

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### *Title:* NORTH AFRICA

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2018/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

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

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge                      DG ECHO<sup>1</sup>/C2

Contact persons in HQ                              Annick VILLAROSA  
[annick.villarosa@ec.europa.eu](mailto:annick.villarosa@ec.europa.eu)  
(team leader North Africa, desk officer  
Tunisia)

Dorota KACZUBA  
[dorota.kaczuba@ec.europa.eu](mailto:dorota.kaczuba@ec.europa.eu)  
(desk officer Morocco and Algeria)

Damian BURD  
[damian.burd@ec.europa.eu](mailto:damian.burd@ec.europa.eu)  
(desk officer Libya)

in the field    Patrick BARBIER  
[patrick.barbier@echofield.eu](mailto:patrick.barbier@echofield.eu)

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 19 000 000 (of which an indicative amount of EUR 500 000 for Education in Emergencies)

Breakdown as per Worldwide Decision:

---

<sup>1</sup> Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)  
ECHO/-NF/BUD/2018/91000

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises <sup>2</sup> :	EUR 18 000 000 <i>EUR 9 000 000 for Algeria</i> <i>EUR 9 000 000 for Libya</i>
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 1 000 000 <i>EUR 1 000 000 for Tunisia</i>
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 19 000 000

### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1. Administrative info

##### Allocation round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 17 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in the specific guidelines below.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018<sup>3</sup>.
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness.
- e) Potential partners<sup>4</sup>: All DG ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>5</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/01/2018<sup>6</sup>

##### Allocation round 2

---

<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> For British applicants (non-governmental organisations): Please be aware that you must comply with the requirement of establishment in an EU Member State for the entire duration of the grants awarded under this HIP. If the United Kingdom withdraws from the EU during the grant period without concluding an agreement with the EU ensuring in particular that British applicants continue to be eligible, you will cease to receive EU funding or be required to leave the project on the basis of Article 15 of the grant agreement.

<sup>5</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>6</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.

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 000 000 for Libya
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: primary and emergency health care; war surgery and physical rehabilitation; support to public health facilities in conflict zones and conflict-affected remote areas, including psycho-social support. Multi-sectoral support to basic needs of conflict-affected vulnerable population, rapid response following new displacement through appropriate modalities.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2018<sup>7</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2018.
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 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>8</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 4 April 2018.

### 3.2. Operational requirements:

#### 3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

Each action will be assessed against a set of criteria according to the specific context of intervention. These criteria include:

- Relevance to DG ECHO strategy and operational requirements;
- Quality of the needs assessment<sup>9</sup>
- Quality of the response strategy, including the relevance of the intervention and coverage;
- The logical framework, including robust and relevant output and outcome indicators;
- Feasibility;
- Implementation capacity and technical expertise; and
- Knowledge of the country/region.

Depending on the characteristics of the crisis, other elements are likely to be taken into account when assessing the proposals, such as:

- Security;
- Coordination;
- Access arrangements;

---

<sup>7</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>8</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>9</sup> Partners are expected to contribute and use coordinated needs assessments on crisis and sector level in line with Grand Bargain commitments

- Monitoring system;
- Sustainability, resilience, Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development;
- Cost efficiency; or comparative advantage of the action or the partners.

In case of actions ongoing in the field, where DG ECHO is requested to fund the continuation thereof, a field visit may be conducted by DG ECHO field expert (TA) to determine the feasibility and quality of the follow-up action proposed.

### 3.2.2. Operational guidelines:

This section outlines the general and specific operational guidelines which need to be taken into account by DG ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. Complementary information can be retrieved on these guidelines in the links provided below. Partners are invited to duly reflect the guidance provided in these documents in the preparation of their proposals to DG ECHO.

#### 3.2.2.1. General Guidelines

**The humanitarian principles** of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, and strict adherence to a "**do no harm**" approach remain paramount.

