Practice Note: Continuity of Protection in Humanitarian Coordination Transitions

Global Protection Cluster

NRC NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL

April 2025

Background

In 2024, at least eight Protection Clusters were in discussions around potential deactivation or transition. Recognizing the need to support these Clusters and others that may encounter transitions in the future, the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) convened a session during its Annual Protection Conference with Cluster and AoR Coordinators on how to promote the continuity of protection in humanitarian coordination transitions. A webinar was later held during the 2024 Global Protection Forum, after several partners also raised interest in this issue.
This note summarizes the learnings from those discussions and aims to offer considerations for Protection Clusters and protection partners in preparing for transitions of the humanitarian coordination architecture. It was prepared by the Norwegian Refugee Council, who co-convened the two transitions discussions in 2024.

The note can be seen as a complement to the IASC's broader Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation, which was published in January 2025. The IASC Guidance is the principal guiding document on transition and deactivation processes. An annex focused on considerations for unforeseen or accelerated transitions has been added, considering the humanitarian reset process started in early 2025.

Note on terminology[1]:

Cluster deactivation is the closure of a formally activated cluster. Deactivation includes the transfer of core functions from clusters that have international leadership and accountability to other structures, including those that are led nationally or development focused. Functions may be transferred to existing or pre-crisis coordination and response structures, or new ones.

Cluster transition refers to the process (and potentially the activities) by which transfer of leadership and accountabilities is planned and implemented, leading to deactivation. A plan is required to map phases of the transition, set transition or deactivation benchmarks for each phase, and schedule activities to meet

Content Outline

This practice note discusses:

1. Deactivation contexts and decision-making
2. Understanding remaining protection needs, risks, and capacities
3. Planning for transition
4. Steps in Cluster transition
5. Transitions and local actors
6. Roles and responsibilities in transition and deactivation processes
7. Post-transition humanitarian coordination mechanism
8. Annex 1: Considerations for unforeseen or accelerated humanitarian coordination transition
9. Annex 2: Template for Protection Clusters deactivating/transitioning

[1] IASC Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation (2025), p. 10

1. Deactivation Contexts and Decision-Making

All Clusters, including the Protection Cluster, are inherently time-bound.[2] As such, Protection Clusters and Areas of Responsibility (AoRs) should prepare for an eventual transition and deactivation from the outset of a response.

In practice, Protection Cluster transitions can take different forms and occur under a variety of conditions. A Protection Cluster and AoRs may transition and deactivate even while other Clusters remain active, or there may be a wholescale transition of the humanitarian coordination architecture. Transitions and deactivations may be initiated on short notice due to external factors or may be planned far in advance and occur gradually.

The protection footprint following a transition will also vary greatly across contexts depending, for example, on the willingness and capacities of national and local authorities to coordinate or deliver protection services, the space afforded to local civil society organizations and national protection actors, and whether there is a continued presence of international humanitarian, development or peace actors. The overall security and risk environment will likewise shape the post-transition protection landscape.

Applying the IASC Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation (2025)

Understanding where and when transitions might occur is key to ensuring Protection Clusters are prepared for them. According to IASC Protocols, Cluster deactivation may be considered when at least one of the conditions for its activation is no longer met, i.e.: when the humanitarian situation improves, significantly reducing humanitarian needs and consequently reducing the associated response and coordination gaps; and/or when national structures acquire sufficient capacity to coordinate and meet residual humanitarian needs in line with humanitarian principles.[3]

In reality, broader contextual factors have been seen to drive country-level discussions on transitions, even when the IASC criteria have not been reached. These have included, or could include:

- Financing considerations, e.g. if the country's operation is facing resource constraints, or if there is pressure and/or need from global level to prioritize responses.
- Political drivers and dynamics, e.g. if authorities do not want to be seen as a context of humanitarian crisis, if they want to centralize the humanitarian system under government control, or if they to push for relocations for political reasons.
- UN/systemic reasons, e.g. if there are renewed efforts to accelerate transition from humanitarian to development approaches.
- Moves to other forms of humanitarian coordination, such as area-based coordination or localized efforts (e.g. flagship initiatives).

Other conditions may point towards external pressure for protection-specific deactivation, possibly even in the absence of a wider humanitarian coordination transition. This can be the case if, for example, authorities show aversion to protection efforts or protection is being mainstreamed.

