

## 2018 Protection Information Management training for protection clusters of Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen



### Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES	2
3. TRAINING CONTENT	2
4. PIM LEARNING OUTCOMES	3
5. PIM CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS	4
ETHIOPIA	4
SOMALIA	5
SOUTH SUDAN	7
YEMEN	9
6. ANNEXES	11

## 1. Introduction

This report captures the learning outcomes and resulting action points established in the Protection Information Management (PIM) training from 12 – 16 March 2018 with funding from ECHO for the protection clusters of Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen. The 29 participants represented a diverse set of information management (IM) and protection profiles, as well as Protection Cluster and activated sub-clusters (Child Protection, Gender-Based Violence and Mine Action) across both field and central levels (for list of participants refer to Annex 1 below).

For the purpose of documenting the learning outcomes, this report both presents the feedback by participants at the individual level, and documents for each cluster, the context-specific PIM challenges identified by participants pre-training, as well as the plans of actions developed by each cluster during the training, in order to address these challenges by drawing on the learning and exchanges of the PIM training.

## 2. Rationale and objectives

The 5-day PIM training package has been developed under the global PIM Initiative spearheaded by an inter-agency working group led by UNHCR and DRC since 2015. The PIM Initiative seeks to enhance collaboration for quality data and information on displaced individuals and groups of persons in a safe, reliable, and meaningful way for quality protection outcomes. The PIM Initiative is based on the rationale that a shared understanding of PIM within the humanitarian community will facilitate the targeted use of protection resources, coordinated protection response, and life-saving protection interventions to a degree otherwise not possible.

With an overall view to enhancing PIM in the work of the participating cluster by strengthening PIM core competencies and collaboration, the training was delivered with the specific objectives of:

1. Demonstrating how PIM supports, informs and enables the development of an evidence-informed protection analysis, strategy and response;
2. Developing PIM-knowledge, skills and attitude that facilitate dialogue and collaboration;
3. Developing PIM-knowledge and skills to create a PIM-plan that informs protection analysis, strategy and response.

## 3. Training content

The training was delivered by a trainer team consisting of UNHCR RRC (Anna Minuto, Snr. Information Management Officer and Laura Swanson, Associate Information Management Officer), UNHCR FICSS (Rachelle Cloutier, Information Management (Protection) Officer) and the Danish Refugee Council (Rikke Enggaard Olsen, PIM Training Officer). Protection Cluster Coordinators present in the training, were invited to steer the engagement and lead discussions by their respective clusters in order to draw up action plans for PIM enhancement post-training, during the action planning session on the final training day.

The training schedule (see Annex 2) consisted of modules specifically designed to strengthen [general PIM competencies](#)<sup>1</sup>, and included presentations by each of the four participating protection clusters. A cross-cutting element of the training was a progression of context-tailored modules to the assess information environment of the participating protection clusters. The fifth training day was specifically designed to inform and enable action planning for application of PIM Principles, approaches and tools in their respective contexts.

All resources from the training are available [here](#)<sup>2</sup>. Further resources and up-to-date information on the PIM initiative is available on [www.pim.guide](http://www.pim.guide).

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://pim.guide/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PIM-Core-Competencies-Framework\\_v4.pdf](http://pim.guide/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PIM-Core-Competencies-Framework_v4.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/osquvy53tdjl0va/AADQ4Uegw8nHK2q2ThwnpSmua?dl=0>

#### 4. PIM learning outcomes

In line with the objectives of the PIM training, at the individual level 100 per cent of participants reported in the final evaluation that the training had demonstrated how PIM supports, informs and enables the development of an evidence informed protection analysis, strategy and response. 100 per cent furthermore reported that the training had equipped them with PIM-knowledge, skills and attitudes that facilitate dialogue and collaboration, and 100 per cent that they had developed PIM-knowledge and skills to create a PIM-plan that informs a protection analysis, strategy and response.

