

TECHNICAL ANNEX

PALESTINE

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 ECHO¹/C3

Contact persons at HQ

Team Leader: Matthew Keyes

Matthew.Keyes@ec.europa.eu

Desk Officer: Aldo Biondi

Aldo.Biondi@ec.europa.eu

in the field

Head of Office: Olivier Rousselle

Olivier.rousselle@echofield.eu

Technical Assistant : Angela Schwarz

Angela.Schwarz@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: EUR 34 644 000 of which an indicative amount of EUR 3 200 000 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). New pilot programmatic partnerships could be envisaged in 2021 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):

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)

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/small-scale/epidemics	Action (c) Disaster Preparedness	Actions (d) to (f) Transport / Complementary activities	TOTAL
Palestine	32 944 000		1 700 000		34 644 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

Proposals (single forms) can be submitted at any moment during the year. However, no formal request for proposals can be made before the publication of the HIP. Agreements can only be signed after adoption of the Worldwide Decision and release of the HIP to partners (both conditions need to be satisfied cumulatively).

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 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 25 300 000
- 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 01/01/2021³
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness as well as for pilot Programmatic Partnerships. In view of the transition towards the 2021-2027 Multi annual Financial Framework, the new Single Form and the Model Grant Agreement, it will not be possible to present follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations, as modification requests for the first allocation round of the 2021 HIP. Proposals will need to be submitted as new proposals on the basis of the new Single Form. The above provision does not apply to pilot Programmatic Partnerships which have started in 2020 and for which a modification request remains the norm.
- e) Potential partners⁴: All DG ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 01/02/2021⁶

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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

⁴ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

Allocation round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 480 000⁷
- b) Provision of protection and assistance to Palestinians at risk of forcible transfer in the West Bank due to recurrent violations of international law through a multi-sectoral approach to reduce vulnerabilities, build capacities, and respond to threats.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/01/2021⁸
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months. Proposals will need to be submitted as new proposals on the basis of the new Single Form.
- e) Pre-selected partner: NRC, in its capacity as the holder of the DG ECHO grant for the West Bank Protection Consortium to which the allocation is to contribute.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁹
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/03/2021.

Allocation round 3

- a) Indicative amount: up to 8 000 000
- b) Provision of emergency assistance to Palestinians affected by the escalation of violence during the month of May 2021 in Gaza and in the West Bank, including urgent repairs to support the resumption of basic services and the replenishment of emergency stocks to restore the local emergency capacity.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2021¹⁰
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months. Proposals will need to be submitted as modification requests of ongoing actions or as new proposals on the basis of the new Single Form, unless otherwise agreed.

⁶ 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.

⁷ This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Italy of EUR 500 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 4% management fee.

⁸ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

⁹ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

- e) Pre-selected partners: In view of the need for the immediate provision of assistance and of the specific mandate of relevant partners and / or their capacity to rapidly upscale ongoing activities: UNRWA for the provision of emergency aid to IDPs in designated shelters and in host families; ICRC for actions included in the extended appeal, in particular Health and WaSH; AAH-ES for emergency provision of WaSH, through quick repairs of community infrastructures; DRC-DK for the emergency provision of medicines and first aid in the West Bank; NRC-NO for the provision of emergency aid through the expansion of the rapid response mechanism in its capacity as the holder of the DG ECHO grant for the Gaza Protection Consortium to which the allocation is to contribute.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹¹
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: as of immediately.

Allocation round 4

- a. Indicative amount: up to EUR 864 000 ¹²
- b. Provision of protection and assistance to Palestinians at risk of forcible transfer in the West Bank due to recurrent violations of international law through a multi-sectoral approach to reduce vulnerabilities, build capacities, and respond to threats.
- c. Costs will be eligible from 1/01/2021¹³
- d. The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months. Proposals will need to be submitted as new proposals on the basis of the new Single Form.
- e. Pre-selected partner: NRC, in its capacity as the holder of the DG ECHO grant for the West Bank Protection Consortium to which the allocation is to contribute.
- f. Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁴
- g. Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/11/2021.

¹¹ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹² This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Finland of EUR 200 000 and by France of EUR 700 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 4% management fee.

¹³ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

¹⁴ 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 a 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/s contributes 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?¹⁵

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.

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

¹⁵ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

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.

