Terms of Reference and Work Plan

GPC Task Team on Cash for Protection

July 27, 2017, Updated 9 November 2017, **December 2018**

The purpose of this document is to clarify the objectives and the ways of working of the Task Team on Cash for Protection Outcomes, as well as highlight the key strategic activities of its annual work plan. The ToR and Work Plan will be reviewed on an as needed basis, and at least once a year.

I.   Introduction

Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA)   is an assistance y modality that in recent years has been increasingly used by humanitarian actors to deliver assistance and facilitate access to services and are seen to deliver greater choice, dignity, and realization of rights to conflict and crisis-affected people as well as strengthening local markets, when contrasted with in-kind assistance. Following the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in Istanbul in 2016, humanitarian organizations committed to increase the use and coordination of CBIs when delivering assistance to affected populations.

Among the six commitments on cash-based programming made at the WHS, aid organizations and donors committed to 'build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery and vouchers, and combinations thereof'. The Grand Bargain specifically states that "delivering cash should, where possible and appropriate, use, link or align with local and national mechanisms such as social protection systems."

To date, the use of cash-based interventions in the protection sector has been limited. This is in part due to the specific nature of protection programs, ranging from delivering emergency/protection services to affected populations, technical support to governments, engagement with communities, or sometimes delivery of in-kind aid. Protection issues are complex, and consequently, protection programs are complex, with CBIs as one modality among many that can be implemented to contribute to protection outcomes.

Considerable work has already been undertaken looking at the risks related to cash programming (i.e. whether CBIs create protection risks). Inter-agency guidance has also been developed to analyse protection risks, identify mitigation measures (particularly community-based), and maximize protection benefits of CBIs, and an updated literature review was undertaken to summarize existing research and identify remaining gaps.[1] Furthermore, a number of pieces of new research since 2015 have begun to document the results and models of cash as part of child protection and SGBV programming,[2] with a number of agencies planning larger and increasingly rigorous research in 2017-18. A number of humanitarian actors have used cash-based interventions paired with case management and other services aimed at achieving protection outcomes - or cash *for* protection - and there is scope for learning from these efforts for duplication to scale good models and to develop greater evidence as to

what type CBIs can be successfully used in different contexts to address different protection concerns. Efforts need to be put in place to understand the possible uses of CBIs in the protection sector, in a strategic manner.

Currently, the understanding and vision on the use of CBIs in protection programming is fragmented, as various organizations have worked individually or in small groups on these aspects, in particular in child protection, SGBV, and migrants in transit, including children on the move. Some work described as cash for protection has a very broad definition of what constitutes 'protection' which is partly due to the existing definitional issues within the humanitarian community about protection. There is also debate around what constitutes prevention of protection risks and difficulty identifying protection outcomes that CBIs have contributed to. This is linked to challenges measuring prevention of protection incidents as well as the mitigation of protection risks. There is inadequate mapping of the current cash for protection initiatives, learning from them, and a need for innovative thinking to bring forward the use of CBIs in protection programs.

II.   Objectives

With the overall goal of increasing knowledge about the use of CBIs in the protection sector, and increasing the effectiveness and quality of programs using CBIs to achieve protection outcomes, the GPC Task Team on Protection and CBIs will aim to:

- Develop in a collaborative manner a position paper on the use of cash for protection outcomes, highlight opportunities that exist in the sector to promote the use of CBIs, and articulate concerns around the use of CBIs in the sector, including regarding the use of Multipurpose Cash Transfers;
- Continually map research and initiatives on CBIs for protection, and identify gaps in knowledge on an annual basis;
- Based on the identified gaps, make recommendations on prioritization of research on CBIs and protection;
- Reach out to donors for funding of prioritized action research on CBIs and protection;
- Support the dissemination of learning from action research undertaken through leadership of global and/or regional learning events;

III.   *Ways of Working*

The Task team will be comprised of members and co-leads.

1.   *C4P Task Team*

The Task Team is currently chaired by the Women's Refugee Commission and the International Rescue Committee.

The Co-chairs are responsible for:

- · Reaching out to key actors to join and participate in the work of the Task Team and updating the list of members and their contact information
- · Representing the C4P TT in global fora, including by attending meetings of the GPC PPRG, and of other Task Teams & AoRs of the GPC, as well as meetings and events led by key stakeholders
- · Overseeing the development and assist with implementation of the work plan
- · Providing technical desk support through the GPC Helpdesk
- · Tracking progress, updating, and revising the ToR/Work Plan
- · Organizing calls every two months, taking minutes and sharing relevant information on the GPC website and other networks.

2.   Membership and Associated Organizations

The C4P TT is open to any organization, agency or cluster that would like to participate. The TT will coordinate with existing initiatives such as the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP). All members are expected to actively participate and support the work of the TT to the extent possible, which may include:

- ● Regularly attending the conference calls
- ● Contributing to the work plan
- ● Volunteering to carry out activities
- ● Sharing learning from practice
- ● Remaining engaged in current debates around cash for protection outcomes.

3.   Decision Making Processes

The co-leads will facilitate a transparent and collaborative decision-making process. The ethos of the group will be open, inclusive, and will seek to work in a way that promotes broader humanitarian goals such as those agreed at the World Humanitarian Summit, for example, on localisation, ensuring greater compliance with IHL, addressing risks of SGBV, etc.

4.   Task Team Conference Calls

The Task Team will hold one 90 minute (maximum) call every two months. Co-leads will aim to circulate an agenda allowing for all members to input and suggest modifications. Members of the Task Team can propose any topic of conversation related to cash for protection. If these topics cannot fit into regular bi-monthly calls, additional thematic calls will be organized on an ad-hoc basis. Co-leads will prepare minutes of calls and make them available through the GPC website and via email to the Task Team members and other interested parties.

IV. Work Plan 2019

Activity	Leads (L) and contributors (c)	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Identify relevant knowledge repositories/platforms and support updating resources on C4P	WRC (L); IRC (L)	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**								
Coordination with Protection Sub-sectors: Child Protection, GBV, Mine Action, and Housing, Land and Property	WRC (L); IRC (L)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Map evidence on C4P to address gaps: Mine Action, and Housing, Land and Property, other protection risks, profiles at risk													
Produce Position Paper on C4P			X	X	X	X				X			
Input into and endorse new field resources (e.g. guidance, tools and trainings) on C4P as developed			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitate thematic discussion/webinar on technical issues related to C4P during bi-monthly TT calls		X		X		X		X		X		X	
Organize or contribute to a minimum of two learning events (preferably in-person, but perhaps electronic) featuring or focusing on C4P													
Advocacy on C4P (with donors, agencies and coordination mechanisms)													

[1] UNHCR and partners interagency "Guide for Protection in CBIs" and "Protection Risk and Benefit Analysis Tool for CBIs" and Danish Refugee Council "Protection Outcomes of Cash-Based Interventions: A Literature Review", 2015, available at www.cashlearning.org/protection.
[2] See research from Save the Children and the International Rescue Committee on www.cashlearning.org/protection.