

TECHNICAL ANNEX

South and East Asia and the Pacific

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/C4
Contact persons at HQ: Team Leader, desk officer South Asia Flavio Bello Flavio.Bello@ec.europa.eu Desk officer Bhutan, Nepal, East and South East Asia Lidia Rodriguez Lidia.Rodriguez-Martinez@ec.europa.eu Desk officer Myanmar and Thailand Maria Ralha Maria.Ralha@ec.europa.eu Desk officer Bangladesh Mirka Mouwes Mirka.Mouwes@ec.europa.eu	Contact persons in the field: Myanmar: Nicolas Louis nicolas.louis@echofield.eu Bangladesh - René De Vries rene.de-vries@ec.europa.eu Bhutan and Nepal – Piush Kayastha piush.kayastha@echofield.eu DRR/resilience: Sylvie Montembault sylvie.montembault@echofield.eu Thailand: Pedro Luis Rojo Garcia pedro-luis.rojo@echofield.eu Philippines: Arlynn Aquino arlynn.aquino@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 45 095 000

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises ¹	HA-FA: EUR 30 395 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 14 700 000
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 45 095 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1: The Philippines

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 725 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/1/2017². Actions may start from 1/1/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO Partners with an established presence in Mindanao.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form³.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 6/12/2016⁴.

Assessment round 2: Myanmar and refugees in Southeast Asia

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 7 200 000.
 - Humanitarian actions within Myanmar EUR 5 200 000.
 - Refugees in Southeast Asia EUR 2 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/1/2017⁵. Actions may start from 1/1/2017.

¹ As possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

^{2,5} 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.

^{3,6} Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

^{4,7} The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁶.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 6/12/2016⁷.

Assessment round 3: Rohingya regional crisis (Myanmar and Bangladesh)

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 800 000.
 - Support to Rohingya humanitarian needs in Bangladesh EUR 2 800 000
 - Support to emergency nutritional interventions in Northern Rakhine State and Cox's Bazar EUR 2 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/1/2017⁸. Actions may start from 1/1/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁹.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 6/12/2016¹⁰.

Assessment round 4: Disaster Risk Reduction in South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal)

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 6 500 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/4/2017¹¹. Actions may start from 1/4/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹².
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 31/1/2017¹³.

^{8, 11, 14} 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.

^{9, 12} Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

^{10, 13} The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

Assessment round 5: Disaster Risk Reduction in Southeast and East Asia

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 8 200 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/3/2017¹⁴. Actions may start from 1/3/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁵.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 1/2/2017¹⁶.

Assessment round 6: Philippines - Mindanao conflict

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 850 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 23/05/2017¹⁷. Actions may start from 23/05/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partner: ICRC
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁸.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 25/07/2017¹⁹.

Assessment round 7: Bangladesh / Myanmar - Tropical Cyclone Mora

- a) Indicative amount:
 - Bangladesh: up to EUR 1 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line
 - Myanmar: up to EUR 500 000 from the HA-FA budget-line
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 30/05/2017²⁰. Actions may start from 30/05/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.

^{15,18,21} Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

^{16,19,22} The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

^{17,20} 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.

e) Potential partners: Christian Aid and IOM (for Bangladesh)

WFP (for Myanmar)

f) Information to be provided: Single Form²¹.

g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 25/07/2017²².

Allocation round 8: Bangladesh/Myanmar: Rohingyas Crisis

a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.

b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.

d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.

e) Potential partners: Priority will be given to partners already active in the most affected areas who are implementing ECHO actions.

f) Information to be provided: Single Form²³.

Allocation round 9: Bangladesh/Myanmar: Rohingyas Crisis

a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.

b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.

c) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.

d) Potential partners: Priority will be given to ECHO partners already implementing humanitarian actions in Cox' Bazar.

e) Information to be provided: Single Form²⁴.

g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 9/11/2017 onwards.

Allocation round 10: Bangladesh and Nepal: monsoon flooding

a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.

b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.

c) Costs will be eligible from 11/08/2017²⁵. Actions may start from 11/08/2017.

d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.

e) Potential partners: Priority will be given to ECHO partners already implementing humanitarian actions in the most affected areas.

f) Information to be provided: Single Form.

