TECHNICAL ANNEX

TURKEY

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 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.3

Contact persons at HQ:

- Team Leader: Christophe PATERON: Christophe.pateron@ec.europa.eu

- Desk Officers: Zudella PIMLEY SMITH: Zudella.pimley-smith@ec.europa.eu; Georgia GALATI: Georgia.galati@ec.europa.eu; Jean DE LESTRANGE: jean.de-lestrange@ec.europa.eu; Devrig VELLY: Devrig.velly@ec.europa.eu; Simona HERMELYOVA: simona.hermelyova@ec.europa.eu; Jonas SCHERRENS: Jonas.scherrens@ec.europa.eu; Thomas FJENDBO: thomas.fjendbo@ec.europa.eu; Mark BENNUN: mark.bennun@ec.europa.eu

Contact persons in the Field:

- Head of Office: Jane LEWIS: jane.lewis@echofield.eu

- Technical Assistants: Simon MANSFIELD: simon.mansfield@echofield.eu;.Anna GADES: anna.gades@echofield.eu; Philippe SCHNEIDER: Philippe.schneider@echofield.eu; Felix LEGER: felix.leger@echofield.eu; Reza KASRAI: reza.kasrai@echofield.eu; Davina HAYLES: Davina.hayles@echofield.eu; Sabah FARA: Sabah.fara@echofield.eu; Annabelle VASSEUR: Annabelle.vasseur@echofield.eu; Lisa MONAGHAN: lisa.monaghan@echofield.eu; Bruno ROTIVAL: Bruno.rotival@echofield.eu;

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR   782 357 929

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 782 357 929

Total: **HA-FA: EUR 782 357 929**

The indicative allocation of EUR 782 357 929 is to be dedicated to the following:

(1) An indicative amount of EUR 773 357 929 may be made available to ECHO Partners in line with the requirements outlined under Section 3.1. herein.

(2) The Commission may also award one or more service contracts as per the relevant applicable Commission procedures established in the EU Financial Regulation[1] for the following activities:

(a)   Establishment of a Coordination Platform and Information System to oversee and report on the implementation of EU funded actions under the Facility for Refugees in Turkey;

(b)   Support of a third party monitoring mechanism, including specific thematic research requirements, allowing for a broader and more holistic assessment of the effects and impact of the humanitarian strategy under the Facility;

(c)   Support to institutional partnerships through the creation of a knowledge and resource hub;

(d)   Support of specific communication actions.

The indicative amount made available through these contracts is EUR 9 million.

3. **PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT**

   3.1.   Administrative info

   Assessment round 1

   a)   Indicative amount: up to EUR 705 038 000.

   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 01/06/2017[2]. Actions will start from 01/06/2017.

   d)   The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 24 months.

   e)   Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.

   f)   Information to be provided: Single Form[3]

   g)   Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 01/06/2017 onwards.

---

[1]   Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union (OJ L 298, 26.10.2012, p. 1).

[2]   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.

[3]   Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

Assessment round 2

a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 68 319 929.

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 01/06/2017[4]. Actions will start from 01/06/2017.

d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 24 months.

e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to partners with well-established operational capacity In Turkey and in particular in the field of education.

f) Information to be provided: Single Form[5]

g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 30/11/2017.

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at (in no particular order of priority):

o The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section.

o Capacity to reach the most vulnerable, and neglected communities/groups/individuals.

o 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.

o In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action propose.

o Addressing gaps in assistance provision, including complementarity with Government services.

o Building upon and supporting the capacity of, existing systems so as to ensure medium and long term sustainability.

o Capacity to implement at scale and to support capacity development of Turkish stakeholders as relevant.

---

4   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.

5   Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

o Actions that include and articulate pre-defined exit strategies for transition to development programmes or integration with Government services.

o Effectiveness of approach and intervention logic to achieve aim and outcomes.

o Efficiency in terms of resources used to achieve outcomes and outputs.

o Geographical coverage: where possible, and specifically as related to basic needs and Conditional Cash Transfers for Education (CCTE), country-wide with emphasis on gaps and coverage. At a minimum, at district level for the provision of a full package of protection services. For actions that aim to model education solutions, such as an Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP), the development of curricular materials and guidance for implementation should be suitable for national roll-out and be developed in partnership with the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) centrally. While initial piloting under this HIP may be conducted at district-level, actions should build in processes for scalability from the outset.

o Accountability / transparency / monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework.

