Research and Validation
Linking Relief Rehabilitation Development and Community Protection
Approach

European Union project "Aid Volunteers, getting involved in promoting a
community based protection approach to building resilience and LRRD"
(EUAV10, n.2017 -3661/011-011)

First part

Pavia, 7 July 2019

The We World-GVC Community Protection Approach (CPA):
Analysis of the Relevance, Consistency and Applicability of the Methodology

Team:
Pedro Enrique Arriaza Aldana
Maria Cristina Bentivoglio
Maria Sassi (Coordinator)

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In "The new humanitarian basics", DuBois proposes to initiate a dialogue on humanitarian policies and practices aiming at changing how the humanitarian system thinks "*about itself, its role and the way the broader international community and crisis-affected people think about relief assistance and protection*". He talks about "*design theory suggesting immersing oneself in the user experience*". By putting the "user", the beneficiary, at the centre of the implementing system, he imagines a shifting of power and decision making and a changing of the dynamics, by ensuring that vulnerable people become not just users but owners of the system (DuBois, 2018).[1]

In the global context of increased complexity of crises, recurrent shocks, protracted displacement, limited government capacity and lack of resources for meeting growing humanitarian needs, development and humanitarian actors are joining forces to find innovative approaches (Watson, 2016). Even with good intentions, the international community appears to have great difficulties in working effectively in partnership (Smillie, 2001). While this discussion exists in the development field from decades, there have been limited efforts to obtain quantifiable and measurable data on the results of these efforts. In practice, especially in complex humanitarian settings, the translation of the theory into practice fails, encountering several limits. It has been seen in several humanitarian efforts over the last few years, especially in protracted crisis, that the formal humanitarian system is passing through a critical juncture in its evolution. Much has been written in recent years about the need to build local capacities.

The protection aspect becomes very relevant in a humanitarian setting every day more complex, where there is an emerging need to ensure protection to the vulnerable and affected population, as a central aspect of the humanitarian intervention (WFP, 2013). We World - GVC Community Protection Approach (CPA) is a methodology that comprises a context-specific process of multi-sectoral assessments to determine patterns of risks and understand the resilience capacity of a targeted population versus a specific risk (We World-GVC, 2015). The CPA integrates community-based protection across humanitarian programmes and allows to generate a baseline analysis able to develop evidence-based data for the selection of the most appropriate protection response (Michele, 2015), in different humanitarian settings. The CPA is inspired to the Safety with Dignity approach designed by Action Aid in 2010 and to the "Egg Protection Framework" as a goal to work jointly towards a single shared objective of protecting communities (ICRC, 2001). At the same time, the methodology and its integrated and holistic multi-sector and multi stakeholder approach are an important practical and

---

[1] This is a contemporary interpretation of the literature of mid '80, sustaining the bottom-up approach, the participatory approaches or the "putting the last first" methods envisaged by Robert Chambers through the Participatory Research Approaches and Participatory Rural Appraisals methods, among others. It is not new in the humanitarian settings and it is what, theoretically the humanitarian stakeholders plan to do.

concrete attempt to filling the gap between the Protection Theory and the Humanitarian Development Peace Nexus.

2. The scope of the proposed study and the methodology used

The study conducted by the University of Pavia analyses the Community Protection Approach (CPA), designed by the NGO We World-GVC, across three selected criteria of Relevance, Consistency and Applicability. The **relevance** is described as the criteria that allows defining the new elements introduced by the CPA while guiding the study to investigate on the conditions that establish the methodology and its logic in a multi-stakeholder and multi-sector environment. The **consistency** of the CPA is reflected in its soundness, logic, appropriateness and accuracy in addressing the community's needs and risks. The criteria of **applicability** helps understand the CPA replicability and transferability to other contexts. The CPA has been passed through numerous revisions, adaptations, consultations and adjustment and the refining process will continue in the future.

The study forms an evidence-based analysis around the application, innovation, added value, limitations and areas of improvements that the methodology has in achieving its outcomes and contribution in filling the gap between the Protection Theory and the Humanitarian Development Peace Nexus. The study looked at the CPA methodological approach and its logic, the components and the processes of the CPA itself and, on the other hand, analysed its applicability in the context of the oPt and Lebanon and the replicability to other contexts. By looking at the two programs of oPt and Lebanon, the team studied the different phases established for the implementation and replication (especially with reference to the Handbook material) and highlight the areas for improvement. It represents an effort to help identify strengths and lessons learnt for future applicability.

The methodology was composed of the following phases:

1. Literature review and critical analysis based on the relevant material made available by We World – GVC. The material reviewed is composed of official documents, reports, handbooks, publications as well as academic material and documents and reports produced by international organizations and NGOs (internal and external documents). A specific review was conducted on the CPA Handbook material developed made available by We World – GVC. The Handbook material made available in 2019 and composed by an Overview, a Guideline and a Toolkit offers precious support to understand, step by step, the CPA structure and components. It offers a guide to "set out the general logic of the CPA and to identify application opportunities in different contexts" (GVC, 2018). The handbook provides guidance on how to manage the data collected. The training package will be made available soon, thus it was not part of the present study.

2. A series of Skype calls took place with We World – GVC staff (local and international staff involved in the design and implementation of the CPA both at an operational and technical level). The Skype calls contributed to the literature review exercise and provided valuable information on the tools and operational aspects of the methodology.

3. Field missions to the oPt and Lebanon to conduct semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders on the implementation of the CPA in the two countries (see Annexes of the questionnaire and the list of the stakeholders that have been met). The semi-structured interviews were conducted with We World - GVC staff (national and international), with the four consortium partners (two consortium partners in Lebanon and four in oPt), with donors and with external stakeholders involved in the implementation process of the CPA, both at the technical and operational level.

The semi-structured interviews were divided into specific sessions dedicated to the three criteria of the study (Relevance, Consistency and Applicability), to cross-cutting issues, to technical tools and aspects of the CPA, to operational aspects of the CPA, to the consortium structure and functioning, to the implementation of the CPA in its protection aspects.

3. CPA theoretical approach

The CPA operationalizes integrated protection providing a people-centred system of analysis and monitoring of causal factors, identifying needs and challenges (Oxfam, 2016). The result of this effort is an ambitious and solid systematized approach, structured and modular, where population engagement is central and designed as a process of empowerment (GVC, 2018). It offers the possibility to adapt its components and tools to different contexts as well as to the level of access to the population, according to scenarios, population profile, objectives. The CPA promotes the use of specific tools to elaborate different programmes and analysis outputs (GVC, 2018): the Multi-sector Questionnaire (MQ) that generates the Integrated Protection System of Indicators (IPSI), the Narrated Community Perspective (NCP) and the Individual Protection Approach (IPA)[2].

Local protection activities are elaborated and designed to increase the capacities of the communities, reduce exposure to harm and develop local strategies to increase protection from impeded access to safe and dignified life (ANALP, 2018). The concept of protection encompasses all activities aimed at "*ensuring full respect for the rights of the individual in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the relevant bodies of law i.e., human rights, international humanitarian law and refugee law*" (Caverzasio, 2001).

---

[2] MQ: Questionnaire including sector and risk analysis questions. NCR: An approach of community participation and engagement with mixt modalities. IPA: Mechanism to identify families and individuals whose immediate physical, safety and dignity needs are not met. For more info read CPA Toolkit, page. 3, Introduction section.

The Protection Response Plans (PRPs) generated by the CPA put together different sectors under the protection umbrella and represent a community engagement and empowerment instrument for multi-sectors and multi-stakeholder scenarios. Presently the CPA is implemented in oPt West Bank and Lebanon, have started in Gaza Strip while other scoping missions undertaken outside MENA and in Latina America region.

4. Summary of the key findings

Below, in summary, key findings of the study:

1. The CPA is an extremely innovative methodology that tries to align quantitative and qualitative analysis for the extraction of detailed information about a targeted community. It represents an outstanding effort to re-discuss the humanitarian mindset, translating into practice, the shifting from the traditional humanitarian concept of "assistance centred" towards the "community empowering centred".

2. The CPA uses a holistic and comprehensive approach to translate the theory of community empowerment into practice and, in comparison with other methodologies applied in the humanitarian world, it represents a unique effort to involving the target community through a multi-sectoral approach to make the inclusion of all possible aspects of the community life.

3. The CPA is aligned to the core humanitarian standards and it is framed within the effort of using less "traditional" humanitarian interventions towards a more participatory and inclusive facilitation approach. Participatory approaches are not new within the humanitarian work, but the sophisticated quantitative tools such as the use of the MQ and the IPSI leading to the qualitative tools (e.g. NCP and IPA) is considered innovative, especially in the prioritization exercise that the methodology envisages through the data extraction and interpretation.

4. The CPA represents an innovative holistic approach that tries to overcome the dilemma that Smillie states clearly saying that "*the trade-off between outsiders doing things themselves and working to build longer-term capacities among local communities and local organizations so that people will be better able to deal with their challenges and increase their resilience*" (Smillie, 2001). The CPA represents an outstanding effort in filling the gap between the Protection Theory and the Humanitarian Development Peace Nexus.

5. The CPA aims to establish a conducive environment for the active empowerment of the population in the cyclical process of: identify needs of different sectors, propose credible solutions and translating this effort into action plans, continuously monitoring the evolving of

the context to reshape the initial strategy (GVC, 2018). It really focusses on the most vulnerable and targets them with the whole set of tools under a unique logical rationale.

6. All the CPA stakeholders are certainly supporting the concept behind the CPA and profoundly believe in the relevance of the methodology as it is an innovative effort to try bridging the gap between the humanitarian and developmental interventions, towards a more holistic and integrated approach.

7. The methodology is considered an extraordinary effort of multi-sector approach, working together throughout several areas, representing a good practice of community strengthening method.

8. The CPA results are consistent as it is not a stand-alone methodology bringing different organizations together, targeting the same community, avoiding overlapping and duplication. It has the capacity of the CPA to operate at the community level in a humanitarian setting, which is not common: in fact, although participatory approaches are not new within the aid work, it is recognized that the multi-sector assessment proposed by the CPA results to be practical and concrete, especially in a changing and fragmented environment of protracted crisis like the oPt and Lebanon.

9. The effort done by a small NGO, to create a methodology that has in itself all the potential to really reshape the traditional humanitarian setting from aid dependency (or need's based fast delivery) to let community be empowered to take informed decision and, ultimately be part (or ideally protagonist) of the humanitarian machinery, moved an equally great support from the humanitarian partners as well as governments and donors. In a competitive humanitarian environment, in which all the actors are competing for the same funds and in which political equilibrium has a direct impact on partners' programming, the CPA concentrated its efforts towards the community engagement, empowering them and show a credible effort to be accountable to the beneficiaries.

10. The CPA is a tool that requires commitment, willingness and capacity to be understood: it absorbs time both in its implementation process and in producing results and evidence. In a complex humanitarian system, very often driven by traditional humanitarian mind-set, the CPA can have a multiplier effect to generate a common effort, by putting the community at the centre of the decision making.

11. The consortium roles and responsibilities within the CPA framework, both in oPt and in Lebanon, are a positive effort to harmonize the coordination mechanisms and consequently the relation between the consortium members, as well as to attract other stakeholders to work in a multisectoral and inclusive way. The work within the Consortium has allowed the assessment stage of the CPA in the West Bank to cover almost double the communities and reach settings

without previous access. Working with these communities has allowed creating real engagement and rapport between community members and field staff of the participating organizations.

12. The components of the CPA are flexible and adaptable to different context; hence, the methodology has a great potential for transferability and applicability. The IPSI, among the several tools, showed the highest potential for applicability. However, the transferability exercise of the CPA needs to be accompanied by an adaptation and acceptance process and all the tools need to be tailored to the country capacity/existing situation.

13. The idea of the CPA to put the community at the centre of the implementation implies time to carry out a structured process of continuous engagement, supporting trust building and accountability. At the same time, especially in the complex humanitarian context, the characteristics of the community can represent limitations that need to be tackled and tailored into the CPA tools, through in-depth feasibility analysis and with great anticipation from the start of the process implementation.

14. The contextualization process of the CPA is strongly influenced by the humanitarian (and/or development) architecture in which will be implemented. Being for its nature, flexible and able to provide a snapshot of the community situation, the CPA has the great potential to be adaptable to different contexts. The tools that compose the CPA needs to be tailored to the existing situation and adjusted according to the changes reported during the implementation process. For this reason, the CPA needs to ensure a necessarily extended timeframe for the contextualization process which starting from a pre-filling of the information through secondary data, will need to pass through an adaptation effort of the tools to the context.