**The safe and secure provision of aid:** The ability to safely deliver assistance to all areas must be preserved. DG ECHO requests its partners to include in the project proposal details on how safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets is being considered as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. DG ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

**Accountability:** As the quality and robustness of any humanitarian aid operation lie first and foremost with the organisation that proposes it and will be responsible for its implementation in the field, attention is drawn to the fact that DG ECHO partners' accountability in this respect relate, *inter alia*, to the following aspects of Actions' design and implementation:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs through robust, comprehensive methods conducted in a coordinated manner with humanitarian partners on sector and crisis level<sup>10</sup>;
- Management and monitoring of operations, as properly facilitated by adequate systems in place;
- Monitoring and reporting on activities, outputs and outcomes, through robust indicators and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

---

<sup>10</sup> See footnote related to the quality of needs assessment and the Grand bargain-related section below.

**Local disaster response organisations** have had and continue to play an indispensable role in responding to the humanitarian needs. DG ECHO funds have and will be translated into services and assistance provided by local actors in the majority of cases. As such, DG ECHO will continue to ask for strategic partnerships of FPA/FAFA partners with local actors in line with the Grand Bargain commitments.

**Grand Bargain commitments:** DG ECHO and most of its main partners have signed up to the Grand Bargain, a set of commitments in line with current good practice and ongoing policy discussions seeking to bring about substantial changes in terms of aid efficiency. While many of the commitments require further ground work on a global level, progress can be made in 2018 already on a certain number of commitments. In addition to the commitments covered by specific section in this annex (cash, humanitarian-development nexus, localisation and accountability to affected populations), partners are expected to explore and propose concrete ways of implementing commitments such as multi-annual planning and reduced duplication and management costs (such as making use of technology and innovation to be more cost effective or providing clear, comparable cost structures).

**Innovation and the private sector:** Humanitarian emergencies are reaching unprecedented levels. Strengthening the capacity of humanitarian actors to respond to natural disasters and man-made crises in an effective and efficient manner is a priority. Innovation can play an important role in this respect. Harnessing the technological innovation, technical skills and expertise of the private sector and academia is determinant. Where it is in the interest of the action, and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework, DG ECHO encourages an increased involvement of a wide range of actors, including the local and international private sector, and the adoption of innovative solutions and approaches to optimising the efficiency and effectiveness of the humanitarian response.

**Cash-based assistance:** DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. However, in line with WHS commitments, DG ECHO will endeavour to increase cash-based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded through a robust response analysis (see section below) Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers.

DG ECHO's Cash Guidance note covering the delivery of large-scale cash transfers applies when the delivery of cash at scale is envisaged. The Guidance note, as updated, will apply to 2018 HIPs.

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

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

**Preparedness for Response and Early Action:** As part of the commitment of DG ECHO to mainstream disaster preparedness in EU-funded humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to the range of hazards affecting people at the village/ community level (natural hazards and conflict related threats), the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their ability to cope. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to, and operational capability in, managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention). The Disaster Preparedness (DP) approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard and threats occurrence, and include contingency arrangements for additional or expanded activities that might be required. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated into programme decision making and design, even where the humanitarian operation is not the result of a specific hazard.

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

- all risks have been clearly identified, including their possible interactions;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes regional, national and local capacities for better preparedness and response at local level;
- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure that evidence of the impact of the action and good practices are gathered and effectively disseminated;
- the action is justified by an explanation of the losses and suffering that will be avoided or reduced (and why this conclusion is valid);
- due consideration has been given to the integration of contingencies and preparedness arrangements (shock responsiveness) into planning to provide locally owned basic service delivery and social protection for vulnerable

populations (e.g. for social, safety net programmes), notably in situations of protracted or recurrent crises;

- the use of EU Aid Volunteers in the DP intervention is envisaged or not and for what kind of tasks;
- in more fragile context, the development of national and local competencies for early action and locally owned Rapid/Emergency Response Mechanisms (ERMs) implemented by local actors should be considered. Actions to build local preparedness capabilities will include opportunities to apply and benefit from the resources and expertise held by the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention\\_preparedness/DRR\\_thematic\\_policy\\_doc.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf)

