

TECHNICAL ANNEX

HIP SOUTHERN AFRICA AND INDIAN OCEAN

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/C.3
Contact persons: at HQ	Dorothy MORRISSEY (Dorothy.Morrissey@ec.europa.eu)
in the field	Alexandre CASTELLANO (Alexandre.Castellano@echofield.eu)

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 15 000 000

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters	HA-FA: EUR 10 000 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 5 000 000
Total:	EUR 15 000 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- Indicative amount: up to EUR 14 000 000.
- This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 3.4 of the HIP;
- Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2017 - Actions may start from 01/01/2017;
- The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months;

- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners;
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹;
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 09/01/2017.

Assessment round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 000 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 (cyclone ENAWO Madagascar)
- c) Costs will be eligible from 07/03/2017
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: ECHO funded partners already present: UNICEF, WFP.
- f) Information to be provided: Modification requests or Single form
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 21/04/2017.

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.

¹ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

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-
ECHO/SF/BUD/2017/91000

based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains, The questions ‘why not cash’ and ‘if not now, then when’ should be asked before modalities are selected. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the ['Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors'](#) and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed. Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers. In such approaches, the value of transfer would normally be based upon a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), while taking account the contribution made by households, and available resources.

For in-kind transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible.

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>

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

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. The partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.

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

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their livelihoods and assets. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner’s institutional commitment to and operational capability in managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention. The DRR approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed

programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard occurrence, and include contingency arrangements for additional or expanded activities that might be required. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated into programme decision making and design, even where the humanitarian operation is not the result of a specific hazard.

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

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

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

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

Education in Emergencies: ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education² 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

² 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.

of life-skills, such as vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school, but also strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies, including the recruitment and capacity building of teachers. To reduce the vulnerability of children affected by conflict, actions in the field of education in emergencies and especially conflict situations, should reflect protection, relevant legal frameworks (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law), education in mediation and conflict resolution, child protection (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors and former child soldiers), community-based educational activities and the promotion of peaceful reconciliation. Hence, education projects could include components of child protection and peace education (i.e. mediation, conflict resolution, etc.).

In order to ensure holistic response, linking education to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered.

Activities must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances.

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

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

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Emergencies also tend to change gender dynamics.

The needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and - consequently - assistance must be adapted to ensure equal access and that specific needs are addressed. Context-specific gender-sensitive needs assessments and gender analysis must be conducted to avoid vulnerability-related assumptions (e.g. women should not be considered the most vulnerable groups by default) and to ensure a more effective targeting. On the basis of the identified needs, practical examples of assistance adapted to the needs of different gender and age groups must also be provided in the Single Form. Actions targeting one specific gender and/or age group - particularly when one group is clearly more vulnerable than others —may in some instances be deemed necessary (e.g. unaccompanied minors or adolescents): such actions should respond to a clear need that has been identified through a gender and age analysis and cannot be adequately addressed through mainstreaming. While assistance may specifically target one group, the participation of other groups may prove crucial for reaching the expected impact.

All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

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

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid_en

Integrated approaches: Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. In contexts where it has been determined (see also response analysis below) that cash transfers are an appropriate modality, and that cash can meet multiple basic needs, partners are encouraged to transfer single payments using a common delivery platform. Multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT) should be coordinated alongside other sector-specific responses within a basic needs approach, but fragmenting MPCT into sector clusters for coordination is not encouraged. MPCTs also offer the opportunity to conduct joined up assessments across sectors (including market analysis), common registration, targeting, and monitoring and evaluation frameworks. As far as possible, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to reduce the potential for conflicts of interest. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

The application of an **integrated protection programming approach** is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from issues such as freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30 000 within a grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues on 1) development of indicators to measure impact of integrated protection programming with other sectors; 2) Approaches for monitoring and evaluating integrated protection programmes; 3) Training and human resources needs for integrated protection programming; and 4) Implementation of integrated protection programming in areas of difficult access. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.³

