



MONITORING CHILD PROTECTION WITHIN HUMANITARIAN CASH  
PROGRAMMES

June 2019

©The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, 2019

**The Alliance for the Child Protection in Humanitarian Action** (the Alliance) supports the efforts of humanitarian actors to achieve high-quality and effective child protection interventions in humanitarian settings. Through its technical Working Groups and Task Forces, the Alliance develops inter-agency operational standards and provides technical guidance to support the work of child protection in humanitarian settings.

For more information on the Alliance's work and joining the network, please visit <https://www.alliancecpha.org> or contact us directly: [info@alliancecpha.org](mailto:info@alliancecpha.org).

This paper was developed by Paul Harvey and reviewed by the Alliance's Assessment, Measurement and Evidence Working Group and Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force.

For readers wishing to cite this document, we suggest the following:  
The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (2019). Monitoring Child Protection within Humanitarian Cash Programmes.

Cover photo credits: © UNICEF/UN0218607/Noorani

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	3
Introduction .....	4
The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action .....	4
Methods .....	5
The existing state of play .....	5
Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Jordan .....	5
Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Lebanon .....	6
Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Turkey .....	7
Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Somalia .....	8
Cash and child protection – Theory of change .....	9
Monitoring challenges .....	11
Links to existing initiatives .....	14
Scope for Piloting .....	15
Indicators .....	15
Recommendations and conclusions .....	19
Cash and child protection references .....	22
People Interviewed .....	24

### Abbreviations

AME	WG Assessment, Measurement and Evidence Working Group
AoR	Child Protection Area of Responsibility
CBI	Cash-based Intervention
CCTE	Conditional Cash for Education
CP	Child Protection
CPHA	Child Protection in Humanitarian Action
ECHO	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
ESSN	Emergency Social Safety Net
GBV	Gender-based Violence
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning
MPC	Multipurpose Cash Transfer
NIAF	Needs Identification Assessment Framework
PDM	Post Distribution Monitoring
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-based Violence
TRC	Turkish Red Crescent
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
VAC	Violence Against Children
VAF	Vulnerability Assessment Framework
VASyR	Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon
VAW	Violence Against Women
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme
WRC	Women’s Refugee Commission

### Introduction

This paper summarises findings from an initial scoping study, which seeks to review how child protection outcomes are captured when monitoring multi-purpose humanitarian cash programmes<sup>1</sup>. The study intends to inform the development and piloting of new approaches to integrating child protection concerns into multi-purpose cash monitoring frameworks. It was conducted for the Alliance for Child Protection's, Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force.

As the Women's Refugee Commission (WRC [WRC, 2018]) points out, humanitarian crises are often dangerous contexts that put people at risk. Humanitarian cash programming, as with any other modality, has obligations to monitor and adapt interventions to meet specific needs of diverse groups, and ensure their safety, dignity and inclusion. Therefore, monitoring humanitarian cash needs to capture data relating to protection risks, which includes child protection, so that cash actors can minimize risks and maximise child protection benefits.

By mainstreaming child protection concerns into humanitarian cash throughout the programme cycle and by utilizing cash within child protection approaches such as case management, cash can be optimized as a tool to enhance the protection of crisis affected populations. As WRC (2018) argues, cash is not inherently risky, but simply designing a humanitarian cash intervention without weighing the child protection risks and benefits associated with cash and ensuring mitigation mechanisms, can lead to unintended consequences.

Humanitarian cash that has the objective of meeting basic needs (sometimes called multi-purpose cash [MPC]) is challenging to monitor because there are possible outcomes across protection, child protection and multiple technical sectors (food security and nutrition, livelihoods, WASH, shelter, health and education). Any monitoring tool risks becoming too unwieldy if each sector includes all of the indicators that it would like to include.

There is therefore a need for disciplined narrowness in terms of the numbers and types of questions asked by each focus area, including child protection. A plausible theory of change between cash and the outcome or issue being monitored is also necessary. There is a process going on (within the Grand Bargain workstreams) of agreeing MPC outcome indicators. Whilst some initial child protection related indicators were proposed, the process of agreeing on child protection indicators has been shelved until the piloting process started in this paper is completed.

### The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action

The mission of the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (the Alliance) is to support the efforts of humanitarian actors to achieve high-quality and effective child

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined in the CaLP glossary as [Multipurpose Cash Transfer \(MPC\)](#): Multipurpose Cash Transfers (MPC) are transfers (either periodic or one-off) corresponding to the amount of money required to cover, fully or partially, a household's basic and/or recovery needs.

protection interventions in humanitarian contexts, in both refugee and non-refugee settings. As a global network of operational agencies, academic institutions, policymakers, donors and practitioners, the Alliance facilitates inter-agency technical collaboration on child protection. It sets standards and provides technical guidance to various stakeholders. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) currently co-leads the Alliance with Plan International. Within the Alliance, there are a number of working groups and task forces, including the Assessment, Measurement and Evidence (AME) Working Group and the Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force, who led the development of this paper. It also provides its members with technical support and guidance where needed.

## Methods

For this scoping study, a review of the literature on cash and child protection was carried out drawing from recent review of evidence gaps (Sarrouh 2019; Cross et al., 2018). Interviews were conducted with 25 global and country-based stakeholders from NGO's, UN agencies and donor governments. The study focused on Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan and Somalia where large-scale multi-purpose cash programmes are being implemented.

## The existing state of play

### Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Jordan

There are multiple levels of cash monitoring in Jordan. The Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF) Population Survey data is a random representative sample of registered Syrian refugee population that provides insight into the state of Syrian refugees in Jordan, and is conducted annually (so far in 2014, 2015, 2017 and 2018). The UNHCR Jordan Cash Based Interventions unit has used VAF home visits since 2014 to determine cash eligibility. This data is gathered through periodic home visits of registered refugees and those appealing for UNHCR multipurpose cash assistance. UNHCR carries out between 50,000 and 60,000 home visits each year and re-verifies families receiving cash assistance every two years.

