

We The HUMANITARIAN INNOVATION FUND
Exploring new collaborations to address Gender-based Violence
HIF GBV Seed Funding - Narrative template

- Please try not to exceed 6 pages (Arial, 12pts)-

Organisation Name	Rethink Relief

Project Title	Addressing GBV through refugee led innovation
Partner(s)	D-Lab at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, UNHCR, Oxfam America, Caritas Gulu, Information for Technology University, ITU, Kulika, International Development and innovation Network, IDIN
Problem addressed / Theme	Gender based violence is a massive problem in crises and many relief NGOs do not prioritise mitigation and prevention. There is an opportunity to address GBV from a new entry point – tapping into the creative capacity of displaced populations by teaching them to use the design process to create solutions that prevent and reduce gender based violence in humanitarian situations.
Location	Uganda and South Sudan
Start Date	June 2016
End Date	August 22 2016

Total Funding	\$10,000 GBP and approximately USD\$1,000 from DLab
Total Spent	USD\$14,000

ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT

Our goal is to develop a pilot project that brings the people directly affected by gender based violence to the forefront of creating products and systems that reduce and prevent it. This empowerment approach allows refugees to articulate the problems they face, and have the support to design and produce actual prototypes that can address the problem. D-Lab has developed a methodology for this work called Creative Capacity Building and has a robust experience in training people all over the world with no prior knowledge of design. We seek to support refugees in coming up with solutions that will

impact the way relief agencies provide aid. Engaging refugees in design not only enables them to create innovative solutions but the process itself empowers them by building their confidence and strengthening their sense of agency. We want to explore how that may positively impact the way men and women relate to each other in a refugee situation.

Activities

1. Identification of the core group to contribute to the curriculum, plan an evaluation framework
2. Survey on women's and girls' safety in Ayilo camp, Northern Uganda
3. Cross sector catalyst workshop in Entebbe, Uganda
4. Development of a curriculum for training refugees in design to address GBV
5. Pilot testing of curriculum ideas in CCB trainings in East Africa
6. Development of an plan to implement this project including identifying sites, partners and methodology
7. Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for project implementation
8. Feedback loops with gender based violence experts, innovation experts and people do trainings in camps.

2. If you have made changes or amendments to the planned activities and objectives that have not been detailed in an *Agreement Amendment Form*, please list them here.

We added a survey with women and men in Ayilo camp, Adjumani, Uganda about what situations and places created safety or threatened safety for women as input to the workshop.

ACHIEVEMENTS

3. Has the project demonstrated the success of the idea?

By 'success' we mean that the idea has proven effective.

- Completely successful
- Significantly successful
- Partially successful
- Completely unsuccessful

Please explain further:

- a. We have been successful in developing the curriculum, the implementation plan and the initial framework for evaluation. The implementation plan focuses on working in Rhino and Ayilo camps for Southern Sudanese in Northern Uganda and Ajuoung Thok camp in South Sudan for Kordofan refugees, identifies NGO partnerships for work there. However, given the on-going conflict and heightened security situation in South Sudan, we will may have to re-think that site and that will mean changes to the implementation plan.
- b. Engaging refugees in design not only enables them to create innovative solutions but we believe that the process itself empowers them by building their confidence and strengthening their sense of agency. We have several assumption about the impact of this on refugees and gender relationships. We need to do some further work around how to measure more different types of results through the MEL framework.

4. Please describe how the project achieved the planned objectives, and describe all of the results achieved through the activities indicated in Question 1.

Objective 1. Create a core group of GBV experts, designers and humanitarian workers to develop a GBV-focused curriculum that engages refugees in the design process and can be adapted for use in multiple contexts.

Objective 2. The consortium will create a strategy for piloting and refining the curriculum.

Objective 3. The consortium will develop a plan for a pilot project that includes establishing a program, identifying a partner organization, training refugees in the design process and providing support and mentorship for implementing the technologies and programs that they create.