o Clear definition of roles and responsibilities and complementarities with other stakeholders.

o Clear demonstration of how the complementarities and synergies in the partnerships will be brought to bear on the effectiveness of the action.

o ECHO will favor supporting humanitarian actions that will be implemented in partnership with national organizations, namely Turkish (and Syrian) NGOs and civil society organizations or relevant Government institutions.

o A description of the ways in which the capacity gaps of each of the partners is planned to be addressed, whether as part of the partnership or through external service providers, including the modalities.

o For the pilot protection project foreseen and aiming at facilitating the inclusion of Syrian refugees in social protection services through existing government assistance schemes, the partner must demonstrate a track record of relevant collaboration with the MoFSP in the area of protection, social protection and inclusion. The partner will have proven technical expertise in protection and social protection, and robust administrative and financial practices capable of accompanying a future scale-up to national scale. Prior experience with supporting public policies that encourage inclusion is an advantage.

3.2.2.   Operational guidelines:

This section outlines the general and specific operational guidelines which need to be taken into account by ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by ECHO. Complementary information can be retrieved on these guidelines in the links

provided below. Partners are invited to duly reflect the guidance provided in these documents in the preparation of their proposals to ECHO.

3.2.2.1.   General Guidelines

Involvement of a wider variety of actors: Where it is in the interest of the action, and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework, ECHO supports involvement of a broad range of actors engaged in humanitarian response, including the local and/or international private sector.

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.

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.

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:

o   The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) or beneficiary profiling;

o   Management and monitoring of operations, and having adequate systems in place to facilitate this;

o   Reporting on activities and outcomes, and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;

o   Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers is mandatory. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. However, in line with World Humanitarian Summit commitments, ECHO will endeavour to increase cash-

based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains. The questions 'why not cash' and 'if not now, then when' should be asked before modalities are selected. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. 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 (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the 'Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors' and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed. Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers. In such approaches, the value of transfer would normally be based upon a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), while taking account the contribution made by households, and available resources.

For in-kind transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible.

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

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

Partners should take into account ECHO's "Guidance to partners funded by ECHO to deliver medium to large-scale cash transfers in the framework of 2017 HIPS and ESOP". Given the scale of this HIP, the relevant elements of the Guidance will be applied to the ESSN.

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination (in particular 3RP processes): 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. The 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, 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.

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

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream risk management in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to man-made and natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their livelihoods and assets. It is noted that Turkey is a highly earthquake prone area. 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. This risk management 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 all contexts, and especially to known risks. 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.

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

Education in Emergencies: ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education[6] in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities

---

[6] 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.

in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps. Innovative solutions will 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 enabling activities like 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 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.

Activities must 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.

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

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. 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.

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

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. In contexts where it has been determined (see also response analysis below) that cash transfers are an appropriate modality, and that cash can meet multiple basic needs, partners are encouraged to transfer single payments using a common delivery platform. Multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT) should be coordinated alongside other sector-specific responses within a basic needs approach, but fragmenting MPCT into sector clusters for coordination is not encouraged. MPCTs also offer the opportunity to conduct joined up assessments across sectors (including market analysis), common registration, targeting, and monitoring and evaluation frameworks. As far as possible, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to reduce the potential for conflicts of interest. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

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 issues such as freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. 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 a grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues on 1) development of indicators to measure impact of integrated protection programming with other sectors; 2) Approaches for monitoring and evaluating integrated protection programmes; 3) Training and human resources needs for integrated protection programming; and 4) Implementation of integrated protection programming in areas of difficult access. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and

Protection Programming in the ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.[7]

Protection: Programme design should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population and the response must aim to prevent, reduce/mitigate and respond to the risks and consequences of violence, coercion, deliberate deprivation and abuse for persons, groups and communities in the context of humanitarian crises. Integration of protection concerns is important in all contexts, but 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.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. It refers to the imperative for each and every humanitarian actor to prevent, mitigate and respond to protection threats that are caused or perpetuated by humanitarian action/inaction by ensuring the respect of fundamental protection principles in humanitarian programmes – no matter what sector or objective. While mainstreaming protection is closely linked to the 'do no harm' principle, it widens it to prioritising safety and dignity and avoiding causing harm, ensuring meaningful access, ensuring accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

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 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. The use of integrated protection programming approaches is also strongly encouraged.

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

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.

