

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### SYRIA REGIONAL CRISIS

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

The activities proposed hereafter are subject to any terms and conditions which may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge **ECHO/B.4**

##### **Contact persons at ECHO HQ**

**Team Leader:** Alessandro VALDAMBRINI: [Alessandro.VALDAMBRINI@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Alessandro.VALDAMBRINI@ec.europa.eu)

Mamar MERZOUK: [Mamar.Merzouk@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Mamar.Merzouk@ec.europa.eu)

Martina GHELARDUCCI: [Martina.Ghelarducci@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Martina.Ghelarducci@ec.europa.eu)

Elena FRANCESHINIS: [Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu)

Marcel PIEPER: [Marcel.PIEPER@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Marcel.PIEPER@ec.europa.eu)

**Lebanon:** Joe GALBY: [Joe.Galby@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Joe.Galby@ec.europa.eu)

**Jordan:** Benjamin THIBERGE: [Benjamin.Thiberge@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Benjamin.Thiberge@ec.europa.eu)

**Syrian Refugees in Egypt:** Elena FRANCESHINIS: [Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu)

##### **Contact persons ECHO field**

###### **Syria:**

Youcef HAMMACHE: [Youcef.Hammache@echofield.eu](mailto:Youcef.Hammache@echofield.eu)

###### **Syria Damascus and Cross-border from Jordan and Lebanon**

Julien BUHA-COLLETTE ([Julien.Buha-Collette@echofield.eu](mailto:Julien.Buha-Collette@echofield.eu))

Olivier BEUCHER: [Olivier.Beucher@echofield.eu](mailto:Olivier.Beucher@echofield.eu)

###### **Syria Cross-border from Turkey and Iraq:**

Cedric PERUS: [Cedric.Perus@echofield.eu](mailto:Cedric.Perus@echofield.eu)

###### **Lebanon:**

Massimiliano MANGIA: [Massimiliano.Mangia@echofield.eu](mailto:Massimiliano.Mangia@echofield.eu)

Daniela DURSO: [Daniela.Durso@echofield.eu](mailto:Daniela.Durso@echofield.eu)

**Jordan:** Matteo PAOLTRONI: [Matteo.Paoltroni@echofield.eu](mailto:Matteo.Paoltroni@echofield.eu)

**Egypt:** Aldo Biondi: [Aldo.Biondi@echofield.eu](mailto:Aldo.Biondi@echofield.eu)

###### **Regional:**

Claudia AMARAL: [Claudia.Amaral@echofield.eu](mailto:Claudia.Amaral@echofield.eu)

Davide ZAPPA: [Davide.Zappa@echofield.eu](mailto:Davide.Zappa@echofield.eu)

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 234 400 000

Breakdown as per World Wide Decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises <sup>1</sup> :	HA-FA: EUR 234,400,000
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 234,400,000

## 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

### 3.1. Administrative info

#### **Assessment round 1: LEBANON**

- Indicative amount: up to EUR 85 000 000, of which an indicative amount of EUR 6 000 000 for Education in Emergencies.
- Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP for **Lebanon**.
- Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017<sup>2</sup>. Actions will start from 01/02/2017.
- The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action<sup>3</sup>.
- Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>4</sup>.
- Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **31/01/2017**.

#### **Assessment round 2: SYRIA Part I**

- Indicative amount: up to EUR 50 000 000, of which an indicative amount of EUR 2 800 000 for Education in Emergencies.
- Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP for **Syria**.
- Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017<sup>2</sup>. Actions will start from 01/02/2017.
- The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action<sup>3</sup>.
- Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> As possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

<sup>2</sup> The expected initial duration for the Action is up 12 months, while for project exclusively related to EiE, when relevant and justified, duration of 24 months could be considered.

<sup>3</sup> The expected initial duration for the Action is up 12 months, while for project exclusively related to EiE, when relevant and justified, duration of 24 months could be considered.

<sup>4</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information by **15/02/2017**.

### **Assessment round 3: SYRIA PART 2**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 64 400 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP for Syria.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017. Actions will start from 01/02/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action<sup>3</sup>.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>4</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by **16/06/2017**.

### **Assessment round 4: JORDAN**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 35 000 000<sup>5</sup>, of which an indicative amount of EUR 6 000 000 for Education in Emergencies.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP for **Jordan**.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/03/2017<sup>2</sup>. Actions will start from 01/04/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 24 months for Education in Emergencies Action<sup>3</sup>.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>4</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information by **31/03/2017**.