²³ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

²⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 9/11/2017 onwards.

Allocation round 11: Bangladesh/Myanmar: Rohingyas Crisis

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 600 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- d) Potential partners: Priority will be given to ECHO partners already implementing humanitarian actions in Cox' Bazar.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form²⁶.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 9/12/2017 onwards.

Allocation round 12: Myanmar: Rohingyas Crisis

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 400 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- d) Pre-selected partners only.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form²⁷.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 9/12/2017 onwards.

Allocation round 13: Philippines

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 320 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- d) Pre-selected partners only.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form²⁸.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: from 27/12/17 onwards.

²⁶ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

²⁷ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

²⁸ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- In case of actions already being implemented 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 proposed
- Other elements that may be taken into account in the appraisal, based on context, relevance and feasibility, e.g.: coordination, security, monitoring and control management, access arrangements, lessons learned, exit strategy, comparative advantage, added value, sustainability.

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

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:

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

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

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 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, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.

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

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

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

- all risks have been clearly identified, including their possible interactions;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes the role of the state and non-state actors in disaster reduction and climate change adaptation from national to local levels;
- the measures planned are effective in strengthening the capacity of communities and local authorities to plan and implement local level disaster risk reduction activities in a sustainable way, and have the potential to be replicated in other similar contexts;
- the intervention contributes to improving the mechanisms to coordinate disaster risk reduction programmes and stakeholders at national to local levels.
- demonstrate that the action is designed including the existing good practice in this field;

- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure evidence of the impact of the action and good practice are gathered, and effectively disseminated.

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 education²⁹ in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps. Innovative solutions will 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](#).

²⁹ 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.

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.³⁰

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

³⁰ 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

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 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:

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.
- Specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:
 - Section 9.1.A, Standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU funded relief items and equipment; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the Action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the Implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed-upon in the individual agreements.
 - Section 9.1.B, Standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.
 - Section 9.2., Above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

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 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>

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

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

Assessment round 1 - The Philippines – EUR 725 000

The focus will be on the most vulnerable displaced population in Mindanao. Priorities for ECHO proposals are as follows:

- Zamboanga (IDPs): water and sanitation, health.
- Central and North-eastern Mindanao: Protection, food assistance and targeted nutrition interventions.

All proposals should include advocacy, visibility and communication activities aimed at highlighting this forgotten crisis.

Assessment round 2 - Myanmar and refugees in Southeast Asia – EUR 7 200 000

Priorities for proposals under this assessment round are as follows:

- Myanmar
 - Kachin and Shan states, Wa and Kokang self-administered areas: protection, food assistance, shelter, CCMM, non-food items, WASH and health, including psychosocial support.
 - Rakhine state: protection, CCMM, food assistance, nutrition, health including psychosocial support, WASH, shelter and non-food items.
 - Eastern states: in case of significant/mass return of refugees from Thailand, or increased forced population displacement, ECHO support may be considered.
 - Up to € 1 million shall be considered for *education in emergencies*, including mine risk education.

Cross cutting issues for all zones described above: centrality of protection, mainstreaming of disaster preparedness and risk reduction, specific needs linked to gender/age.

- Refugees in Southeast Asia (focus on Thailand)

- Protection and refugee status determination; advocacy.
- Health support for refugees and/or asylum seekers.
- Preparedness for a potential organized return of refugees.

Assessment round 3 – Rohingya regional crisis (Myanmar and Bangladesh) – EUR 4 800 000

- Emergency nutrition interventions in Northern Rakhine State (Myanmar) and Cox's Bazar province (Bangladesh) – EUR 2 000 000 million.

Priorities for ECHO proposals are as follows:

- Nutrition interventions encompassing both areas.
-
- Most vulnerable Rohingya and host community population in Cox's Bazar – EUR 2 800 000.
- Priorities for ECHO proposals are as follows:
- Food assistance in Kutupalong and Leda camps.
 - Water and sanitation in Kutupalong and Leda camps and host communities.
 - Provision of Health services in Cox's Bazar (Rohingya and host population).
 - Protection as standalone and/or cross cutting the above interventions.