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen, self-reliance through 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 (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local

---

[7]   See Annex 4 on p. 49 and forward in http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf

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.) and IDPs; iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

Where applicable, partners should reflect on applying resilience thinking and programming to (protracted) **forced displacement** situations – so as to harness resilience and strengthen self-reliance of affected populations – refugees, IDPs and their host communities. Working towards the gradual socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced populations – focusing on access to employment opportunities and access to services – in protracted crises is a priority for ECHO, DEVCO, NEAR and the EEAS, working in a comprehensive manner, each under their mandate – and should be supported by ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide. Investment in social protection mechanisms is an opportunity tackling the challenges faced by humanitarian crises and contributes to a reduction in the chronic humanitarian caseload, especially in the context of extreme fragility. Access to predictable, adequate and regular aid can, in the short-term protect poor households from the impacts of shocks and help to build capacity over time. Moreover, emergency safety nets can be incorporated as a cornerstone of self-reliance strategy for empowering the forcibly displaced and giving them support to address vulnerabilities.

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Communication_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff_working_document_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf

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.

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

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:

o 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.

- o 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.

For standard visibility activities, partners may, in principle, allocate a budget of up to 0.5% of the direct eligible costs of the action with a ceiling of EUR 8 000. However, for individual agreements equal or above EUR 5 million no absolute ceiling applies. Hence, in such cases, the standard visibility budget may go up to 0.5%, even when this amount s EUR 8 000. In the latter case, partners must provide an overview of planned visibility activities and a budget breakdown.

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/.

Other Useful links to guidelines and policies:

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

Cash and vouchers

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

Thematic Policy Document No. 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors

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

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

Guidance to partners funded by ECHO to deliver medium to large-scale cash transfers in the framework of 2017 HIPs and ESOP

Health

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

Remote Management

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

The EU resilience communication and Action Plan

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

Gender

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

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

ECHO Visibility

http://www.echo-visibility.eu/

Children in Conflict

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

Protection

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

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

3.2.2.2.   Specific guidelines

3.2.2.2.1 Protection interventions

The core of ECHO's strategic response is to invest in outreach, awareness and specialized protection services in the form of Case Management (CM) and Individual Protection Assistance (IPA), Protection Monitoring and Protection Advocacy. Note that Specific Needs Funds (SNF) are no longer considered a protection intervention as of 2017, as this should be handled by relevant sector expertise (mainly in health sector).

Key components:

Outreach

Outreach serves as the entry point for further services and is here defined as a means to increase the knowledge of procedures, rights, entitlements and available protection services among both persons of concern[8] as well as amongst service-providers on the applicable legislation, rights of persons of concern as well as on existing referral pathways.

In Turkey, outreach could be provided in community centers or by mobile outreach teams:

i). Community Centers/Multi-service centers:

ECHO could envisage funding protection activities within centers as an outreach point for protection services. A minimum package of protection to be covered in the centers could include:

- Information dissemination, counselling and legal aid (individual and group/community)
- Psychosocial support (PSS) (individual and group)
- Tools used: Individual Protection Assistance and Case Management (but the latter only for centers that have the specific capacity to conduct CM).

Additional services that could be seen as having a protection outcome, but which falls outside of ECHO's protection response under the Facility, and are thus not to be covered by this HIP or HIP-TA:

- Advice on access to the labour market
- Life skills training/Vocational training
- Language training
- Catch-up classes
- Home-work classes
- Social cohesion activities: Intercultural activities and Community Initiative projects

ii) Mobile outreach teams:

---

[8]   'Persons of Concern' (POC) as per UNHCR's definition including refugees, asylum seekers, internally displaced persons (IDPs) who are protected/assisted by UNHCR, stateless persons, and returnees (returned refugees and IDPs).

Outreach teams are relevant both in rural areas (where the population density may not be sufficiently substantial to set up a community center), but also at neighborhood level in larger cities where persons of concern may live in isolation due to a variety of factors. Outreach teams should be capable of providing information about basic legal issues (e.g. registration), access to services and ESSN (Emergency Social Safety Net)/CCTE (Conditional Cash Transfer for Education), assistance in filling out various forms, facilitation ("holding hands") and referral to IPA, CM.

Outreach is a key activity in ensuring referral to specialized protection services, as well as for those cases that may need referral to specialized non-protection services or assistance (e.g. health). As such, both outreach teams and community centers must possess a comprehensive overview of access to government and non-government services in their areas of operation, and should always attempt to ensure access to government services for their clients. Likewise outreach provides an important contribution to protection information management and monitoring.

