

TECHNICAL ANNEX

HORN OF AFRICA¹

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 ECHO²/C3

Contact persons at HQ:

Horn of Africa:	Sandra Descroix sandra.descroix@ec.europa.eu
Somalia:	Bérengère Tripon Berengere.tripon@ec.europa.eu Ellen Vermoesen Ellen.vermoesen@ec.europa.eu Riikka O'Sullivan riikka.o'sullivan@ec.europa.eu
Ethiopia:	Daniel Clauss daniel.clauss@ec.europa.eu Ondine Ripka Ondine.ripka@ec.europa.eu
Kenya	Bérengère Tripon Berengere.tripon@ec.europa.eu
Uganda	Elisabeth Coelho Detournaij Elisabeth.coelho-detournaij@ec.europa.eu Juan Luis Barbolla Casas juan-luis.barbolla-casas@ec.europa.eu

¹ Horn of Africa for this HIP and technical annex covers: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda.

² Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)

Djibouti and Eritrea: Juan Luis Barbolla Casas
juan-luis.barbolla-casas@ec.europa.eu

Contact persons in the field:

Somalia: Johan Heffinck
Johan.heffinck@echofield.eu
Morten Petersen (as of July 2018)
Morten.Petersen@echofield.eu
Quentin Le Gallo
quentin.le-gallo@echofield.eu

Ethiopia: Ségolène De Béco
segolene.de-beco@echofield.eu
David Sevcik (as of July 2018)
David.Sevcik@echofield.eu
Lars Oberhaus
lars.oberhaus@echofield.eu

Kenya: Jean-Marc Jouineau
jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu

Uganda: Isabelle D'haudt
Isabelle.dhaudt@echofield.eu
Jordi Torres Miralles
Jordi.Torres-Miralles@echofield.eu

Eritrea: Peter Burgess
Peter.Burgess@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 199 500 000 (of which an indicative amount of EUR 10 000 000 for Education in Emergencies³)

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises⁴: HA-FA: EUR 199 500 000

Total: EUR 199 500 000

Country/Thematic	Indicative allocation in EUR
Djibouti	500 000
Ethiopia	61 000 000
Kenya	10 000 000
Somalia	89 000 000
Uganda	39 000 000
TOTAL	199 500 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 99 500 000
- 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 **Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda**.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2018⁵
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Education for Emergencies
- e) Potential partners⁶: All DG ECHO Partners

³ A tentative indicative amount of EUR 10 000 000 for Education in Emergency components may be implemented in the current HIP. This amount may be reviewed in the context of the 2018 allocation of funds, based on the quality of proposals received

⁴ As possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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

- f) Information to be provided: Single form⁷
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information⁸:
 - For **Somalia, Kenya and Djibouti** by **20/11/2017**⁹
 - For **Uganda, Ethiopia** by **22/1/2018**

Assessment round 2 - Somalia

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 50 000 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 (Somalia).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/04/2018 for new actions¹⁰. Start date will be as from 1/5/2018 for new actions.
- d) The expected initial duration for new actions is up to 8 months.
- e) Potential partners⁶: ECHO partners already responding to the drought.

Priority will be given to ongoing DG ECHO projects to cover the second part of 2018. For Education in Emergencies response, only partners with demonstrated technical expertise in addressing needs of children on the move and proven experience in defined priorities (see p 29) will be considered.
- f) Information to be provided: Modification requests or Single form.¹¹
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 20/04/2018**¹²

Assessment round 3 – Ethiopia

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 35 000 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 (second modification, Ethiopia).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/06/2018 for new actions¹³. Start date will be as from 01/07/2018 for new actions.

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.

⁷ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

⁸ 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.

⁹ To minimise the risk of the most affected population further falling into higher levels of food insecurity/vulnerability if the current response is not scaled up and maintained in a timely manner, partners are kindly invited to submit proposals by 20 November. This should allow a smooth transition towards 2018 ECHO support.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ they will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

¹² 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.