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

³ 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

exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. It refers to the imperative for each and every humanitarian actor to prevent, mitigate and respond to protection threats that are caused or perpetuated by humanitarian action/inaction by ensuring the respect of fundamental protection principles in humanitarian programmes – no matter what sector or objective. While mainstreaming protection is closely linked to the 'do no harm' principle, it widens it to prioritising safety and dignity and avoiding causing harm, ensuring meaningful access, ensuring accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

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

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

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

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen, self-reliance through livelihoods and capacities. ECHO encourages its partners to develop their contextual risk and vulnerability analysis and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified (see template). This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc.) and IDPs; iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

Where applicable, partners should reflect on applying resilience thinking and programming to (protracted) **forced displacement** situations – so as to harness resilience and strengthen self-reliance of affected populations – refugees, IDPs and their host communities. Working towards the gradual socio-economic inclusion of forcibly

displaced populations – focusing on access to employment opportunities and access to services – in protracted crises is a priority for ECHO, DEVCO, NEAR and the EEAS, working in a comprehensive manner, each under their mandate – and should be supported by ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide. Investment in social protection mechanisms is an opportunity tackling the challenges faced by humanitarian crises and contributes to a reduction in the chronic humanitarian caseload, especially in the context of extreme fragility. Access to predictable, adequate and regular aid can, in the short-term protect poor households from the impacts of shocks and help to build capacity over time. Moreover, emergency safety nets can be incorporated as a cornerstone of self-reliance strategy for empowering the forcibly displaced and giving them support to address vulnerabilities.

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Communication_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff_working_document_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other Useful links to guidelines and policies:

Food Assistance

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

Nutrition

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

Infant and Young Children Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF)

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

Health

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

Remote Management

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

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

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

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

I. Humanitarian Food Assistance and Nutrition

First Priority: Humanitarian food assistance during 2016/2017 lean season.

Second Priority: Restoration of self-reliance and recovery of livelihoods threatened by recent crises while contributing to resilience.

II. Disaster Risk Reduction

III. Response to emerging humanitarian needs

I. Humanitarian Food Assistance and Nutrition

The first pillar of the HIP includes both HFA and nutrition. The elements mentioned below are of particular importance to be taken into account in the proposals submitted to ECHO in relation to this HIP.

This HIP prioritises two sets of activities to meet the humanitarian needs under this pillar of the HIP. However, financial support will be awarded by ECHO by priority to the first set of activities ("first priority"); activities belonging to the second set ("second priority") should only be considered by ECHO for financial support in the event where sufficient appropriations are made available to ECHO in the course of the year. While ECHO's Humanitarian Partners are free to submit at this stage, proposals covering both sets of activities, no expectations whatsoever can be entertained by ECHO's Humanitarian Partners as to the possible financing of second priority activities on the basis of this version of the HIP. In the event where additional appropriations are made available, a revised version of this HIP will be published in response to which Partners will be invited to submit proposals for new actions or modification requests to existing actions, as the case may be.

First Priority: Humanitarian food assistance during 2016/2017 lean season

The principal objective of sub-pillar is to “*Ensure the consumption of sufficient, safe and nutritious food to avert excessive mortality, high rates of acute malnutrition and detrimental coping mechanisms*” through a scale-up of the humanitarian food assistance during the peak of the 2016/2017 lean season. This includes actions that jointly address complementary food assistance and nutrition interventions in line with ECHO policies including Infant and Young Children Feeding (IYCF) practices.

When designing and implementing the actions, partners shall give particular attention to the following aspects:

- *Effectiveness of the response.* It is imperative that actions under this sub-pillar are timely implemented, limited in duration and strictly coinciding with the peak of the 2016/2017 lean season ending with the 2017 rain-fed harvest. Partners shall have prepared themselves for swift horizontal and/or vertical scaling-up of on-going food assistance interventions. Preparatory phases (targeting, registration, and identification of beneficiaries) shall have been done **prior to the peak time of the delivery** of the assistance through: i) a targeting process balanced between the urgency and the time needed for targeting; ii) use of innovative and scalable delivery mechanism (common electronic / mobile delivery platforms and synergies with social protection programs); iii) Capacity to mobilise own financial resources prior to signature of the contract.
- *Transfer modality.* All proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment, and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria. Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis (see the decision tree in the Cash and Vouchers Guidelines). The market assessment should not be limited to analysis of the existing situation, but shall explore potentialities for expansion and the capacity of the private sector to adapt to an increase in demand. While recognising that in some localities of the Region, in-kind assistance may still be possible and relevant, ECHO preferred delivery modality is through cash based transfers. Partners shall answer the questions "*Why not cash? And, if not now, when?*" Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.