15. The above-mentioned contextualization process needs to be accompanied by an acceptance process from partners and stakeholders, from national to the local level, from the consortium partners to the external stakeholders that will necessarily be involved at a certain stage of the implementation process. The acceptance of the CPA from partners and stakeholders is a costly and time-consuming process, but it is a vital investment for the effectiveness of the CPA action.

16. The CPA offered the possibility, especially in a complex humanitarian context such as Lebanon, to have something that was related not only to emergency response but also community-level transitional intervention. The CPA in fact targets specific actions that endorse a rights-based approach, rather than responding through the more traditional humanitarian perspective to use a needs-based approach. However, the application of this into practice pointed out in Lebanon a questionable capacity of the methodology to provide evidence-based analysis on having contributed to empowering the community in complex humanitarian settings, where targeted

communities are on a protracted early recovery phase. This is partially due to the short time of implementation of the CPA in Lebanon (only one year so far).

17. Advocacy, visibility and communication are components that will play a crucial role in providing an evidence-based approach that will benefit the credibility of the consortium and, lastly, will contribute in scaling up good practices and lessons learned for future application. This is especially true for the Lebanon case, where the relatively short time-life of the CPA did not allow yet, to show all its beneficial potentials.

18. The CPA has a shown credible capacity to be transferred to another context. Especially in developing contexts, the CPA will be fully and easily adapted to be tailored.

5. Analysing the CPA

5.1 The Relevance of the CPA

Through the analysis of the relevance, several innovation elements have been identified, both in comparison with other approaches and in consideration of its strategies adjusted to certain social, political and economic contexts.

5.1.1 The Relevance of the CPA in comparison with other participatory approaches

Being built on lessons learned and existing methodologies and tools, the CPA has similarities with many approaches used in humanitarian and developing programmes. In literature, the Capacity and Vulnerability Analysis (CVA) introduced by Mary Anderson and Peter Woodrow in 1989 (Chigas and Woodrow, 2018), was based on the idea that "*individuals and groups have capacities in addition to obvious vulnerabilities*". For the first time, concepts like vulnerabilities and capacities were introduced in humanitarian settings. The Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), a revolutionary approach introduced in the early 1990s, introduced instead of the awareness of the considerable gap between the objectives and the results of many rural development efforts. The PRA provides a systematic approach to learning about people and context, recognizing the capacity of individuals and communities (Smillie, 2001; Chambers, 1997; Peter, 1994). The Participatory Capacity and Vulnerability Analysis, the Vulnerability Risk Assessment are risk analysis tools designed to help organizations engage with communities in contexts where crisis are significant drivers of poverty and suffering (ADB, 2004). It is in fact recognized in the literature that "*participatory research brings a commitment to respect local knowledge facilitating local ownership and control*" (Chambers, 1997).

Other methodologies more sector-specific like the FAO Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) or the WFP-UNICEF Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) are also powerful instruments that promote the multi-partner initiatives for improving food security and nutrition analysis and decision-making. The two

approaches work to strengthen the design, planning and implementation of longer-term resilience-building programmes, developed in partnership and aligned to national and local priorities. They place people and partners at the centre of planning, using converging analyses and consultations (ICA Manual, WFP and IPC Manual, FAO). However, the tools are sector related and are not applicable to multi-sector scenarios.

Table 1: Comparison of the CPA with other approaches.

METHOD	OBJECTIVE	POSSIBLE COMPLEMENTARITY
PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT IN OPERATIONS UNHCR	Is a process of building partnerships with refugee women and men of all ages and backgrounds by promoting meaningful participation through structured dialogue.	THE APPROACHES PRESENT SEVERAL SIMILARITIES. THE CPA CAN BENEFIT FROM THE SAME PARTICIPATORY PROCESS AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE MONITORING ON THE EVOLUTION OF PROTECTION RISKS AND RELATED MULTI-SECTOR NEEDS.
INDEX FOR RISK MANAGEMENT INFORM IASC, EC	It is a composite indicator that identifies 'countries at risk from humanitarian emergencies and disasters that could overwhelm current national response capacity, and therefore lead to a need for international assistance'.	INFORM IS PART OF THE SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS OF THE CPA. THE CPA CAN FURTHER SUPPORT THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF CERTAIN PHENOMENA IN SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC AREAS. IT CAN PROVIDE A STATUS OF SPECIFI NOT-UP-TO-DATE SECONDARY DATA.
VULNERABILITY AND CAPACITY ASSESSMENT IFRC	This is investigation that uses various participatory tools in order to understand the level of people's exposure to (and capacity to resist) natural hazards at the grass-roots level.	THE APPROACHES PRESENT SEVERAL SIMILARITIES. THE CPA CAN OFFSET VCA ASSESSMENT CARRIED OUT BY IFRC NATIONAL SOCIETIES. THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE MONITORING OF THE EVOLUTION OF PROTECTION RISKS AND RELATED MULTI-SECTOR NEEDS CAN FEED VCA ASSESSMENTS.
SAFETY WITH DIGNITY ActionAid	Integration of a community-based protection approach within programs across diverse sectors and contexts.	THE CPA STARTED AS A GVC TRIAL TO OPERATIONALIZE THE APPROACH. EVEN THOUGH THE CPA HAS EVOLVED IN TERMS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, ANALYSIS AND MONITORING, THE OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES OF THE CPA CAN COMPLEMENT THE APPROACH.
NATION-SPECIFIC MULTI-SECTOR HUMANITARIAN ASSESSMENTS VASyR in Lebanon, RAIS in Lebanon, VPP in the OPT, MIRA, and others.		THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS CAN BE TAILORED TO INCLUDE KEY DATA, TO PROVIDE ONGOING MONITORING AND UPDATING, AS WELL AS COMPOSITE ANALYSIS, OF PROTECTION RISKS BY BUILDING ON MULTI-SECTOR DATA.

Source: GVC, 2018

By doing a comparative analysis of the CPA with the above-mentioned methodologies, it can be said that the CPA provides a participatory multi-level mixed method approach of research and analysis that allow having more interpretive information (GVC, 2018). The CPA is designed to generate a localized system of monitoring and analysis and it doesn't encourage the creation of new community groups to work with. It is built upon the existing social and cultural systems and it tries to build up a picture of the functioning and characteristics, environment, capacity, conditions of a community with two main core activities (GVC, 2018):

1. *Define a set of activities to ensure integrated protection;*
2. *Ensure complementarity and coordination between the different actors, with the population at its centre. (GVC 2018, WBPC 2016).*

While other methodologies have possible complementarities with the CPA approach, it is essential to mention that the CPA aims to establish a conducive environment for the active empowerment of the population in the cyclical process of: identify needs of different sectors, propose credible solutions and translating this effort into action plans, continuously monitoring the evolving of the context to reshape the initial strategy (GVC 2018). While most of the participatory methodologies are results-based

analysis or activities, the CPA offer a need and rights-based monitoring and analysis that it is constantly adjusted to the changes reported from the community, their evolving conditions and capacity. For this reason, it requires an enormous effort of identification of community characteristics (exercises like community analysis, community profiling, legal mapping, risk mapping is some of the tools of the methodology).

5.1.2 The relevance of the CPA within the Humanitarian Development Nexus

Part of the innovation of this approach stands in the fact that it entitles the decision to work collaboratively with the communities at the whole range of actors, supporting the common effort of achieving "safety and dignity". CPA quality and success are based on the collaborative work of all management and technical experts within the organization, involving multi-dimensional factors connected with sector priorities (CPA Guidelines, 2018, page 7) and concretely address them at the same time. This is not very common in humanitarian work.

With its modular adaptable components, the CPA represents an effort in bridging the gap of the applicability of the Humanitarian Development Nexus offering a key innovation that contributes to the strengthening of the relationship between the community and the other stakeholders (Mode 1 and 4 of the CPA) (CPA Guidelines, 2018).

The activities try to reach all the community levels, "even the most isolated in terms of vulnerabilities and risks and they foster decision making", programmatic analysis and data sharing for the entire project life cycle (GVC, 2016; GVC, 2018). The decentralization approach is core in every component and is envisaged since the first steps of the CPA implementation. Furthermore, the implementation mechanism integrates multi-sector activities and stress the importance of an interdisciplinary approach, and the appliance of theory and practice in the field as well as policy level (ANALP, 2018).

5.1.3 The relevance of the community empowerment

The CPA methodology endorses an integrated holistic approach that allows addressing the causal factors of people's vulnerability, capacity and risk even in complex contexts in which humanitarian and development aid is provided in fragmented ways and where operates a high number of humanitarian actors. Through the CPA the targeted community is enacted to self-analyse needs and vulnerabilities: this is meant to support an ongoing process of review and identification of actions that promotes protection in vulnerable contexts (GVC, 2016). The activities follow the evolution of the population conditions/capacity, leaving space to multiple possibilities of adjustment and interpretation. The methodology endorses the self-decision making of the targeted population that is the holder and owner of the activities.

In contexts in which it is difficult to guarantee sustainable solutions and, at the same time, high quality of interventions, the CPA has a solid structure able to translate into practice the concept of community empowerment, and it has demonstrated to be able to put them at the centre of the action by building trust among the communities, "spend time with them" and make them aware of their capacity, responsibilities and rights. The methodology, in fact, is extremely varied, based on multiple layers, all interconnected allowing a greater capability of the tools to be transferred at the local level, where the actual implementation of the activities takes place. Although facing challenges, the context-specific process of multi-sectoral assessment is a sophisticated effort that allows describing, with remarkable precision, the resilience capacity of a targeted population versus a specific risk (GVC, 2016).

The engagement of the community is a long path that needs to be supported by local authorities and partners, while the disengagement of these actors into the process can affect the community and the potentiality of their expression within the CPA. To this extent, staff capacity is an extremely vital aspect for the effectiveness of the CPA, especially in a changing/evolving working culture, in a multi sector-stakeholders' environment where it is essential to have an in-depth capacity to understand the tools. Guarantee this level of engagement for a tool that is complex needs an effort of coordination and management skills that requires high commitment and capacity.

There is a fragile but important wire that supports the effectiveness/quality of the community empowerment path that stands practically in the capacity of the CPA staff/management *"to indeed engage with the CPA essence and scope, to indeed be committed in understanding the "hows" and the "whys" of the CPA and be willing to defend them"* (Anonymous, 2019). These are the key requirements and personal skills that outperform professional and academic background (that are also important).

Building acceptance from the community and have staff that will be able to manage the CPA, however, are extremely interrelated, especially in complex situations, where there are several layers of coordination. The field staff working within the CPA usually have exposure to things that work in multiple sectors and have a broad understanding of what can be applied in those areas. On the other side this aspect can be also seen as a limitation to innovation: the fundamental importance of not going to fast or not being "*too picky at the beginning of the CPA implementation process*" (Anonymous 2019) (for example in the oPt), has been a problem while conducting for example the MQ in a high number of communities, putting too much pressure on the field team that had not enough time to empower people and make them understand the CPA (Anonymous, 2019). "*Who we talk to fundamentally shaped the planning*" and it is easy to do bias to shape the results (Anonymous, 2019). In a context where external factors can contaminate the planning of the activities, it is important to ensure that the empowerment of community is protracted in time. The governments are not always fully willing to join the CPA, reason why the communities need to be resistant, consistent and resilient at the same time, in being empowered by the effort put into the CPA (Anonymous, 2019).

5.1.4 The relevance of the consortium

The CPA functioning is strictly dependent by the capacity of the stakeholders to work in partnership, encouraging to work not to "reach the organizations' goals" but to act as "a partnership that shares priorities and programme methodologies". Partners (the West Bank Protection Consortium [WBPC] in the case of the oPt) are "one" entity with same work modalities and the same objectives. This guarantees the centrality of the safety and dignity-oriented effort (which all the partners share as a priority area) (OCHA, 2019) and make essential the requirements asked to the partnership/consortium that will manage the CPA. The consortia found in the oPt and Lebanon are a good result of how to vehiculate the effort of introducing and implementing the CPA, through an inclusive and comprehensive approach. Although the coordination effort in both countries resulted to be fragmented at different stages of the implementation process of the CPA (and costly resulted also the effort to harmonize the organizations' structures and processes) it has been recognized the value to have an open structure capable to absorb and incorporate innovations and changes in the way of working. So far, the consortium embodies the best space to fit the CPA process. Overall, the consortium idea fits with great potential within the CPA represent a relevant platform able to channel the implementation process vertically (from national to community level) and horizontal (among partners and with local authorities). There will be a chapter dedicated to the Consortium, it's functioning and potentiality further in this study.