- d) The expected initial duration for new actions is up to 12 months. Ongoing operations can be extended by up to 12 months. Actions of an initial duration of up to 24 months in response to the needs of refugees are considered if the duration is justified by a detailed analysis of the added value of multi-year planning and financing of the specific action as compared to a sequence of yearly actions.
- e) Potential partners¹⁴: ECHO partners with ongoing humanitarian operations in Ethiopia.

In order to respond to the urgent humanitarian needs as quickly as possible, partners have to demonstrate 1) their operational presence and expertise through ongoing humanitarian operations in the geographic areas and sectors which are targeted for ECHO funding, and 2) their capacity to rapidly scale-up and expand their operations in response to the evolving needs; and 3) whenever relevant for the type of intervention, their capacity to respond to additional crisis within the crisis, based on an analysis of the risks, the development of scenarios and a contingency plan. This must be reflected in the project and intervention logic through a dedicated crisis modifier result.

- f) Information to be provided: Modification requests or Single form.¹⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 06/07/2018.**^{16[4]}

Assessment round 4 – Uganda

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 15 000 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 (third modification, Uganda).
- c) For new actions, costs will be eligible from 01/11/2018. Start date will be as from 01/11/2018 for new actions.
- d) For new actions the expected initial duration is up to 24 months. For modifications, the extension could be up to 24 months where the duration is justified by an analysis of the added value of multi-year planning and financing of the specific action as compared to a sequence of yearly actions.

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ they will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

¹⁶ 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.

- e) Potential partners¹⁷: ECHO partners with ongoing humanitarian operations in Uganda.

The proposals and modification requests received will be assessed jointly with the projects to be funded under the 2019 HoA HIP. Therefore the same criteria will be applied:

- Relevance;
- Capacity and expertise
- Methodology and feasibility
- Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements
- Cost-effectiveness/efficiency/transparency

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.

- f) Information to be provided: Modification requests or Single form.¹⁸
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 26/11/2018**¹⁹.

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 assessment²⁰
- 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;

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ they will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ Partners are expected to contribute and use coordinated needs assessments on crisis and sector level in line with Grand Bargain commitments

- 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;
- 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 level²¹;
- 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.

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

²¹ See footnote related to the quality of needs assessment and the Grand bargain-related section below.

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

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's²² education while ensuring inclusive and quality education²³. 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

²² 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.

²³ 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.

- **Outcome 3:** Education services are strengthened through preparedness, response and recovery interventions in line with the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*²⁴

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

²⁴ Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery.

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

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

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/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.²⁵ 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

²⁵ 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

the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the DG ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.²⁶

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

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

²⁶ 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.

and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified (see template). This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, 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 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/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

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

Infant and Young Children Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF)

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

Health

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

Remote Management

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

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

EU Aid volunteers

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

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

General principles

Proposals from partners should be aligned with and address the following principles:

- **Needs assessments:** All proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on recent needs assessment, and informs and prioritises response(s) as well as the targeting criteria (to be clearly defined). Various sources of information can inform the needs assessment, but should always be complemented by direct evaluation of the needs by the partner.
- **Humanitarian access:** Humanitarian access is the capacity of people in need to access timely and pertinent humanitarian assistance, and it is also the capacity for humanitarian actors to access people affected by crises who depend on humanitarian assistance to meet their basic needs. Humanitarian access is regularly challenged and restricted requiring constant efforts from all stakeholders in order to be negotiated and expanded. Each partner should consider integrating approaches and activities to protect and preserve humanitarian access through its interventions, including adequate knowledge and promotion of humanitarian principles as well as emphasis on quality of humanitarian assistance. Such an approach should address humanitarian needs as well as improving partners' acceptance among affected communities. Only partners with a suitable and adequate direct access, presence and implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region will be considered. Support to common services, dissemination of IHL and humanitarian principles and advocacy, as well as coordination efforts, including civ-mil coordination, will be considered as they can improve meaningful access to affected populations.
- **Response to protracted situations will be considered** based, on vulnerability, including needs-based targeted approach rather than status-based blanket assistance (e.g. food assistance) and on emergency gaps analysis (e.g. new displacements in existing camps, increased morbidity/mortality, outbreaks, etc.). **Nexus** opportunities should be analyzed and promoted for responses in protracted situations in order to establish a link with longer-term engagement of development support. Sustainability and cost effectiveness of basic services should be considered when designing the intervention, including fair community participation.
- DG ECHO-funded actions need to be environmentally-friendly (e.g. sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy).
- Partners should demonstrate correct targeting and quality monitoring, including mainstreamed biometrics verification.
- DG ECHO has introduced standard **Indicators** for outcomes and results. The use of a specific KRI is mandatory for all actions covering the relevant sub-sector. Partners are strongly encouraged to use KOI whenever possible and in conjunction with "Custom" indicators.

