

TECHNICAL ANNEX

Southern Africa and Indian Ocean

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 ECHO ¹ /C3
Contact persons at HQ	Dorothy MORRISSEY (dorothy.morrissey@ec.europa.eu)
in the field	Alexandre CASTELLANO (alexandre.castellano@echofield.eu)

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 9 000 000

Breakdown as per Worldwide Decision

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 9 000 000
Total:	EUR 9 000 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Allocation round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 9 000 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018. Actions may start from 01/01/2018.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months.

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

- d) Potential partners²: All DG ECHO Partners:
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form³
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 29/01/2018

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 assessment⁴
- Quality of the response strategy, including the relevance of the intervention and coverage, and expected impact;
- 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;
- Innovations
- Cost efficiency; or comparative advantage of the action or the partners.

² 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.

³ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

⁴ Partners are expected to contribute and use coordinated needs assessments on crisis and sector level in line with Grand Bargain commitments

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.

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 level⁵;
- 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 an indispensable role in responding to the humanitarian needs. DG ECHO funds have and will be translated into services and assistance provided by local actors in the majority of cases.

⁵ See footnote related to the quality of needs assessment and the Grand bargain-related section below.

As such, DG ECHO will continue to ask for strategic 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 addition to the commitments covered by specific section 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.). 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>

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): DG ECHO will support education actions in emergencies including sudden onset emergencies, ongoing conflicts, natural disasters and situations of displacement (IDP/Refugee). The objective of these EiE actions will be to prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to emergency-related barriers to children's⁶ education while ensuring inclusive and quality education⁷. EiE actions will respond to the multiple barriers (academic, financial, social, institutional, physical/infrastructural) that children face in accessing their education due to their experiences of the humanitarian situation. 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 to 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*⁸

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

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery.

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 – must 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 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.

Notwithstanding the paragraph on *protection* on the next page, which should be read in conjunction, all humanitarian interventions funded by DG ECHO must take into consideration, together with other protection concerns, any risk of gender-based violence and develop and implement appropriate strategies to prevent such risks. Moreover, in line with its life-saving mandate, DG ECHO encourages the establishment of quality, comprehensive and safe GBV response services since the onset of emergencies. Further details are available in DG ECHO 2013 Gender policy.

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

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. More information about the marker and how it is applied are available in 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 and it is recommended to use the risk equation model as a tool to conduct this analysis.⁹ The analysis 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.¹⁰

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.

⁹ 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

¹⁰ 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.

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 with 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

Resilience: 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 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_Force_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff_working_document_Force_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/>.

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

Shelter and Settlements

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/ss_consolidated_guidelines_final_version-20-02ev.pdf

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

The present HIP and Technical Annex is structured around two pillars:

- PILLAR 1) Targeted Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Preparedness for response and early action;
- PILLAR 2) Multi-sector response to any natural and man-made disasters affecting the region.

PILLAR 1) Targeted Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)

Funds allocated to this pillar: EUR 9 000 000

Eligible countries for this pillar are Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. Priority will be given to country level actions. Regional activities, in particular advocacy for the pillar I priorities of this HIP are encouraged. Such regional activities are recommended (whenever possible) to be included as part of national focused actions.

Regional organisations like SADC are playing an increasingly significant role in DRR and in emergency response. A priority is to increase regional and national responsibilities for risk management and enhanced response capacities. DG ECHO's contribution should strengthen regional and national preparedness capacities, ensuring these are responsive to and inclusive of community priorities.

DG ECHO approach to DRR in SAIO

For nearly 20 years the European Commission/DG ECHO has consistently funded Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) programmes worldwide, in particular through DIPECHO, with an aim to reducing the impact of natural disasters on populations and facilitating early warning and early action. The resilience agenda has followed a similar approach in the sense that it is more effective and cost-efficient to invest in preparedness instead of only responding once a situation has deteriorated to a degree that triggers a major humanitarian operation.

Over time, the approach to DRR has become more comprehensive, to enhance coherence with other EU-funded projects, better complementarity with local systems and a clearer portrayal of DG ECHO's added value. Also, a multi-hazard approach was adopted (beyond natural disasters) and funding from the DP budget line was integrated into HIP strategies to ensure synergies.

