

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### NORTH AFRICA

#### 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/C2
Contact persons at HQ	Annick VILLAROSA <a href="mailto:annick.villarosa@ec.europa.eu">annick.villarosa@ec.europa.eu</a> (team leader North Africa, desk officer Tunisia)
	Maddalena MASUCCI <a href="mailto:maddalena.masucci@ec.europa.eu">maddalena.masucci@ec.europa.eu</a> (desk officer Libya and Algeria)
in the field	Patrick BARBIER <a href="mailto:patrick.barbier@echofield.eu">patrick.barbier@echofield.eu</a>

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 20 000 000

*Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:*

##### ALGERIA

Indicative amount	EUR 9 000 000
Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises <sup>1</sup> :	EUR 8 000 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO:	EUR 1 000 000
Total:	EUR 9 000 000

---

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

## **LIBYA**

Indicative amount	EUR 10 000 000
Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises <sup>2</sup> :	EUR 10 000 000
Total:	EUR 10 000 000

## **TUNISIA**

Indicative amount	EUR 1 000 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO:	EUR 1 000 000
Total:	EUR 1 000 000

### **3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT**

#### **3.1. Administrative info**

##### **Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 12 000 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in section 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017<sup>3</sup>.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months, except in operationally well-justified cases such as actions in the Disaster Risk Reduction and Education in Emergency sectors.
- e) Potential partners: Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated presence and operational capacity in Libya, in the Sahrawi refugee camps and in Tunisia.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>4</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information:
  - by 16/12/2016<sup>5</sup>

##### **Assessment round 2**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 000 000 for Libya

---

<sup>2</sup> As possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

<sup>3</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

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

<sup>5</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: primary and emergency health care; maternal and child health; war surgery and physical rehabilitation; support to public health facilities in conflict zones and remote areas (south of Libya), including mobile clinics and psycho-social support. Support to basic needs of conflict-affected vulnerable people (shelter/non-food items/food/health) through appropriate modalities, including multi-purpose cash transfer where feasible (detailed analysis required of cash-related issues and alternative solutions to demonstrate that the proposed action will not contribute to the shadow economy). Initiatives to improve coordination and access of humanitarian actors and broaden humanitarian space.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2017<sup>6</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated presence and operational capacity in Libya.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>7</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 30 June 2017.

### **Assessment round 3**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 000 000 for Libya
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in section 2.2 of the HIP especially in areas of returnees and recent population displacement.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2017<sup>8</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated presence and operational capacity in Libya.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>9</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 24 August 2017.

## **3.2. Operational requirements:**

### *3.2.1. Assessment criteria:*

The assessment of proposals will look at:

---

<sup>6</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>7</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>8</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>9</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

- 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:** Risks inform programming is a must. 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>10</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>10</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>11</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.

---

<sup>11</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)

While humanitarian assistance often focuses on community-level interventions, it is important to remember that, in order to fully address many protection issues, it is also necessary to consider the relevance and feasibility of advocacy (structural level) interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities. The use of integrated protection programming approaches is also strongly encouraged.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff\\_working\\_document\\_humanitarian\\_protection\\_052016.pdf](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_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.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_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf)

**Community-based approach:** In all sectors, interventions should adopt, wherever possible, a community-based approach in terms of defining viable options to effectively help increasing resilience and meeting basic needs among the most vulnerable. Community inclusion should be considered at all stages – design and implementation. Community ownership of the process is more effective and is encouraged. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritised by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

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

**ECHO Visibility:** Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with **visibility** requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of and partnership with the EU/ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

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

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

visibility activities and a budget breakdown.

Further explanation of visibility requirements and reporting as well as best practices and examples can be consulted on the dedicated ECHO visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>.

### **Other Useful links to guidelines and policies:**

#### *Food Assistance*

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

#### *Nutrition*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04\\_nutrition\\_addressing\\_undernutrition\\_in\\_emergencies\\_en.pdf](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. Sector Specific guidelines

#### **Disaster Preparedness actions:**

The entry point for the intervention logic of any targeted DRR project supported by ECHO must be **the hazard itself**, and not a problem that is essentially structural in nature, de-linked from a disaster event. Proposals that seek merely to address structural issues such as inadequate delivery of basic services, will not be considered a priority for a DRR targeted action.