Upon training completion, participants were asked to report their top 3 key take-aways from the training. The following three key-take away's were pointed to by most participants:

**1) The learning of “Assessing the Information Landscape” module series** (which offers a detailed review of the first step of the PIM Process) was reported by 50 per cent of the training participants, to be among their key take-aways. Pointing to the potential impact of this learning post-training, 55 per cent of the training participants included in their personal plans of action, plans to apply the PIM Process and the PIM Matrix in their own work. 45 per cent of the participants furthermore included in their individual plans of action, plans to revise of IM and Protection tools in own organization to align with the PIM framework (in collaboration with colleagues). Examples concrete actions for application of the PIM Process (Step 1), include:

*“Provide input to the team on how to conduct a secondary data review before initiating primary data collection; using resources efficiently and think out of the box when working with other cluster resources.”*  
(participant from the Ethiopia Protection Cluster)

*“Set up a PIM Working Group and collectively work through (some of the) PIM Process steps.”*  
(participant from the Somalia Protection Cluster)

**2) The PIM Matrix was noted as a key take-away by 45 per cent of training participants.** As noted above, 55% of the training participants included in their personal plans of action, plans to apply the PIM Process and the PIM Matrix in their own work. Examples concrete actions for application of the PIM Matrix, include:

*“Use the PIM Matrix as a template to map the data and information outputs produced under the Child Protection Sub-Cluster.”*  
(participant from the South Sudan Protection Cluster)

**3) A specific category of the PIM Matrix** was noted by 35 per cent of participants as a key-take away from the training. Based on the learning needs identified by the protection cluster coordinators, the training included four modules for in-depth exploration of the specific PIM Matrix categories of ‘Protection Needs Assessment’, ‘Protection Monitoring’, ‘Security&Situational Awareness’ and ‘Communication with(in) Communities’. An example of concrete action for application of learning related to specific categories of the PIM Matrix, include:

*“Train the cluster on the PIM Matrix in order to enhance a mutual understanding of what protection needs assessment versus protection monitoring is.”*  
(participant from the South Sudan Protection Cluster)

## 5. PIM challenges and solutions in the respective contexts

Prior to the training, all participants were asked to discuss with the wider cluster membership and elaborate on PIM challenges in their context and cluster. On the final day of the training, the participants convened for an action planning session, in order to develop a plan of action for PIM enhancement to tackle the PIM challenges identified, based on the learning and exchanges, which the PIM training had enabled.

The below summaries for each cluster outline both the identified PIM challenges as well as the solutions, which the participants jointly committed to following up on after completion of the training, under the leadership of the respective protection cluster coordinators.

### ETHIOPIA

The six training participants from Ethiopia represented both the Protection Cluster and CP and GBV AoRs from both field (Gambella and Jijiga) and central levels (Addis Ababa). Prior to the training, the participants were asked to discuss with the wider cluster membership and elaborate on PIM challenges in their context and cluster. Key challenges reported were:

Capacity gaps: Both gaps in capacity and skills of Government partners, as well as general lack of PIM system coordination experiences and leadership within the Protection Cluster.

Lack of IM structure: The absence of designated IM support was pointed out, with no dedicated IMO for the PC to manage and analyse the protection information that is gathered by the protection partners across the country.

Lack of common systems/approaches/tools: Since the Ethiopia PC is new (established in September 2017), it is still finding its way. There is no strategy regarding information management and an absence of regulations, guidelines and systems for the establishment of functional PIM. It was noted that protection data is minimal in the region, and that clear guidance is needed from the Protection Cluster to regional structures - which is consistent with national and global practices.

Lack of shared conceptual clarity: Different understandings prevail of protection information within the protection cluster and by other clusters (e.g. WASH, Health, Nutrition, etc). It was noted that the concept of protection is not well integrated into other sectors, which challenges delivery of protection on the ground. The high number of differently positioned partners (INGOs, local NGOs, UN agencies, Government) was pointed to as a challenge in relation to the operationalization of protection.