- **Capacity building and self-reliance.** Partners should develop and implement long term strategies for capacity building when providing technical assistance. Trainings should be administered by qualified professionals, and include entry and exit tests, extensive on the job practice, adult education good practices, good educational material, etc. The final objective should be not only knowledge transfer, but the promotion of capacities eventually leading to self-reliance.

Sector-specific priorities

Protection

DG ECHO's priorities in terms of protection are to address violence, coercion, deliberate deprivation and abuse of persons, groups and communities in the context of humanitarian crises, in compliance with the humanitarian principles and within the framework of international law and in particular international human rights law (IHRL), International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and Refugee Law. The entry point for DG ECHO funding protection interventions are situations of short-term nature, though structural problems exacerbated by conflict could be envisaged if justified.

Considering the existing conflict dynamics and inter-communal tensions in the Horn of Africa, coupled with recurrent natural shocks/disasters, all proposed interventions should be informed by a thorough risk analysis aimed at 1) developing a conflict-sensitive response (i.e. when the main outcome of the intervention is not protection); 2) directly tackling threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations, hence reducing their exposure to protection risks (i.e. interventions with a protection outcome).

Detailed priorities for the protection sector are included in the country-specific paragraphs below.

Education in Emergencies

1. EiE-related funding may focus on safe access to quality formal and non-formal education services, focusing on primary, lower secondary and secondary education (please refer to countries priorities).
2. The duration of the action should aim at covering the total duration of a school year and allowing the evaluation of the impact, especially in terms of retention of children in the next school cycle.
3. EiE actions integrated into multi-sectoral rapid response mechanisms with established exit strategies will also be considered for funding.
4. Non-formal education activities should be aligned to the formal system providing children with opportunities to enter (or re-enter) the system. Curricular needs of IDPs and refugees / asylum seekers should be addressed following a learning needs assessment, considering language of instruction, teacher capacity development needs and gaps in their academic levels. Whenever possible, EiE in refugee settings should reflect formal systems and provide children with pathways to transition into other systems as their circumstances change.
5. Child safe-guarding mechanisms must be established to ensure both that children are not at risk when attending school and that child protection related issues are timely and effectively responded to by professional actors: codes of conduct for education

- staff, strategies to promote positive classroom management together with the development of up to date referral mechanisms for child protection cases will be considered as minimum requirements for funding.
6. Specific activities can include the establishment of / support to Accelerated Learning Programs, payment of teacher incentives (especially in refugee settings), rehabilitation of classrooms and/or establishment of transitional structures, as well as provision of emergency supplies.
 7. Capacity building opportunities for education personnel should be based on in-depth assessment of the needs of both education personnel and learners. Considering the low number of qualified teachers in the region, in settings with a large presence of protection actors, capacity-building opportunities should primarily focus on contributing to enhanced education outcomes for learners.
 8. The provision of life-saving skills and messages will be considered for funding when part of a broader intervention and if developed on the basis of a thorough needs assessment contextualised to the specific crisis. For this specific component, coordination and active collaboration with agencies working in other sectors is highly encouraged.

