



protectioncluster
AFGHANISTAN



Cash for Protection (C4P)

Guidelines for Protection Partners in Afghanistan

1. Introduction

The Cash for Protection (C4P) Task Force of the Afghanistan Protection Cluster (APC) developed these guidelines to enhance or refine the cash for protection programming of protection cluster members, including new organizations who are planning to set up their cash-based protection interventions. C4P is a form of assistance that aims to prevent, mitigate, or respond to protection risks/threats. Based on international standards and adapted to the context, this document aims to unify the understanding of cash for protection concepts, definitions, eligibility criteria, calculation of amounts and tools to monitor and measure impact of C4P programs. It is also based on good practices adapted by the partners gathered over time in the Afghanistan context. The C4P Task Force will review this document on a minimum annual basis and update it. This document was shared with relevant working groups including the Cash Working Group (CWG) for input and endorsement to ensure collaboration and wider dissemination. Considering the sensitivity of protection activities in the current context by de facto authorities, guidance on how to present the activity to de facto authorities has been added.

These guidelines do not draw an exhaustive list of protection threats; however, it should be noted that Cash for Protection can be used to address protection risks/threats related to a person's life, physical safety, psychological well-being, liberty, dignity, and other fundamental human rights. For further guidance on cash, please also see the detailed [Afghanistan Cash & Voucher Working Group \(CVWG\): Interagency Cash Based Assistance guidance and minimum requirements](#) on practices and operational aspects.

2. Definition and objectives

C4P is an intervention that utilizes cash and voucher assistance (CVA) to address the protection needs of individuals or households (HH) at an individual or HH level. This approach is applicable in various situations, including instances where there is an immediate risk of harm to an individual or HH, as well as cases where individuals or HHs face protection concerns that negatively affect their well-being, regardless of specific time frames. Cash for protection serves as both a responsive¹ and remedial² measure, aiming to prevent, reduce, or alleviate exposure to protection risks, or minimize the impact of risks on survivors. Cash for Protection is designed with the specific and primary aim to address or reduce a person's exposure or susceptibility to an imminent protection threat including a sudden emergency shock. This modality can be used to address the critical protection risk identified. Cash for Protection is an intervention where cash is

¹ Responsive action: to prevent a protection risk from occurring or to stop a protection incident which is unfolding. In such cases, cash for protection should be used to prevent the protection incident to take place or to reduce the level of risk by decreasing the person's level of exposure to a threat.

² Remedial action: to limit or alleviate the effect of a protection incident or rights-violation and to restore the person's capacity to life a safe and dignified life.

used as one of several modalities for a protection response designed to meet basic needs alone and should not be used as a blanket response.

Cash for Protection, implemented within the context of case management, entails the direct provision of cash to individuals such as survivors and at-risk groups. The primary objective is to assist them in meeting crucial needs pertaining to their case action plan, as well as facilitating recovery and accessing services to mitigate risks. Additionally, Cash for Protection can be utilized independently of a case management action plan, serving to prevent or respond to emergency shocks with the aim of minimizing severe and immediate harm.

The purpose of providing cash for protection should never be to address general socio-economic vulnerabilities; these can be tackled through multipurpose cash assistance (MPCA) and sectoral cash responses. Instead, the provision of Cash for Protection is guided by a direct connection between a well-defined protection concern and an analysis of how the cash assistance will yield a protective outcome by preventing, reducing, or mitigating the identified risks. Although Cash for Protection is typically unconditional, it necessitates additional monitoring to assess its impact on the protection concern and to monitor any potential new or emerging risks arising from the cash assistance.

3. Objective

The objective of Cash for Protection is to respond to urgent and immediate consequences of violence, coercion, deprivation, and abuse to address or reduce the impact of serious harm because of a protection risk/threat.

4. Scope of application

Cash for Protection should be provided to address protection needs when the persons we serve are exposed to specific protection risks or subject to rights-violations. While the purpose of these guidelines is not to draw an exhaustive list of protection risks or incidents, it should be noted that Cash for Protection should be used as a modality to address violations of fundamental human rights. Cash for Protection can contribute positively to protection outcomes; however it is not a “panacea” and should be part of a broader protection response and strategy that considers the specific needs and vulnerabilities of affected populations. Whenever possible and appropriate, protection actors should provide Cash for Protection to the concerned individuals according to their needs, based on a protection risk analysis/needs assessment and refer them to other service providers to address medium- and longer-term needs, such as to Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) actors and other national safety nets programmes as part of development nexus.