Objective 4. The plan for a pilot project will also include a novel monitoring and evaluation framework that builds on the principles of participatory evaluation and Lean Research

Activities

a. **Identification of the core group to contribute to the curriculum, plan, and a monitoring and evaluation (MEL) framework**

Rethink Relief wanted to bring together very different perspectives and experiences to create better outcomes. We worked with the consortium and identified 22 people from 10 different countries whose could contribute the following experience and skills to the project; life as refugees, work in a range of humanitarian crises in areas of protection, girls' education, gender, livelihoods, youth, and psychosocial work; NGO coordination through the UNHCR; SGBV experts in humanitarian crises; gender experts, grassroots innovation trainers, and innovators and engineers whose experience includes a wide range of appropriate technologies. We brought these people together for the workshop to contribute their input. Several have continued to work with the consortium on the development of the curriculum, implementation plan and MEL framework. They have helped identify partners, sites and target populations in the camps. Some will be implementation partners on the ground in the next phase.

b. **Survey on women's and girls' safety in Ayilo camp, Northern Uganda**

We did a survey of women and men refugees in Ayilo Camp in Arua Uganda around safety for women and girls in the camp, focusing on when they felt safe (what activities, what areas) and then they felt unsafe (what activities, what areas) to contribute to the context and framework for the curriculum and the workshop discussions.

c. **Cross sector catalyst workshop in Entebbe**

We brought together the core group (which includes the consortium) for a three day workshop May 26-28th in Entebbe to exchange their knowledge and experience about GBV, innovation and training and gain a mutual understanding of approach and work. We then divided into three teams to work on curriculum, program plan and evaluation matrix, with refugees, innovators, trainers and GBV workers on each team. The workshop was the catalyst for people from different sectors to understand their different approaches and get to common ground

d. **Development of the curriculum for training refugees in design to address GBV**

During June and July, the curriculum team continued the work begun at the workshop. They drew on the CCB curriculum, training experiences, the results from the Ayilo safety survey, advice from GBV experts, and refugee input to put together a 7 week curriculum that will target mixed groups of camp leaders, GBV workers, refugee workers from different sectors, youth, and men and women who wish to participate. The curriculum will be given at intervals over the year and there will be spin-off trainings on safety around specific themes such as ICT, WASH, income generation. There will be one training a year for NGO participants. The curriculum is geared to generate a discussion around GBV from a new angle. (See much greater detail in the curriculum itself)

e. **Pilot testing of curriculum ideas in CCB trainings in East Africa**

The two curriculum team leads were doing several trainings in Africa in July and August, they were able to test pieces of the developing curriculum in these trainings and refine them for insertion.

f. **Development of a plan to implement this project including sites, partners and methodology.**

In July and August the implementation plan team used the work developed in the workshop to do numerous consultations with both the core group and other networks around implementation. The project will be implemented in Ayilo and Rhino camps for South Sudanese in Northern Uganda and Ajourng Thok in South Sudan for the third site. Rethink Relief will partner with Caritas in Ayilo, International Rescue Committee in Ajourng Thok and we are still finalizing our implementation partner in the Rhino camp. Two people in from the core group played key roles in project design, the GBV manager (IRC) in South Sudan and an innovation social worker from Caritas in Uganda. UNHCR

Innovation agreed to coordinate the NGO collaboration in each of the three sites. In each site we will establish a makerspace/innovation centre where trainings will take place and people can do long term work on prototypes. Kulika from Uganda will carry out the trainings and staff the centres. Design trainings will begin in the camps with mixed groups in the targeted population described in point d. above and then experiment with single sex groups to compare results.

In each camp Rethink Relief will form a team with a GBV NGO worker, the implementing NGO, UNHCR, Kulika and two refugees who have gone through the design training. They will work with the implementing NGO to create different dialogues, workshops and events among refugee designers, NGOs and the general population around how use the prototypes that come out of the trainings to address gender based violence. This team will guide the development of the project in the camps under Rethink Relief. Mid-way through the project, there will be a co-creation summit bringing refugees, innovators and engineers and NGO workers together on innovative solutions to problems chosen by refugees. (Please see much greater detail in the implementation plan).

g. Development of a monitoring and evaluation framework for project implementation.