### **Assessment round 5: EGYPT**

Dedicated assessment round for Egypt may take place in the course of the year subject to the availability of additional release of appropriations in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures. More information will be available in the course of the 2017's first semester.

---

<sup>5</sup> This amount complements the EUR 20 000 000 frontloading allocation (December 2016) for projects implementation in 2017, as to reach the committed amount of EUR 55 000 000

## 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](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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf)

**Education in Emergencies:** ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education<sup>6</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.

Coordination is essential and all education in emergencies projects need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian and, if appropriate, development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Education Cluster, Refugee Working Groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education).

All actions funded on education in emergencies should in their design adhere to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [IASC Minimum Standards for Child Protection](#).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children\\_2008\\_Emergency\\_Crisis\\_Situations\\_en.pdf](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/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid\\_en](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.<sup>7</sup>

**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

---

<sup>7</sup> 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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf)

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

**Resilience:** ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while taking opportunities to increase their **resilience** – to reduce on-going and future humanitarian needs and to assist a durable recovery. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen, self-reliance through livelihoods and capacities. ECHO encourages its partners to develop their contextual risk and vulnerability analysis and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified (see template). This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local 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/Communication%20Forced%20Displacement%20Development%202016.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff working document Forced Displacement Development 2016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff_working_document%20Forced%20Displacement%20Development%202016.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](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](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](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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_policy_doc_en.pdf)

### 3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

#### **LEBANON**

##### **Programming priorities**

In 2017, ECHO will focus on providing protection and dignity to vulnerable refugee populations through integrated programming. All proposals should integrate protection and promote protection outcomes whilst demonstrating solid referral capacity and strong control and accountability mechanisms. All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based, built on robust and systematic, repeated needs assessments to rapidly address the needs of the most vulnerable households and groups. In addition, interventions must respect humanitarian principles, and in particular the principles of impartiality and ‘do not harm’. ECHO’s partners should respond in an integrated and harmonized manner to arising emergency situations.

##### **Thematic priorities**

##### **Basic-needs assistance (BNA)**<sup>8</sup>

After five years into this protracted refugee crisis, both the approach and the framing of the BNA need substantial changes in line with Grand Bargain commitments in order to improve its (i) Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness; (ii) Accountability and Protection; (iii) Consistent Governance and Operational Structure<sup>9</sup>.

A new, restructured model for BNA should include at a minimum the following elements:

- **Efficiency and cost-effectiveness**
  - One nationwide approach with proven efficiency gains over the current system;
  - One targeting system based on agreed socio-economic vulnerability indicators and thresholds to capture the most vulnerable households;
  - One single delivery transfer mechanism: one card and one platform to manage one single, unrestricted, monthly cash transfer to cover basic needs of targeted households. The use of vouchers will be considered only if justified and deemed to be a better option over cash;
  - Flexibility and expandability: the system can include transfer “top-ups” for specific targeted activities (i.e. education) and to respond to an unpredicted influx of refugees.
- **Accountability and Protection**
  - A robust appeal system to guarantee accountability to affected population (AAP), equity and transparency;
  - Well defined linkages with complementary measures (i.e. through referrals) and synergies with existing outreach systems;
  - Beneficiary representation in governance.

<sup>8</sup> BNA refers to a regular and unrestricted cash transfer (MCPT) provided on a monthly basis to the most vulnerable refugees assessed on the basis of socio-economic vulnerability indicators.

<sup>9</sup> [http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Grand\\_Bargain\\_final\\_22\\_May\\_FINAL-2.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Grand_Bargain_final_22_May_FINAL-2.pdf)

- **Consistent Governance and Operational Structure**
  - One governance structure to guarantee transparency, accountability and overall efficiency of the response model, as well as compliance with donors' financial regulations and humanitarian principles;
  - One harmonised performance management, results monitoring and reporting framework;
  - One independent needs assessment and evaluation system.

Furthermore, streamlined processes, segregation of duties and the involvement of a limited number of actors must be reflected into the response model to minimize operational overheads and deliver the best value for money.

Finally, as ECHO recognizes the need for more predictable and longer-term funding mechanisms and instruments to ideally transition the basic-needs assistance into a social protection-type of scheme, longer-term strategies aiming transfer/hand over to other/long term funding instruments should be elaborated and included in the proposals.

### **Protection**

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

Protection monitoring through community based structures will be considered when it provides an evidence-based trend analysis, informs response programming, identifies beneficiaries requiring specific case management through direct interventions or timely referral to other actors and support protection advocacy strategies. Proposals that identify common methodologies of data collection, analysis and response will be prioritized. Provision of specific protection services, including access to documentation, legal assistance and counselling will be considered when based on sound needs analysis, identifying the most appropriate response modality and demonstrated capacities.