Assessment round 4 – DRR / Resilience in South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal)

ECHO priorities are as follows:

- Regional actions (covering Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal) may be considered for DP in the Education sector, aiming to consolidate past efforts in the region.

- Bangladesh – EUR 3 000 000
 - Earthquake preparedness in urban contexts (e.g. Dhaka, Sylhet, Chittagong), particularly regarding preparedness for response.
 - Water and sanitation and livelihoods actions aimed at increasing self-reliance and resilience for Rohingya and host communities in Cox's Bazar, through a Resilience approach.

- Bhutan – EUR 500 000

Strengthen the country's capacity for DP/DRR, especially in the education sector. The programme should allow ECHO to exit the education sector in DRR at the end of this funding cycle, while building the capacity of the national authorities to take over the pilot and roll out activities.

- Nepal – EUR 3 000 000

All proposed actions must: (a) include the lessons learned from the 2014 flood and 2015 earthquake, (b) integrate humanitarian principles, (c) set advocacy lines and a corresponding plan, and (d) take into account the protection needs of the most vulnerable people in times of disaster.

- Institutionalization and advocacy - Support national and local authorities to institutionalize DP/DRR activities and advocate with government and donors to mainstream DRR in their sectoral plans and activities (education, health, agriculture, housing, economic infrastructure, etc.)
- Urban DRR - The country's rapid urbanization presents major challenges for disaster preparedness and risk reduction. In the aftermath of the 2015 earthquake, emergency response in cities was hindered due to unplanned settlements, low capacity of local authorities for disaster response and lack of coordination. Even though the private sector played a major role in the earthquake response, it was not and is still not taken as a key stakeholder in DP/DRR. ECHO envisages a pilot programme aiming to increase local authorities' capacity for DP/DRR, in coordination with private sector and civil society, to improve emergency response capacity in urban areas. The involvement of private sector (including insurance) regarding building codes and their supervision/enforcement should be explored.
- Education DP/DRR – Past ECHO-funded school based DP/DRR activities have contributed to introduce DRR in the newly developed school sector strategy, roll out DRR activities at school level and influence DRR curricula

and learning tools. The priority now is to stimulate education authorities and donors to mainstream pilot DRR activities in regular education plans, allowing ECHO to exit from this sector at the end of this funding cycle.

- Preparedness for emergency response – Taking into account the lessons learned from the 2015 earthquake and 2014 flood, build the capacity of national and local authorities, in particular District Disaster Risk Reduction Committees and District Emergency Operations Centers, to effectively manage emergency disaster response. This should include information management system, needs assessment and strengthening cluster contingency plans.
- Health emergency preparedness – Support the government to extend emergency health preparedness beyond the Kathmandu valley. As a pilot programme, demonstrate implementation of "the hub concept" by national health institutions, including the tertiary hospitals that were strengthened by previous ECHO actions.

Assessment round 5 - DRR / Resilience in East and Southeast Asia

ECHO's DRR/resilience approach in Southeast Asia has, since 1996, aimed at providing most vulnerable communities with sound technical solutions to improve their preparedness for natural hazards. ASEAN was the first regional body to adopt a legally binding document in this respect: the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) which entered into force in 2009. The recently launched AADMER 2016-2020 Work Programme covers the eight core ASEAN DRR priorities and is based on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The following 6 Priority Programmes of AADMER 2016-2020 appear to be the most suitable for ECHO proposals:

Priority Programme 1 – AWARE

- Strengthening ASEAN capacity in Risk and Vulnerability Assessment
- Improving the availability of data and information on regional risk and vulnerability
- Enhancing the mechanism on risk data utilization and information sharing

Priority Programme 2- BUILD SAFELY

- Promoting equitable and high quality infrastructure and essential services
- Scaling up ASEAN Safe Schools initiative (ASSI)
- Promoting innovative practices towards building resilient and climate adaptive cities

Priority Programme 3- ADVANCE

- Strengthening institutional capacity and policy frameworks for effective implementation of DRR and CCA actions
- Increasing replicable programmes and models of building community resilience.