Case Management (CM)

CM is to be considered as a medium to long-term process intervention that has a specific, intentional and articulated protection outcome. CM can be defined as a 'collaborative, multi-disciplinary process promoting quality and effective outcomes through communication and the provision of appropriate resources to meet an individual's needs" through the support of a professional case worker and specialized protection actors. Typical issues to address could e.g. be gender based violence (GBV), other types of violence and child protection (CP) cases, but could also be severe cases of chronic diseases or disability that require a combination of protection services and medical interventions (the latter to be assisted not by the protection actors but by and in close collaboration with medical service providers).

CM service provision consists of a one-to-one relationship between the caseworker and the 'client'. Due to high sensitivity, it is paramount to respect guiding principles such as - but not limited to – confidentiality (protecting information gathered about clients and ensuring it is accessible only with a client's explicit permission), informed consent (voluntary agreement of an individual who has the capacity to give consent, and who exercises free and informed choice), empowerment (staff must work to engage 'clients' to play an active role in the CM process).

CM involves 6 specific steps that must be followed:

1. Identification and registration of the individual/case;
2. Assessment of the specific needs;
3. Development of an individual case plan, with time bound and measurable objectives;
4. Implementation of the case plan;
5. Follow up and review;
6. Case closure.

A key component to be included in protection programs providing services through CM is an adequate and structured level of supervision intended as: 1. Supervision of individual cases to help case workers to find solutions to challenging cases, 2. Support for personal wellbeing for case workers, and 3. Support for wider processes: this may

include operational challenges that the supervisor can raise with management for resolution.

Skills and competencies of staff are vital to implement case management in a safe and professional manner. Assessment of skills and competencies of the staff should take place as part of the recruitment processes and should represent the basis for capacity building activities:

Caseworkers/Case Managers are the key workers carrying on the case management process. They are responsible for ensuring that the case is managed in accordance with an established process and taking responsibility for coordinating the actions of all actors involved in the process. Case workers must have a reasonable caseload (i.e.: for CP interventions, this limit is set in Child Protection Minimum Standard (CPMS) at 25 cases/ caseworkers at the same time), however this ratio will depend on the kind of programme which is implemented, and it has to be clearly defined in the project rationale.

Supervisors are in charge of: administrative case management, reflecting on and learning from practice, personal support to case workers, mediation, and professional development. Each case worker has to be provided with supervision. The ratio supervisor/case workers will depend from the typology of programme implemented, and it has to be clearly defined in the project rationale.

Caseworkers/case managers and supervisors should have, at minimum, prior experience working with people of concern (and children in case for CP interventions) as well as appropriate social work certifications (degree/diploma/certificate). When certifications are not available, personal skills, attitude and prior experience should be prioritized and a clear capacity building plan should be developed on the basis of assessed capacity gaps. All case management staff must sign a Code of Conduct.

Note: mental health level services should always be provided by professional health providers.

Monitoring & Evaluation of CM: As case management is an individualized response to an individual and specific need, the process and output must be reviewed through a range of modalities and tools that take into consideration the complexity and the variables of the whole process, such as: case management meetings, case management conferences, review of case plan, case closure reports. In their proposal partners should provide a clear explanation on the M&E tools and modalities they chose to adopt. While ECHO will always respect partners' decision not to disclose confidential information on specific cases, partners must on the other hand propose precise means of verification (e.g.: statistics, data flows, case studies) that can sufficiently document the output of the action.

CM will address the following types of protection interventions: Prevention of and Response to Violence (including GBV); Response to the exclusion and specific needs of LGBTI refugees; Response to Child Protection violations typically Unaccompanied Minor/Separated Child (UAM/SC) support, violence, severe abuse and neglect, and prevention to Children Associated to Armed Forces and Armed Groups (CAAFAGs); Response to Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals (particularly family law, tracing and detention). It will furthermore feed into Protection Information Management and Monitoring.

Individual Protection Assistance (IPA)

IPA is carried out by a protection actor and aimed at reducing specific protection risks or reducing an individual's vulnerability to a specific threat, which can be addressed with protection assistance; either in the form of one-off service/assistance or a process. The one-off or process intervention has to have a specific, intentional and articulated protection outcome. IPA should be implemented by a protection actor and/or specialized protection actor.

