

TECHNICAL ANNEX

Syria Regional Crisis

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2018/01000 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

DG ECHO¹/B.4

Contact persons

at HQ

Team Leaders:

Mamar MERZOUK:

Mamar.MERZOUK@ec.europa.eu

Alessandro VALDAMBRINI:

Alessandro.VALDAMBRINI@ec.europa.eu

Regional Horizontal Issues Coordination:

Roxane HENRY:

Roxane.HENRY@ec.europa.eu

Syria:

Elena FRANCESHINIS:

Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu

Joe GALBY:

Joe.GALBY@ec.europa.eu

Martina GHELARDUCCI:

Martina.GHELARDUCCI@ec.europa.eu

Silvia NAVEIRA CAMPOS:

Silvia.NAVEIRA-CAMPOS@ec.europa.eu

Dina SINIGALLIA:

Dina.SINIGALLIA@ec.europa.eu

Lebanon: Nicolas RITZENTHALER:

Nicolas.RITZENTHALER@ec.europa.eu

Jordan: Jacopo LOMBARDI:

Jacopo.LOMBARDI@ec.europa.eu

Egypt: Gaetan MIONI:

Gaetan.MIONI@ec.europa.eu

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

in the field

**Syria Damascus and Cross-border from
Jordan and Lebanon and Iraq:**

Olivier ROUSSELLE:
Olivier.Rousselle@echofield.eu

Olivier BEUCHER:
Olivier.Beucher@echofield.eu

Julien BUHA-COLLETTE:
Julien.Buha-Collette@echofield.eu

Syria Cross-border from Turkey:

Vanessa MERLET:
Vanessa.Merlet@echofield.eu

Cedric PERUS: Cedric.Perus@echofield.eu

Lebanon:

Massimiliano MANGIA:
Massimiliano.Mangia@echofield.eu

Fabrice MARTIN: Fabrice.Martin@echofield.eu

Jordan:

Matteo PAOLTRONI:
Matteo.Paoltroni@echofield.eu

Yassine GABA: Yassine.Gaba@echofield.eu

Egypt:

Aldo BIONDI: Aldo.Biondi@echofield.eu

Regional:

Claudia AMARAL:
Claudia.Amaral@echofield.eu

Davide ZAPPA: Davide.Zappa@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 260 000 000² (of which an indicative amount of EUR 15 800 000 for Education in Emergencies)

Breakdown as per Worldwide Decision³:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises⁴: HA-FA: EUR 260 000 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 260 000 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Allocation round 1: LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 80 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round – all interventions are described in section 3 of the HIP for Lebanon.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018⁵. Actions will start from 01/01/2018
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies, Disaster Preparedness.
- e) Potential partners⁶: All DG ECHO Partners.⁷
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁸
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **31/01/2018**.

Allocation round 2: SYRIA Part I

² Indicate here the total amount allocated to the crisis as per the General Guidelines on Operational Priorities for 2018.

³ Only the relevant lines are kept in the list hereafter

⁴ As possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

⁵ 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.

⁶ For British applicants (non-governmental organisations): Please be aware that you must comply with the requirement of establishment in an EU Member State for the entire duration of the grants awarded under this HIP. If the United Kingdom withdraws from the EU during the grant period without concluding an agreement with the EU ensuring in particular that British applicants continue to be eligible, you will cease to receive EU funding or be required to leave the project on the basis of Article 15 of the grant agreement.

⁷ ICRC (in view of its comprehensive presence in all countries in the region combined with its multi-sectoral intervention capacity and presence in the field, notably with respect to protection, ICRC has been pre-selected to run a Grand Bargain related regional pilot project)

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

- h) Indicative amount: up to EUR 105 000 000.
- i) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round – all interventions are described in section 3 of the HIP for Syria.
- j) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018⁹. Actions will start from 01/01/2018
- k) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action or in exceptional cases. .
- l) Potential partners¹⁰: All DG ECHO Partners.¹¹
- m) Information to be provided: Single Form¹²
- n) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **31/01/2018**.

Additional assessment round(s) will take place in the course of the year upon release of additional appropriations in accordance with the applicable rule and procedures.

Tentative date for receipt of the requested information for the following assessment round will be communicated in due course.

Allocation round 3: SYRIA Part II

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 35 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round – all interventions are described in section 3 of the HIP for Syria.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018¹³. Actions will start from 01/01/2018
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action or in exceptional cases.
- e) Potential partners¹⁴: All DG ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **25/06/2018**.

Part of the indicative amount may be tentatively allocated to proposals already submitted under round 2 which were put on hold due to budgetary limitations¹⁶.

⁹ See footnote 5.

¹⁰ See footnote 6.

¹¹ ICRC (in view of its comprehensive presence in all countries in the region combined with its multi-sectoral intervention capacity and presence in the field, notably with respect to protection, ICRC has been pre-selected to run a Grand Bargain related regional pilot project)

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

¹³ See footnote 5

¹⁴ See footnote 6.

¹⁵ See footnote 8.

¹⁶ Partners with proposals on hold will be invited to submit a revised version of the Single Form already submitted.

Allocation round 4: EGYPT

- h) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 000 000.
- i) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round – all interventions are described in section 3 of the HIP for Egypt.
- j) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018¹⁷. Actions will start from 01/03/2018
- k) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies, Disaster Preparedness.
- l) Potential partners¹⁸: All DG ECHO Partners.
- m) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁹
- n) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **28/02/2018**.

Allocation round 5: JORDAN

- o) Indicative amount: up to EUR 36 000 000.
- p) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round – all interventions are described in section 3 of the HIP for Jordan.
- q) Costs will be eligible from 01/03/2018²⁰. Actions will start from 01/04/2018
- r) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies, Disaster Preparedness.
- s) Potential partners²¹: All DG ECHO Partners.²²
- t) Information to be provided: Single Form²³
- u) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **31/03/2018**.

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ See footnote 6.

¹⁹ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

²⁰ 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.

²¹ See footnote 6.