A thorough analysis of the natural disaster risk (at the appropriate scale) is expected and shall generate the following:

- a typology of hazards affecting the area
- the determination of the range of negative consequences of these hazards
- the identification of both, existing capacities to address the negative consequences of these hazards as well as specific vulnerabilities

Actions should prioritise **cost efficient, affordable and replicable methodologies** adaptable to local financing and planning mechanisms or easily bought in by authorities or by development actors and by other donors. This approach should remain at the centre of any DRR intervention supported by ECHO.

The implementation of a successful DP/DRR strategy is dependent upon **the sustained investment of all stakeholders** (incl. communities, relevant authorities at multiple levels, etc...) **throughout the project cycle**.

Likewise, relevant public entities, officials and stakeholders at the appropriate levels must be consulted and involved at all stages of the action to ensure sustainability and replication.

Additionally, actions should ensure comprehensive **participatory approaches and methodologies that address vulnerabilities and inclusiveness** as far as gender, children, elderly or specific groups are concerned.

**Enhancing networking and promoting the exchange of experiences and development of existing initiatives** related to DRR matters are strongly encouraged,

Applicants must systematically consider documenting and taking stock of experiences and most of all, their dissemination in an appropriate manner. These activities should be explicitly envisaged under the activities and in the work plan of each proposal.

Systematic integration of technical, specific and scientific institutions and of the academic sector should be sought. Proposed actions should also seek synergies with institutions in charge of local development, in order to contribute to institutionalization processes.

### 3.2.2.3. Country Specific guidelines

#### **Libya – Sectoral Priorities**

**Actions falling under the following sector will be prioritized for the commitment of the initial envelope:**

**Health:** Access to health care for conflict-affected people, including provision of essential medicine and medical equipment, of medical staff and specialized services (war and trauma surgery, maternal and child health, rehabilitation services, prosthesis and orthopaedics, mental health and psychosocial support;) and outreach activities (such as essential health and nutrition activity package according to identified needs).

Outreach activities should target vulnerable Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), returnees and host communities in areas where health services are disrupted or inaccessible due to the on-going conflict, and high IDPs concentration areas.

Attention to the specific needs of highly vulnerable groups (children, disabled, elderly) is encouraged. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers could be beneficiaries to the extent that they are part of the most vulnerable populations supported.

**Actions falling under the following sectors could be considered in case of budgetary reinforcement:**

**Shelter, NFI (non-food items) and food assistance:** NFI, food and shelters assistance to forcibly displaced persons and returnees will be considered. Multi-purpose cash transfers will be used as appropriate. Targeted interventions will be privileged according to documented vulnerability criteria.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene:** Support could be considered in conflict affected zones or in high IDPs concentration areas based on evidence based assessment.

**Education in Emergencies:** All type of formal education up to secondary school could be considered as long as the related strategy is driven by a protection related problematic and response affecting a specific group of age, sex or segregation in conflict affected zones.

**Mainstreaming of protection** must be ensured in all actions proposed to ECHO. Partners are encouraged to include the analysis of on-going conflict dynamics as well as the analysis of protection risks faced by the most vulnerable population.

**Libya – Remote management**

Please note that remote management is considered by DG ECHO as a last resort option. Remote management entails transferring operational responsibilities usually carried out by expatriate staff to national and local employees or external partners. ECHO considers that remote management and outsourcing might entail transferring security risks, managerial and monitoring responsibilities from international to national staff. Remote management may also compromise commonly accepted accountability standards. It can also be difficult to reverse the process, once started. ECHO will thus consider funding actions that involve remote management only if a number of questions are answered:

1. **Access problems:** Access issues should be sufficiently serious to prevent humanitarian delivery unless a remote management is adopted. Please explain access issues in areas where you work under section 3.1.3 or 6.6 (in case of security problems) of the Single Form.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: access problems are serious and cannot be resolved by partners; no other humanitarian organization is willing and able to deliver assistance through direct management.