3.2.2.1 Health

DG ECHO will prioritize interventions aimed at providing lifesaving healthcare assistance to victims of violence and outbreaks, including emergency, surgical (e.g. trauma care), post-operative and rehabilitation care. Preparedness for response in the health sector may be considered to ensure that partners have the soft- and hardware capacity to respond in times of emergency in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza. DG ECHO will continue to monitor the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic on the provision of and access to healthcare, and in the event a response is required only critical gaps should be responded to. Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) will only be considered as an emergency response intervention integrated with other activities and / or mainstreamed in the proposed action.

In Gaza, priority will be given to Emergency Preparedness and Response along the trauma pathway with a focus on the pre-hospitalization and hospitalization phases.

3.2.2.2 WASH and Shelter

For Gaza, interventions should aim to maintain a minimum level of WASH and Shelter emergency response capacity that also includes protection mainstreaming. At this stage, with the exception of a major escalation in Gaza, DG ECHO will not consider a stand-alone shelter response. Programmes could prioritize activities that focus on linkages between WASH and Health, particularly in health clinics and hospitals. DG ECHO will also consider community-based early warning systems of public health risks associated with water borne diseases.

With regard to projects involving solar energy, DG ECHO will prioritize interventions in critical facilities with demonstrated necessity, effectiveness, viability and impact. Particular attention should be paid to the coordination of the proposed intervention amongst all actors.

3.2.2.3 Protection

In the West Bank, the intended protection outcomes should focus on reinforcing the response to settler violence, military incursions, attacks against students and education

facilities, demolitions, preventive measures against destruction of Palestinian assets and include evidence-based advocacy plans focused on reducing International Humanitarian Law (IHL) violations. This should be addressed within an integrated programming strategy targeting communities most vulnerable to protection violations such as settler violence and forcible displacement.

In Gaza, the integrated emergency preparedness and response programming should clearly be designed in line with an analysis of context-specific threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities and must include a basic protection response package and evidence-based advocacy plans founded on monitoring and documentation of IHL violations.

Legal aid, case management and accompaniment might be supported if pertinent, and done in line with international guidelines and demonstrated capacities. Utilisation of cash in protection programming must have a clear protection outcome and will not be supported unless embedded within legal assistance, case management or accompaniment, and within a wider comprehensive and integrated protection response.

3.2.2.4 Basic Needs Approach

DG ECHO will prioritise an integrated multi-sectoral approach that aims to meet the basic needs of affected populations. This will be highly relevant for the nexus, with DG ECHO promoting a social protection angle. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area. Should this provide distinct added value, DG ECHO encourages a consortium approach to implement the BNA.

Protection-sensitive vulnerability targeting (see more under Protection) is an essential element of the Basic Needs Approach, and targeting should never be dependent only on status (e.g. refugee, displaced).

Cash transfers

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.

DG ECHO will continue prioritising cash transfers over vouchers and in-kind assistance as the default modality. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons behind the choice of a specific transfer modality through a detailed decision tree analysis and a robust response analysis, which is mandatory. The choice of one modality over another

needs to be justified, considering all relevant contextual factors and including an analysis of market functioning in the affected areas.

Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA)

In Gaza, DG ECHO and like-minded donors aim to consolidate a Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance programme of sufficient scale to address the multi-faceted needs of the most vulnerable people. At the same time, this injects liquidity in support of the local economy. DG ECHO's response will be tailored to respond to conflict-shocks and specific, well-identified protection concerns. Key elements of the MPCA programme include:

- Harmonisation of the targeting approach based on socio-economic indicators, vulnerability criteria and context-specific protection risks;
- Agreement on standardised transfer values based on the Cash Working Group's Minimum Expenditure Basket (60% thereof);
- Coordinated monitoring approach, including the adoption of Grand Bargain Multipurpose Cash Outcome Indicators¹⁶;
- Functional distribution of tasks between implementing partners;
- Close coordination with the national social protection system, e.g. the "National Cash Transfer Programme (NCTP) led by the Ministry of Social Development and supported by the EU - PEGASE instrument.

It is essential that partners indicate, from the outset, the amount of assistance that will be delivered in the form of cash transfers, completing the appropriate sections of the Single Form clearly and accurately, specifying the net delivery amount transferred to beneficiaries and indicating separately the transaction costs. This is important in tracking the EU's international commitments on the use of cash.