5.1.5. The relevance of the Rights-based approach fostered by the CPA

It is observed that the CPA's effectiveness and efficiency are subordinated to the ethical principles by which people should not just hold power over the crisis in their community but hold the self-decision-making power in protracted and complex crisis while remaining present at all stages and at all levels (DuBois, 2018). This concept leaves space to the rights-based approach, fostered by the CPA. The human rights-based approach envisaged by the CPA means that individuals and communities should know their rights. It also means that they should be fully supported to participate in the development of policy and practices which affect their lives and to claim rights where necessary. A human rights-based approach emphasises the moral foundation that goes deeper than the 'on-off' legal commitments and rights granted by governments and highlights that every human has rights (Carroll et al., 2009). The rights-based approach means a deliberate and explicit focus on enabling people to achieve the minimum conditions for living with dignity – in other words, achieving their human rights. A rights-based approach is grounded in the International Human Rights Framework and is a value-based development approach which works for the inclusion of all people on ethical grounds, without discrimination, in building a fair, just and non-discriminatory society. A rights-based approach also works to strengthen the willingness and readiness of all people – both as 'rights holders' (individuals and groups with valid

claims) and as 'duty bearers' (State, non-State actors and other power-holders with correlative obligations) – to take up their responsibilities and to fulfil their obligations towards each other (Carroll et al., 2009). The focus is on changing relationships in ways that ensure that power and responsibility can be shared safely between all stakeholders, building accountability and encouraging a willingness to fulfil obligations.

It is remarkable the effort and results gathered by the application of this approach, through the CPA, in an incredible political complex contest like the oPt, were the synergies of the main stakeholders (including the right holders and duty bearers) had the same direction to fulfil the goal of the CPA to empower people and guarantee their ownership through the process. The results obtained by the community are documented in several reports representing an extraordinarily good practice relevant for replication. It has been observed however that the application of the rights-based approach envisaged by the CPA has shown some limitations. In protracted contexts in which the duty bearers are not engaged, where the status of the beneficiaries of the humanitarian/development assistance is not recognized by the governments, where the humanitarian community is fragmented and not fully supportive of the CPA approach and the community identity is very diversified (Clusters in Lebanon where the refugees are grouped in temporary settlements), the communities are repeatedly left in a permanent condition of not being able to guarantee their basic needs. This is the situation in which the rights-based approach is completely suffocated by the vicious circle of the traditional humanitarian assistance (dependency from humanitarian aid). Under this kind of scenario, the CPA takes more time to express its potential while, at the same time, can be put under a latent reputational risk of being ineffective "*propose simply nothing new*" (Anonymous, 2019).

The humanitarian mandate of partners and donors, and the context in which they operate (e.g. in the case of Lebanon), their programming and their timeframe should be seen as the first fact that needs to be analysed at the time the CPA wants to be introduced. The humanitarian settings (emergency and protracted crisis) are characterized by a needs-based approach that cannot be reshaped nor accompanied by a parallel system if the basic needs of a population are not fulfilled (Anonymous 2019). Thus, by the time the CPA will start introducing a rights-based approach in a complex humanitarian setting, it is recommendable to come in with a technical entry point making sure that the intervention will not suffer from the focus that is proposed by the methodology. At the same time, there might be a better position *vis a vi* the donors and partners to present the right-based CPA programming approach, "*clarifying the need to have a longer timeframe implementation process and that it will bring its potential benefits into the community in a more solid way*" (Anonymous, 2019*)*. In that way it might be easier to advocate for the methodology, attract partners since the beginning, and have a major impact on the communities.

5.2 The Consistency of the CPA

The consistency of the CPA is reflected in its soundness, logic, appropriateness and accuracy in addressing community's vulnerability, risk and resilience capacity while, at the same time, keep the two CPA aims as binding principles:

i. Increase communities' and individuals' capacity to make informed decisions;

ii. Support the coordinated mobilization of multi-stakeholder and multi-sector efforts (GVC, 2018).

The consistency of the CPA has strengths and weaknesses. The structure of the CPA remains theoretically solid in its soundness, logic and robustness and very flexible to bounce back the effects of variables that can put at risk its consistency. At the same time, the great capacity of the methodology to collect data and the ability to interpret the information has an incredible capacity to transform them into an understanding of perceptions. Furthermore, the perception versus the reality (and the evolution of the reality) doesn't necessarily change the CPA programming but there are contextual risks (external to the CPA) versus the community that can affect the robustness of the CPA.

The logic, appropriateness and accuracy of the CPA is described as follows: as an incredible effort to come closer to "*reflecting community's vulnerability, risks and capacities*" (Anonymous, 2019) – and to a transfer of power not merely from international to local agencies, but from a "global" to a home society (European Commission, 2016). The system of data collection, analysis and monitoring results used by the CPA resulted to be robust and effective in its soundness and structure: it is adaptable to different range of skilled staff, with attention to guarantee a scientific approach to analysis (GVC, 2018) and, at the same time, it is flexible to a wide range of variables without losing its focus. It is a data collection tools composed by a modular methodology: structured through the three instruments of the MQ/IPSI, NCP, IPA, is a mixed between quantitative and qualitative data, triangulated and tailored throughout the different phases of the CPA with aim to "*identify needs in conjunction with rights and entitlements*" (GVC, 2018) of a vulnerable population.

In relation to the analysis of the CPA's intervention logic and its level of flexibility (capacity to consider any changed circumstances and consequent updates), it has been observed that the CPA has proved capacity to remain consistent given changed circumstances. The tools used for monitoring and assessing the evolution of the situation allows having a remarkable interpretation of the changes in the population conditions. The Protection Response Plan (PRP) is an example of a credible tool that is continuously updated, tailored and adjusted to the evolution of the community. The CPA monitoring system allows protection activities to be measured and reshaped along the programme lifecycle. The CPA signifies that protection, as such, is not envisaged as a stand-alone sector and it is represented across all sectors of action, monitored by the combination of the IPSI and the NCP results (GVC 2018). To ensure that the data is collected in the most comprehensive way: MQ, IPSI, IPA and NCP questions and indicators

are combined, and a trigger mechanism is automatically generated with the objective of capturing the evolution of protection risks and vulnerabilities (Anonymous, 2019). The second stage of this exercise is then activation of specific tools to further investigate and address the variation of those risks and respond by reshaping and readjusting activities within a certain timeframe (GVC 2018).

5.2.1 The consistency of CPA's Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning (MEAL)

MEAL system within the CPA is a vital mechanism that allows a permanent eye and reflection of the evolution of the community, within the CPA implementation process. The CPA has a theoretical approach solid in its structure of ensuring that the changes and the evolution of the community are registered and reported within the framework of the PRPs. The soundness and logic of the CPA tools allow the community to participate in the process of monitoring their conditions and at the same time learning from their engagement process.

A limitation that came out from the two consortiums (oPt and Lebanon) during the field missions was the need to improve the MEAL component into the structure of the CPA and the need to have a more systematic capacity to analyse data (Anonymous, 2019). In the context of Lebanon, the capacity of monitoring and evaluation is linked to the expectations of consortium partners (and donors) "*on the MQ results with the consequence to have implemented the questionnaire much quicker than needed and with a quick pre-filling exercise*" (Anonymous, 2019). The nation-wide assessment done in Lebanon for instance, highlighted a need to improve preparedness in planning the outputs produced with MQ and IPSI that was incredibly high in numbers and difficult to systematize within the first year of the project (and considering the unrecognized status of the refugees placed in settlements). This can become a risk for the accuracy of the whole methodology especially when time and resources are little.

Data extraction can also be affected by contextual risks like seasonal variables adding a burn to the MEAL component, the reason why the timeframe for the implementation of the MQ is vital to ensure its quality. Ultimately, the acceptance and confidence in data sharing among the different stakeholders involved in the CPA can generate a risk for the transparency and neutrality of the process with a potential reputational risk for the consortium and for the CPA as a whole (Anonymous, 2019).

It has been observed that the preparedness work and contextualization of the methodology lack in consistency in the measure the process is put under pressure when the need to accomplish partners/donors is higher than the need to properly review and prepare for implementation. The consequent of this circle is the production of data that are not able to profoundly reflect perspectives nor to cover the perceptions of the community (Anonymous, 2019). This generates a lack of confidence in the data holder in sharing results in an inclusiveness way, given the lack of capacity to conduct an

analysis that respects in practice, all the CPA steps. The sustainability of the methodology fully depends on the capability to show results and will depend on the willingness of the stakeholders to open and share the methodology with other partners. The MEAL structure will play a fundamental role in strengthening and improving CPA processes.

The above-mentioned dynamics is strictly linked also with another aspect, which is the work in partnership with the local NGOs present on the field. The engagement with these organizations can be thwarted by the unwillingness and resistance to being involved in the CPA implementation process, especially if the consortium partners are new into the community. It has been observed that, even by showing complementarity within programmes and activities, the CPA inclusion into existing mechanisms has been seen as a mere monitoring exercise and duplication of activities (Anonymous, 2019). This can represent a risk for the consistency of the CPA as a whole, as the community could perceive the fragmentation of the activities with the same community representatives engaging with several entities and putting energies on different activities (sometimes contrasting once). This lack of coordination and duplication can ultimately affect the community, the accountability to them and can overwhelm the environment with repetition and confusing mechanisms. Even in areas where there is no presence of the consortium, but there are community targeted, it will be vital to work with the local NGOs and ensure they gather a deep knowledge of the methodology, its approach, it's functioning. It needs to be sufficiently contextualized even if it comes to the extent of compare it globally with other existing tools risking the acceptance in certain contexts, but it is vital for the community-driven approach.

5.3 The Applicability of the CPA

The criteria of applicability help understand the CPA replicability and transferability to other contexts. The CPA has been passed through numerous revisions, adaptations, consultations and adjustment and the refining process will continue in the future.

The Handbook material made available in 2019 and composed by an Overview, a Guideline and a Toolkit offers precious support to understand, step by step, the CPA structure and components. It offers a guide to "set out the general logic of the CPA and to identify application opportunities in different contexts" (GVC, 2018). The handbook provides guidance on how to manage the data collected. The training package will be made available soon.

The replicability of the CPA stands, for its nature, within the conceptual framework that guided the creation of the methodology, since the very first stages of designing and testing in 2013. In fact, at that time, the team assigned to develop the CPA investigated the following objectives (GVC, 2018):

i. *Ensure its applicability within humanitarian and development project cycles:* the CPA applies a multi-level mixed approach that can capture single or multiple level analysis and it has been tested and applied in complex protracted crisis, such as the oPt context.

ii. *Investigate the effectiveness of its people-centres and empowerment approach:* population engagement is designed as a process of empowerment and it results to be adapted to different contexts.

iii. *Verify its actual value to reduce the assessment fatigue of the population:* through the identification of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities from a set of quantitative indicators make the tools sustainable and replicable.

The CPA results to be credible in its capacity to be transferred and adapted to different contexts as the methodology is managed by a multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral approach that demonstrated its incredible strengths of flexibility in its single tools. The implementation and the flow of the steps of its phases are very solid and structured for transferability. Furthermore, as in the case of the implementation in oPt, the CPA was managed by a consortium of organizations (West Bank Protection Consortium - WBPC) that guaranteed progressive operational, technical, institutional and financial autonomy (WBPC, 2016). The CPA promoted its autonomy through the strengthening of the synergies among the organizations that, through the consortium, had the direct responsibility (together with the communities) of CPA activities. It is therefore important to recognise that it is essential for the replication of the methodology, to sustain a management structure that can follow up and remain present exhaustively during the different phases of the implementation process and beyond.

