

## **HUMANITARIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (HIP)**

### **Central Asia, Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans**

**The activities proposed hereafter are still subject to the adoption of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2016/01000**

AMOUNT: EUR 10 300 000

The present Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) was prepared on the basis of financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2016/01000 (Worldwide Decision) and the related General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid (Operational Priorities). The purpose of the HIP and its annex is to serve as a communication tool for ECHO's partners and to assist in the preparation of their proposals. The provisions of the Worldwide Decision and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

#### **0. MAJOR CHANGES SINCE PREVIOUS VERSION OF THE HIP**

##### **Modification 1 – December 2016**

On the occasion of a donors' conference on 15/12/2016 the Government of Serbia has expressed serious concerns about a shortfall for food provision for refugees in camps, alongside concerns over the provision of basic medical care. The Serbian authorities estimated the additional funding required at over 40M EUR. However, the amount includes also non-humanitarian assistance. While the caseload is comparatively modest (7,500 refugees/migrants according to the Government of Serbia, with an expected number of 10,000 in the coming months), the increasing length of average stay in the country leads to increased requirements for assistance.

The main sector of intervention is food. The changed needs of a stranded population hosted in camps imply a different approach on food provision with respect for nutritional requirements and specific dietary requirements for certain categories (i.e. baby food).

ECHO is examining the different modalities through which this aid can be channeled, including the possibility of creating self-service kitchens to be used by the refugees in the reception centres.

ECHO is also engaged in financing basic health care provision in the reception centres (including the newly rehabilitated camps), with an attention to special needs.

It is therefore proposed to add a further amount of EUR 3,000,000 to this HIP.

#### **1. CONTEXT**

The HIP for Central Asia, Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans (EN) covers the following 16 countries:

- In Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan;
- In the Eastern Neighbourhood: Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia (described also as “Southern Caucasus”), Belarus, Moldova
- In the Western Balkans: Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro.

To note that although Ukraine falls under Eastern Neighbourhood, the Ukrainian crisis will not be covered by this HIP but covered under a separate HIP.

This HIP covers both Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) programmes (former DIPECHO programmes) and man-made humanitarian emergencies.

#### Political context and man-made disaster threats

The post-communism and post-independence period in the region witnessed a proliferation of political tensions and ethnic conflicts, confronting the region with massive temporary and sometimes prolonged displacements. Some of these conflicts, such as Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia in the Caucasus, or Transnistria in Moldova are still unresolved or "frozen", and contribute to consistent low-intensity war or tension, which exacerbates the vulnerability and prevents development of their communities and societies. Incidents can easily escalate into a major ethnic and political internal conflict, as happened in 2010 in Southern Kyrgyzstan. A potential threat of massive refugee influx or spill over of Islamic fundamentalism from Afghanistan or stemming from the Syria crisis into Central Asia, especially into Tajikistan, is low, but persistent. The threat of expansion of IS ideology could be potentially dangerous to political and social stability, especially in Central Asia.

In Western Balkans, after civil wars in the early 1990s, and the Kosovo conflict in 1999, as of today the tensions are relatively low.

The repercussions of the Ukraine crisis are global, and definitely bring a certain threat of destabilising or at least affecting the countries in Central Asia, Eastern Neighbourhood and Western Balkans (CAEN), especially in Moldova and Belarus, but also Central Asia and Southern Caucasus (CASC). Georgia with two breakaway republics supported by Russia –Abkhazia and South Ossetia might be particularly sensitive and vulnerable in this regard. The disputes over the status of the non-government controlled areas in Ukraine may have implications on the status of Kosovo, Transnistria or Bosnia and Herzegovina, which may bring instability or social unrest. The economic crisis in the Russian Federation has almost a direct adverse impact on the regional economies, and even stability of several countries in CAEN region, in particular on Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan where remittances from economic migrants primarily from the Russian Federation play an important role in the national economies. In Tajikistan the situation is compounded by the forced return of migrants from Russia who are finding themselves jobless and in an ambient of growing Islamism radicalization, while for Kyrgyz migrants it will be easier to stay and work in Russia thanks to the adhesion of the country to the Eurasian Economic Union.

Another potential threat for a man-made disaster in Central Asian countries is related to Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Risks.