Typical issues addressed through IPA in Turkey could include: Lack of information, uncertainty and language issues preventing access to ESSN/CCTE, services, other support systems; mild PSS symptoms; as well as preventative activities on violence and child protection – these would typically be addressed through one-off interventions. It would also include legal (documentation) issues preventing access to ESSN, services, other support systems and security of tenure; – these would be process interventions.

The type of modalities under the one-off interventions could include: Legal/rights information and counselling, translation services, facilitation, psycho-social support (often in the form of group counselling), etc. Interventions likely to require a more elaborate process include: Legal aid and counselling, which may in certain cases require legal fees (in the form of cash) in order to recuperate legalized documents from country of origin.

One-off IPA will address the following types of protection interventions: <u>Prevention activities</u> (typically sensitization and awareness raising) under *Prevention of and Response to Violence (including GBV)*, *Child Protection* violations, and *Mine Risk Education*; <u>Information provision</u> on *Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals, Protection Information Dissemination and Housing, Lands and Property Rights.*

Process IPA will address the following types of protection interventions: <u>Response</u> to *Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals and Housing, Lands and Property Rights*.

Both one-off and process IPA will furthermore feed into *Protection Information Management and Monitoring*.

Protection Monitoring

Protection monitoring is documenting trends and identifying primary protection threats and risks in a given location. Protection monitoring is used to develop a better understanding of the situation faced by different population groups as a basis for designing an evolving protection response which incorporates preventative measures.

Protection data is inherently sensitive. For this reason there is a greater obligation to share this information and related analysis appropriately, within a reasonable timeframe, and as widely as possible. Information Sharing Protocol (ISP) needs to be in place.

Protection monitoring must go beyond incident reporting and produce trends analysis that can inform programming and advocacy.

Protection Advocacy

Protection advocacy in the context of Turkey should focus on access and enforcement of rights contained within Turkey's Temporary and International Protection regimes, as well as basic tenets of international treaties ratified by the government of Turkey. Advocacy must always be evidence-based.

Types of Protection Issues to be addressed:

Please refer to section 10.7 of the ECHO protection policy for a more detailed description of the different types of protection interventions. Those listed here below are the ones considered relevant for Turkey within the protection programming components described above. Please refer to part 10.3 of the ECHO protection policy for a list of relevant reference documents.

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals

Civil documentation; restoration of lost civil documentation; and Family tracing and reunification.

Prevention of and response to violence (including GBV)

Prevention: Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies (particularly related to GBV); Response: Medical, MHPSS, Legal and Security

Specifically on GBV: DG ECHO would like to recall that all GBV services must be available to men, boys, women and girls.

Child Protection

Prevention of and response to violence; Case management including Best Interest Assessment (BIA) and Best Interest Determination (BID) processes; Family tracing and reunification; Prevention of CAAFAGs

For more information on the child protection please refer to the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Minimum Standards on CP in humanitarian action (2012).

Housing, Land and Property Rights (HLP)

Security of tenure in displacement situations and prevention of forced evictions. Information on relevant rights, legal aid and obtain appropriate documents to challenge evictions

Mine Action

Mine risk education.

Community-based Protection

Community-based protection enables communities to better analyse, deconstruct and manage the risks a community face and thus contribute to reduce/mitigate their fear.

Protection Information Dissemination

Rights awareness and access to services; Sensitization campaign/Risk awareness.

Protection Information Management and Monitoring

Protection monitoring; Screening, registrations and verification exercises; Protection databases. Partners proposing information management activities should clearly specify which IM category they are proposing and how they will apply commonly agreed global standards. For further information please refer to http://pim.guide/.

Advocacy

Mobilization involves engaging with other key stakeholders so that they themselves put some pressure on duty-bearers. Persuasion requires a discreet engagement with duty-bearers to let them know about their duties in protection and to promote their fulfilling their protection obligations.

Modalities:

Facilitation

"Holding hands" or interpretation may be used in protection assistance to ensure persons of concern have access to all available services.

Cash

Cash may be used as a response modality in IPA and CM if and when deemed absolutely necessary and no other response can provide an appropriate solution. Please refer to reference documents listed above under "other useful links to guidelines and policies."

