PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND ENDORSEMENT CHECK-LIST

This check-list (part I.) highlights key elements that should be included during the design and development of a project to be considered a project which integrates protection mainstreaming. These elements should be integrated in all projects developed during and after a humanitarian crisis which fall under one or more of the MCOF sectors of assistance (MCOF wheel as reference).

Suggestions for protection mainstreaming indicators are also included in part II. They could be included in the design of the project results matrix.

The list is to be used also during the project endorsement phase

MEANINGFUL ACCESS

☑	Ensure **sex and age disaggregated data** (even if estimates) are considered during the development process and duly reflected in the project (including in baselines and targets).
☑	Are activities designed to respond to the questions: **who needs what, why, when and how**?
☑	Has **access** to the various services been checked in relation to the profile of the affected population (specific considerations for disabled people, separation of male and female facilities etc.)? Have specific disadvantages/barriers for certain groups been identified/addressed (look at migrant communities caugth in crisis for instance)?

PRIORITIZE SAFETY AND DIGNITY AND DO NO HARM

☑	Has the applicable **legal framework** been assessed and referenced in the proposal (applicable legal framework depends on the content of the proposal but should usually be: international humanitarian law, refugee law, international human rights law, migration relevant bodies of law, data protection national law, national disaster law etc.)?
☑	Has the local **security and conflict context**, as well as **local power dynamics** been assessed?
☑	Have **risks assessment** (see tool 1) related to the project implementation been conducted? Have **mitigating factors** been considered in the project design?
☑	Have different **vulnerable groups** and their specific needs and capacities been identified?
☑	Have **protection capacities** of the State as well as of the affected population been assessed and included in the project, with attention paid to specific capacities and needs of relevant groups (e.g. look at the migrant population)?
☑	Have **positive self-protective practices** been enhanced in the proposed response?
☑	Has **safety** of both beneficiaries (for all relevant groups) and staff been assessed?
☑	Have **staff capacities** been assessed in terms of protection mainstreaming? If gaps exist, is training going to be part of the project and the budget? If not, are other protection partners able to provide support in this specific context?

PRIORITIZE SAFETY AND DIGNITY AND DO NO HARM (CONTINUED)

☑ Do the activities **discriminate against** any group or might they be perceived as doing so? Do the activities **protect** the rights of people who have historically been marginalised or discriminated against?

☑ In protecting and promoting the rights of such groups, what will be the i**mpact** on the relationships within and beyond the community?

☑ Could the activities **exacerbate** existing divisions in the community or between neighbouring communities?

☑ Could the activities **inadvertently empower or strengthen** the position of armed groups or other actors?

☑ Has staff been informed of **applicable IOM staff policies** (Code of Conduct, Security, PSEA, Data Protection, etc.)? Is the project including raising awareness events or trainings on those policies?

☑ Have **local norms** and **cultural habits** been identified and taken into consideration to ensure the dignity and meaningful access of affected populations?

EMPOWERMENT, PARTICIPATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS

☑ Are participatory approaches designed to ensure the safety, dignity and meaningful access of the affected populations?

☑ Were the participatory assessment, M&E system and accountability mechanisms designed to identify the **needs and capacity** of the affected population – as well as their safety, dignity and meaningful access to planned humanitarian services?

☑ Have procedures been included to ensure **informed consent** of the beneficiaries to the disclosure of personal information as well as to the participation to specific activities?

☑ Have **confidential procedures** been established to receive, manage and respond to any complaints or feedbacks about the programme/project and about project staff behavior – including local partners (code of conduct)? Have barriers to the access to these complaint mechanisms been analyzed/ taken into account for women and men and other relevant groups? Are response/feedback process and resources identified?

☑ Have **restrictions** to access and participation (including for particular groups) been challenged/further analyzed?

IDEAS FOR INDICATORS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROJECTS

The below suggested indicators could be a source of inspiration while designing a project , most specifically while completing a project results matrix. They should be readapted to the specific situations/context/ project targets and baselines.

PROTECTION MAINSTREAMING PRINCIPLE	PROPOSED INDICATORS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX
Prioritize safety and dignity and do no harm	▶ Number of **safety incidents** reported and addressed (disaggregated by sex and age, diversity) ▶ Frequency and quality of **reports** conducted by staff on project implementation modalities with impact on beneficiaries (management of personal data, incident referral mechanisms, etc.) ▶ Number of **risk assessments** conducted throughout the project implementation time ▶ Number and type of **risk mitigation measures** taken to re-direct projects as per assessment results ▶ Number of **staff trainings** on internal policies and number of reported issues by staff after training ▶ Specific project targeting criteria (**vulnerability**) are explained in a language understandable to all.
Meaningful Access	▶ Number of **individuals accessing services** (age and sex disaggregated data) ▶ Number and type of **measures** implemented to **adapt services** as per profile of the population (sex, age and diversity, etc.) ▶ If variables describe lack/weak access, number and type of measures taken to **re-direct services** as needed ▶ Number of **consultation meetings** with beneficiaries and partners on the satisfaction on services (disaggregated by sex, age and diversity) ▶ Number of individuals (disaggregated by sex and age) **satisfied with access to services** (as determined through questionnaires)
Participation, empowerment and accountability	▶ Number (age, sex, diversity disaggregated data) of beneficiaries participating in **consultative meetings** and/or members of committee (disaggregated by sex) in charge of specific elements of the project (formulation of targeting criteria, management of a service, etc.). ▶ **Positive self-protection practices** used as elements to counter harmful practices / protection incidents ▶ Number of and **participation** (sex, age and diversity disaggregated data) to meetings dedicated to identify solutions to protection incidents happening in a given area ▶ Number and type of **feedbacks** collected on services provided (disaggregated by sex, age and diversity) ▶ Number and type of **measures** taken to address complaints