#### Natural Disaster Risks

The entire region is highly exposed to natural hazards, including earthquakes, landslides, floods, mudflows, droughts, avalanches and extreme temperatures. The geological characteristic of this area, placed along several fault lines, makes it one of the most seismically active regions in the world. The historic data shows that every 5 years there is an earthquake of significant magnitude to cause destruction and human losses, sometimes of huge devastation effects. Floods, landslides, and avalanches are recurrent and can also be devastating such as the massive floods in the Balkans in May 2014.

Natural hazards, combined with the high vulnerability of the population and insufficient local capacities to address (prepare, mitigate or prevent) the risks, exacerbate the impact of disasters. In this regard, the high vulnerability of Tajikistan in particular, but also of Kyrgyzstan is highlighted. Climate variability is also having effects on the frequency and intensity of disasters. As in other disaster risk regions of the world, the scale of vulnerability and exposure to hazards, and subsequently the need for assistance, are projected to substantially increase in the coming years and decades. In the CAEN region, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan face potentially the highest threat from climate change impact.

### Refugee crisis: the Western Balkan route

Since January 2015 an unprecedented number of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants has arrived in Greece, with more than 643 000 individuals counted for as of 9 November, who mostly qualify as asylum seekers from Syria, Afghanistan and to a lesser extent Iraq. Refugees, asylum seekers and migrants reach Greek islands by boat from Turkey, reach the Greek mainland and then cross the borders with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, cross the country and then enter into Serbia to eventually reach Hungary or Croatia and onwards. As Hungary decided to build a fence to stop migrants from entering the country, the pressure on Serbia and the former Yugoslavia Republic of Macedonia has increased.

Serbia and, since June, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have in place legislation allowing refugees and migrants who express an intention to request asylum to remain in the country and travel freely on public transport through the country for 72 hours. Indeed, as of 01 November 2015, almost 380 000 people of whom over 90% come from refugee-producing countries have registered the intent to request asylum in Serbia. Ever since, the number of refugees shows a constantly growing trend. A relevant share, estimated in at least 50%, of the refugees, have been crossing the country undetected and avoiding registration.

While the main Western-Balkan migratory route is at present starting from Turkey, through Greece to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to Serbia and eventually to Croatia, the changing conditions could result in people deviating through Albania, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina, to reach Italy and Slovenia.

The main pillars of this regional CAEN 2016 HIP will be:

1. DRR in Central Asia and South Caucasus (CASC).
2. Humanitarian response to the refugee crisis in the Balkans.
3. Responding to any other major natural/man-made crises. If such new crises would materialize in the course of the year, these will be addressed through a modification and a financial top up of the current HIP.

## **2. HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

### **1) Affected people/ potential beneficiaries.**

#### For Central Asia and Southern Caucasus (CASC)

In the CASC region, resilience building of both communities and institutions is warranted in all countries. All countries of the region are considered to be highly prone to natural disasters, in particular earthquakes, floods, landslides and droughts. The capacities of national governments in the CASC region to respond to natural disasters vary significantly from country to country. Some are characterised by higher economic

development, such as Kazakhstan, and in general possess more resources available, such as Turkmenistan, while others countries are poorer, and despite having gained significant experience due to frequency of small-scale disasters, such as Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Armenia, or Georgia, cannot cope on their own.

This HIP aims primarily to:

- Target the most vulnerable communities and segments of the population to consolidate and promote disaster preparedness models compatible with local institutional environments, utilizing proven effective methodologies that can be integrated into local development planning and mechanisms with a view to replication.
- Ensure sound partnership with local and national DRR stakeholders and DRR initiatives, for the integration of adequate disaster preparedness mechanisms in national and sub-national development plans.
- Focus both on rural and urban areas with high exposure to frequent or potentially devastating natural hazards and with limited coping capacities.
- Give special attention to excluded, underserved and remote communities or segments of the targeted population groups, with a systematic focus on the inclusion of women, children, the elderly and people living with disabilities.

#### For the Western Balkans

Most of the refugee, asylum seekers and migrants arriving in the Western Balkans are vulnerable and in need of assistance. When arriving in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia from Greece, people are exhausted, suffer hunger, thirst and some need urgent medical attention.