About the engagement of the community the methodology resulted adaptable to different contexts. However, it is recommended to better define the process behind the choice of a community recipient and of the stakeholders that will be involved in the facilitation process. Here there are possible risks that could affect the applicability, identified through several internal reviews during the implementation of the CPA, both in Lebanon and in oPt:

1. Conflicts and competition within the community and with the community within the political context;

2. Individuals that refuse to attend meetings or participate in the activities;

3. People not really engaged with the process;

4. People not really understanding the importance of taking responsibilities in facilitating the CPA implementation;

5. People that are not able to access participation (due to location, time, age, gender, condition etc);

6. Lack of capacity to monitor and measure the level of community engagement and participation;

7. Weak understanding of protection definition and notions among partners;

8. Lack of engagement among stakeholders and consortium partners;

9. Lack of engagement and support from the humanitarian agencies, local NGOs;

10. Lack of willingness from local authorities can lead to inconsistency and, ultimately, the inefficiency of the CPA.

11. Lack of communities' councils to follow up on the actions throughout the CPA and the PRPs

12. Lack of engagement with protection groups could affect the coordination mechanisms since the first steps of the contextualization process.

13. Too much emphasis on the implementation process (due to time constraints and pressure to implement) can affect the quality of the PRPs that need time and quality.

The replication of the CPA to other contexts need to be careful review as the scenarios in which the CPA could be applied can be very different. Perhaps the single most important cause of deviation from planned goals is ambiguity, confusion, or misunderstanding of immediate and long-term project objectives (Rondinelli, 1976). The elaboration of a regular, contextualized and easy-to-use monitoring of the multi-sector needs and problems is key to guarantee an effective review and replicability. The development *vis-à-vis* the humanitarian settings scenarios need a deep analysis that might consider the following, among others:

i.   Low-income, middle-income context;

ii.   Institutional structure, capacity;

iii.   Types of international cooperation settings and programmes;

iv.   Existence of social protection programmes;

v.   Interpretation and contextualization of protection needs, targeted to socio-economic scenarios and development initiatives (mode 2 identified by the CPA);

vi.   Human resource capacity and availability in country;

vii.   Existing coordination capacity among organizations operating projects and programs in key development sectors;

viii. Community Feedback – understand what is important for a given community. Consider whether different dimensions, from safety and dignity, are important to consider and how important are them to the community concerned.

Lastly, the fact that the modular structure of the CPA allows to select and use and apply the tools in their completeness or use only parts of them, guarantee adaptability of the methodology to different contexts and, at the same time, resilience capacity to absorb contextual risks.

5.3.1 The applicability of the CPA in developing contexts and its challenges

The experience of the implementation of the CPA in the oPt and Lebanon, the characteristics analysed together with the structural logic and its components, make the methodology particularly suitable for

development contexts due to the nature of the methodology to spend time and build trust within a community. However, the tool resulted to be very valuable also in complex humanitarian settings and, not without difficulties, challenges and reshaping of the activities throughout the process, demonstrated valuable in an extremely complex context through a complementarity set of tools that involve different stakeholders, engaged people at the centre of the vulnerability and risk analysis.

Very often in the humanitarian sector, the measurement of the intervention is done by how much resources are spent on a specific component, rather than understanding how specific activities have impacted and changed a community (this is the capacity that the Humanitarian Nexus is trying to address).

However, in this scenario, it can occur that the success of the CPA will be measured by how many PRPs have been implemented in "*the targeted communities, at the expenses of the effort spent to make and time-consuming analysis*" (Anonymous, 2019). This situation has a dangerous possible repercussion on the accountability to the beneficiaries generating the paradox of giving value to the CPA's hard activities (provision of items for example), much more than to the soft ones (awareness raising or training) in contexts where partners are pushed to "produce results" and show that they are empowering communities in some ways. The above situation opens the door to a dilemma: although in development the risk is considerably lower, the lack of understanding/stages and the lack of capacity to advocate (on a continuous basis) on community empowerment activities, there is the risk to reduce the CPA contribution to the theoretical (and practical) discussion on the Humanitarian Development Nexus, relegate the CPA to "mere traditional humanitarian need-based methodology".

The reduced and limited funds represent an opportunity to join efforts and make the coordination mechanisms free from the results-based expectations/pressures. Furthermore, in a developmental context, the NGO relationship is vital for synergies and coordination and it might be easier to build trust among agencies given the lower pressure on the implementation phase (Anonymous 2019).

Furthermore, the transferability, for the nature of the CPA, will be easier in a developmental context. In fact, all the changes encountered in a protracted emergency context are difficult to be monitored and registered (Anonymous, 2019), while in development or recovery context there might be more time to plan for the activities. Short term and long-term needs are a lens that already exists within the CPA assessment tools as well as in its application. A good example is in the oPt where the programme timeframe allows to look in detail into short- and long-term transitional needs. The inclusion of this concept at the stage of the implementation and contextualization of the methodology it is vital for the effectiveness of the replicability.

Ultimately, it has been observed that to increase acceptance is important to ensure consistent replicability in every kind of context, thus it is vital to use as much as possible the pre-filling of information with secondary data available in order to tailor the MQ and be context specific. At the same

time, it is important to use the CPA tools designed for the contextualization, such us the legal and stakeholder mapping, that produced outstanding results.

5.3.2 Importance of communication and advocacy for the replicability of the CPA

The fact that the CPA is right based, provides an overview and a space for the CPA to really scale up the humanitarian role of helping towards a transition period that look at the awareness of the community in knowing their rights and participate actively in the decision making that are referred to their future (Anonymous 2019). It has been observed that within the two CPA projects, advocacy and communication efforts for sharing lessons learned and good practices of the CPA needed much more emphasis and coordination effort that what was done. It is, in fact, remarkable the amount of information and data produced through the CPA for each community. At the same time, it is observed that sometimes, this information is not utilized or becomes obsolete and not used. Staff capacity at the national and field level, dedicated to the implementation aspects, lack in having a solid structure for systematically produce and document effectively the results of the CPA. There is a huge quantity of information that could produce an amazing quality of products able to be used for advocacy, communication, donor relations, fundraising and scale up good practices for replication. A key challenge, representing an opportunity moving forward, is the training of the staff to efficiently use the data extracted from the CPA for advocacy purposes. Communication departments within We World GVC have the potential with the data to create effective audio-visual representation (infographics, factsheets), with the main objectives of advocacy, awareness (Anonymous, 2019).

6. Relevance, consistency and applicability of the MQ, IPSI, NCP and IPA tools in summary

The different tools that compose the CPA, represent a practical example of how the theory of the Humanitarian Development Nexus through a concrete effort in bridging that gap, widely discussed but erratically demonstrated at field level. The CPA tools result to be relevant, consistent and applicable in their entire structures and interrelation among them. Here follows a snapshot with the main contribution and challenges for each tool:

Regarding the MQ, it is important to underline its effort in combining different questionnaires and statistical methods to gather detailed information about communities. It has been reported that the MQ allows to "*Spend time with the community and help the community to open. This helps to extract detailed information about them, their ability, coping strategy and the CPA tools represent an extraordinary mix of qualitative and quantitative tools that helps to interpret*" (Anonymous, 2019). It is time-consuming and much elaborated but "*resulted to be able to create a snapshot of the situation, help*

prioritizing while ensuring a sectoral and comprehensive length of the reality" (Anonymous, 2019). The technicality of the tool is a strength that, at the same time, requires a minimum level of preparation from the staff implementing it requiring good capacity. Regarding the consistency of the MQ/IPSI, it has been observed that the MQ reports on a high number of missing information or info that is not applicable. This mechanism has a double impact on the information as (i) it contributes in building the information on the score as also the "not/applicable" or "don't know" answers are being registered and scored, and (ii) to have a variation of the score, the MQ need to have a massive variation of the answer while the IPSI is not able to reflect small changes (Anonymous, 2019)[3]. Another limitation encountered during the contextualization exercise (adaptation of the CPA to Lebanon context) stands in the fact it must make efficient use of secondary data, according to its scope and implementation process. In some complex contexts, like Lebanon for instance, a not properly contextualized MQ could result in a time-consuming implementation process, whose length may pose conditions to its quality while, at the same time, and the number of questions asked could represent a risk for the accuracy of the answers (Anonymous, 2019). It is, however, important to highlight that this can occur especially in complex contexts in which the contextualization process can encounter contextual limitations and where the multi-stakeholder approach requires additional time to effectively work. Additionally, the context in which the community is involved within the answers of the questionnaire can also affect the process and the reflection of the reality: for example, in Lebanon, the presence of the *shawish*[4] can make people uncomfortable to share their view, while the protection concerns can be hard to be captured (Anonymous, 2019). It is in fact observed that in temporary shelters (settlements) people have the tendency to move to find better opportunities, especially in contexts like Lebanon in which the status of the refugees is restricted to a small range of work. Thus, their socio-economic inclusion is limited and denied by unrecognized regular status within the country, making them dependent on the humanitarian assistance, being not able to scale up from their struggling for basic needs. This circumstance evidences the risk of losing or not capturing important issues related to the dynamics inside the settlements: in this kind of environment, the MQ can result to be a static tool not able to reflect the variabilities of such settings (Anonymous, 2019). Tracking of the changing in these environments is not easy: the CPA comes with different tools used at different stages and it is fundamental for the field staff to be familiar and be able to deliver the PRPs together with the

---

[3] In a context that is drastically changing will be very responsive while in the initial part of the MQ, the quantitative changes are difficult to be reflected. On this regard, the externalities of the context can represent a threat to the effectiveness of the tool in measuring changes. In identifying factors in response modality, the threat for the consistency of the quantitative tools, can be observed in the capacity itself that will depend on which context the CPA is operating and, in the ability to go into the community and understand the context

[4] In Arabic, "shawish" – a masculine word – has been used to refer to men managing foreign labour in Lebanon. But since the onset of the Syria conflict and the influx of more than a million refugees into the country, the word has found a new meaning. In informal tented settlements, a shawish is the person nominated by other refugees to act as the settlement supervisor and decision-maker. Most of the shawish in Lebanon are men.

communities, engage them into the activities ensuring the process of empowerment to take informed decisions.

In the context of the oPt, critics were directed to the application of the Protection Vulnerability Index (PVI). The PVI was a quantitative tool created in 2015 with the objective of measuring the risks faced by communities in the region.[5]: while allowing to present a snapshot/overview of the community in many specific areas, the methodology is "not a scientifically strong or valid, presenting redundant indicators (and too many), that end up presenting overlapping information on sectors" (Anonymous, 2019). The interpretability of the results of the PVI resulted to be difficult, with too many indicators hard to summarize into useful advocacy tools. We World - GVC has invested a great amount of effort in the creation, introduction and use of the IPSI as a solution and step forward from the PVI. The transition from an old methodology to this new, robust, consistent set of indicators have potential benefits for stakeholders involved, as well as internally, for advocacy purposes. The use of the platform with automatic results of the IPSI can prove to be valuable to donors and stakeholders involved, that agree on the fact that IPSI provides a tool "simple and intuitive enough to understand" (Anonymous, 2019).

On the other hand, the fear within We World - GVC to lose the possibility of trend analysis is one of the main limitations and possible refrains of transitioning from the PVI to the IPSI. Although it is a valid concern, it is not necessarily true: the Junior Research Centre of the European Commission, through their work on the Index for Risk Management (INFORM) applies changes in its methodology annually and hasn't lost the trend analysis from 5 years back. To ensure accountability in certain parts of the methodology, the changes should be applied retroactively to existing data of previous years. The manual of the OECD (2008) on the construction of composite indicators, validate this idea of an effective and powerful method. It is in fact advised that a composite indicator should always strive to improve and achieve its main goals: summarize complex realities while reducing the size of sets of separate indicators, while providing at the same time facilities to interpret results (OECD, 2008).

Regarding the IPA, while the tool was not been implemented in the oPt, in Lebanon represented an incredible example of how the information extracted and interpret through it, supported and complemented the NCP in its effort of outlining and providing qualitative data on the community situation, needs and evolution. The combination of the two tools put to walk together, represent a credible synergy able to improve CPA's integrated approach, sustain vulnerable communities to reach their primary emergency needs and accompany them through the empowerment process. It has been reported that one of the main IPA strengths is that "*it is a pure protection focussed tool and it really*

---

[5] This present work of evaluation concerns the IPSI, as one of the main elements of the CPA. The PVI is referenced as an initial step towards the creation and development of the system of indicators currently used in measuring threats, vulnerabilities and capacities, together creating the IPSI.

addresses protection concerns. It is able to identify the needs of individuals, have a detailed planning case and link them with service providers and service activities with a community lens. The IPA has a specificity to address individual needs and has the capacity to link the results by interrelating and referring to the information produced by the MQ/IPSI and NCP exercises" (Anonymous 2019). Good communication and engagement skills with the community are very vital for the effectiveness of the tool. The IPA has the great capacity to further engage with key actors and attract them into the multi-sector and stakeholder approach. The IPA gives also space to take on board external partners and better engage them into the PRPs.