The MEL team worked with a liaison from the Implementation plan team to develop a core framework for monitoring and evaluation, using the input from the workshop. We are still finalizing the MEL framework since we need to build in MEL from so many different areas: the effectiveness of the design training, the effectiveness of the prototypes being produced to help mitigate and reduce GBV, how do people access successful prototypes; How has this affected women’s feelings of safety in the camps; how do people access them; are these results impacting NGO’s provision of services; is there a behaviour change related to the empowerment and sense of agency refugees can achieve through designing their own solutions; and can that improve relations between men and women. While we have the basic framework, we are waiting to hear from a GBV evaluator and an innovation evaluator to inform and improve our final framework.

g. Feedback loops with gender based violence experts, innovation experts and people do trainings in camps.

Once the curriculum and implementation plan teams took the information from the workshop and began to more fully develop the work, they began feedback loops with different people from each sector, both those who had been in the workshop and other contacts. This was immensely helpful both for content and for developing relationships. As a result, we extended our network of relationships to Field Ready, Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, Refugee Lab, people in the SAFE (Safe Access to Fuel and Energy) network, the I Danish Refugee Council and trainers for the new IASC Guidelines for introducing Gender based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action. We are in the process of determining how to work with some of these groups in the implementation phase.

MULTI-DISCIPLINARY CONSORTIUM

h. Describe the impact of the cross-sector collaboration on the project in general and in which ways the fresh skillset has allowed to address the problem differently.

The key impacts of the cross sector collaboration were:

1. The space to understand very different approaches and hammer out a common strategy that integrates the concerns from different sectors (see challenges)

2. It was to have not only cross-sector collaboration but vertical collaboration so that we had GBV workers and innovators from the head office, country offices and NGO, CBO and refugees from the camps. This made it possible to make informed decisions about best practice for implementation and best ways to shape the curriculum. People working at the camp level were able to provide very practical input about constraints and opportunities on the ground, specific difficulties in generating effective participation from the community, suggestions for effective engagement and opportunities for integrating messages around preventing gender based violence.
3. Refugee participation was essential. Refugees with experience in three different camps brought real insights to refugee's concerns, priorities, what would be the constraints and how to make the project relevant, accessible and acceptable.
4. Without the cross sector collaboration and particularly the experience of the workshop, we would not have understood our difference sufficiently to be able to find common ground and agree upon an approach.

Methodology

- i. **Describe how the methodology used was or was not appropriate to carry out the planned activities or achieve the planned objectives.**

Our methodology was: to do preliminary identification of key people to provide input; bring them together for cross-fertilization and planning; continue the planning work long distance, look for on-going input with a wide variety of people working in innovation/maker spaces in camps and people working on GBV in camps.

- a. The workshop was effective and appropriate. It served as both a real catalyst of creativity and an incredibly useful exchange of knowledge that permitted us to get to a place of common agreement. It provided us with an on-going network of people that we continued to consult for developing the plan, curriculum and evaluation.
- b. In the workshop we used many hands-on exercises and co-creation small group activities. These tactile and creative exercises (e.g. building a mock-up of a lighting system to reduce attacks on women) really helped people understand each other's perspectives, promoted effective discussion and moved us forward.
- c. The on-going communication and work back and forth among the different core group members in refugee camps and remote location was essential to grounding the planning work in reality. However the technical difficulties of communication with so many people in locations with poor or no internet was frustrating and extremely time consuming. We needed better technology systems for dialogue and discussion.
- d. Investing time into the creation of a broad network of experts for consultation was an effective methodology for improving the plan, curriculum and MEL framework. It helped us foresee problems, understand challenges and incorporate new ideas and content.

MAJOR OBSTACLES

7. Please list the three most significant obstacles faced during the implementation of the project and describe how they affected the planned activities and results.

E	Impact of Obstacle
---	--------------------

1. Very different approaches on how to structure the design trainings to address GBV.

Initially the core group could not agree on a common way to develop the curriculum, the approaches were too different. For CCB innovation trainers, the problem articulation process should be open-ended. They felt that framing trainings to specifically address GBV from the start would compromise the integrity of allowing people to formulate the problem. Some NGO people felt that introducing the project as GBV would immediately limit interest and participation. GBV workers felt that if the trainings were not focused on GBV from the beginning, GBV would get lost.

