



# **CERF FUNDING SPECIFIC SECTOR PROTECTION**

CERF Secretariat  
*22 September 2011*

## **A. Introduction**

The CERF, following extensive consultations with the UN Agencies and IOM, the Global Cluster Leads, and the CERF Advisory Group, 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 emergencies windows of the CERF. One of the sectoral focuses 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 the members of the Advisory Group with information related to the definition, trends, challenges and perception of the CERF funding of protection sector.

## **B. Definition**

The agencies involved in delivering protection were extensively involved in the dialogue leading to a better understanding of protection activities as life-saving. Within the CERF Life-Saving criteria, protection is grouped with human rights while there are separate sections 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 as a priority 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 more as a guideline. As for all other sectors, flexibility and context specific interpretation are key factors to determine whether CERF funding is appropriate.

## C. Trends

Since the inception of the CERF, some US\$78 million have been allocated by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) to stand-alone protection projects, which correspond to 3.5 % of the total funds allocated by the CERF.<sup>1</sup>

*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	1.1%	2,365,100	3.1%	4,318,482	1.7%
2007	9,739,828	4.3%	11,213,657	9.1%	20,953,485	6.0%
2008	6,150,243	2.0%	4,647,449	3.6%	10,797,692	2.5%
2009	7,678,671	2.9%	8,964,335	6.9%	16,643,006	4.2%
2010	4,534,415	1.6%	6,030,565	4.3%	10,564,980	2.5%
2011	9,273,414	4.1%	5,443,145	4.5%	14,716,559	4.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39,329,953</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>38,664,251</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>77,994,204</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

The table above is showing that more funds are provided through the Underfunded emergency window than through the rapid response one window (as a percentage of overall allocations by window). This might indicate that, in chronic emergencies, there is no question about including protection but in rapid onset emergencies, Humanitarian Country Teams do not always see it as the first priority. In cases when the CERF funding was provided in tranches (Haiti, Pakistan 2010) some agencies noted that sectors like protection and education were included in the second and/or third tranches but not the first.

*CERF Funding for Protection Activities per Agencies and Windows*

Agencies	Rapid Response	Underfunded Emergencies	TOTAL
UNHCR	21,483,941	19,895,198	41,379,139
UNICEF	10,314,897	9,355,602	19,670,499
UNFPA	2,553,057	5,808,342	8,361,399
IOM	3,827,121	2,649,701	6,476,822
UNDP	137,129	742,574	879,703
OHCHR	543,437	146,494	689,931
UNIFEM	299,172	66,340	365,512
UNRWA	171,200	0	171,200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39,329,953</b>	<b>38,664,251</b>	<b>77,994,204</b>

UNHCR remains the agency which is receiving the most CERF funding for protection activities, followed by UNICEF, mainly for child protection and UNFPA for response to GBV. Again, it

<sup>1</sup> Figure as of 20 September 2011 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. This has a particular influence as the multi-sector applies mainly to refugees situation and is submitted by UNHCR, an agency which is implementing a significant amount of protection activities. IOM often carries out multi-sector projects for IDPs that include protection-related activities but to a lesser extent.

should be noted that the above table does not take into account the funds allocated to protection activities in multi-sector projects.

#### **D. Current situation**

While the above tables clearly indicate that CERF is providing funds to protection activities, it should be noted that the percentage of CERF funding is relatively low. However, it should be noted that the approval rate for protection projects is not significantly different than for other sectors/clusters and could not be identified as a cause for the low percentage.

Despite the clarification provided by the update of the CERF Life-Saving Criteria in January 2010, the perception remains, in particular, at the field level, that it is more difficult to secure CERF funding for protection activities. This inaccurate perception has been raised in several occasions, and, in particular, during the last meeting of the Advisory Group in Nairobi in April 2011. It is presumed that this is partially responsible for the relatively limited requests received to support protection activities.

#### **E. Way-Forward**

The CERF Secretariat is endeavouring to use every opportunity to clearly communicate that the protection can benefit from the CERF funding like every other sector, assuming that the concerned activities adhere to the life-saving criteria. As this inaccurate perception appears to be more acute at the field level, the CERF Secretariat ensures this issue is highlighted in the six regional CERF trainings every year. Copies of the Life-Saving Criteria are provided to the Humanitarian Coordinator and OCHA office for distribution when the CERF is made aware of a potential rapid response submission and the Life-Saving Criteria are distributed in the UFE process.

*CERF Secretariat  
New York, 22 September 2011*