



Humanitarian Response Planning

- Quick Guide -

Country Operations

In 2018, there will be Humanitarian Response Plans in 23 countries: Afghanistan, Burundi, Chad, Cameroon, CAR, DRC, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Ukraine and Yemen. The HRP for Cameroon, Chad, CAR, DRC, Somalia, Haiti, Sudan, Nigeria (and potentially Niger and Afghanistan) will be multi-year Plans.

Deadline for Completion

The global deadline for completion of HRPs is 10 November in Geneva and the Global Needs Overview will be published in December 2017.

HRP Templates

We understand that the HRP templates for 2018 remain unchanged from 2017. When the HCT introduces changes to the HRP templates (e.g. by inserting cash chapters) it must be borne in mind that changes to the template require approval at the IASC and cannot be made locally- please let us know if in your country there is an attempt to change the template.

Costing Approach

The costing approach will not change in most countries, although discussions are on-going in some. Please keep us informed of the approach and/or changes.

The HNO aims to reflect the humanitarian needs of a country or situation and it is important the protection clusters and areas of responsibility have solid information management staffing, tools and processes to ensure reliable data is available and that it is robustly analysed. The GPC and some global AORs have information management experts who can assist.

Scope and Purpose

The HRP is a planning instrument and a collective fundraising tool and we expect all field clusters and areas of responsibility to play an active and constructive part in collectively shaping the HRP to ensure that the protection risks of affected people are identified and reduced. The Central Emergency Response Fund has warned us that funding requests for protection do not reflect the importance placed on it by the IASC, and this seems particularly true for child protection and response to SGBV. As in previous years, we expect that field coordinators will ensure that the different protection needs of women, girls, boys and men will be identified and that appropriate response plans are put in place. It is important that appropriate visibility is given to the needs of children, survivors of GBV and mine victims in HNOs and HRPs and that a coherent and collective protection plan is defined that responds to the needs of everyone.

The Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action

As in previous years, we expect that field clusters will ensure that the RC/HC (or DSRSG, where there is one) will make the protection of affected people at least one of the overall objectives of the HRP, to which the sector response plans must react. You should remind RC/HCs and HCTs of the [2013 IASC Statement on the Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action](#) and the [2016 IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action](#). A policy is qualitatively different from guidance or

other form of communication of standards in that it must be followed unless there are objectively justifiable and cogent reasons to depart from it. Where there is any uncertainty about the inclusion of protection as an overall objective in HRP please let the GPC and the global AORs know so that we can support your advocacy.

The IASC Protection Policy reminds HCTs that “all humanitarian actors, irrespective of their sector-specific expertise, can contribute to the protection of affected persons”. With protection as an overall objective of the HRP, we expect that all sector response plans will integrate protection priorities within their activities and as an outcome of sector plans. In February 2017, the GPC published a Review of actions to promote the centrality of protection that provides good practice examples. Where other sectors are unsure about how to go about this we expect that cluster and AOR coordinators and partners will provide advice and guidance, including by referring to global clusters for support. The GPC Task Team on Protection Mainstreaming is available to provide training and guidance on how protection can be integrated into other sectors and the GPC website includes a section with practical tips and guidance.

The GPC expects that all humanitarian actors shape their plans to achieve protection outcomes. The IASC Protection Policy defines a protection outcome as “a response or activity ...when the risk to affected persons is reduced. The reduction of risks, meanwhile, occurs when threats and vulnerability are minimized and, at the same time, the capacity of affected persons is enhanced. Protection outcomes are the result of changes in behaviour, attitudes, policies, knowledge and practices on the part of relevant stakeholders. Some examples of protection outcomes include:

- Parties to conflict release enrolled boys and girls and issue explicit prohibitions, reinforced by disciplinary measures, to prevent child recruitment by their forces.
- National legislation formally recognizes land tenure entitlements of displaced populations.
- Safe access to alternative sources of cooking fuel reduces exposure to the threat of sexual violence.
- Community-based preparedness and early warning mechanisms support timely evacuation of especially vulnerable individuals from areas where they are at risk of violent attacks.
- Community leaders renew and promote societal norms that condemn gender-based violence and its perpetrators.
- Community level protection committees influence security forces to change their conduct in and around civilian areas through on-going liaison and negotiation.
- Government authorities support the voluntary movements of affected persons by ensuring full access to information that enables free and informed decision-making. “

Connexion between hunger and protection

Particular attention should be paid to the connexion between hunger and protection. Conflict and lack of respect for the principles of IHL, poor governance and human rights abuses are drivers in crisis situations characterized by hunger (e.g. Yemen, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan) and a range of protection risks arise out of hunger. The GPC has provided numerous briefings on this issue in 2017.

Thanks to relentless efforts by some field operations, a few HRP integrate mine action into their analysis or as objectives. For mine action, we expect field colleagues to ensure that, where necessary, the problems associated with explosive remnants of war and other explosive hazards as well as the needs of mine victims and for mine risk education are prioritized.

Housing, land and property issues deserve integration into protection analysis and as objectives both in the protection and shelter clusters. Identification documents and documentation, including of



property holdings, is consistently raised by affected people as a priority and we would like to see response plans include it, either within the protection sector or the shelter sector- there is certainly room for cross-cluster efforts in HLP.

Cash

Cash-based interventions, like in-kind, are modalities to deliver assistance and services. They have the potential to provide the people who have lost all means of gainful earning with the ability to make their own choices about their needs in a dignified manner. On behalf of clusters, lead agencies have committed under the Grand Bargain to increasing the use of cash as a modality.

Where functioning markets exist, CBIs are increasingly proven to be an effective modality to deliver assistance and services by building on the capacities of the communities and locally available resources. Through cost-efficient market-based assistance, CBIs support the local economy and create economic benefits for host communities. Unrestricted cash grants, in particular, afford affected people the flexibility to prioritise their own needs.

There is recent research on cash and protection. We want to encourage an innovative approach from the side of field protection clusters on the 'experimental' use of cash-based interventions for protection, and encourage the learning of lessons during the implementation of such projects. The GPC website has a section devoted to [learning and development on cash and protection](#) and we encourage you to access it. The GPC has formed a task team on cash and protection to gather further evidence and promote the use of cash as a modality in protection and is able to provide expert advice on the use of cash. The GPC will also shortly establish a Protection Innovation Lab to gather lessons and promote innovative practices in the field.

Global Protection Cluster Support

The GPC and the AOR teams have all been through HNO/HRP processes in the field and know full well the work that has to go into these processes and the creation of the plans. We are here to support the field clusters and sub-clusters as much as we can. We also have developed a [Q&A document](#) to provide practical tips and advices on how best PCs and AoRs at country level could work together to ensure better integrated analysis.

For further advice, in the first instance, we have put as much as we can onto the website at www.globalprotectioncluster.org and you should consult it. If you don't find what you are looking for, then please contact the Global Protection Cluster at GPC@unhcr.org or reach out to respective coordinators.

Contact Details:

Simon Russell
Global Protection Cluster
russell@unhcr.org

Michael Copland
Child Protection Area of Responsibility
mcopland@unicef.org

Jennifer Chase
Gender-Based Violence Area of Responsibility
chase@unfpa.org



Sarah Marshall
Mine Action Area of Responsibility
Sarah.marshall@un.org

Shobha Rao
HLP Area of Responsibility
shobha.rao@nrc.no