Priority Programme 4 – PROTECT

- Protecting economic and social gains of ASEAN community integration through Risk transfer and social protection
- Strengthening evidence- based policy analysis and strategies on the linkage between disaster management and the economy to contribute to a more deeply integrated and highly cohesive ASEAN economy
- Ensuring social protection and establishing social safety nets in the context of disasters.

Priority Programme 5- RESPOND AS ONE

- Sustaining the operations of AHA Centre
- Enhancing the mobilization of regional response

Priority Programme 6- EQUIP

- Enhancing the implementation of Disaster Emergency Logistic System of ASEAN
- Enhancing the capacity of ASEAN Emergency Response and Assessment Team

ECHO encourages initiatives that seek to engage with the UN System, EU Member States and other Commission services, towards the promotion of sustainable resilience strategies. In line with the EU Communication on Resilience and its Action Plan, the rationale should be to lay the foundations for more effective EU collaborative action on building resilience, bringing together humanitarian action, long-term development cooperation and on-going political engagement. Its determinant of success will be a reduction in humanitarian needs and more equitable development gains.

The following are ECHO's DP/DRR priorities for ASEAN countries³¹ in 2017:

A. **All actions must contribute to the implementation of the AADMER 2016-2020 Work Programme**, under one or more of the six priority programmes described above. **All proposals** (either single country, multi-country or fully regional) **must clearly explain:**

- **How the action will contribute to the implementation of the AADMER 2016-2020 Work Programme in the country(ies) covered.** Cross-border visits to exchange experiences, cross-learning and improve regional coordination are encouraged, as they contribute to the regional dimension.
- **How the action might be linked with other initiatives**, in particular with DEVCO-funded actions on Climate change, DRR and resilience.

B. **Consolidation of previous DIPECHO investments** where opportunities for replication, consolidation and institutionalization exist (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar in particular) in conformity with the AADMER 2016-2020 Work Programme. An exit from the classical DIPECHO approach (rural CBDRR) is foreseen over a period of maximum 3 years (i.e. by 2020) in Cambodia and Lao PDR.

³¹ For specific guidance and priorities for Mongolia please see the reference at the end of this section.

Active linkages with existing long term initiatives should be sought, as relevant, in particular with those led by the EU Delegations.

C. Integrated DRR operational approach, new DRR actions (including pilots). Two types of actions have been prioritised:

1. Urban DRR, bearing in mind the trends of urban population growth in Asia. Expected outcomes are:
 - DRR in the most vulnerable urban areas through targeted CBDRR techniques are piloted and tested.
 - Lessons learned are identified and disseminated.
 - Replicability of the action is assessed and advocated for, if relevant.
2. Increasing preparedness for response (partners and governments) leading to a faster response to slow onset disasters, drought in particular. For instance: increasing data gathering capacity and preparedness, enhanced emergency response capacity, increased use of safety nets systems to anchor emergency response, support the development of contingency plans, etc.

To attain these objectives/priorities, actions can have a regional, multi-country or one-country scope.

- **Specific considerations for each country:**

Cambodia: DIPECHO consolidation and piloting urban community-based DRR

The adoption of the Disaster Management (DM) Law in 2015 is a major milestone that provides a good opportunity for ECHO partners to consolidate and replicate proven CBDRM methodologies to support the Government's operationalization of the law, in line with key priorities outlined in the Sendai framework for Action 2015-2030 and the AADMER 2016-2020. However, continued needs remain for building the capacity of institutions to roll-out the DM Law effectively, in particular at sub-national level, to ensure sustainability. Cambodia has one of the highest urbanization rates in the region (estimated at approx. 3.5% per annum) and urban disasters are acknowledged as one of the least recognized and understood future risks (according to Cambodia's national Action Plan for DRR 2014-2018). DRR practitioners in the country continue to require support to understand the challenges and operationalise the response, focusing on vulnerable communities in urban and peri-urban areas. Lessons learned from El Niño indicate the need to focus on strengthening drought related DRR methodologies and better preparedness capacities within the Humanitarian Response Forum (HRF).