UNHCR also conducts annual and mid-year Post-distribution monitoring (PDM) research of cash assistance. Part of the PDM is a livelihood coping strategy index where the following child protection focused questions are asked. Whether or not families have had to do any of the following over the last 4 weeks:

- Send children to work
- Send children to beg
- Remove children from school
- Early marriage

The 2018 PDM survey reported that 9% of respondents had sent their children to work in the last 4 weeks, 1% had been forced to ask children to beg and 2% reported early marriage (UNHCR, 2019). The Livelihood Coping Strategy Index ratings are broken down by governorate

to show parts of the country where there are particular concerns. The forthcoming 2018 VAF Population report has a new chapter focusing on child labour and new questions are being developed on child labour for home visits. The VAF Population Survey identified 5% as working children (<18), with 95% of those defined as child labour cases (i.e. exceeding acceptable hours per day, and/or hazardous work) (UNHCR, 2019). This figure is higher than the 2016 national survey on child labour (1.8%), which could indicate that the prevalence of working children is higher in the refugee population than in the host community. UNHCR is working with International Labour Organization to develop new indicators on child labour.

In the PDM, questions are asked to the head of the household and protection-focused questions are assessed in separate processes (see below). If, at the end of the PDM interview, enumerators have protection related concerns, they refer them to specialist protection teams.

Protection cases in Jordan are handled separately by UNHCR protection staff. The staff can refer cases for inclusion in the MPC even if they have not met standard eligibility criteria. Inclusion is based on a careful assessment of protection risks and anticipated positive impact the cash will have on the person at risk. Due to the high sensitivity of protection information, particularly on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), the Protection Unit decided to exclude specific protection questions in the home visit assessment process, and instead collect information as part of case management.

The specific protection cases identified to need long-term support, a separate referral is sent to the cash focal point, requesting urgent and exceptional cash assistance, without sharing details of the protection situation of the woman, child or LGBTI refugee. The protection staff also has the option to advise the transfer of amounts if needed, which ensures that cash assistance is tailored to the individual's needs. Those cases would then be followed up on a regular basis by case workers and the impact and need for cash is monitored. For example, if cash support is provided because children in the household have to work, case managers will monitor that the children are no longer working once cash support is received. Cash is seen as one tool and as part of an overall protection response.

In addition to MPC, UNHCR provides other types of cash assistance such as urgent cash grants, which is on-the-spot emergency cash for refugees at risk. Urgent cash is approved for specific quick-impact and high-risk cases, which could include, an imminent eviction, a critical family need, or other protection concerns. UNHCR also provides cash assistance for secondary and tertiary health care, education, and to cover winter fuel costs.

### **Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Lebanon**

Since 2016, World Food Programme (WFP)'s Food Security Outcome Monitoring measures the outcomes of WFP's food programming among beneficiary and non-beneficiary households on a quarterly basis. As of November 2017, monitoring is conducted on four different household groups:

- Food e-card - households receive US\$27 per family member. This can be redeemed on food at any of the 500 WFP-contracted shops across Lebanon



- Cash for food e-card - households receive US\$27 per family member. They have the choice to redeem either at a WFP-contracted shop or to withdraw as cash from any ATM
- Multipurpose cash for essential needs e-card - households receive US\$27 per family member for their food needs, and US\$175 per household for their essential needs that can only be withdrawn from an ATM
- Non-assisted households - registered Syrian refugees not receiving WFP assistance (WFP Lebanon, 2018)

This has a livelihood coping strategy index component, which measures the strategies used by households to access food and cover their basic needs during stress. However, published monitoring reports just look at the composite index and do not highlight child protection related strategies.

The 2018 Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon (VASyR) is the sixth annual survey assessing the situation of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, to identify changes and trends in vulnerability. The context is continually evolving, and the VASyR is the only assessment in Lebanon covering all sectors on a yearly basis. In relation to child protection, it looks at child labour, violent discipline and early marriage. In 2018, it found “the share of working children as reported by household heads remained the same at 5% as of 2017. However, when it came to child labour (as defined in the chapter), 2.2% of Syrian refugee children aged 5–17 years were engaged in child labour, with boys being more affected than girls (3.4% vs. 0.9%). Refugees reported that 73% of children under the age of 18 had experienced at least one form of violent discipline. Furthermore, at the time of the survey, 29% of girls aged 15–19 years were married, an increase of 7% from 2017” (UN 2018).

The VASyR (2018) has a chapter on assistance received, and notes that “between 2017 and 2018, nearly 200,000 of the most vulnerable Syrian refugee families in Lebanon were reached with regular basic assistance through cash-based interventions (cash for winter, cash for food, multi-purpose cash, child-focused grants).” However, it fails to analyse differences in outcomes (for child protection or other sectors) between those receiving and those not receiving cash.

### **Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Turkey**

In Turkey, multi-purpose cash assistance is dominated by the WFP / Turkish Red Crescent (TRC) run Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN), and a Conditional Cash for Education (CCTE) programme run by UNICEF and the Turkish Red Crescent.

WFP has carried out two comprehensive vulnerability monitoring exercises that capture data on ESSN recipients and non-recipients. Child protection issues are covered in livelihoods coping strategies, which ask questions about withdrawing children from school, begging, early marriage and child labour. The data shows that beneficiary households “were more likely to withdraw their children from school and send them to work (crisis strategies). Again, this is likely influenced by the fact that they tend to have larger families.” (WFP, 2018).

