

TECHNICAL ANNEX

TURKEY

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2016/01000 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 which may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge: ECHO/B.4

Contact persons at HQ:

- **Team Leader:** Christophe PATERON: Christophe.PATERON@ec.europa.eu
- **Desk Officers:** Sofie HENELL: Sofie.Henell@ec.europa.eu; Zudella PIMLEY SMITH: Zudella.PIMLEY-SMITH@ec.europa.eu; Zsofia KUSZENDA: Zsofia.Kuszenda@ec.europa.eu; Jean De LESTRANGE: jean.de-lestrange@ec.europa.eu; Georgia GALATI: georgia.galati@ec.europa.eu

Contact persons in the field:

- **Head of Office:** Jane LEWIS: Jane.Lewis@echofield.eu
- **Technical Assistants:** Jean-Christophe PEGON: Jean-Christophe.Pegon@echofield.eu; Sara McHattie: Sara.McHattie@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR: 505 650 000.

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR: 505 650 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 505 650 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 505 650 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time. More information will be available upon adoption of the general budget of the European Union for the year 2016).
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/07/2016¹. Actions will start from 01/07/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners:
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 16/06/2016.³

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at :

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- In case of actions already being implemented and where ECHO is requested to provide follow-on funding, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the action proposed
- Capacity to reach the most vulnerable, the underserved and neglected communities/groups/individuals.
- Protection sensitive: integrates protection concerns (appeals process) and incorporates needed complementary measures (referrals and integration in protection programs).

¹ 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.

² Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

³ 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.

- Effectiveness of approach and intervention logic to meet minimum basic needs.
- Efficiency in terms of resources used to achieve outcomes and outputs: streamlined processes and limited number of actors to minimize operational overheads.
- Capacity to implement at scale and to support capacity development of Turkish stakeholders as relevant
- Geographical coverage – country-wide with emphasis on gaps and coverage including complementarity with Government services
- Accountability/transparency/M&E framework
- Clear definition of roles and responsibilities and complementarities with other stakeholders
- Coordination
- Pre-defined exit strategies / strategic partnerships

More specifically for the set-up of the ESSN, DG ECHO will consider partnership arrangements with partners which can demonstrate proven and tested expertise in the use of cash transfers in the region and globally. Technical expertise and capacity in cash/safety net programming as well as capacity development of local and government partners are important considerations, particularly how expertise will be transferred for long-term sustainability

3.2.2. *Operational guidelines:*

3.2.2.1. General Guidelines

In the design of your operation, ECHO policies and guidelines need to be taken into account:

The EU resilience communication and Action Plan

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/resilience>

Food Assistance

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/food-assistance>

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/food_assistance/them_policy_doc_foodassistance_en.pdf

Nutrition

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04_nutrition_addressing_undernutrition_in_emergencies_en.pdf

Cash and vouchers

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>

10 Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles_en.pdf

Protection

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf

Children in Conflict

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf

Health

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/health>

Civil–military coordination

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/civil-military-relations>

Water sanitation and hygiene

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_policy_doc_en.pdf

Gender

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid_en

Disaster Risk Reduction

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf

ECHO Visibility

Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with **visibility** requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of and partnership with the EU/ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.
- Specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:
 - Section 9.1.A, Standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU funded relief items and equipment; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the Action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the Implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed-upon in the individual agreements.
 - Section 9.1.B, Standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4

out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.

- Section 9.2., above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

Further explanation of visibility requirements and reporting as well as best practices and examples can be consulted on the dedicated ECHO visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>.

Remote Management

http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start

The following set of overall principles should guide every operation supported by ECHO:

The humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, and strict adherence to a ‘**do no harm**’ approach remain paramount. A needs-based approach will drive all allocation decisions.

The safe and secure provision of aid: the ability to safely deliver assistance to all areas must be preserved. ECHO requests its partners to include in the project proposal details on how safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets is being considered as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

Accountability: partners remain accountable for their operations, in particular:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) or beneficiary profiling;
- Management and monitoring of operations, and having adequate systems in place to facilitate this;
- Reporting on activities and outcomes, and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is important to ECHO. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Emergencies also tend to change gender dynamics.

The needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and - consequently - assistance must be adapted to ensure equal access and that specific needs are addressed. Context-specific gender-sensitive

needs assessments and gender analysis must be conducted to avoid vulnerability-related assumptions (e.g. women should not be considered the most vulnerable groups by default) and to ensure a more effective targeting. On the basis of the identified needs, practical examples of assistance adapted to the needs of different gender and age groups must also be provided in the Single Form. Actions targeting one specific gender and/or age group - particularly when one group is clearly more vulnerable than others —may in some instances be deemed necessary (e.g. unaccompanied minors or adolescents): such actions should respond to a clear need that has been identified through a gender and age analysis and cannot be adequately addressed through mainstreaming. While assistance may specifically target one group, the participation of other groups may prove crucial for reaching the expected impact.

All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf

Protection: Partners should ensure that the context analysis is protection-sensitive by taking into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities of the affected population. This model is useful in designing an appropriate response.

Protection Mainstreaming in traditional assistance programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO⁴. This approach is closely linked to the principle of 'do no harm', and implies incorporating protection principles and promoting meaningful access, safety and dignity in humanitarian aid. All proposals must demonstrate integration of basic protection principles also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

Integration of protection concerns should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement/hosting context (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

While humanitarian assistance often focuses on community-level interventions, it is important to remember that, in order to fully address many protection issues, it is also

⁴ For further details on ECHO position on Protection Mainstreaming see section 5.2.1 of the *Commission Staff Working Document “Humanitarian Protection: Improving protection outcomes to reduce risks for people in humanitarian crises”*

necessary to consider the relevance and feasibility of advocacy (structural level) interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities.

Do no harm: Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

Education in Emergencies

ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education⁵ in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps Innovative solutions will particularly be supported. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention may also be supported.

It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programs. It is vital to ensure that children can access education where they feel safe and protected. Therefore, education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include psychosocial support; mine risk education and provision of life-skills, such as vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school, but also strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies, including the recruitment and capacity building of teachers. To reduce the vulnerability of children affected by conflict, actions in the field of education in emergencies and especially conflict situations, should reflect protection, relevant legal frameworks (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law), education in mediation and conflict resolution, child protection (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors and former child soldiers), community-based educational activities and the promotion of peaceful reconciliation. Hence, education projects funded under this HIP could include components of child protection and peace education (i.e. mediation, conflict resolution, etc.).

In order to ensure holistic response, linking education to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered.

⁵ The Commission adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

Activities shall be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances.

Coordination is essential and all education in emergencies projects need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian and if appropriate development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Education Cluster, Refugee Working Groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education).

All actions funded on education in emergencies should in their design adhere to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [IASC Minimum Standards for Child Protection](#).

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their livelihoods and assets. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to and operational capability in managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention. The DRR approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard occurrence, and include contingency arrangements for additional or expanded activities that might be required. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated into programme decision making and design, even where the humanitarian operation is not the result of a specific hazard.

All ECHO beneficiaries and activities should be appropriately protected from hazards and shocks – according to their likelihood of occurrence, intensity and possible impact. ECHO uses two complementary methods for DRR: 1) **Integrated DRR** is where ECHO humanitarian interventions are risk informed 2) **Targeted DRR** refers to specific DRR risk reduction actions – that cannot be "integrated" into ECHO response projects (see above) but that will strengthen a system to avoid future humanitarian needs by reducing risk to vulnerable populations.

For targeted DRR interventions, the information in the Single Form should clearly show that:

- all risks have been clearly identified, including their possible interactions;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes the role of the state and non-state actors in disaster reduction and climate change adaptation from national to local levels;
- the measures planned are effective in strengthening the capacity of communities and local authorities to plan and implement local level disaster risk reduction activities in a sustainable way, and have the potential to be replicated in other similar contexts;

- the intervention contributes to improving the mechanisms to coordinate disaster risk reduction programmes and stakeholders at national to local levels.
- demonstrate that the action is designed including the existing good practice in this field;
- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure evidence of the impact of the action and good practice are gathered, and effectively disseminated.

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in relevant coordination fora: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. Partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.

Integrated approaches: Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area. Response analysis to support modality selection for all types of assistance provided is mandatory. DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. For in-kind transfers, local purchases are encouraged when possible. While DG ECHO recommends to consider the use of cash-based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups market situation, cost efficiency and effectiveness. It is strongly recommend for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Thematic Policy Document n° 3](#). This includes the use of the decision tree and respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.⁶

Resilience: ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while taking opportunities to increase their **resilience** – to reduce on-going and future humanitarian needs and to assist a durable recovery. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

⁶ See section 1.2 and 2.3.3 of the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#).