### **WASH and Shelter**

Proposals integrating interventions in Informal Settlements (ISs) and Sub-Standard Building (SSBs) will be prioritized based on demonstrated needs and vulnerability ranking and cost effectiveness.

Partners should also specifically address their plans to ensure systematic monitoring, harmonized analysis and reporting capacities in order to guarantee the efficiency, effectiveness and transparency of the proposed response. Interventions for ISs and SSBs should focus on the following parameters:

In Informal Settlements (ISs):

- Routine distribution of shelter and hygiene kits will no longer be considered by ECHO. Consideration will exclusively be made for one-off distribution to new arrivals<sup>10</sup> or other emergency needs to be justified.
- Provision of basic WASH services based on WASH vulnerability ranking<sup>11</sup> support to water trucking must be accompanied by a water quality protocol and analysis of

---

<sup>10</sup> Could be the case of evictions or evacuations

<sup>11</sup> Partners are expected to identify areas of intervention (IS) based on clear vulnerability ranking of needs, agreed with ECHO

legality of water source utilized. The construction of new latrines and sanitation facilities and hygiene promotion will only be considered for demonstrated emergency needs.

In Sub-standard building (SSBs):

- SSBs hosting severely vulnerable refugee families could be supported through holistic and cost efficient interventions, prioritising households receiving first-time assistance for shelter rehabilitations and repairs.
- For SSBs that are deemed too far below standards for adequate shelter, rehabilitations and repairs should not be considered;
- Contributions to achieving the Neighbourhood Approach initiative through rehabilitation and repair of SSBs should no longer be considered unless the added value of a short term humanitarian intervention and the needed synergies with structural interventions are duly demonstrated.

### **Health**

ECHO may support partners with demonstrated capacities to provide the delivery of primary healthcare packages including mental health in areas with proven lack of access due to acute emergencies or evidence of increased mortality and morbidity. ECHO will contribute to supporting access of vulnerable refugee populations to essential secondary healthcare with a focus on reproductive healthcare. Moreover, proposals that ease blockages faced by refugees to access the most needed hospital care are encouraged. Rehabilitation needs for conflict affected individuals will be considered.

### **Education in Emergencies (EiE)**

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

### **Coordination and advocacy**

Effective and transparent coordination remains a critical need in Lebanon; accountability mechanisms must be enhanced through adequate Monitoring and Evaluation and Information Management and Analysis capacities and systems aimed at supporting integrated interventions and a coordinated response in all its elements as described above.

Humanitarian Advocacy will be a precondition for ECHO partners in Lebanon: the causes of the continuous deterioration of the humanitarian situation, with a specific concern regarding the protection of the refugees, must be specifically addressed through coordinated, evidence-based and effective advocacy in all proposals.

## **SYRIA**

### **Programming priorities**

ECHO in Syria in 2017 will focus on addressing basic needs of the most vulnerable people and communities in a timely, principled and quality manner through the most appropriate modalities or entry points, ensuring provision of integrated and flexible essential life-saving assistance (first line response) as well as coordinated and targeted multi-sectorial post-emergency responses (protracted needs).

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

Effective and transparent operational coordination (at hub and inter-hub level) remains a critical requisite for inside Syria proposals; likewise accountability mechanisms should be enhanced through adequate platforms based on Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and Information Management (IM) capacities and systems aimed at quality evidence-based analysis, outcomes evaluation, supporting integrated interventions and coordinated response in all its elements.

### **Thematic priorities**

#### **Basic needs assistance**

By way of promoting comprehensive approach and efficiency gains, ECHO will support basic needs assistance, through a combination of modalities, including multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT), as cash allow beneficiaries to meet a wide range of needs in a dignified manner.

The basic needs assistance proposed should be in line with the following principles:

- Well-articulated multi-sector response analysis that builds on comprehensive needs assessment, and clearly informs the choice of response(s) and modality(ies) to be duly justified according to the needs and vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- Detailed and adequate targeting and prioritization mechanisms with focus on most vulnerable individuals.
- Flexible and reactive operation with capacity to scale up in shortest delay.

Within the overall country strategy, a basic-needs response requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimized through effective operational coordination platforms and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessments, targeting, joint delivery mechanism and monitoring. These dimensions should be clearly addressed in proposals.