The livelihoods-based coping strategies module asks “during the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to do one of the following things because there was not enough money

to meet your basic needs?” Each strategy is categorized as ‘stress’, ‘crisis’ or ‘emergency’ depending on its level of severity, and the impact on future household productive capacity. Within the Turkey context, spending savings, buying food on credit and borrowing money are categorized as stress; selling productive assets, reducing non-food expenses, withdrawing children from school, sending them to work and marrying children under 16 years of age are considered crisis strategies; and a household member moving elsewhere, engaging in risky or illegal behaviour, begging or returning to their home country are considered emergency strategies (WFP, 2018).

There are some cash programmes with specific protection objectives. UNHCR has programmes for teenagers discharged from orphanages, for women survivors of SGBV and a newly launched programme for separated children all of which have a cash component. They all have strong case management components and are small (600 individuals in total) but very labour intensive. They coordinate with TRC to avoid duplication of support, but it is not straightforward since there are strict data confidentiality and legal requirements. The ESSN has a demographic approach to targeting, so its connections are limited.

TRC implements two large-scale cash programmes, the ESSN with WFP and CTE with UNICEF. Both have protection components. Under ESSN all cash teams in the field receive a basic protection training module. This provides training in basic concepts and in referral pathways. Cash teams have standard referral forms that are completed whenever they identify a potential protection case. Call centre staff operating a hotline for all TRC programmes can also instigate referrals. These are checked weekly, filtered by geography and referred to local community centres where follow-up is done. There is an obligation under Turkish law for anyone with child protection concerns to notify the government. The main child protection issues they deal with are child labour, children out of school, early marriage and, unaccompanied and separated children. WFP also has protection focal points in its seven field offices and all cash field staff have received basic protection and referral training.

There is a more specific focus on child protection in CTE programme. The cash assistance is conditional on the children regularly attending school. In cases where households have stopped receiving the grant because of poor school attendance, they are followed up by child protection outreach teams that conduct household visits, looking at all the children in the household and providing support for identified child protection concerns.

### **Humanitarian cash monitoring and child protection in Somalia**

In Somalia, the Somalia Cash Consortium (an NGO consortium with six INGOs funded by ECHO) operating a multi-purpose cash assistance programme (targeting 20,000 households in 2019 and 50,000 in 2018) and a much larger WFP-run programme.

For the Somalia Cash Consortium, data on cash recipients is disaggregated by gender, age and disability at the registration stage. The extent to which child protection concerns are examined in the monitoring processes is limited. Questions on coping strategies include if families have had to send children to eat elsewhere, questions on school enrolment and

whether or not cash has caused tensions within the household. There are no questions about child labour or early marriage.

The consortium has recently focused more on referral systems for child-headed households. Each partner has been asked to submit a mapping of child protection actors operating in the locations they are providing cash and the types of support provided. Referral systems were previously informal and less systematised; they are moving towards a more formal system.

In the community-based targeting process carried out by village relief committees, child-headed households were among the suggested targeting criteria. This raised concerns that targeting child headed households could create problematic incentives for households to present themselves as child headed. This was changed to targeting households that would find it difficult to earn a living, which could include child headed households.

### Cash and child protection – Theory of change

An issue with the MPC outcome indicators originally proposed in 2018 in the Grand Bargain process around child protection is that there was often little clear causal link between cash and the indicator. We argue that there needs to be a plausible theory of change of the possible links between cash and child protection to inform the development of a monitoring strategy. While existing literature (Sarrouh, 2018; Mishra, 2017) notes limitations in quality and depth of the evidence base, it provides a starting point to explore possible positive impacts of cash on child protection and risks that might arise.

There are three broad areas of concern regarding the link between humanitarian cash and child protection:

1. The possible positive impact of cash on child protection outcomes – e.g. is cash helping to prevent negative coping strategies such as child labour or early marriages, or contributing to mental health and psycho-social well-being by mitigating stress on households?
2. The coordination of cash and child protection – are there clear referral pathways for the children at risk; are those monitoring and implementing cash able to identify child protection risks, and is cash linked to complementary child protection programming in ways that may create synergistic impact and minimize any child protection risks of cash?
3. The need to be sure that cash does no harm and mitigates any safeguarding risks – e.g. risk of children being left alone when people have to travel long distances to get cash, risks of perverse incentives in targeting or risk of cash leading to tension within households that lead to domestic violence.

For child protection, we propose the following theories of change / hypotheses (Cross et al., 2018; Sarrouh, 2019).

<p>Possible positive impacts that increased income from humanitarian cash might contribute to</p>	<p>Increased household income from cash might:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce risk of child marriage</li> <li>• Reduce participation in child labour and in particular in worst forms of child labour</li> <li>• Reduce risk of deliberate family separation</li> <li>• Increase school enrolment and attendance leading to reduction in child labour</li> <li>• Reduce risk of danger, injuries and sexual violence through girls doing less risky unpaid work (e.g. collecting water and firewood)</li> <li>• Enable families to access services related to child protection (health care, mental health, education)</li> <li>• Reduce engagement with risky coping strategies such as transactional sex</li> <li>• Greater income may have positive effect on perceived well-being and mental health, which could reduce risk of violence within the household</li> <li>• Reduced parental stress leading to better parental practices</li> <li>• Foster caregivers and other interim caregivers are able to (better) support unaccompanied and separated children</li> <li>• More effective community-based child protection systems due to increased resources within communities</li> </ul>
<p>Possible risks / negative impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of children being left unaccompanied if caregivers have to travel long distances or wait long time to receive cash</li> <li>• Risk of children being left on their own or additional childcare responsibilities if adults work more</li> <li>• Risk of children being bullied or harassed if targeting of cash creates tensions or conflicts within communities</li> <li>• Risk that targeting criteria creates child protection risks (e.g. incentives to split families, separate children, pull out of school, put to work etc.)</li> <li>• Particular protection risk if unaccompanied children are targeted for cash (e.g. greater exposure to extortion or abuse)</li> <li>• Conflict within households on how to spend cash leading to violence against children</li> <li>• Risk of more child labour due to more income – investment in agriculture or business (tending fields, working in shops)</li> <li>• Risk around patterns of movement – e.g. girls spending more time travelling hence exposed to potential sexual violence</li> <li>• Risk of more early marriages due to increased income that makes families feel more able to afford the cost of marriage</li> </ul>

