

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### AFGHANISTAN, PAKISTAN<sup>1</sup>

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2015/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

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

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge                      ECHO.C/4

- Contact persons for **Afghanistan**

**In HQ:**    Daniel WEISS (daniel.weiss@ec.europa.eu)

**In the field:**                                      Esmée DE JONG (esmee.de-jong@echofield.eu)

Philippe BONHOURE (philippe.bonhoure@echofield.eu)

- Contact persons for **Pakistan**

**In HQ:**    Phillip MAUGHAN (phillip.maughan@ec.europa.eu)

**In the field:**                                      Olivier ROUSSELLE (olivier.rouselle@echofield.eu)

Caroline BIRCH (caroline.birch@echofield.eu)

Shohreh NAGHCHBANDI

(shohreh.naghchbandi@echofield.eu)

- Contact person for **Afghan refugees in Iran:**

**In HQ**    Lale WIESNER (lale.wiesner@echofield.eu)

**In the field**                                      Olivier ROUSSELLE (olivier.rouselle@echofield.eu)

---

<sup>1</sup> Afghan refugees in Iran are also covered by this HIP and its Technical Annex.

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Total Indicative Allocation: EUR 66 307 000

### Afghanistan:

Man-made crisis: HA-FA: EUR 39 780 968

Natural disasters: HA-FA: EUR 385 000

### Pakistan:

Man-made crisis: HA-FA: EUR 10 919 032

Natural disasters: HA-FA: EUR 13 800 000

### Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Risk Reduction, Resilience:

Disaster Preparedness in Afghanistan and Pakistan: EUR 1 422 000

## 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

### 3.1. Administrative info

#### Assessment round 1 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to **EUR 24 500 000**.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP – Afghanistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Iran may be covered under this allocation and under this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Pakistan are covered by the allocations and assessment round for Pakistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2015<sup>2</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2015.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action: up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form 2014<sup>3</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **15/01/2015**<sup>4</sup>

#### Assessment round 2 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to **EUR 12 380 968**.

---

<sup>2</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>3</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<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.

- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP – Afghanistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Iran may be covered under this allocation and under this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Pakistan are covered by the allocations and assessment round for Pakistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2015<sup>5</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2015.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action: up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners with the capacity to respond quickly to urgent unmet needs of the affected population and already engaged in areas of high need.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>6</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **08/01/2016**<sup>7</sup>

### **Assessment round 1 for PAKISTAN**

- a) Indicative amount: up to **EUR 27 619 032**.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point of the HIP Pakistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Pakistan may be covered under this allocation and this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Iran are covered under the allocations and assessment rounds for Afghanistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/01/ 2015<sup>8</sup>. Actions may start from 1/01/2015
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form 2014<sup>9</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **15/01/2015**<sup>10</sup>

### **Assessment round 1 for Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Risk Reduction, Resilience**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR **1 807 000**.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all other interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP – DP/DRR/Resilience section.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2015<sup>11</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2015.

<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 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.

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

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

<sup>10</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>11</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.

- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form 2014<sup>12</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **15/01/2015**<sup>13</sup>

### **3.2. Operational requirements:**

#### 3.2.1. *Assessment criteria:*

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed.

#### 3.2.2. *Operational guidelines:*

In the design of the operation, ECHO policies and guidelines need to be taken into account:

*The EU resilience communication and Action Plan*

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

*Food Assistance*

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

*Nutrition*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/201303\\_SWDundernutritioninemergencies.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/201303_SWDundernutritioninemergencies.pdf)

*Cash and vouchers*

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

*Protection*

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

*Children in Conflict*

---

<sup>12</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>13</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.

[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)

*Emergency medical assistance*

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

*Civil–military coordination*

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

*Water sanitation and hygiene*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH\\_SWD.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_SWD.pdf)

*Gender*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/Gender\\_SWD\\_2013.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/Gender_SWD_2013.pdf)

*Disaster Risk Reduction*

[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)

*Health guidelines*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health2014\\_general\\_health\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health2014_general_health_guidelines_en.pdf)

*ECHO Visibility website – visibility and communication manual*

<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

[http://www.echo-visibility.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014\\_visibility\\_manual\\_en.pdf](http://www.echo-visibility.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014_visibility_manual_en.pdf)

A set of overall principles must guide every operation supported by ECHO.

**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. ECHO requests its partners to include in the project proposal details on how safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets is being considered as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

**Accountability:** partners remain accountable for their operations, in particular:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) or beneficiary profiling;
- Management and monitoring of operations, and having adequate systems in place to facilitate this;
- Reporting on activities and outcomes, and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

**Remote management:** ECHO does not fund actions using remote management, other than in exceptional circumstances, where access to a crisis zone is limited due to security concerns, administrative or other obstacles. This mode of operations should therefore only be proposed as a last resort, and in the context of life-saving activities.