Humanitarian food assistance (HFA)

1. Food assistance interventions will be supported to save lives and to protect productive assets as a response to severe, transitory food insecurity due to natural and/or man-made disasters.
2. Food assistance interventions will target the most severe food insecure as a priority based on food security indicators and analysis such as IPC (eg IPC 3 or more households, households with poor FCS, high CSI, etc).
3. All interventions should be built upon a strong analysis aimed at minimizing or eliminating protection risks: the analysis should inform both targeting, modalities and response should include strong and safe feedback mechanisms.
4. Age and group specific nutrition needs must be taken into account in HFA. For example, food in-kind distributions should always include appropriate complementary food for children aged 6 to 24 months. At the same time, breastfeeding practices must be protected from potentially harmful products and actions.
5. Actions for protracted displaced people should be based on vulnerability criteria (profiling) and livelihoods capacities to cover food needs, and the use of tools such as Household Economic Approach (HEA) is encouraged. The status-based approach should be guaranteed for new influxes of displaced populations.
6. Emergency livelihoods activities should be included in the response whenever possible in order to support strategies for self-reliance and livelihoods protection. Livelihoods actions should be based on livelihoods assessments and risk analysis and should not be confined to agricultural and pastoral livelihoods. Interventions should be environmentally-friendly. Sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy will be favoured.
7. The choice of transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) must be based on a sound analysis, with cash based transfers preferred over other modalities for food assistance and livelihoods responses. The purpose of the transfer, the value that will be covered for each beneficiary and the criteria for determining the exact amount

- must be clearly explained and clearly justified. The partner should include analysis of the different delivery mechanism options and ensure coordination and harmonisation with other actors for the design and implementation of the selected modality. Innovative approaches (e.g. using new technology) which can enhance access by populations in need are encouraged.
8. Partners should ensure coordination and complementarities with national safety nets where possible, and support when relevant the strengthening of the safety nets to cover acute needs in times of crisis.
 9. Emergency livestock activities can be supported where livestock are proven to be a vital asset for the most vulnerable people. Priority must be given to households with "minimal" livestock holdings and to those who have left the pastoralist livelihood due to asset depletion. Proposals should demonstrate linkages of these interventions to longer term development. The feasibility and appropriateness of the interventions should be carefully considered and documented using the minimum standards developed by the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS: <http://www.livestock-emergency.net>) and considering existing early warning systems.
 10. Agricultural inputs, such as seeds and tools, can be considered where there is a clear link between the shock and the loss of such assets, and where they are important for livelihood recovery. A robust analysis of seed systems (such as a Sustainable Seed System Assessment: SSSA) should be conducted to make the appropriate choice of modality (in-kind, cash or vouchers) and especially to ensure that seed systems (private and public) are not undermined by an in-kind provision of seeds.
 11. Food utilization is a pillar of food security that should be an inherent part of any food assistance project. Components such as hygiene, appropriate feeding practices, proper energy source and technology for adequately processing, cooking and conservation of food/ making and safe water should be considered alongside food access and availability.

Nutrition

1. Nutrition needs must be clearly identified by quality and representative surveys or surveillance systems. DG ECHO will fund under-nutrition treatment projects where the prevalence is above the critical threshold, but also where justified by the analysis of the risks and vulnerabilities.
2. Although weight-for-height (WHO 2006) is still the internationally agreed indicator to estimate the prevalence of under-nutrition, MUAC-based assessments can be used to trigger nutrition operations in specific circumstances after consultation with DG ECHO.
3. Partners should ensure maximum coverage: coverage assessments, using globally approved methodologies, can be conducted to identify barriers/boosters.
4. Nutrition interventions will be implemented following the CMAM protocols in effect in each country. In exceptional cases, implementation of simplified protocols, or any other situation where derogation from MoH guidelines is needed, the partner should receive approval from DG ECHO.
5. Treatment of acute malnutrition and its complications should be provided free of charge for the beneficiaries. This should include systematic and non-systematic drugs and lab tests, transport and board for caretakers, etc.

6. Innovative approaches to target MAM children can be considered but should be negotiated with DG ECHO beforehand. MAM treatment services should always be ‘linked’ to a health facility where SAM services are available. Standalone MAM services will not be considered for funding.
7. Partners should specify in the proposal the source of therapeutic food (whether procured with DG ECHO funds or granted by UN agencies) and include an indicator for stock-out.
8. All nutrition projects should promote IYCF practices and detail the strategy adopted in the funding proposal.

