University of York
Centre for Applied Human Rights

Human Rights Defender Hub
Working Paper No. 1

Protecting Human Rights, Humanitarian and Development Actors

Lucy Harding
July 2015

About the author

Lucy Harding recently completed her PhD and works as a Research Associate at the Centre for Applied Human Rights. She is currently working on a research project that explores different approaches to protection, with a particular focus on the risks faced by human rights defenders. Her previous research has explored civil society responses to sexual violence focusing on initiatives that engage men to promote gender equality and responses to male rape victims. She is currently Chair of the Trustees for a York-based NGO, Survive, which supports survivors of rape and sexual abuse.

To get in touch with the author email:
lucy.harding2700@gmail.com

About CAHR

The Centre for Applied Human Rights (CAHR) is an interdisciplinary research and teaching centre based at the University of York. It focuses on the real world challenges of putting human rights into practice and protecting human rights defenders (HRDs) at risk.

Since 2008, CAHR has hosted a Protective Fellowship Scheme for Human Rights Defenders at Risk. Under the auspices of this Scheme, up to ten defenders per year join the Centre for the purposes of training and networking.

CAHR is currently leading research on HRDs and has brought together scholars, practitioners, and HRDs to publish on issues of risk and protection. The Centre's research in this area informs its training and teaching courses, including an online programme specifically targeted at HRDs to support protection and capacity building.

For further information about CAHR, contact:

Sanna Eriksson, Centre Co-ordinator
Centre for Applied Human Rights
University of York
Yorkshire House
6 Innovation Close, York Science Park
Heslington, York YO10 5ZF

Tel: +44 (0)1904 325830
Email: sanna.eriksson@york.ac.uk

Web: http://www.york.ac.uk/cahr/

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author/s and do not imply endorsement by the Centre for Applied Human Rights or University of York. Working papers are intended as works in progress. Publication in this series should not preclude publication elsewhere.

Working Paper No. 1

July 2015

Protecting Human Rights, Humanitarian, and Development Actors

Lucy Harding

Executive summary

Humanitarian, development and human rights actors are facing increasing risks as a result of their work. Yet, when it comes to protection, these actors have tended to work in separate silos. This paper explores the different approaches to protection taken by human rights, development and humanitarian actors, exploring whether there are lessons to be learnt from adjacent fields.

The paper sets out a number of ways humanitarian and development actors could benefit from the approaches to protection developed by the human rights community, and vice versa.

These include opportunities for development and humanitarian actors to:

- Utilise the label of 'human rights defender' (HRD) to draw attention to at-risk individuals and groups.
- Strategically use the HRD label to assert the legitimacy of particular actions by claiming their validity is recognised by the 'international community'.
- Utilise the array of protective mechanisms targeted at HRDs.

There are also opportunities for the human rights community to:

- Apply a resilience framework to ensure efforts to promote enabling environments for HRDs are locally-based and locally-owned, incorporate long-term thinking, and consider the need to both mitigate risk and recover from attack.
- Give greater recognition to the protection needs of communities and the role of communities as potential buffers to external threats.
- Develop holistic responses which recognise the intersections between physical protection, material assistance and psycho-social well-being.

Recommendations

The paper makes a number of key recommendations. To enhance current responses to risk there is a particular need for actors to:

1. **Increase development and humanitarian actors' knowledge, and capacity to access, protective mechanisms** targeted at HRDs.

2. **Strengthen the legitimacy of the HRD label**, particularly in local contexts, through developing counter-narratives to challenge negative assumptions and framing human rights in terms that have legitimacy within local contexts.

3. **Share knowledge and information** to broaden understandings of threats and to build an evidence base around protective interventions.

4. **Work in partnership to enable protective strategies to be combined and to develop holistic responses** without overstretching resources.

5. **Make clear the responsibilities of different groups** in relation to protection to ensure that the practices of one group do not heighten the risks faced by actors in adjacent fields.

Acknowledgements

This paper benefitted greatly from the presentations and comments made by participants at a workshop on risk and protection, hosted by the Centre for Applied Human Rights in May 2015. Particular thanks are due to Paul Gready and Lars Waldorf for their helpful comments on various drafts of this paper.

This paper was completed with generous financial support from the Open Society Foundations Human Rights Initiative, which also supported the hosting of the May workshop.

Table of contents

Tables

I. Introduction

This document was developed to encourage discussions between human rights, humanitarian and development actors on the issues of risk and protection. The document was initially produced to form the starting point for discussions at an interdisciplinary workshop held at the Centre for Applied Human Rights on May 5th 2015 which brought together practitioners, academics and donors from across diverse fields.[1] Subsequently, the document has been reworked to reflect the presentations and discussions that took place in the workshop. Speakers included representatives from ActionAid, Amnesty International, the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, Frontline Defenders, Global Witness, the Overseas Development Institute (Humanitarian Policy Group) and the office of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights.

This document seeks to explore the different approaches to protection taken by human rights, development and humanitarian actors. The aim is to explore whether there are lessons to be learnt by considering differing approaches to protection that may enhance current responses to the risks faced by these actors, and the protection needs of the communities in which these actors are embedded. The document explores whether there are opportunities to work collaboratively across fields, or pitfalls to avoid that may enhance practitioner's capacity to respond to the risks they encounter through their practice.[2]

The document is divided into four sections. The first explores the context and rationale for the work. The emergence of a new category of actor (the 'human rights defender') is explained, convergences between fields are

[1] The central question for the workshop was: what lessons, synergies or tensions emerge by considering development, humanitarian and human rights actors' approaches to protection? Workshop participants were asked to consider the following questions:

- What lessons can be drawn across fields from different understandings of, and strategies for, risk and protection?
- How may working across fields help us to face common issues of concern, such as the repression of NGOs or the need to build 'enabling environments' for HRDs?
- What, if anything, could be gained by understanding development or humanitarian actors as human rights defenders?
- When do development or humanitarian actors choose to claim or reject the HRD label, and how does this impact on their vulnerability?

[2] This document focuses on trends in development, humanitarian and human rights practice in order to highlight some of the possibilities and pitfalls associated with different approaches to protection (drawing lessons across 'fields'). Yet, it should be clear from the outset that 'fields' are comprised of diverse actors and that an individual actor may draw across fields to shape their frameworks and practice.

highlighted, and the risks faced by aid workers and those who engage in human rights defense are briefly explored. Secondly, the potential utility of the HRD label, and its associated protection mechanisms, for development and humanitarian actors are identified. Thirdly, consideration is given to how approaches to protection within development and humanitarianism could enhance current responses to the protection of HRDs (through their emphasis on strengthening resilience, on communities as subjects and agents of protection, and holistic responses). Finally, the imperative and opportunities for human rights, development and humanitarian actors to work collaboratively are detailed with specific reference to the benefits of knowledge-sharing, combining protective strategies, defining actors' responsibilities in relation to protection, and considering rights-based development as a strategy to foster enabling environments.