²² ICRC (in view of its comprehensive presence in all countries in the region combined with its multi-sectoral intervention capacity and presence in the field, notably with respect to protection, ICRC has been pre-selected to run a Grand Bargain related regional pilot project)

²³ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

Each action will be assessed against a set of criteria according to the specific context of intervention. These criteria include:

- Relevance to DG ECHO strategy and operational requirements;
- Quality of the needs assessment²⁴
- Quality of the response strategy, including the relevance of the intervention (including contingency planning) and coverage;
- The logical framework, including robust and relevant output and outcome indicators;
- Feasibility;
- Implementation capacity and technical expertise ; and
- Knowledge of the country/region.

Depending on the characteristics of the crisis, other elements are likely to be taken into account when assessing the proposals, such as:

- Security;
- Coordination;
- Access arrangements;
- Monitoring system;
- Sustainability, resilience, Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development;
- Cost efficiency; or comparative advantage of the action or the partners.

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.

3.2.2. Operational guidelines:

This section outlines the general and specific operational guidelines which need to be taken into account by DG ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG 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 DG ECHO.

²⁴ Partners are expected to contribute and use coordinated needs assessments on crisis and sector level in line with Grand Bargain commitments

3.2.2.1. General Guidelines

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.

The safe and secure provision of aid: The ability to safely deliver assistance to all areas must be preserved. DG 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. DG ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

Accountability: As the quality and robustness of any humanitarian aid operation lie first and foremost with the organisation that proposes it and will be responsible for its implementation in the field, attention is drawn to the fact that DG ECHO partners' accountability in this respect relate, *inter alia*, to the following aspects of Actions' design and implementation:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs through robust, comprehensive methods conducted in a coordinated manner with humanitarian partners on sector and crisis level²⁵;
- Management and monitoring of operations, as properly facilitated by adequate systems in place;
- Monitoring and reporting on activities, outputs and outcomes, through robust indicators and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

Local disaster response organisations have had and continue to play a vital role in responding to the humanitarian needs. With a keen local understanding of the conflict, the people and the area, local aid organisations are uniquely qualified to know what is most needed, in which areas, and how to gain access to those in need. DG ECHO funds have and will be translated into services and assistance provided by local actors in the majority of cases. As such, DG ECHO will continue supporting strategic, genuine and inclusive partnerships of FPA/FAFA partners with local actors, in line with the Grand Bargain commitments.

Grand Bargain commitments: DG ECHO and most of its main partners have signed up to the Grand Bargain, a set of commitments in line with current good practice and ongoing policy discussions, seeking to bring about substantial changes in terms of aid efficiency. While many of the commitments require further ground work on a global level, progress can be made in 2018 already on a certain number of commitments. In

²⁵ See footnote related to the quality of needs assessment and the Grand bargain-related section below.

addition to the commitments covered by specific sections in this annex (cash, humanitarian-development nexus, localisation and accountability to affected populations), partners are expected to explore and propose concrete ways of implementing commitments such as multi-annual planning and reduced duplication and management costs (such as making use of technology and innovation to be more cost effective or providing clear, comparable cost structures).

Innovation and the private sector: Humanitarian emergencies are reaching unprecedented levels. Strengthening the capacity of humanitarian actors to respond to natural disasters and man-made crises in an effective and efficient manner is a priority. Innovation can play an important role in this respect. Harnessing the technological innovation, technical skills and expertise of the private sector and academia is determinant. Where it is in the interest of the action and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework, DG ECHO encourages an increased involvement of a wide range of actors, including the local and international private sector, and the adoption of innovative solutions and approaches to optimising the efficiency and effectiveness of the humanitarian response.

Cash-based assistance: DG 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 WHS commitments, DG ECHO will endeavour to increase cash-based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded through a robust response analysis (see section below) 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.

DG ECHO's Cash Guidance note covering the delivery of large-scale cash transfers applies when the delivery of cash at scale is envisaged. The Guidance note, as updated, will apply to 2018 HIPs.

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of coordinated 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, AU missions, etc.).

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

Preparedness for Response and Early Action: As part of the commitment of DG ECHO to mainstream disaster preparedness in EU-funded humanitarian operations, the

needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to the range of hazards affecting people at the village/ community level (natural hazards and conflict related threats), the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their ability to cope. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to, and operational capability in, managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention). The Disaster Preparedness (DP) approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard and threats 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.

For targeted DP 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 regional, national and local capacities for better preparedness and response at local level;
- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure that evidence of the impact of the action and good practices are gathered and effectively disseminated;
- the action is justified by an explanation of the losses and suffering that will be avoided or reduced (and why this conclusion is valid);
- due consideration has been given to the integration of contingencies and preparedness arrangements (shock responsiveness) into planning to provide locally owned basic service delivery and social protection for vulnerable populations (e.g. for social, safety net programmes), notably in situations of protracted or recurrent crises;
- the use of EU Aid Volunteers in the DP intervention is envisaged or not and for what kind of tasks;
- in more fragile context, the development of national and local competencies for early action and locally owned Rapid/Emergency Response Mechanisms (ERMs) implemented by local actors should be considered. Actions to build local preparedness capabilities will include opportunities to apply and benefit from the resources and expertise held by the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM).

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

Education in Emergencies (EiE): The objective of the EiE actions will be to prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to emergency-related barriers to children's²⁶ education while ensuring inclusive and quality education²⁷. EiE actions will respond to the multiple barriers (academic, financial, social, institutional, physical/infrastructural) that children face in accessing their education. As such, EiE actions must be tailored to the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances including the specific impact of the emergency they face (e.g. unaccompanied minors, former child soldiers, and disabled children). DG ECHO EiE actions work towards three outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Children affected by humanitarian crises access and learn in safe, quality and accredited primary and secondary education
- **Outcome 2:** Children affected by humanitarian crises learn life-saving and life-sustaining skills, are protected and have increased personal resilience
- **Outcome 3:** Education services are strengthened through preparedness, response and recovery interventions in line with the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*²⁸

DG ECHO's support to EiE will focus on non-formal and formal education in the context of primary and secondary levels of education. Non-formal education supports should, where possible, enable children to enter (or re-enter) the formal system. Early childhood development will be considered in specific circumstances where it is already embedded in formal education in a national system or where specific skill or protection needs are identified to enter primary school. Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) programmes are considered to fall outside of the scope of work for DG ECHO's EiE response.