**Education in Emergencies (EiE):** DG ECHO will support education actions in emergencies including sudden onset emergencies, ongoing conflicts, natural disasters and situations of displacement (IDP/Refugee). The objective of these EiE actions will be to prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to emergency-related barriers to children's<sup>11</sup> education while ensuring inclusive and quality education<sup>12</sup>. EiE actions will respond to the multiple barriers (academic, financial, social, institutional, physical/infrastructural) that children face in accessing their education due to their experiences of the humanitarian situation. As such, EiE actions must be tailored to the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances including the specific impact of the emergency they face (e.g. unaccompanied minors, former child soldiers, and disabled children). DG ECHO EiE actions work towards three outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Children affected by humanitarian crises access to and learn in safe, quality and accredited primary and secondary education
- **Outcome 2:** Children affected by humanitarian crises learn life-saving and life-sustaining skills, are protected and have increased personal resilience
- **Outcome 3:** Education services are strengthened through preparedness, response and recovery interventions in line with the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The Commission adheres to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

<sup>12</sup> The definition of quality education: Quality education is affordable, accessible, gender-sensitive and responds to diversity. It includes (1) a safe and inclusive learner-friendly environment; (2) competent and well-trained teachers who are knowledgeable in the subject matter and pedagogy; (3) an appropriate context-specific curriculum that is comprehensible and culturally, linguistically and socially relevant for the learners; (4) adequate and relevant materials for teaching and learning; (5) participatory methods of instruction and learning processes that respect the dignity of the learner; (6) appropriate class sizes and teacher-student ratios; and (7) an emphasis on recreation, play, sport and creative activities in addition to areas such as literacy, numeracy, and life skills. INEE. (2010). *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*.

<sup>13</sup> Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*.

DG ECHO's support to EiE will focus on non-formal and formal education in the context of primary and secondary levels of education. Non-formal education supports should, where possible, enable children to enter (or re-enter) the formal system. Early childhood development will be considered in specific circumstances where it is already embedded in formal education in a national system or where specific skill or protection needs are identified to enter primary school. Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) programmes are considered to fall outside of the scope of work for DG ECHO's EiE response.

Protection must be considered as both a core component and key outcome of EiE response. The provision of safe learning environments, psycho-social support and direct referral to child protection services will provide a protective environment for children impacted by emergency. The learning itself – in both formal and non-formal education actions – must provide relevant life-saving and life-sustaining skills and messages, including vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness. In order to ensure safe and protective education, all actions supported by DG ECHO are expected to be designed and implemented according to the principles of conflict sensitive education (CSE). EiE actions should reflect relevant legal frameworks for protection (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law).

In order to ensure holistic response to the needs of children, it is encouraged that beyond child protection EiE actions are also linked with other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH, health and nutrition, whenever relevant and feasible.

EiE actions should be recognized as not distinct from long-term learning goals and as such also aim at strengthening the quality aspects of education, in particular the availability of and support to teachers through the recruitment and capacity development of facilitators and teachers.

Whenever relevant and supportive of safe, inclusive and quality education, DG ECHO will support innovative EiE solutions.

EiE actions should be conceived with a medium to long-term vision. This implies first and foremost that programmes be designed and implemented in a way that allows for the fullest and most rapid recovery of safe, inclusive and quality education services. At the same time, programmes must be aligned with development and/or government actors to ensure continuity of learning for affected children through proper transition planning. Therefore, in order to ensure continuity and alignment with both, the wider humanitarian and development context, EiE actions must be informed by any existing education sector framework as well as the inter-sectoral humanitarian response. Furthermore, in order to ensure coordination, harmonization and effective prioritization within the EiE response, partners implementing EiE actions supported by DG ECHO will be expected to participate in, and contribute to, national and/or sub-national sector coordination activities throughout the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. EiE actions should contribute to the strategic objectives of the education cluster/working group strategy (if one exists) and to any wider strategic sector objectives based on the humanitarian-development nexus.



All EiE actions funded by DG ECHO should adhere in their design and implementation to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [IASC Minimum Standards for Child Protection](#).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children\\_2008\\_Emergency\\_Crisis\\_Situations\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf)

**Gender-Age Mainstreaming:** Women, girls, boys, men of all ages are affected by crises in different ways and emergencies tend to change gender dynamics. Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is therefore crucial to DG ECHO and an issue of quality programming. To this end, the needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and assistance must be adapted to ensure that equal access is granted and specific needs are addressed.

