**PROTECTION RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX TEMPLATE**

**INTRODUCTION**

A Protection Risk Assessment is a straightforward, operational tool that helps to identify protection risks – including risk of gender-based violence and sexual exploitation and abuse – and strategies to mitigate these.

This template is an example and can be adapted as needed. It can be used:

* To inform strategic planning processes (HRP and CCCM Response Strategy), filled by the CCCM Cluster coordination team in consultation with Cluster members
* To help plan specific activities that have protection concerns, filled by the Cluster or CCCM partners

Read more about Protection Risk Assessments in *CCCM Cluster Coordination Toolkit Section 9. Cross-Cutting issues – Protection Mainstreaming*.

 **TEMPLATE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Activity 1: *name/ description of activity*** |
| **Risk 1:** *What are the key protection risks beneficiaries or humanitarians may be exposed to through this activity's implementation?* |
| **Likelihood**: ***Low / Medium /******High*** *What is the likelihood of this risk actually occurring?* | **Impact**: ***Low / Medium / High****What would be the level of impact on beneficiaries and/or humanitarian workers? Describe briefly potential impacts.*  |
| **Mitigation measures** | **Monitoring** | **Resources Required** | **Acceptable** |
| *What are ways we could reduce the risk or weaken its impact?* | *What are ways we could reduce the risk or weaken its impact?* | *What resources, if any, would be required to mitigate and/or monitor the risk?* | ***Yes / No****Is this an acceptable level of risk? Do we go forward with the activity?* |

**EXAMPLE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Activity 1: Registration / Maintaining Site Resident Database** |
| **Risk 1:** Registration process becomes a pull factor for nearby populations, inducing displacement and exposing populations to risks of harm  * Large influx of populations to registration locations can lead to overcrowding, loss of control of the registration process, and expose populations and humanitarian staff to risk of violence or harm
 |
| **Likelihood: High** | **Impact**: **High** - Direct harm to populations, impact on ability to deliver assistance, and organizational reputation  |
| **Mitigation measures** | **Monitoring** | **Resources Required** | **Acceptable** |
| * Clear agreed messaging on the purpose of the registration / database: to collect population data to inform protection and assistance responses, with no commitment on specific response packages
* Messaging on plans for similar activities in other locations
* Disseminate clear messages for rural and/or areas of origin where IDPs have come from or may potentially be drawn from to prevent displacement of populations
 | * Population movement monitoring pre and during registration.
* Monitoring of new arrivals
 | * Training of monitoring staff
* Dissemination of key messages through different modalities
 | Yes   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk 2:** Heightening of tensions between IDPs, host communities, “gate-keepers”, authorities and/or humanitarian workers around the registration process / database, leading to risk of violence or harm * Loss of control of registration / site resident database process due to potential high influx of populations, overcrowding, or exacerbated tensions along different group-affiliation lines that lead to situations of violence
 |
| **Likelihood: High** | **Impact**: **High** - Exposure of populations and humanitarian staff to risk of harm, inability to deliver assistance, loss of trust in humanitarian organizations and response.   |
| **Mitigation measures** | **Monitoring** | **Resources Required** | **Acceptable** |
| * Clear agreed messaging and dissemination on the purpose of the registration exercise / database to all relevant stakeholders, including IDPs, host communities, “gate-keepers” and authorities.
* Proactive and meaningful engagement and participation of authorities and “gate-keepers” throughout all planning and implementation stages.
* Ensure meaningful community engagement and participation from the start of the initiative, working closely and hand-to-hand with community leaders & committees throughout planning, preparation and implementation. Ensure community committees have 50% representation of women.
* Ensure registration process is well-organized including preliminary identification of sites through CCCM partners, as well as assessment of environment and security of registration locations.
 | * Close monitoring of power dynamics among different stakeholders involved, including working hand-in-hand with community-based committees and leaders

  | * Training of all staff on agreed messaging
* Staff directly supporting community engagement processes with committees and leaders

  | Yes   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk 3:** Exploitation and/or abuse of populations by humanitarian staff or “gate-keepers”, including SEA  |
| **Likelihood: High** | **Impact**: **High** - Direct harm on populations, loss of trust in humanitarian organizations and response.   |
| **Mitigation measures** | **Monitoring** | **Resources Required** | **Acceptable** |
| * Ensure a community-based feedback and complaint mechanism is in place and accessible to all population groups. Ensure wide and clear dissemination of CFM to populations, and that humanitarian staff responsible for the CFM are appropriately trained to receive and address cases.
* Ensure gender-balance of the registration teams, with at least 50% female staff.
* Ensure registration teams receive full training on Code of Conduct and PSEA. Both CoC and PSEA must be clearly included on all staff contracts.
* Work with community committees and ensure 50% representation of women
 | * Monitoring during registration, post registration, as well as any subsequent assistance response that follows as a result of the process.
 | * Mandatory training of all frontline staff on Code of Conduct and PSEA
 | Yes   |