- *Multi-sectorial approach.* Partners applying for ECHO funding should highlight linkages with other sectors either within their proposed actions or with other actions. Where possible, food assistance should be integrated within a multi-sectoral approach to the crisis. While the response strategy, (amount of the transfer, frequency of transfers, targeting criteria), shall be designed primarily to address food gaps, delivery mechanisms permitting the unrestricted use of the assistance are encouraged (see ECHO Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer – MPCT and the “*Common principles for Multipurpose Cash-Based Assistance*”). Considering the overwhelming humanitarian needs and limited resources, partners need to reconcile smaller transfer values to wider coverage of beneficiaries VS higher transfer values to smaller coverage of beneficiaries. Partners’ participation in coordination mechanisms is critical for geographic segregation, harmonization of the value of the transfers and linking humanitarian and development interventions.
- *Food utilisation* is a pillar of food security that should be an inherent part of any food assistance project. Components such as hygiene, appropriate feeding practices, proper energy source and technology for adequately processing, cooking and conservation of food, access to safe water should be considered alongside food access and availability. All these aspects and particularly access to safe water must be considered in both the situation and response analysis including the amount and type of transfer to be provided to the beneficiaries in order to ensure food utilization. Partners are encouraged to use the Decision Support System (DSS) and the guidelines developed with ECHO funds available at the www.set4food.org to propose the most appropriate technologies where relevant.
- *HFA checklist.* The use of the [HFA checklist](#) is strongly encouraged to ensure that all necessary dimensions of interest are coherently taken into account in proposals submitted to ECHO.
<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/food-assistance>
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/funding/decisions/2015/Checklist_HFA_Interventions_en.doc
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/2014/toolkit_nutrition_en.pdf
- *Nutrition in HFA.* ECHO will continue advocating for strengthened linkages between food assistance interventions and nutrition outcomes. Whatever transfer modality is used it should include ways to ensure access and consumption of appropriate complementary food for children aged 6 to 24 months. Appropriate and frequent post distribution monitoring and individual dietary intake reports should therefore be used to adapt the transfer modality chosen to the needs of this group. The partner must promote and protect breastfeeding practices from potentially harmful products and actions.
- *Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF).* The specific nutrition needs of infants, young children and pregnant and lactating women should be considered at all stages of the project cycle and across all sectors.
- *Nutrition (Diagnostic).* Nutrition programming will be implemented where nutrition needs are identified, particularly where the prevalence of acute under-nutrition is higher than international critical threshold, but also where justified by the analysis of

the risks, vulnerabilities, and potential caseload. Nutrition needs should be informed by quality and representative surveys and surveillance systems. Although there is currently no MUAC globally approved threshold to characterize nutrition emergencies, MUAC-based assessments can be used to justify an intervention in consultation with ECHO. The conduction of nutrition causal analysis (NCA) is encouraged to help identify the main determinants of under-nutrition and guide the development of multi-sector projects.

Nutrition (Treatment). The nutrition programs implemented by ECHO's partners will thrive to reach good coverage and good treatment performance, as defined by the Sphere standards. Nutrition interventions will be implemented following the Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) including all its components: treatment of SAM with and without complications, treatment of MAM and community components. In refugee and displacement settings, nutrition and health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities. Innovative approaches, for example to manage MAM cases, can be considered based on context. MAM treatment services should always be 'linked' to a health facility where SAM services are available. The integration of nutrition programming into the existing health services is the standard implementation strategy. To this end, the partner has to develop a support and capacity building strategy. Treatment of acute malnutrition and its complications has to be provided free of charge.