While these factors are de-facto drivers of transition processes, the two IASC criteria for deactivation continue to apply and should be met. In all the above cases, a Protection Cluster can push back on transition plans if they feel the environment is not yet permissive for deactivation. This can be escalated through the lead agencies at country level, through the Global Protection Cluster and AORs, or through lead agencies at global level. Recognizing that it will not always be possible to avoid the deactivation of a Cluster, however, Coordinators and partners should be attentive to the above dynamics as they may signal the need to scale up preparations for a transition.

---

[2] The general protocols for transition and/or deactivation of a cluster previously and formally activated by the IASC are established by the IASC's Cluster Coordination Reference Module.

[3] IASC Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation (2025), p. 10

Country-level determination of whether the IASC criteria have been met

The IASC Guidance advises that decisions about cluster deactivation should follow an in-country review of the cluster coordination architecture. Cluster Coordination Architecture Reviews should be conducted at least annually. The IASC guidance provides resources for Humanitarian Coordinators and Humanitarian Country teams for HCTs to review the coordination architecture vis-à-vis the two IASC criteria.

IASC Guidance Cluster Transition and Deactivation – Resources and templates

1. Example Transition Strategy Template
2. Example Risk Analysis Template
3. Example template for communication planning
4. Examples of cluster transition and coordination structures after cluster deactivation
5. Summary Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation
6. IASC Key Considerations for HCs and HCTs on Cluster Transition and Deactivation

2. Understanding Remaining Protection Needs, Risks, and Capacities

In many cases, Protection Clusters can anticipate significant protection issues even after the Protection Clusters deactivate, such as population groups that continue to face persecution or exclusion, areas that remain inaccessible, or specific rights that are denied. As such, the Protection Cluster, AoRs, and partners in affected contexts need to have a plan for if and how remaining protection needs and risks will be addressed and how protection activities and services will be coordinated. To that end, it may be helpful to think through the following questions:

- Are there any **population groups that may face persecution or exclusion** from access to services following the deactivation of the cluster? What safeguards are in place for these individuals or groups?
    - *Example: are there communities with perceived ethnic or political links that could expose them to harm or exclusion?*
- Do the authorities/remaining actors have the capacity to **identify**, **prevent and respond** to ongoing or new protection risks and needs? Can they do so on the required scale?
    - *Example: are enough social workers and/or case management systems in place for gender-based violence (GBV) survivors or unaccompanied and separated children (UASCs)?*
- Are the remaining services adapted to the **new types of risks and needs** that emerged during the crisis?
    - *Example: are mental health professionals trained to deal with trauma? Are medical facilities trained in clinical management of rape?*
- Are the authorities able and willing to take on a **coordination role** for the remaining protection services and actors?
    - *Example: is there a clear focal point who is able and willing to help coordinate the interventions of different line ministries/departments, with civil society, and with international actors?*
- Do authorities have **guidance and common standards** for key protection modalities? Are they able to promote these and monitor their implementation?
    - *Example: are there protocols for family tracing and reunification? For identification, clearance, and disposal of explosive ordinance?*
- Are there contexts in which authorities **should *not* take the lead** for protection coordination?
- **Are there any options to link to development sectoral coordination,** if more appropriate?
- Where conflicts persist or areas remain under the control of different authorities, are residual systems and/or actors **able to work cross-border or crossline** where necessary?

- *Examples: are protection actors able to carry out family tracing and reunification cross-border or crossline? Can the Mine Action actors work or coordinate across borders/frontlines on identification and clearance of unexploded ordinance?*

The answers to these questions should help inform the steps that Protection Clusters and AoRs should take, and how to prioritize in preparation for the transition. Moreover, the IDP Protection Risk Assessment Tool in Government-led Solutions Processes (piloted in a few countries in 2024; forthcoming in 2025) can provide additional insights and support to Protection Clusters in this regard.

See Chapter 5.2 of the IASC Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation (2025) for options on coordination handover and leadership.

3. Planning for Transition

It is important to start preparing for transition or deactivation from the moment of Cluster activation. Actions can be taken from the beginning to enable later transition and deactivation, including strengthening of existing national protection systems; promoting participation and leadership of local and national actors; and creating linkages with government and development actors, including through the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus collaboration and IDP Durable Solutions frameworks (hence contributing to the "circuit-breaker" approach in IDP response systems)[4].

