

TECHNICAL ANNEX

SYRIA REGIONAL CRISIS

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2021/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

The activities proposed hereafter are subject to any terms and conditions that may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge	DG ECHO ¹ /C3
Contact persons at HQ	Team Leaders: Mamar MERZOUK (inside Syria): Mamar.MERZOUK@ec.europa.eu Matthew KEYES (Lebanon, Jordan): Matthew.KEYES@ec.europa.eu Desk Officer for Regional, Thematic and Operational Issues: Roxane HENRY: Roxane.HENRY@ec.europa.eu Syria: Joe GALBY: Joe.GALBY@ec.europa.eu Danielle KEULEN Danielle.KEULEN@ec.europa.eu Inaki AREVALO MILLET Inaki.MILLET@ec.europa.eu Dina SINIGALLIA: Dina.SINIGALLIA@ec.europa.eu Manuela FISCHANGER Manuela.FISCHANGER1@ec.europa.eu Lebanon: Kirsten NOBEN Kirsten.NOBEN@ext.ec.europa.eu Leire ALONSO VICINAY: Leire.ALONSO-VICINAY@ec.europa.eu Jordan: Magali LE-LIEVRE: Magali.LE-LIEVRE@ec.europa.eu
in the field	Syria Damascus and Cross-border Iraq: Olivier ROUSSELLE: Olivier.Rousselle@echofield.eu Olivier BEUCHER:

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
ECHO/SYR/BUD/2021/91000

Olivier.Beucher@echofield.eu

Vanessa MERLET:

Vanessa.Merlet@echofield.eu

Anna ORLANDINI

Anna.Orlandini@echofield.eu

Syria cross-border from Turkey:

Pedro-Luis ROJO-GARCIA:

Pedro-Luis.Rojo-Garcia@echofield.eu

Syria cross-border from Iraq :

Cedric PERUS

Cedric.Perus@echofield.eu

Lebanon:

Esmee DE-JONG:

Esmee.De-Jong@echofield.eu

Beatriz NAVARRO RUBIO

Beatriz.Navarro-Rubio@echofield.eu

Jordan:

Jean-Marc JOUINEAU:

Jean-Marc.Jouineau@echofield.eu

Branko GOLUBOVIC:

Branko.Golubovic@echofield.eu

Regional Office:

Yorgos KAPRANIS (Head of the Regional Office):

Yorgos.Kapranis@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: EUR 212 500 000 of which an indicative amount of EUR 23 500 000 for Education in Emergencies.

In line with DG ECHO's commitment to the Grand Bargain, pilot programmatic partnerships have been launched in 2020 with a limited number of partners (in direct management). An indicative amount of EUR 5 000 000 is earmarked for the second year of implementation of the programmatic partnership in the Syria Regional Crisis. What is more, new pilot programmatic partnerships could be envisaged with partners in indirect management. Part of this HIP may therefore be awarded to these new pilot programmatic partnerships.

Breakdown per Actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros):

² The Commission reserves the right not to award all or part of the funds made or to be made available under the HIP to which this Annex relates

Country(ies)	Action (a) Man-made crises and natural disasters	Action (b) Initial emergency response/sm all- scale/epidem ics	Action (c) Disaster Preparedness	Actions (d) to (f) Transport / Complemen- tary activities	TOTAL
SYRIA CRISIS	212 500 000				212 500 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

a) Co-financing:

Under the EU Financial Regulation, grants must involve co-financing; as a result, the resources necessary to carry out the action must not be provided entirely by the grant. An action may only be financed in full by the grant where this is essential for it to be carried out. In such a case, justification must be provided in the Single Form (section 10.4).

b) Financial support to third parties (implementing partners)

Pursuant to Art. 204 FR, for the implementation of actions under this HIP, partners may provide financial support to third parties, e.g. implementing partners. This financial support can only exceed EUR 60 000 if the objectives of the action would otherwise be impossible or excessively difficult to achieve. Such situations can occur in cases where only a limited number of non-profit non-governmental organisations have the capacity, skills or expertise to contribute to the implementation of the action or are established in the country of operation or in the region(s) where the action takes place.

Ensuring broad geographical/worldwide coverage while minimising costs and avoiding duplications concerning in particular presence in country, prompted many humanitarian organisations to network, e.g. through families or confederations. In such a context, the situations referred to above would imply that the partner would rely on other members of the network. In such cases, justification must be provided in the Single Form.

c) Alternative arrangements

In case of country or crisis-specific issues or unforeseeable circumstances which arise during the implementation of the action, the Commission (DG ECHO) may issue specific ad-hoc instructions which partners must follow. Partners may also introduce via the Single Form duly justified requests for alternative arrangements to be agreed by the Commission (DG ECHO) in accordance with Annex 5 to the Grant Agreement.

d) Field office costs

Costs for use of the field office during the action are eligible and may be declared as unit cost according to usual cost accounting practices, if they fulfil the general eligibility conditions for such unit costs and the amount per unit is calculated:

- i. using the actual costs for the field office recorded in the beneficiary's accounts, attributed at the rate of office use and excluding any cost which are ineligible or already included in other budget categories; the actual costs may be adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, if they are relevant for calculating the costs, reasonable and correspond to objective and verifiable information

and

- ii. according to usual cost accounting practices which are applied in a consistent manner, based on objective criteria, regardless of the source of funding.

3.1. Administrative info

Allocation round 2 SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 10 million
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions related to this assessment round: Support will focus on two priorities:
 1. providing emergency winterisation response to the most vulnerable populations in Syria (in pre-identified areas).
 2. addressing the humanitarian consequences of the water crisis in Syria, in particular on population centres and IDP camps or settlements with high reliance on water and sanitation systems affected by the low Euphrates River flow, supporting drought-resilient access to water and emergency WASH interventions, emergency food and nutrition interventions, and expansion of essential medical services as well as ICRC WASH response, notably rehabilitation of water infrastructure.Activities should be in line with the WHO Covid-19 Global Humanitarian Response Plan. Protection should be mainstreamed across all activities.
- c) Costs will be eligible from: 15/12/2021.³
- d) Eligible partners: pre-identified partners based on comparative advantage, expertise and presence.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form4
- f) Indicative deadline for submission of proposals: 20/12/2021.⁵

³ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

Allocation round 1 SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 130 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round *if it does not cover all the funding*.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2021⁶
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies as well as for pilot Programmatic Partnerships.
- e) Potential partners⁷: All DG ECHO Partners/Preselected partners:
[the related activities present specific characteristics that require a particular type of body on account of its technical competence, its high degree of specialization or its administrative power]
[the Action is part of a pilot Programmatic Partnership]
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁸
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 01/02/2021⁹

Allocation round 2 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 500 000
- b) Costs of new actions will be eligible from 01/01/2021.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 12 months. Modification requests, which would complement ongoing operations, should have a maximum time extension of up to 12 months and a total duration of the modified action of maximum 48 months.
- d) Support will focus on strengthening health services, vaccination, preparedness and response, as well as outbreak surveillance. Activities should be in line with the National Covid-19 Response Plan and WHO Covid-19 Global Humanitarian Response Plan. Protection should be mainstreamed across all activities.