Protection must be considered as both a core component and key outcome of EiE response. The provision of safe learning environments, psycho-social support and direct referral to child protection services will provide a protective environment for children impacted by emergency. The learning itself – in both formal and non-formal education actions – should provide relevant life-saving and life-sustaining skills and messages, including vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness. In order to ensure safe and protective education, all actions supported by DG ECHO are expected to be designed and implemented according to the principles of conflict sensitive education (CSE). EiE

²⁶ The Commission adheres to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

²⁷ The definition of quality education: Quality education is affordable, accessible, gender-sensitive and responds to diversity. It includes (1) a safe and inclusive learner-friendly environment; (2) competent and well-trained teachers who are knowledgeable in the subject matter and pedagogy; (3) an appropriate context-specific curriculum that is comprehensible and culturally, linguistically and socially relevant for the learners; (4) adequate and relevant materials for teaching and learning; (5) participatory methods of instruction and learning processes that respect the dignity of the learner; (6) appropriate class sizes and teacher-student ratios; and (7) an emphasis on recreation, play, sport and creative activities in addition to areas such as literacy, numeracy, and life skills. INEE. (2010). *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*.

²⁸ Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*.

actions should reflect relevant legal frameworks for protection (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law).

In order to ensure holistic response to the needs of children, it is encouraged that beyond child protection EiE actions are also linked with other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH, health and nutrition, whenever relevant and feasible.

EiE actions should be recognized as not distinct from long-term learning goals and as such also aim at strengthening the quality aspects of education, in particular the availability of and support to teachers through the recruitment and capacity development of facilitators and teachers.

Whenever relevant and supportive of safe, inclusive and quality education, DG ECHO will support innovative EiE solutions.

EiE actions should be conceived with a medium to long-term vision. This implies first and foremost that programmes be designed and implemented in a way that allows for the fullest and most rapid recovery of safe, inclusive and quality education services. At the same time, programmes must be aligned with development and/or government actors to ensure continuity of learning for affected children through proper transition planning. Therefore, in order to ensure continuity and alignment with both, the wider humanitarian and development context, EiE actions must be informed by any existing education sector framework as well as the inter-sectoral humanitarian response. Furthermore, in order to ensure coordination, harmonization and effective prioritization within the EiE response, partners implementing EiE actions supported by DG ECHO will be expected to participate in, and contribute to, national and/or sub-national sector coordination activities throughout the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. EiE actions should contribute to the strategic objectives of the education cluster/working group strategy (if one exists) and to any wider strategic sector objectives based on the humanitarian-development nexus.

All EiE actions funded by DG ECHO should adhere in their design and implementation 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: Women, girls, boys, men of all ages are affected by crises in different ways and emergencies tend to change gender dynamics. Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is therefore crucial to DG ECHO and an issue of quality programming. To this end, the needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and assistance must be adapted to ensure that equal access is granted and specific needs are addressed.

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. 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 children 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.

The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly DG 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, and in line with DG ECHO's Guidance on the delivery of large-scale cash transfers, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to enhance efficiency, transparency and accountability. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

Multi-year planning and funding: In crises where it is appropriate to engage in multi-year interventions (i.e. 24 months and longer), actions should be grounded in a longer-term strategy including possible risks and contingencies that may occur over the timeframe as well as exit scenarios and Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. Project design should also be done in a more flexible manner, taking into account the longer duration and the possible changes in context that may occur during implementation.

Protection: All programme design and targeting should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population. It is recommended to use the risk equation model as a tool to conduct this analysis which should bring out external and internal threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to

counteract the vulnerabilities arising from the threats. Protection responses 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. Consideration 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, and where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

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. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the DG ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.²⁹

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.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to DG ECHO – 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, and ensuring meaningful access, accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles in its substantive sections, i.e. the response strategy, the logic of the intervention, and the indicators.

To follow the principles of protection mainstreaming, targeting of humanitarian assistance should be done in a manner that takes into account the protection concerns of individuals and groups based on: A) the risk of exposure to harm, exploitation, harassment, deprivation and abuse, in relation to identified threats; B) the inability to meet basic needs; C) limited access to basic services and livelihood/income opportunities; D) the ability of the person/population to cope with the consequences of this harm; and E) due consideration for individuals with specific needs. Particular attention must be paid to ensure that issues of social exclusion and discrimination are not overlooked, and that the specific needs of groups most often affected by this – people with disabilities, LGBTIs, and very marginalized social groups – are appropriately addressed in programme design and targeting. In line the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action, specific attention will be paid to the measures ensuring inclusiveness of people with disabilities in proposed actions.

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

²⁹ See Annex 4 on p. 49 and forward of http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf.

Resilience³⁰: DG 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, DG 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 DG ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen self-reliance through livelihoods and capacities. DG 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. This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, DG ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Preparedness for response and early action should be the main element of DG ECHO's contribution to resilience and to humanitarian-development nexus/Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) programming.

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 dignity and 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 DG ECHO, DEVCO, NEAR and the EEAS. This joined-up approach of different EU instruments, each under their mandate should be supported by DG ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles. Where feasible, DG ECHO partners should consider the use of EU Aid Volunteers if the security conditions in the country allow.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide : scaling up social protection systems in response to shock and crisis

³⁰ Resilience opportunities differ according to context. However, these opportunities should be considered in all locations. HIPs, designed after consultation with partners, should explain broad resilience parameters and expectations of partners. DG ECHO partners are required to fill in the "Resilience Marker" in the e-Single Form. Four guiding questions are presented. For each of these questions, for example "does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses, and vulnerabilities," the technical annex should indicate expectations (i.e. what may be considered as adequate according to the situation).

has been identified as one of the core measures to enhance resilience and empower people, and most importantly to be able to react quickly and efficiently to disasters.

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. The increasing profile on multi-purpose cash-based emergency response provides further momentum towards safety nets as a component of a wider social protection approach. 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.

Without compromising humanitarian principles, DG ECHO partners are expected to consider if it is appropriate to deliver humanitarian assistance through national social safety nets or if it is possible to use the humanitarian response as a window of opportunity to trigger investments in the development of "nascent" safety nets. The longer-term aim in such a scenario is to progressively move chronic humanitarian caseloads into social protection systems.