- *Nutrition (Prevention and multi-sector).* Whenever possible, the integration of nutrition considerations into others sectors shall be promoted.

Prevention interventions should be properly justified; they can include the following:

- Food-based interventions (targeted food assistance, BSFP) where access to adequate foods is a main determinant of undernutrition.
 - Provision of free health care to the individuals the most vulnerable to undernutrition.
 - Wash In Nut.
 - Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention (SMP).
 - Emergency preparedness interventions.
- *Nutrition (Monitoring and coordination).* Assessments of coverage should be conducted regularly and programs adapted to boost it. Active participation to and data sharing with coordination mechanisms, such as the nutrition cluster, is strongly recommended.

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

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

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

Second Priority: Restoration of self-reliance and recovery of livelihoods

The principal objective of this sub-pillar is "*restoring the self-reliance and recovery of livelihoods threatened by the recent crisis*". Actions under this sub-pillar should be designed in a way to contribute to the resilience building of affected individuals, communities and livelihoods. However, as resilience building entails structural and

behavioural changes not always achievable within the timeframe of this Decision, actions should remain focused on the support of the recovery phase and proposed activities should yield measurable impact within the action's timeframe.

When designing and implementing the actions, partners shall give particular attention to the following aspects:

- *Integration of DRR.* While DRR shall always be mainstreamed, actions under this sub-pillar shall capitalize on lessons learnt from the previous crisis. Focus shall be on building the coping capacity of individuals and communities and reducing the exposure and vulnerability of their livelihoods to hazards. If proposing "livelihood diversification", partners shall prioritise activities less dependent from climate variability and focusing on protection and restoration of productive assets.
- *Synergies and complementarities with resilience building programs.* ECHO will prioritize actions that are integrated and part of a solid partner's resilience-building country strategy. Contribution to/synergies with resilience building programs supported by DEVCO and/or Member States are regarded with particular interest. In several countries of the region, public work programs are an opportunity for community resilience but poor technical quality and ownership of the assets created is a constraint. While direct support to the cost of assets-creation cannot be supported under this HIP, ECHO may favourably consider actions aiming at improving the effectiveness of government-led assets creation programs. Partners may make available their know-how for sounder technical compliance and better community-led management of the assets.
- *Support to the economic and livelihood recovery;* ECHO encourages partners to identify and support opportunities for livelihood recovery. Partners must provide economic and contextual analysis proving the socio-economic feasibility and sustainability of the economic activity to be supported (be agricultural, livestock or off farm). Partners shall propose activities whose economic return is achievable within the timeframe of the action and measurable against the resources invested by the action. ECHO will prioritise actions framed into broader value chain processes linking the beneficiaries to the markets and processing. The choice of the beneficiaries should be based on criteria not only economic but social too. Livelihoods support should be accompanied by alternative activities to meet the needs of the most vulnerable people without access to land and to work.
- *Emergency livestock* activities can be supported where livestock is a vital asset for the most vulnerable people. Priority must be given to households with "minimal" livestock holdings and to those who are risk of dropping-off the pastoralist livelihood due to asset depletion during the recent droughts and to link these interventions to longer term development. The feasibility and appropriateness of the interventions will have to be carefully considered and documented using the minimum standards developed by the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS: <http://www.livestock-emergency.net>) and considering existing early warning systems and documented gaps.
- *Agricultural inputs*, such as seeds and tools, can be considered where there is a clear link between the shock and the loss of such assets, and where they are important for livelihood recovery. A robust analysis of seed systems (such as a Sustainable Seed

System Assessment: SSSA) should be conducted to make the appropriate choice of modality (in-kind, cash or vouchers) and to especially to ensure that seed systems (private and public) are not undermined by an in-kind provision of seeds. Market analysis should also consider potential capacity of private traders to respond and contribute to the process. ECHO will favourably consider actions that create partnerships with private traders and stimulate the market. Effectiveness of the provision of farm inputs depends on its timeliness. Partners shall base their intervention strategy on solid understanding of the agriculture calendar specific to each locality and crop.