<p>In order to maximise positive impacts and minimize negative ones well run cash programmes should have:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong referral systems for children at risk to specialist child protection actors</li> <li>• Train staff involved in registration and monitoring to recognise child protection risks and red flags</li> <li>• Complementary or cash plus programming</li> <li>• Provide information – mechanisms to inform recipients about where to get help if further support is needed to deal with child protection challenges</li> </ul>
---	--

## Monitoring challenges

In view of how the potential positive and negative impact of humanitarian cash on child protection relate to monitoring, it is important to remember:

- What questions are being asked in cash monitoring systems and how they could be tweaked to address better the child protection issues
- Who the questions are being asked to? (whether children are included – whether it covers both people receiving cash and those not receiving cash; and who might be excluded)
- The skills and capacities of those doing the monitoring – have they been trained to recognise red flags and action to take if they have child protection concerns

It is also important to think through two broad categories of monitoring. On one hand you have a concern at the individual level with identifying individual children with child protection issues that should be referred to case management. On the other hand there are population-level interventions and monitoring that are concerned with identifying which geographies or communities are most vulnerable or most at risk in relation to child protection risks.

Currently, MPC monitoring systems are generally picking up issues on child labour only, and sometimes early marriage based on questions asked on coping strategies. They provide some information on household profiles (numbers of children in the household – sometimes disaggregated by age groups). These monitoring systems are usually unable to show the amount or type of work, hence difficult to indicate whether or not children are engaged in dangerous work (worst forms of child labour). In addition, questions are often directed to the heads of households and not the children or adolescents.

Given the need for disciplined narrowness, is it realistic to expect cash monitoring systems to provide analysis of other child protection concerns? There are two (and not necessarily mutually exclusive) ways to improve child protection monitoring within humanitarian cash:

1. Add or tweak questions in the PDM systems, including child protection indicators being added in the process of agreeing on MPC indicators under the Grand Bargain process. For example, better disaggregation of age and gender data for children or adding in extra questions about types of child labour and risks associated with them.
2. Develop a complementary child protection module, which could be similar to (or combined with) WRC (2018) PDM Module: Adapt Cash Based Interventions (CBIs) to

Mitigate GBV risks that could sample a smaller number of people and ask more detailed questions on child protection than is possible in standard PDM covering multiple sectors.

There is scope for better identifying some child protection concerns during household profile questions. It might be possible for instance to ask questions such as:

- Have any household members left the household?
- Are there any children living with you who don't usually live with you?
- Have any household members married?

This could give some indications of child separations and early marriage. For example, the Needs Identification Assessment Framework (NIAF) process looked at adding sub-questions to household profiling in Mali carried out by food security actors, to ask how many girls and boys aged 5–12 years and 13–18 years are married to provide a better picture of early marriage prevalence.

It is important to think about MPC monitoring as more than just household level surveys within post-distribution monitoring. Complementary qualitative monitoring and focus group discussions may provide a wider scope for discussing sensitive questions. So instead of asking households directly about issues such as violence within their own family, you are asking them to discuss possible risks within communities in ways that enable more open discussion about sensitive issues; Like “have you heard about anyone – rather than ‘have you.” WRC (2018) used depersonalized stories as part of focus groups discussions to enable people talk about sensitive issues related to gender-based violence. This is known as ‘neighbourhood methodology’ and is often used in child protection research (Mansourian et al. 2016).

Most post distribution monitoring of humanitarian cash occur at the household level with questions asked to the head of household. Thompson (2012) points out the need to ensure children participate in all stages of the programme cycle including monitoring. Save the Children’s guide on safeguarding in cash transfer programming recommends to “engage children in monitoring and evaluation in order to identify outcomes, sometimes unplanned that benefit children, or to help pinpoint unexpected negative consequences of an intervention.” (Thompson, 2012).

It is clearly hard and sometimes inappropriate to tackle questions on sexual violence and harmful practices during household level monitoring, given the sensitivity of these issues and the fact that those being asked the questions may be the perpetrators. Potential risks of cash – that for instance targeting criteria could lead to child protection harm by creating incentives for separation – are important but hard to monitor. If people are forced into risky behaviours to try qualify for cash support then they are unlikely to be open about it in monitoring.

Berman et al. (2016) notes that clear child protection protocols are required when children are part of the research or monitoring. “Protocols may address issues such as what to do if a child becomes visibly distressed; how to detect indirect signs of distress; how to decide when immediate support is required (including health services) or what to do if risk of serious harm is disclosed.”

Child protection issues – for instance violence in a household – are very sensitive, and need delicate approach that may not be appropriate to include in large scale PDM processes where enumerators may have limited training. WRC (2018) piloting GBV modules in Jordan noted that, “staff experienced challenges during data collection, in particular with focus group discussions and interview facilitation on sensitive topics.” WRC (2018) work on gender-based violence emphasizes the need for training of monitoring staff on GBV issues that should also apply to child protection. WRC (2018) recommends:

- Cash and Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) staff are trained on the basic concepts of gender, GBV, and the guiding principles for GBV prevention and response;
- Cash and MEAL staff are trained on diversity sensitivity and the importance of respect for all persons regardless of their sex, age, ability, identity, associations or occupation;
- The data collection team reflects the profile of the PDM sample. They are able to speak the same language and represent the same diversity of groups. Teams include women and men with the understanding that the PDM will be conducted by data collectors of the same sex as the respondent, unless respondents prefer otherwise. Efforts are made to recruit persons with disabilities and when possible LGBTI individuals;
- Data collectors are trained on the humanitarian imperative and codes of conduct, including the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, child safeguarding policies, and accountability and reporting mechanisms;
- GBV referral pathways (including sub-population-specific pathways that have been assessed for sensitivity) are mapped and the data collection team is trained on the referral pathways as well as in psychological first aid;
- Appropriate gatekeepers are informed of the purpose of data collection activities and the explanation of the tools being used (questions on GBV may otherwise be poorly received);
- Tools are translated into local language(s) and reflect the preferred language, dialect, and cultural sensitivities of the targeted populations. This is especially important when discussing sensitive issues such as safety and GBV; and
- Data collection team is trained on the PDM tool and methodologies. Data collectors understand the rationale for the types of questions and analysis.