Cash for Protection and MPCA can be combined and used strategically to address protection outcomes in humanitarian contexts. MPCA is an approach where multiple humanitarian actors coordinate their cash assistance efforts to address socio-economic vulnerabilities, while Cash for Protection focuses specifically on using cash assistance to enhance protection for vulnerable populations. Therefore, the provision of Cash for Protection should never be intended to address socio-economic vulnerabilities, these will be addressed by MPCA. 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 will be used as a modality to address protection risks by preventing, reducing, or mitigating the risks identified. Cash for Protection is generally unconditional and unrestricted to offer full autonomy and flexibility in deciding how to use the funds, on the specifically identified protection risks. However, it does require additional monitoring to measure the impact on the protection concern as well as monitor any new or emerging risks because of the cash assistance.

4.1 Protection and MPCA referrals

While Cash for Protection addresses immediate protection risks/threats, MPCA focuses on addressing socio-economic vulnerabilities. Protection actors should be able to link with MPCA actors for referrals, when necessary. The aim should be to ensure that individuals affected by crises receive the appropriate support, whether it pertains to their safety or broader socio-economic conditions, contributing to a more effective and efficient humanitarian response. Training should be conducted to ensure that MPCA and Protection partners are well-equipped to jointly identify, collect relevant information and implement effective referrals.

5. Guiding Principles in Cash for Protection

These guiding principles aim to uphold the safety, dignity, and well-being of recipients throughout the Cash for Protection program while effectively addressing identified protection concerns.

i. Safety and avoid causing harm

The potential risks and benefits of Cash for Protection should be analysed, to ensure they do not result in safety concerns and must adhere to the do no harm principle. The provision of cash should not undermine individual capacities or exacerbate negative coping mechanisms, create dependency, or expose individuals to further risks/threats. Direct provision of cash to children should never occur. Cash transfers should be provided to the child’s caregiver. Consult recipients on potential risks associated with cash disbursement and involve them in planning preferred currency, delivery method, location, timing, and communication mode. The Cash for Protection (C4P) task force in Afghanistan describes C4P as a form of assistance that aims to prevent, mitigate, or respond to protection risks. A protection incident/situation is defined as an event where an individual has experienced or is at risk of serious harm, violence, abuse, and exploitation.

ii. Complementarity and duplication

Cash for Protection should not replace other protection responses, but rather complement them. The impact of this assistance should be assessed not just at the individual level, but at household and community levels too. Cash for Protection is part of the comprehensive response that is provided in the community centers/households and communities and is guided by the case management principles. The provision of cash should be based on assessment and care plans accompanied by an action plan where households are supported to identify long-term strategies to address their protection concerns beyond cash intervention. Complementarity with in-kind assistance to determine the appropriate transfer amount and increase the likelihood that cash will not be spent on items recipients are receiving in-kind or any other cash from other agencies. Persons with protection needs should not be receiving cash for the same protection concern from more than one agency.

iii. Gender analysis

Gender considerations are crucial in providing Cash for Protection. Analyse the impact of assistance on gender dynamics at household and community levels prior to starting the initiative and throughout the process. Failure to prevent and mitigate threats may result in tensions between spouses, increased burden on women and girls, and gender-based violence. Cash-based interventions may not always meet the specific needs or address protection-related vulnerabilities of individuals, such as those who have experienced sexual and gender-based violence. Targeting strategies should aim for a balance between improving accuracy and minimising inclusion and exclusion errors while considering the time, complexity, and cost involved.

iv. Data protection

Cash for Protection requires collecting personal sensitive data from vulnerable individuals, especially in cases of gender-based violence (GBV) and child protection (CP). Therefore, agencies providing the assistance must make sure to have reliable data protection policies, guidelines, and tools in place to avoid creating any harm to the people that will benefit from the assistance. In the cases of CP and GBV survivors, the personal data must only be handled by the case workers and must be kept locked and in a safe place in the community center. Data sharing agreements with MPCA actors need to be established prior to referrals. If an assessment of the possible risks³ related to data protection has taken place, describe the main findings here. If not, describe any potential risks related to sharing data about beneficiaries with partners (e.g. sharing names and addresses with banks). Describe what steps will be taken to ensure that beneficiary data is appropriately protected. See ‘Protecting beneficiary privacy in e-transfer programmes’ – A code of conduct for the secure management of personal data.

v. Accountability

Implementing agencies must allow people (individually or through community structures) benefiting from Cash for Protection to inform the design and implementation of the activity. Two-way feedback mechanisms that are relevant and safe must be in place, the intervention must be communicated in a transparent way with the community.