### **Protection**

ECHO will prioritize a clear focus on protection in the humanitarian response within Syria, linked to the application of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), International Human Rights (IHRL) and Refugee Law (IRL). Interventions designed to reduce and mitigate the protection risks of man-made violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons in Syria will be supported in the form of either stand-alone or integrated programmes aimed at achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection-sensitive targeting. Decisions on specific activities to be supported will be based on an up-to-date and comprehensive protection risk analysis and vulnerabilities as well as operational capacities and expertise. These dimensions must be specifically described in all proposals.

Specific protection interventions that will be considered for funding include:

- Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals (such as, but not limited to, registration for refugees, returnees and asylum seekers, legal aid for displaced and conflict-affected population, family tracing and monitoring of detention conditions);
- Information Management (such as, but not limited to, forced internal displacement tracking systems or protection monitoring);
- Advocacy (such as, evidence-based advocacy on grave violations of IHL (e.g. on protection of medical staff and facilities or other types of public infrastructure, essential for the survival of the population); IRHL and IRL
- Dissemination of IHL
- Assistance to victims of all kinds of violence, including SGBV, along with child protection from all kind of exploitation, violence and abuse (particularly activities addressing separation of children and families, unaccompanied children, recruitment of children in armed groups, and psycho-social needs of children).
- On account of the degree of contamination by land-mines, Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs) and Improvised Explosive Device (IEDs) in some areas, a comprehensive approach to Mine Action (including Humanitarian Demining / marking; Assistance to Victims, Mine Risk Education) will be considered either as a stand-alone project or part of an integrated approach.

### **Health**

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

- Comprehensive Primary Health Care, inclusive of communicable diseases as well as mother and child care, but also provision of emergency health care, including obstetric care, and emergency psycho-social support. Preventive and cost-efficient care for chronic and non-communicable diseases may also be considered.
- Comprehensive health services and referral for injured and war wounded, including first line responders, postoperative and rehabilitation care.

- Comprehensive care for victims of SGBV, including Clinical Management of Rape (CMR) and Psycho-social support<sup>12</sup>, should be integrated as much as possible in all proposed health facilities.
- The functionality of existing Early Warning, Surveillance and Response systems (like the Early Warning and Alert Response Systems EWARS inside Syria) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed.
- Mainstreaming disability in humanitarian operations inside Syria.

### **Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)**

Food assistance interventions will be prioritized as saving-lives response to severe, transitory food insecurity, preferably as an integral part of a multi-purpose response for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

- All proposals should clearly identify food gaps, and include well identifies food outcomes Key Objective Indicators (KOIs) and Key Result Indicators (KRIs) relevant for the action.
- The general rule should favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households with well-identified basic humanitarian food and nutrition needs.
- All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms. Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed (ie. sudden emergency)
- Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- Proposals should advocate for linkages between food assistance interventions and other sectors, i.e. protection and nutrition outcomes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices.

### **WASH, Shelter and NFI**

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

- For water and sanitation, rehabilitation, maintenance and repair of existing basic services, such as water and wastewater systems, in the emergency and post-emergency phase, will be prioritized. Investment in water and wastewater infrastructure should be supported by a quality assurance mechanism that includes detailed technical specifications (e.g. Bill of Quantities –BoQs-), establishment of Water Safety Plans (WSP)<sup>13</sup>, Operation and Maintenance (O&M), and strengthening technical and regulatory capacity at local level.

---

<sup>12</sup> Focused non-specialized support (PSS) – in the form of e.g. individual or group counseling – may be provided at community centers, schools, etc. provided that this is done by trained staff supervised by a qualified psychologist.

<sup>13</sup> WSP focus on ensuring safe, drinkable water throughout the safe water chain, from source to point of consumption. WSP are centred on proper system assessment; effective operational monitoring; and management and communication to ensure proper adherence to procedures.

- Partners must demonstrate in proposals their capacity to evaluate and assess the impact of investments to water and wastewater systems, by providing data related to improvements to access and availability based on pre and post-implementation status of the system. Water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort, lifesaving intervention that is well planned and executed with a defined exit strategy for the emergency phase. This should be accompanied by a detailed water quality monitoring protocol.
- Standalone Hygiene promotion (HP) activities will not be considered. In the frame of a water & sanitation project, HP will be only considered if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonized messages and communication channels in line with the national WASH Cluster guideline. For Shelter, only emergency interventions, such as, basic shelter upgrades, sealing off kits or emergency shelter comprehensive package will be considered.
- No routine distribution of Non Food Items (NFI) and hygiene items will be considered. This will exclusively be considered for emergency response to specific emergencies (Sudden displacement for example).