All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. Context-specific gender-sensitive needs assessments and gender analysis must be conducted to avoid vulnerability-related assumptions (e.g. women should not be considered the most vulnerable groups by default) and to ensure a more effective targeting. On the basis of the identified needs, practical examples of assistance adapted to the needs of different gender and age groups must also be provided in the Single Form. Actions targeting one specific gender and/or age group – particularly when one group is clearly more vulnerable than others – may in some instances be deemed necessary (e.g. unaccompanied children or adolescents): such actions should respond to a clear need that has been identified through a gender and age analysis and cannot be adequately addressed through mainstreaming. While assistance may specifically target one group, the participation of other groups may prove crucial for reaching the expected impact.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender\\_thematic\\_policy\\_document\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_thematic_policy_document_en.pdf)

The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly DG ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. More information about the marker and how it is applied are available in the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit:

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender\\_age\\_marker\\_toolkit.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/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, and in line with DG ECHO's Guidance on the delivery of large-scale cash transfers, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to enhance efficiency, transparency and accountability. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

**Multi-year planning and funding:** In crises where it is appropriate to engage in multi-year interventions (i.e. 24 months and longer), actions should be grounded in a longer-term strategy including possible risks and contingencies that may occur over the timeframe as well as exit scenarios and Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. Project design should also be done in a more flexible manner, taking into account the longer duration and the possible changes in context that may occur during implementation.

**Protection:** All programme design and targeting should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population and it is recommended to use the risk equation model as a tool to conduct this analysis.<sup>14</sup> The analysis should bring out external and internal threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities arising from the threats. Protection responses must aim to prevent, reduce/mitigate and respond to the risks and consequences of violence, coercion, deliberate deprivation and abuse for persons, groups and communities in the context of humanitarian crises. Consideration of protection concerns is important in all contexts, but should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement-hosting context (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, and where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

The application of an **integrated protection programming approach** is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from issues such as freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the DG ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> 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

<sup>15</sup> See Annex 4 on p. 49 and forward of [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff\\_working\\_document\\_humanitarian\\_protection\\_052016.pdf](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.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to DG ECHO – no matter what sector or objective. While mainstreaming protection is closely linked to the 'do no harm' principle, it widens it to prioritising safety and dignity and avoiding causing harm, and ensuring meaningful access, accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles in its substantive sections, i.e. the response strategy, the logic of the intervention, and the indicators.

To follow the principles of protection mainstreaming, targeting of humanitarian assistance should be done in a manner that takes into account the protection concerns of individuals and groups based on: A) the risk of exposure to harm, exploitation, harassment, deprivation and abuse, in relation to identified threats; B) the inability to meet basic needs; C) limited access to basic services and livelihood/income opportunities; D) the ability of the person/population to cope with the consequences of this harm; and E) due consideration for individuals with specific needs. Particular attention must be paid to ensure that issues of social exclusion and discrimination are not overlooked, and that the specific needs of groups most often affected by this – people with disabilities, LGBTIs, and very marginalized social groups – are appropriately addressed in programme design and targeting. In line the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action, specific attention will be paid to the measures ensuring inclusiveness of people with disabilities in proposed actions.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff\\_working\\_document\\_humanitarian\\_protection\\_052016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf)

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

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

possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Preparedness for response and early action should be the main element of DG ECHO's contribution to resilience and to humanitarian-development nexus/Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) programming.

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

Where applicable, partners should reflect on applying resilience thinking and programming to (protracted) **forced displacement** situations so as to harness resilience and strengthen dignity and self-reliance of affected populations – refugees, IDPs and their host communities. Working towards the gradual socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced populations – focusing on access to employment opportunities and access to services – in protracted crises is a priority for DG ECHO, DEVCO, NEAR and the EEAS. This joined-up approach of different EU instruments, each under their mandate should be supported by DG ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles. Where feasible, DG ECHO partners should consider the use of EU Aid Volunteers if the security conditions in the country allow.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide : scaling up social protection systems in response to shock and crisis has been identified as one of the core measures to enhance resilience and empower people, and most importantly to be able to react quickly and efficiently to disasters.