Considerations around transition and deactivation should be included in initial Protection Cluster/AoR strategies and planning processes. This would ideally allow for a transition strategy with a set of defined, measurable benchmarks to be developed as soon as it is contextually appropriate to do so. Transition plans should be reviewed periodically, and their requirements monitored through existing mechanisms such as Cluster's annual strategic planning process and the Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring, allowing for the plan to be flexible enough to reflect how the above considerations, and any changes in them, will affect the transition.

Cluster Lead Agencies have a key role in supporting Protection Clusters and AoRs to create conditions for a successful transition by:

- **Establishing links with appropriate governmental protection actors at the national and sub-national level** where there is coherence in cluster activities and ministry functions (e.g. Ministries of Social Affairs or Justice). *This practice note acknowledges that while government engagement may be limited by protection concerns or sensitivities, and that it may not be appropriate for authorities to co-lead Protection Clusters, clusters can liaise on specific modalities or caseloads that are aligned with government services (e.g. case management).*
- **Establishing links with relevant non-governmental bodies and agencies** such as Human Rights Commissions or Bar Associations.
- **Establishing connections between national government systems and non-governmental organizations** where needed and possible. It can be meaningful to help establish bridges between national government systems and non-governmental operational partners, to encourage more inclusive national coordination mechanisms.
- **Promoting localization by empowering and engaging with local and national protection actors**, be it state institutions or civil society, and going beyond participation in cluster meetings and processes.
- **Establishing links with development and durable solutions coordination bodies** that might take over coordination roles after deactivation, ensuring knowledge of where protection risks and concerns intersect with their work.

[4] See particularly the GPC Guidance Note on the Role of Protection Clusters in Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons.

- **Encouraging mutual understanding within the Cluster Lead Agency (CLA),** including ensuring programmatic staff understanding of the Cluster's functions and the benefits of coordination participation for Cluster members.
- **Encouraging mutual understanding between CLAs**. For instance, agreements on transition and any complementary roles and responsibilities can be included in the CLA Memorandum of Understanding.

These measures towards a successful transition process should begin as early as the cluster activation stage. An analysis of national emergency and protection systems and structures should inform the way the cluster and AoRs are set-up and led. Where possible, these should build on existing structures and avoid creating parallel ones. If this step was not carried out at activation stage, it is never too late for existing cluster operations to set these planning recommendations in motion.

Protection and development cooperation in Libya

The Protection Cluster in Libya was deactivated in late 2022. The UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) agreement between the UN and Libyan authorities established transition plans for the Protection Cluster. Regardless of the new structure, in-country INGOs and UN agencies agreed on the need for continued coordination, creating different protection-specific coordination mechanisms. These mechanisms were tasked with reporting on protection needs in Libya, which concerned vulnerable groups such as non-Libyan migrants and asylum-seekers and made recommendations on how to address them.

Localization of protection coordination in Ukraine

The Protection Cluster in Ukraine is still active in 2025. The Ukrainian context is complex, with still an important presence of humanitarian actors and needs, but a strong government and a developed civil society. The traditional Cluster structure is led by the Ukrainian government and still needs further coordination with other protection actors, making planning for transition difficult. NNGOs working with IDPs, like Right to Protection Ukraine, have been active in the country since the Protection Cluster was activated in 2014. They were invited to co-coordinate the Cluster in 2022. Localization of Cluster activities can help provide actors that will be responsible of providing protection services after deactivation with the coordination experience necessary to continue the humanitarian response in the country.

4. Steps in Cluster Transition

Although each transition and deactivation will remain context-specific, certain steps should always be taken in planning for it[5]t. The following should be read alongside the IASC Guidance on Transition and Deactivation (2025) – section 4.2 'Actions'.

1. **Contextual risk analysis and protection needs mapping:** first, conduct a contextual analysis and mapping of remaining protection risks and needs. This should include groups that may be at risk of exclusion or persecution, as well as possible sources of future tensions. It should also consider the steps needed to address persistent risks, including preventing new cycles of violence, and an analysis of emergency preparedness arrangements.
2. **Identification of future coordination needs and functions that need to be transitioned:** after an initial mapping of current Protection Cluster activities and functions, identify what coordination functions are needed after Cluster deactivation. To achieve accurate conclusions, consult relevant Cluster members whose operations are likely to continue beyond the lifespan of the Cluster.
3. **Planning for future emergencies:** Cluster coordinators and partners should think about potential future emergencies and how they would be coordinated - and setting up mechanisms that could take on this coordination.

[5] A detailed guide on how to develop a Cluster transition plan is available on Chapter 4 of the IASC Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation.