DG ECHO's DRR and resilience approaches are focused on **preparedness for response and early action**. Some key aspects of this approach relevant to SAIO are listed below under the Pillar I priorities

Pillar I priorities.

The priorities and potential component considered for funding of this pillar are set out in the main HIP document (section 3.2.2.1) and expanded below:

Priority 1) – Strengthening and Linking Early Warning (EW) to Early Action (EA);

- 1.1)** Setting up/improving/strengthening of integrated and functional Early Warning Systems (EWS) - possibly multi-hazard - that effectively operate at the local level, are owned by the local population and link with district, national and regional EWS.
- 1.2)** Reinforce the nexus between early warning and early action strengthening the capacity of communities and local institutions to prepare for and respond to rapid onset disasters; this may include aspects of logistic preparedness. Where possible this nexus should be linked to a SRSPS. Considering that DG ECHO's main added value is in strengthening communities, these remain the entry points for key activities such as: establishing functional and interlinked functional EWS; capacity building and equipping local civil protection committees; conducting risk assessments; risk mapping using innovative approaches; developing contingency and evacuation plans; establishment and equipment of evacuation sites; conducting drilling exercises; prepositioning emergency stocks, etc.

Thresholds and triggers for action following an early warning need to be identified and agreed.

Support to communities/local/national authorities to develop contingency plans that are based on sound analysis of risks. Partners should consider the climatic/hazard situations of 2017 and 2018 in the region. Linking community plans to local/national and as much as possible to regional levels is vital for harmonization and coordination and ultimate effectiveness of DRR plans.

- 1.3)** Advocacy for further development fund raising to continue medium long term DRM programmes. Advocacy for National DRR guiding frameworks and/or their operationalization. This includes knowledge management platforms for DRR learning, awareness, and strengthening technical capacity and accountability mechanisms.

Priority 2) - Roll out of Emergency Preparedness & Response (EP&R) approach / Crisis Modifiers (CM) mechanisms

2.1) Crisis modifiers (CM) embedded into the actions.

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce a crisis modifier to mobilize resources from on-going actions and swiftly respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations (a crisis within a crisis).

The CM can be triggered to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis; the two main scenarios are:

- i) to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources;
- ii) to respond to small scale humanitarian needs which would otherwise remain unattended.

The proposed Crisis modifier should:

- Be designed to provide an early lifesaving multi-sectoral assistance in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis (provided that the partner has demonstrated multi-sectoral expertise).
- Be guided by multi-risk analysis and the development of scenarios.
- Be based on an Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) plan considering surge capacity (prepositioning of stocks, surge staff), process for decision, triggers for engagement/disengagement, activities, sectors of intervention.
- Preparedness activities included in the CM (including pre-positioning of stocks) must be implemented in a timely manner in anticipation of recurrent hazard calendar.
- Duration of the CM should be limited in time and should be triggered within a few days of the alert.
- Standardised indicators should be used and should include timeframe required to deliver the first assistance (ex. Lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within 3 days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers).
- The geographical coverage of the crisis modifier should correspond to the area targeted by the action, but a larger geographic area is encouraged and in any case it should be clearly reflected in the proposal.
- Partners shall inform DG ECHO by email/phone before the use of the CM
- After the use of the CM, partners shall conduct a review of the exercise for lesson learning in collaboration with the community and the local/National Government DRR authorities

- If the funds allocated for the crisis modifier are not used for this purpose the partner shall propose to DG ECHO in the interim report or not later than one month before the end of the action how to reallocate these resources within the implemented action.

In the single form, the CM should be the object of an ad-hoc result and budget line.

- 2.2) Advocacy to governments and development and humanitarian actors (other donors and implementing agencies) to systematically include crisis modifiers in development programmes.**

Priority 3) - MPCT/cash preparedness:

Preparedness for cash transfer. DG ECHO encourages proposals for cash transfer preparedness including promotion of electronic platforms for preregistration and adapting existing social protection systems using single registry for future emergency responses.