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen livelihoods and capacities. ECHO encourages its partners to develop their contextual risk and vulnerability analysis and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified (see template). This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services, development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc.); iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

Community-based approach: In all sectors, interventions should adopt, wherever possible, a community-based approach in terms of defining viable options to effectively help increasing resilience and meeting basic needs among the most vulnerable. Community inclusion should be considered at all stages – design and implementation. Community ownership of the process is more effective and is encouraged. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritised by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

3.2.2.1. Specific guidelines

3.2.2.2.1 The Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN)

ECHO will support an Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) to allow the most vulnerable refugees to meet their basic needs in a dignified manner and at scale all over Turkey. The ESSN is a hybrid social assistance scheme anchored on and aligned with government systems and integrating crucial humanitarian safeguards.

The ESSN will, at a minimum, include the following distinctive features:

- One-card system: a single unrestricted monthly transfer ensured by one single FPA/FAFA partner organisation for unconditional cash.
- The transfer amount should be sufficient for the recipient to meet minimum basic needs.
- Needs based: targeting the most vulnerable households based on (proxy) socio-economic vulnerability criteria,
- Countrywide: focusing on people in need wherever they are,
- Cost efficient: streamlined processes and limited number of actors to minimize operational overheads.
- Overhead costs should be kept to an absolute minimum and duly justified.
- Protection sensitive: integrates protection concerns (appeals process) and incorporates needed complementary measures (referrals and integration in protection programs).
- Anchored on the existing experience and partnership.

- Aligned with MoFSP systems for longer-term sustainability and transformation.
- Integrates financial oversight and humanitarian accountability (both fiduciary and beneficiary).
- Complementary with ongoing humanitarian and development action.
- Expandable: the system can easily include transfer “top-ups” (winterization, education, etc.) as needed and extend to other population groups (new arrivals, IDPs, etc.) as appropriate.

Due diligence and accountability in the selection, enrolment, cash transfer and appeals processes is required to provide humanitarian assurances and fiduciary oversight:

- Awareness raising and outreach to refugees and persons of concerns to take place country-wide.
- Applications coherent with procedures of the national social protection system and underpinned by Turkish law.
- Eligible beneficiaries identified as per vulnerability criteria and cross-checked against government databases (income and assets).
- Application and beneficiary identification process will generate referrals to complementary assistance and protection services.
- Eligible beneficiaries validated by a Board of Trustees at the district level and enrolled in the programme.
- Rejected applicants have the opportunity to appeal (on the basis of vulnerability not picked up by the targeting criteria). This will involve a verification by MoFSP/TRC, and a review by the Steering Committee of the programme, which is composed of all the stakeholders to ensure neutrality is maintained.
- The ESSN includes two feedback loops for improved accountability: the first through financial reconciliation of the FSP, the second through a beneficiary complaints mechanism managed by a call centre.

To enhance efficiency and accountability, DG ECHO FPA/FAFA partners will provide technical expertise, overall humanitarian accountability and oversight of the ESSN as/if needed.

Independent ECHO FPA/FAFA partner monitoring and evaluation will also take place on a regular and rolling basis to capture all and any irregularities of the system and also a means to continually improve on programme quality.

3.2.2.2 Protection

In addition to the general principles reflected above, the following applies to the Turkey context.

Maintaining a clear focus on protection in the humanitarian response in Turkey is a key feature of DG ECHO’s strategy. Decisions on specific activities to support will be based on a clear and comprehensive analysis of protection threats, vulnerabilities and capacities leading to a prioritization of the appropriate responses.

Targeted protection interventions designed to *prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to the protection risks of human-generated violence, coercion, deliberate deprivation and*

abuse for persons, groups and/or communities might be supported either in the form of stand-alone programmes or in an integrated manner by achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection sensitive targeting. The application of an integrated protection programming approach is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. DG ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30,000 within an existing grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues, including those listed in the [Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming](#).

Specific protection interventions that will be prioritized under this HIP are listed below along with technical requirements and recommendations:

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals: Registration and/or actions enabling access to appropriate documentation, including birth registrations, for individuals under temporary protection (TPR), refugees and asylum seekers as well as separated and un-accompanied minors;; support to restoration of lost personal documentation; restoration of family links, family tracing and reunification (only by specialised agencies); monitoring of detention conditions (only by specialised agencies).