⁵ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

⁶ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

⁷ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

⁸ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

⁹ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- e) In view of the need for immediate provision of assistance, their existing capacity to rapidly upscale ongoing activities, their proven expertise in the relevant sectors and their presence in the targeted areas, the following partners have been pre-selected:
- MEDAIR to scale-up the Covid-19 vaccination in areas with low coverage
 - WHO for outbreak surveillance, provision of medication, rapid testing and infection prevention and control (IPC) for emergency rooms
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form for a new proposal or modification request for an on-going DG-ECHO funded operation.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **13/08/2021**.

Allocation round 1 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 50 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round *if it does not cover all the funding*.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2021¹⁰
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies as well as for pilot Programmatic Partnerships.
- e) Potential partners¹¹: All DG ECHO Partners/Preselected partners:
[the related activities present specific characteristics that require a particular type of body on account of its technical competence, its high degree of specialization or its administrative power]
[the Action is part of a pilot Programmatic Partnership]
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 01/02/2021¹³

Allocation round 2 JORDAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000
- b) Costs of new actions will be eligible from 01/01/2021.

¹⁰ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

¹¹ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations..

¹² Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹³ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 12 months. Modification requests, which would complement ongoing operations, should have a maximum time extension of up to 12 months and a total duration of the modified action of maximum 48 months.
- d) Support will focus on the provision of Covid-19 related health services in the refugee camps and the provision of emergency cash assistance to households identified by the Covid-19 emergency response task force. Activities should be in line with the National Covid-19 Response Plan. Protection should be mainstreamed across all activities.
- e) In view of the need for immediate provision of assistance, their existing capacity to rapidly upscale ongoing activities, their proven expertise and their presence in the targeted areas, the following partners have been pre-selected:
 - UNHCR for the provision of Covid-19 related emergency cash assistance;
 - INTERSOS-IT for the provision of Covid-19 related health services in the camps through its implementing partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form for a new proposal or modification request for an on-going DG-ECHO funded operation.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **13/08/2021**.

Allocation round 1 JORDAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 15 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round *if it does not cover all the funding*.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2021¹⁴
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies, as well as for pilot Programmatic Partnerships.
- e) Potential partners¹⁵: All DG ECHO Partners/Preselected partners:
[the related activities present specific characteristics that require a particular type of body on account of its technical competence, its high degree of specialization or its administrative power]
[the Action is part of a pilot Programmatic Partnership]
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁶
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/02/2021¹⁷

¹⁴ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

¹⁵ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

¹⁶ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

1) Relevance

- How relevant is the proposed intervention and its compliance with the objectives of the HIP?
- Has the joint needs assessment been used for the proposed intervention (if existing)?
- Has the proposed intervention been coordinated with other relevant humanitarian actors?

2) Capacity and expertise

- Does the partner, with its implementing partners, have sufficient expertise (country / region and / or technical)?
- How good is the partner's local capacity / ability to develop local capacity?

3) Methodology and feasibility

- Quality of the proposed response strategy, including intervention logic / logframe, output & outcome indicators, risks and challenges.
- Feasibility, including security and access constraints.
- Quality of the monitoring arrangements.

4) Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements

- Extent to which the proposed intervention is to be implemented in coordination with other humanitarian actors and actions (including, where relevant, the use of single interoperable registries of beneficiaries).
- Extent to which the proposed intervention contribute to resilience and sustainability.

5) Cost-effectiveness/efficiency/transparency

- Does the proposed intervention display an appropriate relationship between the resources to employed, the activities to be undertaken and the objectives to be achieved?
- Is the breakdown of costs sufficiently documented/explained?¹⁸

In case of actions ongoing in the field, where DG ECHO is requested to fund the continuation thereof, a field visit may be conducted by DG ECHO field expert (TA) to determine the feasibility and quality of the follow-up action proposed.

¹⁷ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

¹⁸ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

No award will be made to NGO partner organisations which have not complied with their obligations concerning the submission of audited financial statements (i.e. which would not have submitted those in due time to the Commission without a proper justification) or which would appear not to offer sufficient guarantee as to their financial capacity to implement the proposed actions (in light of their liquidity and independency ratios as appearing from their latest available annual statutory accounts certified by an approved external auditor).

3.2.2. *Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:*

This section outlines the specific operational guidelines that DG ECHO partners need to take into account in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. It also lists and explains the assessment criteria – based on those outlined in section 3.2.1 - that DG ECHO will apply in the specific context of the HIP to which this Technical Annex relates when assessing proposals submitted in response to the related HIP.

The HIP Policy Annex should be consulted in parallel.

Where assistance is to be delivered in the form of cash transfers, particular attention will be paid to the principles laid down in DG ECHO's cash guidance note, which will form the basis for the assessment and selection of partners, in particular in the case of large-scale transfers. Partners will be expected to demonstrate a satisfactory efficiency ratio and, to the extent possible and taking into account the operational context, partners will be assessed on their ability to work based on common targeting criteria, single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework. In line with the cash guidance note, DG ECHO will expect partners to strive for segregation of duties and full transparency on the costs of implementation. Furthermore, partners should ensure that the efficiency ratio is maintained throughout the action, unless otherwise approved by DG ECHO. For the delivery of smaller-scale cash transfers, DG ECHO will assess proposals paying particular attention the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach.

SYRIA

Programming Priorities

DG ECHO 2021 strategy for Syria is built around three complementary approaches:

DG ECHO will continue to focus on responding to the life-saving needs and protection concerns of the most vulnerable persons inside Syria. In line with the need to ensure flexible and timely response to evolving needs in a volatile context, DG ECHO will continue to promote in-built multi-sectorial emergency response through its First Line Emergency Response (FLER) approach. Unpredictable context development may result in restricted humanitarian access. In order to ensure the effective continuity of services to beneficiaries, partners are encouraged to factor this risk in their response and plan for operational contingency/preparedness in line with DG ECHO's FLER approach. Remote management could also be considered where appropriate and where duly justified.

Consideration will also be given to the support of protracted needs of the most vulnerable people in under-served, newly accessible areas, areas with low level of access and areas with restrictive operational environment/prone to displacement, with a view to reach basic minimum standards and limit the risk of falling into life-threatening situations where no assistance would be provided.

Whenever possible and appropriate and with the aim to maximize the impact of humanitarian actions, more resilience-oriented activities aiming at building an integrated and gradual approach from emergency response to more sustainable early recovery programmes will also be considered.

In all situations described above, assistance must be delivered through the most appropriate, cost-effective and efficient modalities and entry points (including through enhanced partnership with local humanitarian actors), in a timely, principled and quality manner, ensuring the provision of integrated, flexible life-saving assistance as well as coordinated and targeted multi-sectorial life-sustaining or resilience-oriented response.

Proposed interventions should be context-specific, needs-based, underpinned by a well-defined situation and response analyses, access strategy, contingency/preparedness planning considerations clearly detailed and a sound risk analysis. Robust primary needs assessments – in addition to and complementing the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) – and continuous needs monitoring arrangements aimed at responding to changes in the operational context must be clearly outlined. Targeting based on needs and vulnerability criteria indicators will be also required.

Adherence to the humanitarian principles, including the Do No Harm principle, should remain a cornerstone for all proposals.

Holistic interventions based on a harmonized and coherent strategy for each sector of intervention and on a strong coordinated approach among implementing partners are strongly recommended.