2. Communication problems over internet and skype with remote areas.

We really needed to include reference people in the on-going discussions who were in very remote areas with extremely limited connectivity. This really delayed our project work as we needed and valued their input and had to try sometimes weeks in a row to share information effectively.

3 Lack of sufficient time to develop partnership with implementing agencies. This is not an overwhelming obstacle, but it was there. Partnership takes time and understanding and the agreement needs to be institutional.

8. Please indicate what steps were taken to address these obstacles and whether the solutions were effective.

Solution	Effective?
1. 1. After intense discussion we came to a joint decision to present the design trainings around how to improve safety in the camps for women, girls and boys and how women can access safer livelihoods. We will pilot an open ended training in one of the camp and use the information to inform future work.	
2. There were no real solutions to this other than spend an inordinate amount of time trying to communicate! It significantly delayed the development of the curriculum and implementation plan	
3.	

OPTIONAL: BENEFICIARIES/HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS IMPACTED

If your project was intended to impact upon beneficiaries, please answer question 9.

9. Indicate the affected population as well as the humanitarian interventions that have benefited from the project.

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

1. Did the consortium composition change during the course of the project and why?

We added Mustafa Nasseem from the Information Technology University in Pakistan to the consortium because of the content he brought on information technology training at the grassroots.

11. Are there plans to continue your partnership, either while continuing this project or working on other ones?

- Yes, with this innovation
- Yes, with another project
- Maybe
- No

Please describe further: In the implementation phase we will continue to partner on the ground in the camps with UNCHR, Caritas, and IRC. We will also continue to partner with ITU Lahore and Kulika to do the training and run the innovation centres in each camp. We will work directly on the ground with some of the people from the core group who were at the catalyst meeting.

DISSEMINATION

12. Please describe any steps taken to disseminate the outcomes of the project.

Research and policy reports, journal articles, video blogs, evaluations). Please include all completed and forthcoming, as well as all planned and unplanned products (for example,

1. **We will test parts of the curriculum in the MIT-UNHCR project in one refugee site in Uganda before beginning implementation**
 2. **We will make the implementation plan, curriculum and MEL framework into a formal project proposal and submit it for funding in the fall of 2016 so that we can implement it.**
 3. **Once the curriculum has been tested, we will formalize it and make it available through the International Development and Innovation Network, and our partners.**
 4. **We will use the results of the survey from Ayilo camp as a case study for the Humanitarian and Innovation class at MIT in the spring of 2017.**
 5. **We will do a blog for MIT D-Lab on the curriculum and this approach to innovation and GBV.**
-

NEXT STEPS

13. Will the project be replicated, carried forward or scaled up?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

Please describe further:

Yes, by the end of September we will have completed a formal proposal to do the training, establish maker spaces and run the program in three sites and submit it to HIF. We are currently planning two sites in Uganda, Rhino Camp and Ayilo, and a third in Ajoung Thok camp in South Sudan, but Ajoung Thok camp may not be possible due to the unstable and insecure situation there.

D-Lab is concurrently developing a CCB training project for refugees with UNHCR in two sites in Uganda that will begin in the last quarter of 2016. We will use that project to pilot test parts of the GBV and innovation curriculum and inform our implementation plan for the next step of this project. We will be able to maximize resources by sharing trainings and one maker space between the two projects. Each project will inform the other.

14. If the project could be carried forward, replicated or scaled up, please list the three most important issues or actions that will need to be considered (where 1 = most important and 3 = least important)

Suggestion/issue	1	2	3
1 Site selection. At the moment we have put a lot of effort into developing Adjoung Thok, South Sudan as a site but the on-going conflict there may make it necessary to select another site. There is interest in our developing this work in Lebanon but that would be a whole new area without the human resources we do have in East Africa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 Partnership on the ground (Implementing partner). In each camp, UNHCR's role will be to convoke the NGOs for dialogue and co-creation. However there will be a lead implementation partner in each site. If we have to change the third site, we will need to identify and reach an agreement with a new implementing partner on the ground. We are still finalizing our implementing partner in Rhino camp in Uganda.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 In the implementation we will need to spend time and effort on buy-in from camp leadership and others to spend the time in the training. This is one of thing most people have highlighted as a difficulty/challenge in technology training programs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>