

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

Under the EU Financial Regulation, grants must involve co-financing; as a result, the resources necessary to carry out the action must not be provided entirely by the grant. An action may only be financed in full by the grant where this is essential for it to be carried out. In such a case, justification must be provided in the Single Form (section 10.4).

3.1. Administrative info

Allocation round 1

- a) Indicative amount
 - HA/FA: up to EUR 20 000 000
 - DRR: up to EUR 2 500 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 1/01/2019.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness.
- d) Potential partners²:
 - HA/FA: All DG ECHO Partners. ICRC (in view of its comprehensive presence in all countries in the region combined with its multi-sectoral intervention capacity and presence in the field, notably with respect to protection, ICRC has been pre-selected to run a Grand Bargain related regional pilot project).
 - DRR: All DG ECHO Partners or EU Member States Specialised Agencies (MSSA)
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form³
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 11/01/2019

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. *Assessment criteria:*

- 1) Relevance
 - How relevant is the proposed intervention and its coverage for the objectives of the HIP?

² For UK based applicants (non-governmental organisations): Please be aware that you must comply with the requirement of establishment in an EU Member State for the entire duration of the grants awarded under this HIP. If the United Kingdom withdraws from the EU during the grant period without concluding an agreement with the EU ensuring in particular that British applicants continue to be eligible, you will cease to receive EU funding or be required to leave the project on the basis of Article 15 of the grant agreement.

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

- Do joint (prioritised) needs assessment and coordination mechanisms of the humanitarian actors exist, and if so, has the joint needs assessment been used for the proposed intervention and/or has the proposed intervention been coordinated with other relevant humanitarian actors?
- 2) Capacity and expertise
- Does the partner, with its implementing partners, have sufficient country / region and / or technical expertise?
 - How good is the partner’s local capacity? Is local capacity of partners being built up?
- 3) Methodology and feasibility
- Quality of the proposed response strategy, including intervention logic / logframe, output & outcome indicators, risks and challenges.
 - Feasibility, including security and access constraints.
 - Quality of the monitoring arrangements.
- 4) Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements
- Extent to which the proposed intervention is to be implemented in coordination with other actions (including where relevant use of single interoperable registries of beneficiaries).
 - Extent to which the proposed intervention contribute to resilience, LRRD and sustainability.
- 5) Cost-effectiveness/efficiency/transparency
- Does the proposed intervention display an appropriate relationship between the resources to employed, the activities to be undertaken and the objectives to be achieved?
 - Is the breakdown of costs sufficiently displayed/explained?⁴

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. *Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:*

This section outlines the specific operational guidelines that need to be taken into account by DG ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. It also lists and explains the assessment criteria – based on those outlined in section 3.2.1 - that will be applied by DG ECHO in the specific context of the HIP to which this Technical Annex relates when assessing proposals submitted in response to the related HIP.

⁴ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

3.2.2.1 Health

DG ECHO will prioritise interventions aimed at providing comprehensive healthcare assistance to victims of violence, including emergency, surgical (e.g. trauma care), post-operative and rehabilitation care, including prevention of disabilities as well as integrated Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS). Ensuring access to basic health services of quality for populations hindered from reaching health services can also be considered if needs assessment are properly documented.

3.2.2.2 WASH and Shelter

ECHO encourages partners to include WASH and Shelter among the proposed activities as part of integrated programming (vis-à-vis other sectors, such as, Food/Livelihoods and Protection), with the aim to ensure direct links between emergency preparedness and response activities.

Targeting should focus on a multi-layer approach that identifies vulnerability both at geographical location and at household level, based on conflict-affected populations for response activities, and on estimation of the likelihood of being affected (i.e. as hosting households) for emergency preparedness ones.

In more specific terms, activities should focus on linkages between WASH and Health, particularly in health clinics and hospitals. DG ECHO will also consider in particular community-based early warning systems of public health risks associated with water borne diseases.

With regard to projects involving solar energy efforts, DG ECHO will pay particular attention to coordination amongst all actors.

For the Gaza strip, planning should include interventions (not as standalone) to maintain a minimum level of WASH and Shelter emergency response capacity that also includes protection mainstreaming.