II. Disaster Risk Reduction

While DRR shall be systematically integrated in all actions under this HIP, which shall be risk informed through joint risk assessments involving the Governments and other stakeholders, this pillar focuses on "targeted DRR" interventions. Targeted DRR refers to specific DRR actions that cannot be simply "integrated" into ECHO response projects. Targeted DRR will strengthen individuals, communities and systems to avoid future humanitarian needs by reducing risk to vulnerable populations. Partners shall operationalize the targeted DRR objective in the current regional context: The effect of the 2016 El Nino has exhausted the coping capacities of populations which are now more vulnerable to any other eventual hazard, be it drought, cyclone and floods. Eligible countries for Targeted DRR actions under this pillar are: **Madagascar, Malawi and Mozambique**. The priorities and potential component considered for funding of this pillar are set out in the main HIP document. Please also refer to the general guideline section 3.2.2.1 in this technical annex (above) and to the aspects described below which are of particular importance and should be taken into account in the proposals:

The elements mentioned below are

- *Preparedness for cash transfer.* ECHO will regard with particular interest proposals for cash transfer preparedness including promotion of electronic platforms for preregistration and adapting existing social protection systems for future emergency responses.

While mobile and electronic technologies have simplified and automatized the transfer operations, targeting and registration of beneficiaries remains a very time and resource consuming process. The limited use of electronic technologies during field activities and lack of proper data management including filing makes it difficult to re-use data and to carry out pre-registration of beneficiaries thus targeting and registration process have to be repeated during each crisis which results to duplication of costs while also affecting timeliness of the assistance provided.

- *Contingency plans.* Support to communities/local/National authorities to develop contingency plans that are based on sound analysis of risks and guided by the local/National Early Warning Systems. It is expected that partners take into particular consideration the climatic/hazard situations of 2017 in the Region, which are likely to be influenced by La Nina phenomenon. Linking community plans to the local/national and as much as possible to regional levels is paramount for harmonization and coordination and ultimate effectiveness of DRR plans.

- *Establish partnerships* for sharing of information, linkage with long term development actors including Governments for sustainability as a step towards resilience building.
- *DRR lesson learning and best practices* forms an integral part for linking with the Development actors and other stakeholders. Partners should therefore ensure that systems to capture this are in place throughout the operation.
- *Advocate for National DRR guiding frameworks* including knowledge management platforms for DRR learning, awareness, and strengthening technical capacity and accountability mechanisms. For DRR targeted actions, partners could directly support the National Governments to achieve the mentioned elements thereby ensuring all the required structures are in place.
- *Coordination and coherence of DRR implementation in the Region*, linkage with the SADC DRR Unit and the RIASCO while building needed capacities to sustain various DRR efforts, either directly with the National Governments, or through advocacy for the required frameworks for enhancing DRR actions in the Region.

http://www.sadc.int/files/4314/7222/7297/SARCOF_20_Statement.pdf

III. Response to emerging humanitarian needs

In the Region, vulnerable population are exposed to natural hazards, mainly floods, cyclones and communicable disease epidemics, but also conflict-related crisis; ECHO's mandate to respond to emerging humanitarian needs is based on crisis modifiers and Ad hoc Decisions.

All actions under pillars I and II should include "crisis modifiers" as an ad-hoc result. The crisis modifiers will allow first response while waiting for eventual additional resources through Ad Hoc Decisions that would be conditional upon budgetary availability and a modification of the HIP.

The objective of this pillar is to "*address immediate, life-saving and essential needs across all sectors as a result of rapid onset disasters*". At proposal stage the partners shall indicate the geographical area targeted by the crisis modifier and develop an Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) plan to enable efficient use of the crisis modifier. Maps and EP&R shall be shared with ECHO.