In order to mitigate the root causes of vulnerability due to the protracted nature of the crisis, partners are encouraged to promote the restoration of local economies and markets by prioritizing local procurements and invest in local capacities. Robust monitoring mechanisms to ensure the quality of inputs should also be in place.

With the situation rapidly worsening in Syria, the spread of COVID-19 and its consequences must be properly taken into account in 2021. Mainstreaming possible COVID-related activities and appropriate mitigation measures in the different sectors, whenever relevant and feasible, is therefore recommended. Specific COVID activities could also be considered within each sector, with the aim to limit the negative impact of COVID-19 on the achievement of each sector outcome (refer to each sector thematic priorities further below).

Protection mainstreaming will remain of paramount importance to DG ECHO through all sectors of intervention. While this closely links to the 'do no harm' principle, it also includes prioritizing safety and dignity of beneficiaries and local populations, preventing causing and/or exacerbating harm, ensuring meaningful access, clear accountability, due diligence, genuine participation and empowerment. Partners must demonstrate the actual integration of these principles in all relevant sections of their proposals, in particular in the response strategy and in the logic of the intervention through relevant indicators. Particular attention should be given to the needs of people with disabilities (PwD). The inclusion of disability should be properly taken into account, in line with the core principles of accessibility, universal design and reasonable accommodation.

Harmonised standard operating procedures and data protection safeguards need to be in place in order to consult and inform beneficiaries on the use of the data.

Advocacy could be supported both at field level and in international fora where it is based on strong evidence and clear operational objectives. Partners willing to carry out advocacy initiatives must share a detailed advocacy plan providing information on the activities to be undertaken and under which timeframe, resources required for implementation, expected outcomes, as well as potential risks and mitigation measures to be put in place. Advocacy initiatives must be conducted in the best interests of beneficiaries and pursue clear humanitarian and protection objectives. Partners should develop realistic, achievable and concrete advocacy plans and objectives, as well as specify the level at which advocacy activities should be undertaken. Advocacy should primarily focus on key protection issues, including violations of International Humanitarian and Human Rights Laws (IHL and IHRL), issues related to humanitarian access, quality access, independent assessment, targeting and monitoring, protection of civilians including humanitarian workers and health staff, and civilian infrastructure such as schools and hospitals. Joint advocacy initiatives are also strongly encouraged (i.e. on behalf of a specific area or actors engaged in a specific sector).

Effective and transparent operational coordination, including inter-sector coordination - at community, hub and inter-hub levels - remains critical for all actions inside Syria and needs to be reflected in all funding proposals. Efforts to strengthen coordination could also be supported where justified. Within the overall country strategy, a multi-purpose response requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost-efficiency gains should be optimised through effective operational coordination platforms aiming at the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessments, targeting, joint delivery mechanisms and monitoring. These dimensions should be clearly addressed in all proposals with robust inter-sectoral and inter-agency referral capacities.

Efforts to strengthen partnerships with local and national implementing partners are recommended, including duly justified investments and capacity building activities, with the aim to better define the nature and scope of the partnership and to enhance local sustainable response capacity based on shared accountability and commitment to DG ECHO principles, management and monitoring arrangements, distinct budget lines and shared visibility obligations.

Accountability mechanisms should be enhanced through adequate Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) as well as Information Management (IM) capacities and systems aimed at quality evidence-based analysis and outcomes evaluation. Proper complaint and feedback mechanisms with multiple channels should be in place with adequate follow-up capacity.

While a standard duration of 12 months is recommended for emergency actions, longer actions could be considered where a different timeframe would be operationally justified and necessary to achieve the expected outcomes.

Thematic priorities

Humanitarian Food Assistance, Food Security and Livelihood

Considering the aggravating factors contributing to the deteriorating economic situation inside Syria, DG ECHO will consider inter-related food security interventions aiming at building an integrated approach and referral mechanism from emergency response to early recovery programmes and possibly up to livelihood interventions (through direct implementation or the strengthening of referral of beneficiaries between programmes) with strong harmonization and coordination within the sector and between sectors.

DG ECHO will consider different delivery modalities, including cash, voucher, e-voucher and in-kind, in responding to the basic needs of households. The modality of intervention must be justified through a sound and detailed decision tree analysis. Market assessments and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are strongly recommended as part of the situation and risk analyses. DG ECHO will favour interventions building on local production, procurement and markets, ensuring a strong monitoring of the quality of inputs, to stimulate local economies. When conditions are met, DG ECHO recommends Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) as the default modality of intervention, to ensure appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency as well as the dignity of beneficiaries. Risk mitigation measures should be strengthened, with appropriate tracking and digitalization of MPCA to enhance transparency, accountability and harmonization of the response. Partners are also encouraged to develop inter-operable, non-proprietary, digitalized beneficiary platforms in a way that is safe, secure and improves humanitarian programming through enhanced accountability and within an effective multi-sectorial referral mechanism, taking into account data responsibility standards and procedures.

The harmonization of robust needs-based targeting system to reach the most vulnerable households, based on integrated socio-economic criteria and protection indicators, is strongly recommended. Clear justification needs to be provided where a blanket approach is proposed (e.g. for sudden onset emergency).

Partners are encouraged to propose multi-sectorial, integrated programmes, with enhanced cross-sector coordination and effective internal and external referral mechanisms. Partners should consider linking food security and livelihood interventions with other sectors such as Protection, Health, Nutrition, Education in Emergencies, including immediate practical activities towards adequate maternal, child feeding and care practices.

Partners should clearly identify the gaps in terms of basic needs and include relevant Key Objective Indicators (KOIs), Key Result Indicators (KRIs) as well as Grand Bargain Multi-Purpose Cash Outcome Indicators. Partners should also be able to demonstrate the capacity to report on SMART outcome indicators in terms of basic needs improvement, preferably aligned with Food Security and Livelihoods (FSL) Cluster recommendations.

1. Emergency Assistance: Within an integrated and multi-sectorial approach aiming to cover basic needs, food assistance interventions will be prioritised to ensure immediate access to the necessary food commodities aimed at meeting recommended (SPHERE standards) kilocalorie and nutritional requirements as a life-saving response to severe, transitory food insecurity. Assistance should be delivered preferably as part of an integrated and comprehensive response to cover basic needs, as defined by the Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket (SMEB/MEB) and aiming for greater efficiency and effectiveness. Timeliness of the response must be ensured. In principle, such response should be supported for a period of up to three months, with a clear indication of integration or referral of targeted caseload to more durable, appropriate solutions whenever feasible.
2. Life-sustaining Multi-Purpose Assistance: Following emergency or within protracted post-emergency setting, these interventions should aim at ensuring immediate response to the most urgent and basic needs, as defined by the SMEB/MEB. Timeframe and targeting should be defined and aligned with the joint FSL Cluster and Cash Working Group recommendations. Any conditionality proposed should be duly justified according to the specific vulnerabilities of the targeted group and to other sectoral priorities.