In Serbia, the number indicating an intent to request asylum has been increased from 2 700 in 2012, to 5 100 in 2013, 16 500 in 2014 to almost 380 000 from January to 1 November 2015. The European Commission's economic forecast projection estimates for end-2015 around 1 000 000 arrivals. In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, since until 19 June 2015 the country did not record the persons in need of international protection who did not apply for asylum, thus statistical breakdown is not available. However, the number of refugees and migrants declaring their intention to apply for asylum reached 182 778 including 43 183 children until 27 October 2015.

#### For any other major unforeseen natural and man-made crises in CAEN region

In case of any other unforeseen natural and man-made disasters, vulnerable population requiring humanitarian assistance should be considered as potential beneficiaries.

### **2) Description of the most acute humanitarian needs.**

#### In Central Asia and Southern Caucasus (CASC)

In the entire CASC region, capacities of national institutions to respond to smaller-scale disasters exist. However, it is also recognised that the combined capacities of respective government and existing partners on the ground is inadequate and insufficient to cope with any major humanitarian situation without external support.

#### ***Improving institutional preparedness capacity***

All countries across the region share the weaknesses in essential preparedness at institutional level, for example: absence of effective early warning systems; poor capacity for monitoring and prevention of natural hazards; lack of comprehensive

vulnerability and risk assessment and mapping; absence of effective DRR legislative frameworks; insufficient DRR planning and funding; weak communication, cooperation and coordination at national and regional levels; non-functioning cross-border arrangements; non-standardised policies and practices.

Strengthening of the capacities and knowledge of existing specialised emergency management agencies for DRR and in general for disaster prevention/mitigation is required.

Linkages between the national/regional and community levels are still insufficient and are often done on an ad hoc basis. The reinforcement of the existing DRR platforms should be promoted at national, regional and local levels.

There is a need to build community and institutional capacity and resilience, especially in terms of DRR knowledge, as well as sharing best practices from other countries in the CASC region.

### ***Strengthening community based preparedness mechanisms***

Direct support to communities remains critical in order to increase risk awareness, design community disaster preparedness plans and strengthen local disaster response capacity. Formal integration of Local Disaster Management Committees (LDMC) into the existing structures of Ministries/ Committees of Emergency Situations at national, regional and local level, as well as promotion of LDMCs as primary organizations of Red Cross/Crescent Societies need to be promoted. This approach should lead to greater sustainability and greater financial autonomy of the DRR committees.

### ***Improving policy and legislative frameworks for disaster prevention/mitigation***

National policies and legislation, despite many changes in the legislation, are still largely focused on rescue and relief activities. Countries in the CASC region in some cases lack comprehensive and functional national disaster management plans. This in turn affects the response capacities which are generally less than adequate to deal with large scale crises and new types of challenges. This is often compounded with low presence, coordination, and overall capacity of partners to support the government, especially in the countries which have not been confronted with emergencies in recent years or even decades, but are now at risk of such developments on the ground.

### ***Mainstreaming DRR into the Education sector***

Another important direction is integrating DRR into educational activities at the policy and operational levels, including community and school-based activities reaching the local population. Incorporation of DRR into the local, regional and national policies, including education and school curricula is a long-term process which aims at ensuring that knowledge about hazards, risks and appropriate safety behaviour is deeply entrenched within all age and gender groups in the communities. The good results and the impact of DRR in education in previous DIPECHO rounds show the relevance of the continuation of DRR mainstreaming in education, both at local and national level.

### **In the Western Balkans**

The refugee crisis through the Western Balkans is expected to deteriorate as the conflict in Syria shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Syrians made up to 88% of the newly registered refugees in the Western Balkans, and the almost two million refugees currently in Turkey will continue to search for a better life in the EU for as long as jobs or livelihood opportunities continue to be denied in Turkey.

At the same time the capacities of the governments and civil society organizations in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia are already overstretched and insufficient to respond to the basic needs of refugees while in transit, or staying as asylum seekers. Unless those capacities are promptly reinforced, many urgent humanitarian and protection needs will remain unaddressed.

In the longer term the Western Balkans countries will have to continue to move towards and eventually adopt the EU acquis. This implies structural support to help with the main identified structural needs.