Access to predictable, adequate and regular aid can in the short-term protect poor households from the impacts of shocks and help to build capacity over time. The increasing profile on multi-purpose cash-based emergency response provides further momentum towards safety nets as a component of a wider social protection approach. Moreover, emergency safety nets can be incorporated as a cornerstone of self-reliance strategy for empowering the forcibly displaced and giving them support to address vulnerabilities.

Without compromising humanitarian principles, DG ECHO partners are expected to consider if it is appropriate to deliver humanitarian assistance through national social safety nets or if it is possible to use the humanitarian response as a window of opportunity to trigger investments in the development of "nascent" safety nets. The longer-term aim in such a scenario is to progressively move chronic humanitarian caseloads into social protection systems.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Communication\\_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)

### **Resilience mainstreaming – The Resilience Marker**

Actions addressing the immediate needs of affected populations, however, can also present opportunities for strengthening resilience. DG ECHO's approach to resilience, and the intent of its Resilience Marker, is to ensure that these opportunities are used to the greatest extent possible without compromising humanitarian principles. Four steps are key to take these good practice opportunities in humanitarian programmes:

- Conduct an analysis of hazards, threats, vulnerabilities and their causes;
- Be risk-informed (i.e. ensure that activities do not aggravate risks or vulnerabilities, do no harm and are prepared for likely hazards and threats);
- Contribute to building local capacities so that the most vulnerable can cope better with shocks; and
- Include a deliberate strategy to reduce future humanitarian needs.

The marker ensures a systematic consideration and inclusion of resilience considerations in project proposals, implementation and assessment. The marker is used for all DG ECHO projects apart from those that may be considered "Non-applicable" because of the urgency of context or the type of activity being conducted (e.g. capacity raising).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/resilience\\_marker\\_guidance\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/resilience_marker_guidance_en.pdf)

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

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

**Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers** is mandatory. DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. Partners should provide sufficient evidence to support the choice of one modality over another, taking into account all relevant contextual factors and including an analysis of the market situation in the affected area. For any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the '[Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors](#)' and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed. Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers. In such approaches, the value of transfer would normally be based upon a Minimum Expenditure

Basket (MEB), while taking account the contribution made by households, and available resources.

For in-kind transfers local purchases are encouraged when possible.

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Food Assistance*

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

#### *Nutrition*

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

*EU Aid volunteers*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/eu-aid-volunteers\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/eu-aid-volunteers_en)

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/eu-aid-volunteers\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/eu-aid-volunteers_en)

*Shelter and Settlements*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/ss\\_consolidated\\_guidelines\\_final\\_version-20-02ev.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/ss_consolidated_guidelines_final_version-20-02ev.pdf)

### 3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

#### 3.2.2.2.1 Recommendations common to the region

##### **1. SECTORIAL AND OPERATIONAL SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:**

ECHO programming is part of an annual funding cycle. However, there are many actions - especially in protracted situations - that require operational embedding in a strategy spanning over several years. In these cases, proposals should reflect the multi-year vision, demonstrating a coherent articulation of activities from one year to the next and a measurable evolution of objectives and results.

In terms of implementation, partners must justify the choice of the transfer modality (including, but not limited to, the "multi-purpose cash" approach). ECHO will support the most effective and efficient form of assistance, whether cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance.

Partners should note that funding for actions up to 100% is accepted only in well-justified exceptional cases, such as, for example, for forgotten crises, emergency decisions, or if no other funding is available.

All interventions should systematically take into account aspects of cost-effectiveness, efficiency, quality and innovation. To the extent possible, transition from stand-alone humanitarian interventions towards complementary actions with development and national actors and instruments should be sought to strengthen the resilience of the most vulnerable populations.

Effective coordination is essential. DG ECHO supports the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Transformative Agenda (ITA) and expects its partners to demonstrate their engagement in implementing its objectives and to actively take part in coordination mechanisms (e.g. Humanitarian Country Team, clusters and technical working groups).