### Solutions

On the final day of the training, the participants convened for an action planning session led by the Protection Cluster Coordinator. In this session they drew up a plan of action for PIM enhancement to tackle the PIM challenges identified during the training, based on the learning and exchanges, which the PIM training had enabled. The action plan included the following action points:

**a) Engage the wider Protection Cluster and AoRs on PIM:** Participants will develop a report on the training to share with partners, and have drafted a PIM workplan, which they will present to the other partners and focal points of the coordination fora upon return. Action outlined include:

**b) PIM capacity building, through training of:**

**Government:**

- PIM Training in Addis Ababa (in April or May 2018 with support of RCC Snr. IMO) which is to have participation of the Government, as they are the ones delivering the response, and;
- 'Case Management' training for Bureau of Justice based on assessment of the case management situation (in May 2018, for which Oxfam, UNHCR, UNICEF will be focal points).

**DTM enumerators:**

- Countrywide training on protection concepts and protection mainstreaming (April 2018, with IOM, UNHCR and relevant focal points).

**c) Assess information landscape with view to closing information gaps, through:**

Bringing cluster members together to assess further information gaps than those identified during the "Assessing the Information Landscape" module series during the training, and to search for sources to meet the identified information needs (assumption that relevant documents may be available with government offices) and to harmonize different systems across regions, specifically in relation to:

**Countrywide service mapping:** Has already been initiated with UNHCR as focal point. Want to draw on the PIM conceptual framework in the further mapping.

**Countrywide desk review on UASC:** Registration has been initiated in the Somali region and want to roll out the same model to other regions, such as Gambella.

**Countrywide assessment of GBV perceptions by government and communities:** Continuing the discussions started in this training, will work further to meet the identified information needs in relation to SGBV by assess all SGBV information currently available (May to June 2018, Oxfam and UNFPA as focal points).

## SOMALIA

The ten training participants from Somalia represented both the Protection Cluster and CP and GBV AoR from both field (Hargeisa) and central levels (Mogadishu and Nairobi). Prior to the training, the participants were asked to discuss with the wider cluster membership and elaborate on PIM challenges in their context and cluster. Key challenges reported were:

Lack of common systems/approaches/tools:

- Lack of clear ToRs for both sub-national and AoRs in some areas resulting in lack of effective coordination and synergies, with a disjointed approach between different areas and actors in Somalia with unclear overall plan or guidance and harmonized framework for information collection and analysis to implement Somalia HCT Implementation Plan for centrality of Protection.
- Need to strengthen system wide data collection, analysis, response and to build a repository on protection risks/threats in order to enable an over-arching protection picture of the humanitarian crisis including, the national picture, the sub-national picture and the local picture.

- Lack of standardized forms, tools, reporting templates and databases which can be used to capture relevant information from the sub-national clusters and AoRs, which results in lack of standardization of information; challenges for comparability of data across assessments; reluctance to engage in data sharing; and lack of adequate analysis of available data). Tools are needed to improve joint analysis and data-sharing – how to pull together the different protection related data systems (MRM, GBV IMS and population data systems such as PRMN/CCCM DSA and other systems) to develop a comprehensive protection picture.

Humanitarian access: The remote programming of the Somalia response, makes it difficult to access information on key groups and protection issues in much of South and Central Somalia, which entails challenges in relation to mapping exclusion and targeting based on vulnerability and marginalization.

Capacity gaps: Available data is not used most effectively through analysis and interpretation, due the complexity of mapping and working with the huge amount of data collected, and a lack of IM on GIS and visualization tools. Lack of IM capacity of at sub national level, was furthermore pointed to as resulting in poor reporting from the field.

No/limited data/info sharing: Information sharing was noted as a key challenge resulting in inconsistency in information sharing and reporting, amongst others due to privacy SOPs (particularly on GBV and CAAFAG data) prohibiting information sharing.

