To see the webinar, with slides, go here.

To do the one-hour Women's Refugee Commission's e-learning course on making work safe, go here.

Other tools are cited below.

Zehra: Good morning and welcome from New York City to everyone who has logged on to this webinar. My name is Zehra Rizvi, and I am the Senior Livelihoods Officer of the Women's Refugee Commission. Today's webinar is titled: *Peril or Protection: Making Work Safe.* We'll be looking in depth at the intersection of gender-based violence (GBV) and livelihoods.

Before we begin, there is some housekeeping to get through, as this may be the first time people are logging on to a webinar or have used a different platform when looking at other webinars. If you are having technical difficulties with the audio, etc., let us know using the chat function, which you'll see is on the right hand side of the webinar screen.

All you have to do is type in your question and hit submit. We have the lovely Kelsey and Caitlin, from Social Media Today helping us out. Thanks, guys. Hopefully they'll be able to assist you with any technical difficulty issues that you may be having.

The webinar is an hour long. It will be approximately 25 to 30 minutes of presentations from our two expert panelists, whom I will introduce you to in a minute. Then we will open up for questions and discussion from the participants, you guys, who are all logged in. You can ask questions on an ongoing basis, again, using the chat function I just mentioned on the right hand side of your webinar screen.

I will consolidate these and bring them up for the panelists in the second half of the webinar. We would like this to be as interactive as possible, so we will have some polls for you, and the presenters may also be throwing out questions and things for you to think about and respond to and for us to discuss further in the Q&A part of the webinar.

When asking questions, it would be great if you could just identify yourself. You can give us your name, agency, location, what you do, any of that stuff we will take. It will be great to know who we're interacting with. The webinar will also be recorded, so you'll be able to find it on our website in a day or two. All the slides and everything that you see in this webinar, all of that will be included.

I think that about covers our housekeeping topics. We'd like to start with two quick polls for the participants who are logged in. The first question we have for you is—you can see it on your screen right now—"Is gender-based violence a problem where you work?" You can just click right on your screen. You can click either on the "yes" or the "no."

That will move you on to our next question that we have for you, which is…"Do economic programs targeting the affected populations where you work help make women and girls safer from gender-based violence?"

Again, all you need to do, a simple "yes" or "no." Just click on what you would like your response to be. What we'll do is we'll tally up these results from the poll, and I'll share the responses with you right after I introduce our two panelists. We saw that slide already that had our two panelists on it.

---

I'm going to go ahead and introduce to you our first panelist. Her name is Mendy Marsh. She is based in New York City at the UNICEF headquarters. She is their GBV specialist in emergencies. Mendy has a Masters in Public Health and a Masters in Social Work from Columbia University in New York. Mendy's career in the development field started over 14 years ago.

During this time she has worked primarily on reproductive health, HIV/AIDS and GBV. She has worked on GBV in conflict and other disaster-affected countries, primarily in Asia and Africa. She is responsible for providing UNICEF headquarters, regional offices and country offices with direct technical support on GBV in emergencies to ensure that UNICEF programs are in place to prevent and respond to GBV and also to ensure that appropriate coordination mechanisms are in place.

She also supports UNICEF and other partners on capacity building, on GBV prevention and response. She is their main focal point for the co-responsibility that UNICEF has for the GBV area of responsibility under the global protection collector. Welcome, Mendy. It's great to have you here with us.

Mendy: Thank you. I'm happy to be here.

Zehra: Excellent. The second presenter, you can see his photograph. I have the great pleasure of working with him over here at the Women's Refugee Commission. It's Dale Buscher. He's the Senior Director of Programs. Dale leads the commission's work on refugee livelihoods, youth, gender and disabilities, and he oversees…work on sexual and reproductive health and detention and asylum. He has been working the refugee assistance field since 1988 in a variety of capacities, including with Vietnamese boat people in the Philippines, with Haitian refugees interned at Guantanamo Bay, with displaced Kurds in Northern Iraq, with Bosnian refugees in Croatia, and with Kosovars in Albania and in Kosovo.

He also led the International Catholic Migration Commission's $25 million international programs in 20 countries. He has also worked for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and wrote the handbook, Operational Protection in Camps and Settlements. Dale has designed and implemented refugee assistance programs covering lifesaving services, refugee resettlement and reintegration and economic recovery.

He has written numerous publications and presented at global conferences. He is also an adjunct professor at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs. He has a Master's degree in Social Work from the University of Utah and a Bachelors of Science degree from Iowa State University. Welcome to you, Dale.

Dale: Thank you. Happy to be here.

Zehra: Excellent. We're going to get into the webinar, the main topic of our webinar, very quickly, but I just wanted to share the poll results with everyone. There you can see the results, right there. From our first poll, we asked: "Is gender-based violence a problem in the setting where you work?" Sixty-one percent of you logged on right now did indeed say that it was.

The second poll that we had asked about, and the results for that: "Do economic programs targeting the effective population where you work help make women and girls safer from GBV?" Sixty-seven percent of you said yes, that they do indeed make it safer, which is fantastic to hear. Thirty-three percent said no, they don't actually make women and girls safer.

It's telling. The results just highlight what we have learned as part of our research at the Women's Refugee Commission, and highlights the need for webinars such as these.