3. Emergency Livelihood: These interventions should aim at reducing beneficiaries' dependency on humanitarian assistance and at promoting increased access to markets by restoring and/or protecting livelihoods, productive assets and incomes of targeted households. Emergency livelihood programming should be integrated from the start of the emergency response, with proper internal and external referral systems. Activities could include facilitating the access to productive assets and inputs; strengthening livelihood opportunities that promote the restoration of the most promising value chains in terms of market access and sustainability, as well as restoration of assets; promotion of effective income generating activities and creation of new economic opportunities in urban and rural areas. DG ECHO encourages robust targeting of individuals benefitting from life-saving and life-sustaining assistance who have the capacities to move from their aid dependency. These more sustainable early recovery interventions should contribute to boost the stability and sustainability of local markets and economies. The use of cash as main modality of intervention will be prioritised.

Protection

DG ECHO places the protection of affected populations at the centre of its response, and protection service delivery as a priority, whether at individual or community level. Considering that direct service delivery might require further capacities, DG ECHO can consider developing those capacities through capacity building components where duly justified. With a view to ensure that the response is timely, efficient and effective, DG ECHO also promotes the assessment of the impact of interventions, assessing the quality of services and the relevance of the proposed action.

The impact of COVID-19 on protection service delivery has been tangible throughout 2020. In 2021, responses to protection needs should also take into account potential heightened risks for women and children due to confinement or isolation due to quarantines/lockdown. A particular focus should be paid to ensure that potential at risk groups are able to access protection services. Interventions could therefore be designed in the form of stand-alone protection actions or integrated protection actions. DG ECHO partners are expected to provide details on how their protection activities may overcome or mitigate challenges triggered by COVID-19 in 2021.

It is important to highlight that considering the limited coverage of specialised protection services in Syria, DG ECHO could also consider a community-based protection approach and the roll out and the strengthening of specialised protection services, including those to address complex cases.

Specific activities proposed must be based on up-to-date and comprehensive protection risk analysis as well as demonstrated capacities and expertise to provide quality services following a Do No Harm approach. These dimensions must be explicitly described in all funding proposals. Further, partners are expected to contribute to a comprehensive service mapping and referral mechanism within their specific areas of intervention.

In order to ensure adequate service provision and in locations where a thorough risk analysis has been conducted, DG ECHO could also consider cash assistance as part of specialised service provision, for example as a part of the case management process. Cash within protection interventions will only be considered when the partner can demonstrate that a protection outcome from the use of cash can be guaranteed.

Where appropriate, partners should ensure linkages with other relevant sectors, such as Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) and Psycho-Social Support (PSS) within Health

interventions, Child Protection and case management - or referral to specialised services - within Education in Emergencies programmes, security of tenure within Shelter interventions, etc. Linkages should include cross-sectorial referrals.

Specific protection interventions which can be considered include, among others:

Prevention and response to violence: Assistance to victims of any kind of violence, including SGBV. All proposed activities should entail, as a minimum, identification, referral and basic response and consider safety options for survivors. Particular modalities which can be supported include:

- Case management for SGBV survivors (full package, including conflict related SGBV prevention activities and legal awareness);
- Psycho-Social Support (PSS) to enhance the well-being of individuals and communities. Activities for both individuals and at community level could be supported. All PSS activities must demonstrate an improvement in well-being through relevant and SMART indicators.

Child Protection: Partners willing to engage in child protection activities must have demonstrated capacities in adequate child protection case management inside Syria, in line with international child protection case management guidelines and child safeguarding measures.

- For children at risks: case-management, including Best Interest Assessment (BIA) and alternative care arrangements (where possible) as well as family tracing and reunification to the extent possible. Unaccompanied and separated children/minors (UAMs) are a particularly vulnerable category.
- For children in other situations of neglect or abuse: community-based interventions and case management.
- Assistance to children engaged in armed forces or armed groups (CAFAAG), activities which involve engagement and dialogue on prevention of child recruitment and child reintegration could be supported.
- Specialised services for complex child protection cases will be considered where partners can demonstrate adequate access and capacity to deliver a quality intervention.

Humanitarian Mine Action

- Considering the degree of contamination by Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) – such as landmines, Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs) and Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) - a comprehensive approach to Humanitarian Mine Action will be considered. This can include humanitarian demining/removal, assessment, mapping and marking, as well as assistance to victims. Risk Education and information on contamination will be considered either as a stand-alone project or as part of an integrated programme. A particular focus will be put on clearance activities and victims' assistance wherever partners have the expertise and ability to do so. Coordination with relevant actors/stakeholders must be ensured. Transition towards longer-term support instruments must also be explored and promoted.
- Awareness-raising will be prioritised and should include basic information on risks, as well as service provision. Moreover, any information sharing and/or basic counselling

activities during emergency phases that focus on providing awareness on potential risks will be prioritised.

Access to documentation:

- Registration;
- Family tracing and reunification;
- Access to civil documentation (among others) and legal assistance. House Land and Propriety-related interventions (HLP) will not be covered by DG ECHO protection funding. HLP considerations must however be taken into account and properly integrated in all shelter and CCCM programmes.

Information Management (IM) such as, but not limited to, population movement tracking, including returns, protection monitoring and protection assessment. Beyond the quantitative data gathering on displacement and return, DG ECHO prioritises quality analyses of movements, needs and gaps, as well as service mapping initiatives that could be undertaken in areas of need, with a view to inform humanitarian programming. Coordination of IM tools and initiatives are essential in such a volatile context.

Emphasis on the **dissemination and compliance with IHL and IHRL**, including activities related to mobilisation and persuasion. Advocacy actions related to IHL could be also considered by DG ECHO. A detailed advocacy plan, including key expected outcomes, must be provided.

For people deprived of their liberty:

- Monitoring of detention conditions will be supported for partners engaging in response to detention. Partners should consider activities which contribute to maintain family links.
- Provision of basic services or protection specific services in detention conditions and to others deprived of their liberty.
- Specific Mental Health/Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS) interventions targeting victims of torture and abuse, including people deprived of their liberty.

Health

DG ECHO will consider actions aiming at improving access to quality basic health services for the most vulnerable population, including war-wounded victims, and ensuring continuity of services.

Specifically:

- Comprehensive Primary Health Care (PHC), following the Essential Primary Health Care Package as defined by the Health Cluster. This includes the provision of services for communicable diseases but also preventive and cost-efficient care for non-communicable diseases. Maternal and childcare should be addressed, including Ante- and Post-Natal Care (ANC/PNC) as well as screening and ensuring access to treatment for acute under-nutrition. Mobile clinics should be complementary to health facilities as last resort.
- Coordinated scale up of accessible and sustainable mental health services, supporting MH-GAP, and community-based approach should be enhanced.

- Emergency, life-saving and comprehensive medical care for war wounded, including first line response, trauma, surgical, psychological, post-operative and rehabilitation services. It may include strengthening referrals, ambulances and dispatch systems. Services targeting war victims should include early prevention/treatment of disabilities and address the needs of Persons with Disabilities (PwDs).
- Comprehensive care for victims of GBV, both male and female, including Clinical Management of Rape (CMR) and Psycho-Social Support (PSS), should be integrated as much as possible in all proposed health facilities.
- The functionality and contribution to both disease surveillance systems (EWARN and/or EWARS) should be systematically assessed and reinforced if needed.
- Partners should ensure that WASH and Protection considerations are duly integrated within Health services, respecting the Do No Harm principle (i.e. medical waste & PPEs/IPC for HFs staff). All health facilities should be inclusive, particularly for people with special needs, including Persons with Disabilities (PwDs).
- Procurement and provision of health supplies must follow DG ECHO rules and regulations, ensuring their quality.
- Measures to address shortage of qualified medical staff such as capacity building can also be considered.
- In the context of COVID-19, the impact and consequences on health provision and workforce need to be closely monitored. While WHO's eight pillars strategy remains relevant to properly address the identified critical gaps, DG ECHO also recommends to integrate any activity related to the pandemic response in the overall health provision, mainly for reasons of cost-efficiency.
- DG ECHO priority will remain to ensure the continuity of services and access to health facilities. A strong focus on IPC measures for health care providers is essential.