II. Context and Rationale

The rationale for this document is two-fold. It is a response to the fact that, despite a growing interest in the category of HRD, efforts to address HRDs' protection needs have paid little attention to the approaches of humanitarian and development actors who may not self-identify as HRDs. Relatedly, it derives from the need to address the increasing risks faced by humanitarian, development and human rights actors.

Human Rights Defenders

In 1998 the United Nations (UN) adopted a Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. The Declaration outlined the rights and protections that should be granted to HRDs with corresponding duties imposed on state and non-state actors. Although the Declaration itself does not explicitly use the term HRD or establish a precise definition, the term HRD was used during the negotiations that led to the Declaration (Jones, 2013). As such, the Declaration is now used as a point of reference for a growing community of human rights practitioners who increasingly identify as 'human rights defenders'. International fora are now using the term HRD more frequently, a range of protective mechanisms have been developed (at international, regional and national levels), and a number of large civil society organisations have emerged with the specific aim of protecting HRDs at risk (see, for example, Frontline and Protection International).

The definition of an HRD is highly contested. In practice, the term has been applied broadly "to refer to anyone who carried out peaceful activities in the defense of human rights" (Nah et al., 2013: 403). Yet, HRDs themselves and organisations that support them often impose more stringent criteria, such as understanding HRDs as those that exhibit greater levels of professionalism (Nah et al., 2013). The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights has also argued for a narrower interpretation in its guidance, specifying that HRDs "must accept the universality of human rights" and only engage in "peaceful" actions (OHCHR, 2004: 9-10).[3] This can exclude a range of actors: those working on rights outside the context of formalised organisations, those that prioritise particular rights struggles[4], and those actors operating in times of conflict (Nah et al., 2013).

Although practitioners have argued for more attention to be played to non-traditional HRDs, the HRD label is applied inconsistently to humanitarian and development workers. Humanitarian (or aid) workers are understood here as:

> "personnel of not-for-profit aid agencies (both national and international) that provide material and technical assistance in humanitarian relief contexts" (Humanitarian Outcomes, 2014).

Development workers are understood here as those working to address poverty and inequality, as well as associated issue areas (such as access to healthcare, education and strengthening capacity to respond to disasters). It is entirely possible to view humanitarian and development workers as human rights defenders. Many development and humanitarian activities not conceptualised as 'rights-based' nevertheless intersect with human rights issues. For example, issues surrounding food and hunger link to, among other things, the right to food. As development and human rights actors may make claims on the state and seek to ensure individuals have access to socio-economic resources they can often be understood to be at the 'front line' of human rights defence (Ensor, 2013).

[3] This interpretation draws from the Declaration on HRDs. Article 12 of the Declaration stipulates that everyone has the right "to participate in peaceful activities" (UN, 1998: 6). The Declaration also reasserts that human rights are universal (UN, 1998: 3). Although, the Declaration does not explicitly state that protection is conditional on an individual accepting the universality of rights.

[4] Jaraisy and Feldman (2013), for example, point out the fact that many activists in the occupied Palestinian territory believe the focus should be on national liberation and therefore don't want to draw attention to the rights violations faced by particular groups in Palestinian society (e.g. women who face severe discrimination).

In recent years, there have been increasing convergences between human rights, humanitarianism and development, as reflected in approaches that draw across fields (e.g. rights-based development and legal empowerment[5]), the increasing number of hybrid organisations that draw on convergent methodologies, and the emergence of human rights campaigns to address economic rights (Hertel, 2006; Nelson & Dorsey, 2008). As such, excluding development and humanitarian actors from the category of HRDs is inconsistent with the fact that these actors frequently work to (at least implicitly) defend rights, and often draw (at least to some degree) on rights-based methodologies.

"The HRD label has often not been claimed by development and humanitarian actors."

It is significant that the HRD label has often not been claimed by development and humanitarian actors. There appear to be a number of reasons for this. These include the fact that humanitarian and development actors may not have knowledge of the label and its associated protection mechanisms, or may choose to specifically reject the label (as it is not always seen to enhance legitimacy and protection) (Gaziyev, 2015; Teale, 2015). Development and humanitarian workers may not always see their work as explicitly seeking to defend rights (i.e. the label may not always resonate or appear to make sense). For similar reasons, protection mechanisms and resources available to HRDs are often not open, accessible or targeted to development and humanitarian actors. Despite this, there are opportunities for development and humanitarian actors to draw on the protective strategies developed by the human rights community, and vice-versa.

Urgent protection needs

Fast (2014: 1) argues that "the dangers to aid workers have increased". Records of major incidents of violence against aid workers recorded by

[5] The Open Society Foundations (2015) defines legal empowerment as "about grassroots justice": "about strengthening the capacity of all people to exercise their rights, either as individuals or as members of a community" to ensure that the law is "available and meaningful to ordinary people". Legal empowerment strives to integrate law into socioeconomic development. For example, legal empowerment is integrated into public health, livelihoods and education initiatives in order to strengthen communities' access to appropriate justice mechanisms.

The Aid Worker Security Database (AWSD) support this claim. Between 2011 and 2013 the number of major attacks on aid workers rose from 152 to 264. Aid workers have been deliberately targeted such as with the bombings on the United Nations headquarters in Baghdad and Algiers, the murder of International Committee of the Red Cross delegates in Chechnya or the massacre of 17 Tamil staff of Action Contre la Faim in Sri Lanka (Fast, 2014; Slim, 2015).

Similarly, HRDs are facing increased risks. Global Witness (2013), for instance, has documented a rise in attacks against environmental and land defenders. In 2012, three times as many defenders were killed as 10 years earlier. HRDs working on socio-economic rights face higher levels of risk than other HRDs (UN, 2013a). Global Witness (2013) documented 908 known killings of activists working on land and environmental issues between 2002 and 2013. The UN Special Rapporteur on HRDs has drawn attention to the particular risks faced by HRDs working on large-scale development projects (UN, 2013a).

"HRDs working on socio-economic rights face higher levels of risk."