### **Education in Emergencies (EiE)**

ECHO will prioritize education activities that enable children's access to quality education in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and immediate post-emergency phases. Innovative solutions will particularly be considered.

- It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programmes. In addition the design of any EiE interventions must fully adhere to protection mainstreaming principles, including, but not limited to, do-no-harm considerations.
- Partners must ensure that there is no overlap with education interventions that could be funded by DG NEAR.
- Priority will be given to education activities that entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school through various modalities (this could include e.g. support to informal education, distance learning) and to mine risk education. Activities shall be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances like access to safe and secure learning space.
- All education in emergencies proposals need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian mechanisms

### **Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and information management (IM)**

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

- Harmonized and compatible in order to enable IM and M&E systems to produce comparable information and data.

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

## **JORDAN**

### **Programming priorities**

ECHO’s priorities in 2017 focus on the provision of timely, adequate and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas and to refugees living in camps or in hosting communities based on the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF). Despite significant achievements following the London Conference in early 2016 and the signature of a Compact agreement between the EU and the Government of Jordan, the humanitarian space for Syrian refugees in Jordan continues to erode, with cases of forced encampment or *refoulement* to Syria. In mid-2016, Jordan tightened its border policy management, leading to a full closure of the borders with Syria. ECHO interventions will also focus on new arrivals in 2017, if confirmed, throughout the thematic priorities described below.

### **Thematic priorities**

#### **Protection**

Protection should be an integral part of all ECHO projects, not only as a mainstreaming component, but also as part of an integrated programming approach. Activities aiming to i) provide legal documentation enabling refugees to access available services, ii) increase economic and social opportunities for refugees, particularly for those living in the hosting communities and iii) related advocacy would be considered. To enhance an overall coordinated response, based on harmonized targeting and robust referral systems, ECHO will consider funding a protection-focused consortium. Proposed target groups for the intervention could include people living in transit centers, camps, hosting communities as well as those stranded at the Berm.

ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions among the following:

At the Berm and in transit centers

- Advocacy for refugee's access to the Jordanian territory, prevention of *refoulement* as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to Syrian refugees stranded at the Berm and for those stuck in transit centers.
- Registration and profiling of the asylum seekers stranded at the Berm.

In camp settings

- Ensure a robust referral system is in place to capture and track all types of protection cases, and follow up of referred cases ensuring access to services.
- Advocacy towards the camp management and towards the relevant Jordanian authorities to expedite refugees' (originating from the Berm) screening in Azraq

camp, to guarantee their freedom of movement and access to the necessary services including basic needs, health, and protection.

- Whilst GBV issues could be addressed, related services should be delivered through the reproductive health (RH) angle.

In the hosting communities (a proposal from a protection consortium would be advisable)

- Continuation of the 2016 protection monitoring exercise aiming at protection needs identification and the provision of protection services.
- Provision of protection services, especially for refugees lacking proper documentation and/or registration to enable access to all available services.
- Redress legal support for protection cases beyond basic legal advice.

### **Basic-needs assistance**

Promoting a comprehensive approach and efficiency, ECHO supports basic-needs assistance (BNA<sup>14</sup>) allowing the most vulnerable refugees, inclusive of any new arrivals, particularly in the hosting community, to meet in a dignified manner a wide range of their needs. In Jordan, refugees are facing multiple needs since several years, resorting to extreme negative coping mechanisms. Viewing refugees' limited access to livelihood opportunities, a multi-purpose approach should be proposed in response to the multiple needs faced by refugees in Jordan.

Nonetheless, given the need for more predictable / longer-term funding mechanisms / instruments and the need for transitioning the basic needs approach into a social protection-type of scheme, ECHO will consider:

- Proposals aiming at the provision of basic-needs assistance (here referred as 'regular BNA') to the most vulnerable refugee households in urban contexts. Proposals must envisage clear targeting and verification mechanisms, to ensure caseload punctual update, sound outreach and referral system to reduce exclusion errors. Proposals must also contain clear transition strategies and linkages with other longer-term development instruments.
- Proposals aiming to assist refugees excluded or temporarily unable to access the regular BNA, identified as socio-economically vulnerable. Those interventions should:
  - provide an adequate BNA as consistent as possible with the regular BNA;
  - should be considered as a temporary measure (up to 3- 6 months maximum);
  - be delivered in close conjunction with legal and/or protection support to facilitate their access/admission to the regular BNA

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

<sup>14</sup> BNA refers to a regular and unrestricted cash transfer (MPCT) provided on a monthly basis to the most in-need refugees assessed on basis of socio-economic vulnerability indicators.