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

Resilience mainstreaming – The Resilience Marker

Actions addressing the immediate needs of affected populations, however, can also present opportunities for strengthening resilience. DG ECHO's approach to resilience, and the intent of its Resilience Marker, is to ensure that these opportunities are used to the greatest extent possible without compromising humanitarian principles. Four steps are key to take these good practice opportunities in humanitarian programmes:

- Conduct an analysis of hazards, threats, vulnerabilities and their causes;
- Be risk-informed (i.e. ensure that activities do not aggravate risks or vulnerabilities, do no harm and are prepared for likely hazards and threats);
- Contribute to building local capacities so that the most vulnerable can cope better with shocks; and
- Include a deliberate strategy to reduce future humanitarian needs.

The marker ensures a systematic consideration and inclusion of resilience considerations in project proposals, implementation and assessment. The marker is used for all DG ECHO projects apart from those that may be considered "Non-applicable" because of the urgency of context or the type of activity being conducted (e.g. capacity raising).

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/resilience_marker_guidance_en.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>

Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers is mandatory. DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. Partners should provide sufficient evidence to support the choice of one modality over another, taking into account all relevant contextual factors and including an analysis of the market situation in the affected area. 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 transfers local purchases are encouraged when possible.

DG 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/DG ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

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

and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.

- Section 9.2., above standard visibility: applicable if requested and if agreed with DG 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 exceeds 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 DG ECHO visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>.

EU restrictive measures: Partners are reminded that EU restrictive measures apply, inter alia, to any person inside or outside the territory of the Union who is a national of a Member State as well as to any legal person, entity or body which is incorporated or constituted under the law of a Member State. Reference also needs to be made in this respect to Article 5(c) of the 2014 Framework Partnership Agreement with Humanitarian Organisations pursuant to which EU-funded humanitarian aid actions must comply, inter alia, with applicable international law, Union law, and the law of the Humanitarian Organisation's country of registration. The European Commission is also committed to ensure compliance with EU restrictive measures.

The list of EU restrictive measures in force is available at: https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage_en/8442/Consolidated%20list%20of%20sanctions.

To access the EU consolidated list of persons and entities please consult <https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/consolidated-list-of-persons-groups-and-entities-subject-to-eu-financial-sanctions>.

Both lists are regularly updated by the Commission.

Partners are reminded that restrictive measures prohibit making available, directly or indirectly, funds or economic resources to or for the benefit of persons or entities designated by the EU under such restrictive measures, save where such making available is expressly authorised by a competent authority of an EU Member State or by the European Commission in its capacity of EU institution entrusted by the Treaties with the management of EU funds.

Should partners consider necessary for overriding humanitarian reasons to make funds or economic resources directly or indirectly available to any of their implementing partners or contractors that are designated entities under EU restrictive measures in force, an express derogation needs to be requested. Any such request needs to be duly reasoned and substantiate the imperative humanitarian grounds which make it absolutely necessary for the partner to entrust part of the implementation of the Action to the implementing partner(s) or contractor(s) concerned.

DG ECHO will fully abide by international humanitarian law's rules and humanitarian aid principles under which all parties concerned must allow and facilitate rapid and unimpeded passage of humanitarian relief for civilians in need, which is impartial in character and conducted without any adverse distinction.

Other Useful links to guidelines and policies:

Food Assistance

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

Nutrition

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

Infant and Young Children Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF)

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/2014/toolkit_nutrition_en.pdf

Health

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

Remote Management

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

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

EU Aid volunteers

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

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/eu-aid-volunteers_en

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

ISSUES APPLYING TO ALL THE 4 COUNTRIES INTERESTED BY THIS HIP

ECHO needs based approach consists in targeting individuals based on their demonstrated needs and vulnerabilities. Therefore ECHO will prioritize areas or population groups in comparatively greater needs. As such, ECHO will not support interventions based on status based targeting. Partners are expected to share their needs and vulnerability assessment(s) as part of their proposals.

ECHO encourages a non-discriminatory displaced populations (refugees and IDPs) approach; it will therefore aim to support humanitarian interventions targeting the most severely affected segments of the displaced population (refugees and IDPs) in need of protection and assistance, irrespective of their country of origin. If any returnees, likewise host community members and/or asylum seekers and/or IDPs, are identified among the most vulnerable within a targeted community, assistance could be provided to them as well as to other vulnerable groups. ECHO will provide assistance based on assessed needs where minimum protection and security guarantees are in place within the Do No Harm approach.

SYRIA

Programming priorities

ECHO's focus in 2018 will be on addressing basic needs of those most vulnerable as well as their communities in a timely, principled and quality manner. Assistance proposed by partners must be delivered through the most appropriate modalities or entry points, ensuring provision of integrated and flexible essential life-saving assistance (first line emergency response) as well as coordinated and targeted multi-sectorial post-emergency assistance (life-sustaining response).

All proposed interventions should be context-specific (geographic or community) and evidence-based, based on a well-defined situation and response analysis, with access strategy and contingency/preparedness planning considerations clearly detailed. Robust primary needs assessments – in addition to and complementing the Humanitarian Needs Overview – and continuous needs monitoring arrangements, aimed at responding to regular changes in the context, to rapidly address the needs of the most vulnerable households and groups, must be outlined by partners. Adherence to humanitarian principles, inclusive of “do no harm”, should be described in proposals.

Effective and transparent operational coordination (at hub and inter-hub levels) remains a critical requisite for actions inside Syria. Accountability mechanisms should be enhanced through adequate Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and Information Management (IM) capacities and systems aimed at quality evidence-based analysis, outcomes evaluation.

Thematic priorities

Basic needs assistance (BNA)

By way of promoting a comprehensive approach and efficiency gains, ECHO will support basic needs assistance, through a combination of modalities. The basic needs assistance proposed should include the following elements:

- Well-articulated multi-sector response analysis, which should build on comprehensive, needs assessments. The choice of response(s) and modality(ies) should be duly justified according to the needs and vulnerabilities of the targeted group and in line with the above mentioned assessments. Whenever possible, ECHO will support multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT), as cash allows beneficiaries to meet a wide range of needs in a flexible and dignified manner.
- Detailed and adequate targeting and prioritization mechanisms with focus on most vulnerable individuals.
- Flexible and reactive operations with capacity to scale up with the shortest delay.
- Within the overall country strategy, a basic-needs response requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost-efficiency gains should be optimized through effective operational coordination platforms aiming at the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessments, targeting, joint delivery mechanisms and monitoring. These dimensions should be clearly addressed in proposals.