3.2.2.5 Food Security & Livelihoods

Food security interventions, preferably as part of an integrated response aiming to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness, can also be considered in emergency response. All proposals should clearly identify food gaps and target the most vulnerable households. Response analysis should also include market assessments and Household Economic Analysis (HEA). The modality of response should be selected according to a thorough decision tree and feasibility analysis possibly designing innovative and accountable solutions in terms of service delivery mechanism and risk mitigation strategy. Any conditionality proposed should be duly justified taking into consideration the specific vulnerabilities of the targeted groups. For in-kind transfers local purchases are encouraged whenever possible.

Livelihood interventions should aim at graduating beneficiaries from their dependency on humanitarian assistance, especially in Gaza. Activities could include the promotion of diversification of productive assets and practices, strengthening livelihood opportunities and value chains that are critical to food security, as well as restoration of assets and

¹⁶ <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/multipurpose-cash-outcome-indicatorsfinal-draft-for-testingjuly-2019.pdf>

income generating activities and creation of new economic opportunities in urban and rural areas. The interventions shall be adapted to the needs of different groups and to each specific crisis situation and therefore be based on strong needs and risk analysis, which should inform the response analysis and its delivery modality, in full respect of the do no harm principle. The choice of the most appropriate intervention and transfer modality (cash, voucher, in kind) must be context-specific, evidence based and possibly regularly reviewed.

3.2.2.6 Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO will prioritize integrated education and child protection interventions, with an emphasis on safe access to protective learning environments, including the protection of education from attacks, ensuring learning continuity in crises, and addressing the psychosocial support needs of children in highly vulnerable communities in both the West Bank and Gaza Strip. All EIE interventions must integrate a COVID-19 response.

In the Gaza Strip, special consideration will be given to interventions that focus on:

- a. Identifying ways to incorporate EiE and child protection into an emergency response, including preparing for the response.
- b. Urban (most conflict affected) and most vulnerable rural (access restricted) areas,
- c. Ensuring partners have strong capacities in both child protection and education responses.

In the West Bank, special focus should be directed to schools affected by demolitions, settler violence, military incursions and child protection. Preventative and responsive advocacy efforts for safe access to education must be considered.

Advocacy and legal support to schools under attack are key elements of the protection of education in Palestine.

EiE interventions should be coordinated with other stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, UNRWA, Education Cannot Wait (ECW), and Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) donors and the Education cluster to optimize synergies, complementarities, and avoid any overlap. Sustainability of interventions must be demonstrated as endeavored.

3.2.2.7 Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Preparedness (DP)

All humanitarian actions must be risk informed. Therefore, partners are requested to ensure projects are designed based on an assessment of risks and implemented to reduce these risks.

Targeted DRR/DP actions should primarily aim at consolidating emergency health preparedness in Gaza, but not only, in order to prepare existing health systems for a surge in demand for services in case of a disaster. Concerning the health system, proposed actions could focus on emergency response mechanisms, recovery planning, establishing and testing of standard protocols, development, application and communication of early warning systems, training of health staff, development of flexible coordination structures at local, sub-national and national levels and identification and deployment of extra supplies to anticipate emergency response. At community level, actions can include risk

awareness, community risk assessments, contingency planning, referral pathways, response and recovery and the training of community health workers.

Building on the actions initiated in Gaza, DG ECHO could support DP actions aiming at strengthening emergency preparedness capacities, access and knowledge in the West Bank and East Jerusalem (EJ). Partners should demonstrate their capacity to support first responders and local systems in EJ to link with national systems, advocate for those linkages via various disaster preparedness advocacy efforts and resorting to IHL as the main advocacy tool with Israel and the international community.

All DRR/DP actions should demonstrate solid linkages with relevant state and local actors to ensure sustainability while identifying a clear exit strategy including a Nexus approach when possible.

3.2.2.8 Humanitarian Advocacy

Advocacy, at all levels (both field level and international fora), can be supported when it is based on strong evidence and clear objectives: the causes of the on-going deterioration of the humanitarian situation can only be addressed through effective advocacy, by calling all parties to respect IHL. 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. 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), including issues related to access, protection of civilians including humanitarian workers and health staff.

3.2.2.9 Humanitarian – Development – Peace nexus

Support to the operationalization of the triple nexus in Palestine can be considered as long as the proposed interventions are in line with a well-coordinated and well-founded analysis.

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).