4. **Mapping services/activities and caseloads that can be transitioned:** Cluster transition is not a wholesale transition of the cluster architecture to another actor. Different solutions can be found for different cluster activities and populations of concern. For example, a cluster may work more closely with the government to align case management support and integrate people into state services but work with UN political missions to follow up on specific populations of concern.
5. **Stakeholder identification and analysis of existing coordination structures**: Outline a plan of which protection stakeholders will be engaged in the transition or deactivation, and what phase they will be engaged in. This is key to ensure that transition mechanisms are designed according to the coordination needs of those involved (including affected communities. The analysis should also include any other existing coordination structures that are related to the protection sector.
6. **Identification of actors who can take over protection coordination functions:** identify any entities that are competent and willing to assume leadership for protection coordination functions. The analysis should address whether said entities have the necessary structure (including budget, resources, and staffing), technical and coordination capabilities. This can range from formal leadership e.g. Government line ministry or another UN coordination body, or informal coordination between NGOs
7. **Identity the role of the Cluster Lead Agency after any transition/deactivation.** The leadership of any new coordination structure should be clear, as well as the role that other actors (e.g. former CLA and/or co-lead) will play in supporting the new coordination setup. See the IASC Guidance on Transition and Deactivation (2025) – section 5.5 'Continuing coordination support after deactivation.'
8. **Engagement with relevant actors:** planning should include engagement strategies with different actors who will take over protection elements of the coordination response. This might include government actors at different levels (central, sub-national, and municipal); local civil society, and/or peacebuilding, and human rights actors. The Protection Cluster should flag issues that may continue to require their attention and/or engagement after cluster transition. They should also flag this to the diplomatic and donor community.
9. **Capacity building:** local protection actors' capacities to coordinate the post-transition response should be supported and/or strengthened. Similarly, communities and partners should be prepared for the transition, including for the likely disruption, suspension, or changes in the services provided, and protection clusters should aim to work with partners to encourage considering programmatic shifts that may be needed if humanitarian funding phases out. For instance, remaining partners should be encouraged to move programming from an individual to a community approach as far as possible, if the type of service allows for it.
10. **Development of localized transition plans:** for a variety of reasons, different drivers of transitions and/or protection needs and risks may be present at different levels. Therefore, if contextually necessary, specific transition plans should be put in place at smaller scales (for example, at area or camp level). Localized transition plans should include considerations on how, if necessary and appropriate, local actors can be supported to engage with the national structure.
11. **Establishment of residual monitoring and alert systems:** a monitoring plan that includes transition benchmarks should be put in place as part of the Cluster transition plan. It should outline how specific protection risks will be monitored and how determinations will be made on whether risk levels are deemed acceptable or not. It should also determine who is responsible for monitoring and how risk analysis and alert systems will be updated as needed.

Protection coordination in Iraq after deactivation

In 2022, Cluster deactivation in Iraq was a political decision, informed by the Government of Iraq and developments in durable solutions coordination. While there were remaining humanitarian needs and humanitarian response capacity, actors found it difficult to rationalize humanitarian response planning. The Protection Cluster raised concerns about population groups that faced specific risks and exclusion (e.g. persons with perceived affiliation to the Islamic State, persons from "areas of no return") and the significant gap in civil documentation, particularly for IDPs. After deactivation, a Protection Platform was created to

support continuity of the response, led by UNHCR and OHCHR with international and local partners participation. Engaging with a wide range of actors proved to be important for the continuation of protection services. For instance, donors like DG ECHO were able to act as intermediaries between the Iraqi government, UN agencies, and INGO. DG ECHO supported a protection consortium that continued the operational priorities of the Protection Cluster after cluster deactivation.

Engaging with the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines

The response to humanitarian emergencies in the Philippines has been mostly led by government agencies, with UNHCR leading the Protection Cluster within the HCT. Presence of other international protection actors has been limited due to government policy. In a context of transition shifting towards a more nationally led response, national actors like the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines monitor the provision of protection services to communities and ensure their inclusion in humanitarian response programming, especially those who may be excluded from government policy. They also provide information and referral to Cluster services on specific issues like gender-based violence. In this case, the localization of protection monitoring, and alert systems is beneficial to ensure the needs of vulnerable communities are met beyond the lifespan of the Protection Cluster.