Short-term humanitarian support is necessary. The humanitarian needs identified are linked to the protection concerns most of the refugees, asylum seekers and migrants are facing and their poor living conditions while transiting through the region. They mainly consist of needs in terms of primary health care services, NFI assistance to improve the hygiene and sanitary conditions, with particular attention to the needs of women and children, water, food, psycho-social support and assistance to restore family links; adequate and safe temporary reception/accommodation facilities for people declaring intention to apply for asylum, etc. In particular:

**Health:** First Aid capacity needs to be ensured at the border and in the points where refugees wait for long hours or even days such as the Gevegeliya in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Presevo registration center in Serbia. Access to Health for primary and secondary health conditions has so far been fairly provided by the Public medical centres of the Ministry of Health in both countries.

**Food:** While many of the refugees, particularly those from Syria, are travelling with some savings the big majority are disoriented and in need of food aid when they arrive at

the borders and reception centres. So far, most of the food is being provided by local volunteers, UNHCR and by the National Societies of the Red Cross (RCNS). However the current needs exceed the food supplies in those distribution points. In addition, volunteers and RCNS lack supplies for people with special needs.

Protection: In general there is need for technical support and capacity building of the relevant authorities dealing with migration in both countries for a protection-sensitive management of the most vulnerable refugees. Presence of protection mandated agencies should be ensured at borders, registration points and detention centres. Refugees should be well informed on their status and rights and the legal frameworks that protect them.

A particular Protection related problem is the separation of families between border lines.

WASH: Water and sanitation facilities are insufficient along the migration routes as the countries were not prepared for such unprecedented refugee influx. Yet WASH facilities – toilets, showers, water taps – are particularly needed in border areas where refugees concentrate at borders, registration centres and the points they wait for transportation to keep moving ahead. There is also need for hygiene items distribution to ensure minimum hygiene standards. Trash collection is also urgently needed.

Psychosocial: Psychological stress is extended among refugees after the traumatic experiences they have endured before arriving to the Western Balkans. Psychosocial Support and counselling (which should be provided in the language of the refugees) is needed, including Child Friendly Spaces.

Shelter and NFIs (winterization): The bed capacity in reception centres is insufficient and needs to be. The risks of sleeping in the open will only increase during winter as refugees are not prepared for the cold temperatures and harsh weather.

### **3. HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE**

#### **1) National / local response and involvement**

##### In Central Asia and Southern Caucasus (CASC)

While there have been demonstrated impact of progress achieved in DRR, national authorities often do not have the adequate legislative framework, technical expertise, capacity, and/or resources to systematically and sustainably introduce and integrate DRR at all levels. In the Southern Caucasus, the DRR legislative framework requires strengthening in all three countries, and emergency preparedness mechanisms are limited. In Central Asia, only Kazakhstan is considered to have the substantial capacity for successful mainstreaming of DRR. In Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, there is potential to further explore how best to strategically contribute to the governments' DRR efforts. In Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, budget constraints and the need for more sustained political impetus are required for the implementation of DRR legislation at community level, although national DRR platforms exist at national level.

##### In the Western Balkans

In the region, governments have been involved since the beginning in the response but have been challenged by the growing numbers and have therefore turned to the international community with request for assistance.

In Serbia, the government has established an Inter-Ministerial Working Group on Mixed Migration. However, in Southern and Northern Serbia authorities and civil society are

currently stretched to provide basic humanitarian aid, registration and accommodation to the refugees, asylum seekers and migrants that approach them each day.

In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the government established an Inter-Ministerial Coordination Body. However, authorities have limited capacities available to respond to the emergency. So far, food distribution is being conducted by local NGOs that lack the capacity to cover the needs of the increasing numbers of refugees and migrants. Those NGOs currently being supported by private donors will not be able to sustain their activities, and will phase out food assistance in coming weeks/ months. First aid is provided by Red Cross Society of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and supported by Ministry of Health and UNFPA.

## **2) International Humanitarian Response**

### For Central Asia and Southern Caucasus (CASC)

Through the HIP, cooperation and coordination with a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including national authorities, academic institutions and civil society will be encouraged. UN agencies, International organizations, Red Cross and Crescent Societies, and NGOs are indispensable partners when it comes to DRR.