Information Management: Monitoring of violations and protection threats to feed a trend analysis that informs response programming and advocacy, and identifies victims of violence subsequently addressed by appropriate case management as outlined below; population movement tracking for internal displacement.

Advocacy: Informed and evidence based advocacy and communication on protection threats is encouraged and will be supported.

Durable solutions (DS): specific activities aiming at facilitating unforced, well-informed, safe and dignified durable solutions might be considered when targeting extremely vulnerable cases. For the time being this will mainly focus on support to preparatory activities linked to resettlement. This might include legal assistance and support to restoration of personal documentation; information dissemination on DS possibilities where this option is available to refugees; direct assistance in Turkey, where country of temporary residency.

Programmes to assist victims of all kinds of violence, including GBV, can be supported along the following lines:

- Medical assistance: must be provided as quickly as possible, by skilled staff, and according to internationally recognized protocols. Medical assistance for victims of rape must be provided within a 72h frame. Ensuring availability of PEP kits for both adults and children is absolutely essential.

- Mental Health and Psycho-social/Psychological support: should be provided by sufficiently trained providers⁷.
- Participation in coordination structures (i.e. particularly Health, Protection, Child Protection, GBV) is essential and clear referral pathways must be foreseen within the proposal.
- Legal recourse: information on possibility to access to legal recourse should be provided whenever contextually feasible.
- GBV specific: Services must be available to men, boys, women and girls. Proposals must specify the main type of GBV issue(s) they seek to address. Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies might be funded, and male targeting and involvement in these activities are crucial.

Use of Cash Based Intervention (CBI): cash based interventions for a protection outcome may be considered as an assistance modality, and as such they may be used as one of a range of complementary activities to achieve protection specific results. The logical causality and the process leading to the protection outcome through the use of CBI need to be clearly and explicitly identified in the proposal by the partner. Measures to avoid possible duplications and increase the synergies with the ESSN and other MPCT programs need to be clearly specified in the proposals. Economic assistance as direct compensation for protection violations experienced will not be funded.

Child Protection: Particularly activities addressing separation of children and families and unaccompanied children, including BID processes. Tracing activities might only be supported through partners with specialised experience herein, and partners must document that they have the necessary capacity to link up with similar relevant agencies across the region to ensure that cross-border tracing is conducted if necessary. Addressing psycho-social needs of children might be considered provided quality of services and comprehensive referral pathways are ensured.

Housing, Land and Property Rights: Security of tenure for people displaced in private housing and preventing/addressing forced evictions might be considered.

Community-based protection interventions – activities aiming to increase self-protection capacities of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promoting cohesion with host communities might be considered. This might include support to community based protection committees and networks; community-hub for crisis-affected populations to access vital information, protection awareness and legal information, safe space and counselling; social cohesion initiatives in host communities.

Information dissemination: dissemination of information to the affected population on relevant legal frameworks, rights and entitlements in the country of displacement and asylum and concrete possibilities for assistance. Field-level interventions aimed at facilitating access to existing services, contributing to reduce barriers in access and linking the most vulnerable population to available support, will be prioritized.

⁷ Partners' proposals should specify the educational level of the service providers they engage, and service providers of psycho-social support should preferably as a minimum have the educational level of social workers

For further details on ECHO position and approach on Protection programmes, all partners should refer to the Commission Staff Working Document “Humanitarian Protection: Improving protection outcomes to reduce risks for people in humanitarian crises.”

3.2.2.2.3 Health

Support to humanitarian health assistance should be based on improving access to basic health services of quality for the most vulnerable population and war wounded victims.

- Utilization and access by the most vulnerable of basic health services needs to be monitored and reported. Free access to healthcare remains a key principle for ECHO. When non-availability of basic health services can be shown, partners may directly provide health services.
- Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives (during the period of assistance) should be prioritized. Actions should reinforce Primary Health Care through family and community health centers covering communicable diseases, mother and child care, as well as preventive and cost-efficient care for chronic and non-communicable diseases but also addressing mental health needs ideally in an integrated manner. Duly justified, interventions may also cover specialized care like postoperative and rehabilitation services for injured and war wounded, and comprehensive care for victims of SGBV.
- Actions should be based on a quantitative needs analysis (to be repeated at regular intervals). Health Data, disaggregated according to sex and age, should be collected and analysed. Continuations of previously funded projects should highlight the advances made and changing needs over the past period(s).
- Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to medical waste management; safety (quality) of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (ambulances; drugs;..).
- Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted. Interventions can aim at removing barriers for the most vulnerable. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.
- In refugee settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities.
- Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. IcSP and ENI) needs to be established and opportunities for LRRD fully explored.
- As part of the Transformative Agenda, ECHO expects partners to collaborate with the health cluster and sector working groups.