Protection

ECHO will put protection of affected persons at the centre of its humanitarian response within Syria and will prioritize it as a sector encompassing humanitarian access, protection of humanitarian workers, child protection, Gender Based Violence, UXO/ERW/mine action and persons with Disabilities, Survivors of Torture and other groups of concern with specific needs, in line with International Humanitarian Law (IHL), refugee law and International Human Rights Law (IHRL). Interventions designed to reduce and mitigate the protection risks of man-made violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons inside Syria will be supported in the form of either stand-alone or integrated programmes aimed at achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection-sensitive targeting. Decisions on specific activities to be supported will be based on an up-to-date and comprehensive protection risk analysis and vulnerability assessment as well as operational capacities and expertise. These dimensions must be specifically described in all proposals.

Specific protection interventions that will be considered for funding include:

- *Access to documentation:*
 - Registration of IDPs, including family tracing and reunification;
 - Access to documentation (primarily civil documentation) and legal assistance. Monitoring of detention conditions could be supported for partners that have demonstrated capacities in this sector (partners engaging in response to detention should consider activities to help maintain family links).
- *Prevention and response to violence:* Assistance to victims of any kind of violence, including GBV, will be supported. All proposed activities should entail, as minimum, identification, referral and basic response. Particular modalities which will be supported are:
 - Case management for GBV survivors (full package, including prevention activities);
 - Psycho-social support (PSS) will be mostly implemented through non focused activities (case management) and Community-centred activities will be supported only in cases where partners demonstrate capacities in enhancing well-being through community based PSS³¹;
 - Case management for children – this includes supported unaccompanied children and children in other situations of neglect or abuse, for partners which have demonstrated adequate child protection case management expertise in line with international child protection case management guidelines;
 - Assistance to children engaged in armed forces or armed groups (CAFAAG) can be supported only when partners who have demonstrated capacities in these activities.
- *Awareness raising* will be prioritized during emergency phases – this includes basic information on risks, as well as service provision. Specifically:
 - On account of the degree of contamination by Explosive Remnants of War (ERWs) – so to say land-mines, Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs) and Improvised Explosive Device (IEDs) - in some areas of Syria, a comprehensive approach to Mine Action (including humanitarian demining, assessment and risk mapping/markings; assistance to victims, Mine Risk Education) will be considered either as a stand-alone project or part of an integrated programme;
 - Emphasis on the dissemination of IHL and the importance of the centrality of protection in all interventions will be supported at all times (awareness raising/capacity building activities).

³¹ PSS activities integrated into Education in Emergencies (EiE) will be considered as part of the integration of EiE and Child Protection necessary for adequate identification and referral (for child protection specialised services).

- *Advocacy*, such as, evidence-based advocacy on grave violations of IHL (e.g. on protection of civilians, including of humanitarian staff and premises or other types of civilian infrastructure, essential for the survival of the population); IHRL.

Health

Improving access to quality basic health services for the most vulnerable population and war wounded victims will be considered for funding by ECHO. Specifically:

- Comprehensive primary health care, following the Essential Primary Health Care Package as defined by the health cluster. This includes provision of services for communicable diseases but also preventive and cost-efficient care for non-communicable diseases. Mother and child care should be addressed and coordinated scale up of accessible and sustainable mental health services should be enhanced.
- Emergency and comprehensive health services for injured and war wounded, including first line responders, surgical, postoperative and rehabilitation care.
- Comprehensive care for victims of GBV, both male and female, including Clinical Management of Rape (CMR) and PSS, should be integrated as much as possible in all proposed health facilities.
- The functionality and contribution to both disease surveillance systems (EWARN and/or EWARS) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed.
- Partners should systematically address disability related needs in humanitarian operations inside Syria whenever possible. Services targeting war victims with disabilities or aiming at improving their access to comprehensive health services will be considered at all times.

Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

Food assistance interventions will be prioritized as lifesaving response to severe, transitory food insecurity, preferably as part of an integrated response aiming for greater efficiency and effectiveness. All proposals should clearly identify food gaps, and include relevant food outcomes Key Objective Indicators (KOIs) and Key Result Indicators (KRIs). Proposed actions will prioritize support to operations that target the most vulnerable households with well-identified basic humanitarian food and nutrition needs.

Clear justifications need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed (e.g. sudden emergency). Market assessments and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) must be presented as part of the response analysis; if not available, this needs to be justified accordingly in proposals. Any conditionality proposed should be duly justified according to the specific vulnerabilities of the targeted group. Proposals should advocate for linkages between food assistance interventions and other sectors, e.g. Protection, Health

and Nutrition outcomes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices. The modality proposed, as well as the duration of the assistance, should be duly justified in proposals.

WASH, Shelter and Non Food Items (NFIs)

ECHO will prioritize proposals clearly embedding an integrated programming approach, based on the linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter and Protection, to ensure coordinated, multi-sectoral response focused on effectiveness and efficiency. Partners are encouraged to demonstrate justification of costs based on technical details, such as minimum quality standards as per international guidelines (e.g. Sphere standards), etc.

For Water and Sanitation, rehabilitation, maintenance and repair of existing basic services, such as water and wastewater systems, in the emergency and post-emergency phase, will be prioritized. Investment in water and wastewater infrastructure should be supported by a quality assurance mechanism that includes detailed technical documents (e.g. technical assessments, technical designs and specifications, Bill of Quantities (BoQs) etc.), establishment of Water Safety Plans (WSP)³², Operation and Maintenance (O&M), and strengthening technical and regulatory capacity at local level.

Partners must demonstrate in proposals their capacity to evaluate and assess the impact of investments to water and wastewater systems, by providing data related to improvements to access and availability based on pre- and post-implementation status of the system. Water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort, lifesaving intervention that is well planned and executed with a defined exit strategy for the emergency phase. This should be accompanied by a detailed water quality monitoring protocol.

Stand-alone Hygiene Promotion (HP) activities will not be considered. In the frame of a water and sanitation project, HP will only be considered if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonized messages and communication channels in line with the national WASH Cluster guideline.