5. Transition and Local Actors

A challenging component of any situation of decreased humanitarian funding is the impact that it has on local and national organizations and actors. These actors are critical to the success of any effective and accountable response. As with international organizations and agencies, many local organizations will no longer program when either the needs decrease or government capacity increases. Planning for transition requires transparent engagement with local and national actors.

The cluster should recognize the need to invest in partnerships with organizations that have a formal role in governance such as Human Rights Commissions or Bar Associations, or organizations that operate at a scale that they have independent operational capacity.

Different local partners will have different coordination needs post transition/deactivation – for example, while some partners may engage with local level coordination, other partners can be supported to engage in human rights mechanisms or other civil society platforms.

6. Roles and Responsibilities in Deactivation and Transition Processes

To assess who holds what roles and responsibilities during deactivation and transition processes, the following questions can be asked:

- What should we, collectively, be doing to prepare for a transition?
- What should Cluster/AoR coordinators be doing?
- What should we encourage our partners to be doing?
- Who do we and our partners engage with and on what issues?

Certain actors and responsibilities can be identified and, in general, will remain across contexts, as is detailed in the IASC's Guidance on Cluster Transition and Deactivation (2025)

7. Post-Transition Humanitarian Coordination Mechanisms

Coordination mechanisms may remain in place after humanitarian coordination transitions. However, the continuation of formal coordination mechanisms only for the sake of coordination should be avoided, rather focusing on ensuring the coordination of the remaining humanitarian response and preparedness for future emergency response.

There are roughly three options for the handover of coordination functions. See the IASC Guidance on Transition and Deactivation (2025) – section 5.2 Options for Coordination Handover and Leadership.

- Cluster functions are merged into existing coordination mechanisms and responsibilities of the existing group expand (e.g., area-based coordination groups, government-led development sectoral group expands to include emergency preparedness).
- Clusters are modified into new structures or new structures are established (e.g. sector working group).
- Formal coordination functions fully cease.

Likewise, there are a few options for leadership and responsibility for continuing coordination. These include handover to government leadership, remaining with the CLA or identified NGO partners, integrating into UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) or other UN-led coordination (e.g., a durable solutions coordination architecture), or there is no handover, and all formal coordination functions cease.

No structure will fully absorb all the roles and responsibilities of a cluster. Alternative structures will have different views on strategic partnerships, policy goals and localization. As with funding, there is no such thing as a full transition of cluster functions and priorities. Clusters will have to assess which body will be able to take forward what issue most effectively and balance the strategic advantage of each alternative forum.

Coordination structures do not remain for the sake of it. Any post transition coordination reflections should be governed by:

- Are there operational partners working on similar work streams that wish to collaborate with each other?
- Are there any specific issues or caseloads where governments are unable or unwilling to take on coordination roles, for instance, because the authorities are an active party to the conflict?
- What is required to ensure preparedness and efficiency in future crisis cycles?

There may be different answers and solutions to each of these questions. Cluster coordination teams should work with their partners and other key stakeholders to identify simplified actions that can be taken to allow organizations who wish to work together to continue to do so, that support populations at high risk, and enable a foundation of preparedness.

Annex 1: Considerations for Unforeseen or Accelerated Humanitarian Coordination Transitions

External unforeseen changes, such as the 2025 global humanitarian aid funding crisis, can trigger cluster deactivation in contexts where it was not planned nor expected to happen. As such, coordination mechanisms may be unprepared. In such cases, priority must be given to mitigating the impact of deactivation on the most vulnerable communities.

To mitigate the impact the steps outlined above should be followed to the extent possible in a short timeline, prioritizing:

1. The identification of critical protection risks and coordination risks
2. The mapping of relevant actors who can take over protection coordination functions
3. Identification of protection services that should be prioritized for continuity
4. Implementing or identifying residual monitoring and alert systems.

The deactivation of a cluster in unforeseen or accelerated circumstances does not mean that protection programming will stop. On the contrary, there are likely to be partners who have response capacity and will want to continue to coordinate with each other and want to continue to coordinate and engage with any remaining interagency mechanisms (e.g. if there are remaining clusters and working groups).