Crisis modifier activities, including pre-positioning of life saving material / equipment must be implemented in a timely manner in anticipation of recurrent hazard calendar in the region; in the crisis modifier result, a specific indicator shall mention the time the first response will be delivered after a disaster strikes. Emergency response shall be multi-sectorial including WASH, shelter, health, protection and any other relevant sectors based on the needs of the affected population. The use of mobile cash transfer is encouraged and partners should explore and anticipate the possibility to use this delivery mechanism and, where relevant, contribute to prepare common transfer platform. After the crisis, wherever possible, partners shall conduct a review of the exercise for lesson learning in collaboration with the community and the local/National Government DRR authorities. If the funds allocated for the crisis modifier are not used for this purpose the

partner shall propose to ECHO in the interim report or not later than one month before the end of the action how to reallocate these resources within the implemented action.

The following applies to all the pillars of the HIP

Multi-Purpose Cash-based Assistance (MPCT). The choice of modality for a resource transfer should be common across sectors and follow the same essential response analysis described in ECHO's Cash and Vouchers Guidelines. DG ECHO recommendation is to consider the use of cash based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible. In any case, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. It is strongly recommended for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#). This includes the use of the decision tree and to respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.⁴

While single-sector cash transfers are to be promoted where appropriate, cash is increasingly being used to address multiple humanitarian/basic needs. **ECHO will prioritize MPCT where possible.**

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

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

⁴ See section 1.2 and 2.3.3 of the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#).

determine whether broader improvements to the lives of beneficiaries have been achieved.

- Protection and gender analysis should be integral to the design and implementation of MPCT.

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

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

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

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

Linking social protection and humanitarian action. In several countries of the SAIO Region, DEVCO supports social protection systems. Social protection / social safety nets should be considered in light of complementarities between humanitarian short term assistance and poverty/chronic vulnerability alleviation systems and to promote LRRD. ECHO encourages using/supporting national electronic platforms for targeting, registration and delivery of beneficiaries for current and future emergency response and to avoid creation of parallel systems, whenever possible. The use of existing social protection systems in emergency response must comply with the humanitarian principles of neutrality, independence, impartiality and humanity and the priorities set by the HIP.

The targeting criteria used during an emergency response should be in line with humanitarian objectives and not only poverty alleviation and chronic vulnerabilities. The time and frequency of the transfers should correspond to the humanitarian needs identified, monthly transfers are preferred when addressing food consumption needs. Similarly the amount should be calculated to address at least the survival gap, but possibly to address the basic needs or part of it of the affected beneficiaries. Preference is given to systems that use mobile transfer modalities.

Existing social protection systems used for emergency response should have clear trigger mechanisms and be able to swiftly expand either vertically (amount transferred) or horizontally (targeted beneficiaries). Proposals should demonstrate if the above conditions exist or can be achieved within the timeframe of the proposed response. If this is the case, **ECHO will prioritize the proposals that use existing social protection systems for emergency responses.** If these conditions are not currently present, actions including technical capacity building to prepare and enhance an existing social protection system to become an emergency response tool for future interventions are encouraged. In this case the partner will have to demonstrate close coordination and link with existing development programmes.

Innovations. Considering the context of several countries in the SAIO region there is a real opportunity to further test, use and scale innovative approaches and technologies without compromising the priorities of the HIP. Innovations are therefore encouraged, especially for: i) DRR related activities; ii) common targeting/identification/delivery

mechanisms for cash based interventions; iii) outsourced grievance / accountability and complaint mechanism; iv) collaboration with private sector, particularly in using the humanitarian assistance as an opportunity for expansion of markets.

The primary aim in testing and scaling innovative solutions should be to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian actions now and in the future. Where relevant innovative approach or solution already proved to be the best solution, ECHO may encourage its scaling up in the contexts of actions funded under this HIP. Other type of innovation may need first to be further piloted. In this case ECHO may support piloting of activities.

Examples of innovative approaches could include: i) the use of drones for mapping and rapid assessment during floods and /or deliveries; ii) remote sensing, and mobile technologies for EWS; iii) innovative mobile or internet based delivery technologies; iv) integration of humanitarian responses within social protection systems; v) prepositioning of multi-sector contingency stocks and equipment; vi) safer hospital approaches, etc.

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

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

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

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

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