3.2.2.3 Protection

Section 3.1.3 of the eSF should include a context-specific analysis of risks (threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities) faced by contextually relevant gender, age, and disability groups and section 3.1.4 of the eSF should clearly demonstrate how the risks informs the response strategy. Protection mainstreaming (including disability inclusion) and gender and age mainstreaming are reflected across all results and activities and the logical framework includes an indicator at outcome level measuring protection mainstreaming. In multi-sectorial programmes, the partner should demonstrate capacity to mainstream protection and gender in the proposed action.

In the West Bank the intended protection outcomes should focus on reinforcing the response to demolitions, preventive measures against destruction of Palestinian assets and include evidence based advocacy plans focused on reducing International Humanitarian Law (IHL) violations. This should be addressed in an integrated programming strategy

targeting communities most vulnerable to protection issues such as settler violence and forcible displacements.

In Gaza, the integrated emergency preparedness and response programming should clearly reflect analysis of context-specific threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities and include evidence-based advocacy plans focused on reducing IHL violations.

Finally, DG ECHO encourages partners to include an advocacy component in their project proposal.

3.2.2.4 Basic needs Assistance

By way of promoting a comprehensive and coordinated approach and increased efficiency, DG ECHO supports basic-needs assistance (BNA), through a combination of modalities. 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. DG ECHO will favor the use of cash transfer/vouchers over in-kind food distributions. 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.

Cash-based assistance

Where assistance is to be delivered in the form of cash transfers, particular attention will be paid to the principles laid down in DG ECHO's cash guidance note, which will form the basis for the assessment and selection of partners, in particular in the case of large scale transfers. Partners will be expected to demonstrate a satisfactory efficiency ratio and, to the extent possible and taking into account the operational context, partners will be assessed on their ability to work on the basis of common targeting criteria, single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework. In line with the cash guidance note DG ECHO will expect partners to strive for segregation of duties and full transparency on the costs of implementation. For the delivery of smaller-scale cash transfers, DG ECHO will assess proposals paying particular attention to the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach. A good efficiency ratio will also be expected for small-scale projects.

Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

Food assistance interventions, preferably as part of an integrated response aiming at greater efficiency and effectiveness, can also be considered. All proposals should clearly identify food gaps and target the most vulnerable households. Response analysis should include market assessments and Household Economic Analysis (HEA). The modality of response should be selected according to a thorough decision tree and feasibility analysis. Any conditionality proposed should be duly justified according to the specific vulnerabilities of the targeted groups. For in-kind transfers local purchases are encouraged when possible.

3.2.2.5 Resilience

DG ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while contextually increasing their resilience. 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 therefore expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks for 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, including through community mobilisation, CSOs support, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

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.

3.2.2.6 EiE

DG ECHO will prioritise education and child protection interventions, with an emphasis on safe access to education, the protection of education from attacks and psycho-social support for children in highly vulnerable communities both in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

In the Gaza Strip, special consideration will be given to interventions that focus on:

- a. identifying ways to incorporate EiE and child protection into the Designated Emergency Shelter response,
- b. urban (most conflict affected) and most vulnerable rural (access restricted) areas,
- c. ensuring partners have strong capacities in both child protection case management and education.

Advocacy and legal support to schools under attack are key elements of the protection of education in Palestine.

EiE interventions should be coordinated with other stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, Education Cannot Wait (ECW), and Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) donors to avoid any overlap.

3.2.2.7 Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Preparedness (DP)

DG ECHO encourages partners to mainstream DRR and DP when and where possible and feasible. DG ECHO also encourages targeted actions.

In this regard, DG ECHO will focus on emergency preparedness for response in Gaza. An emergency response mechanism in Gaza is deemed highly relevant given the context. A two-pronged approach focusing on preparedness for response and responding in a timely manner (either through the setting of an Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanism ERMRRM and/or through flexibility measures) would be most effective. Support to capacity building for preparedness such as evidence building, scenario planning could be considered.

Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERMs/RRMs) are stand-alone actions pooling capacities of different partners for improved and more coordinated preparedness and early response, guided by early warning and contingency plans. ERMs/RRMs are designed to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose assistance when other response mechanisms are not yet in place. ERMs/RRMs are mostly used for rapid-on-set crisis. For slow-on-set, objective indicators with thresholds for engagement / disengagement should be defined in coordination with other stakeholders including the State Authorities.

3.2.2.8 EU Aid Volunteers

Where feasible, DG ECHO partners should consider the use of EU Aid Volunteers if the security conditions in the country allow.