Good practice:

Management of sensitive protection information

Recommended reference documents for data management:

Policy on the Protection of Personal Data of Persons of Concern to UNHCR *(2015)*

ICRC (2013) - Chapter 6 of Professional Standards for Protection Work carried out by humanitarian and human rights actors in armed conflict and other situations of violence

DRC and UNHCR - Protection Information Management Initiative (PIM),

The European Interagency Security Forum (2010) - The information management challenge: A briefing on Information Security for Humanitarian NGO in the field

Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS)

MHPSS is considered a priority in humanitarian interventions as reflected in the ECHO Health and Protection Policies, and ensuring that a proper referral pathway is in place between the different levels before embarking on any MHPSS intervention is a sine qua non. In other words, PSS interventions must not be started without having an agreement with MH service providers to take cases that may require MH specialized services.

Accordingly focused non-specialized support (PSS) – in the form of e.g. individual or group counseling – may be provided at community centers, schools, etc. provided that this is done by trained staff supervised by a qualified psychologist, whereas provision of medical mental health assistance (i.e. specialized services) should always be carried out by a psychiatrist, psychotherapist or a clinical psychologist, and ideally contributing to expand the mhGAP strategy.

In proposals, partners must specify what kind of MHPSS activities they plan to do, whether it falls under IPA, CM and/or Health, who the target group will be and what the expected outcome will be.

Psychological first aid (PFA) is not considered a priority in the Turkey context, and will not be regarded as a PSS intervention (even if it might be advantageous that e.g. outreach staff is trained in PFA).

MHPPS should follow the IASC Guidelines (2007)

[Inter-agency Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings.](#)

3.2.2.2.2 Social Services

With a view to facilitating access of refugees to and inclusion in social services through existing government assistance schemes, ECHO will support a pilot project that aims to address the specific vulnerabilities of refugees in partnerships with the MoFSP.

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

- The capacity of social service centers (SSCs and SASFs) to respond, either directly or through referrals, to the psychological, social and financial needs of refugees living in Turkey;
- Opportunities for certification and integration of foreign nationals in social service provision of the MoFSP;
- Referrals and counter-referrals between the SSCs and SASFs, also taking into into account the large number of refugees applying to the ESSN.
- Referrals and facilitated access to refugee registration and legal assistance services;
- Creative solutions facilitating access to SSC and SASF supported services for not-yet-registered refugees;
- Safeguards (appeals, complaints, M&E) designed to ensure overall humanitarian accountability and compliance with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid ("the EU Consensus").

The pilot should aim at targeting as many as ten provinces among those most densely populated by refugees for a maximum duration of 18 months. Provinces should be selected to reflect a diversification in geography and refugee needs, as well as existing government capacity. At least three provinces with a population of no fewer than 20 000 refugees and including SSC and SASF offices should be included to test the feasibility of the referrals between SSCs and SASFs.

The partner must demonstrate a track record of relevant collaboration with the MoFSP in the area of protection, social protection and inclusion. The partner will have proven technical expertise in protection and social protection, and robust administrative and financial practices capable of accompanying a future scale-up to national scale. Prior experience with supporting public policies that encourage inclusion is an advantage.

3.2.2.2.3 Basic Needs Response

In line with commitments of the Grand Bargain and ECHO guidance on the delivery of medium to large-scale cash transfers, ECHO will continue funding the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) to respond to the basic needs of 1 million refugees in Turkey. The ESSN should aim for improvement in the following areas:

    i.   Efficiency and cost-effectiveness,
   ii.   Accountability and protection;
  iii.   Governance, management and M&E

In addition, an exit strategy that includes full integration into the Government of Turkey's social protection system - with a transitional phase to diversified funding options as appropriate - should be elaborated and included in proposals for funding.

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

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

- One-card/one-platform: a single unrestricted monthly transfer ensured by one single FPA/FAFA partner organisation for unconditional cash with a unique targeting system based on verified and agreed socio-economic vulnerability indicators and thresholds to capture the most vulnerable households.

- An indicative efficiency ratio of at least 90:10 for the delivery of the multipurpose cash transfer (90% directly reaching beneficiaries in form of cash).

- An adequate transfer value with a demonstrable impact on beneficiaries' ability to meet minimum basic needs as defined by the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB).

- Flexibility and expandability: the system should allow for variations in cash delivery to achieve additional outcomes, such as conditionality (i.e. education, as in the case of the CCTE) or one-off assistance in case of a sudden onset emergency, for example.

Accountability and Protection

- A robust appeals system to guarantee accountability to affected populations (AAP), equity and transparency.