WaSH, Shelter and Settlements

DG ECHO will prioritise proposals clearly embedding an integrated programming approach, targeting emergency life-saving humanitarian needs, and based on linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter, CCCM and Protection. This includes supporting emergency life-saving responses, with the ability to rapidly transition to more durable life-sustaining interventions or more cost-effective provision of basic services.

Costs in WaSH, Shelter and NFIs interventions need to be justified according to technical specifications and including minimum quantity and quality standards as per international guidelines (e.g. SPHERE standards).

Against the backdrop of the COVID-19 outbreak, DG ECHO priority is to ensure the continuity of services and reduce the virus transmission. DG ECHO funded activities need to be adjusted and if needed expanded accordingly.

Safe water supply

- Community level light rehabilitation, repairs of existing water supply services and operation and maintenance, integrating community participation and ownership. Rehabilitation of water infrastructure should be supported by a quality assurance mechanism that includes needs and damages assessments, a description of required works (based on damages) and costs estimates. More detailed documentation in terms of technical designs, technical specifications, and related BoQ will have to be provided

before the execution of works and will be regularly verified by DG ECHO at the monitoring stage. Partners should also provide Water Safety Plans (WSP), Operation and Maintenance plans (O&M), as well as what is foreseen in order to strengthen technical capacity at local level. Requirements for power (energy needs) to operate any water network should be specified and considered in O&M plans. Small-scale extension of water systems can be considered based on identification of critical needs, feasibility and cost-efficiency analysis. Partners must demonstrate their capacity to assess the impact of investments to water systems, by providing data related to improvement of access and availability based on pre- and post-implementation status of the system. A mapping of the water infrastructure should be provided in order to justify the choice and area of intervention. Support of O&M activities will be considered based on feasibility, sustainability and Do No Harm approach.

- Water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort response and with a defined exit strategy. Partners are encouraged to explore alternative options to water trucking (e.g. rain water harvesting systems, boreholes, WSP focus on ensuring safe, drinkable water throughout the safe water chain, from source to point of consumption), and invest in such solutions to reduce the overall dependency on water trucking, while ensuring better cost-efficiency and sustainability of the intervention. No water trucking activities will be accepted without a water quality monitoring protocol.
- Transport and storage solutions, also at household level, could also be considered.
- Innovative alternatives (reverse osmosis systems, solar energies, etc.) could be supported where no other water solution is possible, and in case of chemical contamination. Coverage, costs and effectiveness of this type of system will be analysed on a case-by-case basis.

Sanitation

- Sanitation interventions in camps will be prioritised, provided that emergency needs are demonstrated. A maintenance plan should be included in all funding proposals. Community incentives could be considered for maintenance and cleaning of sanitation facilities, where duly justified.
- Waste water management and/or solid waste management can be supported, where partners can demonstrate its direct relation to life-threatening health conditions and risks such as communicable diseases.
- While stand-alone Hygiene Promotion (HP) activities will not be considered, they may be considered within a water and sanitation project if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonised messages and communication channels in line with the country-specific WASH Cluster guideline.

Hygiene kits

Distribution of hygiene items through different modalities (in-kind, cash or vouchers) will be considered in case of emergency needs (e.g. new displacements) and based on targeting of the most vulnerable households. Clear justifications need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed (e.g. large sudden emergency).

Shelter, NFIs and winterization

For Shelter/NFIs and winterization, emergency interventions will be prioritised. Partners will have to demonstrate their ability to target the most vulnerable households within a given community, even in emergency settings and responses. Clear justification must be provided where a blanket approach would be proposed (e.g. sudden onset emergency).

Specifically, Shelter/NFIs and winterization support will be prioritised for:

- CCCM support to camps, informal settlements and collective centres;
- Distribution of tents, sealing-off kits, shelter kits (related tools and material) for recently displaced persons;
- Distribution of NFIs will be considered where grounds for emergency response are demonstrated. Actions must prioritise support to operations which target the most vulnerable households with clearly identified humanitarian needs. Funding proposals should foster the integration between NFIs/hygiene kits distribution and other sectors (inter-sectorial coordination and integration).
- Light repairs of individual buildings and houses aiming at accommodating the most vulnerable families could be considered where those are clearly life-saving and small scale. Funding proposals should clearly mention the average cost of light rehabilitation per shelter or unit, which cannot exceed the cost per family defined by the Shelter/NFIs Cluster guidelines. The selection of buildings/houses should be based on specific vulnerability criteria, protection considerations and not be status-based. Light repairs of the building where the selected individual houses are located and light interventions of some collective spaces in the area of intervention could be considered if duly justified under protection and safe access concerns.
- Light rehabilitation of collective shelters could also be considered if duly justified by the emergency nature of the crisis and provided that sustained access to the shelters is assured. Considering the COVID-19 outbreak, collective shelters should be considered as last resort. Activities supporting the adequate social distancing and the decongestion of over-crowded shelters and sites should be prioritised.
- Integrated transitional shelter may be considered in context of protracted displacement as pilot projects based on feasibility, HLP, and cost/benefits analysis.

Housing, Land and Property (HLP) rights must be integrated and considered all along shelter interventions.

Conditions/damage assessment and measures to accommodate the needs of people with special needs (including PwDs and reflecting gender specific needs) must be included and addressed in the proposal. For any cash/voucher modality targeting shelter, NFIs and winterization needs, a clear and detailed plan is required (including market analysis, quality and availability of items, post distribution monitoring, etc.). The overall cost per family or individual should not exceed that defined by the Shelter/NFIs/winterization cluster guidelines.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO's support will target out-of-school children (OOSC) and children already enrolled in formal education but at risk of dropping out with the aim to promote their (re)integration, attendance and retention in formal education, while ensuring a safe and effective access to schools.

Partners must propose tailored Non-Formal Education (NFE) activities which are adapted to each child specific learning and academic needs in order to provide the most relevant

pathways (in terms of type and duration of the support) to enter, re-enter or stay in the formal education system, while also focusing on the effective performance of children in school. Where Non-Formal Education is not needed, OOSC should be supported to directly access formal school.

NFE support may include catch-up classes, Accelerated Learning Programmes (ALP), homework or remedial support, self-learning activities, or any course designed to meet the needs of targeted beneficiaries. Innovative monitoring tools to ensure proper education outcomes follow up should be systematically integrated into programming. Moreover, DG ECHO will support activities that help beneficiaries to receive proper certification of education (e.g. support to successfully pass grade 9 and grade 12 examinations, including access to official placement test). Efforts towards continuation of education and transition from non-formal to formal schools must be demonstrated, also as part of phase out (e.g. through clear mapping and corresponding support of pathways). DG ECHO may consider NFE activities for adolescents who have been out of school for a long period of time and/or who cannot enter formal education, with the objective of ensuring literacy and numeracy at least at minimum standard. Partners are encouraged to create synergies with livelihood programmes and establish internal and/or external referrals to ensure access of these beneficiaries to livelihood opportunities. Funding proposals must detail how such referral would be conducted, including proper mapping (availability, eligibility, relevance, etc.) and follow-up.