While mobile and electronic technologies have simplified cash transfer operations, targeting and registration of beneficiaries remains time and resource consuming. The limited use of electronic technologies during field activities and lack of proper data management including filing makes it difficult to re-use data and to carry out pre-registration of beneficiaries. Thus targeting and registration processes have to be repeated by each agency following each crisis which results in duplication of costs and affecting timeliness of the assistance.¹¹

- o 3.1)** Cash preparedness activities can include agreements with the private sector, the establishment of cash related contingency plans, and setting up of common registration, identification and scalable delivery mechanisms for cash transfer programmes, particularly MPCT. Particular emphasis is given to common electronic/mobile identification and delivery platforms and links with existing social protection/safety nets.
- o 3.2)** Advocacy should target both national and regional policy makers and relevant institutions. Concrete outputs like policies and SOP in place are recommended.

Priority 4) - Shock Responsive Social Protection System (SRSPS).

In several countries of the SAIO Region, DEVCO and other development actors support social protection systems. However these systems often lack the shock responsiveness that make them SRSPS.

In this respect DG ECHO funds where possible should be used to promote the shock responsiveness of governments' own social protection system in order to have Shock Responsive Social Protection System (SRSPS) able to expand its social services

¹¹ See section below providing further details on the MPCT.

vertically(amount transferred) and horizontally (number of beneficiaries) in prompt response to a shock.

When considering the support, advocacy and development of SRSPS, DG ECHO funded actions should prioritise linking relief-rehabilitation-development continuum. It is crucial to coordinate with longer term development partners, especially the EU Delegations and other development donors involved in social protection as these have developed together with the governments targeting systems that should be used in priority and avoid piloting parallel initiatives. The SRSPS should therefore build upon the work done by development programmes, without hindering their objectives or altering their targeting during period without crisis, but rather enhance them with an ‘additional’ capacity to be shock responsive in line with humanitarian principles when needed.

SRSPS should be considered in light of preparedness and complementarities between humanitarian short term assistance and poverty/chronic vulnerability alleviation systems and to promote LRRD. Some important aspects of a good SRSPS are:

- Must comply with the humanitarian principles of neutrality, independence, impartiality and humanity and the priorities set by the HIP.
- Government led with clear role for non-state actors including NGOs, UN and IOs.
- Should have and use a national electronic platform for targeting, registration and delivery of beneficiaries.
- SRSPS should have clear trigger mechanisms linked to functional EWS and be able to swiftly expand either vertically (amount transferred) or horizontally (targeted beneficiaries).
- The amount should be calculated to address at least the survival gap, but possibly to address the wider basic needs of the affected beneficiaries.
- The targeting criteria used during an emergency response should be in line with humanitarian objectives and not only poverty alleviation and chronic vulnerabilities.
- The timing and frequency of the transfers should correspond to the humanitarian needs identified, monthly transfers are preferred when addressing food consumption needs.
- Preference is given to systems that use mobile cash transfer modalities.

4.1) Provide support to Governments in the region and/or at national level to develop shock-responsive social protection systems, including single register, in order to facilitate the effective and rapid horizontal and vertical expansion of nationally led interventions, in time of shocks in particular using cash transfers and preferably MPCT. This includes, among other, activities such as advocacy, establishment of common system of targeting and single registries, piloting and scaling up SRSPS, etc.

4.2) Advocate and technically support development and humanitarian donors and any relevant agency/institution to a) include SRSPS in their long term plans and b) design and implement functional SRSPS linked to functional EWS in at least two countries.

The following components, whenever aligned to the principal priorities of the HIP set above, are also considered for funding:

5) Minimize education service disruption to enhance children's safe access to schools during and after natural disasters and embed DRR messaging in education curricula. This can include, but is not limited to, the development of an effective participatory school-based response plan which involve students, parents, education personnel and the community in general and/or the incorporation of risk mitigation and reduction measures in the resumption of teaching and learning. DRR planning in schools should include context-specific disaster preparedness and life-saving educational messages for children. Where schools are used as community shelters during natural disasters, DRR plans should specify actions to restore schools as education spaces immediately following the disaster.¹²

6) Improvement of Water and Sanitation in DRR, particularly in respect of risk of cholera epidemics.

7) Primary health/epidemics prevention, health surveillance, monitoring and response (EWARS);

8) Piloting and scaling up / use of innovative solutions (see below).

9) Targeted DRR activities in urban contexts.