Within the NCP monitoring, another interesting tool offered by the CPA is the Changes Sessions, a continuation of community engagement system that monitors and reports how the situation has evolved (GVC 2018). Even though the Changing Sessions' functioning has been discussed at different stages of the CPA implementation in the oPt (with challenges and lessons learned have been identified), it allows re-shaping and readjusting needs and the changes registered and reported from the targeted population. There are aspects that need to be improved, especially in relation to the implementation and extraction of the updated information. Nonetheless, the qualitative interpretation that is provided to the data through the analysis and monitoring systems proposed by the CS represents a powerful example of how to reflect population evolution consistently (Oxfam, 2009; Fatterman and Wandersman, 2005).

Regarding the widely discussed contextualization process, it has been emphasised that the tools of the CPA created for ensuring the pre-filling of the data (such as legal and stakeholder mapping) resulted to be relevant and consistent as they help to adapt the MQ, make IPSI more sustainable and streamline the NCP. These tools have an extraordinary potential for making the CPA implementation process more sustainable and flexible at the same time as a credible mechanism that links several tools under the same contextualization umbrella.

7. Cross-cutting issues within the CPA

In relation to cross-cutting issues that are relevant to ensure the consistency of the CPA, it is observed that the relation with the variables and the fact that the CPA is not an output-driven approach (but is based on the analysis of outcomes of specific interventions associated with the evolution of the vulnerability and protection conditions), support the inclusion and adaptation of cross-cutting issues, at all stages, remaining consistent even during changes and reshaping of the information. For example, during the implementation of the CPA in the oPt, the Consortium that was managing the project (West Bank Protection Consortium – WBPC) worked at different stages to the incorporation of a systematic

application of an Age, Gender and Diversity Approach (AGD).[6] The effort of applying an AGD approach into the CPA, ensured it's mainstreaming into the implementation process. It was read in an internal document: "*applying an AGD approach is not an add on: it is a core element of fair and equal protection to better understand the multifaceted protection risks and capacities of individuals and communities, and to address and support these more effectively*" (GVC, 2018). Challenges and difficulties in the application of the AGD approach have been identified during the CPA implementation and a strategy was prepared a reference for the consortium, showing to recognise the centrality of the issue. It is important to highlight that the AGD inclusion into the CPA was seen as a necessity (and not as "must" to fill a form) to better interpret people needs and rights.

It is important to mention, especially for the replicability of the tool, that there are topics that are sensitive, like acute malnutrition, Gender Based Violence (GBV) or child protection that in a specific context are difficult to map and monitor. Even though the IPA constantly monitors these sensitive issues in the context of Lebanon, it is important that this methodology is highlighted and included within the CPA for effective replicability in other settings, for the correct assessment of individual needs. Understanding perception versus facts needs training of the staff to guarantee space to these issues and allow understanding of how to better target. It has been reported that "*sensitive issues should be targeted strategically in order to guarantee specific service providers and identification barriers to ensure protection to the most vulnerable people and allow them to fully participate in community activities*" (Anonymous, 2019).

8. The role of the Consortium into the CPA implementation

There cannot be a uniform way of managing the different types of relationships and, every time the entity decides to come together, there are risks and opportunities that need to be identified. In fact, a consortium can be defined as a group of organizations that jointly participate in the design and delivery of a specific objective. The focus is not only on joint delivery but also on joint design and hence, shared ownership (of both risks and responsibility) (Macharia, 2016). However, according to Carter (Carter, 2017), there is limited detailed information on how to set up, manage and guide Multi-Stakeholder Partners – MSPs and even less on consortia.

For the sustainability of the CPA and to ensure that the main CPA principles are not altered, it is important to learn from the experience of the West Bank Protection Consortium created to implement

---

[6] Upon the recommendations of an ECHO Global Protection Expert to explore mechanisms to better target individual protection concerns, GVC oPt did a review of the CPA mechanisms and tools during 2017 to better mainstream gender into all phases and steps. The review is framed within the specific work of a GVC Protection Task Force dedicated to work on Integrated Protection at Global Level, in coordination with ECHO and other relevant actors. Given the additional resources brought forward by GVC, the exercise has explored further the integration of Individual Protection, building on lessons learned from the West Bank Protection Consortium, and from GVC operations in Lebanon, Gaza and Libya.

the CPA in the oPt. Overall, the Consortium has been able to sustain the implementation of the CPA. There is some work in the literature on identifying success factors and limiting conditions of work in partnership. Beisheim and Simon (2016) highlight evidence that consortia have a poor record in promoting systemic change. They may involve parallel structures that weaken country ownership. They find that the design and management of any consortia must ensure that projects are adapted to fit local conditions. Hence, the criticality of contextualization of the CPA results to be a successful and powerful tool. They sustained that "e*xternal success conditions include an enabling environment and a country ownership and complementary partnership structures that take into account national and international governance architecture*" (Beishem and Simon, 2016).

Nonetheless, the involvement of national authorities may be limited or almost non-existent, leaving space to a high risk for the consortium to fulfil the gap of the relationship with local authorities. The success in managing the CPA through the Consortium will result from a successful involvement of local governments and support to the creation of local councils within the community, to ensure proper follow up of the outcomes and staged interventions (Anonymous, 2019).

In the external evaluation conducted in 2017 by the group Advance, it is documented how the Consortium has learned a great deal through the development of its integrated protection approach, which could be of benefit to the broader humanitarian community, particularly in terms of the effort of "*promoting humanitarian programming that provides a more holistic approach focused on protection outcomes*" (Thomas, 2015). Given the context in which the WBPC works, it provides an interesting struggle of how different organisations have come together and developed an integrated protection approach, from which others can draw several lessons if they are considering forming a consortium (Michele and Rodier, 2016).

Not without difficulties and contrast, case studies and reports undertook on the Consortium work in West Bank, have resulted in the following recommendations that are compiled and summarized here:

- ➢ Ensure the revision of the integrated protection approach (*inter alia* its focus; tools; methodologies; reliability; monitoring and evaluation; and impact (to the extent possible)) that the group will adopt in implementing the CPA;
- ➢ Suggest ways to fine-tune and simplify the integrated protection approach and its tools, without losing its quality and coverage;
- ➢ Ensure that the CPA approach/tools/methodology is broadly accessible, understandable, and shareable – to internal and external actors and – within the context in which the consortium will operate.
- ➢ Empower national staff, field workers and Consortium members on the CPA methodology, to help identify critical needs for proper implementation of every step. When each organization

takes ownership of the methodology and make it part of their own strategies and agenda, only then the CPA will attain effectivity and efficiency (Anonymous, 2019).

➢ Ensure that the consortium will establish an exit strategy and an advocacy methodology, since the beginning. The creation and execution of the PRPs will allow a proper linkage to development actors, which will help accord sustainable projects to humanitarian assistance. Within the exit strategy, the establishment of local councils and proper training will ensure effective follow-up on projects and regular updates on interventions' outcomes.

The effort pursues by the WBPC in implementing the CPA in all its components has resulted in an outstanding effort especially considering the characteristics of the oPt and Lebanon protracted crisis and its complexity. The CPA was created and developed in complex contexts, and though many challenges in communication and acceptance of the methodology remain, the results have proven to be more than satisfactory (Anonymous, 2019). One of the most important strengths highlighted by stakeholders has been the extensive coverage of communities thanks to the implementation of the CPA within the Consortium, and at the same time, the ease of involving community members into the process, due to the prolonged relationship of the organizations with this communities. Community ownership and empowerment has been easier due to this close relationship and rapport created between the field staff and communities (Anonymous, 2019).

In the case of Lebanon, it is relevant to mention the creation of the TRG – Technical Reference Group that supports the coordination effort of the consortium (LPC – Lebanon Protection Consortium). Some outlined the outstanding effort of having reached a good level of acceptance by reaching a very wide geographical coverage: however, it was mentioned the need to have a more open structure capable to absorb and incorporate innovations and changes in the way of working (Anonymous, 2019). A representative from the TGR reported that "*the coordination efforts undertaken by the LPC was fragmented given each organization structures and processes that need to be put together*" (Anonymous, 2019).

The Consortium Management Unit (CMU) was created in Lebanon to ensure the coordination effort under its umbrella. One of the challenges that the CMU was facing is the lack of promotion of the CPA contextualization exercise and the lack of its leading role in ensuring mechanisms to make the coordination and implementation system improved. For some people, the LPC is perceived to create a parallel coordination structure or improve the existing one, while it is challenging the capacity of the actors to work together: the innovation introduced by the LCP in Lebanon stands in the fact the "*is trying to bump into the barriers of truly coordinating, pushing towards the limit the capacity and the rigidity of a system that needs to learn how to ensure that people are able to work together*" (Anonymous, 2019).

It has been observed that "*each agency of the consortium has its own functioning and layers of structure and it is not easy to be put together but, from an advocacy and communication perspective, this could be overcome by start sharing results, sharing data, even if they are not 100% reliable*" (Anonymous, 2019). Opening to feedback and sharing data and results outside the consortium, showing the methodology and the way it is functioning could have the benefit to build trust and confidence among consortium partners.

In summary, the "consortium idea" is challenging and costly while the time it takes to have it working properly should never be underestimated. A fundamentally important point for the consortium is that "*once it is working it should be considered as added value that each consortium member can bring something that the other members don't have*" (Anonymous, 2019). There is a great potential to have a very special case for the members to work together: what matters is the principle to choose the people that can bring added value rather than focussing too much on the consortium *modus operandi*, which might result not effective in the last instance. Eventually, there is a principle fundamentally important in the integrated processes: the willingness to work together and the division of the programme among members are very important (Anonymous, 2019).

9. Conclusions and recommendations:

Considering the above discussion, here follows conclusions and key recommendations to further improve and support the CPA implementation process:

i. To **improve the CPA structure** within the implementation process, it is important to guarantee that all the CPA steps are respected in their timeframe and technicality, ensuring that political pressures of partners/donors do not affect the quality and, ultimately, the empowerment process of the community. It is recommended to ensure that the local staff is prepared on the CPA tools and schedules while, at the same time, that the consortium (or the entities supporting the CPA implementation process) have the capacity to clearly position those non-negotiable steps, essential to the effective achievement of the specific objectives set by the CPA. To do so, it is essential that the contextualization process (among the first step for replication of the CPA in other countries) includes since the scoping missions, a clear positioning on the following:

   ▫ The positioning of the CPA within the ongoing humanitarian/development and engagement with duty bearers and external stakeholders

   ▫ Objectives of the CPA and of each CPA tool

   ▫ Structure and use of the CPA (entire of part)

   ▫ The timeframe of the CPA and of each CPA tool

      ⯈ Financial needs VS technical implementation capacity (this includes also staff need/capacity)

      ⯈ The clear position of the Consortium within the Humanitarian/development context in which the CPA will operate VS the humanitarian community/country team

      ⯈ Clear position towards the targeted community, its characteristics and minimum engagement conditions

ii.   Within the framework of the New Way of Working (OCHA, 2017), CPA can prove a valuable tool to **operationalize the Humanitarian Development Nexus**. From the first moment, CPA allows for collective efforts through the work of the Consortium organizations, while identifying risk in a multidimensional fashion. CPA allowed for the efficient identification of communities in emergency interventions settings, which had reduced their vulnerabilities and need for development interventions. The data provided by the CPA helped achieve advocacy by funding 19 communities in the Tubas region in the oPt, where the operationalization of the nexus was done through four pillars: infrastructure (roads, water, grazing lands), support for the creation and training of cooperatives, women (small businesses) and governance of Tubas (through the revision of development plans and creation of local councils. It will be important to document this with case studies, emphasizing the contribution to the Humanitarian Development Nexus for scaling up good practices.

iii.   In contexts where a multi-sector/stakeholder approach exists, it might be complicated to introduce a methodology that involves a certain amount of work to different organizations. This has already been seen, for example, in countries under the ONE UN Reform or the attempt to introduce new methodologies for specific sectors like the Integrated Country Approach (ICA) promoted from FAO for the agriculture and livelihoods sector. There is the **risk that the methodology remains embedded** and linked to a specific programme/fund to then slow its implementation strategy when the programme ends. As these types of innovative methodologies are a flagship for policy support and institutional capacity development to address specific challenges, there should be an effective and clear strategy to ensure sustainability over time. It is essential for members of the Consortium to understand that the CPA is a tool that provides valuable community-wide data, to complement and support their own labour, without the intention of substituting or competing with their own internal activities. To ensure so, it is recommended to study, discuss and design an implementation strategy that has the capacity to absorb and adapt to different coordination mechanisms contexts while, at the same time, document experience to scale up good practices.