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Consolidation and replication of effective CBDRR actions initiated during the previous DIPECHO cycles (for example, consolidating evidence-based knowledge on

drought-resilient agriculture techniques and savings groups, mobile Early Warning Systems, etc).

2. Advocacy for increased Government leadership and budgetary support for DRR at relevant levels, ensuring the effective implementation and roll-out of the national DM law.

3. Apply CBDRR techniques into urban and peri-urban areas, integrating lessons learned from previous urban DRR initiatives. These should include linkages with the Making Cities Resilient initiative (as appropriate).

4. Learning from the impact of the recent El Niño system, actions aimed at improving effective preparedness for response and mitigation strategies. This may include, for example, exploring joint needs assessment and data gathering methodologies, and setting triggers to improve early humanitarian response to slow-onset disaster.

Lao PDR: Replication, consolidation and institutionalization of DIPECHO achievements

Since the first DIPECHO action plan in 1996, ECHO has observed slow but significant progress in piloting CBDRR models and building local and national capacity at institutional level. However, significant acceleration of progress must be made if the country is to keep up with its neighbours and its regional and global commitments under AADMER 2016-2020 and the Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030. There is a need to ensure that local level initiatives are integrated and replicated at scale and that the necessary legislative and policy frameworks are in place with appropriate resource capacity (the national Disaster Management Law is still being deliberated and hopefully will be endorsed by 2017). The on-going regional urban resilience action, funded under DIPECHO 2016 (which also covers Lao PDR), will provide an important basis for learning and exploring the potential to pilot urban DRR as a single country action in the coming years.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. To harness buy-in from Government ensuring a fully functioning and accountable National DRR platform, in order to validate and institutionalize technical guidelines in areas such as school safety, post-disaster needs assessments, early warning mechanisms, improved preparedness and response planning, etc.

2. Consolidation and replication of community-based DRR interventions, targeting high-risk areas and focusing on the most vulnerable populations.

3. Actions aimed at ensuring effective preparedness for response and mitigation strategies. This may include, for example, exploring joint needs assessment and data gathering methodologies to improve early humanitarian response to disasters.

Myanmar

ECHO was among the first donors to support targeted DRR projects in Myanmar, a dynamic that is now firmly established. Previous DIPECHO programmes have built a very solid and multi-sector platform of qualified agencies. The current programme is delivering quality integrated and inclusive CBDRR, but acute needs are far from being covered, in light of the country's exposure to disasters and the vulnerability of the population. It is recommended to consolidate DIPECHO investments where opportunities for replication, consolidation and institutionalization exist. This includes actively fostering linkages with existing longer term initiatives, such as those funded by the EU Delegation, in order to identify complementary interventions and synergies. An institutionalization component is mandatory, including documenting and capitalizing on the interventions' achievements to support advocacy towards authorities and development donors.

New areas of focus, such as: Urban DRR and Earthquake Risk, DRR and Protection, increased use of Safety Nets Systems to anchor emergency response, Cash Preparedness, etc., all of which relevant for the implementation of the Sendai framework for Action and the AADMER 2016-2020 Work Programme, can be considered provided learning is properly documented. Some could contribute to the development of a national earthquake and tsunami strategy.

DRR has proven to be a natural and uncontroversial entry point for community dialogue in Rakhine State, in a context of inter-community tension and segregation – this opportunity should be further explored.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Emergency preparedness and response.
2. Rakhine state: resilience and nutrition sensitive programming.
3. Urban risk reduction with a focus on earthquakes. Synergies may be possible with a regional or multi country action.
4. DRR/DP in conflict affected zones – link with Protection.

The Philippines: Disaster Risk Reduction in Urban areas and in Mindanao

In 2016 ECHO started a pilot of urban DRR initiatives in the National Capital Region (NCR). While the full set of outcomes of this pilot will only be available towards the end of 2017, ECHO meanwhile intends to further boost DRR capacities and ownership of local government units in urban or peri-urban zones of Metropolitan Manila during 2017-2018.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Increase the resiliency of urban poor populations against perennial floods and preparedness measures for earthquakes.