In the CASC region, the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the World Bank (WB), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) have all committed funding support to DRR projects. Nevertheless, there has been a continuous downward trend in DRR funding in the region in recent years and programmes mainly designed to combine DRR with development. In recent years, ECHO has been the single largest, and in some cases the only donor supporting DRR activities.

### For the Western Balkans

In 2014, flood emergency response was provided in Serbia and BiH by the EU with bilateral support from other countries (including the US and Russia). Since 2015, the massive arrivals refugees, asylum seekers and migrants a mounting concern about humanitarian consequences. International organizations including UNHCR, IOM, IFRC, UNICEF as well as NGOs are ready to respond to the crises.

## **3) Constraints and ECHO response capacity**

While there are generally no security concerns and access hindrances, the successful implementation of DIPECHO in CASC is contingent on the willingness, motivation, and capacity of the selected communities, as well as on the support and commitment by the relevant local authorities and government structures. The location where DRR projects are implemented should enjoy a solid degree of security and political stability, thus minimizing the risk of project interruption. The conflict zones with difficult or no access for partners, (South Ossetia, Nagorno-Karabakh) are to be excluded. On the other hand, if DIPECHO can indirectly contribute to confidence building, e.g. in Fergana Valley in cross-boundary projects or regional projects in South Caucasus, this is encouraged. In Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, with a more restricted number of ECHO partners present the possibilities for interventions are more limited.



As for humanitarian action, ECHO in principle already has access to all countries, with the possible exception of conflict zones in the Caucasus and Moldova. It is important for ECHO to establish essential contacts with key partners and counterparts in all countries. Dealing with the conflict in Ukraine and the refugee crisis in the Western Balkans requires concerted efforts by various stakeholders. As these new crises are highly politicized and concern immediate EU neighbourhood, all threats need to be part of a longer-term and holistic EU action involving where the humanitarian principles need to be always respected.

#### **4) Envisaged ECHO response and expected results of DRR and humanitarian aid interventions**

##### On Disaster Risk Reduction, DRR

In the CASC region, the focus will be primarily on DRR programmes. The main objective will be to reduce the vulnerability and improve the resilience of the most vulnerable local communities as well as to build the capacity of national/regional/local institutions dealing with DRR in natural disaster prone areas. This HIP will seek to consolidate and institutionalise the results achieved through previous DIPECHO programmes. The HIP is in line with the Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030 (SFDRR).

This round of DIPECHO will concentrate DRR interventions in certain countries, taking into account factors as vulnerability in terms of risks of natural disasters measured, existing response capacity and the impact and added value of DRR interventions:

- Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan will remain the two priority countries in Central Asia;
- For Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, a gradual phasing out is planned over 2 years since they belong to the category of middle income countries and are generally slightly less vulnerable than other countries in the region. This gradual phase should permit the hand-over of DRR to the government and other donors and consolidation of the implemented DIPECHO actions;
- All South Caucasus countries (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan) will continue to benefit from DIPECHO interventions.

DIPECHO will work through a “traditional” and programmatic approach, whereby the consolidation of earlier efforts should lead toward maximum replication, adaptation of common approaches, integrating DRR into key government policies, and institutionalisation of efforts, while bringing in and sharing best global and regional DRR practices. Regional projects are encouraged where this approach can contribute to increased impact and exchanges of good practices, but also when this can contribute to confidence building. This HIP aims primarily at:

- Pursuing strategic facilitation of national/regional/local initiatives on institutionalizing achievements and capacity building of mandated actors in the area of DRR. DRR projects should be implemented in coordination with the appropriate institutions of national governments at all relevant levels, in particular the principal National Disaster Management structures.
- Reinforcing the coordination and linkages between national, regional and local entities dealing with DRR.

- Aligning projects with the new Sendai priorities and with respective regional and national plans. This implies systematic work in the area of urban DRR/safe city campaign, involvement of private sector, access to multi-hazard early warning system, etc.
- Mainstreaming DRR in development actions: in collaboration with other donors whenever possible, promote incorporation of DRR into development actions through advocacy measures and systematic collaboration with the development sector.