iv.   Although with areas that need improvement, overall the CPA assessment tools and products are well adaptable to the local context (e.g. the Context profiling tools). Most of the implementation constraints have been observed in the **staff capacity whose minimum requirements remain of high standard** for the CPA: the dependency of the CPA success from this aspect seems to remain considerably high, especially in comparison with the possibility for the beneficiary community to be able to take ownership of the process, without a clear leadership of the CPA management team. It is essential that the staff involved in the process have the necessary skills required to extract information from both qualitative and quantitative approaches with communities, going beyond of what is said, and trying to further understand what is said from the community. It is recognized that We World – GVC has created tailored and specific training packages for automation of certain tools, to further simplify the process of data collection and community engagement. For this reason, it is recommended to study and identify possible activities that can support the CPA approach to maintain high engagement and to achieve meaningful levels of participation. The ability of the staff to engage the community in qualitative methods (e.g. Narrative Community Perspective) is crucial to extract real information from community members and ensure that details not captured through the IPSI are properly reflected later in the PRP. Even though PRP is not only an implementation tool but an empowerment means to keep dialogue with the community to engage in their own strategies to address risks and needs, it is fundamental to document its great potential as well as the way is impacting the daily life of the targeted communities (Anonymous 2019). It will be also important to ensure that the process to keep the above concept up to dated and handed over for successful replicability.

v.   **Staff capacity** can be a limitation to the effectiveness of the CPA. Investments in training and capacity building of staff are already fostered by the CPA. Even though this aspect reported successful results in the oPt, this was more complicated for Lebanon, where there is a high turnover of staff and difficulties finding people that were able to quickly absorb and implement a set of tools that require a minimum level of skills as well as great availability of time. Time and capacity are certainly two variables that can negatively affect the implementation process of the CPA, since the first stages of the contextualization process. In addition to the training package recently developed, it is recommended to introduce a systematic feedback/assessment to field staff with the aim of improving the monitoring of the quality of the implementation process.

vi.   It has been observed that within the two CPA projects, **advocacy and communication efforts** for sharing lessons learned and good practices of the CPA need more emphasis and

coordination effort. It is remarkable the amount of information and data produced through the CPA for each community. However, this information is often not utilized or becomes obsolete. Staff capacity at the national and field level, dedicated to the implementation aspects, need a solid structure for systematically produce and document effectively, the results of the CPA. It is recommended to structure a communication and advocacy strategy, managed by the Consortium, able to produce material useful for documenting lessons learned, advocacy, communication, donor relations, fundraising. This resulted to be feasible during the field interview by hiring dedicated people within the consortium that can liaise with field staff and field managers and, at the same time, reserve dedicated funds throughout the project timeframe.

vii.   The lack of an effective communication strategy could create the perception that the consortium is trying to **create a parallel mechanism of coordination**, beyond the established system. The objectives and scope of the CPA are not to blame other actors or substitute existing mechanisms of coordination, but rather to contribute to the overall efficiency of humanitarian interventions and to the improvement of coordination and cooperation mechanisms. However, the risk of being perceived as a threat is present. Significant efforts need to be done to create acceptance and synergies with other humanitarian actors in the field. The first step would be to strengthen the contextualization process since the beginning and have a realistic planning of the activities and engage with duty bearers and external stakeholders. That way, organizations will be more comfortable in working on quality and produce good data, share them, build acceptance and trust each other.

viii.   Linked to the above, and depending on the context, it has been reported that the CPA will have a greater impact on the empowerment of the communities **if there is a local authority engaged and concerned about people** and, at the same time, a **solid community identity**. In contexts where the local authority is not supporting nor engaging with the community and with CPA, and where there is not a solid community identity, there is the risk to compromise the capacity of the CPA to extract good data. In this scenario, the assistance delivered, and the empowerment component of the process is not contextualized and accepted. The reputational risk on the CPA might be very high, as well as the risk of not being accountable to beneficiaries. It has been observed that to increase acceptance is important to ensure consistent replicability in every kind of contexts. Therefore, it is vital to use as much as possible the pre-filling of information with secondary data available to tailor the MQ and be context-specific. At the same time, it is recommended to use the CPA tools designed for the contextualization, such us the legal and stakeholder mapping.

ix. The **fragmentation of the division of the work** on the field, among consortium partners, can make the coordination very costly. Pre-filling the questionnaire with secondary data can help have more accurate information and make less effort while reshaping the information. The more the CPA management team will use, whenever possible, the **secondary data available** in the country to pre-fill the information and have a basis for the MQ, the better the contextualization will work and will create the basis for a correct implementation of the CPA.

x. The l**ack of political, financial, and operational independence** of the humanitarian sector is profoundly disconcerting. One way of thinking about the principle of independence is to recognise that full independence is very hard to achieve, but autonomy in decision-making and action is essential (DuBois, 2018). Good practice must focus on those elements that most interfere with principled humanitarian action. A methodology that puts at the centre the self-decision making of a community, within the existing social and cultural system, conceives an innovative "way of working" that need to promote the inclusion of its principles within the framework of the traditional funding mechanisms and programme implementation. An advocacy mechanism can be a powerful instrument to show evidence of the innovation brought by the CPA methodology. However, it has been observed that there is a need to attract donors in a way that the CPA principles will trigger a discussion and reflection on the humanitarian funding mechanisms and programming from their foundations.[7] As demonstrated in the success of the TURBO project in Tubas, the oPt, some of the key aspects to ensure going from a pure humanitarian assistance scheme to development programmes lies within the **involvement of local authorities**, and in the creation of community councils. When lacking response from the central government, the synergy and communication between local partners and local organizations proved to be valuable for community advocacy and for the inclusion of actions within the regional development plans.

xi. **Financial autonomy** is certainly fostered (not without challenges and limitations) as the management team (e.g. the West Bank Protection Consortium in the oPt) works like networking that can potentially increase its capacity to advocate for the CPA and raise funds. It is recommended to have a discussion to strengthen the capacity of the CPA for self-advocacy and for resource mobilization.

---

[7] While to try identifying the limits of the humanitarian role, in his "the new humanitarian basic", Dubois explains that, very often, the evidence-based results requested by donors for their reporting, is far from the field reality and it reflects the gap between the implementation of the activities and the achievement of project objectives, with the broader approach behind a specific programme/methodology (DuBois, 2018).

xii.   Given the fact that the assessment tools of the CPA have the capacity to reach a nationwide connotation, it is recommended to capitalize coherently the coordination among consortium partners as the information gathered can reach very high dimensions. It is therefore important to ensure an info-**sharing mechanism transparent, timely and consistent among consortium partners.** The same mechanism can be used to ensure timely reporting of evidence-based results to donors and partners.

xiii.   It has been reported that the **disengagement of the local NGOs** (and other key actors) within the CPA implementation process can create miss-coordination, assessment fatigue among communities, duplication of work and ultimately can affect the accountability to beneficiaries. Even in areas where there is no presence of the consortium, but there are community targeted, it will be vital to work with the local NGOs and ensure they gather a deep knowledge of the methodology, its approach, its functioning. It needs to be sufficiently contextualized even if it comes to the extent of comparing it globally with other existing tools risking the acceptance in certain contexts, but it is vital for the community-driven approach.

xiv.   In relation to the above mentioned, it has been observed that, even by showing complementarity within programmes and activities, often the **CPA inclusion into existing mechanisms** has been perceived as a mere monitoring exercise and duplication of activities. This can represent a risk for the consistency of the CPA, as the community could perceive the fragmentation of the activities and have the community representatives engaging with several entities and putting energies on different aspects (sometimes contrasting activities). It is vital to ensure that all the stakeholders present at the community level are mapped, informed and involved with inclusiveness within the CPA implementation process since the first steps of the contextualization exercise. It is recommended to make a bigger effort in explaining the essence and objectives of the CPA and take them on board. There is the need to re-discuss the mapping exercise by including more cohesive and practical participation of external NGOs/partners. The political implication (positive and negative) of having local NGOs fully on board with the CPA concept is a critical part of the success and replication of the methodology.

xv.   Although the monitoring system of the CPA has become accurate enough to reflect a realistic picture of the community, based on lessons learned from the oPt, it has been reported to be difficult to determine how successful protection interventions have been. Recommendations related to calculation of the impact of different types of contexts has been already provided to GVC and the introduction Participatory Research to elaborate

flexible mechanisms has been already considered for future inclusion. It will be important to ensure follow up on this aspect.

xvi. With a special reference to the oPt model, following the CPA Methodology Review results and the section dedicated to the IPSI and Changes Sessions it is reported the necessity to **streamline data collection,** *provide a more rigorous technical base and ease its interpretation* (WBPC review of the CPA, 2016). In the same paper, it is also stated that "*The CPA methodology, and especially for the data collection of the PVI, seems to require a back and forth between different informants. This way of data collection is complex and time demanding which could affect not only efficiency, but also quality if it is performed by poorly qualified staff in research methods and overloaded of work, as it is common for the field staff in operational organizations*". In addition, with the large questionnaire for the risk and community, all these can increase the risk of lack of quality of the data collected (D'Ancona, 2005). Therefore, it would be pertinent to explore ways to streamline the method for data collection making use of the data already available, which would reduce the amount of data to be collected and moving to more standardized techniques that require less technical knowledge and expertise from data collectors (Lightfoot et al., 1999).

xvii. One of the biggest concerns in the implementation of the CPA in the oPt is the use and methodology of the PVI. The fear of losing the ability for trend analysis with existing data from 2015 if there is a **shift to the IPSI** is not methodologically relevant. The PVI indicators used in the oPt should go through a revision work to match with the existing indicators of IPSI, to properly overcome the main concerns of stakeholders: number of indicators, interpretability of data, consistent, robust and scientifically strong methodology. Whenever changes are applied to composite indicators, especially techniques like weighting, aggregation and multivariate analysis, these techniques can be applied to data from previous years, with the objective of not losing data. This is already done in indicators used by ECHO and JRC (INFORM Index) in the context of risk analysis. The importance of understanding the IPSI, what it does and how it works is important for transferability (Anonymous, 2019): the IPSI is one of the ways that could be used for advocacy and scale the CPA up to the international level. To replicate the methodology through an effective strategy, it would be recommended to initiate the analysis of protection by introducing vigorously the IPSI which has the potential to be shared ad advocate for the CPA within the humanitarian system on a bigger scale. The CPA must be contextualised and it is certainly creating lots of discussion, battles and contradictions but has the potential to have a solid base for starting the CPA in another region.

xviii.   "The tailored NCP is the moment when the AGD groups in the community are engaged, including the **most vulnerable groups**. However, consultation of these groups is effective if their engagement is maintained throughout the CPA, to achieve meaningful levels of participation and empowerment" (GVC internal review, 2016). Considering the above, it would be interesting to understand how the participation of these groups can be ensured if there is the possibility to officially engage in the CPA implementation process and nominate a focal point/representative of the most vulnerable groups. The inclusion and **applicability of the AGD** with the CPA improved its quality and efficiency. It is perceived as essential. It is recommended, to strengthen community empowerment, more systematic and structured extraction of information related to sensitive cross-cutting issues, difficult to be reflected, such as child protection or GBV, to ensure that people suffering from those experiences do not remain neglected.

xix.   In Lebanon (and possibly in other contexts), the presence of the *shawish* (or the **presence of the community leader) within the FGD** for the collection of the information, can be a threat for the collection and reflection of the reality which the community live. The CPA has an excellent capacity to ensure that people feel free to answer the questions and share their conditions. This capacity could be further improved by ensuring the following, for example, dividing males from females (already happening within the projects), mitigate the presence of leaders in the groups, endorse women in the role of leaders within the community and ensure they take it as a proper job with clear deliverables and responsibilities.

xx.   It is recommended to **reinforce the MEAL** role into the consortium to have more systematic monitoring of the activities.

xxi.   Although the root causes for the protracted crisis scenario in the oPt comes from a political setting, and many of the interventions help alleviate but not cure them, CPA has been a powerful tool for donors to receive a complete picture of risks faced by communities, that can help identify the vulnerabilities and needs to humanitarian and development actors. It will be important to ensure the **process of formalization of PRP within the communities** and the continued updating of the information provided by the community itself, as it will be crucial for ensuring community ownership and for advocacy purposes with future organizations and local authorities.

xxii.   It should be recommended to **simplify and continue making accessible the CPA's tools** and methodologies so that others can benefit from the data and potentially replicate elements of the CPA in every context (Thomas, 2017). The CPA web platform is a good tool to be maintained and expanded in other countries.