More generally, the UN has documented that HRDs, and their families, are frequently subjected to surveillance, threatened, tortured, subjected to enforced disappearances and killed by both state and non-state actors (UN, 2013b). Even where HRDs are not subjected to such extreme threats (such as kidnappings or killings), their work can be undermined through more subtle yet highly effective means. HRDs have been evicted from their homes, lost their jobs, been ostracised, stigmatised, and forced to live in debilitating conditions (Nah et al., 2013).

HRDs are increasingly facing more sophisticated means of silencing alongside a continuation of traditional forms of repression (Anderson, 2015). This has included the use of legislation and administrative provisions, and the misuse of the judicial system, to criminalise and stigmatise HRD's activities (Defending Civil Society Project, 2014). Specifically, the Special Rapporteur on HRDs has pointed to a number of worrying trends, including increased use of legislation to restrict the establishment and activities of associations (e.g. restricting engagement in political advocacy), the criminalisation of activities carried out by unregistered groups, and restrictions on the use of foreign funding (UN, 2014). Legal barriers impeding civil society organisations access to

international assistance can be seen in every region, including countries from Africa (e.g. Ethiopia), Asia (e.g. Indonesia), Europe and Eurasia (e.g. Russia), Latin America (e.g. Bolivia), and the Middle East (e.g. Egypt) (ICNL, 2014). These patterns undermine the work of HRDs as well endangering HRDs' physical integrity and imposing a broader climate of fear.

Given the increased risk faced by HRDs, and challenges that arise from both traditional and more sophisticated means of repression, there is a surprising paucity of academic research that considers the protection needs of HRDs (Nah et al., 2013). Where research does exist on the protection needs of human rights, humanitarian, or development actors it tends to be narrowly focused on the protection needs on a particular grouping (e.g. aid workers or 'traditional' HRDs) as opposed to considering what we can learn by exploring differing approaches to protection across fields.

III. Contributions of human rights approaches

Despite the fact that humanitarian and development actors are often not conceptualised as HRDs there are potential benefits of utilising the HRD label. These include drawing attention to at risk individuals and groups, promoting the legitimacy of particular actions, and providing a range of associated protective mechanisms and strategies.

At risk individuals and groups

One of the potential benefits of the HRD label for development and humanitarian actors is its ability to draw attention to at risk individuals and groups. The HRD label has been used to focus the attention of the international community on particular cases where HRDs have been subjected to threats and repression. Through reports by the UN Special Rapporteur on HRDs and the work of organisations focused on the protection of HRDs, attention has been drawn to various groupings, such as women HRDs, environmental and land defenders, journalists, and student and youth activists (UN, 2010; 2011). This ensures that the cases of individuals who are particularly active in human rights defence, or who are at particular risk, are targeted through protective strategies. The HRD label can also facilitate new solidarities as individuals are united through

their commitment to human rights defence (Riethof, 2015). The label can provide a point of commonality for individuals working in diverse country-contexts across a range of issue areas. As a result, individuals at risk are able to share their learnings around effective protection strategies with other defenders as they join a 'network' of activists at risk.[6]

Global Witness provides an interesting case study, revealing how the HRD label can be used to address the risks faced by particular groups of HRDs. Global Witness uses the HRD label to focus attention on 'environmental and land defenders'. Moye (2015) argues that this framing has been useful in two ways. First, it has enabled the NGO to draw attention to particular stories of individual environmental and land defenders who have been subjected to attacks, or been killed, as a result of their work. This focus on individuals has provided an emotive entry point for the NGO to draw attention to a range of related issue areas, including the lack of protection available to indigenous communities. Secondly, the HRD label has acted as a means for Global Witness to generate statistics on attacks against environmental and land defenders. By framing attacks across different regions, and attacks on activists working on a range of land and environmental issues, as part of the same phenomenon (as attacks on environmental and land defenders) the NGO has been able to highlight global and regional trends. In turn, this has enabled the NGO to highlight issues that underlie attacks on HRDs (e.g. land grabbings) and draw attention to key issues (e.g. the lack of impunity for attacks on HRDs) (Global Witness, 2013).

In sum, humanitarian and development actors could use the HRD label as a tool to highlight cases where particular individuals are at risk and to act as an emotive entry point to draw attention to issues which underlie attacks on humanitarian and/or development actors. The HRD label may enable these actors to broaden their current solidarities. For instance, whereas current statistics are compiled around attacks on 'aid workers' in particular contexts it may be useful to highlight trends in attacks on 'HRDs' (including a full spectrum of actors engaged in human rights defence) in order to draw together shared risks faced by a range of actors working on a particular issue areas (such as monitoring food distribution during conflict).

[6] The Dublin Platform for Human Rights Defenders is an example of an event that uses the HRD label to bring together a diverse range of actors from around the word, enabling HRDs to share experiences and learn from each other.

Legitimacy

There may be scope to strategically use the HRD label and discourse to promote the legitimacy of the work of development and humanitarian actors. Adopting the HRD label may act as a way to challenge opponents' attempts to delegitimise activists' work. For example, in the context of large-scale development projects, activists' opposition is often painted as being anti-development and anti-growth (UN, 2013a). The HRD label may help to counter such assertions by reframing oppositional activities as legitimate attempts to defend the rights of those affected by development projects and policies. Riethof (2015) notes that the HRD label can support claims to legitimacy due to its grounding in international legal frameworks. Although the Declaration on HRDs is not in itself legally binding, it contains principles and rights that are based on human rights standards found in legally binding international instruments. The fact that the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration through consensus means HRDs can claim the validity of their work is recognised by the 'international community'.

Having said this, it is important to recognise that human rights and the HRD label are currently facing a backlash. Human rights can be viewed as something imposed from the 'outside'. Human rights defenders are often perceived as foreign agents, particularly by regimes that are eager to point to the lack of integrity and hypocrisy of the US and Europe on human rights (Anderson, 2015; Savage, 2015). Due to its grounding in international law, human rights can also be viewed as imposing top-down solutions. As a result, Teale (2015) notes that the HRD label often reduces the perceived legitimacy of paralegals by the communities in which they are embedded as human rights are viewed as something distant, lacking local credibility.

"Human rights and the HRD label are currently facing a backlash."

The fact that human rights lacks legitimacy in particular contexts points to an imperative that the human rights community develops strong 'counter-narratives' to reassert the legitimacy of HRDs' work, particularly if they want development and humanitarian actors to claim the HRD label (Gaziyev, 2015; Savage, 2015). Given the tendency to paint those defending human rights in the context of development as anti-growth,

narratives that highlight how human rights supports economic growth are important. Lazala (2015), for example, argues legitimacy is enhanced by highlighting how support for human rights does not affect companies' bottom-line and by developing arguments to demonstrate how a vibrant civil society is able to benefit business. Legitimacy may also be enhanced through modes of translation. Merry (2006), for example, has described how activists can act as translators, framing human rights law in local terms so it is accepted and effective in enacting change within a given context.