As an overview of what we will be discussing in this webinar, Mendy will first talk about the links between livelihoods and gender-based violence, followed by a quick explanation of how gender-based violence activities or interventions are divided between either prevention or response.

Dale will then talk about the work of the Women's Refugee Commission in using livelihoods as a tool for protection, which will include a quick walkthrough of the safety mapping tool we have developed that should be of special interest to GBV and livelihood practitioners, or really any practitioners, that are implementing in the field.

We will then, as I mentioned before, head into a discussion and Q&A session where we look forward to your active participation. With that, I would like to ask Mendy to lead us through the links between livelihoods and GBV. Over to you.

Mendy: Thank you. Okay, so what is the link between livelihoods and gender-based violence? We know in conflict settings that as a result of conflict and displacement, women and adolescent girls adopt new strategies to provide for themselves and their families. It often puts them at greater risk of gender-based violence.

Whereas displacement or desperation may affect men and women differently. Where men may actually lose their status or their power in their community and within their family, women and adolescent girls take on additional roles and responsibilities.

Changes in power and in relationships can lead to positive changes, but they can also lead to increased risks for women and girls, especially when women and girls lack access to safe livelihoods options. When we think about programming for livelihoods, programmers often make assumptions, assumptions around what we think is going to happen around protecting women and adolescent girls in particular.

Some of these assumptions include that economic opportunities will actually a positive role and effect. Women and girls, or older adolescent girls, may actually become safer when they have an income, which we think often will lead to having their children be more likely to attend school, be more likely to access health care and be better fed.

But we're going to get into some of these assumptions and see how we really need to analyze our programs to ensure that these efforts really will protect women and girls. Before we do that, we want to think a little bit about what the actual vulnerabilities are in relation to gender-based violence and conflict. There are a number of vulnerabilities to gender-based violence and conflict.

These include underlying root causes, which are embedded in the social and cultural acceptance of any qualities and discrimination against women and girls. Everyday risk factors that contribute to the risk of gender-based violence can be broken into the following five categories.

For example, inadequate legal frameworks, which can include things such as persistent impunity; lack of awareness of rights and obligations; lack of basic survival needs, which can lead to risk of sexual exploitation and abuse due to inadequate access to food, non-food items, cooking fuel, access to water, and safe shelter; lack of economic and social education opportunities, which can lead to financial dependence and income generating activities that are unsafe and lead to exploitation.

Socio-cultural norms which also impact gender-based violence, including factors that actually lead to displacement, such as domestic violence or harmful practices, such as female genital mutilation or cutting or early forced marriage.

Lastly, insecurity and lack of physical protection, which can lead to increases of gender-based violence due to periods of insecurity during flight or displacement, not having access to appropriate lighting or safe shelters, poor latrines or hygiene facilities that are not separated for males or for females—it may not be lit or lockable from the inside—or actually just being dependent on males for needed information.

What do we do about these situations, and how do we deal with gender-based violence in conflict settings? These activities are generally divided up into two large areas. One is prevention and one is response. We're going to break these down in further detail.

When we think about response, response means actually establishing services to mitigate the effects and reduce the likelihood of re-victimization, or set up services to minimize the consequences of gender-based violence, which will actually prevent further harm, injury or suffering. Experiences from the field have revealed that no single sector or agency can actually address gender-based violence.

The multi-sectoral model is generally what we rely on, which actually forces us to think about the need for intra-organizational and intra-sectoral efforts that cross the health, welfare, legal and security sectors. These efforts must promote participation of the community. They must focus on interdisciplinary work and collaboration among different sectors.

A key principle around the multi-sectoral model is the rights and needs of survivors are preeminent in terms of access to respectful and supportive services, guarantees of confidentiality and safety and the ability to determine the course of action for addressing the gender-based violence incident. In general, an emergency contact would tend to focus on the health and psychosocial sectors.

The psychosocial sector is often where we actually bring in the livelihoods effort to ensure that women and girls have that as a referral option when we're trying to meet their basic needs. Let's think a little bit more about prevention. Prevention activities in many ways are the longer-term efforts that we must actually deal with. They're not necessarily as concrete or as tangible as the response activities.

Prevention activities can result in some risk reduction and immediate scale changes in behavior, while beginning a process that will encourage long-term social change and social norms in gender.

Prevention means that all sectors and actors must take action to address gender-based violence and make sure that anything that they do within their sectors will actually ensure the protection and security of women and girls, while it also means engaging in activities to identify positive social norms that protect women and girls from violence while leveraging social dynamics to change social norms that serve to hide or actually encourage forms of violence.

While prevention efforts are improving, up until now the humanitarian community's response has largely focused on response. More specifically, it has focused on service delivery for various reasons. One of the first reasons is that in many contexts, sexual violence has become so common that we think about it as being inevitable.

Another reason is that addressing gender-based violence in humanitarian context is still not a donor priority, which forces us to do what we can with very limited resources, and thus response ends up being the large focus. In addition, response activities have also been prioritized, because we always have to

ensure that we undertake intervention that will have an immediate impact on saving lives, especially from the health and psychosocial perspective.