2. Focus on urban locations in Metropolitan Manila with the highest vulnerability and exposure (lack of appropriate DRR and contingency plans, exposure to most threatening hazards such as massive flooding and earthquake, low net resources for DRR, and large groups of urban poor settlements in high risk areas). Targeting of locations must realistically consider the ability and willingness of local authorities to actively implement the project, take ownership and disseminate learnings to other urban areas.
3. Proposals should consider the following components:
 - Support local government bodies to increase DRR awareness and planning (local guidance in case of emergency situations, development of contingency and evacuations plans, evacuation drills, etc.).
 - Integration of alternative temporary shelters in contingency plans.
 - Increase and/or integration of DRR awareness in schools (children, youth and teachers to be targeted).
 - Communication and dissemination of best practices by the end of the action.
4. Actions may also consider policy improvement and/or policy change that support the adoption of such urban resiliency models in other relevant parts of the country.
5. Actions supporting livelihood diversification under a Resilience approach, in synergy with on-going humanitarian actions, can be considered for *Mindanao*. Proposals should consider the following:
 - Development of alternative sources of food and income that are viable during displacement.
 - Building the skills of affected communities to develop relevant new and/or additional livelihoods, including matters such as: marketing, financing and investing, etc.

Vietnam: Piloting urban risk reduction

ECHO's engagement in Vietnam has yielded significant results both at community and national levels. Vietnam has made remarkable progress in developing DRR frameworks and policies, thus allowing ECHO to exit rural CBDRM programmes in 2015. However, as identified by the evaluation of 17 years of DIPECHO in Vietnam, gaps in urban DRR remain significant and the evaluation made some specific recommendations. The policy environment is conducive to addressing urban vulnerabilities and risks. In tune with these recommendations, interventions should focus on providing policy makers, urban planners and long term development partners, a range of tested methodologies and intervention tools to improve vulnerability risk mapping and response capacity for at-risk urban communities. Despite being considered one of the most advanced countries in the region in terms of institutional capacity, lessons learned from El Niño highlight that gaps remain

in what concerns early warning, preparedness and response capacity, in particular to slow onset disasters.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Adapt proven techniques in CBDRR safe housing and pilot methods and tools for assessment of vulnerability and response capacity in at risk urban areas in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh city (as the most populated cities). These should include linkages with the Making Cities Resilient initiative (as appropriate).
2. Learning from the impact of El Niño, actions aimed to ensure effective preparedness for response and mitigation strategies in situations of slow onset disasters. This could include for example, piloting adapted livelihoods to drought/saltwater intrusion prone areas and ensuring functional and timely Early Warning Systems and data collection at local level.

Mongolia - Urban Disaster Risk Reduction and Dzud

The country is not an ASEAN Member and therefore adequacy between the proposals and AADMER is not relevant in this particular case. Mongolia is prone to a variety of hazards, if confronted with a major earthquake or an industrial catastrophe in Ulaanbaatar, the country may be faced with an unprecedented crisis, given that over 50% of its population lives in the capital city. Vulnerabilities vary according to the type of emergencies: those living in Ulaanbaatar's city centre would suffer particularly from the consequences of an earthquake; whereas those recently arrived and living in its outskirts, would be more likely to suffer from devastation brought by industrial catastrophes or flash floods. Rural populations are regularly exposed to harsh winters (dzud) and, to some extent, droughts. There is a growing understanding by the authorities, civil protection agencies and civil society organisations, of the overwhelming challenges and capacity shortcomings in case of disasters, and thus there is willingness to upgrade overall capacity. The lack of funding instruments focusing on DRR (both from the government and international donors) is an obstacle in addressing the preparedness gaps.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Increase urban disaster response capacity (e.g. NEMA, Mongolian Red Cross) in particular in relation to earthquakes, industrial catastrophes and floods.
2. Basic pre-positioning of life-saving items to be used during an emergency can be considered.