For research on the impact of multi-purpose cash on child labour in Lebanon, World Vision (2018) recruited trained social workers with backgrounds in psychology and early childhood education to conduct interviews with children on school enrolment, child labour and protection risks. The study looked at participation in household chores, engagement in child labour, work accidents and whether children felt safe or had experienced violence in the workplace. It attributed the higher rates of child labour found in this survey to those found in the VASyR survey partly to the fact that trained social workers interviewing children directly decreased the chances of under-reporting.

## Links to existing initiatives

There are currently a number of initiatives that any further work would need to link to. Most notably it is intended that this work and the follow-up will feed directly into the Grand Bargain process of agreeing indicators for MPC.

There may also be opportunities to link this work to the NIAF, which works with indicators available from other technical sectors to enhance the analysis of child protection risks. The Child Protection Needs Identification & Analysis Framework (CP NIAF) is the approach that the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (AoR) has defined since 2018, to support country offices in country AoR, and national and international partners, to identify and analyse needs of children in humanitarian settings. Countries currently rolling out the CP NIAF are: Ethiopia, Iraq, Mali, Niger, Syria Arab Republic, South Sudan and Yemen. UNCHR is collaborating with NIAF to develop a handbook.

It might therefore be possible to combine the child protection and cash module piloting with the expansion of the NIAF where large-scale multi-purpose cash is being implemented. Or to pilot a cash and child protection module in one of the existing NIAF countries where multi-purpose cash is already being implemented (Iraq) or is expanding (Syria). A conversation could be initiated on whether this work can be integrated into or constitute a chapter within the NIAF Handbook.

The WRC, in partnership with Mercy Corps and International Rescue Committee, has recently developed a toolkit for mainstreaming GBV considerations in cash-based interventions (WRC 2018). This includes a PDM module. Instead of developing a separate child protection monitoring module it might be possible to explore combining child protection and GBV concerns into a single module. This rationale is strengthened by the inter-linkages between violence against women and violence against children. As Bermudez et al. (2019) note,

*“In reality, violence against women (VAW) and violence against children (VAC) often co-exist within households, suggesting interrelated drivers (Gracia, Rodriguez, Martín-Fernández, & Lila, 2017; Guedes et al., 2016). A recent literature review of 33 peer-reviewed studies from humanitarian contexts identified multiple risk factors that are common across violence against women and children, including conflict exposure, alcohol and drug use, income/economic status, mental health/coping strategies, and limited social support (Rubenstein, Lu, MacFarlane, & Stark, 2017). Humanitarian settings are likely to intensify these risk factors due to increases in stress, breakdown of family and community support networks, loss of employment, and engagement in harmful coping mechanisms such as substance use. While distinctions between VAW and VAC can be beneficial, such as for the development of legislation, advocacy, and programming, there are many compelling reasons for prevention and response efforts to jointly address both types of violence in the home, including better use of resources, more efficient coordination and potentially synergistic impact (Bacchus et al., 2017)”*



### Scope for Piloting

Based on interviews with organisations that implement humanitarian cash programmes / MPC in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan, there are well established systems for cash monitoring and child protection monitoring and case management to relate to each other. These are described in more detail below. But the initial feedback was that further indicators or additional modules are not needed and that existing systems are working well. That raises two options:

- The current systems are indeed working well to enable monitoring of key child protection risks, strong referral systems and links to case management. What is needed is less new indicators, modules or piloting new systems and better documentation, analysis and learning from existing good practice.
- There is a scope to improve existing systems but more in-depth work at the country level is needed to figure out what opportunities exist and how existing systems could be best supported and adapted.

Based on this initial scoping, it seemed that the Somalia Cash Consortium was the most open to pilot new approaches to integrate child protection concerns into existing monitoring systems. There would also be scope for more fully documenting existing practice in the other reviewed contexts with Jordan possibly being the best option. It was beyond the scope of this initial exercise to look at all the contexts where multi-purpose humanitarian cash is being provided. Iraq and Nigeria might be other contexts that could be examined as examples of emerging practice and possible piloting options.

A feature of some of the contexts where large-scale multi-purpose cash is being implemented is that some monitoring is ongoing at the wide population or national level. In Jordan and Lebanon national level surveys of refugees are taking place and allow monitoring of those receiving cash and not receiving cash. WFP's monitoring of the ESSN in Turkey covers beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. This is clearly preferable from a child protection perspective as it is possible there will be child protection risks amongst people not getting cash and it enables a comparison between those getting cash support and non-beneficiaries.

The ideal would be a strong process from a joint system wide monitoring that covered the whole population at risk, mainstreamed protection concerns (including child protection) and looked holistically the support people were receiving and its impact. In this case, MPC monitoring would be much narrower and more focused. In the continued absence of good system-wide joint monitoring system, then better monitoring of multi-purpose cash may be a decent second-best option.

### Indicators

There is an ongoing process to agree on standard outcome indicators for multi-purpose cash. However, the process has been shelved while this research took place. The issue with the initially suggested indicators is that it is not clear that they relate directly to the receipt of cash. In addition, they are more generic child protection indicators concerned with whether

or not child protection interventions are in place. There are also a large number of indicators, which would make it difficult to integrate all into existing monitoring systems (along with other protection and sectoral concerns) without PDM systems for MPC becoming too unwieldy.