## **A – PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SUPPORT TO CONFLICT-AFFECTED POPULATION**

### **(i) Strategic lines:**

Sectoral strategies: Two types of context are present in the region: 1) in the case of Libya, the scale of the crisis is clearly worsening, with new needs arising suddenly and recurrent difficulties of access to the beneficiaries that require constant adaptation and the capacity to react quickly and with flexibility and 2) in the case of the Sahrawi crisis, a protracted humanitarian situation with limited changes over time but also limited vulnerability assessment. A multi-sectorial approach with a focus on access to basic services will be favored in both types of crises.

Coordination: The performance of local and national coordination platforms (cluster, working group, etc.) will need to be analyzed and strengthened. Given the peculiar nature of both crises targeted, active participation is expected. Partners should provide



information on their commitment to contribute to cluster / sector coordination mechanisms.

Security and access: The use of means such as armed escorts can only be considered as a last resort following a documented analysis of its necessity, modalities to preserve the support and protection of beneficiary and host populations and that of the humanitarian community as a whole (neutrality of the system). Actions that facilitate the access of humanitarian actors can be supported if they have demonstrated added value.

Monitoring of service performance: Wherever access is available, the performance of the services provided must be measured over a relevant period of time beyond their opening to ensure that the results expected by these services are achieved. Depending on the nature of the services, this period may vary from 3 to 6 months. In the absence of humanitarian access constraints, the performance of these services will be measured at their point of access (point of distribution) and point of use (home).

Multi-year strategy: Articulating the evolution of the action over time makes it possible to improve the planning, the efficient and effective optimization of resources, the evaluation of the direct effects and the medium-term impacts as well as the interaction with the other parties including others stakeholders. The design of multi-annual operational strategies must be considered for any action where relevant in order to anticipate the collection of technical and contextual data making it possible to optimize the assistance provided with respect to the evolution of the intervention context. The time scale and format of the presentation are left to the partners' appreciation for the needs and context in each country. This may be for example under certain sections of the Single Form or in the form of an Annex, given that the contractual logical framework (section 4) is modeled on the duration of the Action financed.

"Crisis modifiers", if possible, will have to be analyzed (alert and triggering factors) and integrated (deadlines and response levels) in the proposals submitted to DG ECHO in the form of dedicated non-budgeted results.

Support for Rapid Response Mechanisms (RRMs) may be considered if their responsiveness is in line with the urgency of the needs to be covered. Although all RRM have a common architecture, their settings (targeted sectors, response times, and support modalities during and / or after the evaluation phase) must be contextualized. Their performance must be reported through a dedicated result.

## **(ii) Sectorial specificities:**

**Health**: in a context of acute humanitarian crisis, the delivery of health services should ensure continuity of care for emergency cases for conflict-affected population. This would require delivering essential package of primary health care and provision of emergency secondary health care (including adequate maternal and child; access to war related trauma management).

Collaboration with existing health systems should be the preferred option. Modalities of provision of care should take into account constraints linked to the context and then strive to overcome them. Combination of mixed curative and preventive packages should

be considered and all opportunities like immunization campaign or outreach activities must be seized to offer the most adequate package possible. The provision of care while supporting health service delivery should secure access to essential medicine, the reinforcement of health workforce, as well as ensure continuity in the health information system to guarantee early warning and early response.

Attention should be given to highly vulnerable groups (children, women, elderly, disabled). Vulnerable population should be selected based on their needs and not their status.

**Humanitarian food assistance:** in a context of acute humanitarian crisis, the sectoral priority is to enable the affected population to access an adequate diet. It translates into ensuring access to 2,100 Kcal per person per day with a dietary diversity  $\geq 3$ , monitored through the collection and analysis of simple and standard indicators (ie FCS, CSI, H/IDDS).

It must be adapted to specific nutritional requirements and consumption habits of beneficiaries, notably the most vulnerable groups, and using the transfer modality best adapted to the prevailing situation.

In a context of stabilized humanitarian crisis, targeting and calibrating of assistance should take place according to reliable socioeconomic vulnerability criteria defined by thorough household-level food security and livelihood baseline assessments.

Support to income generating activities and institutional integration of project holders are encouraged, assuming that the objective is the financial sustainability of the activity and that it is measured thanks to an appropriate monitoring system.