Protective mechanisms

Even where the HRD label does not enhance actors' legitimacy, it can be used strategically to enable individuals to access protective mechanisms (Moye 2015). Gaziyev (2015) notes that the HRD label tends to have more utility after an individual has been threatened or attacked (as a means to access protective mechanisms), as opposed to as a means to deter attack (as a preventative measure).

Over time a range of protective mechanisms, and practices, have been developed to support HRDs at risk (Nah et al., 2013: 410-14). These include international, regional and national mechanisms which seek to monitor and respond to rights violations against HRDs. At the international level the Special Rapporteur on HRDs is able to receive complaints where the rights of HRDs are violated, conduct country-visits and issue reports on the issues facing HRDs. At the regional level, in Latin America, for example, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has established an office to examine the situation of HRDs. The office is able to receive information pertaining to human rights violations and can issue 'precautionary measures' (e.g. asking states to put in place urgent measures to prevent harm to HRDs). Some countries have also put in place national mechanisms to respond to violations against HRDs. For example, Mexico has created mechanisms with the intention of protecting HRDs and journalists at risk (Joloy, 2013). One of the strengths of these mechanisms is that they make clear the unacceptable nature of threats towards, or attacks on, HRDs. Relatedly, a focus on rights violations can help ensure protection is linked to accountability. The HRD discourse makes it very clear that rights abuses amount to failures of the duties of state and non-state actors, and that remedial measures should be put in place (UN, 1998).

Practitioners have also developed a range of strategies in response to threats against HRDs. These have included: international solidarity to increase the costs of attacks on HRDs (e.g. urgent appeals, public statements, trial monitoring, human rights awards)[7]; international accompaniment (having international volunteers accompany HRDs to increase their visibility and act as witnesses to any violations)[8]; and the provision of services and material assistance (legal aid, temporary relocation, support with conducting risk assessments etc.)[9]. Increasingly, attention has been placed on more preventative measures that seek to foster 'enabling environments' for HRDs to work (i.e. environments free from repression and threats). Current strategies for promoting enabling environments have included:

- Building commitment and institutions to promote human rights at the national level (e.g. supporting governments to put in place national human rights institutions and human rights commissions).
- Strengthening of the capacity of HRDs (typically by proving toolkits and training programs to support risk-management and better enable HRDs to use the protective mechanisms on offer).
- Developing networks and coalitions to support HRDs at risk (Nah et al., 2013).

One of the strengths of the protective strategies developed by the human rights community is that they are focused on individuals working, and typically living, in contexts of risk. Although strategies may involve (often temporarily) relocating HRDs, protective strategies are mostly directed at those living and working within high-risk environments.

Despite the opportunity for humanitarian and development actors to capitalise on available protective mechanisms (including strategies, resources and networks), there are limitations in the current protection architecture. [10] Currently, support for HRDs at risk is often narrowly targeted at particular groups (e.g. journalists, lawyers) with a lack of programs set up to specifically meet the needs of development or humanitarian actors. Furthermore, current approaches have an 'unintended exclusivity' (Savage, 2015). For instance, Riethof (2015) notes that there are high numbers of 'environmental HRDs' in Latin

[7] See, for example, the work of Amnesty International and Frontline. Thoolen (2013) provides an interesting discussion of the role of human rights awards in protection.
[8] See the work of Protection International.
[9] For examples see the Civil Rights Defenders 'emergency fund' or the Centre for Applied Human Rights (University of York) 'protective fellowship scheme'.
[10] Although it is clear that HRDs are better off with protective mechanisms, not a lot is known about what strategies and approaches are most effective (Savage, 2015).

America who often do self-identify as HRDs but are not able to access protection schemes or mechanisms. This is due to the fact these groups are often extremely marginalised: they have low levels of education, no connection to capital cities, and do not speak Spanish or English. As such, for humanitarian and development actors to be able to use protective mechanisms, mechanisms need to ensure they are targeted at these actors. In addition, efforts need to be made to increase the capacity of particularly marginalised groups. This is likely to involve combining resources across fields as a key concern with expanding the parameters of current work has been the danger of overstretching pre-existing resources (Savage, 2015).

VI. Contributions of development and humanitarian approaches

Approaches to protection developed by the human rights community may offer benefits but there are also strong imperatives for human rights actors to learn from the approaches of humanitarian and development actors. There are now a number of pertinent critiques of dominant approaches to the protection of HRDs. One is that current approaches have been overly reactive, focused on emergency response as opposed to working preemptively to reduce risk (Petranov, 2011).

There have also been calls for protection mechanisms for HRDs to pay more attention to the environments in which HRDs are embedded. There are concerns that protection strategies are not always responsive, or flexible enough, to the situation for HRDs on the ground. Petranov (2011) argues there is a need for more locally-owned and nationally-based protection initiatives. HRDs can end up dislocated from their local context, and struggling to remain fully engaged in their work, as emergency relocation initiatives often involve relocating HRDs outside of their country. This is usually as there are a lack of options for relocating defenders within their country (even when it may be safe to do so). Concerns have also been expressed that resources can end up being targeted at more professionalised NGOs (often based in urban centres) to the neglect of the protection needs of community level HRDs (PBI, 2012: 14).

The strategies adopted by human rights actors have also been criticised for focusing on physical protection (e.g. the threat of kidnapping or

torture) and neglecting a range of broader concerns such as psychological wellbeing, family protection and health. These critiques have been particularly strong from those concerned with addressing the security needs of women HRDs. It is argued that women HRDs are in particular need of a holistic understanding of security (that recognises the need to feel safe at home, at work and on the streets) and a view of security that recognises that HRDs, particularly women, are often subject to deeply personal attacks where their families are targeted (Barry, 2011; Barry and Nainar, 2008; IM-Defensoras, 2013). This has led to calls for an 'integrated security' approach.

These critiques of the protective strategies developed by the human rights community (for being overly reactive, not paying enough attention to the environments in which HRDs are embedded and for over-focusing on physical protection) mean the approaches to protection employed by development and humanitarian actors offer important insights. In particular, there may be lessons learnt from development and humanitarian actors' focus on strengthening resilience, recognising communities as subjects and agents of protection, and holistic responses.