In general, as we think about how we're going to deal with gender-based violence and emergencies, we know that GBV exists in all communities. This is in contexts that are not actually suffering from instability or conflict. To get to the root cause it's necessary to change gender inequality.

Gender-based violence is a social problem, and because of this reality, if we're not working towards some sort of social change, we're always going to be responding to incidents of gender-based violence rather than preventing them. In recent emergency contexts, such as Haiti, the Horn of Africa and the Sahel, gender-based violence has always been a persistent problem in these countries.

But as these major emergencies have unfolded, we have consistently seen the problem of gender-based violence against women and girls be exacerbated. In Haiti, for example, sexual violence, including exploitation and abuse and domestic violence were significantly increased after the earthquake.

While in the Horn of Africa and most recently in the Sahel, we have seen an increase in sexual violence due to women and girls adopting exploitative coping mechanisms to find food for their families, as well as sexual violence, including gang rapes in northern Mali and Somalia and in camps in Kenya and Ethiopia. Within those contexts, we've also seen that early marriages have taken place where families may be more likely to marry their daughters earlier in an attempt to protect them.

To promote women and girls' protection, the humanitarian community must significantly expand its effort to respond to gender-based violence and emergencies. This includes both prevention and response.

In the short term, this means addressing everyday risks, your concrete primary prevention-focused intervention, including ensuring that women and older adolescent girls have access to safe livelihoods opportunities, while we continue to work in the long term to address the underlying causes of gender-based violence by changing social norms.

With that, I will hand it over to Dale, so he can get into some of the research and the learning that Women's Refugee Commission has brought to the fore.

Dale: Thank you, Mendy. I'm going to talk first a little bit about some of the research we did looking at the link between gender-based violence and livelihoods, because we've been doing work around livelihoods for a long time, but we wanted to ensure that actually promoting economic opportunities for women and older adolescent girls actually increased their safety and mitigated some of these risks.

We undertook research on gender-based violence and livelihoods in three settings, in Kuala Lumpur, in Cairo, two urban settings, and in two camp settings in the Jijiga region [of Ethiopia]. What we found in our research was first, through

our desk research, there was very weak evidence based on the link between gender-based violence and livelihoods.

What we found in those settings was that many of the livelihood opportunities being implemented for women and young women, even by NGOs, actually increased their exposure and their risk of gender-based violence. Women were entering the public sphere. They were going to market. They were going on transportation that was not safe.

We found a lot of the economic opportunities were actually heightening the risks women and girls faced. We found overall that participation in a livelihood program may or may not reduce a woman's risk of gender-based violence by increasing her economic independence and her household decision making.

Does that mean we don't want to create economic opportunities for women and older girls? Of course not. But what we need to do is think through how we make those opportunities as safe as possible. We took some of this learning and did trainings around the world on using livelihoods to mitigate the risk of gender-based violence, bringing together GBV practitioners and economic program people.

What the economic program people told us was, "People told us we were supposed to help people get jobs or earn money. Nobody told us we had to think about their safety at the same time." Many of the GBV practitioners told us, much as Mendy said, "We've focused on cultural and social norm change. Nobody has really pushed us to think about how do we operationalize prevention."

One of the things I want you to think about for the discussion that follows is the following question: What have you done in your programs to ensure that economic programs are protected? I just throw that out there for you all to think about, and we'll come back to that in the Q&A time. If you have responses to that, clearly you can start putting them in the chat line already.

Because we've done this research, we also wanted to say, okay, economic program people often haven't thought about this. How do we help them think through how to make their programs safer? We developed a tool that focuses on doing a protection assessment, which I am going to walk you through. That tool has several pieces to it. [The tool is available in the Women's Refugee Commission's report, "Preventing Gender-based Violence, Building Livelihoods: Guidance and Tools for Improved Programming," which you can download here.]

It starts with secondary research, includes safety mapping, a safety tool and a decision chart. Each of these flow together. But we start with the secondary research. We start with what's already out there, what's already known. That includes reviewing existing documents and publications, talking with colleagues and others in the communities, participating in GBV and livelihood coordination meetings, conducting market observations to see what men and women are doing in the market. Are there risks associated with what they're doing?

The better the analysis that secondary research is going to help you draw, then the better the response. The more data you have, the better the analysis. The better the analysis, the better the response. I'm going to walk you through each of these subsequent steps.

The safety mapping, and I know many of you are familiar with this, what we try to do is take this good tool and build on it. It's very basic. It asks people to basically draw a map of their community and then identify the places that are important to them for their livelihood. That might be the market. It might be the bus or the taxi stand. It might be one of the supply shops. It might be going to the nearby fields.

To mark those places that are important to them for their livelihood, and then as a group—and, again, you do this with disaggregated focus groups, disaggregated by men, women, older adolescent boys, older adolescent girls—you ask them, do they feel safe in those places, never, sometimes or always. If they say never or sometimes, you ask them, "Well, what are those associated risks?"

Is it they're being taunted? Is it they're being touched inappropriately? You figure out what forms of GBV they're actually being exposed to at those places. For example, you might do a focus group with women, and one of the places they say is the market. They might say they never feel safe there, that they get touched inappropriately by men when working in the market.