## Solutions

On the final day of the training, the participants convened for an action planning session led by the Protection Cluster Coordinator. In this session they drew up a plan of action for PIM enhancement to tackle the PIM challenges identified during the training, based on the learning and exchanges, which the PIM training had enabled. The action plan included the following action points:

### a) Establishment of PIM/Assessment and Analysis Working Group:

The core of the people who will be involved in the WG group were in the PIM training, and establishment of a WG allows continuation of the dialogue around the issues related to operational gaps and identified needs which was opened during this training in a smaller group referring to the Protection Cluster. The training has led to the conclusion that the information landscape is quite rich, but not indexed properly and that gaps may exist. Though there are quite a few IMOs, their roles are not necessarily aligned or structured. Enhanced protection informed analysis and data sharing under the protection strategy is needed, though it is not yet defined what that will mean in practice. The WG has two overarching goals:

### b) Enhance strategic operational and understanding of situation

Promote a principled and systematic approach to analysis (using PIM) across cluster and help members with that, amongst others by:

- Providing tools and simplified guidance (including on the PIM Process with key points for smaller organizations with limited capacity).
- Possible delivery of capacity building trainings.
- Explore the first step of the PIM Process (Assessing the Information Landscape) when working on the HNO to strengthen evidence base, by:

- Categorizing by violation and protection-specific need in order to have a structured analysis. Undertake secondary data review (desk review) for each violation category. Use DEEP analysis tool, to further use the categorized information.
  - Develop a harmonized analysis and dissemination approach by documenting data and outputs generated by existing IM systems, with a view to linking existing IM systems more strongly in order to combine the data and outputs currently used or generated by IM systems. Comes back to joint analysis and briefings on protection situation.
  - Develop harmonized assessment tools (tied to the to-be-developed analysis frameworks) for HH assessment, KII, FGD, post-distribution monitoring and other things to measure the protection situation, in order facilitate work of PC members.
  - Harmonize indicators across assessments, including other clusters in order to allow for cross sector analysis and comparison.
- Explore how to structure information flows from sub-national cluster to national, and potentially back again in light of the HCT Protection Strategy and to help sub-national to have more strategic discussions on the situation in their areas of operation - for example by classifying changes in situation and coding the level of deterioration (e.g., CP level has deteriorated, according to ABC categories) accompanied by qualitative reports, in order to be more structured and make information more digestible.
  - Maybe introduce a severity index based on impressions of practitioners in the field (sought input from other Protection Clusters present in the training).

### c) Stimulate and facilitate a culture of joint analysis and data sharing:

The Working Group will stimulate and facilitate a culture of joint analysis and data sharing by seeking to define how the PC can fulfil its role under the HCT protection strategy (how to share, who do we involve, who do we share info with?) in order to inform protection-informed analysis of the situation, amongst others by:

- Including in the (forthcoming) Protection Cluster strategy a ‘trust statement’ and commitments by cluster members.
- Mapping systems and flows to highlight where blockages and why, which can be used as analytical and advocacy tool in order to improve.
- Consistently engaging actors beyond the humanitarian spectrum (e.g. OHCHR) in order to cement that relationship and operational way of working together and creating joint ownership of data, potentially via joint assessments.

## SOUTH SUDAN

The seven training participants from South Sudan from field (Malakal, Yei) and central levels (Juba) represented both the Protection Cluster and GBV, CP and MA AoRs. Prior to the training, the participants were asked to discuss with the wider cluster membership and elaborate on PIM challenges in their context and cluster. Key challenges reported were:

Lack of collaborative systematic approach to PIM: Protection is more complicated to gather quantitative data, in comparison to clusters with more tangible indicators. The operation is moving more data driven information, but the Protection Cluster is ill prepared to collect quantitative data. This will have impact on the effectiveness of the clusters advocacy on protection concerns and for funding.