Strengthening resilience

Strengthening resilience is now viewed as a core component of development and humanitarian action and a central framework that guides responses to risk (ActionAid, 2009; IFRC, 2012; Runde & Savoy, 2014). Although there is no common definition of resilience, the IFRC (2012: 3) defines it as:

> "the ability of individuals, communities, organisations or countries exposed to disasters, crises and underlying vulnerabilities to anticipate, reduce the impact of, cope with, and recover from the effects of adversity without compromising their long term prospects."

This definition features key elements found in most definitions of resilience: the capacity to withstand, recover and adapt from threats and critical events (Runde & Savoy, 2014). Resilience refers to a process whereby actors take on lessons learnt so if they are to face threats again they are better prepared and crises have less impact (Runde & Savoy, 2014). As such, resilience interventions are not just concerned with providing immediate responses to a crisis but building capacity to address underlying vulnerabilities (e.g. poor governance, social exclusions, lack of skills) in order to build capacity (IFRC, 2012).

Resilience interventions acknowledge that individuals and communities always have some capacity to protect themselves. This recognition of local capacity typically forms the starting point of resilience interventions and ensures interventions have local ownership (IFRC, 2012). Although development and humanitarian actors usually focus on strengthening community resilience, best practice interventions tend to work at multiple levels as they recognise that individuals contribute to community resilience and that community resilience is dependent on government policy (IFRC, 2012). As such, interventions may be targeted at the individual level (e.g. providing individuals with information), community level (e.g. supporting projects which increase food security), national level (e.g. working with governments to reform and strengthen institutions) and/ or global level (e.g. advocating for changes at the UN) (IFRC, 2012; Runde & Savoy, 2014).

Humanitarian and development actors' approaches to strengthening resilience often look at improving communities' capacity to respond to natural disasters, disease epidemics and access to socio-economic resources (e.g. food and livelihoods). Yet, a resilience framework could be applied to address the deliberate attacks faced by HRDs. This may apply both in the sense that access to socio-economic resources is interconnected to issues of physical protection (see below) but also in the sense that an emphasis on resilience could be applied to increase the ability of HRDs to withstand, recover and adapt from deliberate attack.

Efforts to promote 'enabling environments' for HRDs may increase resilience. For example, trainings on security management could increase the ability of communities to withstand threats. Similarly, the strengthening of human rights institutions could support the capacity of actors to recover after an attack. Having said this, a resilience framework could challenge current approaches to promoting enabling environments by ensuring interventions are locally-based and locally-owned, incorporate long-term thinking, and consistently recognise the need to both mitigate risk and recover from an attack (if a risk materialises).

Exploring current approaches to training HRDs provides a window on how a resilience framework could reform current approaches. Current trainings targeted at HRDs have been criticised for the fact they have tended to be offered as a series of discrete interventions (with indications that few HRDs take on the learnings from trainings to develop, implement and

adapt preventative policies within their organisations). Trainings are also frequently designed without adequate input from HRDs themselves (Petranov, 2011). In contrast, if trainings were implemented in order to strengthen resilience they would be more likely: to be developed in conjunction with local actors; to be delivered by local actors (as opposed to out-of-country experts); to be more focused on "service/accompaniment" focusing on providing advice over time in order to respond to threats as they arise (as opposed to discrete interventions); and be adapted to ensure they provide insight into both how to respond to an immediate risk but also how to cope and adapt in the longer term if a threat materialises (Petranov, 2011: 5).

Despite the potential of a resilience framework, it is important to note that experience of supporting resilience in development and humanitarian aid has revealed potential pitfalls. These include unrealistically suggesting that as individual or community resilience increases vulnerability disappears (Levine & Model, 2014). Relatedly, the actions people take to survive in risky contexts can end up being recast as resilience (Levine et al., 2012). For instance, in the face of risk HRDs may turn to their community for support. This may be a product of limited resources: the HRD may have turned to the community as the state failed to provide effective protection. Yet, there is a danger that this becomes cast as something positive (resilience), rather than viewed as the result of the unacceptable risks faced by HRDs and limited resources on offer.

The literature also points to the danger that resilience comes to be associated with generic resilience interventions, as opposed to a good analysis of the local context (Levine and Model, 2014). As such, it is clear that interventions to strengthen resilience need to be embedded in an understanding of local contexts and combine a recognition of actors' victimhood or vulnerability with a consideration of the agency HRDs exercise in developing means to protect themselves. It is also important to note that the relationship between risk and resilience is unclear. Although it is often presumed that reducing risk increases resilience, it may in fact be necessary to take risks to increase resilience (see the discussion of 'Humanitarian Zones' towards the end of this document) (Levine and Model, 2014).

Communities as subjects and agents of protection

One of the key distinctions between the approaches to protection taken by humanitarian and development actors, and current approaches to the protection of HRDs, are the contrasting focuses on community versus individual protection. This difference in understandings of protection can inhibit discussions across fields. Whereas development and humanitarian actors tend to consider protection in terms of whole communities caught up in chronic violence, current approaches to the protection of HRDs tend to focus on the protection needs of individuals (ActionAid, 2009; Anderson, 2015; Collinson, 2015; Savage, 2015).[11]

There are benefits of interventions that recognise communities as subjects and agents of protection. This framework can draw attention to the protection needs of community groups that may be obscured by protective mechanisms and practices targeted at individuals at risk. Strengthening community resilience involves looking to the capacity of communities to help themselves. By looking at the skills, resources and knowledge held by communities there is the potential to identify ways that communities can come together to engage in acts of human rights defense. Where protective interventions draw on community as opposed to individual capacity the potential for effective action is likely to be greater given increased resources. For instance, communities working together to identify risks are more likely to recognise warnings signs than individual HRDs as they are likely to have access to a greater range of information. Strengthening community resilience necessarily involves some degree of collaborative action. In itself, this can act to reduce individual vulnerability as relationships are built or enhanced, and isolation of HRDs is reduced.

"One of the key distinctions is the contrasting focus on individual versus community protection"

[11] There are caveats here. Anderson (2015) argues that individual HRDs typically see their work as for, and linked to, communities. However, it appears to be more usual for HRDs to see their work as for specific 'communities' (e.g. women, LGBT), as opposed to the broader communities in which they are embedded. As noted above, best practice approaches to community-based protection by humanitarian and development actors do consider the need to strengthen resilience at different levels.