10) Logistic preparedness. This can include, but is not limited to, activities such as reinforcing logistics capacity at national and cross-border levels; creation of networks for the movement of supplies; advocacy to further include Humanitarian Supply Chain (HSC) in contingency plans and for resolution of issues that impact the HSC; ensuring that common logistics services, including private sector and tools are pre-identified and fit for purpose in case of natural disasters, encouraging interoperability and sharing of information and resources.

11) Advocacy and promotion of Joint Humanitarian Development Frameworks (JHDF) and fund raising with medium/long term development actors;

Country specific priorities

The following specific priorities have been identified by DG ECHO for the individual countries targeted under pillar I. Partners are free and encouraged to include other priorities among the ones listed above as evidenced by the risk assessment conducted and in alignment with Government priorities.

¹² Please refer to this non prescriptive, useful "DRR Education in Emergencies Guidance Note..." (UNICEF, PLAN Save The Children) - available at :
<http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Disaster%20risk%20reduction%20in%20education%20in%20emergencies.pdf>

Lesotho - Priorities in order of importance are: 4, 3, 1. Actions funded by DG ECHO can promote the shock responsiveness of the government's social protection system in order to contribute to making it shock responsive. The use of the recently developed land cover atlas funded by DG ECHO is recommended.

Madagascar - Priorities in order of importance are: 1, 2, 3, 5 and 10, with a clear priority for the West coast. Partners are also invited to consider urban areas, including medium sized agglomerations provided that the proposed approach is tailored to the specificities of the urban context.

Malawi - Priorities in order of importance are: 4, 3, 2, 1 and 8 with favourable consideration also to 11.

Mozambique- Priorities in order of importance are: 3.2, 1, 2, 5 and 9.

Zimbabwe - Priorities in in order of importance are: 1, 2, 3, 5 and 4.2.

PILLAR II. Response to emerging humanitarian needs

No funds are initially allocated to this pillar but may be allocated in the case of unforeseen disaster event, depending on needs and availability of funding.

Eligible countries under this pillar are: Botswana, Comoros Islands, Lesotho, Malawi, Madagascar, Mozambique, Seychelles, Swaziland, South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe.

The objective of this pillar is to "address immediate, life-saving and essential needs across all sectors as a result of rapid onset natural or man-made disasters".

DG ECHO's response to emerging humanitarian needs will be based on:

1. First instance, the crisis modifiers already present in actions funded by DG ECHO (pillar I or previous decisions);
2. If needed, ad-hoc decisions conditional upon budgetary availability and a modification of this HIP to respond to emerging needs. This can be done as follows:
 - a. For small scale operations, requiring less than EUR 300 000 DG ECHO can activate the Emergency Toolbox.¹³
 - b. For larger scale operations, DG ECHO can modify this HIP under this pillar (II).

Any eventual emergency response would consider a multi-sectorial approach including WASH, shelter, health, protection and any other relevant sectors based on the needs of the affected population.

All actions funded under this pillar must mainstream DRR and include a CR.

¹³ The Emergency Toolbox consists of three instruments: 1) Epidemics; 2) Small-Scale Response; 3) Support to the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF).

DG ECHO will prioritize under this pillar action that use existing SRSPs if available. In this respect, if the condition listed under Pillar I priority III (above) are not currently present, actions under Pillar II could propose a parallel system provided that good coordination is ensured. Moreover, actions under Pillar II are encouraged to include technical capacity building to prepare and enhance existing social protection systems to become an emergency response tool for future interventions. In this case the partner will have to demonstrate close coordination and link with existing development programmes.

The following applies to both pillars of the HIP

Crisis modifier. As indicated under the pillar I all actions funded by DG ECHO should include "crisis modifiers" as an ad-hoc result in all actions whenever relevant and possible.

Innovations. There is a real opportunity in several countries in the SAIO region there is a real opportunity to further test, use and scale up innovative approaches and technologies without compromising the priorities of the HIP. Innovations are therefore encouraged; they should not be an end in themselves, but should directly lead to achievement of the objectives of the action.

The primary aim in piloting and scaling up innovative solutions is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian actions now and in the future. Where relevant innovative approaches or solutions have demonstrated their effectiveness/relevance, DG ECHO may support scaling up in the contexts of actions funded under this HIP.