The following should be discussed with individual recipients/clients/beneficiaries:

- The amount of money they are eligible to receive, and the fact that it is allocated to address protection risks identified in their action or safety plan.
- Risk mitigation/safety plan for when they receive the cash for protection assistance, including personal or community safety and accessibility concerns that could arise because of receiving cash.

³ The CVWG has developed CVA Risk and Mitigation Strategy with various and comprehensive list of risks which will be adopted.

- Barriers that could arise from accessing cash assistance and jointly identify what could be reasonably accommodated. In some cases, a proxy may be used to collect the cash for the individual if there are significant issues of accessibility that cannot be addressed otherwise. Discuss and confirm if a proxy or a caregiver is required to pick up the cash assistance and what documentation is required. The proxy or caregiver should fully understand that the cash is intended wholly for the client. Consider establishing a ‘memorandum of understanding’ between the beneficiary and proxy to document this and avoid future issues.
- Identify, together with the beneficiary, a safe and accessible location, and time to receive the cash assistance and who will be distributing the cash assistance. Explain also how they can raise concerns about the process.
- Explain any required documentation, such as ID, or a code etc. that will be required to receive cash assistance.
- Inform the beneficiary that there will be additional monitoring processes, conducted by separate teams to ensure they have no challenges with the cash distribution.

vi. Capacity building

Staff involved in Cash for Protection must be trained in protection from sexual exploitation and abuse and child safeguarding, protection mainstreaming, disability inclusion at the minimum. Staff must also be trained on the referral pathway prior to their engagement in this intervention.

vii. Vulnerability:

People in Afghanistan, already face numerous conditions that make them more vulnerable and any added protection risks/threats will exacerbate people’s vulnerability, thus the rationale for providing Cash for Protection to the most vulnerable. This will be a short term measure, while partners continue to address the underlying causes of vulnerability to such protection risks/threats.

6. Process and modalities of implementation.

i. Eligibility criteria

Eligibility for Cash for Protection relies entirely on the identification of a protection risk; vulnerability criteria alone are not sufficient to justify a C4P modality. It is therefore important to identify which protection risks can be addressed by providing C4P. Each context requires a specific protection risk analysis to determine which risks will be prioritized for this modality. C4P should never be a standalone activity; follow-up, referrals, and Psychosocial First Aid (PFA) should be provided as necessary as part of a holistic protection response. Legal assistance, psychosocial support, awareness, and outreach among other protection interventions would accompany cash for protection.

There should be a proper and regular analysis of the protection risks and outcomes⁴, complaints and feedback mechanisms for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries; two-way feedback mechanisms between communities and humanitarian agencies by involving individuals, households and communities in

⁴ Partners will continuously update the list of risks for which cash is provided and will eventually integrate it in the guidelines.

assessment and design. Clear information and two-way feedback mechanisms with beneficiaries, whistleblowing mechanisms and swift agency response to reports of fraud or corruption. Appropriate delivery mechanism, e.g. electronic transfer modalities with offline tracking capability.

When targeting specific groups, the eligibility criteria must be clearly communicated, prior to programme implementation, to recipients and non-recipients to avoid tensions within displaced communities, and between these groups and host communities. Any perception of bias could compromise the programme, undermine community relationships, or provoke conflict.

ii. Differences in cases that qualify and don't qualify.

i. Cases that do qualify for Cash for Protection

- Cases denied access to essential services due to safety risks and discrimination.
- Cases lacking access to civil documentation, leading to further protection risks. E.g. When a person is missing core civil documentation, the person therefore faces recurring rights-violations, such as restriction on freedom of movement and is at a higher risk of arrest and detention. In such a case, Cash for Protection may be used to pay for the various costs associated with the issuing of civil documentation, including lawyers' fees, court fees, cost of civil documents, transportation to civil affairs directorates, court, etc.
- Risk/threat of evictions (linked to protection risks of abuse, verbal threats, etc. more than just lack of ability to pay rent, which in this case should be referred to Shelter colleagues)
- Cases with risks to physical safety due to violence and/or abuse, e.g. people needing to access medical health but who do not have the means to access the service and there is a threat to life.
- Cases exposed to severe negative coping mechanisms, based on assessment, but are unable to access other services. In between referrals, they can receive C4P assistance while processes are finalized.

ii. Types of cases that **do not qualify** for cash for protection.