- Feedback and accountability mechanisms integrated into programme design, development and M&E to improve policy and practice in programming.

- Transparency: accessible and timely information to affected populations on organizational/programme procedures, structures and processes.

- Improved referral system to ensure linkages with relevant services, existing outreach systems and complementary measures.

Governance, management and M&E

- A single integrated governance structure to guarantee transparency, accountability and overall efficiency of the response model, as well as compliance with donors' financial regulations and humanitarian principles.

- A single and harmonised performance management, results monitoring and reporting framework.

- An independent assessment and evaluation system.

Furthermore, streamlined processes, segregation of duties and the involvement of a limited number of actors must be reflected in the response model to minimize operational overheads and deliver the best value for money, as outlined in ECHO's "Guidance to partners funded by ECHO to deliver medium to large-scale cash transfers in the framework of 2017 HIPS and ESOP".

3.2.2.2.4 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.

Free primary healthcare services will continue to be provided while the Ministry of Health (MoH) implements its plan for the establishment of Migrant Health Centres. Monitoring and reporting on the utilisation of and access to, ECHO-supported PHCs will be expected. No new primary health care facilities will be supported except in case of emergency (or if justified by dire needs) and if endorsed by the MoH.

Actions in primary health care should reinforce mother and child care, but also address mental health needs in an integrated manner, aligned with the Ministry of Health (MoH) policy.

Health interventions targeting GBV should provide comprehensive care for victims, both female and male, including CMR, MHPSS, as well as covering legal and security aspects.

Health interventions may also cover specialized care aimed at post-operative and rehabilitation services for war wounded or injured.

All actions should be based on a quantitative needs analysis. Health Data, disaggregated according to sex and age group, should be collected and analysed on a monthly basis. Actions should also measure the quality of health care services provided.

In the case of continuations of previously funded Actions, 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 medicines avoiding duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (medicine stocks).

Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted, in a coordinated manner. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.

ECHO may consider the inclusion of "Special Need Funds" in health actions to address acute medical needs by competent medical actors only, duly justified, based on vulnerability and only as a measure of last resort.

3.2.2.2.5 Education in Emergencies

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

Conditional Cash Transfers for Education - CCTE
In an effort to increase access to education of the most vulnerable refugees and other persons of concern, ECHO will continue to support the delivery of conditional cash top-ups for education through a single provider, particularly under the ESSN framework in partnership with the Ministry of Familiy and Social Policy (MoFSP) and Ministy of National Education (MoNE). Other forms of cash transfers for formal education will not be supported by ECHO. The CCTE project aims to increase the enrolment of out-of-school children, and to improve attendance and retention of vulnerable children within the school system. This will include monitoring of student attendance to ensure a minimum of 80%, aligned with MoNE and MoFSP minimum standards. Particular attention is paid to out-of-school children and children at risk of dropping out due to protection-related concerns, with community outreach, referral and response mechanisms. Children who leave school or do not meet minimum attendance criteria are provided with direct support for reintegration.

The CCTE framework covers children in Temporary Education Centres (TECs) and Turkish schools, and if an enabling framework for Non-Formal Education (NFE)[9] is

---

[9] **For the purposes of this HIP, the following definitions apply: Formal education:** An educational system with hierarchic structures and a chronological progression through levels or grades with a set beginning and end. Formal education usually takes place in an institution and involves some kind of assessment leading to a certificate of qualification (available at: http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

Non-formal education: A flexible approach to education using alternative modes of delivery outside the formal system. The content offered by non-formal education programs may be identical to that available in school or it may be different, as in the case of literacy programs and popular education initiatives that do not lead to certificates (Save the Children http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

developed in future ECHO could consider expanding CCTE to include children enrolled in NFE. The expectation is to achieve national coverage in the course of school year 2017-2018.

Non-Formal Education - NFE
While a normative framework for NFE has not yet been developed, a number of initiatives are planned for Syrian refugees and other children of concern under the Facility. These include, amongst others, Turkish language training for children in school and out-of-school, catch-up classes for out-of-school children and back-up trainings (learning support classes) for children in school.

To address gaps in NFE service provision, ECHO may consider funding pilot initiatives that provide NFE under the two options described below. Any NFE initiatives should be developed in collaboration with MoNE, aligned to the Turkish curriculum and designed to be replicable, at scale, nationally. ECHO's support to NFE would aim to contribute to the establishment of a normative framework for NFE. In doing so, partners should consider NFE as models for broader application rather than geographically or contextually specific projects.