Although there are opportunities that arise from involving communities in efforts to address protection needs, it is also important to acknowledge that the risks faced by humanitarian, development and human rights actors often come from within the communities in which these actors are embedded (Collinson, 2015; Teale, 2015). There has been a tendency amongst humanitarian agencies to respond to these risks through the fortification of aid (e.g. the building of walls, use of armed escorts) and arm's length aid management. This approach has been strongly criticised for separating aid workers from the societies in which they are working, and creating hierarchies of protection where security risks are transferred from international to local staff (Collinson and Duffield, 2013; Fast, 2014).[12]

Despite this tendency there are examples of good practice where practitioners have sought to address community threats through community engagement. Teale (2015), for example, describes a range of strategies that have been used to address threats to paralegals (working on legal empowerment) from the communities in which paralegals are embedded. These strategies have included: embedding paralegals within strong domestic organisations, ensuring a mapping is carried out of local actors (i.e. allies and potential opponents are understood), using sequencing (i.e. starting with soft issues and then using these as an entry point to address more controversial concerns), strategically working with gatekeepers, and taking the time to build paralegals' credibility within the community. This is not to say there is no role for 'external actors'. Teale (2015) notes the importance of being able to refer to a lawyer or external members of staff if a particular issue is too controversial and poses a high risk to the paralegals embedded within local communities. Yet, referring to external actors is the exception rather than the rule. In sum, a greater consideration of the role of communities as potential buffers to external threats, as well as recognition of the need to work with communities to mitigate for internal threats, could potentially enhance current approaches to the protection of HRDs.

[12] Aid workers are also becoming separated from the societies in which they are working as a result of humanitarian approaches to protection becoming overly professionalised. Collinson & Duffield (2013) argue that security is increasingly being placed in the domain of experts, ultimately removing responsibility from aid workers themselves to address risks through building an understanding of, and addressing concerns within, the local context (also see Fast, 2014).

Holistic responses

Another potentially helpful component of humanitarian and development frameworks is the fact that protection is often conceptualised broadly (ActionAid, 2009; Trōcaire, 2014). This includes recognising the significance of psychosocial wellbeing as a protection issue in its own right, and as intrinsically linked to the ability to maintain physical safety. Trōcaire (2014), for instance, seeks to 'mainstream' interventions to address psychosocial wellbeing across their work (e.g. collecting information relevant to mental health during assessments) and, where appropriate, also seeks to take more proactive steps (e.g. arranging psychosocial support through referrals, training staff to provide 'psychological first aid training' following stressful events, conducting awareness-raising sessions with communities on stress management).

As well as linking psychosocial wellbeing to physical protection, humanitarian and development actors have recognised the intersections between physical protection and material assistance (e.g. access to food and shelter). Recognising this link can broaden the range of strategies used to address risk. As an example, in the Nuba Mountains of Sudan, recurrent conflict has meant individuals frequently have to flee (often for extended periods) to the mountains (Levine and Mosel, 2014). When they flee finding food is difficult and livestock were left behind as they could not survive the harsh conditions. In response, a different breed of goat was introduced to the area which was selected due to its ability to withstand the cold, allowing individuals to take the goats as they fled. Such programmes may provide important lessons for approaches to protection. In this case, the intervention demonstrates the importance of developing interventions from an understanding of the local situation (as opposed to a 'shopping list') and recognising the intersectionality of issues across sectors (this project cannot be discretely categorised as either a protection or livelihood project) (Levine & Mosel, 2014).

There are clearly opportunities raised by a more expansive view of protection: safety and security is not reduced to freedom from physical attack, the intersections between issues are recognised (e.g. between food and physical security), and a greater array of strategies are considered to address risk. However, it is important to recognise that the downside of a more expansive understanding of protection is that protection risks becoming ambivalent. A whole range of activities (providing material assistance, documenting abuses etc.) risk becoming

recast as protection, despite the fact they are not actually designed to stop violence (Angir, 2015; DuBois, 2010).

Table 1: Overview of understandings of protective action amongst human rights, development and humanitarian actors

	Human Rights	**Development and Humanitarianism**
Labeling of actors	Human rights defenders	Development or aid workers
Prime beneficiaries of protection	Individuals at risk	Communities caught in chronic violence
Focus of protection	Addressing physical protection	Providing material assistance
Proactive protection strategies	Building safe and enabling environments	Strengthening resilience

VII. Collaborative action

The shared imperatives of humanitarian, development and human rights actors to address issues of protection points to the necessity of collaborative action or at least coordinated efforts. Drawing from the discussions above, the final section of this document sets out four potential areas where actors could benefit from working together: in building knowledge, combining protective strategies, in defining responsibilities, and fostering enabling environments. Ultimately, these areas point to the benefits of increased communication across fields to address protection needs.

Sharing knowledge

Sharing knowledge and information is one way actors could work together to strengthen their response to risk. Examples of knowledge sharing could include:

- Sharing knowledge of protective mechanisms, strategies and threats. For instance, sharing knowledge to identify shared threats that require coordinated responses, or to enhance early-warning systems to better identify when threats may be increasing.
- Building an evidence base. Sharing knowledge of what protective interventions have, or have not, worked to better understand what strategies may be effective under particular circumstances.
- Sharing contacts and knowledge of key actors. Ensuring actors are aware of individuals or organisations outside of their particular field that may be able to offer support to address particular security concerns, provide support in heightening the visibility of particular cases of individuals at risk, or offer a pathway for referral.
- Sharing resources. For instance, protection and security manuals for HRDs or tools to facilitate a vulnerability analysis could be beneficial to those working in adjacent fields.
- Sharing ideas to enhance responses to key challenges. For instance, does joint strategising lead to new ideas for ways to promote the legitimacy of human rights work or to address the issue of impunity for attacks on HRDs?

Combining protective strategies

There is the potential for actors to look to adjacent fields to enhance their effectiveness. This may involve actors adopting the tools of adjacent fields. For example, there may be opportunities for humanitarian actors to use the reporting mechanisms at the UN. However, there is obviously a danger here that actors become overstretched and end up adopting strategies that are beyond their area of expertise (Savage, 2015). As such, drawing on a greater range of protective strategies could also be addressed through strengthening partnerships. For instance, it may be actors could work closely together to develop holistic responses: humanitarian and development actors could offer material assistance to address particular risks whilst human rights actors could provide interventions to explicitly address concerns regarding physical protection.

"Strengthening partnerships would enable actors to draw on a greater array of protective strategies."