Coordination with other Education actors (including Cluster/Working Group and relevant Education authorities) should be strengthened in order to identify harmonized and coherent criteria and activities in terms of pathways to formal education, including harmonized curricula, targeting and payment of teachers' incentives, and continuity of education opportunities. DG ECHO may consider direct support to coordination structures at top level where capacities are limited, and needs are identified.

In light of the challenges and delays faced in obtaining required approvals to conduct NFE activities, partners are expected to include in their funding proposals contingency planning, as well as a detailed description of technical and operation preparatory activities to ensure the smooth implementation of the planned activities.

The spread of COVID-19 has posed an additional constraint to Education and to the capacity to ensure continuity of learning. Partners are therefore encouraged to propose effective alternative modalities, including but not limited to blended or home-based learning, also through investments in teachers' and care-givers' capacity to deal with these additional challenges. Piloting of innovative approaches that can be applicable to different scenarios where access to schools is limited is also encouraged. Within the specific context of COVID-19, stand-alone rehabilitation to ensure sufficient social distance as well as rehabilitation of WASH facilities and provision of hygiene supplies should be considered. Similarly, with the aim to provide a safe school package in the context of COVID-19, teacher training may also be proposed along with light rehabilitation in order to strengthen teachers capacity to deal with the health, protection and education aspects related to the outbreak.

Convergent and comprehensive programming is recommended unless justified by a sound need assessment. If this is the case, DG ECHO may consider stand-alone education interventions when a clear education outcome in terms of reintegration and effective access can be demonstrated and when barriers to access to education can be addressed based on specific identified needs.

The following activities may therefore be proposed within a more comprehensive NFE approach or as stand-alone activities, if duly justified and with due consideration of conflict sensitivity:

- Light repairs (i.e. not related to structural damages) of school facilities/learning spaces and rehabilitation of basic WASH services. Stand-alone rehabilitation can be justified provided that it is needed to ensure a minimum standard of safety and protection for children returning to school as well as sufficient available space. Light repair of school facilities/learning spaces should be supported by a quality assurance mechanism that includes detailed technical documents, notably needs and damages assessment, cost estimates, description of works. More detailed documentation in terms of BoQ will have to be provided before the execution of works and will be regularly verified by DG ECHO at monitoring stage.
- Provision of teaching and learning package for children and teachers involved in NFE activities. Stand-alone provision may be considered where the lack of such materials would constitute a barrier to reintegration and access and if duly justified. The content of this package should be properly specified in the proposal.
- Cash for Education or the inclusion of Education costs in the Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket may be considered where a needs assessment demonstrates that cash is appropriate in addressing financial and access barriers to Education (including transport to reach schools/learning spaces) and when the partner can demonstrate the outcome of the provision of cash on school reintegration, attendance and retention of beneficiaries. Cash for education activities must be based on sound and contextualised technical analysis, due coordination, including with the Cash Working Group and Education Cluster, Do No Harm, and demonstrated efforts towards inclusion in Education (based on a comprehensive response to identified barriers) and sustained education participation after phase-out.
- Training of teachers involved in NFE activities to strengthen their capacity (including technical, pedagogical) to deliver EiE or Child Protection activities could be supported. Longer-term support to teachers and activities focused on teachers well-being could also be considered.

Integration of Child Protection activities will be an essential prerequisite to all Education actions, including Psycho-Social Support (PSS), social/emotional support, documentation support and where possible case management or referral pathways for children in need of specialised services where those cannot be provided by the partner. It is expected education actors to have robust internal and external referral mechanisms to detect children at risk.

DG ECHO will support the roll-out of the Safe Schools Declaration to protect education from attack. This may involve partnership with non-education actors to prevent occupation of learning spaces and attacks on education facilities and actors. Coordinated support to develop evidence-based approaches to address attacks on Education will be considered.

Partners should also be able to identify any protection risk (including humanitarian demining) which prevents safe access to schools/learning spaces and propose alternative solutions, including safe schools and safe routes to or from schools. Support to emergency action plans or contingency plans that include Education in areas affected by active conflict and population displacement will be considered.

First Line Emergency Response

Partners may consider to include within their action a separate emergency Result on *First Line Emergency Response* (FLER) under the DG ECHO sector Disaster Risk Reduction/Disaster Preparedness. This FLER Result will aim to respond to newly emergency needs through the provision of life-saving multi-sectorial assistance.

This Result should:

- Be designed to provide an early life-saving multi-sectorial and flexible assistance in the direct aftermath of a rapid onset crisis;
- Be based on an Emergency Preparedness and Response plan, considering pre-positioning of stocks and resources, process for decision-making, triggers for engagement/disengagement, activities, and sectors of intervention;
- Duration should be limited in time and be triggered within a few days from the alert;
- Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness. Partners should adopt standardised indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver assistance.

This Result can be activated in two situations:

1. Selected areas of intervention where a DG ECHO Action is already ongoing: in case of sudden emergency needs not directly covered by the DG ECHO action, the activation of the FLER modality will allow to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources to be deployed;
2. Pre-identified areas where emergencies could occur and where the partner could have access in case of sudden emergencies.

Within the specific context of COVID-19, partners willing to include the FLER Result in their funding proposals should also consider the possibility to activate it to respond to unexpected emergency needs related to the spread of the virus (for example through the distribution of hygiene supplies).

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Information Management (IM)

DG ECHO will only consider proposals paying particular attention to M&E and IM components that both build upon and help improve existing capabilities and systems in accordance with guidelines and standards adopted by inter-agency working groups. In this respect, M&E and IM tools should be:

- Harmonized and compatible in order to enable IM and M&E systems to produce comparable information and data.
- Time-sensitive, in order to allow for appropriate analysis of information/data, early emergency response, and decision-making when and where programme adjustments are required, as well as the development of a solid base of lessons learnt that should feedback into the programme cycle and help inform longer-term strategies. Efficient and cost-effective, making full use of existing capacities and technical/technological resources. The use of new, additional capabilities or resources must be clearly justified.

LEBANON

Programming priorities

Building on the objectives set out in previous DG ECHO strategies, programming priorities in 2021 will aim to keep strengthening the protection space and dignity of refugees seeking safety in Lebanon. Within this context, the strategy will be an integral part of the broader EU response in Lebanon, designed in synergy with interventions funded under other EU instruments.

In 2021, DG ECHO will build upon the operational response implemented under the HIP 2020, further strengthening the focus on protection, integrated and multi-sectorial

approaches as well as evidenced-based humanitarian analysis and advocacy. The 2021 strategy will continue to focus on two key programmatic pillars:

- a. Protracted basic needs – through Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) to address the compounding impact of the acute economic and inflation crisis and the COVID-19 outbreak and related containment measures on the socio-economic vulnerability of the most vulnerable refugees;
- b. Acute and sudden needs – through integrated multi-sectorial response to address needs at community, household and individual levels. Specific protection programming will be favoured for targeting specific individuals facing protection threats or vulnerabilities.