That's a form of sexual gender-based violence that you would then highlight and fill this out. You would do this. There would a row for this, for every single livelihood place within the community that they have identified. Then you move on to the next part of the tool, which is the safety tool. This helps you actually look a little—it takes you one step further.

It helps practitioners identify factors that increase the risk of harm and violence, and, more importantly, identify current protection strategies used by communities. Again, you do this by sex and age disaggregated focus groups, and you look at when. What time? Are there times of day when the risks are higher? At night time, certain times of the week, when everybody is off work on a Friday or Saturday, for example, or certain times of the year when nobody is working in the fields and men have a lot more free time?

What times are at particular risk for them? What situations? When they're selling by the side of the road, when they're going door to door to sell items, when they're alone in their shops, for example. Which relationships put them at particular risk? When they're dealing with a boss, when they're dealing with a supplier, when they're dealing with buyers, when they're dealing with an intimate partner? What are those relationships?

You list the reasons why community members feel unsafe, at certain times, in certain situations and in specific relationships. Then you summarize those. What are the primary risk factors that come up over and over again? It may be, for

example, walking to and from the market. Then you ask them about what protection strategies do they employ as individuals.

Do they have a protection strategy? Do others in their community have a protection strategy? What are the strategies others in the community use to protect themselves to reduce the risk of violence? Then finally, that final column on safety net, you're going to ask them questions, which I'm going to get to in the next slide.

Those questions are those you see on your screen and what you're asking them here, each of these questions. If they answer less than four of them yes, that means they have a very weak safety net. If they answer four yes, that means it's probably sufficient. It doesn't mean they're safe, but at least there's a safety net in place. More than four means they have a fairly strong safety net.

Why is this information important? We know that social capital, that is, social networks, are vital to safe livelihoods. In your programming, if social networks and safety nets are weak, you want to think about how you can strengthen those. Women's cooperatives, women's savings clubs, that kind of thing.

Finally, you move on then with this information to your decision chart, where you list your livelihood activities. Maybe it's giving loans to women to set up a small business. In the next column, you're actually importing the information you've already collected from the previous two charts that you've completed. Is there risk associated with that activity? Yes, maybe. If so, what is the risk?

"Yes, we're giving loans to women. They don't have a safe place to save it, and the men are using the loan," so that's a risk. Does the community have a protection strategy? Again, you're importing that from the previous chart that you've used. What are those? Is there a protection strategy in place? Yes or no?

Then finally you go on to say, "Okay, we've identified that this livelihood activity has associated risks, and there's not a protection strategy in place, and yet I'm implementing that activity, so I need to develop a protection strategy. How do I do that?" You then engage in a consultative process with the target participants.

Again, if this is women receiving a loan, you'll consult the women to review the potential risk of the activity, and you jointly develop a protection strategy, as well as identify which risks they're willing to take, because every livelihood activity will have associated risks.

Finally, what I want to do, what I want to conclude my part of this presentation with, is to get to the point that we were trying to make in our research, which is that safe, dignified work may be the most effective form of protection. We really believe that.

That's what we're pushing the humanitarian community and those economic programmers to do, because we believe that if you actually make economic opportunities safe, you can mitigate many of those negative coping strategies

that were identified by Mendy earlier, the transactional sex, child labor, all of those kinds of things.

When people affect by conflict can safely earn money, they can provide for their basic needs, which means they don't need to sell their rations. They don't need to sell their bodies for money. They don't need to pull their kids out of school and force them to work, and that boys and girls have alternatives and other opportunities, rather than just potentially joining armed groups.

We believe that when families have steady, safe income, they can afford to keep their children in school, feed them nutritious meals and ensure they have and receive appropriate health care. That's what we're pushing for. At this point what we would like to do is to open it up for questions.

Zehra: Yes. Thank you both, Mendy and Dale, for walking us through GBV. Mendy, one of the things you were talking about is that it is a social problem first and foremost, it seems. The sort of problems that we have in the response side of it are very well funded, and the prevention side, which is really where a lot of focus should be right now, because this is a social-cultural problem in a lot of instances, is not so well funded.

Then Dale was able to walk us through livelihoods as a protection tool. It's almost on the prevention side. Would you say that's fair to say, Dale?

Dale: Yes. Certainly what we're trying to do and to push the humanitarian community to do, which Mendy also referenced, was how do you think about prevention, and how do you actually operationalize and program to enhance that protective environment? We think safe livelihoods is one of the ways you can do that. If you remember the risk factors that Mendy pointed out, this is addressing some of those risk factors, like the lack of meeting survival needs.

Zehra: Right. One of the questions that has come through right now is just asking about if the mapping is done before implementing. Then the design of programs, the way that you talked about the tool, it seems to be a very participatory tool. I think it might be interesting for our participants to hear about when would be an appropriate time to use the tool and how you would use the tool in programming then and designing programs.

Dale: Very good question. We look for your feedback on how you might use this. We will tell you where you can find the tool at the end of the webinar. But certainly we would suggest you use it in program design before you start implementation. Obviously, your participants, your target participants, may not have all the information yet. That will at least have them think through what kind of risk may this activity expose you to.

But even in programs currently being implemented, we would recommend that people do this, to look at, "Are we having unintended consequences with our programming? Can we modify our programs? Can we build in protective elements to actually make this program safer?"