For Shelter, only emergency interventions, if adequately tailored to different target groups according to needs, will be considered. Even in emergency settings the partner will have to demonstrate its ability to target the most vulnerable households within a given community. Specifically, Shelter support will be prioritised for:

- Distribution of tents, sealing-of kits, shelter kits.
- Support to camps, informal settlements and collective centres (including CCCM/CSMC approaches).
- Rapid rehabilitation and repair of individual sub-standard buildings, on a limited scale. Light and medium repairs of individual houses may be considered under

³² WSP focus on ensuring safe, drinkable water throughout the safe water chain, from source to point of consumption. WSP are centred on proper system assessment; effective operational monitoring; and management and communication to ensure proper adherence to procedures.

specific conditions such as social-economic vulnerability; protection; shelter condition, whilst integrating HLP.

Distribution of NFIs and hygiene items will be considered provided that grounds for emergency response to specific emergencies (e.g. sudden displacement) are demonstrated.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

The duration of EiE actions could be up to 24 months, to allow partners to support the transition of children into the formal system.

ECHO's support will focus on bringing out-of-school children (OOSC) into primary school education in areas where the OOSC population is high, and areas where education services have been disrupted by the conflict. Non-Formal Education (NFE) activities proposed must provide pathways for the most vulnerable children to enter/re-enter the formal education system and will be prioritised accordingly. NFE support may include catch-up classes, accelerated learning programmes, homework support, self-learning activities and curriculum B (if such accelerated learning programme - ALP - is implemented out of formal schools), or any course designed to meet the needs of OOSC returning to formal primary school. It is essential that education programmes proposed must include child protection activities, such as PSS, social/emotional support and referral pathways for children in need of specialised services. EiE actions that are included in multi-sectoral emergencies responses (when relevant) will be supported.

Packages of support to re-open schools that have closed or been disrupted for several months/years due to the conflict may be considered. These activities should be limited to maximum six months duration of support to schools, with clear entry criteria and an exit strategy to hand over to relevant authorities/communities as appropriate. Solely light repairs to school infrastructure will be considered, to ensure a minimum standard of safety for children returning to school (including mine risk education).

Actions proposed should be aligned to the INEE Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies. Proposals should include strategies to support quality teaching and learning, including teacher training, student learning materials and appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and information management (IM)

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

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

LEBANON

Programming priorities

Considering the protracted nature of the Syria crisis, and building on the strategic lines set by the previous ECHO HIP (2017), ECHO's 2018 programming priority remains to enhance the protection space and dignity of the refugees seeking safety in Lebanon. The 2018 ECHO strategy is an integral part of the broader EU response in Lebanon and is designed in synergy with the interventions funded by other EU instruments.

In 2018, ECHO aims at developing a cross-sectoral framework that guarantees better responsiveness to arising needs, greater accountability to beneficiaries as well as improved cost-effectiveness of the response. This approach will be developed along two major integrated programmes: i) Basic needs - cash based programme and ii) Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanism, to address the socio-economic vulnerability of refugees and protection-related needs evidenced at community, household and individual levels. Impartiality, independence, neutrality and "Do no Harm" principles will have to be articulated by partners in their proposals throughout the project management cycle. Partners should also demonstrate adequate capacities to conduct robust needs analysis that leads to targeting the most vulnerable population and implementing effective projects with comprehensive control and accountability mechanisms. Evidence based advocacy must be detailed by all ECHO partners in their proposals.

In view of the above, ECHO's strategy in Lebanon in 2018 will mark a shift from recurrent sectoral service delivery to a focus on protection, emergency preparedness and response, and humanitarian advocacy.

Thematic priorities

Basic-needs assistance (BNA)³³

ECHO considers multi-purpose cash-assistance (MPCA) to be the most effective modality of addressing chronic, structural socio-economic vulnerabilities in Lebanon. ECHO will continue pursuing its vision to enhance the cash based response in Lebanon

³³ BNA refers to a regular and unrestricted cash transfer (MCPT) provided on a monthly basis to the most vulnerable refugees assessed on the basis of socio-economic vulnerability indicators.

in line with the Grand Bargain commitments. The principles of efficiency and cost-effectiveness, accountability and protection coupled with consistent governance and sound operational structure remain key elements to place the needs of the beneficiaries at the center of the cash-based response.

There should be one nationwide approach based on one targeting system, one card and one single, unrestricted, monthly cash transfer to cover the basic needs (including food) of severely vulnerable Syrian refugees. The response should include robust referral/appeal systems and linkages with complementary actions to guarantee accountability to the affected population, equity and transparency. Independent monitoring and evaluation systems as well as a governance structure are required to guarantee transparency, accountability and overall cost-effectiveness of the cash response. Streamlined processes, segregation of duties and budget transparency must be reflected into any proposal in a detailed manner.

This model lays the foundation for a shift from basic-needs assistance schemes to a social protection and poverty-alleviation mechanism, with a view to facilitate the engagement and support of long term funding instruments whilst enhancing the predictability and sustainability of the response. Partners should demonstrate their capacity in building synergies and/or common outcomes that allow this transition in their proposals.

Emergency / Rapid Response Mechanism (E/RRM)

While structural and chronic needs will be addressed by the BNA programme and close coordination and synergies built with other EU instruments, ECHO will prioritise coordinated, inter-sectoral and integrated projects that address acute and urgent needs that are too often left unattended by the current response.

The E/RRM in Lebanon should follow a comprehensive approach based on needs and clear socio-economic and protection-related vulnerability criteria. Any proposed response should aim at improving community targeting in addition to responding at household level, ensuring the involvement of other stakeholders on resilience and a community-based protection mechanism. Proposed humanitarian assistance must address needs arising from sudden shocks (e.g. evictions, new arrivals, clashes, natural disasters, etc.) or proven deterioration of emergency indicators (e.g. alarming morbidity and mortality trends). Any assistance detailed in proposals will also need to contribute to enhancing the resilience of the targeted population, provide evidence-based advocacy gathered through quality programming and promote humanitarian advocacy which addresses the root causes of the increased vulnerability.

Any envisaged humanitarian response, which needs to be comprehensive and integrated, must be anchored to a strong context analysis that takes into account the analysis of threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities. This analysis should specifically consider both external threats to the target population as well as community's coping strategies, at the same time balancing any protection concern. Based on this risk analysis, ECHO partners must propose integrated programme responses, where protection actions contribute to addressing needs in other sectors and where other sector actions mitigate or increase resilience to protection risks.