Excitingly, there is also the potential for actors to develop combined approaches by using the strategies and discourses of adjacent fields. The work of CAVIDA and their Humanitarian Zones in Cacarica (Colombia) provide an interesting case study in this regard as CAVIDA uses humanitarian and human rights discourses, alongside modes of community resilience, to respond to threats (see Burnyeat, 2013). In 2001, families in Cacarica, in an attempt to return to their land after forced displacement in the midst of conflict, decided to organise under the name CAVIDA and form 'Humanitarian Zones'. These Zones involved the creative use of humanitarian law by constructing physical spaces solely for the civilian population (surrounding Zones by wire and large signs insisting no armed actors enter). CAVIDA's approach emphasises community resilience. The Humanitarian Zones are examples of community human rights defense: acting collectively is seen as a means to enhance protection and is an act of community resistance, which in turn serves to strengthen the community. The system works imperfectly: threats have meant that many families have had to remain inside the Humanitarian Zones as opposed to returning to their surrounding farms, and armed actors have sometimes attempted to enter. However, human rights discourse has helped to construct the perceived legitimacy of the Zones: the granting of precautionary measures to CAVIDA by the Inter-American Commission is written on signs visible to armed actors. In addition, CAVIDA has used protective national and international accompaniment (by Peace Brigades International and Colombian NGO Inter-Church Justice and Peace Commission) and drawn on a support network which has enabled a coordinated emergency response at points where risks have increased. Significantly, CAVIDA's approach to protection does not involve international relocation despite the fact that conflict is ongoing and that community members face high levels of risk. CAVIDA's example demonstrates that responses to threats may be improved by drawing across a range of discourses and combining a range of protective strategies.

Defining responsibilities

Collaborative action could also lead to a clearer demarcation of responsibilities in relation to protection. Currently there are open questions: Do organisations working to protect HRDs at risk have responsibilities to HRDs' families and to support HRDs' psychosocial wellbeing? Are humanitarian actors responsible (and do they have the skills) to address physical protection needs (Collinson, 2015)? More

generally, what are the responsibilities of individuals, their associated organisations, protection 'experts', and donors, when it comes to protection (Fast, 2014; Teale, 2015)?

The fact that the practices of one group can heighten the risks faced by actors in adjacent fields makes the need to define responsibilities particularly clear. In some instances development agencies have failed to support the construction of safe, or enabling, environments for HRDs. In cases where governments have actively repressed civil society, development agencies have not always spoken out (Anderson, 2015). For instance, in the Ethiopian case, development agencies have been accused of reinforcing human rights violations as the government has used donor-supported development programs as a means to undermine dissent by denying opponents access to food aid, agricultural land etc. (HRW, 2010). Human Rights Watch (2010) has documented that in Ethiopia development agencies, despite in principle recognising that civil-political rights are central to sustainable development, have in practice reinforced repressive government practices. These government practices have included the enacting of restrictive legislation and the imprisonment and silencing of regime critiques.

Yet, there is a danger that by speaking out development or humanitarian actors increase the risks faced by their staff. As MSF (2001; 2014) notes, despite often choosing to speak out against violations:

> "each time MSF considers speaking out, we face the difficult question of whether our actions could jeopardise the safety of the populations we are seeking to protect, our own staff, or the continuation of the medical programs we are running."

In seeking to balance the demands for material assistance, immediate safety considerations, and the long-term necessity of building safe spaces for HRDs to work actors clearly need to work together so as to avoid undermining the safety of those in adjacent fields. There may be opportunities for actors to develop coordinated responses in particular local contexts in order to balance competing demands. For instance, a decision could be taken that particular actors will speak out whilst others maintain a strategic silence to enable continued service delivery (Moye, 2015).

Rights-based development to foster enabling environments

Working across fields has the potential to broaden human rights actors' approaches to fostering enabling environments. Approaches to building enabling environments are increasingly associated with particular strategies (i.e. strengthening human rights institutions, training HRDs, and supporting networks and coalitions). The danger here is that other possibilities are crowed out. By considering the intersections between the approaches of human rights and development actors there is the potential to explore new avenues to foster environments free from repression and threat.

The Special Rapporteur on HRDs has posited that a rights-based approach to large-scale development projects could help to create safe and enabling environments for HRDs (UN, 2013a). Yet, the critical question of how development actors may create safe and enabling environments in practice remains underexplored. In practice, rights-based approaches may increase development actors' level of risk as activists are drawn into potentially difficult relationships with duty-bearers (UN, 2013b). Rights-based approaches may replace service delivery programmes with advocacy and draw attention to power imbalances as obstacles to development. As such, there is the need to interrogate how development actors may promote enabling environments through the adoption of rights based approaches.

There are also other links that remain unexplored. Over the past ten years there has been a remarkable surge of interest in legal empowerment (a form of RBD). Legal empowerment has the potential to support efforts to construct enabling environments due to its emphasis on improving access to justice for poor and marginalised communities and its delivery of practical solutions to address impunity. Due to its strong emphasis on socioeconomic rights, and concern with access to justice for disadvantaged populations, this approach could provide tools to protect HRDs who are at particular risk. Yet this particular application does not appear to have been explicitly considered.

VIII. Conclusion

In conclusion, there are both opportunities and key imperatives that arise for humanitarian, development and human rights actors when they look

across fields to consider a range of approaches to protection (see table 2). Despite the fact that many humanitarian and development actors have been reluctant to adopt the label, there are a number of opportunities that arise from conceptualising development and humanitarian actors as HRDs. These include the potential for these actors to make use of the range of protective mechanisms and strategies that have emerged to protect this at-risk group. Human rights actors could also learn from humanitarian and development approaches in order to strengthen their preventative strategies and more effectively utilise the protective expertise of communities and HRDs themselves. Increased communication across fields would create a number of exciting opportunities to enhance responses to current threats. Specifically, providing the opportunity to share knowledge, draw across protective strategies, ensure responsibilities in relation to protection are clearly defined, and offer new avenues to establish safe and enabling environments for activists at risk.