Zehra: Okay, cool. The questions are coming in. As a follow-up to how to use the tool and timing and stuff like that in terms of using the tool, Amy [Yaki]—and I apologize if I am not pronouncing names correctly. She's a PhD student at Tulane working on the needs of the elderly in post-conflict situations as well. Can the tool be adapted to bring in those needs as well?

I know this is something at the Women's Refugee Commission, because we do look at population groups. We've looked at people with disabilities, adolescent girls. Is this something that you can see incorporating within the tool?

Dale: Yes. In fact, I should have mentioned it. It's a very good question, Amy. What I should have mentioned while I was walking you through that is when you do the secondary research and you're gathering available data, that should actually inform your questions.

If your target population is the elderly, and you do all the secondary data collection on what's already out there on the elderly within your target population, then you might ask different questions or modify those questions accordingly, so you're adapting it to find out the information you really need.

Zehra: Okay, great. Thanks for sharing on that. I haven't actually seen any examples coming in so far from our participants, just a lot more questions. But I thought it might be good to talk about examples where you guys have seen this tool used, or you know of organizations that are using the tool. The Women's Refugee Commission obviously is—we do applied research.

We're not actually implementers, but we're getting tools together for practitioners to use. Would you be able to talk about some examples from the field?

Dale: When we were doing the research that I mentioned in the camp, the Jijiga area camp in Ethiopia and in Cairo and Kuala Lumpur, certainly examples came through. For example, in the Jijiga camps, one of the activities one of the NGOs was implementing was helping women actually start small businesses, like selling biscuits in the camp, that kind of thing, going door to door selling biscuits to earn at least a little bit of income so they could supplement their food rations.

What they found is that, and what the women told us there, is they appreciated the extra income, but when they went home their husbands knew they had it and demanded it. If they didn't give it to their husbands, they would get beaten. Obviously this economic activity was exposing women to heightened risk of domestic violence in this case.

We asked the women, "Well, what would you like to see done? How can we make this safer?" They said, "If we had a safe place to save the money, we could put half of it there where our husbands would never know, and we could use that for our kids' education, whatever we needed it for. We could give the other half to our husbands, and they'd never be wiser. But we would have control over at least half of what we earned."

Zehra: Brilliant. Thank you. One of the other questions that we have coming in from Amelia Moore—and I know we've definitely looked at this at the Women's Refugee Commission, but Mendy, it might be good to hear from you on this. It's about, with GBV programs, both as a prevention and response level, what about the participation of men?

Mendy: Yes, that's a great question. I think we're learning, from any aspect of dealing with gender-based violence in an emergency setting that we have to involve men and boys. We know that they are largely the perpetrators of gender-based violence, but we also have to recognize that we need their involvement in order to actually solve the long-term problem of gender-based violence, and especially within livelihoods programs.

I think it's absolutely essential. We've had experiences where if we've engaged the community from the very beginning, the gatekeepers, which are often the males in the community, from the beginning to help identify vulnerable women and adolescent girls from a variety of criteria, not just ones that have been exposed to gender-based violence, but ones that are also dealing with other vulnerabilities, they're much more likely to support the program from the beginning to the end.

They will actually help identify vulnerable girls and women and support them in the process, so that knowing that we're investing in their income generation activities, they may adopt other protective mechanisms, such as making the market safer for women and girls to sell their goods or other things that will actually promote their protection and the success in that program.

They're also able to understand that this is something that supports families and the communities where they are living.

Zehra: Okay, great. Thanks for that. It is absolutely important, and we cannot stress it enough, in looking at GBV prevention programs, the involvement of men and boys is so very, very crucial, given that a lot of our tools, at least at the Women's Refugee Commission, have to do with displaced and refugee populations. One of the questions coming in is around incorporating marginalized displaced women in GBV programs.

I know a lot of times, even when I was working in the field, is you had people within a community that because of caste or they were minorities or religious minorities or whatever it was, the invisible people that we talk about a lot of times. What sort of strategies would you say there are to make sure that they are incorporated within GBV programs?

Mendy: That's a really good question, and it's actually sometimes a hard question to answer. It requires really adopting some innovative approaches in terms of reaching the people that are the most marginalized in society. Often when we engage with communities, we tend to go to the people that are easiest to access, the people that have more position and power and community, the people that have had more privilege over time.

We have to come up with ways of accessing those individuals that may not be part of the conversation, especially for older adolescent girls, the girls that are actually at home, invisible because of all of their domestic duties. One way of dealing with it is to adopt measures to actually access some of those girls, those older adolescent girls, and ask them who they know is in a similar situation to them, or if they know of girls that are dealing with particularly difficult circumstances in their homes, because they know their communities well.

Accessing them and coming up with a strategy with them to help identify times and places where we would actually be able to access those girls, because they know better than anyone how to access opportunities or what can make accessing an opportunity safe for them. Dale, I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

Dale: I think it's a really important point, because I think what we've also found or are learning is the women and girls who are most marginalized are the ones who are also most at risk, those with disabilities, those who may be ethnic or religious minorities there. We do have to figure out how do we access them and ensure that they are included in any of that prevention and response activities. Very good point.