Partners should demonstrate the cost effectiveness of the proposed actions through enhanced synergies and adequate coordination and pooling of resources with other actors. Accountability towards affected populations will also need to be demonstrated, including through protection mainstreaming.

Protection mainstreaming will remain of paramount importance to DG ECHO – in all sectors and objectives. While this closely links to the 'do no harm' principle, it also includes prioritising safety and dignity of beneficiaries and local populations, preventing causing and/or exacerbating harm, ensuring meaningful access, clear accountability, due diligence, genuine participation and empowerment. Partners must demonstrate the actual integration of these principles in all relevant sections of their proposals, in particular in the response strategy and logic of the intervention sections and indicators.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the Beirut Port blasts in the country have also borne an important impact on the health sector; the provision of health services is being addressed by the international instruments mobilised in the country to respond to the increasing needs. Close monitoring of access to healthcare will remain crucial in 2021, in order to respond to critical gaps deriving from the crises.

Thematic priorities

Multi-Purpose Assistance

DG ECHO considers multi-purpose cash assistance (MPCA) to be the most effective modality of addressing chronic, structural socio-economic vulnerabilities in Lebanon. DG ECHO will continue to enhance the MPCA response in Lebanon, in line with the Grand Bargain commitments and the DG ECHO Cash guidance note. The principles of efficiency and cost-effectiveness, accountability and protection, as well as consistent governance and sound operational structure are key elements to ensure that the needs of beneficiaries remain central to the response. Integration of critical learning from the ongoing Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) work should be duly considered in the overall design of any MPCA action.

The current Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance scheme will be updated and adjusted in 2021, aiming to safeguard the most vulnerable from resorting to irreversible coping strategies, while building a progressive transition towards more sustainable funding schemes and livelihood strategies. To ensure an effective transition, DG ECHO will focus on strengthening the coordination among concerned stakeholders, as well as further review and fine-tune technical aspects of the ongoing action. Such aspects include recalibration and targeting, reduction of inclusion/exclusion errors, review of the Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket (SMEB) and transfer value, Accountability to Affected Populations

(AAP), strengthening referral pathways between the MPCA and basic service provision (health, WaSH, protection, etc.), to improve outcomes by providing a holistic package.

Considering the compounding socio-economic impacts resulting from the ongoing economic meltdown, coupled with the COVID-19 crisis and the Beirut Port blasts, it will be paramount to reinforce vulnerability analysis, in order to allow a clear distinction of the most severely vulnerable. Close monitoring of currency and market price volatility, as well as impact of subsidy removal from key commodities and market supply chains will remain essential. Risk mitigation and/or stopgap measures should be factored to avert the impact on the beneficiaries' purchasing power.

Stand-alone, sector-specific cash assistance could be considered, based on sound technical justification, Do no Harm principle and prior consultation with DG ECHO. Specific attention should be paid to cash-for-rent subsidies (shelter sector), as vulnerable households whose houses were destroyed by the Beirut explosions report extremely high needs in this sector.

Integrated and multi-sectoral response to acute and sudden needs

While structural and chronic needs will be addressed by the Basic Needs Assistance programme through close coordination and synergies with other EU instruments, DG ECHO will prioritise coordinated, inter-sectorial and integrated projects that address acute and urgent needs.

Humanitarian response must be comprehensive and integrated. It must be anchored to a strong context analysis of hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities. This analysis should specifically consider both external threats to the target population as well as community's coping strategies, while balancing any protection concern. Based on this risk analysis, DG ECHO partners must propose integrated and multi-sectorial responses at community and household levels, ideally where protection actions contribute to addressing needs in other sectors and where other sector actions mitigate or increase resilience to protection risks. Supported actions should also demonstrate capacities to adapt and respond to arising sudden shocks or proven deterioration into emergency situations.

Humanitarian engagement and advocacy remain essential for DG ECHO. Partners are expected to engage in strong analysis and advocacy through their action, aiming at strengthening effectiveness and accountability of the humanitarian response at all levels.

Effective coordination is essential and must be demonstrated by partners through their active engagement in the existing coordination mechanisms, and by effectively building programmatic synergies and complementarities.

Protection

Focus on protection is a key feature of DG ECHO's strategy in Lebanon, with a view to provide refugees with improved access to protection, legal assistance and quality services. Protection monitoring will only be considered when it provides an evidence-based trend analysis and informs direct programming. Protection monitoring should also provide the basis for coordinated advocacy efforts, whether by individual organisations or through coordination mechanisms. Protection monitoring activities should always be complemented by protection response activities, most notably the provision of information on existing services and referrals for cases in need of specialised services. Sudden rapid protection assessment capacity can be considered depending on the area of intervention/future developments.

Protection interventions will be supported through the following modalities:

- Legal assistance – provision of specific legal protection services, including access to documentation, legal assistance and counselling when based on sound identification of needs, determination of the most appropriate response modality and through demonstrated legal capacities in the Lebanon context.
- Case management protection services will be considered when based on an individual protection assessment and where in line with international case management guidelines. Community activities as an entry point may be considered if there is a correlation with identification of cases for further case management specialised services.
- Accompaniment services will be considered when they are targeted at groups or individuals with specific vulnerabilities (elderly, disabled, etc.) and indicate a demonstrated protection outcome. Accompaniment services need to be strongly anchored in an analysis of how the accompaniment increases access to a protection service. Protection staff capacities within accompaniment services need to be demonstrated by partners, to include a holistic service provision.
- Psychosocial support activities will be supported where partners can demonstrate specific needs in a location or issues of access to MHPSS services. PSS activities must be based on a structure that allows the partner to actually measure improvements in well-being (including outcome /output level indicators). PSS activities can be delivered to both individuals and groups. Activities will only be supported for partners with demonstrated capacities in PSS, including capacities to run integrated programmes. Partners providing PSS activities also need to demonstrate referrals to MH services have been documented and established, if possible.
- Refugee recording and verification activities will be supported, as well as underlying evidence-based analysis linked to performance of related activities (effectiveness, accountability), taking into account the link between refugee status, vulnerability and timely access to humanitarian assistance.

Use of cash in protection programming must have a clear protection outcome and will not be supported unless embedded within one of the above modalities (legal assistance/case management or accompaniment) and within a wider comprehensive and integrated protection response. Protection outcomes for cash assistance need to be documented through a protection risk analysis (per case) and through rigorous follow up. Mitigation of risks due to cash provision also need to be reflected in any protection cash assistance activity.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

Specific needs of the most vulnerable out-of-school children will be addressed through quality and appropriate non-formal education activities. Targeted efforts must be demonstrated to ensure integration of children into formal education or, if/as applicable, other resilience pathways. Activities in this sector should complement and in principle be integrated with multi-sector response that will tackle barriers to education from several angles (e.g. legal or economic). All EiE actions should include child protection response, including referrals to and from protection activities, and the provision of psycho-social support for children. Strong monitoring of education and protection outcomes is required. All interventions must integrate COVID-19 response. Proposals must be compliant with education sector policies, and ensure due coordination with relevant stakeholders for

complementarities and synergies, including the Cluster/Working Group and Education Cannot Wait. Evidence-based analysis must be built into EiE programming to allow for advocacy on barriers and risks (complete with dialogue, where appropriate, with nexus/development stakeholders).