- Basic needs (due to lack of access to a sufficient source of income) should not be covered by C4P, as these cases should be handled by non-protection actors. However, people may experience protection risks because they are unable to meet basic needs (exploitation, abuse, physical safety risks). Since C4P is a one-off modality, an assessment should be made as to whether the provision of C4P would reduce exposure or impact of the identified protection risk, or whether a referral to other services would be more appropriate and effective.
- Large events of forced displacement with identification of a high prevalence of needs and risks; MPCA is more appropriate for this kind of situation due to the emergency nature and the difficulty to assess every single case for protection risks. However, referral mechanisms from MPCA teams to protection teams should be put in place to ensure that potential protection cases are assessed and supported.
- Cases that should and can be referred to case management should not receive C4P unless it is an emergency, and the case management team is unable to respond immediately to the protection need. In other words, case management should be prioritized over C4P. (For CP, case management services in some cases, includes Cash for Protection depending on needs. Cash is a component of case management).
- Provision of cash to purchase other sectoral items/needs, such as medicines (sectoral health cash), shelter items or cash for rent (sectoral shelter cash), or educational materials (sectoral education

cash) does not qualify as C4P. Protection partners should not be held responsible for other sectoral interventions and/or diverting resources to the other sectors.

- Cases where protection risks can be responded to or mitigated by referral to other services should not receive C4P but should be referred to the respective services. If after follow-up, the referral did not successfully address the protection risk, C4P can be considered as an appropriate response.

iii. Provision of Cash for Protection

i. Transfer/aspects of the transfer.

a. Transfer Modality

The partner should, depending on the location and safety, assess the reliability and capacity analysis to determine how the assistance should be delivered. Depending on the context, the most common delivery mechanism used to distribute cash will vary and can include cash in envelopes (hard cash), as well as others from the Cash and Voucher working group (CVWG) including commodity vouchers, Bank transfer, Paper Voucher, Electronic cards, and Direct Cash token systems.

b. Transfer value

The transfer value should be determined by the protection staff in charge, following an assessment of the protection need and the related cost. Each response will entail a different cost and therefore it is not possible to set one amount as the transfer value. In the context of Afghanistan, most cases can be supported by providing an amount ranging from \$100 to \$300 per person, with \$300 being the maximum amount. In June 2025, the protection cluster partners who will have been implementing C4P, based on their experiences, will review the cash value currently offered and discuss if it is possible to develop a minimum expenditure basket like the Cash and Voucher Working Group (CVWG).⁵

c. Duration

C4P should be a one-off modality to respond to or mitigate a protection risk and should be accompanied by other relevant protection and non-protection interventions to ensure sustainability and mitigate future protection risks. The duration of the C4P modality should therefore be time-bound and should be followed up by individual monitoring of the case to ensure that the protection risk has been addressed.

⁵⁵ [Afghanistan Cash & Voucher Working Group \(CVWG\): Minimum Expenditure Basket \(MEB\) and Setting the Transfer Value \(TV\) - Guidance Document, Updated September 2023, Approved by the CVWG - October 2023 - Afghanistan | ReliefWeb](#)



protectioncluster
AFGHANISTAN



7. Link with other protection activities

Community-based activities: Community-based protection activities can support the implementation of Cash for Protection by sharing information about this type of assistance in affected communities and by facilitating the identification of individuals or households in need of such assistance by community-based protection committees. However, given the sensitivity and complexity of this intervention, the decision on a person's eligibility, the actual provision of cash assistance and the impact evaluation, should solely be done by the protection staff of partner organizations.

Protection monitoring: Protection monitoring informs direct responses to identified protection needs. As protection monitoring leads to the identification of individuals or households who require protection assistance, Cash for Protection can be one of the direct responses to the protection risks and needs identified.

