Module 5:
Programming & Protection

Objectives

- **Identify some of the negative and positive effects that programmes can have on the protection of refugees;**
- **Describe some of the factors that influence programme decisions;**
- **Describe factors that determine the protective character of a programme;**
- **Identify ways to adjust programmes to improve refugee protection.**

Programming and protection

- **What is programming?**
- **What is programming for protection?**
  - Programmes that have protection as a specific objective
  - Other programmes that adopt a protection approach
  - Is this a meaningful distinction?

**It is the objective (protection)
that should define the programme as protective,
not the activities.**

Benefits-Harm approach

4 reasons for unintended consequences:

- **Lack of knowledge of context;**
- **Lack of thought about impact;**
- **Failure to take action to mitigate;**
- **No risk-management strategy to look at all risks in humanitarian intervention.**

Root causes

- **Push to focus on positive outcomes, not on negative ones;**
- **We don't evaluate for unintended impact (a health worker is not a security expert!);**
- **Time, resources, priorities;**
- **Lack of competence, training, tools;**
- **Don't engage experts.**

Better programming initiative…

- **Choose to intervene?**
- **… Then you are part of the context**

- **Analyse the context before intervening**
- **Identify dividers and connectors**
- **Leads to better programme design**
- **Identify the impact of programmes and search for alternate solutions.**

Dividers and connectors

- Connectors are positive factors for peace and cohesion;

- Dividers are negative factors that may cause conflict and expose individuals to threats;

- Provide an analysis tool to inform programme design, monitoring, and evaluation.

Case study questions

1. What factors influenced the design and implementation of the programme?

2. What were the positive and negative effects of the programme decisions made, and were opportunities missed?

3. What could have been done differently to improve protection?