**Gender-Age Mainstreaming:** Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Thus, the assistance needs to be adapted to their specific needs - otherwise it risks being off-target, failing its objectives or even doing harm to beneficiaries. It is also a matter of compliance with the EU humanitarian mandate and the humanitarian principles, in line with international conventions and commitments. All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender\\_age\\_marker\\_toolkit.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf)

**Protection:** Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in traditional assistance programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. This approach is closely linked to the principle of 'do no harm', and also extends the commitment of safe and equal access to assistance as well as the need for special measures to ensure access for particularly vulnerable groups. All proposals MUST demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

Integration of protection concerns should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement- hosting context (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

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.

**Do no harm:** Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to

focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

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

For **targeted DP/DRR/resilience interventions**, the information in the Single Form should clearly show that:

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

**Strengthening coordination:** Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. The partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, local and international organizations, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and interaction with military

actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that upholds humanitarian principles and does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space.

**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. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

**Resilience:** ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while increasing their **resilience** in line with EU resilience policy. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

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

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

**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. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritized by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

**Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers** is mandatory. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. ECHO does not advocate for the preferential use of either (i) cash/voucher-based or (ii) in-kind humanitarian assistance. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming



of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the ['Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors'](#) and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed.

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

### 3.2.3. *Specific guidelines for Disaster Preparedness/Disaster Risk Reduction/Resilience*

Afghanistan and Pakistan present very distinct working environments but share a number of common characteristics, such as critical access issues related to insecurity and/or political/administrative obstacles. Partners' disaster preparedness strategies are still often focused on pilot approaches or direct project implementation. The last DIPECHO Action Plan initiated a more coordinated and collaborative work among ECHO partners and led to the development of methodological models for Community-Based and School-Based Disaster Preparedness. Although they represent a major step forward, these "common models" are still at a draft stage and necessitate further field testing and efforts to be more cost-effective, adapted to the local context and affordable to be progressively embedded into Governments' systems and owned by local stakeholders.

ECHO partners must have identified relevant local partnerships at the initial stage of the project's development in order to ensure i) an effective contribution, ii) a commitment to the implementation of the project and iii) the ownership of the project beyond its completion. Local (national and sub-national) authorities as well as local NGOs and the civil society should play a leading role while mobilising existing resources in the implementation of ECHO-funded Disaster Preparedness/disaster risk reduction/resilience action, as a way of supporting and demonstrating ownership of the models.

The ambition of ECHO's Disaster Preparedness/Disaster Risk Reduction/Resilience approach is to initiate and support processes implemented by local stakeholders; hence partners shall not substitute local government services, but rather work through a partnership approach, along with the local civil society.

Disaster Preparedness actions will have no specific geographical targeting but a multi-hazard focus. Although both countries are generally highly exposed to natural hazards, not all regions have the same degree of exposure to similar hazards and level of resilience, thus requiring adaptable approaches.

The Disaster Preparedness, disaster risk reduction and resilience targeted actions will aim at:

- Supporting the development, adaptation and consolidation of Disaster Preparedness methodologies (models) in rural and/or urban communities and schools, which have proven to be effective and compatible with local capacities, institutional environments and existing administrative mechanisms.
- Ensuring that the supported Disaster Preparedness models are inclusive of all segments of the population while allowing special attention to the most vulnerable, excluded and underserved ones by promoting a participatory rather than strictly top-down approach.
- Ensuring strong partnerships with national DRR stakeholders and linkages with national DRR initiatives, for integration of adequate disaster preparedness mechanisms into national and sub-national development plans, promoting ownership and institutionalization.
- Promoting local efforts for the replication and implementation of the models by local stakeholders and duty-bearers by supporting the development of cost-effective mechanisms and ensuring adequate coaching and capacity-building at central and grassroots levels.

Operational priorities:

Through its Disaster Preparedness/Disaster Risk Reduction/Resilience approach, ECHO intends to provide a framework for the development of Disaster Preparedness models that will be owned by national stakeholders, integrated into Governments' structures and implemented by Governments' services through their own human and financial resources, with the support of the local civil society. Meeting this challenging objective implies developing cost-effective models that are fully adapted to local capacities and constraints, in environments characterised by scarce resources. Promoting local ownership of the models outlined above is a priority.