Zehra: Okay. Thank you both for that. Participants, people logged on to this webinar, there are some great questions coming in, and I'm trying to do my best as I can. I'm involved within the webinar and also looking at the questions. I will apologize ahead of time if we don't get to all of them. But as many as we can we will today.

We will keep this conversation going. At the end of the session, I will direct you to our web page. We're just starting this conversation. It would be amazing to stay involved with everybody and keep this discussion ongoing.

A question has come in around the research and how the Women's Refugee Commission actually came up with the tools. Dale, I'm going to direct this to you. It was around what methods were used and what sort of diversity were you able to cover in looking at livelihood strategies while doing the research. If you could just recap, because you mentioned Kuala Lumpur was a place that we had gone to, Jijiga, and I think there was a third location?

Dale: Cairo.

Zehra: Cairo.

Dale: Yes. Even that bit of research was part of a larger body of research. We started doing research just on livelihoods with conflict-affected populations about seven years ago, where we went out actually to 10 settings around the world, urban, camp-based and return situations, both looking at IDPs, refugees, returnees, to really help try to understand why economic programs weren't actually more effective and what we could to help make them more effective.

That was a larger body of research. It covered quite a geographic range and included a lot of qualitative research with the affected populations. Lots of focus group discussions, lots of in depth interviews, as well as with the UN agencies and all of the practitioners on the ground in these settings, and site visits to the programs.

But in doing that research, the question emerged, well, when we create economic opportunities for women and older adolescent girls, are we actually exposing them to risk? We said if we're promoting economic opportunities for these folks, we need to understand this. We actually did a lot of secondary research on the link between gender-based violence and livelihoods.

Interestingly enough, there was almost nothing out there, especially in humanitarian settings. There was a bit from development settings, which we culled and learned from. We said we have to unpack this a bit more in humanitarian settings, and that's where we did the three additional site visits.

Again, much of the research was done with the affected populations themselves. How are you earning money? What kind of risks does that expose you to? How might we help mitigate that risk if we design those programs differently? Then we did trainings. We've done about 10 different trainings around the world with economic practitioners and GBV practitioners, bringing them together in the room at these trainings, and then culling and learning from them as well.

What are your experiences? Have you thought about this? How are you doing this? Then the tools—obviously at the trainings we kept telling people, "How do you think about protection? How do you make sure your programs are safe?" The economic program people said, "Okay, we get it. We haven't thought about it before. We get it. How do we do it? Can you help teach us how to do it?"

That's where we decided, "Well, we need a tool. We need something." Obviously, many of you on the webinar are familiar with safety mapping. But we were like, "That's not quite enough. We have to take that a step further," so we actually looked at everything we could find that was out there, and then said, "How do we actually modify that, take it a couple more steps to actually force economic program people to think? Does my program put people at risk? If so, are there protection strategies I can build into that?"

Zehra: One of the questions, and this is kind of a hot topic these days, and it's about the urban contexts. I would think it would be good for both of you to respond to. Are there different challenges that we are looking at in the urban context when thinking about GBV? The question is actually from somebody working in Brazil, from UNHCR.

How do we look at GBV and/or livelihood strategies, programs, doing the safety mapping in an urban setting? What are the challenges? What are the differences?

Dale: Yes. It's an excellent point, because we've done quite a bit of other related urban work on livelihoods, and certainly the issue of exposure to risk of gender-based violence comes up over and over again. We did assessments in Kampala, Nairobi, New Delhi, Johannesburg. In every one of those situations there were very high risks of gender-based violence.

The risks are somewhat different. Again, it's kind of getting out into that public sphere, using public transportation, going to and from jobs, going to jobs after dark, being in informal work places where you're not protected from your employer and the other employees, where you're exploited in the work setting. In many of these situations, because if you're a refugee you may not have the right to work, and you're working in the informal market, it also means you don't have any legal recourse.

You don't have a means of actually protecting yourself. How do you think about it in those settings? Certainly in New Delhi, for example, some of the NGOs were thinking about that. They said, "We're helping place people in these informal factories, but we're going to monitor them. We're going to do regular monitoring of every one of these informal factories we're placing refugees in. No woman will get placed into a factory without at least two other women."

Women are never alone in there, in a factory full of men. They do training on codes of conduct with the managers and owners of these factories. It's just thinking about it differently. But again, they're very much talking with the community to figure out what are those risks and what are those opportunities they're accessing?

Zehra: All right. I think that's a great question. A couple of you on this webinar have asked about the urban context. I think that answers that quite well. Did you want to add something to that, Mendy?

Mendy: I think Dale covered it well.

Zehra: One of the questions—and I don't know if this is something we can answer or not, but I think it's quite interesting to think about, because at the Women's Refugee Commission we're always looking for feedback on our tools, on how to make them better, how to make them more user friendly. We have a question from somebody who works in the United States with African-American Diaspora, or African Diaspora communities, it sounds like.

She's wondering if our tool can be adapted to global networks, other than domestic violence or other sorts of sexual violence that occurs within gender-based violence. There's also something around social networks and stigma that comes. She's wondering if there's something around our mapping that we would be able to adapt to global social networks.