Lack of common systems/approaches/tools: Guidance by the Cluster on establishing SOPs, guidelines, or toolkits has previously is lacking. Besides from global IM systems (GBVIMS, MRM), currently no mechanisms exist for facilitating systematic and effective reporting, feedback, and usage of protection information (other than to donors), making it difficult to work consistently with data and information (*“The Protection Cluster comes up with tools while each sub-cluster (led by different agencies) want to use their own tools”*). The current state of PIM in South Sudan is very rudimentary and does not occur at the national level in a consolidated manner: A recent, national-level survey of data collection tools and products currently in use by PC members found that few partners engage with the PC on any kind of information management, or a coherent, consolidated PIM system.

Capacity gaps:

- Lack of designated IM support, including for analysis and visualization of data (example of IMOs double hatting, hence give priority to agency work rather than prioritizing PC assignment).
- Those engaged in every day operations do not possess necessary protection expertise.
- Lack of familiarity with basic PIM concepts among PC partners - many are unaware of the difference between protection assessments and protection monitoring and lack or have insufficient protocol and systems for data protection among other shortfalls. This has consequences on identification of gaps in protection information, collection of data, analysis, and appropriate dissemination. This challenge is likely to persist because of quick staff turnovers, lack of prioritization of PIM, and limited financial and human resources.

No/limited data/info sharing: The weak PIM of the cluster itself (e.g. shared information not being analysed) compounded by the challenges partners face, has resulted in a lack of confidence by partners in the cluster and limited information sharing: Little data is shared through the Cluster, and reports and assessments which are shared do not follow common data collection and analysis standards. In relation to GBV, not all partners use GBV IMS and filling the 5Ws, and the 5W reports are not being compiled and shared. Reports from Safety Audits, Partners reports are not being compiled for HNO or HRP. There is a need for the PC to establish better central mechanisms to process information.

Data/info gaps: Lack of accurate population data means that PC cannot reasonably estimate people in need. It was noted that accurate information is crucial to identifying the protection concerns and needs of the affected population, mapping severity of protection risks, tracking the response, identifying gaps, and having sufficient evidence to effectively advocate.

## Solutions

On the final day of the training, the participants convened for an action planning session led by the Protection Officer reporting to the South Sudan Protection Cluster Coordinator. In this session they drew up a plan of action for PIM enhancement to tackle the PIM challenges identified, based on the learning and exchanges, which the PIM training had enabled. In complementary to PIM initiatives already put in place (by South Sudan participants in previous PIM training), participants used the present PIM training as an opportunity to reflect on the South Sudan coordination structure, capacity of partners, come up with common understandings of key protection terms, issues etc. Further building on progress on PIM enhancement made by previous South Sudan participants, the action plan included the following action points:

### a) Boost the existing PIM Working Group:

Strengthen role of the existing PIM WG, which to date has not been particularly active (beyond feedback and sign-off). Action points for PIM WG include:

- Map existing PIM structures within the cluster, and in partners: Mapping of coordination structure at field and national level view to understanding the structure and how to maximize coordination and info sharing (agenda item of PIM WG meeting in late March).
- Facilitate data sharing: Partners require a variety of info sharing platforms and modalities. Understanding partners' info-sharing needs is a prerequisite for ensuring that information is relevant and actionable for them. Will raise the topic at: 1) PC meeting in late March, and get feedback on how to move forward, 2) Inter-Cluster Working Group retreat in late March.
- Introduce common typology: Better definitions for partners on the activities already carried out, will help with communication, including between PC and partners. Will convene a typology action group (TAG) in Q2 of 2018, to come up with common terminologies, review existing datasets and see how can merge common information to maximize on disparate sources of information available.
- Finalize set of common indicators: There is realization that many assessments and information products do not capture key info we need as a cluster to analyse the situation, to advocate at HCT on centrality of protection, etc. Drawing on outcome of the "Assessing the Information Landscape" module series, work will continue to better define information needs, and purpose, and expected outcome.
- Collective analysis of the situation: In follow up to existing HCT commitment on more collective analysis of the situation and development of collective tools, will raise dialogue with other sectors on the criteria are being used to calculate persons in need and persons to target for the HNO and HRP, how to ensure consistency across different operations and how to improve severity mapping and balance out various data sets. Will raise at Inter-Cluster Working Group retreat in late March.
- Improve severity mapping by raising need for expert guidance and common standards including by reaching out to OCHA IMO or HQ. At present, severity mapping does not consider issues around access to population, and with gaps in data on populations in least accessible and most affected areas, this skews accuracy of estimation of severity of the situation in South Sudan.