Health

1. Access to a package of basic health services needs to be ensured in any crisis situation. Interventions that contribute to the reduction of key morbidities and mortality, targeting vulnerable populations, will be prioritized. These should include improved free and equal access to quality primary and secondary health care, war surgery and basic and comprehensive Emergency Obstetric and Neonatal Care.
2. Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives during the period of assistance should be prioritized. Evidence-based community health approaches are encouraged. High impact public health mass interventions (i.e. measles vaccination, Vitamin A, de-worming, MUAC assessment, LLINs distribution) are encouraged especially for areas of high vulnerability and precarious access.
3. Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided as much as possible and capacity building promoted. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR development frameworks.
4. Regular supportive supervision should be ensured to guarantee the quality of the services and on the job training.
5. The functionality of existing early warning, surveillance and response systems (EWARS) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed. All health projects should contribute to strengthen EWARS and to support basic control programs (i.e. EPI, TB, Malaria, HIV/AIDS). Since these programs are often funded vertically by global financial instruments, partners should ensure synergies and avoid duplications.
6. Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. EDF programs; Global Fund; GAVI) need to be established, duplication avoided and opportunities for LRRD fully explored. Partners are expected to participate actively in the health cluster meetings and activities.
7. Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to universal precautions, safe transfusions, medical waste management; safety (quality assurance) and efficacy of drugs; protection of human resources, premises and means (personnel, ambulances, drugs, etc.) pursued.
8. Advocacy towards the integration of nutritional activities in the healthcare package will be supported.
9. In refugee settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities

Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

1. Solar-powered pumping systems will be considered on a case-by-case basis, according to water-source capacity, demonstrated performance of the solar pump, proven proficiency of the partner, and availability of appropriate providers / installers in the country.
2. In dry lands areas, local dynamics of water use and availability should be thoroughly investigated (quantity and quality) and recorded.
3. Partners should focus on rehabilitation and repair of existing WASH systems / facilities before constructing new ones.
4. Water trucking should only be considered for the shortest time, and as a last-resort lifesaving intervention requiring a clear and concrete exit strategy.
5. Community-based water supply management should be promoted, including community contributions, leading to enhanced self-reliance of the targeted community.
6. Whenever possible, WASH services for displaced populations should be connected to / integrated with those of host communities, promoting equity in the level of service.
7. WASH activities have a complementary value in the control and prevention of epidemics, and should be linked to epidemics response where relevant, addressing the root causes of the disease.
8. Whenever relevant, WASH should be integrated into nutrition interventions to ensure a holistic and integrated approach to reduce vulnerabilities. The minimum package for WASH in Nutrition interventions should include:
 - 8.1. Safe water access and storage as well as appropriate sanitation in health facilities
 - 8.2. Hygiene kit distribution, containing water treatment product (if relevant in the context), jerry-can, and soap.
 - 8.3. Implementation of adapted and targeted awareness campaign related to diarrheal disease and its impact on the malnutrition status of children.
9. Hygiene promotion strategies should be dynamic, innovative, adapted or tailored to the context to avoid routine and loss of interest. Notice boards should be installed at strategic locations to enable awareness campaigns. In times of epidemics outbreak/emergency, simple direct communication should be prioritised; the use of heavy and long participatory methods, aiming at unrealistic behaviour changes, should be avoided unless supported by specific relevant contextual justification.
10. Latrines must:
 - Address / take into account protection concerns
 - Constitute a barrier to the transmission route of diseases.
11. Sanitation projects should, where possible, have a clear community-based approach with beneficiary contribution. The design of household latrines and related capacity building should privilege and be based on the capacity of the people to replicate it (once the pit is filled), to ensure sustainability.

Shelter and Settlement:

1. Emergency and transitional shelter should be prioritized. The design should be based on local capacity for self-replication or/and self-upgrading. The re-use of materials and tools to upgrade shelter into more permanent structure should be fostered as much as feasible.