Strategic partnerships are essential to the strategy as above and will continue to be sought with ECHO partners with demonstrated capacity and mandate to consolidate efforts - inter alia in the form of consortia - to scale up emergency response activities. In addition, a stronger engagement with local actors (e.g. inter alia municipalities) will be encouraged by ECHO in order to reinforce emergency preparedness capacities. Effective coordination is essential and must be demonstrated by partners through their active engagement in the existing coordination mechanisms.

Humanitarian advocacy remains a pre-condition for ECHO partners: the causes of the ongoing deterioration of the humanitarian situation cannot be properly addressed without effective advocacy. To ensure the effectiveness of proposed interventions, partners are expected to integrate a strong advocacy strategy in their action that aims at strengthening accountability of the humanitarian system at all levels.

Protection

Focus on protection is a key feature of ECHO's strategy in Lebanon, to provide refugees with improved access to protection, legal assistance and quality services.

Routine protection monitoring will not be supported. Protection monitoring will only be considered when it provides an evidence-based trend analysis and inform direct emergency response programming and coordinated advocacy efforts.

Protection interventions will be supported through the following modalities:

- Legal assistance – so to say provision of specific protection services, including access to documentation, legal assistance and counselling when based on sound identification of needs, identifying the most appropriate response modality and demonstrated capacities.
- Case management protection services will be considered when based on an individual protection assessment and if in line with international case management guidelines. Community activities as an entry point may be considered if there is a correlation for identification of cases.

Utilization of cash for protection must have a clear protection outcome and will not be supported unless embedded within one of the above modalities (legal assistance and/or case management) and within a wider comprehensive and integrated response.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

Specific needs of children unable to access formal education will be addressed by quality and appropriate non-formal education activities. Preferably, these activities should facilitate the eventual access of children to formal education. Activities in this sector need to be integrated in a multi-sectorial response that will tackle barriers to education from multiple angles, primarily protection and basic needs' response, with the scope of mitigating the main economic and legal causes that limit access to formal education. All proposals must detail coordination arrangements and support priorities set with relevant sectorial humanitarian and development governance mechanisms.

Coordination and advocacy

ECHO will support coordination and advocacy mechanisms if operationalized within integrated and coordinated strategic partnership frameworks. Development of robust information management systems will be supported if they lead to informed programming decisions and evidence based advocacy strategies. In this regard, coordination should essentially be articulated as a structural mean to improve the timeliness, inclusiveness, transparency and connectedness of proposed actions within existing coordination set ups. Advocacy should primarily aim at stimulating specific changes at policy level and/or addressing critical gaps in the current response.

JORDAN

Programming priorities

ECHO's priorities in 2018 focus on the provision of timely, adequate and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas as well as to refugees living in camps and/or in hosting communities based on the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF). Despite significant progress following the London Conference in 2016, the ensuing "Compact" agreement signed between the EU and the Government of Jordan, the 2017 Brussels Conference "Output Paper for Jordan", the humanitarian space for Syrian refugees in Jordan continues to erode, with cases of forced encampment and/or *refoulement* to Syria.

In 2018, ECHO will support the thematic priorities as described below.

Thematic priorities

Protection

Protection should be addressed systematically in all proposals to ECHO, preferably as part of an integrated programming approach rather than a mainstreaming component. ECHO would consider activities aiming at:

- Providing civil and legal documentation thus enabling refugees to access available services.
- Increasing economic and social opportunities for refugees, particularly for those living in the hosting communities.
- Related advocacy.

To enhance an overall coordinated response, based on harmonized targeting and robust referral systems, ECHO will consider funding a protection-focused consortium. Proposed target groups for the intervention could include people living in transit centres, camps, hosting communities as well as those stranded at the Berm.

ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions amongst the following:

- *At the Berm and in transit centres:*

- Advocacy for refugees' access to the Jordanian territory, prevention of *refoulement* as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to Syrian asylum seekers/refugees;
- Registration and profiling of the asylum seekers stranded at the Berm;
- Needs profiling of conflict affected people stranded at the Berm;
- Advocating for durable solution for those stranded at the Berm.
- *In camp settings:*
 - Activities to ensure that a robust screening and referral system is in place to capture and track all types of protection cases, and follow up of referred cases ensuring access to services;
 - Advocacy towards the camp management and relevant Jordanian authorities to expedite refugees' screening in Azraq camp, thus guaranteeing their freedom of movement and access to the necessary services including basic needs, health, and protection;
 - Whilst GBV issues could be addressed, related services must be delivered through the reproductive health (RH) angle.
- *In the hosting communities:*
 - Continuation of monitoring activities as per previous ECHO HIPs aiming at protection needs identification and the provision of protection services;
 - Provision of protection services, especially for refugees lacking proper documentation and/or registration to enable access to all available services;
 - Address legal support and/or accompaniment of protection cases beyond basic legal advice.

Basic-needs assistance

With the aim of promoting a comprehensive approach and increased efficiency, ECHO will support basic-needs assistance (BNA³⁴). In Jordan, refugees have been facing multiple needs since several years, resorting to extremely negative coping mechanisms. Given refugees' limited access to livelihood opportunities, a multi-purpose approach should be proposed in response to the multiple needs they face in Jordan. The most vulnerable refugees must be identified to meet a wide range of their needs in a dignified manner – ECHO will specifically prioritise the needs of undocumented and unregistered refugees, inclusive of any new arrivals, particularly in the hosting community.

Concurrently, given the need for more predictable/longer-term funding mechanisms/instruments and for the transitioning of the BNA into a social protection-type scheme, ECHO will consider proposals aiming to assist refugees excluded or temporarily unable to access the regular BNA, identified as socio-economically vulnerable. Those interventions should specifically:

- Propose an adequate BNA as consistent as possible with the regular BNA;
- Be considered as a temporary measure (up to 3-6 months maximum);

³⁴ BNA refers to a regular and unrestricted cash transfer (MPCT) provided on a monthly basis to the most in-need refugees assessed on basis of socio-economic vulnerability indicators.

- Be delivered in close conjunction with legal and/or protection support to facilitate their access/admission to the regular BNA.

Protection monitoring and referral systems should be privileged mechanisms to ensure that those falling through the cracks are captured, and to facilitate their access to such schemes as those described above. Partners should note that the BNA should not be combined in proposals with any sectorial intervention utilizing cash as a response modality, as this will contribute to a negative assessment by ECHO.