## YEMEN

The five training participants from Yemen from field (Aden, Lahj,) and central levels (Saana) represented both the Protection Cluster and CP AoR. Prior to the training, the participants were asked to discuss with the wider cluster membership and elaborate on PIM challenges in their context and cluster. Key challenges reported were:

Capacity gaps: Only a very limited number of local NGOs on protection due to little or no funding (as protection is not seen as life saving for important in Yemen humanitarian context), and in general local NGOs lack the protection capacity required to do protection monitoring and IM.

Humanitarian access: Restrictions on access causes a challenge i.e. for protection monitoring as it may not be possible in certain areas, certain topics cannot be addressed, and data collection cannot be done electronically.

Lack of common systems/approaches/tools: There is a lack of or incomplete use of harmonized protection monitoring questionnaires by the multiple partners involved, and systems used (ActivityInfo) has limitations.

No/limited data/info sharing: Across the humanitarian community, partners do not share the qualitative and quantitative data needed to support the planning and implementation of HRP across the country. At inter-agency level, the issue pertains to confidentiality and consent, prevalence of different (and incompatible) data matrices, and partners primarily prioritizing reporting to donors over coordination with the cluster. Slow internet was pointed to as a further impeding factor.

Poor data/info quality: Challenges triangulating HH-level, KI, FGD and open source data, as well as between different IM systems (MRM and GBV IMS), prioritizing themes and visit locations and tackling discrepancy in the data received (double counting, incomplete data etc.). No or insufficient monitoring of partner's programme implementation.

## **Solutions**

On the final day of the training, the participants convened for an action planning session led by the Protection Cluster Coordinator. In this session they drew up a plan of action for PIM enhancement to tackle the PIM challenges identified during the training, based on the learning and exchanges, which the PIM training had enabled. The action plan was developed in light of the HC's request for a presentation of an annual assessment plan and foreseen upscale of protection monitoring activity. The action plan included the following action points:

### **a) Assess information landscape with view to closing information gaps**

Undertake more thorough secondary data review on topics most relevant to impact the protection response, and supplement with FGD or survey to the extent that information gaps are identified, in order to build evidence on extent of protection risk that result from displacement:

- Early marriage and SGBV against children. Information is believed to be available but must discuss and address potential gaps with cluster and sub-clusters.
- Issue of mental health and MHPSS – what cumulative effect of conflict and famine and cholera. What is the relevance of protection in famine and cholera situation? MHPSS. Lots of information requiring review in order to enhance our understanding.

### **b) Systematize and enhance protection monitoring**

Will invest in use of protection monitoring as a means to better to triangulate existing and available information on different needs and sites, including by developing a systematized FGD SOP with partners.

### **c) Shift the crisis narrative using protection evidence**

Yemen is described as a famine/cholera context, and the protection narrative is largely missing. The PIM Conceptual Framework can be used to show-case, with evidence, what the underlying causes of famine and cholera are – which is protection. We want to raise profile of protection issues in the HTC.

### **d) Address gaps in protection response monitoring**

The Yemen Protection Cluster is not very advanced on protection response monitoring, especially in the programmatic area of cash, vulnerabilities, post-distribution monitoring of cash in protection. Will address this by incorporating it into a PIM Strategy.