The priority activities include:

- a) Strengthening capacities for disaster risk management at community and government levels, including institutional linkages and advocacy;
- b) Supporting hardware measures (e.g. small-scale mitigation work, response capacity)
- c) Advocate for and contribute to specific DRR sensitive policies and mainstreaming of DRR into any relevant policy fields;
- d) Support to capacity and resilience building of most vulnerable people through community-based DRR action in rural and urban areas. Urban DRR will be focused on hazard zones with poor preparation and urban planning; Formal integration of Local Disaster Management Committees (LDMC) into the existing structures of Ministries/ Committees of Emergency Situations at national, regional and local level, as well as promotion of LDMCs as primary organizations of Red Cross/Crescent Societies need to be promoted.
- e) School safety and formal integration of DRR in education curricula is a priority sector;
- f) Contributing to establishment of effective early warning systems at community and government levels, including awareness, knowledge, and equipment, mainly for floods, landslides and mudflows;
- g) The introduction of approaches to DRR, innovative for the region, including adaptation capacities to climate change (e.g. livelihood diversification, water storage, shelters). Support to pilot projects, should attract the interest of other financing sources;
- h) Stock-piling of emergency and relief items, targeting the reinforcement of the response capacity of local actors and institutions in disaster-prone areas.

#### On the humanitarian response to the refugee crisis in the Western Balkans

The current HIP will only focus on the humanitarian needs of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants crossing or stranded in the Western Balkans. The ECHO support will aim at reinforcing the capacity of organizations providing first line response to the beneficiaries upon arrival and ensure their protection along the migration route. The assistance will take into account that beneficiaries are in transit but also that the period of stay. While both, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, have legal frameworks to protect the migrant and refugee population their capacities are overstretched, ECHO action will be limited to short-term emergency support and focus on basic humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable persons. The structural needs of hosting countries in terms of registration, reception capacity and asylum policies should be covered by development funds.

EU humanitarian assistance will support multi-sector emergency activities including food (also baby food and food for people with special needs), hygiene items, temporary shelter, emergency Health and Psychosocial support, winterization, contingency planning, wash. Protection of the most vulnerable people will also be supported, by promptly identifying and addressing acute protection needs, keeping in mind that the vast majority of people migrating through the Western Balkans originate from refugee-

producing countries. The provision of information is essential to ensure that refugees are aware of their rights and how to access them. The provision of multi-purpose cash assistance as an efficient and dignified modality to meet those needs will be considered.

#### On any other major unforeseen natural and man-made crises in CAEN region

If an unforeseen natural disasters, as well as potential conflict-related emergencies emerges, a financial top-up of the current HIP could be considered as to respond on the basis of on sound needs assessments to the identified humanitarian needs.

#### On coordination

Effective coordination is essential. ECHO supports the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Transformative Agenda (ITA) and encourages partners to demonstrate their engagement in implementing its objectives, to take part in coordination mechanisms (e.g. Humanitarian Country Team/Clusters) and to allocate resources to foster the ITA roll-out.

#### On Visibility

Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with visibility requirements in accordance with the applicable contractual arrangement as well as with specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements. In particular, this includes prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU funded project sites, relief items and equipment and the acknowledgement of the funding role of and the partnership with the EU/ECHO through activities such as media outreach and digital communication. Further explanation of visibility requirements can be consulted on the dedicated visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

#### Thematic priorities

During the implementation of this HIP, special attention will be given to relevant aspects related to migration and displacement, advocacy, international humanitarian law and humanitarian access.

ECHO will provide further support to meet the mounting needs of children in conflict affected contexts that are out of school or risk education disruption. Within this HIP project addressing education and child protection will be funded. ECHO will favour education in emergency projects in areas where the % of out-of-school children is particularly high, there are grave child protection concerns and where other sources of funding available are limited. Complementarity and synergies with other EU services and funding instruments will be sought. In addition, complementarity and synergies with funding provided by the Global Partnership for Education is encouraged.

#### **4. LRRD, COORDINATION AND TRANSITION**

##### *1) Other ECHO interventions*

For over two decades, the EU has supported humanitarian interventions in CAEN. The most recent large emergency humanitarian aid actions were implemented in Georgia in support of the populations displaced as consequence of the Georgian – Russian conflict in 2008; in Central Asia, humanitarian assistance was provided to the population affected by the inter-community violence in Kyrgyzstan in 2010 and to respond to a food security crisis in Tajikistan in 2012. In Serbia and Bosnia, ECHO and other EU bodies supported flood response and recovery in 2014, with a major complementary with the assistance provided through EU Civil Protection mechanisms.