3.2.2.2.4 Basic-Need Response

By way of promoting a comprehensive, integrated approach and effectiveness and efficiency gains, DG ECHO supports a basic-needs approach, through a combination of modalities, preferably multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT), as cash allows beneficiaries to meet a wide range of needs in a flexible and dignified manner. The ESSN will put this approach into practice for Turkey and the experience gained will help to further refine and inform the development of this approach more generally.

3.2.2.2.5 Education in Emergencies

In addition to the general principles reflected above, the following applies to the Turkey context.

Activities related to formal education will be addressed through other EU instruments under the Facility and will not be prioritized by ECHO. Issues related to improved quality of formal education should also be addressed through the appropriate EU instrument, although provisional support can be considered to limit breaks in funding.

Due to the mounting needs in terms of enabling access to formal education, ECHO will support non-formal education schemes and child protection actions that promote access to education for boys and girls currently out of school. The aim would be to foster an enabling environment that will ensure access to safe, high-quality, child-friendly, flexible, relevant and protective learning opportunities. If necessary activities need to be adapted to ensure equal access for boys and girls of different age groups, including for children with disabilities. Moreover, actions especially targeting meaningful education for children with special needs could also be covered.

While a normative framework for non-formal education is under development by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), the development of effective models in non-formal education is further encouraged, especially with regards to ALP/catch-up classes to facilitate access to formal education. Issues of coverage and scale will be looked at carefully. The continued relevance of the ECHO instrument for non-formal education once a normative framework is established will be assessed overtime in collaboration with the MoNE, UNICEF and other EU instruments.

In an effort to increase enrolment and improve attendance to formal education of the most vulnerable refugees and other persons of concern, ECHO will consider supporting the delivery of conditional cash top-ups for education under the ESSN framework in partnership with the MoFSP. Conditional cash top-ups for education for families that are not categorized as vulnerable will not be supported by ECHO. Transport costs for vulnerable refugees and other persons of concern will be considered where other EU instruments are not providing support.

3.2.2.2.6 Visibility and Communications

Standard visibility (<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>) is a contractual obligation for all ECHO-funded projects. ECHO makes available up to 0.5% of eligible costs to cover expenses related to the implementation of standard visibility requirements. It entails:

1. Display of the EU humanitarian aid field visual identity. The size and prominence of the EU visual identity will depend in the specific context (e.g. the amount and proportion of EU funding).
2. Written and verbal recognition of the EU's role in global humanitarian aid, in partnership with the agency implementing the action, when referring to an EU funded project in media interviews, press releases, webpages, social media, blogs, articles about the project, etc.

However, we also highly encourage partners with strong and ambitious communications ideas, aiming at reaching principally EU audiences, and with a demonstrated media/communications capacity to apply for above-standard visibility (<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/above-standard-visibility-template/>). ECHO can provide additional budget should a partner want to carry out such more elaborate communication actions. Communication actions must always be designed to fit the target audiences, the key messages, the concrete project and the capacity of the partner. Relevant actions could include for example audio-visual productions, journalist-visits to project sites, poster-campaigns, exhibitions or other types of events with an important outreach to the European public and media.

A separate communications plan, costed, with an estimated audience reach and a timeline, must be submitted and approved by ECHO's Communication Unit (ECHO.A2) prior to the signing of the contract. The plan must be inserted as an annex in the Single Form (under point 9.2). Partners will normally maintain contact to the Communication Unit and/or the relevant [Regional Information Officer](#) in the course of the implementation of the plan.

Above-standard visibility/communication is *additional* to standard visibility.

Therefore, in all projects standard visibility, including on-site display of the ECHO visual identity will still need to be implemented based on the specifications in the Single Form.

Communication actions must always be designed to fit the target audiences, the key messages, the concrete project and the capacity of the partner. Relevant actions could include for example audio-visual productions, journalist-visits to project sites, poster-campaigns, exhibitions or other types of events with an important outreach to the European public and media.