9.1 Recommendation dedicated to the rights-based approach vis a vi the needs-based approach

Below, we present some recommendations dedicated specifically to the effort of the CPA, to ensure a rights-based approach in different contexts:

i. The implementation of the **CPA components takes time** to show concrete actions: for replicability of the methodology, it will be important to understand the expectations on this from donors and partners and make sure that the compromise reached to initiate the CPA is not bigger than the real capacity to implement it. A discussion supported by detailed feasibility studies that include scenarios with possible operationalization strategies is recommended to be produced before the implementation starts. It has been observed that in some cases the contextualization process is overcome by putting "*too much emphasis on the implementation process within the project timeframe without thinking that the PRP is created from/for the community and not for the donor reporting requirements or for the advocate and communication requirements*" (Anonymous 2019). This could affect the community empowerment process as the planning of the activities needs more time and more quality. If from a side, the CPA needs to follow the planned steps to guarantee results, there a pressure to implement, on the other side and the need and request from donors and from the humanitarian community to receive results.

ii. In relation to the above, the experience of the Lebanon model showed a dilemma reported on the CPA capacity to accomplish and guarantee a **rights-based rather than a needs-based approach.** The protracted humanitarian situation scenario of Lebanon (where refugees live in settlements) delayed the potential capacity of the PRPs to generate innovative activities for the communities. Where the community is still struggling for primary necessities, it will be hard for the CPA to propose scaling up activities if the assistance will be focussing at securing needs-based assistance. In the case of Lebanon, this will be accurately included and ensured in its phase II of the programme. This dilemma is generating criticism directed to the CPA for not empowering the community as promised with the risk to affect the implementation process and the effectiveness of the approach. However, The CPA purposely uses a need-based narrative and operational instruments as buy-in to introduce carefully right-based considerations. In conclusion, if from a side the minimum level of standards of basic needs should be pushed further and, if it is true that basic needs must be provided first, yet the type of engagement carried out through the CPA with the community takes a "rights-based" stance: i.e. instead of running a questionnaire and design the response based on the quantitative results of the questionnaire (typical of

the basics of humanitarian assistance), the questionnaire entails a "reviewed engagement" with the affected population on the basis of additional factors of analysis that may bring to responding in different ways than pure relief. In this respect, the CPA envisages already through its innovative approach, a right-based direction and guarantees it from the onset. For a more effective transferability of the methodology it is recommended to project the CPA potential against community conditions well in advance and plan accordingly in relation to the results that can be gathered within the project timeframe.

iii. It is recommended to **continue investing on the use the IPA** approach and methodology as a powerful tool that has a great potential, within the CPA, to concretely contribute in bridging the gap of the humanitarian nexus and supporting the community to scale up their capacity by ensuring a mapping of the primary needs as an essential step to initiate the empowerment and awareness process. The IPA was linked to the CPA for the first time in Lebanon and it is already showing remarkable results in supporting and guiding the targeted community. In such complex contexts (characterized by high competition among partners and reluctance to share), the natural predisposition of the IPA methodology to serve as an inclusive effort of putting partners together under the same CPA umbrella come up clearly.

iv. Another issue related to the difficulties to concretely foster an innovative right-based approach stands in the **capacity of the community to drive the process** while ensuring, at the same time, full participation and, ultimately, ownership of the activities. It has been reported in fact that, after the process of extraction of data and delivery of the PRPs to the community, they will be involved in other partner's activities. This can bring **burn out and assessment fatigue on the community**. It is recommended to ensure that mapping exercises are done in partnership.

v. At the same time, if the traditional humanitarian assistance will continue to have a much shorter timeline with a much visible **return on the investment on communities** living protracted crisis, the CPA will have difficulties in advocate for its sustainability and replicability and show concrete results. There is a need to recognize a more solid and inclusive effort to start a discussion on this and ensure the participation of all the relevant stakeholders.

vi. In a **context as Lebanon where there is not a pure emergency** occurring as it has been already protracted over time and where the needs are still of an emergency nature due to the lack of response from the government, it is important the need for the CPA implementation to take more time.

vii. The **consortium is vital to demonstrate that the methodology is valuable** and has the capacity that We World - GVC alone doesn't have. "*The completely different functioning*

of the agencies inside the consortium is difficult to manage and it has at its inside a rigidity in its implementation. However, is very important to support the multi-sectoral nature of the consortium has the expression of its capacity to address community needs from several perspectives ensuring a comprehensive intervention with good chances to, later, to scale up this effort and direct it towards an integrated rights-based approach. needs internal analysis discussion especially in front of the community" (Anonymous 2019).

viii.   The effort of the CPA to include several parameters of the **conflict sensitivity analysis results to be outstanding as they have been introduced in the process of analysis and decision making of the methodology. It is recommended to continue working on ensuring and adapting the conflict sensitivity analysis to contexts.** The conflict sensitivity is an approach to programming, and it is more than just the application of a 'tool' to specific programmes/projects. Carrying out conflict sensitive practice involves the capacity and skills of staff, institutional policies and commitment, and flexibility of donors and other stakeholders. Conflict sensitivity is rooted in solid conflict analysis, which is linked to programming and informs decisions about the 'what' and the 'how' of the planned intervention (Carroll et al., 2009).

9.2 Recommendations to Donors' relation aspects

CPA major Donors have greatly supported the inclusion of the methodology on a wide scale. Donors intend to apply the CPA as an instrument to improve the overall efficiency of the humanitarian intervention in a specific country, by advancing a more integrated and multi-sectoral approach, improving data sharing and coordination and ultimately increasing accountability of humanitarian actors towards the beneficiaries. Donors believe that the CPA can potentially provide the data and analysis to better understand flaws in current humanitarian programming and coordination and suggest a way forward. Moreover, they support the capacity of the CPA to highlight the gap between right-holders and service providers/humanitarian actors, thanks to a comprehensive process of community engagement and participation. However, donors referred that this can be perceived as a possible threat by the other stakeholders if not properly advocated with a communication strategy promoted by the consortium (Anonymous, 2019). The risk is to lack an effective communication strategy with a potential to create the perception that the consortium will impose a parallel mechanism of coordination, beyond the established system. The objectives and scope of the CPA are not to blame other actors or substitute existing mechanisms of coordination, but rather to contribute to the overall efficiency of humanitarian interventions and to the improvement of coordination and cooperation mechanisms. However, the risk of being perceived as a threat is always present. Significant efforts should be considered for future

discussion on replicability in other regions to create acceptance and synergies within the donors' community.

The biggest concerns of the donors in the oPt is that the intervention staged through the CPA may only be remedial of a situation that is chronical and difficult to solve. Although political causes are the root of the protracted crisis scenario in the West Bank, analysing other protection risks through the CPA has been recognized widely to be "more efficient for the community" (Anonymous, 2019). To this extent, the donor highlights the role of the WBPC as "one of the most effective projects in the West Bank. It helps to push the state to do something for the people (e.g. demolition)" (Anonymous, 2019). Donors have praised the use of the CPA for identifying the most important needs of communities and to provide a snapshot of the context of these communities. It is important to continue to build trust with donors through a communication strategy able to consistently produce evidence of the CPA results. An effective and efficient communication strategy needs to be established between We World - GVC and donors, for them to understand the important improvements that have been done to the quantitative element of the CPA.

Linked to the above, in the specific case of Lebanon, donors reported that the indicators and quantitative data produced by the CPA are difficult to understand. The lack of proper analysis and extraction of key messages is a concern, especially if detailed, exhaustive and valuable raw data. This concern could be easily addressed through a shift towards a more robust and strong quantitative methodology like the IPSI, where indicators address specific humanitarian areas, as well as dimensions of safety and dignity. Concerns about data have been considered and improved in the IPSI, now it needs to be conveyed to the donors.

It is recommended to allocate resources in creating staff capacity able to technical analysis, extract, interpret the data produced by the CPA tools about communities, and develop reports/documents on a periodical basis, able to communicate CPA results to stakeholders and communities.

References

ADB, 2004, Effectiveness of Participatory Approaches: Do the New Approaches Offer an Effective Solution to the Conventional Problems in Rural Development Projects? Retrieved from: https://www.oecd.org/derec/adb/35183500.pdf

Anonymous, 2019. The stakeholders interviewed during the second phase of the present studies are marked as "Anonymous" were mentioned in the report. The interviewed were conducted through skype and during the field visits in oPt and Lebanon.

Banerjee V., Duflo E., 2011, Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty, PublicAffairs.

Beishem M., and Simon N., 2016, Multi-stakeholder partnerships for implementing the 2030 Agenda: Improving accountability and transparency. German Institute for International and Security Affairs. Retrieved   from: https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/files/en/2016doc/partnership-forum-beisheim-simon.pdf

Carbonnier G., 2015, Humanitarian Economics: War, Disaster and Global Aid Market. London: Hurst & Co.

Carroll K., Goldwyn R., Lagu M., 2009, Rights based approaches and Humanitarian Interventions in Conflict Situations, a learning and discussion document (London, ActionAid International and CARE UK. Retrieved from: https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/Rights-in-Conflict.pdf

Carter B., 2017, Effectiveness of working in consortia, Institute of Development Studies. Retrieved from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ba3785740f0b6071970c21f/067_Working_in_Consortia.pdf

Caverzasio, G. (ed.) 2001. Strengthening Protection in War: A Search for Professional Standards, p. 19. Geneva, ICRC.

Chambers R., 1994, Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Challenges, Potentials and Paradigm, Institute   of   Development   Studies.   Retrieved   from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/373b/7c8222d2bfd87bceedaa4ba85adb74e522dd.pdf

Chambers R., 1997, Whose Reality Counts? Putting the first last, Stylus Pub Llc.

Chigas D., Woodrow P., 2018, Adding up to peace – the cumulative impacts of peace initiatives, CDA Collaborative Learning Projects. Retrieved from: https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/ADDING-UP-TO-PEACE-The-Cumulative-Impacts-of-Peace-Initiatives.pdf

Christoplos, I., 2005, Institutional capacity building amid humanitarian action, ALNAP Review of Humanitarian   Action   in   2004.   Retrieved   from: www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/rha04-ch2.pdf

Christopols I., Dillon N., Bonino F., 2018, Evaluation of protection in humanitarian action, ANALP. Retrieved   from:

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ALNAP%20Evaluation%20of%20Protection%20Guide%20web.pdf

Collinson S., 2016, Constructive deconstruction: making sense of the international humanitarian system, ODI. Retrieved from: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10734.pdf

Collinson S., Elhawary S., 2012, Humanitarian space: a review of trends and issues, Humanitarian Policy Group Paper. Retrieved from: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7643.pdf

Cooley A., Ron J., 2002, The NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Action, International Security, 27:1.

D' Ancona, M. A. (2005) La senda tortuosa de la calidad de la encuesta. In Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociologica, 111 (05), pp. 75-103. Retrieved from: http://www.reis.cis.es/REIS/PDF/ REIS_111_051168262751380.pdf

DG ECHO, 2016, Humanitarian Protection: Improving protection outcomes to reduce risks for people in humanitarian crises. Thematic Policy Document n° 8. European Commission. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/policy_guidelines_humanitarian_protection_en.pdf

DG ECHO, ECHO Protection Policy (2016)

Du Bois M., 2018, The new humanitarian basics, ODI-HPG Working Group. Retrieved from: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12201.pdf

FAO, 2005, An approach to rural development: PARTICIPATORY and NEGOTIATED TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT (PNTD), FAO. Retrieved from: http://www.fao.org/3/a-ak228e.pdf

FAO, 2012, IPC: Evidence and stadards for better food security decisions. Technical Manual 2. Retrieved from: http://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC-Manual-2-Interactive.pdf

Fatterman D., Wandersman A., 2005, Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice.