Whenever relevant, the link between food assistance and protection sectors must be analyzed and the design of intervention should be adjusted to mitigate and prevent exposition to increased risks by the most vulnerable groups.

## **B - TO ENHANCE PREPAREDNESS AND CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO EMERGENCIES IN HIGH RISK AREAS**

### **(i) Strategic lines:**

The DRR actions to be supported by DG ECHO should contribute to the implementation of the **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030**.

All DRR actions supported by DG ECHO have to be aligned and to fit into the respective **national and regional DRR frameworks**, such as the priorities set in the Aqaba declaration as part of the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction or ISDRRM.

All partners must demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy at proposal stage that will ultimately lead to a phasing-out and handover.

The implementation of a successful DP/DRR strategy is dependent upon **the sustained investment of all stakeholders** (including e.g. communities, relevant authorities and public entities, institutions and agencies at multiple levels) **throughout the project cycle** to ensure sustainability and replication.

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 conflicts in the region forced to displacement.

## (ii) Sectorial specificities:

### **Disaster Risk Reduction:**

The entry point for the intervention logic of any targeted DRR project supported by ECHO must be **the hazard itself**. 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**. 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.

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.

Where relevant, a link with Civil Protection mechanism should be foreseen, both for the implementation at local level of national Civil Protection priorities and for the integration of Civil Protection into a wider DRR multi stakeholders approach at decentralized level. The latter can be done for example through the implementation of well-defined activities (drills, etc.) to strengthen local capacities.

### 3.2.2.2.2 Country Specific guidelines

## **LIBYA**

### **A – PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SUPPORT TO CONFLICT-AFFECTED POPULATION**

#### **(i) Strategic lines**

##### **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. DG 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. DG 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 DG 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 DG 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 DG 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 DG 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 DG 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 DG 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 DG 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.

## **(ii) Sectoral priorities and specificities**

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

ECHO/-NF/BUD/2018/91000

**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.

**Protection of population at the core of the response:** a protection risk analysis must be carried out and be used as entry-point for the design of all submitted interventions. It shall be included in the section “Problem, needs and Risk Analysis”. Under the section “response analysis”, partners should explain how the designed intervention intends to reduce the identified protection risks. Section 4 “Assumptions and risks” should consider protection and gender-related adverse effects of the humanitarian intervention. Contingency measures should be clearly identified.

**Food Assistance:** Distribution of food, especially in areas where the conflict continues, can be considered, provided that needs are well identified.

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

**Shelter, NFI (non-food items):** NFI and shelter assistance to forcibly displaced persons and returnees will be considered. Targeted interventions will be privileged according to documented vulnerability criteria and will require measurable technical outcome indicators specific to S&S to ensure that outputs can be traced; and need to be complemented with activities to ensure quality assurance (*see DG ECHO Settlements and Shelter Thematic Policy p. 54*),

**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:** Actions to increase access to safe and quality education at primary and secondary school levels will be considered. EiE support may focus on formal or non-formal education, where non-formal education is required to support crisis-affected children to transition into the formal system. An analysis of the crisis-related barriers to education is required, with projects responding through flexible solutions. Catch-up classes, accelerated learning programmes and homework support to enable displaced and out-of-school children to enter and be retained in school will be considered. EiE responses are expected to include an analysis and response to child protection needs, in addition to the academic needs of children. The protection of education spaces from attack and child protection on the way to/from school and while at school will be prioritised in Libya.

## **ALGERIA**

### **A – PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SUPPORT TO CONFLICT-AFFECTED POPULATION (SAHRAWI CRISIS)**

#### **(i) Strategic lines**

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

**VAT:** In line with section 9.3. of the FPA guidelines, partners are expected to apply for VAT exemption with the relevant authorities. Should this exemption not be granted (partners must demonstrate that this is the case), VAT could be considered eligible.

#### **(ii) Sectoral priorities and specificities**

**Food Assistance:** Distribution of 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. To the largest extent possible, food assistance should conform to local dietary preferences and be acceptable to beneficiaries, taking into account the result of the last nutrition survey and the impact of diet on health. The focus should be on the dry food basket. Fresh food could be considered provided its nutritional added value is demonstrated. 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.