Health

ECHO will consider funding specific health interventions amongst the following:

- *In the hosting communities*
 - Given the on-going phasing out from the health support and gradual transition to longer term instruments in 2018, taking into account the 2016 decree of providing maternal health support, solely actions proposing support to undocumented and unregistered refugees will be considered.
 - Strengthening of referral mechanisms and health assistance in mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), physical rehabilitation services, as well as secondary health care for refugees will be considered.
- *In camp settings*
 - Proposals ensuring that refugees, inclusive of new arrivals, have access to direct health services according to their needs will be prioritized.
 - Activities aimed at ensuring that functioning, robust referral mechanisms capture and track information, especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery will be considered. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery, end result, etc.).

Shelter & NFIs

ECHO will consider funding specific interventions amongst the following:

- *In the hosting community*
 - Timely winterization activities based on a sound targeting methodology that focuses on the most vulnerable, primarily undocumented and unregistered refugees will be considered.
 - Coordination arrangements must be detailed, ensuring that a proper referral system is in place³⁵.

³⁵ This should be in coordination/through the WG (BNA) and RAIS II

- *In camp settings*
 - Winterization activities, including shelter upgrades with appropriate delivery modality given the specific context, must be described. Likewise, the methodology to ensure proper targeting and follow up must be fully described. Priority should be given to the most vulnerable individuals.

The use of cash based and/or in-kind (NFIs) distribution modalities, if supported by a comparative analysis, which takes into account cost effectiveness and efficiency, will be considered by ECHO.

WASH is not identified as a priority sector for ECHO funding, although special consideration could be proposed if immediate life-saving needs arise in specific locations.

Education in Emergency (EiE)

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

- Levels of education to be targeted by proposals are: primary and secondary.
- Proposed EiE activities should include an analysis of the barriers faced by vulnerable refugees in Jordan in accessing and succeeding in their education.
- EiE proposals should include activities to support the protection needs of children so they can participate in education, including referral pathways for children in need of specialized protection services. Any proposed activity must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other circumstances. Lifesaving and life-sustaining skills education, relevant to the context, could be included in EiE responses.
- Coordination arrangements must be detailed. Partners should adhere to Conflict Sensitive Education principles and align to INEE Minimum Standards for EiE.

EGYPT

Programming priorities

ECHO's focus in 2018 will be on consolidating the small-scale niche response initiated in previous HIPs (2016 and continued in 2017), focusing on core humanitarian needs. Whilst the Syrian refugees remain ECHO's entry point in country, assistance to the most vulnerable among other refugees groups and their hosting communities will be considered. Egypt remains both a country of destination and transit for asylum seekers,

refugees and migrants. A growing population of concern is stranded in the most overcrowded and poorest neighborhoods of its largest cities as a result of an upward trend of new arrival and tightened control measures aimed at curbing outflows towards Europe.

Project proposals should adhere to the overall ECHO's response strategy aimed at strengthening protection for the most vulnerable whilst at the same time enhancing access to emergency health and education services, including through EiE.

The use of multi-purpose cash transfers for particularly vulnerable groups identified through common platforms will be considered if supported by a comparative analysis which takes into account cost efficiency and effectiveness.

Given the urban concentration of the refugee population in Egypt and the recent dynamic around the refugees-migration nexus, ECHO partners should submit proposals that clearly demonstrate robust complementarities and synergies with other EU instruments such as RDPP/AMIF for protection and mix-migration, the European Neighborhood Instrument (ENI); the MADAD Trust Fund, the EU Trust Fund for Africa (North-Africa window), as well as with any other action under the 3RP-Egypt and the Egypt-specific humanitarian appeal.

Thematic priorities

Protection

Given the upward trend for new arrivals and amongst them the sharp increase of Unaccompanied and Separated Children (UASC), strengthening core protection activities for the most vulnerable will remain the paramount objective of ECHO. Project proposals aiming at enhancing access to basic services as main objective, should give due consideration to protection mainstreaming.

ECHO will specifically consider funding protection interventions among the following:

- Documentation, status determination and protection of individuals.
- Information management and advocacy aimed at extending residence visa and facilitating free and safe access to basic services.
- Child protection including special assistance for UASC.
- Assistance to victims of all kind of violence including GBV.
- Community-based protection interventions.

Health

Whilst refugees in Egypt are legally entitled to access public health services, several structural causes (e.g. poor quality of services), calling for developmental investments, limit their capacity to benefit from them.

ECHO will consider proposals for funding that facilitate access to emergency health services, particularly maternal and reproductive health, for those refugees without financial means to afford health fees as well as for those victims of discrimination and marginalization. Hosting communities may also benefit from these interventions, as long as the most vulnerable groups or individuals are targeted. Proposals under this sector should specifically envisage a gradual phase out and transition to longer term instruments. Although local capacity building is paramount, ECHO funding should not be used to promote standing alone capacity building schemes.

WASH, Food Assistance and Shelter are not identified as priority sectors for ECHO funding in Egypt in 2018, although special consideration could be given if immediate life-saving needs manifest in specific locations as duly justified by partners.

Education in Emergency (EiE)

ECHO will consider proposals that facilitate access to formal schooling and reduce related barriers for the most vulnerable refugee children. Barriers to education may be academic, financial, institutional or social and emotional, as well as any other barriers linked to the challenges children face as refugees. Proposals should demonstrate a focus on out-of-school children and those at risk of dropping out of school, with clear understanding of education pathways into accredited formal education reflected upon. Activities aimed at both enhancing education retention rates and/or for children to progress through the schools system will be considered for funding. Proposals targeting areas with the highest concentration of refugees will be prioritized. Coordination with development partners, other EU instruments, Ministry of Education and other relevant line ministries must be specifically addressed in proposals, in addition to the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM) principles and to globally recognized minimum standards for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and Child Protection.

ECHO support to education activities will focus on primary and secondary school levels. Non-formal education responses (such as community schools at primary level) will be considered solely if coordination with the Ministry of Education and clear entry pathways for children to pursue public education options, particularly from secondary school onwards, is detailed. Actions to prepare children for, to support, and to complement government initiatives for refugee education, such as experimental language schools, will be considered.