2. **Acceptance-building:** The best way to mitigate security risks and to gain access to vulnerable populations is to build acceptance of impartial and independent action among local or displaced communities, with local authorities or non-state actors. Please explain how your organization is currently building such acceptance in Libya in sections 4.3, 4.7 and 7 of the Single Form

Criteria for ECHO assessment: proposals must identify actors at local, regional or national level who could have an impact on humanitarian access; the proposed action includes concrete steps to gain, regain, or maintain acceptance?

3. **Life-saving character:** Operations undertaken through remote management modus operandi should only be implemented if justified by a life-saving imperative. Please explain if the proposed action is life-saving through the preservation of crucial livelihoods in section 4 of the Single Form.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: the proposed action is designed to implement direct life-saving operations, or operations aiming at preserving livelihoods.

4. **Security risks:** risk “displacement” is not acceptable. Please explain if access constraints are connected to a specific threat to expatriate humanitarian workers. In other words, you should be able to demonstrate in section 6.6. of the Single Form that risks for your local staff are substantially lower than the risks identified as the reason for withdrawing expatriate staff.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: clear evidence that all possible measures have been put in place to reduce and manage the risks for humanitarian workers implementing the action; clear evidence that programmes are designed and delivered in a manner that does not impact negatively on the security of the beneficiaries/disaster affected communities.

5. **Needs assessment:** how does your organization intend to guarantee that needs assessment was done in an impartial manner? Crosschecking information through trusted third parties is a must. Please provide details under section 3 of the Single Form.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: the proposed action specifies which sources of information have been used to estimate needs; data collected remotely (e.g. through national/local staff, external partners or aerial surveillance) have been confirmed through cross verification from direct sources.

6. **Qualification of staff:** please confirm that the skills and experience of local staff who will implement the action is adequate in section 6.1 of the Single Form.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: steps are taken to ensure that your organization’s staff who are ultimately responsible for the management and the quality of the action are updated at all times with all relevant information concerning the implementation of the action on the ground; the action identifies potential qualification gaps and explains where the necessary technical, analytical and managerial skills can be found (and possible training measures to address them).

7. **Monitoring arrangements:** face-to-face discussions between senior staff and local stakeholders from the area of intervention such as community reps, authorities or dealers must be arranged as a minimum requirement. Indirect monitoring (mobile & web-based technology, photo evidence, telephone feedback mechanisms, biometrics, vouchers reconciliation, triangulation of information) can also be used. As a last

resort, third-party monitoring will be considered. You need to decide which combination of methods is most suitable to the particular context in Libya and detail these methods in section 8 of the Single Form.

Criteria for ECHO assessment: the proposed action must include arrangements to facilitate direct contact between those who retain the management and responsibility for ensuring the quality of the action and beneficiaries or other local stakeholders; the action does not rely on third party monitoring provided by private firms or individual consultants that offer or have offered their services to military organizations or any other party to the conflict.

## **Algeria**

**Actions falling under the following sectors will be prioritized for the commitment of the initial envelope:**

**Food Assistance:** Distribution of dry and fresh food to the five refugee camps. Interventions should ensure not only the adequate quantity but also the quality and variety of the food basket, in order to contribute to beneficiaries' dietary requirements. Specific attention has to be paid to food (consumption)-related health issues like diabetes, obesity and anaemia. Sensitization on nutrition good practice should be included as a complementary activity.

Particular attention should also be given to food utilization. Components such as appropriate feeding practices, proper energy source and technology for adequately processing, cooking and conservation of food/ making should be considered alongside food access and availability.

Vulnerability criteria should be further developed and progressively implemented, taking in consideration the capacity of refugees households to ensure appropriate coverage of most acute needs rather than status-based blanket coverage. Support to alternative food assistance modalities including cash and/or vouchers, based on a market analysis would be favourably considered if based on a feasibility analysis. Support to income-generation activities is encouraged where suitable.