In line with the Grand Bargain's commitments, partners are encouraged to include a multi-year strategy for food assistance into their proposals where relevant.

Vulnerability criteria should be included in all project proposals and progressively implemented, taking in consideration the economic capacity of refugee households, to ensure appropriate coverage of most acute needs rather than status-based blanket coverage. Introduction of cash transfer modality, based on a market and feasibility analysis is encouraged, while risks associated to such modality should be carefully appraised and considered. Strict monitoring of distributions will be required.

Support to income-generating activities could be considered where feasible.

#### **Water, Sanitation and Hygiene:**

Any support to operation and maintenance should clearly be integrated into multi-annual investment plans as part of a longer-term strategy. In particular, the modalities adopted for the delivery of WASH services (water trucking, water network and access to latrines) must reflect the results of the feasibility studies carried out in 2017 including a multiannual cost effectiveness analysis.

The monitoring of the service supplied must guarantee that the minimum standards of in

terms of water quantity and quality are respected.

Closer linkages are necessary with DRR related strategies, to take into consideration risks linked to natural hazards (floods, storms and duna movements). A proper vulnerability mapping of the construction sites of any new WASH infrastructure is necessary.

**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 revised and 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.

**Shelter and NFI:** This type of activity will be considered only in case of a natural disaster in line with DG ECHO Shelter & Settlement thematic policy.

**Education in Emergencies:** Actions to improve the learning environment in the five refugee camps providing children with safe schools, ensuring equal access for all to quality education at primary and secondary school levels will be considered. An analysis of the crisis-related barriers to quality education is required (quality of curricula and teaching, cultural barriers, teacher retention, etc.). Catch-up classes, accelerated learning programmes and homework support to enable out-of-school children to enter and be retained in school will be considered.

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

## **Tunisia**

### **TO ENHANCE PREPAREDNESS AND CAPACITY TO RESPOND TO EMERGENCIES IN HIGH RISK AREAS**

#### **(i) Strategic lines**

Disaster Risk Reduction operations submitted to DG ECHO should be complementary or built on outputs from on-going DRR targeted actions supported by DG ECHO in the country.

Two municipalities representing two different DRR contexts are targeted in the on-going actions supported by ECHO. The implementation in the second municipality should serve as a replication process of outputs from the first municipality, adapting the tools and products into a new DRR context.

In each municipality, the following steps are foreseen:

- Strengthening local preparedness capacities, including Civil Protection (risk analysis, early warning system, local response plan), adapted to the disaster contexts (i.e. floods, snow and landslides in the North, floods and droughts in the south).



- Implementation of specific measures included in the local disaster management plans, for the protection of key basic services from the impact of shocks (health structures and schools as a priority).
- Continuous documentation of tools and practices by the national DRR stakeholders and creating conditions for institutional linkages so that preparedness actions at local level feed national strategies and procedures.

Actions supported by DG ECHO should be contributing to the revision of national DRR priorities and strategy.

Specific attention should be paid to

- Disaster Risk Reduction in urban areas contributing to the priorities set in the Aqaba declaration (part of the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction or ISDRRM).
- Opportunities for cross border flood risk and watershed management with Algeria
- Possible influx in drought prone areas, of population fleeing from on-going armed conflict in Libya.

(ii) **Sectoral priorities and specificities**

**DRR:** By the end of the action, a comprehensive set of DRR tools and practices should be generated to provide inputs into the revision of the national DRR strategy.

Attention to the specific points should be ensured:

- The design of participatory and people-centred DRR tools
- The multi stakeholder nature and participatory approach of the elaboration of local disaster management plans at municipal level. All plans and DRR tools must be tested.
- Integrating local civil protection capacities into a multi stakeholder approach in targeted municipalities, to strengthen local preparedness and response capacities.
- The link between early warning and early response and the comprehensive design of early warning systems (integrating the four elements of risk knowledge, monitoring and warning services, dissemination and communication, response capability. Source: “*UNISDR, Developing early warning systems - a checklist, 2006*”)
- 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.