Access to services: Cash for Protection may be a means to ensure meaningful access to protection services when the persons cannot access these services due to barriers related to the cost of services or transportation, including with regards to the issuing of legal documentation. The use of cash for protection enables access to protection services and ensures that the person effectively accesses the different types of services and assistance s/he needs.

Case management: Case management is a complex, holistic, and long-term approach that follows a 6-steps process and requires the repeated provision of multiple protection services over an extended period, following a person-centered approach through case planning. When cash assistance is provided to an individual as one of the types of support under a broader case plan, it is then integrated into the overall case management process and should be considered as such. However, cash assistance for protection can also be provided outside of a case management process, either as one-off intervention to address an immediate protection issue or through multiple distributions to address underlying socio-economic vulnerabilities.

8. Link with other cash modalities and coordination with other clusters/stakeholders

i. Differences

MPCA aims to address generic socio-economic vulnerabilities instead of specific protection risks or incidents. While MPCA may contribute to improving the overall situation, well-being, and resources of the concerned households, addressing protection risks is not the explicit and direct objective of MPCA. The table below summarizes the key differences between cash for protection and MPCA.

	Cash for protection	MPCA
Needs	Urgent protection needs	Socio-economic vulnerabilities on HH level
Objective	Address immediate/urgent protection need	Improve the ability to meet basic needs
Assessment tool/ targeting approach	Protection assessment at the individual or household level (incl. protection monitoring); case management	Household level vulnerability assessment
Eligibility	Vulnerability Guidance & Criteria of the National Protection Cluster ⁶	Standardized scorecard system based on socio-economic vulnerabilities
Number of distributions	One-off or repeated distributions, depending on the case	One-off or multiple installments
Amount	Tailored for each case with a maximum ceiling amount	Standardized transfer value based on the Minimum Expenditure Basket
Purpose	To address urgent protection needs	To support partially or fully HHs's basic and /or recovery needs
Usage of cash	Unrestricted	Unrestricted, used at the HH's Discretion
Delivery mechanism	Cash in hand, or transfer via an FSP	Transfer via an FSP (Over the counter/ hawala/ cash in hand/ mobile transfer/ bank transfer)
Conditionality	Unconditional with close follow-up by protection partners	Unconditional
Evaluation	Case management Protection impact assessments	Process monitoring: Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) Outcome monitoring: Baseline/ Endline survey

ii. Complementarities

While Cash for Protection and MPCA are two distinct types of interventions, they are not mutually exclusive. Both Cash for Protection and MCPA can be provided to the same individual or households, either one after the other or simultaneously, in the cases as follows:

1. When some persons, who are facing protection concerns related to a specific risk or incident, also have several generic socio-economic vulnerabilities which hamper their capacities to meet their basic needs. In this case, the protection actors who first identified the persons could refer them to MPCA actors as the provision of MPCA will likely avoid that the Cash for Protection is used to meet basic needs. The provision

⁶ The CVWG's CBA guide and annex will be used.

of MPCA will also complement the positive impact of Cash for Protection by reducing the likelihood of the persons using negative coping mechanisms to deal with their protection issues.

2. When some persons, who are receiving MPCA, remain unable to overcome their socio-economic vulnerabilities due to underlying protection issues. In such cases, MPCA actors could refer the persons to protection partners, for them to conduct a more in-depth protection assessment and provide a wider range of protection services, as required. While protection actors may or may not provide Cash for Protection depending on the case, a more comprehensive protection response will direct additional resources that may enable addressing underlying protection issues that cannot be effectively addressed by MPCA alone.

iii. Engaging local actors

The De facto Authorities (DfA) have continuously questioned the rationale for providing cash. It is important for partners to include cash in their projects for approval by the line ministry and to provide justification for providing cash to individuals. As justification, partners are encouraged to present cash as *“assistance provide in form of cash or Non-Food Items to vulnerable people including persons with disabilities, women, and other persons with specific needs and vulnerabilities”*.

9. Key challenges and mitigation measures

- The use of external parties such as banks or money transfer agents to facilitate the transfer of resources, as well as the use of biometric data, presents new opportunities and challenges for data protection. Money business services should know who their customers are, what they do, and whether they are likely to be engaged in criminal activity or be conduits for proceeds of crime.
- Interference of the DfA in selection of beneficiaries and their lists. Partners should continuously emphasize the importance of independence and neutrality and confidentiality of personal data.