Attention should also be paid to adequate monitoring of distributions and coordination with authorities.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene:** Regular water distribution to the five refugee camps is considered important. This implies basic maintenance and support of distribution networks (reverse-osmosis system/tanks/water trucks/logistics) and control of the quality of the water at the source and at the storage level. A limited extension of the water network could be envisaged to reduce dependency on water trucking and the associated high costs. Local capacity building and enhanced community involvement in the management and maintenance of the water truck system is crucial in order to ensure sustainability of the supported actions and uninterrupted water distribution.

Support to sanitation and waste management in health facilities and schools will depend



on lessons learned, demonstrated needs and culturally adapted responses as well as proven community maintenance management capacity.

**Education in Emergencies (initial envelope: EUR 500 000):** Vocational training (i.e. in mechanics, physiotherapy, agricultural sector and others) should be promoted as it would allow young people to gain useful skills adapted to their current circumstances as well as useful for their future. Capacity-building should be mainstreamed in all community-based activities in order to create employment opportunities and income generating activities. Education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include provision of life-skills and best family practices including nutrition and hygiene sensitization and DRR training and awareness in school settings. Education in Emergency activities are preferably integrated in other actions.

**DRR:** In addition to the points mentioned in the sector-specific guidelines, the design of targeted DRR interventions should integrate lessons learnt from recent disasters, affecting the population living in the refugee camps, so as to build an evidence-based awareness and contingency strategy. The risk context analysis should not be limited within the geographic borders of the camps, but should consider its location within natural boundaries (ex: watersheds, etc...). The constitution of small contingency stocks could be envisaged as part of contingency plans.

Particular attention should be given to the impact of these disasters to the essential services (e.g. education, health) in the camps. DRR actions in this regards should not only aim at reducing the impact of recurrent disasters on these services but also make sure that they would be able to continue functioning during the occurrence of a disaster. The use and adaptation of tools developed by international DRR campaigns such as “One Million Safe Schools and Hospitals” would be seen as an added value.

**DRR Mainstreaming:** All project proposals submitted to DG ECHO should be risk informed (see resilience marker).

**Health:** Activities aiming at providing support to disabled people will be prioritized. The provision and management of medicines, including for non-communicable diseases and small equipment, could also be considered. Drug lists must be based on needs assessment as well as on lessons learned from previous years in terms of quantities requested by the different health centres, used and disposed of.

**Security:** ECHO acknowledges the continued security risks for humanitarian workers in the Saharan context. Security related costs will therefore continue to be eligible but should preferably be integrated into proposals for funding proportionally to the use of security services.

**Actions falling under the following sectors could be considered in case of budgetary reinforcement:**

**Shelter and NFI:** If allocation criteria are clearly defined in line with humanitarian imperatives and adequately monitored, targeted support with shelter and NFIs could be envisaged.

## **Tunisia**

**DRR:** In addition to the points mentioned in the sector-specific guidelines, the DRR actions to be supported by ECHO should contribute to the implementation of the **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030**

All DRR actions supported by ECHO have to be aligned and to fit into the respective **national and regional DRR frameworks**. This includes policies, strategies, legislation and planning at various levels. Promotion of the roll out and implementation of respective regional and national DRR frameworks and programmes at local level will be supported.

Synergies with the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) are encouraged. Proposals aiming at using and adapting tools for the implementation of international campaigns at local level, such as Resilient Cities, Safe Hospitals and Schools can be considered. In this regards, priority should be given to:

- Urban areas exposed to the risk of disaster caused by natural events,
- High concentration of very vulnerable population,
- Where basic services are under pressure due to the influx of population fleeing the existing armed conflict in Libya.

Actions foreseen can include: strengthening local capacities in terms of risk analysis, risk monitoring, early warning systems (from alert to response); but also in local DRR governance (linking early warning and early action, DRR budget allocation, etc.).

The involvement of civil society, local communities, women and children, the private sector should be promoted as relevant stakeholders in DRR. Attention should be given to the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized groups in the risk analysis. Their specific needs should be addressed in local disaster response plans to be defined.

Where relevant, a link with Civil Protection mechanism should be foreseen, using for example well defined activities (drills, etc...) to strengthen local capacities.

All ECHO partners, including Member States Specialized Agencies, are encouraged to submit a proposal.