**Health**

ECHO will consider funding specific health interventions among the following:

In the hosting communities

- Proposing gradual phase out from the health support and transition to longer term instruments, in view of the 2016 decree of providing maternal health support.
- Strengthen referral mechanisms and health assistance in mental health and psychosocial support' (MHPSS), physical rehabilitation services, as well as secondary health care for refugees.
- Partners should quantify coverage and gaps in access to health services as well as evidence access barriers for primary and secondary health care.

In camp settings

- Ensure that refugees, inclusive of new arrivals, have access to direct health services according to their needs with focus on reproductive health. GBV services must be delivered under the RH angle.
- Ensure that functioning and robust referral mechanisms are capturing and tracking type of cases, waiting time, and other challenges; especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery, end result, etc.).

**Shelter & NFIs**

ECHO will consider funding specific interventions among the following:

In the hosting community -

- Timely winterization activities based on a sound targeting methodology, that focuses on the most vulnerable.
- Coordination arrangements must be detailed, ensuring that a proper referral system is in place<sup>15</sup>.

In camp settings -

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

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

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

**Education in Emergency (EiE)**

ECHO will consider supporting educational activities both in the hosting communities and in refugee camps. Innovative approaches will be particularly welcomed. Actions

<sup>15</sup> This should be in coordination/through the WG (BNA) and RAIS II

targeting transition to formal education systems in view of a hand-over to 'development' intervention may also be considered. It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programmes, thus this dimension has to be specifically addressed.

Any proposed activity must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other circumstances. Specifically:

- Provision of life-skills supporting children to access education where they feel safe and protected could be considered.
- Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors, children at work...),
- Activities strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies.
- Coordination will be essential and all proposals including education in emergencies must detail coordination arrangements and should support priorities set with 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).

## **EGYPT**

### **Programming priorities**

Egypt remains a country of destination and transit for asylum seekers, refugees and migrants. Year 2016 was characterized by an upward trend of new arrivals. ECHO funding will aim at consolidating the small-scale niche response initiated in 2016, focusing on core humanitarian needs. Whilst the Syrian refugees remain ECHO's entry point, assistance to the most vulnerable among other refugees groups and their hosting communities will be considered. Project proposals should adhere to the overall ECHO response strategy aimed at strengthening protection for the most vulnerable whilst at the same time enhancing access to emergency health and education services, including through education in emergency. The use of multi-purpose cash transfers for particularly vulnerable groups through common platforms will be considered if supported by a comparative analysis which take into account cost efficiency and effectiveness.

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

### **Thematic priorities**

#### **Protection**

Given the upward trend for new arrivals, the increasing number of UASC and irregular entries, as well as the sharp increase of number of refugees detained for attempted irregular migration, strengthening core protection activities for the most vulnerable remains the paramount objective of ECHO.

ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions among the following:

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

Project proposals aiming at enhancing access to basic services as main objective, should give due consideration to protection mainstreaming.

### **Health**

Whilst refugees in Egypt have overall legal access to public health services, several structural causes (e.g. poor quality of services), thus requiring developmental investments, limit their capacity to benefit from them.

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

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

### **Education in Emergency (EiE)**

ECHO will consider supporting project proposals that facilitate access to the public education system and/or retention to contrast/limit the high levels of school dropout. Proposals targeting areas with the highest concentration of refugees and levels of school dropout as well as particularly vulnerable groups will be prioritized, whilst the creation of parallel systems must be avoided. Coordination with development partners, other EU instruments and GoE's line ministries must be specifically addressed in proposals, as well as the alignment to the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM) principles, and to globally recognised minimum standards for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and Child Protection.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied and separated minors. They could also entail improving the quality of education, the lack of which contributes to dropouts. The scope could also be enlarged beyond children (under 18 years old) to include youth and young adults if appropriately justified.



ECHO will consider funding specific EiE interventions among the following:

- Transition to formal education systems such as community based pre-school as well as actions strengthening or complementing the formal education system by enhancing its capacity facilitating safe access or improving the quality of education.
- Either specific EiE actions and/or multi-sectoral responses that closely link EiE with protection and supporting actions such as psychosocial support, inclusive of provision of life skills training. Proposals must describe in detail how education activities are to be carried out in close connection with protection programmes, also to ensure that children access education where they feel safe and protected.