



Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Protection Mainstreaming Index (PMI) Tools and Calculation

Purpose

The overall purpose of this Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is to provide users of the Protection Mainstreaming Index (PMI) with information on how to use the indicators and questions (analytical framework) to measure a project's ability to mainstream protection principles during implementation. The document provides step by step guidance to partners on the PMI.

Roles and Responsibilities

Any organization (UN agencies, international and national NGOs, government) can utilize the PMI to evaluate a project's ability to mainstream protection principles. While every organization will vary in organizational structure there are some key roles and responsibilities for efficient PMI tool functioning. This requires participating agencies to designate a representative to participate in PMI process and focal points to actively engage in other PMI activities.

PMI Tool Partner Focal Points:

For staff appointed from within member agencies whose role it is to collect PMI inputs using the tool, they are responsible for:

- Ensure PMI is part of the M&E project plan and enumerators are trained on the tool
- Include the PMI questions in the current M&E tools
- Conduct data cleaning and consolidation in line with agreed format (remove org. name, any other identifiable information, group by intervention)
- Calculate the PMI score and share with cluster IMO (with result on each indicator)
- provide support in any consultations, awareness campaigns, training, and monitoring of the protection inputs.
- The focal points to the PMI, which are technical level, must be trained, committed, regularly participate in meetings, and assist in the PMI process and tool
- Given their role as liaison between the PMI process and their agency, TORs for the Focal Points must provide that agency Focal Points be senior enough within their organization to have decision-making authority that will support the PMI process.

Data and Information Management officers:

- PMI members are responsible for ensuring that there is regular compilation of the PMI data.
- Given the multi-agency coordination of the PMI, efforts must be in place to standardize data reports to collection and comparison, this will be managed by the Cluster IM team with consultation where needed.
- Without consistent and comprehensive data, it is simply not possible to paint a full picture of the protection situation, establish a baseline from which to



measure impact of different types of interventions to address protection issues, nor effectively spot alarming trends.

Orientation training:

Prior to starting the PMI process, it is important to refresh the designated PMI team members on the broad concept of the process and needs as well as methodology for undertaking the data collection. One common briefing from the Focal Point should be provided to the sector teams on the PMI objectives, deliverables, duration, communication channels, and reporting.

Categories and Indicators

SN	Category	Indicator
1.1	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say they knew the kind of assistance (service or items) they were entitled to receive prior to the intervention
1.2	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say they knew how to make suggestions or complaints about the assistance (service or items) received
1.3	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say themselves or their neighbours had the opportunity to give your views on how you wish to be assisted prior to the intervention
2.1	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance received (services or items) did not deteriorate the relations within their household
2.2	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance (services or items) received did not deteriorate the relations within their community
2.3	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance received (services or items) did not deteriorate the relations with other communities in their area
3.1	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that persons with different disabilities (visual, physical, intellectual, psychosocial/mental, hearing, speech) and/or chronic illness have equal access to the support (services or items) provided during the intervention?
3.2	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that there were no people in need excluded from the assistance (could not access services or could not receive the items)
3.3	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that there were no groups treated differently (preferential or discriminatory) during the intervention (service provision or distribution of items or cash)
4.1	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who did not witness any form of violence, extortion, abuse, or exploitation related to enrolment and registration in order to receive the assistance (service or items)
4.2	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who did not witness any form of violence, extortion, abuse, or exploitation related to access to assistance (services or distribution of items)

4.3	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who said they have not witnessed situations where people were not treated with dignity by the NGO in relation to the support (services or items) provided
-----	--------------------	---

Calculation Traffic Light

Depending on the minimum threshold met the tool automatically calculates the scores using the traffic light on the following classes:

Traffic light	Description	Criteria	%
Green	Good	All minimum criteria met and at least 1 out of the 4 non-minimum criteria met	70%+
Yellow	Sufficient	At least one of the minimum standards has not been met as per criteria set in column I	60% - 69%+
Red	Need for improvements	All minimum criteria met but none non-minimum criteria met	50% - 59%
White	Poor	None of the minimum criteria is met	0-49%



Instructions on how to Use the tool

The staff filling out the tool should focus on COLUMNS **I and J** depending on the category and indicator that is being used.

Calculations	
Min. threshold	Traffic light

After selecting the category and corresponding indicator, then selects the question and tabulates with the option list as below. The tabulation of the scores is categorized according to the scaled below:

1. Scale #1 option list

yes = 1
no= -1
I don't know = 0
I don't want to answer =0
not asked = 0

SN	Category	Indicator	Option List
1	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say they knew the kind of assistance (service or items) they were entitled to receive prior to the intervention	yes = 1 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
2	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say they knew how to make suggestions or complaints about the assistance (service or items) received	yes = 1 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0

7	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that persons with different disabilities (visual, physical, intellectual, psychosocial/mental, hearing, speech) and/or chronic illness have equal access to the support (services or items) provided during the intervention?	yes = 1 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
10	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who did not witness any form of violence, extortion, abuse, or exploitation related to enrolment and registration in order to receive the assistance (service or items)	yes = 1 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
11	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who did not witness any form of violence, extortion, abuse, or exploitation related to access to assistance (services or distribution of items)	yes = 1 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
12	safety and dignity	% of interviewees who said they have not witnessed situations where people were not treated with dignity by the NGO in relation to the support (services or items) provided	yes = -1 no= 1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0

2. Scale #2 Option List

yes = 1
partially = 0
no= -1
I don't know = 0
I don't want to answer =0
not asked = 0

SN	Category	Indicator	Option List
3	accountability and participation	% of interviewees who say themselves or their neighbours had the opportunity to give your views on how you wish to be assisted prior to the intervention	yes = 1 partially = 0 no= -1 I don't know = 0

			I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
5	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance (services or items) received did not deteriorate the relations within their community	yes = 1 partially = 0 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
6	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance received (services or items) did not deteriorate the relations with other communities in their area	yes = 1 partially = 0 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
8	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that there were no people in need excluded from the assistance (could not access services or could not receive the items)	yes = 1 partially = 0 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0
9	meaningful access	% of interviewees who say that there were no groups treated differently (preferential or discriminatory) during the intervention (service provision or distribution of items or cash)	yes = 1 partially = 0 no= -1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0



3. Scale #3 Option List

yes = -1
partially = 0.5
no= 1
I don't know = 0
I don't want to answer =0
not asked = 0

SN	Category	Indicator	Option List
4	do no harm	% of interviewees who say the assistance received (services or items) did not deteriorate the relations within their household	yes = -1 partially = 0.5 no = 1 I don't know = 0 I don't want to answer =0 not asked = 0

The sum of the total number of the category is then entered in the minimum threshold tab to calculate the scores and give the traffic light values.