We therefore propose a two-pronged approach (described in more detail in the recommendations) to developing indicators:

- Working with MPC cash actors to tweak existing monitoring frameworks (notably the livelihoods coping strategy and household profiles) to better capture some key child protection concerns without adding many more questions
- Developing a separate (or combined with GBV) module for child protection that could focus in-depth on a wider range of child protection outcomes and risks

Household profiles collected during the registration process can be useful to help understand disaggregated demographics, and to identify child and single-headed households, unaccompanied mothers and unaccompanied and separated children. Household profile data collection during post-distribution monitoring can then measure changes over time and whether or not receipt of humanitarian cash is having any impact on child protection concerns such as child marriage and separation. The livelihoods coping strategy index can be used to identify trends in negative coping strategies including child labour. Dayioglu (2012) found that

“Asking just five questions should be able to capture nearly all child labourers working under hazardous conditions. These would ask whether a child: carries heavy loads at work; works with dangerous tools or operates heavy machinery; is *exposed* to dust/fumes/gas; is exposed to extreme cold/heat/humidity; or is exposed to loud noise or vibration.”

More sensitive issues around violence, exploitation and abuse, and context-specific issues such as children associated with armed forces, would be monitored on a less frequent basis within a child protection module. This would focus on the individual rather than the household and include the views of children and adolescents.

There are established child protection indicators, although many are in the middle of revision. The Child Protection Standards and the Child Protection Monitoring Toolkit are being revised and updated. The indicators from the latest version of the Child Protection Monitoring Toolkit are in table 1 below. There is also a Child Protection Rapid Assessment Toolkit. It is important that any indicators for humanitarian cash and child protection builds on these existing child protection indicators. The key sector indicators will be those in the updated Child Protection Minimum Standard as well as any that may be recommended in the NIAF.

Table 1. Child protection monitoring toolkit indicators

Corresponding standard <sup>2</sup>	What we need to know	Indicators (measurement per reporting period)	Note
Standard 7	Scale and type of dangers and injuries affecting children	# of children reported to have suffered from severe injuries	Define severe
		Types of reported dangers and injuries	Pre-define options
Standard 8	Scale and type of physical violence and harmful practices affecting children	# of children reported to have suffered from physical violence or other harmful practice	
		Types of reported physical violence and other harmful practice	Pre-define options
Standard 9	Scale and nature of sexual violence	# of children reported to have suffered from sexual violence	
		Type of perpetrators of sexual violence reporting	Pre-define options
		Reported locations where sexual violence against children takes place	Pre-define options
Standard 10	Psychosocial Distress	# of children showing persistent signs of distress	Define “persistent signs of distress”
Standard 11	Children associated with armed forces and armed groups	# of children reported to have been recruited to armed forces or groups	
		# of children associated with armed forces or groups who are reported to have returned to the community	Define ‘return to community’
		# of recruitment incidences reported	Define recruitment event or incident
Standard 12	Scale and nature of child labour	# of children reported as being newly engaged in hazardous work	Define Hazardous labour Define “newly engaged”
		Reported types of hazardous labour children are engaged in during reporting period	

<sup>2</sup> All 17 indicators should NOT be used in any one context. Especially if community members are the ones reporting against the indicators, the smaller the number, the more reliable the results will be. For a community approach to data collection, between 5 to 10 indicators is suggested.

Standard 13	Scale and nature of separation of children from usual caregivers	# of children reported as being newly separated from their usual caregivers	Concept of separation to be operationalized Define “usual caregivers”
		Reported reasons for separation of children from their usual caregivers	
		Reported care arrangements for children who are newly separated from their usual caregivers	
Standard 14	Scale and nature of children’s contact with the justice system	# of children reported as coming in contact with the justice system during reporting period	Define contact with justice system
		Reported reasons for the contact between children and the justice system	

There are also relevant key actions from the draft standards for food security and child protection:

- Brief food security staff on child protection risk criteria to identify vulnerable households for inclusion in programming, and how to respond to child protection concerns
- Set up child-friendly, multi-sector referral mechanisms so food security workers can safely and efficiently refer children with protection needs
- Integrate child protection staff to provide support within the food security response – particularly during the identification of at risk households and beneficiaries – distributions and response monitoring
- Agree on appropriate joint indicators to monitor progress on child protection and food security. Make child protection issues an explicit component of food security programme design and implementation
- Adapt existing tools such as post-distribution questionnaires for monitoring child protection threats that affect food security
- Ensure that child-headed households and unaccompanied and separated children are given beneficiary cards to access in-kind or cash-based food security assistance in their own names. Work with child protection workers to be careful not to encourage separation in the hopes of receiving additional rations or cash assistance
- Ensure that all food security workers have signed and trained on child safeguarding procedures, including codes of conducts and prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse policies

Relevant indicators from the draft child protection minimum standard are:

Indicators	Target	Notes
20.1. % of food security programmes in target location that include an integrated approach to child protection.	100%	“Integrated approach” refers to child protection programming interventions are integrated into the design of food security programmes to promote the wellbeing and protection of children.
20.2. % of surveyed unaccompanied and separated children that report provision of food security assistance.	90%	Includes street children and child headed households.
20.3. # and % of identified child protection cases referred by food security staff to child protection case management staff.	Tbd	Target to be determined in country based on context.
20.4. % of food security programmes that include a child-focused risk mitigation strategy.	100%	Risk mitigation strategies should include risks specific to sex, age and disability.
20.5. % of food security-focused agencies that have adopted a Child Safeguarding policy.	100%	
20.6. % of food security-focused agencies that require all staff to sign the Child Safeguarding policy.	100%	

## Recommendations and conclusions

Based on this short review we recommend the following approach to further mainstream child protection concerns into humanitarian cash programming:

- Where possible, monitor at the population of concern level not just beneficiaries of cash – as in Lebanon and Jordan with national level vulnerability assessments
- Explore the potential to tweak the livelihoods strategy coping index to include questions on early marriage, separated children and amount or worst forms of child labour. For example:
  - Have your children had to engage in work that is dangerous?
  - Have any of your children sustained injury or health problems through work over the last y days?