## 6. Annexes

### Annex 1) List of participants

#	Location	Name	First name	Organization
1	East Africa Region	van Praag	Clara	UNHCR
2	Ethiopia	Wellesley-Cole	Olivia	DRC
3	Ethiopia	Hussein	Sundus	OXFAM
4	Ethiopia	Alemu	Gelila Dereje	UNHCR
5	Ethiopia	Ostasz	Aneta	UNHCR
6	Ethiopia	El Mouden-Roberts	Samira	UNHCR
7	Ethiopia	Belay	Semhal	DRC
8	Somalia	Subow	Abdifatah Ahmed	DRC
9	Somalia	Munoz	May	MSB/UNICEF
10	Somalia	Bhagi	Prerna	REACH (IMPACT INITIAT
11	Somalia	Abdille	Abdirizak	SSWC
12	Somalia	Abou Hamra	Albert	UN OCHA
13	Somalia	Kagori	John	UNHCR
14	Somalia	Mohamed	Ismail	UNHCR
15	Somalia	Zeilstra	Matthijs	UNHCR
16	Somalia	Stobbs	Martin	UNHCR
17	Somalia	Abdillahi Elmi	Salma	Women and Child Care C
18	South Sudan	Mamai	Rita	DRC
19	South Sudan	Butterfield	Connolly	NRC
20	South Sudan	Kakela	Katherine	UNHCR
21	South Sudan	Watanasab	Tukkie	UNHCR
22	South Sudan	Mudahemuka	Sikubwabo (Cleopas)	UNICEF
23	South Sudan	Mangwi Ochola	Alice	IRC
24	South Sudan	McAulay	Kelly	UNMAS
25	Yemen	Farag	Ahmed	DRC
26	Yemen	Al Kanda	Lubna A.	INTERSOS
27	Yemen	Alwadi	Fatima	OHCHR
28	Yemen	Tilakamonkul	Fern	UNHCR
29	Yemen	Cheung	Samuel	UNHCR

## Annex 2) Training schedule

Mon 12 March	Tues 13 March	Wed 14 March	Thurs 15 March	Fri 16 March
	09:00-09:20 Day 2 opening	09:00-09:20 Day 3 opening	09:00-09:20 Day 4 opening	09:00-09:20 Day 5 opening
	09:20-10:30 Information Management	09:20-11:00 PIM Matrix	09:20-10:20 Security and Situational Awareness 10:20-11:20 Communication with(in) Communities	09:20-10:35 Data sharing
	10:30-10:50 Coffee break	11:00-11.30 Coffee break	11:20-11:40 Coffee break	10:35-10:55 Coffee break
	10.50-12.10 Information Management	11.30-12.30 Population Data	11.40-12:20 Matrix categories – exploring the linkages	10:55-11:25 PIM training summary 11:25-11.45 Training evaluation 11:45-12:45 Cluster-led workshop and action planning
12:30-13:00 Welcome	12:10-13:10 Lunch	12:30-13:30 Lunch	12:20-13:20 Lunch	12:45-13:45 Lunch
13:00-13:30 Introduction	13:10-13:40 PIM Process	13:30-14.30 Protection Needs Assessment	13:20-14:45 Assessing your information landscape – II	13:45-15:15 Cluster-led workshop and action planning
13:30-14:30 Review of webinar	13:40-14:40 PIM Sensitivities	14:30-15:00 Presentation 2 (South Sudan)		15:15-15:30 Programme closure
14:30-15:15 Presentation preparation	14:40-15:10 Coffee break	15:00-15:20 Coffee break	14:45-15:05 Coffee break	
15:15-16:50 Protection	15:10-17:30 Assessing the info landscape – I	15:20-16:20 Protection Monitoring	15:05-16:40 Assessing your information landscape – III	
16:50-17:20 Presentation 1 (Ethiopia)		16:20-16:50 Presentation 3 (Yemen)	16:40-17:10 Presentation 4 (Somalia)	
17:20-17:30 Day 1 review	17:30-17:45 Day 2 review	16:50-17:05 Day review 3	17:10-17:25 Day 4 review Evening: Joint team dinner	