

The purpose of this tip sheet is to provide humanitarian responders working in Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) and Protection with basic guidance on key definitions relating to Cash for Protection. This tip sheet has been developed in response to increasing amount of questions coming from the C4PTT members around what falls within the scope of Cash of Protection and what doesn't. It doesn't replace in any way guidance provided by national clusters and cash working groups.

1. What is the definition of Cash for Protection?

Cash for Protection is an intervention whereby cash and voucher assistance (CVA) is used as the modality to address individual, or household (HH)-level protection needs. Consequently, cash for protection can be used in situations wherein an individual and/or HH is at risk of immediate harm, as well as in cases where individuals and/or HHs face protection concerns that negatively impact well-being but that are not necessarily time specific. Cash for protection can be both a responsive and remedial action, meaning that it is aimed at preventing, reducing, or mitigating exposure to protection risks, or limiting the impact of risk on victims. The provision of cash for protection should not be exclusively intended to address generic socio-economic vulnerabilities. Rather, the provision of cash for protection is driven by a causal link between a clearly identified protection concern and the analysis of how the cash assistance provided will produce a protection outcome by preventing, reducing, or mitigating the risks identified. While cash for protection is generally unconditional, it does requires additional monitoring to measure the impact on the protection concern.

Cash for Protection differs from Protection Mainstreaming, which refers to the process of incorporating protection principles (i.e. meaningful access and non-discrimination, safety, dignity & do no harm, accountability, and participation and empowerment) at all stages of the programme cycle in humanitarian programmes using CVA, which could be intended to meet one or more basic needs objectives or sector-specific outcomes, such as food security, livelihoods, education, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for All (WASH), shelter and health. While protection mainstreaming should be part of any CVA intervention (including Cash for Protection), **it does not constitute a Cash for Protection intervention on its own.**

- *Example:* Ensure that targeting methodologies used in the delivery of multipurpose cash transfers to meet basic needs do not expose beneficiaries to protection risks (such as bribery and extortion) and ensure strong community sensitisation, by working with community leaders to ensure that communities understand targeting methodologies to alleviate tensions and associated risks at the community level.

Cash for Protection also does not replace the standard emergency case management fund which remains an integral part of the case management process.

→ [LINK TO GPC C4PTF WEBSITE](#)

Role of the C4PTF in Ukraine

- ➔ Provide technical guidance on the design of CVA & Protection assessments and activities and analysis of findings, including through the dissemination of tools and key resources
- ➔ Offer a space for collaboration and discussion to address key CVA and Protection challenges that emerge, ensuring sharing of best practices and lessons learnt.
- ➔ Adapt global guidance and tools



2. What are the core components of a Cash for Protection program?

Cash for Protection acts as an umbrella term encompassing different types of interventions (section 3). The design, and implementation share similar core components:

1. Economic barriers, root causes and drivers of protection risks are identified at needs assessment/monitoring/risk analysis stage. It may be challenging (particularly at the beginning of a response) to establish the causality between the identified protection risks and the need for financial assistance in the same way as for other sectors (ex: prevalence of food insecurity measured through indicators). However, identifying (even through qualitative data) that financial barriers contribute to increasing/worsening incidents/drivers of protection risks is a key component in the design of a cash for protection intervention. Information may be derived from an analysis of anonymized case management databases which indicate the primary protection risk, and key actions in the care plan.

2. The theory of change is reflective of how the use of the CVA intervention will directly address/prevent identified protection risks. Note that multiple protection risks can be identified in the same context, which could all lead to the design of separate, but yet tailored, adapted and sometimes integrated, cash for protection interventions. Note that the both preventing and responding to the protection risk is likely to require additional support and referrals beyond the CVA, given the complex nature and drivers on various protection risks.

3. The CVA intervention is designed to contribute to reducing protection risks and mitigating protection-related negative coping strategies. In some situations, this will simply mean providing families with CVA of the value of the Minimum Expenditure Basket, in order to enable them to meet their basic needs without having to resort to negative coping strategies (such as separating from children, or taking the risk of farming on mined land to generate income). In other cases, this may mean providing a punctual financial support to meet an immediate, protection need (such as providing emergency support post evacuation) , or covering an extra protection related costs for which the value of the MEB is insufficient (such as paying for legal fees, or specific services for people with disabilities).

4. The targeting methodology to select CVA recipients is designed to target at risk populations, while building in the relevant mitigation strategies. Cash for Protection interventions should always be integrated within the scope of a broader CVA programming, in order to reduce risks of stigma, and avoid the use of negative coping strategies in order to be selected for the program (Sphere Protection Principle 1). For example, we would hesitate to have a program that provides CVA only to Child Headed Households or survivors of GBV, but instead see this integrated into a wider CVA program.

5. The implementation is complemented by protection activities (provided by the organization or other stakeholder) in order to address non-financial root causes of protection risks (such as case management, referral for protection services, PSS, etc.).

6. Protection outcomes are monitored throughout the implementation and integrated in CVA monitoring tools. All monitoring tools are available here.

3. What are some examples of different Cash for Protection Interventions?

The table below provides an example of different sets of interventions using cash for protection outcomes, falling under the Cash for Protection umbrella.

Category	Description	Examples
Child Protection	The cash component is designed to prevent and address the economic root causes of child protection risks, such as family separation, child labor, caregiver stress or neglect. Targeting is typically made through case management and by training CVA team in the identification and referral of potential CP cases.	CVA is provided to prevent a family from placing their child in an institutional care facility due to lack of financial resources to care for them.
GBV	The cash component is designed to prevent and address the economic root causes of GBV risks. Targeting can be made through case management, or by prioritizing at risk population groups in the selection process and providing them with complementation protection services as needed.	CVA is provided to a GBV survivor to allow them to pay for rent in a safe place far from their perpetrator and care for their basic needs independently.
Mine action	The cash component is designed to meet the needs of individuals who have been injured by Explosive Ordnance (EO) or reducing the exposure of individuals to EO	Remedial support through CVA to enable access of EO survivor to services and their family to cover basic needs
HLP	The cash component is designed to prevent eviction, support rehabilitation of homes, and temporary relocation costs.	CVA is provided to support the rehabilitation of destroyed shelter of a returnee family.
Evacuations	The cash component is design to cover the costs following an evacuation from unsafe location until more longer-term assistance is provided.	CVA is provided to families who have fled NGCA to cover costs of transportation, food, shelter and communication, until they reach a safe location and start receiving financial assistance from social protection schemes.
PLWD	The cash component is design to meet the specific needs of PLWD	CVA is provided to families with a PLWD to cover costs associated to the purchase of special equipment and alleviate the financial burden on the household.