Table 2: Overview of key imperatives and opportunities that arise by examining approaches to protection across 'fields'

Humanitarian and/or development actors	**Human rights actors**
Need to find ways to address increasing attacks on aid workers	Need to address the increase in attacks on HRDs, more sophisticated means of repression and particular risks faced by HRDs working on socio-economic rights
Need to address threat of physical violence (alongside offering material assistance)	Imperative to broaden the protective architecture to address the needs of non-traditional HRDs, including humanitarian and development actors working to defend rights
Need to build the capacity of marginalised actors to enable them to access protective mechanisms	Need to improve accessibility of protective mechanisms to marginalised HRDs
Need to ensure actions do not undermine safe and enabling environments for HRDs	Need to explore the impact of the adoption of rights-based approaches on the risks faced by development and humanitarian actors
Opportunity to strategically use the HRD label to promote the legitimacy of their work	Need to strengthen counter-narratives in response to a backlash against human rights
Opportunity to use the HRD label to broaden current solidarities	Opportunity to apply a resilience framework to strengthen preventative strategies
Potential to use the HRD label to draw attention to at risk individuals and groups	Opportunity to work with communities to buffer internal and external threats to HRDs
Opportunity to use protective mechanisms and practices established for HRDs	Opportunity to develop a more holistic understanding of, and response to, protection

References

ActionAid. 2009. Safety with dignity: A field manual for integrating community-based protection across humanitarian programs. Available at http://www.actionaid.org/publications/safety-dignity-field-based-manual-integrating-community-based-protection-across-humanit

Anderson, A. 2015. *What, if anything, could be gained by understanding development actors as human rights defenders? What lessons, synergies or tensions can be revealed by adopting this perspective?* Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Angir, C. 2015. Understanding protection from a women's rights perspective. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Barry, J. Nainar, V. 2008. *Women human rights defenders' security strategies: Insiste, resiste, persiste, existe*. Urgent Action Fund for Women's Human Rights.

Barry, J. 2011. *Integrated security: The manual*. MDG3 Fund.

Burnyeat, G. 2013. On a peak in Darien: Community peace initiatives in Urabá, Columbia. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 435-445.

Collinson, S. 2015. *Protection in Humanitarianism*. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Collinson, S. Duffield, M. 2013. *Paradoxes of presence: Risk management and aid culture in challenging environments*. ODI, Humanitarian Policy Group.

Defending Civil Society Project, 2014. 'Defending Civil Society Toolkit: Tips for Engaging in NGO Law Reform (ICNL)'. Available at http://www.defendingcivilsociety.org/en/index.php/home

DuBois, M. 2010. Protection: Fig-leaves and other delusions. *Humanitarian Exchange*, 46, 2-4.

Ensor, J. 2013. Unpublished Development actors as human rights defenders. Unpublished panel outline.

Fast, L. 2014. *Aid in danger: The perils and promise of humanitarianism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gaziyev, J. 2015. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Global Witness. 2013. Deadly Environment: The dramatic risk in killings of environmental and land defenders. Available at http://www.globalwitness.org/sites/default/files/library/Deadly%20Environment.pdf

Hertel, S. 2006. *Unexpected power: Conflict and change among transnational activists*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Human Rights Watch. 2010. *Development without freedom: How aid underwrites repression in Ethiopia*. New York: HRW.

Humanitarian Outcomes, 2014. 'Aid Worker Security Database'. Available at https://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/awsd

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). 2012. The road to resilience: Bridging relief and development for a more sustainable future. Available at http://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/96178/1224500-Road%20to%20resilience-EN-LowRes%20(2).pdf

IM-Defensoras, 2013. A feminist alternative for the protection, self-care, and safety of women human rights defenders in Mesoamerica, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 401-420.

Jaraisy, R. Feldman, T. 2013. Protesting for human rights in the occupied Palestinian territory: Assessing the challenges and revisiting the human rights defender framework. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 421-434.

Joloy, D. 2013. Mexico's national protection mechanism for human rights defenders: Challenges and good practices, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 489-499.

Jones, M. 2013. *Ending the two solitudes: Bringing human rights defenders at risk into the international refugee regime*. Unpublished paper presented at the research workshop on human rights defenders. University of York. 15-17 May 2013. York.

Lazala, M. 2015. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Levine, S. Mosel, I. 2014. *Supporting resilience in difficult places: A critical look at applying the 'resilience' concept in countries where crises are the norm*. ODI.

Merry, S E. 2006. *Human rights and gender violence: Translating international law into local justice*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Moye, C. 2015. *Protecting human rights, humanitarian, and development actors*. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

MSF. 2001. When does MSF speak out?. Available at http://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/news-stories/newsletter/when-does-msf-speak-out

MSF. 2014. Speaking out case studies. Available at http://speakingout.msf.org/en

Nah, A. Bennett, K. Ingleton, D. Savage, J. 2013. A research agenda for the protection of human rights defenders, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 401-420.

Nelson. P. Dorsey, E. 2008. *New rights advocacy: Changing strategies of development and human rights NGOs*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 2004. Human rights defenders: Protecting the right to defend human rights. Fact Sheet No. 29.

Open Society Foundations. (2015). Legal empowerment. Available at http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/projects/legal-empowerment

Peace Brigades International. (PBI). 2012. An assessment of the feasibility of effectiveness of protective accompaniment in Kenya. Available at http://www.peacebrigades.nl/pdf/Kenia/PBI_Kenya_report.pdf

Petranov, B. 2011. Keeping defenders safe: A call to donor action. Available at https://ihrfg.org/sites/default/files/Keeping_Defenders_Safe_Report.pdf

Riethof, M. 2015.*Transnational strategies of the anti-dam movement in Brazil: Linking environmental protests with the human rights agenda.* Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Runde, D. Savoy, C. 2014. Resilience: a critical framework for development. Available at http://csis.org/publication/resilience-critical-framework-development

Savage, J. 2015. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Slim, H. 2015. Review of Aid in danger: the perils and promise of humanitarianism by Larissa Fast, *International Affairs*, 91(3), 629-31.

Teale, L. 2015. *Protecting community based paralegals*. Unpublished paper presented at 'Risk and protection workshop'. Centre for Applied Human Rights. 5 May 2015. York.

Thoolen, J. 2013. Human rights awards for the protection of human rights defenders, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 5(3), 548-555.

Trōcaire. 2014. Humanitarianism protection handbook. Available at http://www.trocaire.org/sites/trocaire/files/resources/policy/trocaire-humanitarian-protection-handbook-2014.pdf

UN General Assembly. 1998. Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognised Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

(commonly referred to as the Declaration on human rights defenders), adopted by UN General Assembly resolution 53/144, 9 December 1998. A/RES/53/144.

UN General Assembly. 2010. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya. 20 December. A/HRC/16/44.

UN General Assembly. 2011. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya. 21 December. A/HRC/19/55.

UN General Assembly. 2013a. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya. 5 August. A/68/262.

UN General Assembly. 2013b. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya. 23 December. A/HRC/25/55.

UN General Assembly. 2014. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst. 29 December. A/HRC/28/63.

UNIVERSITY of Ghana