In Central Asia, 8 DIPECHO rounds have been implemented since 2003 (Over 100 projects for a total of nearly EUR 40 million). In the Southern Caucasus, 3 DIPECHO rounds have been implemented since 2010 (15 projects for a total of EUR 8 million).

In addition to the DRR interventions, ECHO also provides assistance to respond to small scale natural disasters through the DREF (Disaster Response Emergency Fund) implemented by the International Federation of the Red Cross/Crescent (IFRC) and national societies and through the financing decision of small scale humanitarian response.

Enhanced complementarity between DIPECHO and EU Civil Protection mechanism should be further explored especially in terms of preparedness support - whenever possible EU Civil protection should complement ECHO's DRR action. EU Civil protection has already been engaged in response activities in the region, and this practice is expected to continue. PRRD East can be used to complement DIPECHO where applicable. Through ECHO formal partners, DIPECHO actions should provide capacity building support to local NGOs to ensure long term capacity and sustainability of DRR.

##### *2) Other services/donors availability*

EU humanitarian aid is framed in an overall international approach bringing together a wide diversity of humanitarian actors, including UN, the Red Cross/Crescent movement and NGOs. The EU ensures that its overall contribution to the humanitarian response is effective and appropriate, underpins the international humanitarian effort to deliver aid to people in need and addresses adequately the challenges. Consistency with other donors' interventions must be ensured, in particular interventions by EU MS and international organizations (UN agencies, World Bank) in the field of humanitarian aid and development cooperation. Mainstreaming the results of the programme is likely to require a long-term strategic engagement with national and regional authorities. For this reason financial support for mainstreaming is likely to be most appropriate from development donors and engagement with these donors should be sought from an early stage.

##### *3) Other concomitant EU interventions*

DRR is a vital part of the EU's resilience agenda. The resilience approach will encourage DRR to be more consistently integrated into longer term development processes and to scale up and replicate the benefits of ECHO's DRR activities.

Humanitarian actions must be implemented consistently with EU development programmes as laid down in Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and Multi-annual Indicative Programmes (MIPs) and funded by other EU instruments (notably the Development

Cooperation Instrument (DCI), the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), the European Instrument for Democratisation and Human Rights – EIDHR, the newly created Partnership Instrument (PI) in order to link relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD). The European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) supports a wide range of co-operation areas in the Southern Caucasus. ECHO DRR Actions are intended to be complementary with DRR actions financed by other EU instruments.

The European Commission's development cooperation with the countries of Central Asia is based on a multi-annual regional cooperation strategy and is provided through several instruments.<sup>1</sup> Although opportunities are limited, potential synergies in the field of education and rural development for a mainstreaming of DRR in development programmes should be explored.

EU assistance is provided to the countries of the South Caucasus through a set of instruments: The European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI), Twinning, TAIEX (Technical Assistance and Information Exchange), SIGMA (Support for Improvement for Governance and Management) and Thematic Programmes. The IcSP provides an effective, timely, flexible and integrated response to situations of crisis, emerging crisis conflict prevention or continued political instability.<sup>2</sup>

In the Western Balkans IPA support is primarily focused on helping the countries develop the capacity to implement effective migration/asylum policies in line with the EU acquis. A whole range of interventions are currently planned.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>(a) DCI which funds both regional programmes as well as bilateral programmes. These programmes are potentially complementary to the DIPECHO, in particular, where focal sectors concern rural development (KG, TAJ, UZ) or social sector development (TU, KG, TAJ); (b) EIDHR; (c) Nuclear Safety Instrument under which EU assistance in the area of Nuclear Safety is provided; (d) IcSP which provides support to conflict prevention and promotes stability at regional or country level. In particular: to OSCE Community Security Initiative and the Constitutional Chamber in Kyrgyzstan (end June 2016 with a budget of EUR 1.8 million, and end November 2015 with a budget of EUR 1.7 million), to the implementation of the Joint Plan of Action for Central Asia under the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (end August 2016; EU contribution EUR 800 000). In addition, a new regional EUR 3.5 million programme on conflict prevention related to water issues has recently been adopted

