



CERF FUNDING SPECIFIC SECTOR PROTECTION

CERF Secretariat

27 September 2013

In September 2011, the CERF secretariat provided a short paper to the Advisory Group that outlined the Fund's support for protection activities. This paper serves as an update to the 2011 paper and the background is provided in Annex I.

A. Funding Trend Analysis

Since the inception of CERF, some US\$118 million have been allocated by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) to **stand-alone protection projects**, which correspond to 3.8 per cent of the total funds allocated by the CERF.¹

The funding analysis below does not comprehensively reflect protection by presence on the whole as agencies have their own protection presence on the ground that are not part of the CERF allocation and/or portion of such presence may be included in other sectors. It should also be noted that the below table does not take into account the funds allocated to protection activities in multi-sector projects.

Table 1: Evolution of CERF Funding for Protection per Year and Window

Year	Rapid Response US\$	Percentage of total Rapid Response	Underfunded Emergencies US\$	Percentage of total Underfunded Emergencies	TOTAL US\$	Percentage of total
2006	1,953,382	1.08	2,365,100	3.08	4,318,482	1.68
2007	9,739,828	4.24	11,213,657	9.11	20,953,485	5.94
2008	6,300,243	2.10	4,647,449	3.62	10,947,692	2.55
2009	7,678,671	2.86	8,964,335	6.94	16,643,006	4.19
2010	4,534,415	1.64	6,030,565	4.33	10,564,980	2.54
2011	11,709,415	4.13	7,893,191	5.50	19,602,606	4.59
2012	14,222,079	4.29	7,135,188	4.51	21,357,267	4.36
2013	6,964,777	3.45	6,423,807	5.19	13,388,584	4.11
TOTAL	63,102,810	3.05	54,673,292	5.35	117,776,102	3.81

¹ Figure as of 23 September 2013 taking into account Protection, Human Rights, GBV and Child Protection. It should be noted however that this figure does not take into account the protection activities which are included in the multi-sector group.

During the last three years, more than four per cent of the total CERF funding has been allocated consistently to protection activities. In general, more funds are provided for protection activities through the Underfunded Emergency window than the Rapid Response one.

Table 2: CERF Funding for Protection Activities per Agencies and Windows

Agencies	Rapid Response US\$	Underfunded Emergencies US\$	TOTAL US\$
UNHCR	28,448,316	26,399,299	54,847,615
UNICEF	19,236,121	14,175,503	33,411,624
UNFPA	5,385,702	9,113,664	14,499,366
IOM	6,847,121	3,064,692	9,911,813
UNDP	907,326	742,574	1,649,900
OHCHR	714,144	246,220	960,364
WHO		865,000	865,000
UNOPS	630,796		630,796
UNIFEM	299,172	66,340	365,512
UN Women	282,603		282,603
UNESCO	180,310	0	180,310
UNRWA	171,200		171,200
TOTAL	63,102,810	54,673,292	117,776,102

Cumulatively since 2006, UNHCR has received the highest amount of the CERF funding for protection activities, followed by UNICEF, mainly for child protection and UNFPA for response to gender-based violence.

B. Current situation

Of the total protection activities supported by CERF, 78 per cent in 2012 and 99 per cent in 2013 were implemented in conflict situations as opposed to natural disasters. The recent allocation of \$40 million for Syria, Jordan and Lebanon focused on prepositioning of stocks and did not include any protection activities.

C. Way-Forward

The CERF secretariat continues to communicate that protection can benefit from CERF funding, as do other sectors that satisfy the life-saving criteria. This point is highlighted in the six regional CERF trainings every year.

ANNEX I:

A. Background

Following extensive consultations with the UN Agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Global Cluster Leads, the CERF Advisory Group and CERF, revised *the Life-Saving Criteria* (LSC) in an effort to clarify definitions and guidance. The revised criteria were approved by the ERC in January 2010.

The primary objective of revising the criteria was to ensure that CERF funds only activities arising out of humanitarian emergencies (both rapid and chronic), in the context of core emergency needs in order to emphasize the principles articulated in the Secretary-General's bulletin. It was also anticipated that the provision of clearer criteria and guidelines would make the application process at the field level much easier for agency and OCHA colleagues.

The *Life-Saving Criteria* cover general as well as cluster and/or sectoral criteria for both the rapid response and underfunded emergency windows of CERF. One of the sectoral areas of focus within the LSC is the protection sector. Among others, the guidance is also helpful in defining what activities within the Protection Sector can be considered positively for CERF funding.

The objective of this paper is to provide Advisory Group members with information related to the definition, trends, challenges and perception of the CERF funded protection activities.

B. Definition

Agencies responsible for delivering protection services were extensively involved in discussion on life-saving criteria, in which protection is grouped with human rights. Two separate sections exist for child protection and gender-based violence (GBV). The *Life-Saving Criteria* includes the following protection activities as eligible for CERF support.

- Deployment of Emergency Protection teams – protection by presence
- Profiling, registration and documentation of affected populations
- Identification and strengthening/set-up of community-based protection mechanism
- Provision of life-saving psychological support to person with special needs
- Provision of life saving information
- Support measure to ensure access to justice

While protection activities had never been excluded from the *CERF Life-Saving Criteria*, the listing of precise activities improved the discussion at the field level, where, in some instances, protection was not always considered a priority by the field during the process of a CERF submission. It should be noted that, as for the other sectors, the list of activities is not exhaustive and should be considered as a guideline. As for all other sectors, flexibility and context specific interpretation are key factors to determine whether CERF funding is appropriate.