She's thinking specifically around Liberian communities in Staten Island, but it made me think about the importance of the Diaspora community when we were dealing with the earthquake in Haiti, and what a big network that was.

Humanitarians didn't really know how to engage with that. Just around that if you have something to say.

Dale: I can't say that we've thought a lot about that, but we would like those of you who are participating in the webinar to actually look at can you adapt this tool. Can you use this tool with the populations you're working with? We certainly know the Diaspora communities here in the U.S., for example, face unique challenges in accessing the workplace. They face discrimination.

They may face different kinds of harassment, different kinds of abuse. Those working in hotels in New York, we're quite familiar with the kinds of abuse they might face in those settings, for example. Think about it, could it be used, could it be adapted? Again, it's how do you use it to learn from the population you're trying to work with?

Zehra: Great. I'd like to really encourage the participants, do get in touch with us. Do let us know if there are different ways of adapting our tool. If you've gone ahead and adapted it already and used it in different ways, it would be fantastic to hear, because we're always looking for good examples to put out there for practitioners. Case studies and things like that are always really great for everybody to have, so that we can see what works and how to keep improving the work we do to assist the populations that we are out there to assist.

I wanted to very quickly just read out an example that we have from a participant who is logged on from UNHCR working in Nepal. She mentioned that she hasn't actually used the safety mapping tool, but she's got a good example of where they—I'm trying to read it off the screen, so just be patient with me just for a little bit.

But basically they merged a vocational training program with a broader curriculum focusing on human rights, sexual and reproductive health, and available services in the refugee camp in order not to just offer livelihood skills for protection, but also life skills. The feedback so far that they've received has been positive.

She's very interested to see if this could be used for livelihoods programs and interested to see if this can be incorporated in programs for men as well. This touches on a couple of things that we've already looked at in this webinar, but it's fantastic to sort of hear that example.

Dale: I think it highlights one of the points I reference, which is that it's the importance of social capital and social networks. I think any time you bring groups together and start working on things like life skills, you're already starting to build that social capital. Some of the broader research we've done on livelihoods has indicated that social capital is even more important than human capital or financial capital in terms of success in livelihoods.

It's those networks you can use to find jobs, to secure protection, to find shelter, etc.

Zehra: Yes. That leads very much into the work that we've been doing with adolescent girls, actually. It is about empowering and protecting and looking at those social networks, which is also related very much to the urban work that we do, where the social capital that we always talk about is so important and often not thought about, because it's not something that you put money behind. It's relationship building, basically.

One last question… This is a very difficult one, one that I used to really struggle with myself when I was out in the field as a practitioner. A lot of the livelihood programs—and this question is from Becky Higgins—a lot of the programs that we're used to doing are putting women in livelihood programs, but they tend to be through the informal economy.

The wages that are earned are really not that high a lot of times. It's higher than what they might be getting. It's better than nothing, in a way, you can say. But is it enough money in order to stop them from calling on negative coping strategies? That's one of the sort of issues to grapple with and deal with. I don't know if either of you has anything to sort of say about that.

Dale: It's an excellent point, and it's true. It's one of the things with our livelihoods work we've been trying to challenge the humanitarian community on. So often we've thought about livelihoods, especially with conflict-affected populations, as being a little bit of money in the pocket to supplement the food rations. We haven't thought about what livelihoods really mean.

Livelihoods means it's sustainable and it helps you meet your basic needs on an ongoing basis. Are we really providing those kind of economic opportunities for people? We often aren't. We really need to be thinking through about the kinds of programs we're offering and are they leading to really dignified work and sustainable income? That should be our goal.

Mendy: This is especially important I think for women and older adolescent girls, as they already have so many domestic duties that they're responsible for. We really have to think critically about the livelihoods options that we are able to engage them in. Is it going to be worth their time, because their time really is taken over by many other chores and things.

We really need to analyze that and think about how we really are going—are we giving them enough to meet those basic needs? Basic needs may mean different things for different people. We really have to look at that as well and think about what are those priorities for an individual woman in terms of taking care of herself and her family.

Zehra: All right. Brilliant. Thank you. I think that was probably a good question for us to end on. I would like you all to know, people who are listening in on this call, that we will try and answer all the questions. We'll make them available on our website: **http://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/peril-or-protection-making-work-safe**

Thank you so much for all your questions, and we will get through them, all of them and make sure that they are answered. You can continue to keep asking them and continue to keep the conversation alive. Stay involved!

We do have an e-learning course that we were speaking about before. It's based on our intersection of GBV and livelihoods and using livelihoods as a tool for protection. It goes through the safety mapping tool as well a bit. [It takes just an hour of your time, here's the link:
**http://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/elearning**

We also have links to all the reports that we've mentioned. We've got the actual report that was published in 2009: **Peril or Protection: The Link between Livelihoods and Gender-based Violence in Displacement Settings.** This is actually the guideline and the tools for how to do this. It leads you through it step by step the safety mapping tool that Dale walked us through, and that is actually inside this publication itself.

Let us know what your thoughts are, how you feel about the tools, what's going on with your programs and how we can support you around that. We would absolutely love to keep this conversation alive. Our email is: **info@wrcommission.org**

Most of all, use the tools that we have out there. I think it's great that the Women's Refugee Commission does this sort of work. I'm not saying that because I work for them. I would use their tools even if I didn't work for them! I just want to thank Dale and Mendy very, very much for agreeing to participate in this webinar today. Thank you.