<sup>2</sup> There are the following on going IcSP short term (crisis response) funded projects in the South Caucasus: Support for stabilisation in conflict affected areas in Georgia (end in July 2015, budget EUR 8.145 million), Support for civil society-based action and for peace and confidence-building activities complementing the work of the EU Special Representative (end in February 2015, budget EUR 6 million) and EUR 6 million for Prevention Preparedness and Response to man-made and natural disasters in the European Neighbourhood Policy East Region (PPRD East) programme from 2010 to 2014 in 7 countries, including the South Caucasus.

<sup>3</sup> In Bosnia EUR 8.5 million of EU assistance has been disbursed covering technical assistance for effectively managing migration and asylum (EUR 4 million), supply of equipment (EUR 3.5 million) and the construction of a reception facility for illegal migrants (EUR 1 million). The reception facility and equipment are now operational. In Albania in 2015 a EUR 1.5 million programme is foreseen for capacity building of law enforcement agencies, which covers, inter alia, integrated border management (IBM) with the aim to further improve the border security system to achieve full compliance with the EU- and Schengen *acquis*. In 2012 EUR 3 million was allocated for the reconstruction of border crossing points, with the aim to improve Albania's focus on, inter alia illegal migration and human trafficking. In Montenegro in 2008 EUR 930 000 was allocated to support migration management. A Reception Centre for Irregular Migrants was built, the migration policy was shaped (the Migration Strategy (2011-2016) being adopted) and the capacity building of government counterparts was increased. A further EUR 450 000 was allocated to the Reception Centre in 2009. There is a 2013 project for EUR 250.000 to ensure that asylum-seekers and vulnerable migrants have access to adequate protection and fair treatment. As well as an ongoing EUR 1 million twinning to support the adoption of the Schengen *acquis*. In 2015 a EUR 20 million sector budget support programme in the area of Integrated Border Management is foreseen. In Serbia EUR 4 million has been allocated to border surveillance and an IPA 2013 twinning project of one million to reform of the asylum system will start in September. The expansion of existing accommodation capacities is planned under IPA 2014 for a value of EUR 3.2 million. It should also be noted that supporting the overhaul of the asylum system is one of the main mid-term priorities of the accession negotiations with Serbia, as reflected in the asylum/migration parts of the action plan requested for the opening of Chapter 24 (Justice, Freedom and Security). In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in 2016 it is planned to support the country's asylum and migration policy through a dedicated action worth more than EUR 10 million. The action will focus, inter alia, on improving relevant infrastructure and reinforcing the protection of the vulnerable categories of migrants and victims of trafficking in human beings. In Kosovo a EUR 2 million 2011 twinning project aimed at

#### *4) Exit scenarios*

On DRR: The DIPECHO programme has made an important contribution to the DRR agenda in Central Asia and Southern Caucasus countries. New initiatives by both governments and donors are needed to complement DIPECHO in its DRR interventions. It is envisaged that the exit scenario should be gradual over the next two years in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. As an exit strategy, DIPECHO should continue in the next phase to consolidate earlier efforts in terms of institutionalisation and hand-over to the government, with possible continuation of technical advice, which would encompass also dissemination of global and regional DRR knowledge. Regional projects may be suggested for this group of countries in the phase out period, separately for Central Asia and Caucasus. The promotion and the handover to local stakeholders and government services of the expertise developed through DIPECHO actions are part of the exit strategies.

On the migration crisis in the Balkans: The current HIP will only focus on the humanitarian needs of migrants and asylum seekers crossing or stranded in the Western Balkans. This short-term support will only be provided as a bridging support before development funds kick in to address the structural needs of hosting countries in terms of registration, protection, reception capacity and asylum policies.

---

improving readmission and reintegration of refugees was completed earlier this year. It is being followed by another EUR 2.5 million twinning project to help Kosovo improve migration management in line with the EU acquis. In addition a EUR 8 million multi-country programme addressing the Western Balkans and Turkey to be managed together with FRONTEX, EASO and other partners will start in the autumn 2015.