German Red Cross, 2011, Helping people, shaping society, German Red Cross. Retrieved from: https://www.drk.de/fileadmin/user_upload/PDFs/Das_DRK/Strategie/GRC_Strategic_development_2020_double-sided.pdf

Global protection Cluster, 2017, Protection Mainstreaming Toolkit. Retrieved from: http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/_assets/files/aors/protection_mainstreaming/gpc-pm_toolkit-2017.en.pdf

GVC-We World, 2018, Guidance note on AGD mainstreaming in CPA, Internal Document.

HERE-Geneva, 2016, On the Right Track? Reasserting the Priorities of Humanitarian Action. Retrieved from: http://here-geneva.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/HERE-On-the-right-track-final.pdf

ICRC, 2001. The gg Protection Framework. Retrieved from: https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/0783-strengthening-protection-war-search-professional-standards

ICRC, Strengthening Protection in War (2001)

Lightfoot C., Ramirez R., Noble R., 1999, Putting the learning into participatory approaches: four dimensions to understand ISG. Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from: www.ids.ac.uk/eldis/isg/isg.html see also http://www.pdforum.org/ramirez26.html

Lusthaus C., Adrien M. H., Anderson G., Carden F., Montalvan G. P., 2002, Organizational assessment: a framework for improving performance. Retrieved from: http://web.idrc.ca/ev_en.php?ID=30161_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Macdonald I., Valenza A., 2012, Supporting Principled Humanitarian Action, NRC. Retrieved from: https://www.nrc.no/globalassets/pdf/reports/tools-for-the-job---supporting-principled-humanitarian-action.pdf

Macharia D., 2016, ARE CONSORTIA A GOOD WAY FORWARD?, OXFAM Learning Paper, Retrieved from: https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/610858/cs-consortia-kenya-310516.pdf;jsessionid=4CF51F56F266232DCF3D73A566AAAE91?sequence=1

Michele F., Rodier R., 2016, Summary finding of the consortium internal evaluation, WBPC, internal document.

Morgan P., 1994, capacity Development – an introduction. Institute on Governance.

OECD, 2019, DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian Development Peace Nexus, OECD Legal instruments. Retrieved from: https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/643/643.en.pdf

OHCHR (2012) Human rights indicators. A guide to measurement and implementation. OHCHR: Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from; http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Human_rights_indicators_en.pdfThomas,

Oxfam 2009, Improving the safety of civilians: a protection training pack. Oxfam.

Pattberg P., Wideberg O., 2014, Transnational multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development, IVM Institute for Environmental Studies. Retrieved from: https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/1068688/R14-31+ICSC+report.pdf

Pattugalan G., Crawford N., 2013. Protection in practice. Food assistance with safety and dignity, WFP. Retrieved from: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/wfp254460.pdf

Rondinelli D., 1976, Project Identification in Economic Development, Journal of World Trade Law.

Sandouka, M., Freij, N., (ADVANCE), 2017, WBPC, External Evaluation of the West Bank Protection Consortium 2015-2017.

Shepherd A., Mitchell T., Lewis K., Lenhardt A., Jones L., Scott L. and Muir-Wood R., 2013, The geography of poverty, disasters and climate extremes in 2030. Report. London: ODI.

Slim H., Bonwick A., A guide for humanitarian agencies, ODI, 2005. Retrieved from: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2346.pdf

Smillie I., 2001, Patronage or partnership – local capacity building in humanitarian crises. Kumarian Press.

Thomas M., Case Study of the West Bank Protection Consortium. Phase One: Formation of a Strategic Partnership with INGOs for a Protection-Centred Humanitarian Response to International Humanitarian Law/International Human Rights Law Violations, 2017. Internal Document.

UNFPA – The oPt, 2016, Mapping interventions preventing and responding to Gender Based Violence (GBV) in the occupied Palestinian territory. Retrieved from: file:///C:/Users/user/Desktop/GENDER/MIRIAM/annex%203/GBV%20Mapping.pdf

Wake C., Bryant J., 2018, Capacity and complementarity in the Rohingya response in Bangladesh, ODI - HPG Working paper. Retrieved from: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12554.pdf

Watson C., 2016, Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems research. Work paper 3: Community Perspective, OPML. Retrieved from: https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a0408-shock-responsive-social-protection-systems/wp3-community-perspectives-sahel-en.pdf?noredirect=1

WBPC, CPA Methodology Review: Focus on PVI and Changes Sessions, Internal Document.
WFP, 2014, A WFP approach to operationalize resilience. Part 1: the Integrated Context Analysis. Retrived from
https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp264472.pdf

Wilson-Grau R., Britt H., Outcome Harvesting, Ford Foundation, 2012. Retrieved from: http://www.managingforimpact.org/sites/default/files/resource/wilsongrau_en_outome_harvesting_brief_revised_nov_2013.pdf

Annex 1: Semi-structured interview for evaluation of the Community Protection Approach (CPA)

After a brief introduction about the purpose of the evaluation and the 3 criteria used, we ask participants to introduce themselves. Before start recording, we will inform that the interview will be anonymous and that their names won't be showed in the final report. We reiterate that this will be an opportunity for them to contribute, with their critical thinking, to the improvement of the CPA.

A. CPA General:

1. In your opinion, what are the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the CPA approach?

B. The relevance of the CPA:

The question of relevance highlights the new elements introduced by the CPA (where possible in comparison with other existing tools) and, at the same time, validates the criteria that establish the methodology and logic of the CPA in multi sector and multi stakeholder scenarios and its strategies adjusted to certain social, political and economic contexts.

2. Would you define the CPA approach innovative? If yes, what are the innovative elements introduced by the CPA?
3. In context of complex emergency/protracted crisis, where the CPA is implemented in an ongoing emergency operation, the approach used is effective in identify, reflect the needs of the targeted groups?
4. In your view, what are the minimum requirements in terms of staff capacity, that are requested to ensure the effectiveness of the CPA?
5. The measurement of the outcomes has been reported to be difficult at different stages of the CPA implementation in The oPt. Do you think that the CPA has good capacity to determine how successful protection interventions have been? Any recommendations for improvement?
6. What are the innovative elements of the MQ/IPSI and how would you define its potential for future programming?

C. The consistency of the CPA:

Explain that we use the criteria of *consistency* to assess the soundness, logic, appropriateness and accuracy of the CPA in reflecting community's vulnerability, risk and resilience capacity. At the same time the consistency helps to understand the level of flexibility (capacity to consider any changed circumstances and consequent updates) and the robustness of the methodology.

7. What are the variables that could be considered for the effectiveness of the tool?

(we want to understand what are the elements of the CPA that are most exposed to changes, and that can be a risk for the effectiveness of the tool)

8. The lack of political, financial, and operational independence of the humanitarian sector is profoundly disconcerting. Although the advocacy effort done for the CPA, in your opinion, is there any space for the CPA to be scaled up and be supported at global level? (to be asked to strategic partners)

9. What strategies are put in place where not enough information is gathered through the MQ that may be crucial for obtaining the values of the IPSI and subsequently help activate the trigger mechanisms?

10. The CPA is a right based approach rather than a need-based approach. How the CPA can guarantee this focus in a complex humanitarian setting with multiple layers of coordination, sectors? What can guarantee the functioning and the sustainability to the right based approach?

11. Community empowerment is one of the main purposes of the CPA. In a multi sector/stakeholder scenario, targeted community can be targeted by different programmes at the same time, causing burning and confusion. What is your experience on this and do you any recommendations to overcome it?

12. Do you think that the community empowerment can have challenges or risks in certain circumstances?

D. The applicability of the CPA:

Explain that we use the criteria of applicability to help understand the CPA replicability and transferability. The CPA can apply to different risk scenario, in particular: primary emergency, post emergency, protracted crisis, socio-economic crisis, developmental initiatives. In the case of The oPt, the CPA addresses specifically emergency scenario.

13. What are the areas of the CPA transferability and replicability than need to be improved?

14. The contextualization work is a vital component for the applicability of the CPA? To which extent?

15. How you consider will be the main opportunities and constraints in countries where protection issues are inter-linked to other primary needs, e.g. disaster risks, climate change, access to food security/nutrition/health/WASH, migration? Have those areas been addressed in The oPt?

16. Is there any transition period for hand over and/or any pool of trained experts that can support the start-up activities?

E. Questions specific to thematic sessions (only for people involved in CPA operational implementation):

17. For each component of the CPA (Multi-sector questionnaire, Narrated Community Perspective, Individual Protection Approach) could you please briefly talk about strengths and weaknesses?

18. Following the CPA Methodology Review results and the section dedicated to the Changes Sessions it is reported the necessity to *streamline data collection and ease its interpretation* (WBPC review of the CPA, 2016). In the same paper, it is also stated that "*The CPA methodology seems to require a back and forth between different informants. This way of data collection is complex and time demanding*". What is your experience with this tool and your recommendations for improvement?

19. The IPSI helps to extract quantitative changes within the community as well as major changes encountered in the MQ and IPA baseline. What you recommend regarding quantitative and qualitative information extraction to reflect community's changes?

20. Regarding the Protection Response Plan, what are the major challenges in reflecting the information provided by the CPA and, at the same time, the evolution of the community over time?

21. Are you familiar or have you ever used the CPA National Platform? Could you please talk about of any improvements you recommend?

22. How can the IPSI be applied to other contexts outside of MENA region and still allow for comparability across regions?

F. Cross-cutting issues within the CPA implementation process:

➤ *Age, Gender and Diversity Approach (AGD)*

23. What are the strengths and weaknesses encountered during the application of the AGD approach into the CPA?

24. What are other cross-cutting areas that have not been considered and it should be include into the CPA and how?

G. Protection approach within the CPA

To understand the implementation of the four key elements of protection mainstreaming (ensuring meaningful access, prioritizing safety and dignity while avoiding causing harm, accountability, and participation and empowerment)

25. In your opinion, how the PRP is related to the concept of community empowerment and what are the challenges in ensuring a genuine protection emphasis within the CPA?

H. The CPA multi-stakeholder approach:

The CPA quality and success are based on the collaborative work of all the management and technical experts within the organization. The CPA supports an integrated approach to support communities. With this in mind:

26. What are the advantages and disadvantages encountered in managing the CPA through the West Bank Protection Consortium – WBPC? Any recommendations for improvements?

Annex 2: Stakeholders for Interviews in Lebanon

Organization	Person	Role
ACF	Valeria Sau	ACF Focal Point LPC
ACF	Jane Burke	ACF Meal Coordinator + secondment LPC
GVC	Giuseppe Russo	Regional Coordinator
GVC	Aloma Garcia	Country Director
GVC	Camille Ameslon	Emergency Coordinator
GVC	Lorenzo Barella	CPA Specialist
Consortium	Dom Hunt	Integrated Response Manager
ECHO	Massi Mangia	Head of Office
ECHO	Jammale Chedrawi	Programme Officer
ECHO	Joachim Delville	TA
NRC	Kate Norton	Country Director
GVC	Ali Mounzer	WASH and Shelter Specialist
GVC	Ahmad Sharif	Information Management Programme Manager
Consortium	Elena Dikomitis	Advocacy Manager
GVC	Abdul Ilah Salloum	CPA Officer
GVC	Raghidah Hamieh	Field Coordinator
GVC	Taghrid Abdallah	Protection Coordinator
GVC	Mustafa Saleh	Protection Officer
GVC	Layla Allam	Case Management Officer
GVC	Abir Toufaily	Case Management Officer
GVC	Francesca Anastasia	ECHO Project Manager

UNIVERSITÀ DI PAVIA
Department of Economics
and Management

Annex 3: Stakeholders for Interviews in the oPt

Organization	Person	Role
Palestinian Authority - ACCO	Marwan Durzi	Head of the Area C Coordination Office
GVC	Fadi Arouri	Communication and Advocacy Officer
GVC	Liu Fornara	Country Director
AAH	Mohammed Amayreh	Head of base South West Bank
GVC	Aqeel, Mahmoud, Hadeel, Saja, Asia	Field Staff in Hebron
NRC	Fadi Shamisti	Shelter Cluster Coordinator
Consortium	Renaud Rodier	Consortium Representative
Consortium	Lina Rabadi	Technical Assistant
PUI	Emilie Debreuille	Foremr Deputy Country Director PUI
Consortium	Wouter	Consortium Data Analyst
GVC	Taysir and Denise	Area Manager Tubas/Development Programme Coordinator
GVC	Luca de Filicaia	North Africa Regional Coordinator
AICS	Dario Rossi d'Ambrosio, Andrea Cascella	Humanitarian Programme Officer