**Answers to audience questions posed through chat not answered during webinar:**

Q1: Hi my name is Santha Devi and I'm the community services coordinator with International Catholic Migration Commission in Malaysia. Does the livelihood support program then increase the risk of empowering women more and as such causing an imbalance in gender roles in family structure?

A: This is something that we at the WRC have looked at within our guidelines. There are times when women become the primary income-earners and this does cause a shift in gender roles within a household and can therefore expose a woman to risk of domestic violence. This is why it is imperative that men (and boys) be involved in GBV prevention and response and sensitization take place alongside economic empowerment programs that target women. See page 10 of our report, Peril or Protection on the importance of involving men and strategies for doing so.

Q2: A question about the WRC's research on this topic: 1) What methods were used; 2) How much diversity was there in livelihood strategies among the communities that were examined? 3) What were the challenges of drawing a causal relationship between GBV and livelihoods, especially when comparing across different research sites?

A: Answers to questions 1 and 2 are answered within the webinar transcript; here is the answer to number 3:

We would not recommend drawing causal relationships between GBV and livelihoods the same way we sought to question the causal relationship between livelihoods and empowerment for women. We do recommend that programmers (and researchers) speak to the communities they wish to engage with and ask the "right" questions when it comes to their safety and security when designing any programs. It was the causal relationship between livelihoods and empowerment that proved to be a weak link in our research and one that needs more thought when implementing.

Q3: Good morning, I am Halima Adams, a UEL Forced Migration/Refugee Studies Program graduate. When evaluating livelihood programs, how can practitioners and/or researchers, involve participants when assessing what a "successful" livelihood program looks like (regarding safety, access, etc.)?

A: The indicators for what a "successful" livelihoods program would look like should be discussed with the participants of the program before the program starts. A great way to start the dialogue and to be participatory is to start with the safety mapping tool that we have developed. It allows for conversation and opinions to come forward and this can then be taken forward on a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework that is designed with the community and at times can also be led by the community itself.

Q4: Does the assessment include a tool or process to monitor unexpected risks with protection strategies decided upon in the process?

A: The WRC study developed a safety mapping tool for practitioners to use as this was found to be a gap. Our recommendations in our guidance include monitoring that is done on an ongoing basis and one that takes on a practice-based approach. Program adjustments should be made in consultation with the participants. Page 24 of our guidance does give a list of possible protection strategies from policy level such as advocacy to the practical level, such as inclusion of women in management roles or providing transport to and from a work place.

Q5: Have you experienced any reluctance on the part of focus groups to engage with the tool due to stigma associated with GBV?

A: We have used this tool in a variety of different contexts (from a research perspective) and even when discussing GBV with displaced adolescent girls from very conservative communities. If given adequate time and an open-ended manner of questioning (the tool has suggestions on how to do this), we have found that people do open up and talk about GBV.

Q6: Annemarie with UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre. Do you have any good experiences with institutionalizing good strategies for protection, in order to scale up the impact and widen the impact to other women and girls (e.g. in situations where refugees are integrated into communities long-term, possibly the situation of refugees in Kuala Lumpur where Malaysian women could benefit from efforts to make economic activities of refugee women safer)?

A: We do have examples from some settings like New Delhi, where an NGO placed refugee women and men in irregular, unregulated factories to work in the informal sector. But the NGO

screened the factory owners and managers first, set expectations, including salary levels, only placed women in settings where there were other women, and did regular monitoring and follow up to ensure that no abuse or exploitation was occurring.

Q7: Jessica Therkelsen, Policy Director, Asylum Access. In my portfolio I argue a lot for the right to work for refugees - often meaning legislation giving access to work and employment rights to refugees. Are there any ways that I can tailor my messaging to ensure that access to employment policy changes take safety into concern? Any concerns I should be aware of?

A: Without the right to work, refugees are forced into the informal, unregulated sector without protections and access to redress for abuses that occur. Access to the formal sector alone would already greatly enhance refugee protection in these settings. Governments also have obligations under CEDAW and under domestic labor law to ensure that labor practices are safe and non-exploitative. I would suggest including identifying the obligations the host country has signed up to and including them as part of your advocacy messages.

Q8: Have the speakers any examples of good practice that has successfully addressed issues of early marriage in emergencies, how feasible is this in an emergency context given the nature of influencing social norms and practices and the competing issues of survival?

A: This is a tough question and an excellent one. We know that early marriage can be a protection response on the part of parents – protecting their daughters from a multitude of men preying on her by marrying her off to one who might guard against abuse by the others. When early marriage is being practiced for this purpose, we have clearly failed as a humanitarian community. We need to improve the safety environment so that this practice is mitigated but what does that mean? That girls are safe in school and when traveling to and from school, that all humanitarian actors, regardless of sector, put gender and GBV prevention lenses on their work – does their program provide equal access and equal opportunity? Does where or how the program is implemented impact the safety of women and girls? From where the water point is placed to lighting to community based emergency response mechanism and community patrols – all these need to be considered.