To the extent possible, remaining time should be used to:

- Engage with partners and organizations that have remaining protection capacity on how they wish to continue coordination beyond the lifespan of the cluster (e.g. alternative working groups, engaging with specific development actors and donors, participation in UN led mechanism, NGO protection consortia). Cluster coordinators should work with these partners to map coordination needs and develop a coordination plan.
- Engage with any remaining humanitarian coordination mechanisms, e.g. area-based coordination and/or remaining active clusters to ensure they are active and engaged on relevant protection risks, community/populations of concern, and mainstreaming and safeguarding strategies.
- Map pathways for the transition of specific services and response modalities that can be supported by alternative actors such as the government or development actors e.g. case management, legal aid and assistance, community centers.
- Update protection information products, such as a protection risk analysis, and final mapping of partner presence, services and referral pathways.
- Agree and communicate a plan for inter-agency referrals, including who humanitarian agencies can refer high risk protection cases to (e.g. UNHCR, UNICEF, UNFPA, a protection consortium, etc.).

Annex 2: Template for Protection Clusters deactivating/transitioning

CLUSTER DEACTIVATION/TRANSITION: NOTE TO FILE

This deactivation plan is in place once clusters have considered all the relevant criteria for cluster transition and deactivation, outlined in the IASC guidance (2025). This template is for clusters that have opted to deactivate, after reaching the benchmarks for deactivation established by the Humanitarian Country Team or other appropriate body.

This document is a common note to file between the deactivated/transitioned cluster and the Global Protection Cluster on the final status of the protection cluster, any issues of concern and follow up, and confirming contact between the GPC and the country office in case of any future cluster activation requirements.

DEACTIVATION/TRANSITION PLAN CHECKLIST

1.1 The RC/HC and Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs), supported by UN OCHA, agree to deactivate/transition the Protection Cluster
1.2 Global CLAs and Global Protection Cluster are alerted and involved in dialogue on deactivation/transition process.
1.3 Protection Cluster has facilitated a workshop with protection partners, and other relevant stakeholders, to identify any population groups and/or protection risks that remain a concern after cluster activation/deactivation.
1.4 Protection cluster has shared analysis with senior coordination bodies (UN HCT/UN CT) on residual protection issues/population groups at high risk
1.5 Protection cluster has established a clear communication strategy with partners and authorities to inform them of transition/deactivation
1.6 The Protection Cluster has been deactivated and/or transitioned into an alternative body
1.7 Debrief with Global Protection Cluster

A. INTRODUCTION

A.1. Deactivation/Transition Structure

Outline the final structure and status of the cluster post deactivation/transition e.g. protection working group, protection platform, government co-leadership.

A.2. Status of AoRs

Outline the status of the AoR deactivation/transition and any working relationship between the structures post transition (CP, GBV, HLP, Mine Action)

A.3 Country level coordination structures

Describe any other inter-agency level coordination structures where protection related issues can be coordinated and discussed post cluster transition, e.g. Durable Solutions bodies, UN Country Team

A.4. Government Leadership

Outline the government leadership – if any – on protection coordination after cluster deactivation/transition.

B. PROTECTION CONTEXT AND ENVIRONMENT

B.1. Relevant legislation

Identify relevant legal provisions in domestic and international law that are relevant to IDPs post transition/deactivation. Note any areas where an appropriate legal framework is absent

B.2. Policies

Identify all relevant national and local policies that are relevant to IDPs post transition/deactivation. Note any areas where an appropriate legal framework is absent

B.4 Protection Risks

Outline the main protection risks or population of concern identified during the protection cluster workshop (1.4)

B.5. Leadership assumptions

Identify and outline assumptions on which actors/coordination bodies can continue to respond to the specific populations/risks identified by protection partners e.g. HR commission, UNHCR, OHCHR etc.

C. CONTINGENCY AND PREPAREDNESS

C.1. Does your country operation have a contingency/preparedness plan in place?

Include any information on which shocks/triggers and scenarios the contingency planning is based on e.g. flood risk, electoral violence etc.

C.2. Scenarios for reactivation/humanitarian scale up

Do you foresee any scenario that would require the reactivation of the cluster and/or the scale up of humanitarian assistance including protection action.

C.3 Reference Documents

Provide information on any existing documents or tools that would be useful to actors in the case of a future scale up or reactivation e.g. strategies, training materials, advocacy action plan, centrality of protection information.

D. RESPONSIBILITIES

The Cluster Lead Agency and the Global Protection Cluster will maintain contact after cluster deactivation/transition to ensure that the GPC can continue to provide appropriate support in the case of any humanitarian scale up, and share any updated guidance, best practice and tools.

D.1 Contacts and Functions

Coordinating Agency	Protection Focal Point	Key functions

Cooperating (supporting) Agency	Key functions