

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### NORTH AFRICA

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2019/01000 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> /C4
Contact persons at HQ	Marco CAPURRO marco.capurro@ec.europa.eu (Team Leader North Africa)

Dorota KACZUBA  
[dorota.kaczuba@ec.europa.eu](mailto:dorota.kaczuba@ec.europa.eu)  
(Desk Officer 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)  
(Head of Office – North Africa)

Soumeiya AMRAOUI  
[Soumeiya.amraoui@echofield.eu](mailto:Soumeiya.amraoui@echofield.eu)  
(Program Officer Algeria)

Hend KHECHINE  
[hend.khechine@echofield.eu](mailto:hend.khechine@echofield.eu)  
(Program Officer Libya)

Fabrice MARTIN  
[fabrice.martin@echofield.eu](mailto:fabrice.martin@echofield.eu)  
(Rapid Response Coordinator)

---

<sup>1</sup> Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)  
ECHO/-NF/BUD/2019/91000

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 17 000 000 (of which an indicative amount of EUR 2 500 000 for Education in Emergencies)

Breakdown per actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros):

Country	Action (a) - Man-made crises and natural disasters	Action (b) - Initial emergency response/small- scale/epidemics	Action (c) - DIPECHO	TOTAL
ALGERIA	9 000 000			9 000 000
LIBYA	8 000 000			8 000 000

## 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: up to EUR 15 000 000.
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 3.4 of the HIP and 3.2.2 of this Technical Annex for Algeria and Libya.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2019. Actions will start from 01/01/2019
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education in Emergencies and any other relevant sectors as further described below.
- e) Potential partners<sup>2</sup>: All DG ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>3</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 14/01/2019<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.  
ECHO/-NF/BUD/2019/91000

## **Allocation round 2**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: emergency multi-sectoral response to newly vulnerable affected population in Libya driven by the escalation of the current conflict in and around Tripoli.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2019<sup>5</sup>. Actions will start from 01/01/2019.
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months.
- e) Potential partners are ICRC and DRC, preselected based on their technical competence and high degree of specialization which are required for the activities that need to be undertaken.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>6</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 20/06/2019<sup>7</sup>

### **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?
  - 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

---

<sup>4</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.

<sup>5</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>6</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>7</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.

- 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?<sup>8</sup>

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.

Preference will be given to proposals of a reasonable scope.

## **LIBYA**

**Actions falling under the following sectors and based on sound needs assessments will be prioritized:**

### **Protection mainstreaming:**

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

---

<sup>8</sup> In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

“Assumptions and risks” should consider protection and gender-related adverse effects of the humanitarian intervention. Contingency measures should be clearly identified.

Reinforce the provision of specialized protection services remains a priority for DG ECHO, especially on the subsectors of Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) and legal assistance to all type of victims of the conflict. Actions focused on Gender Based Violence (GBV) and Child Protection (CP) have to clearly include efforts on strengthening the referral pathway. Protection monitoring will be considered only if a response component is ensured.

Due to the semi-remote management context, **increasing the support to local partners** on protection mainstreaming and protection principles in general is paramount to ensure the effectiveness of the response.

EU funding will be considered only for those proposals indicating the compliance with protection mainstreaming principles at log-frame level. Piloting DG ECHO key objectives indicators (KOI) on protection mainstreaming is strongly encouraged.

**Health:** Support will focus primarily on conflict affected zones where basic health services are unavailable or inaccessible to vulnerable populations with the overriding objective to save lives and prevent permanent disability and disease associated with humanitarian crises. Health services funded by the EU should be free and made available to all, including refugees, internally displaced persons, vulnerable migrants and third-country nationals, without discrimination.

Activities can consist in providing trauma, war and emergency surgery including rehabilitation services - prosthesis and orthopaedics; and contribute to the restoration of primary health care services in area of conflict and/or by deploying mobile health teams when required, and by supporting referral to the secondary health care level. They may include the provision of essential medicines, medical equipment; temporary deployment of medical staff in support of the humanitarian health activities where most needed.

The provision of integrated essential health services that includes maternal and child health and nutrition, psychosocial support, gender-based violence post exposure prophylaxis, non-communicable disease management and a robust referral system should be prioritized. Community-based health promotion activities could be considered according to identified needs.

Attention to the specific needs of highly vulnerable groups (children, women, disabled, elderly, discriminated minorities) is encouraged.

Achieving the objective of humanitarian aid requires maximizing impact, avoiding gaps and duplication, increasing coverage, scaling up interventions and facilitating the post-crisis handing over to the health authorities and development actors. DG ECHO will pay particular attention to enhanced coordination and strive for a higher degree of coherence and complementarity, in the spirit of the Humanitarian-Development nexus.

**Education in Emergencies (EiE):** Actions to increase access to safe and quality education at primary and secondary school levels will be considered for conflict-affected children. 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 attacks and child protection on the way to/from school and while at school will be prioritised.

**Food Assistance:** Distribution of food, especially in areas where the conflict continues, targeting the most vulnerable people affected by the conflict - in particular recently forcibly displaced persons - can be considered, provided that needs are well identified. Using the common vulnerability criteria such as Food Consumption Score and Coping Strategy Index is recommended. Cash will be the preferred transfer option wherever feasible.

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 the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach. A good efficiency ratio will also be expected for small-scale projects.

**Coordination and Support Services:** Support can be envisaged to coordination, needs assessment or access facilitation (including access constraints analysis and information-sharing) if there is a clear added value of EU support.

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

**Shelter, NFI (non-food items):** NFI and shelter emergency assistance to the most vulnerable forcibly displaced persons and returnees can be considered. Support must be targeted according to documented vulnerability criteria and will require measurable technical outcome indicators specific to Shelter & Settlement to ensure that outputs can be traced. It also has to be complemented with activities to ensure quality assurance.

Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer will be the preferred option where relevant (*see DG ECHO Settlements and Shelter Thematic Policy*<sup>9</sup> p. 54). 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.

---

<sup>9</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/emergency-shelter\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/emergency-shelter_en)

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 the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach. A good efficiency ratio will also be expected for small-scale projects.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene:** Support could be considered in conflict- affected zones or in high IDPs concentration areas based on evidence based assessment. Specific WASH activities can be planned to complement health interventions in order to ensure the delivery of adequate health services in the facilities supported.

### **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. Partners should explain access issues 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. Partners should explain how their 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. Mitigation measures to avoid aid diversion or discrimination must be explained

3. **Life-saving character:** Operations undertaken through remote management modus operandi should only be implemented if justified by a life-saving imperative. Partners should 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. Partners should explain if access constraints are connected to a specific threat to expatriate humanitarian workers. In other words, partners should be able to demonstrate in section 6.6. of the Single Form that risks for their 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:** Partners should explain how they guarantee the impartiality of their needs assessment. Crosschecking information through trusted third parties is a must. Partners should 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:** Partners should 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 the 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. Partners should 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 includes 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.



## **Strengthening early response capacity**

### **(1) Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERM/RRM) as standalone actions**

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.

### **(2) Flexibility embedded into the actions**

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce flexibility to mobilize resources from on-going actions and swiftly respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations (a crisis within a crisis). Flexibility measures can be triggered to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis; the two main scenarios are: i) to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources; ii) to respond to small scale humanitarian needs which would otherwise remain unattended.

The application of flexibility measures should be based on a multi-risk analysis and the development of worst and most likely scenarios. Partners should develop a detailed plan considering prepositioning of stocks, surge staff, triggers and sectors of intervention.

ERM/RRM and flexibility measures are complementary and do not exclude each-other; flexibility measures enable to bridge the time gap between the shock and the time needed to mobilize ad-hoc resources through the ERM/RRM or additional funding. Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness of both flexibility measures and ERM/RRM. Partners should adopt indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance (e.g. lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within xxx days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers).

## **ALGERIA**

**Food Assistance:** The provision of food assistance should be nutrition-sensitive. Specific attention should be paid to food-related health issues like anaemia. The food assistance provided should be in line with local dietary preferences, acceptable to beneficiaries, and balanced according specific health and nutrition profile of population (as per results of the food and nutrition surveys and the impact of diet on health). The focus should be on the provision of food assistance in the most appropriate modality. The introduction of cash-based transfers, based on a market and feasibility analysis is encouraged, while risks associated to such modality should be carefully appraised. Dry food rations should be fortified to address micronutrients deficiencies. Supporting the access to fresh food for the most vulnerable food insecure refugees could be considered if its nutritional added value and efficiency is demonstrated. Sensitization on nutrition good practice could be included as a complementary activity.

In line with Grand Bargain commitments, partners are encouraged to include a multi-year

strategy for food assistance in 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. Strict monitoring of distributions will be required.

Support to income-generation activities could be considered for the most socio-economically vulnerable and food insecure refugees where feasible.

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 the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach. A good efficiency ratio will also be expected for small-scale projects.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene:** Any support to operation and maintenance should clearly be integrated into a multi-annual strategy. In particular, the modalities adopted for the delivery of WASH services (water trucking, water supply systems and access to latrines) must reflect the results of feasibility studies including a multi-annual cost effectiveness analysis. The multi-year WASH strategy should describe clearly the downsizing timeframe, rationalization and efficiency gain from the gradual shift from water trucking to the extended water supply network coverage.

The monitoring of the service supplied must guarantee that the minimum standards in terms of water quantity and quality be respected.

Risks linked to natural hazards (floods, storms and duna movements) have to be properly taken into consideration. A proper vulnerability mapping of the construction sites of any new WASH infrastructure is necessary.

**Health:** The provision and management of medicines, including for non-communicable diseases and small equipment, could be considered, if medical needs analysis is based on Health Information System data and reflects the lessons learned from previous health support in the camps. Local purchase of drugs and medical equipment that respond to FPA quality criteria are encouraged whenever appropriate.

**Education in Emergencies (EiE):** Priority will be given to provide continuous access to safe, inclusive, quality formal and non-formal education to girls and boys affected by the protracted humanitarian crisis.

Priority will be given to actions that: target children that are out of school or at risk of dropping out; increase retention and transition to secondary education through tackling relevant causes for absenteeism and drop out; provide continuous capacity development of underqualified and unqualified teachers, and other education personnel; provide *ad hoc* support and materials to improve teaching and learning outcomes; promote a contextualized and holistic approach (i.e. mainstreaming WASH, DRR).

Proposed actions should aim at building more sustainability, be innovative and tailored to the different needs of children and adolescents, based on their age and gender. Proposed actions must align to the school academic year to avoid disruption (and cover at least one full academic year).

**Shelter and NFI (non-food items):** This type of activity will be considered only in case of a response to a natural disaster and in line with DG ECHO Shelter and Settlement thematic policy.

**Security:** DG ECHO acknowledges the continued security risks for humanitarian workers in the Saharan context. Security-related costs will therefore continue to be eligible and should be integrated in funding proposals.

**VAT:** In line with section 9.3. of the FPA guidelines<sup>10</sup>, partners are expected to coordinate with the relevant authorities for an effective VAT exemption as granted by the Ministry of Finance since 2016. Only if this exemption is not granted and partners demonstrate that they had taken all the necessary steps, VAT could be considered eligible.

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

---

<sup>10</sup> [http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/reference\\_documents/start](http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/reference_documents/start)