Partners must be aware of previous DIPECHO strategies and achievements and, in particular, the recommendations made in the report<sup>14</sup> of the 2014 regional lessons learnt workshop. Partners must be fully aware of the common models<sup>15</sup> developed so far in Afghanistan and Pakistan and should use them as starting point toward achieving disaster preparedness goals.

---

<sup>14</sup> The 2014 regional lessons learnt workshop report is available to all ECHO partners upon request from ECHO Kabul and Islamabad offices.

<sup>15</sup> CBDP and SBDP models, as well as all related tools, developed under DIPECHO funding are available to all ECHO partners upon request to ECHO Kabul and Islamabad offices.

ECHO will pay particular attention to the following aspects:

- **Continued improvement and promotion** of the Community-Based and School-Based Disaster Preparedness models in rural setting developed during the previous *DIPECHO* Actions Plan with a systematic focus on linking DRR and local development processes. ECHO intends to support actions building on and consolidating previous achievements rather than piloting new approaches.
- **Effective linkages** between Community-Based and School-Based Disaster Preparedness models must be ensured at institutional and grassroots levels to allow synergies between respective capacities and resources, allowing greater impact and resilience. ECHO particularly supports actions focusing on both sectors as a way to ensure such linkages, when relevant expertise is available.
- **Adaptation** of the rural Community-Based and School-Based Disaster Preparedness models to the **urban context in Pakistan**, utilising the same collaborative approach initiated in rural setting, in view of developing common disaster preparedness methodological models. In addition, partners foreseeing to submit for urban contexts should be able to demonstrate a strong experience in working in urban contexts.
- **Strong collaboration** between ECHO partners at country level is an essential requirement. Collaboration is expected at country and field levels in view of creating synergies and consolidating the common methodological models through joint efforts, from project development to implementation, at technical and advocacy levels. Partners' proposals should clearly commit to adhere to these working modalities and reflect this through joint activities and indicators in the Single Forms and Logical frameworks.
- **Reinforcing local capacities and systems** by working with and through local authorities, organisations and institutions, including by contributing to build their capacities, provided that it will support the replication and sustainable scaling-up of the models promoted. Ultimately, the Disaster Preparedness models have to be functional and effective with existing national resources only, optimising the utilisation of the latter by ensuring synergies between Governments' services and the civil society, while ensuring sustainable internal capacity building mechanisms. Although the goal of the disaster preparedness models is to allow a bottom-up approach to Disaster Preparedness in view of strengthening resilience at grassroots levels, it is recognised that a top-down, Government-led capacity building and management mechanism is the most sustainable and cost-effective way of ensuring their systematic implementation.
- **DRR Coordination mechanisms** must be utilized and supported by ECHO Partners whenever relevant and feasible, at local, national and regional levels, as a way to advocate for a greater involvement of DRR into national stakeholders' agendas and provide support and coaching as required while allowing synergies between DRR actors.

- **Inclusion:** Partners' methodologies must be inclusive and culturally appropriate as far as gender and age, children, elderly, ethnic / religious minorities marginalised social groups and people with disabilities are concerned.
- **Climate change** cannot be the sole focus of Union funded interventions. However, ECHO recognises that Climate Change is a major factor to the increasingly intense, frequent and unpredictable natural hazards affecting the region. The “models” developed should thus encompass the impact of climate change on hazards and risks.
- **Small scale mitigation infrastructure** implemented through Union funded actions should remain extremely limited, if any, and should serve the sole purpose of demonstrating their effectiveness. Mitigation works funded through local resources will be a ECHO preferred approach.
- **The protection of Livelihoods and economic assets** through the disaster preparedness models to be developed should be incorporated into Union funded partners' approaches in order to increase communities' resilience.

Expected results of interventions:

Progress toward improving disaster preparedness/disaster risk reduction/resilience in Afghanistan and Pakistan will be measured inter alia through the following indicators:

- Partners have jointly developed Disaster Preparedness models by reaching full consensus on methodological and operational modalities, promoting them among all relevant DRR stakeholders in-country
- National stakeholders have played a key role in the models development process, leading to strong ownership and allowing for local implementation to start
- The implementation modalities of the proposed models have been tested in real local conditions and have proven effective while being supported by existing local human and financial resources only
- The outcomes of the Disaster Preparedness process, in particular the implementation of identified Disaster Preparedness priority actions, have been incorporated into and will be progressively mainstreamed through local development planning and other local initiatives with adequate resource allocations.

The present HIP will support a limited number of actions proposing a clear entry–exit strategy in line with the above mentioned priorities and modalities. Partners are expected to ensure coherence between different DRR funding sources and related strategies in their respective country of intervention.