- Have you had to send children away to live with someone else or had to take children from other families into your household?
- Explore the potential to improve household profile questions to better capture data age, gender and disability disaggregation of children in the household, child marriage and separated children
- Explore the possibility to add a question about perceived well-being, conflict and mental health into the PDM process. For example:
  - Has cash increased or decreased stress and conflict in the household?
- Add into protection process indicator a question for the MPC indicators like: percentage of total cash caseload referred to protection actors for case management follow-up. Have an indicator about whether or not cash monitoring staff are trained in referral processes
- Develop a stand-alone (or combined with GBV) child protection module that asks additional child protection questions including to children that goes into more depth on child labour, looks at psycho-social issues, violence, armed groups and separated children
- Include possible risks of cash to standard post-distribution monitoring: For example, has receiving cash led to conflicts or violence within the household or the community over how it is spent or who gets it? Have there been any instances in the community of people sending children away or taking them out of school in order to qualify for cash

These recommendations could be taken forward in a number of ways. We suggest that a possible more in-depth project include:

- Detailed documentation of existing best practice emerging from specific contexts by case studies (including a country visit to interview key actors in person) of how child protection concerns in multi-purpose cash monitoring are being addressed in Jordan and possibly other contexts

This would require a consultant to travel to one or two contexts where existing monitoring systems within a multi-purpose cash programmes appear well established and functional. The aim would be to document in more detail (than has been possible in this scoping strategy) the current practice in specific contexts through a more thorough review of existing documentation and interviews with a wider range of stakeholders.

- A pilot project that works in a specific context such as with the Somalia Cash Consortium to better integrate child protection concerns into existing monitoring systems and develop a separate child protection (or combined with GBV) module

A consultant would work with the Alliance's Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force and AME Working Group to develop a child protection module. This would be a stand-alone survey tool with a particular child protection focus that asks more detailed questions on how cash assistance has impacted child protection concerns. It would build on the possible positive and negative impacts of cash identified in this document and turn those into a set of survey questions. The consultant would initially develop a generic survey tool, which could be adapted for specific contexts. It might be complemented by qualitative research for which interview and focus group discussion guides could be developed. [WRC gender-based violence module](#) would provide a good starting point.

The Alliance's Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force and AME Working Group could initiate more detailed discussions with the Somalia Cash Consortium (and/or cash actors in other contexts) about the potential to pilot the module. The idea would be for the consultant team to work with the cash consortium MEAL team to adapt the module for the Somali context, train enumerators and (if needed) qualitative researchers, support the survey (probably remotely given security concerns) and work with the MEAL team to analyse and write up the survey results. Again, [WRC cash and gender-based violence case studies](#) provide a good example of what this might look like.

- Possible further roll-out of the pilot, if successful, to other contexts – ideally with a UN agency buy-in, which would require further work with WFP, UNHCR and UNICEF

If successful, it would be desirable to pilot the module in other contexts that would include responses led by a UN agency. The Alliance's Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force and AME Working Group would need to discuss further with cash focal points in UNHCR and WFP at global and country levels to generate support for the approach.

- Discuss with the NIAF project the possibility of a NIAF programme in a context where large-scale multi-purpose cash is being implemented (or focus on cash in an existing NIAF context such as Iraq or Syria). If possible, combine that with the pilot of the module.

Given the similarities between the focus of this project and the NIAF process, it is proposed this project continues to coordinate closely with the NIAF process in any Phase II. If possible, it would be useful if the NIAF process could be extended to a context where multi-purpose cash is being implemented and for it to be carried out in conjunction with a piloting of the child protection module.

- By the end of 2019, and based on the case studies and pilot modules, suggest child protection indicators to the MPC outcome indicators project.

The MPC outcome indicators process is likely to be looking for a small number of child protection indicators. We suggest a focus on the tweaks to existing PDM processes suggested above. By sharpening or adapting slightly the questions on coping strategies and household profiles, it should be possible to generate stronger data on child labour, child marriage and child separation. The proposed indicators for the MPC process would therefore be something like:

- Changes in % of children in cash receiving households involved in child labour and particularly worst forms of child labour
- Changes in % of children under 18 years of age married
- Changes in % of separated children (children leaving a household and households looking after separated children)

And possibly also proposing an indicator around perceived well-being and household conflict:

- % of households reporting high levels of stress and intra-household conflict

## Cash and Child Protection References

- Bacchus, L. J. et al, 'Exploring Opportunities for Coordinated Responses to Intimate Partner Violence and Child Maltreatment in Low and Middle Income Countries: A scoping review', *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 2017, vol. 22, sup 1, pp.135–165.
- Berman, G., Hart, J., O'Mathúna, D., Mattellone, E., Potts, A., O'Kane, C., Shusterman, J., and Tanner, T, *What We Know About Ethical Research Involving Children in Humanitarian Settings: An overview of Principles, the Literature and Case Studies*, Innocenti Working Paper 2016 No. 2016-18, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.
- Bermudez, L. et al, 'Converging Drivers of Interpersonal Violence: Findings from a Qualitative Study in Post-hurricane Haiti, Child Abuse and Neglect', 89 (2019) pp.178–191.
- Cross, A. et al, *Humanitarian Cash-Transfer Programming and Gender Based Violence Outcomes: Evidence and Future Research Priorities*, Women's Refugee Commission and International Rescue Committee. 2018.
- Cross, A. et al, *Cash Transfer Programming in the Education and Child Protection Sectors: Literature Review and Evidence Maps*, LSE and CaLP, 2018
- Dayioğlu, M., *How Sensitive are Estimates of Working Children and Child Labour to Definitions? A comparative Analysis*, MICS Methodological Papers, No. 1, Statistics and Monitoring Section/Division of Policy and Strategy, UNICEF New York, 2012.
- De Hoop, J. et al, *Min Ila" Cash Transfer Programme for Displaced Syrian Children in Lebanon (UNICEF and WFP)*, American Institutes for Research and UNICEF Office of Research Innocenti (2018)
- Global Protection Cluster, *Child Protection in Emergencies Monitoring Toolkit*, Draft 5.2, 2016
- Global Protection Cluster, *Child Protection in Emergencies Monitoring Toolkit*, Draft 5.4, 2016
- Global Protection Cluster, *Child Protection Rapid Assessment Toolkit*, 2012
- Gracia, E., Rodriguez, C. M., Martín-Fernández, M., and Lila, M, 'Acceptability of Family Violence: Underlying Ties between Intimate Partner Violence and Child Abuse', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2017
- Guedes, A., Bott, S., Garcia-Moreno, C., and Colombini, M, Bridging the gaps: A Global Review of Intersections of Violence against Women and Violence against Children. *Global Health Action*, vol.9, no. 1, 2016.
- Inter-Agency Coordination Lebanon Protection (including SGBV and child protection) Jan-Aug 2018 dashboard, 2018.
- Laumann, L., *Household Economic Strengthening in Support of Prevention of Family-Child Separation and Children's Reintegration in Family Care*, ASPIRE, 2015.



- Mansourian, H. et al, 'Assessing the use of the neighborhood method to estimate the prevalence of child separation: a pilot in North Kivu, DRC', *Conflict and Health*, Vol. 10, no. 17, 2016.
- Mishra, A. and Battistin. F, *Child Outcomes of Cash Transfer Programming*, Save the Children, 2017.
- Samuel, Hall., *The Impact of Cash Transfer Programmes on Protection Outcomes in Afghanistan*, 2015.
- Sarrouh, L., *Cash Transfer Programming and Child Protection in Humanitarian Action: Review and Opportunities to Strengthen the Evidence*, The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, 2019.
- Somalia Humanitarian Country Team, 'Centrality of Protection Strategy' – 2018-2019
- Rubenstein, B. L., Lu, L. Z. N., MacFarlane, M., and Stark. L, *Predictors of interpersonal violence in the household in humanitarian settings: A systematic review*, *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 2017.
- Thompson, H., *Child Safeguarding in Cash Transfer Programming*, Save the Children, 2012.
- UN, Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian Refugees in Lebanon, 2018.
- UNHCR, Jordan Vulnerability Assessment Framework 2017 Population Survey Report, 2018.
- UNHCR, Multi-purpose Cash Assistance 2018 Post distribution monitoring report, 2019.
- WFP, Refugees in Turkey: Comprehensive vulnerability Monitoring Exercise (round 2), 2018.
- Women's Refugee Commission and Adeso, *Mainstreaming Gender-Based Violence Considerations in Cash-Based Interventions: A Case Study from Lower Juba, Somalia*, 2018.
- Women's Refugee Commission, *Overview of Toolkit for Optimizing Cash-based Interventions for Protection from Gender-based Violence: Mainstreaming GBV Considerations in CBIs and Utilizing Cash in GBV Response*, 2018.
- Women's Refugee Commission, *Tackling the Integration of Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Response and Cash-Based Interventions*, 2018
- Women's Refugee Commission, *Optimising Benefits and Mitigating Risks of Integrating Cash-Based Interventions and GBV programming, Case Studies from Irbid and Mafraq Jordan*, 2018.
- Women's Refugee Commission, *Assessing and Mitigating Risks of Gender-based Violence: Guidance for Cash Providers*, 2018.
- World Vision, *Impact of multi-purpose Cash Assistance on Child Labour among Syrian Refugee Children in Bekaa Lebanon*, 2018.

### People Interviewed

1. Aftab Alam, Plan International
2. Boris Atistin Gonzalez, UNICEF, Emergency Specialist (Assessment, Measurement and Evidence) Rapid Response Team, Global Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR)
3. Jackline Atwi, UNICEF Lebanon, Child Protection
4. Mohammed Mutleb Al Awamreh, Care Jordan, Deputy Programme Director
5. Elizabeth Barnhart – UNHCR Jordan, Senior CBI Coordinator
6. Francesca Battistin, Save the Children, Senior Economic Programming Adviser
7. Patrizia Benevenuti, Chief, Child Protection, UNICEF Turkey
8. Hannah Hames, Save the Children, Cash and Markets Adviser
9. Harry Brown, UNHCR Jordan, VAF Coordinator
10. Khalil Dagher, UNHCR Lebanon, Basic Assistance Sector Coordinator Inter-Agency Coordination Unit
11. Jacob De Hoop, UNICEF, Innocenti
12. Sophie Etzold, UNHCR Jordan, Child Protection Coordinator
13. Hani Mansourian, UNICEF, Co-Coordinator, Alliance for Child Protection and Humanitarian Action
14. Tenzin Manell, Women’s Refugee Commission
15. Livio Mercurio – UNHCR Turkey
16. Deqa Saleh, ADESO
17. Vanessa Saraiva, Senior Advisor, Protection & Gender, World Vision South Sudan
18. Kath Williamson, Save the Children, Child Protection Adviser
19. Hannah Rachel Thompson, Independent Consultant
20. Kaitlyn Scott, IRC
21. Josh Chaffin, Consultant
22. Dustin Caniglia, USAID