Partners are encouraged to adopt relevant innovative solutions recommended by the DG ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC) funded actions.

Below are some examples of innovative approaches:

- enhanced logistic solution for early response;
- innovative approaches to link and promote DRR in education;
- the use of drones (UAV) for mapping and rapid assessment during floods and /or deliveries;
- remote sensing, and mobile technologies for EWS;
- innovative mobile or internet based delivery technologies;
- new ways to integrate humanitarian responses within social protection systems;
- prepositioning of multi-sector contingency stocks and equipment;
- innovative approaches to link and promote DRR in the health system;
- safer hospital approaches;
- common targeting/identification/delivery mechanisms for cash based interventions;
- innovative outsourced grievance / accountability and complaint mechanism;
- enhanced collaboration with private sector;
- enhance advocacy using internet;
- other

Collaborations with research institutions and private sectors is strongly encouraged. It is extremely important to solidly document the innovations used preferably with scientific peer reviewed papers and ultimately provide clear recommendations.

While single-sector cash transfers are to be promoted where appropriate, cash is increasingly being used to address multiple humanitarian/basic needs. **DG ECHO will prioritize MPCT where possible both for the preparedness component (pillar I) and the Response to new emerging humanitarian needs (pillar II).**

A number of essential steps would be expected in the design of a MPCT project:

- Multi-sectorial assessment to determine the dimension and the priority of the *basic needs* of people in need of assistance;
- Analysis of markets and services to understand which prioritised needs can be met, and to what extent can markets and services adapt to absorb higher demand;
- Calculation of a minimum expenditure basket on the basis of the needs that can be met from the market/services. This may include standard (SPHERE) quantities or qualities intended to be purchased by a beneficiary, such as food (2100 Kcal); water (15 l/p/d) etc.
- Development of a targeting system and targeting criteria;
- Understanding of the deficit that targeted families are experiencing, i.e., to what extent can targeted families meet their basic needs? This might involve an HEA-type analysis, or a simple estimate of income (usually derived through estimating average expenditures);
- Estimate the value of transfer that will enable targeted households to meet their basic needs alongside their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB minus income);
- MPCT requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimised through excellent coordination and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessment, beneficiary registration, targeting, a common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring.
- MPCT in emergencies should exploit social protection systems where possible and appropriate.
- In terms of accountability, partners should use standard outcome indicators for each of the sectors included in the MPCT at the specific objective level of the logframe. A more general well-being indicator such as CSI would also be helpful as a means to determine whether broader improvements to the lives of beneficiaries have been achieved.
- Protection and gender analysis should be integral to the design and implementation of MPCT.

Partners are requested to make reference to *Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs* for more details on DG ECHO's position.

Partners are encouraged to use the Multi-Purpose Grant (MPG) toolkit developed with DG ECHO funds (see link below).

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles

[en.pdf](#)

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

Accountability and Complaint mechanism. For any type and modality of transfer, beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance are exposed to the risk of having their entitlement reduced/taken (kick-backs, forced or “voluntary” sharing, coercion, harassment, larceny and violence). While such risks can be reduced in all phases of the action, a complaint mechanism is an essential element to reduce abuses, rectify targeting errors and spot frauds.

Complaint mechanisms should have SOPs and designated responsibilities among staff to classify and pursue cases, whistleblowing and privacy policies; awareness is particularly important; too often beneficiaries are not informed of the existence of the mechanisms.

Complaint mechanisms should be distinct from a “customer service” which is designed to handle forgotten PINs, wrong spelling of names, etc., not frauds and abuses.

To reduce conflict of interest and to promote confidentiality, partners are strongly encouraged to outsource the complaint mechanisms to third parties specialized institutions (monitoring, audit, insurance, universities, other similar).

Capacity building and self-reliance: Activities related to capacity building must be based on a strategy that has identified specific needs directly linked to the implementation of the action and its results, and which are implemented through regular supervision and monitoring. The partner is encouraged to develop and implement a long term strategy for capacity building when providing technical assistance. Trainings should be administered by qualified professionals and supported by appropriate resources/asset and include entry and exit tests, extensive on the job practice, adult education good practices, good educational material, etc. The final objective should be not only the knowledge transfer, but the promotion of local capacities eventually leading to greater self-reliance and sustainability.