Option 1: Provide basic literacy and numeracy (BLN) classes for out-of-school children with needs that are not sufficiently addressed by the catch-up classes under the Facility. BLN classes should be clearly linked to transition into formal education, and complement initiatives under the Facility rather than overlap.

Option 2: Provide Accelerated Learning Programmes (ALP) for out-of-school children who have missed several years of school, to facilitate their entrance to formal education at their age-appropriate grade. This may combine two or three grades of education into one year, through a condensed and age-appropriate curriculum aligned to the Turkish curriculum. ECHO may support the development of an ALP curriculum, based on a realistic timeframe. To ensure high quality curriculum development, partners should have past experience developing an ALP curriculum in at least two other contexts

3.2.2.2.6 Coordination, Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation

Given the scale and complexity of the humanitarian interventions funded through ECHO under the Facility, it is necessary for ECHO to make certain adjustments compared to the way it operates in other contexts.

Moreover, the actions under this HIP are co-financed from external assigned revenues received by the Union from EU Member States under the Facility. The Member States, through the Steering Committee of the Facility require more regular reporting than the habitual ECHO reporting requirements (interim and final reports).

In light of the above, an internal coordination platform will be established by ECHO in order to ensure availability of up-to-date information, allowing ECHO to both oversee

---

Informal education: A process of learning through everyday experiences and the transfer of knowledge, skills and attitudes through traditional culture, families, communities, and media (Save the Children: http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

and to report on the implementation of Actions funded under the Facility. This will include an information system with the functionality to receive and consolidate data on planned and actual progress of Actions. The reports produced by this information system will provide for: improved and efficient follow-up of Actions by ECHO; up-to-date reporting to the Facility Steering Committee, European Parliament, EU Member States and Turkish authorities; and, information useful for the humanitarian community for operational coordination purposes.

For this reason, additional monthly and/or quarterly reporting will be required from ECHO partners. To achieve this, harmonized results and indicators will be required in certain sectors of activity of the Single Form. Appropriate reporting templates and relevant guidance on the reporting content and the specific reporting schedule will be shared by ECHO to all partners receiving funds under this HIP.

The monitoring of humanitarian interventions under the Facility will in part be served by the above platform. ECHO partners are also expected to have in place monitoring and evaluation systems for their programming. In addition, ECHO will establish a third-party monitoring mechanism allowing for a broader and more holistic assessment of the effects and impact of the humanitarian strategy under the Facility. It will be expected that ECHO partners funded under this HIP extend their cooperation in this regard.

3.2.2.2.7 Partnerships

Local civil society organizations (CSOs) and national NGOs (NNGOs) have had and continue to play an indispensable role in responding to the humanitarian needs in Turkey. Indeed, the majority of ECHO funds has and will be translated into services and assistance provided primarily by local actors. As such, ECHO will continue to require strategic partnerships of FPA/FAFA partners with local CSO and NNGOs.

Recognizing that meaningful partnerships are built over time, continuation or expansion of successful existing partnerships with national organizations will be privileged. Partnerships should strive to be in line with the Principles of Partnership (https://www.icvanetwork.org/resources/principles-partnership).

During evaluations or monitoring of actions funded by ECHO, indications of the quality of the partnership will be sought in addition to the quality and progress of the action's targets and indicators.

In accordance with the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement and pursuant to the EU Financial Regulation, indirect costs shall not exceed 7% of direct eligible cost of the Action.

Business continuity planning for primary FPA/FAFA and their partners will be expected.

3.2.2.2.8 Capacity-strengthening

ECHO will support initiatives to strengthen the capacity of its partners and their implementing partners to the extent that the final objective is an improvement in the quality, sustainability and coverage of services delivered to beneficiaries. Capacity-strengthening plans should be based on an organizational capacity assessment, carried out internally by each organization, in order to identify and prioritize the relevant skills,

systems and procedures requiring development. Following this assessment, the different providers of the capacity-development should be identified, as well as the modalities. Development modalities such as coaching and mentoring, rather than classroom-style trainings, will be privileged.

With reference to the specific guidelines on partnerships above, given that the ability to initiate and nurture partnerships is an organizational capacity in itself, initiatives targeting the improvement of the partnering skills of ECHO FPA/FAFA partners and their implementing partners alike will be considered.

3.2.2.2.9 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.D2) 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.