Coordination and advocacy

DG ECHO will support coordination and advocacy mechanisms if operationalised within integrated and coordinated strategic partnership frameworks. Development of robust information management systems will be supported if they lead to informed programming decisions and evidence-based advocacy. In this regard, coordination should be essentially articulated as a structural means to improve the timeliness, inclusiveness, transparency and connectedness of proposed actions within existing coordination set-ups. Advocacy will be supported when it is based on evidence collected through DG ECHO-funded programming. Partners wishing to engage in advocacy should be prepared to submit an advocacy plan that is able to provide more information on key issues, messaging, target audience, tools, expected outcomes, potential risks and mitigation measures.

JORDAN

Programming priorities

The COVID-19 pandemic and the Government of Jordan stringent coping measures have contributed to the further deterioration of the humanitarian situation, in particular for the most vulnerable people including among refugees and host communities. As a result, and despite the protracted nature of the crisis and the opening to transitional/Nexus paths, humanitarian aid remains vital in certain niche interventions and sectors.

DG ECHO's priorities in 2021 will continue to focus on the provision of timely, adequate and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas, to refugees living in camps and/or in hosting communities and to vulnerable Jordanians based on vulnerability assessments. In 2021, DG ECHO will support the following thematic priorities:

Thematic priorities

Protection

Protection should be addressed systematically in all proposals, preferably as part of an integrated programming approach. DG ECHO could consider activities aiming at:

- Providing support to civil and legal documentation with a view to enable refugees to access services.
- Providing specialised protection services for vulnerable individuals or groups at risk due to specific discrimination or risk factors.
- Related advocacy (including keeping a focus on unregistered refugees).

Proposed target groups for the intervention could include people living in transit centres, camps, host communities as well as those stranded at the Berm.

DG ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions among the following:

At the Berm and in transit centres:

- Advocacy for refugees' access to the Jordanian territory, prevention of refoulement as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to asylum seekers and refugees;
- Advocacy for durable solution for those stranded at the Berm.

In camp settings:

- Activities to ensure that a robust screening and referral system is in place to capture and track all types of protection cases; follow-up of referred cases ensuring access to services needed;
- Advocacy towards camp management and relevant authorities to expedite refugees' screening in Azraq camp, thus guaranteeing freedom of movement and access to the necessary services including basic needs, health and protection;
- While GBV issues should be addressed, related services must be integrated within Reproductive Health (RH) services where possible.
- Specialised protection services to children – such services should focus on particularly at risk children and should be provided by partners with demonstrated capacities and according to international guidelines.

In host communities:

- Provision of protection services, especially for refugees lacking proper documentation and/or registration, to enable access to all available services;
- Address legal support and/or accompaniment of protection cases beyond basic legal advice;
- Specialised protection services to specific at-risk groups – such services should focus on particularly at-risk groups or individuals and should be provided by partners with demonstrated capacities and according to international guidelines.

Health

Since 2019, Syrian refugees can access health services in hospitals and health centres run by the Ministry of Health at the same price as non-insured Jordanians, on the condition that they can demonstrate holding both UNHCR documentation and a registration card from the Ministry of Interior. Similarly, in August 2020, the Government has announced that non-Syrian refugees will have equal access to health care as Syrian refugees. Against that background, DG ECHO will consider funding specific health interventions among the following:

In host communities

- Specific interventions could be proposed for immediate life-saving needs in specific locations or where critical gaps in essential healthcare service provision for refugees and the most vulnerable Jordanians are identified.

In camp settings

- Proposals ensuring that refugees, including newly arrived ones, have direct access to health services according to their needs will be prioritised.
- Activities aimed at ensuring functioning, robust referral mechanisms, including follow-up, will be considered. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times, especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery, end result, etc.).

Shelter & NFIs

DG ECHO could consider funding specific emergency interventions among the following:

In host community

- Timely winterisation activities based on a sound targeting methodology focusing on the most vulnerable.

The use of **cash-based and/or in-kind (NFIs)** distribution modalities, supported by a comparative analysis and taking into account cost effectiveness and efficiency, could be considered by DG ECHO.

WASH

Specific activities could be proposed should immediate life-saving needs be identified in specific locations.

Education in Emergencies

DG ECHO will support education activities that support vulnerable refugees and host communities to enter, re-enter and be retained in formal education (FE). This may involve non-formal education (NFE) to provide pathways for children to transition into formal education, or support to children to directly enter and be retained in FE (including remedial education). Specifically, DG ECHO will consider supporting education activities both in hosting communities and in refugee camps, which meet following criteria:

- Levels of education to be targeted by proposals are primary and secondary.
- Proposed EiE activities should include an analysis of the barriers faced by vulnerable refugees in Jordan in accessing and participating in education.
- EiE proposals are expected to integrate child protection activities that support children so they can participate in education. Any proposed activity must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other circumstances including children with disabilities, girls and boys at risk of early marriage and child labour, etc. When protection activities are proposed towards an education outcome, the relation between Education and Protection has to be clearly explained, starting from a sound intervention logic, which includes demonstrated effort towards sustained educational participation.
- Cash for education will only be considered based on sound, contextualised technical analysis, coordination with relevant working groups, consideration of Do no Harm, and effective referral to livelihoods and/or other assurance of sustained educational participation with phase-out.
- Activities should also consider, based on needs assessment and lessons learned to-date, the impact of COVID-19 on the education of children and the contingency/response plans that will ensure continuity of education, with safety, quality and inclusiveness.

Coordination arrangements, including with the Education Sector Working Group as well as with development programs and alignment with national Education Sector Plan, have to be detailed. Partners should adhere to Conflict Sensitive Education principles and align to INEE Minimum Standards for EiE and relevant sector policies. Innovative/pilot actions that have the potential to be replicated and to the benefit of the broader sector will be considered.

STRENGTHENING EARLY RESPONSE CAPACITY

(1) Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERM/RRM) as standalone actions

Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERMs/RRMs) are stand-alone actions pooling capacities of different partners for improved and more coordinated preparedness and early response, guided by early warning and contingency plans. ERMs/RRMs are designed to

provide initial lifesaving multipurpose assistance when other response mechanisms are not yet in place. ERMs/RRMs are mostly used for rapid-on-set crisis. For slow-on-set, objective indicators with thresholds for engagement / disengagement should be defined in coordination with other stakeholders including the State Authorities.

(2) Flexibility embedded into the actions

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce flexibility to mobilize resources from on-going actions and swiftly respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations (a crisis within a crisis). Flexibility measures can be triggered to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis; the two main scenarios are: i) to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources; ii) to respond to small scale humanitarian needs which would otherwise remain unattended.

The application of flexibility measures should be based on a multi-risk analysis and the development of worst and most likely scenarios. Partners should develop a detailed plan considering prepositioning of stocks, surge staff, triggers and sectors of intervention.

ERM/RRM and flexibility measures are complementary and do not exclude each-other; flexibility measures enable to bridge the time gap between the shock and the time needed to mobilize ad-hoc resources through the ERM/RRM or additional funding. Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness of both flexibility measures and ERM/RRM. Partners should adopt indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance (e.g. lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within xxx days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers).