mitigation mechanisms
  - Determine priority areas such as mapping of social tensions
  - Mapping TORs
- **Potential joint steps between the two sectors:**
  - Jointly address challenges
  - Build on resources
  - Information sharing and advocacy

**Key considerations:**

- Discrepancies between groups' ways of working
- Impact of intervention

**ACTION POINT**



A smaller thematic group will be established which can work on exchanging good practices, discuss more practically about linkages, strengthen M&E (impact) of community-based interventions and develop minimum standards)

## **5. Knowledge management and Protection Information Management (PIM)**

The Syria situation data portal serves as an LCRP knowledge management platform, and provides a wealth of information, data and tools. Yet, the data portal is not being used the way it should, and Knowledge Management is not sufficiently integrated into the Protection sector's discussions. Therefore, it is suggested to:

- Nominate a Knowledge Management focal point (ideally a PIM-trained person) in the Protection Core Group who would support partners in better using knowledge management tools and products, suggest improvements, update the Assessment Registry with planned and finalized research, and trigger regular discussions in the Core Group around knowledge management themes, research questions, products, etc.
- Better link with IMWG to incorporate indicators of interest to protection sector into upcoming surveys, as relevant, enquire its support to strengthen partners' survey methodologies, ensure the use of harmonized tools, etc. Encourage and contribute towards a coordinated assessment approach among partners.
- Revisit the protection research questions using a PIM process, ensuring that they align with sector 2019 priorities. The list will then be uploaded on the data portal and shared with whomever is interested in doing research on Lebanon.
- At inter-sector level, data discussions will be organized to engage partners in validating findings (VASyRs, PAs, etc.), and a Knowledge Management strategy and workplan will be developed to strengthen partners Knowledge Management capacities and Knowledge Management products.