10. Monitoring and impact evaluation

Monitoring and accountability framework

Designing and implementing MEAL components is crucial for C4P. Constantly monitoring risks, impact, and outcomes is required to make improvements, ensure quality, and do no harm, and assess effectiveness of protection outcomes. The suggestion is to design appropriate Post-distribution Monitoring (PDM) surveys in close collaboration with MEAL colleagues, which need to be implemented and analyzed on a regular basis. Feedback and response mechanisms need to be in place and able to pick up immediate feedback on the C4P support, to ensure timely responses. The monitoring should contribute to documentation of the impact of cash on protection outcomes.

11. Annexes/References: Examples of application of cash for protection

i. Tools

- i. Assessment tool (each agency to utilize their own tool)
- ii. Data sharing protocol (please refer to the *Afghanistan Protection Cluster Addendum to the Afghanistan Information Sharing Protocol – July 2024*)

2) Groups at heightened vulnerability and more exposed to the protection risks.

These include cases of high-risk violence, abuse and/or exploitation, such as examples of situations below:

- Gender-Based Violence issues such as rape, sexual assault, physical abuse, emotional abuse, economic exploitation, or abuse, etc.
 - a. A woman was severely beaten by her husband and sought the help of an NGO for medical assistance and a safe place to stay together with her three children. She fears that her husband will kill her, and he will also harm the children. She cannot go seek help from her relatives as they will surely send her back to her husband.
 - b. A child has been sexually abused by a perpetrator living in the same neighborhood with his family, the child and his family's safety are at danger as the perpetrator's family pressures and threatens the child and his family to drop the legal charges. The child and his family need to leave the neighborhood, but they cannot leave due to financial constraints.
- Child Protection issues such as physical abuse, emotional abuse, hazardous child labour e.g. Children and mothers are being consistently physically abused and exploited by the father. They are unsafe and have no financial or community support or resources other than accepting living with the abusive father. Main protection interventions have taken place under case management, (reporting to FPD, psychosocial support and counseling to the family, etc.) Children and the entire family face emotional abuse by the neighbors based on ethnic or origin backgrounds. Bullying is impacting the family accessing services such as education, health livelihood and psychological well-being and coping skills. Children dropped out of school to not interact with the neighborhood while going from and to school.
- Parents are keeping themselves with the children isolated at home not to face any incident of emotional abuse while the living daily needs are not being met. With a limited cash support, the family will be able to provide immediate needs of the children and complementary services such as livelihood, counseling, awareness campaigns in the neighborhood, and this will pave the way for better community integration and long-term interventions for the entire family.
- Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by humanitarian workers Example: a beneficiary seeking for resettlement reported to the complaints hotline that he was being sexually harassed by one of the NGO staff by sending him lewd photos and indecent messages. When the report reached the investigation stage, the beneficiary received death threats from the perpetrator and some unknown persons. The beneficiary feared for his life and needed to transfer to another house for safety purposes. Protection risks with health consequences (including MHPSS) - Life-saving medical treatment or care not covered by organizations who provide medical assistance e.g. Cases of patients or corpses being withheld in hospital due to unpaid bills Police generalization/warrant due to unsettled medical invoices, inability to cover transportation costs to access treatment.
- Vulnerable and other gender people. People facing protection risks/threats due to their vulnerability and or gender related issues which further exacerbate their vulnerability.
- Protection risks with a consequence of a sudden change in economic or living circumstances such as: sudden loss of primary source of income, e.g., due to short term health emergency of primary income earner/caregiver, detention or death of primary income earner/caregiver sudden loss of essential household items, e.g., due to fire or flooding harsh weather conditions in the houses



inability to cover burial costs of a family member; legal protection risks such as unregistered status / waiting for registration; lack of needed documentation, e.g., birth notification/birth certificate/marriage certificate eviction or risk of eviction; detention or risk of detention/police warrant/generalization as part of violation of refugee or migrant rights issues related to family separation/separation from caregiver (e.g., divorce, custody, alimony); protection risks with a consequence of lack of adequate shelter severely damaged or unsafe shelters, lack of safe shelter for SGBV and LGBTI-cases, limited mobility and accessibility of shelter.