2. Environmental impact and risk of conflict over the access to natural resources must be taken into account when designing the project.
3. Environmental hazards should be identified and avoided or mitigated when selecting settlement/camp site. Water source capacity should also be taken into account.

Disaster Risk Reduction - Preparedness for Response and Early Action.

Partners should mainstream DRR in all actions by considering risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, capacity and hazard. Anticipation and preparedness should be guided by EWS to ensure effective response.

Whenever relevant, partners should consider integration of DRR components in humanitarian actions to strengthen the DRR capacities of communities, local and national institutions. This should be done as a step towards integration of DRR into the development agenda, ensuring that local and national institutions are part of the process and wherever possible take the lead.

In line with objective 4 of the Sendai DRR Framework, Preparedness for Response and Early Action is an emerging priority for DG ECHO. In HoA, two models for strengthening early response capacity will be prioritized:

- i) Emergency Response Mechanisms (ERM) as standalone actions.
- ii) Crisis modifiers (CM) embedded into the actions;

ERM and CM are complementary and do not exclude each-other; the CM enables to bridge the time gap between the shock and the time needed to mobilize ad-hoc resources through the ERM or additional funding.

Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness of both CM and ERM. Partners should adopt indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance. (eg. *Lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within xxx days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers*).

Emergency Response Mechanisms (ERMs) 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 are designed to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose assistance when other response mechanisms are not yet in place.

ERMs 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.

Crisis Modifiers (CM). Whenever relevant, partners should introduce a crisis modifier 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).

The CM 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 CM 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.

Country-specific priorities

a) Djibouti

Djibouti adopted its first Refugee Act on 05 January 2017, recognizing freedom of movement, right to employment and access to essential services including health and education among others. Djibouti has been identified as a pilot country for the implementation of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), which should provide avenues to develop synergies with the EU Trust Fund in seeking durable solutions for this vulnerable population. In 2018, the priority for DG ECHO should remain the support to newly-arrived and protracted refugee populations. DG ECHO will prioritize core humanitarian needs in camps, including access to WASH services and food assistance in the form of cash. Protection activities focusing on registration and documentation of refugees and asylum seekers and comprehensive assistance to victims of violence will be also considered based on funds availability.

b) Ethiopia

i) Emergency Disaster Response

DG ECHO's emergency response to mostly natural disasters (drought, floods, epidemics, fire, etc.) will address as priority the most critical life-saving needs in the sectors of food assistance; WASH; nutrition; health; protection; and NFI & shelter. Response to epidemic outbreaks will be considered on a case-by-case basis (including vaccination), in strict accordance with existing international guidelines for the particular disease.

Based on the HRD and the partners' independent analysis, projects addressing the most urgent needs in an integrated and multi-sectoral manner (whenever relevant) will be financed through either:

- a) Bilateral agreements (single partner or consortium). Integration of a crisis modifier (see below) in those projects will be encouraged.
- b) Emergency Response Mechanism (ERM). Since 2013, DG ECHO has been supporting an ERM designed to deliver a coordinated, rapid and effective humanitarian assistance in case of new natural disaster, conflict, or disease outbreak, and aimed at minimizing the time between the occurrence of the crisis and the response.

The ERM can support any type of life-saving interventions - health, nutrition, WASH, short-term emergency livelihood, NFI and shelter; responses should be defined in duration and budget, and with demarcated geographic scope. Support to economic and agriculture recovery actions should not be considered. For reduced conflict of interest, DG ECHO encourages separation of roles among: i) the delivery of the emergency response; ii) decision making and grant management; iii) grievance mechanisms.

Implementing partners of ERMs should have an established presence in the affected area. Partners should invest in their preparedness, for response and early action and adapt their

organizational structure in order to maximize their comparative advantage in terms of access, prepositioned stocks / surge staff, understanding of the situation and capacity to respond.

Complementarity with other rapid response mechanisms (eg Ethiopian Humanitarian Fund) or other DG ECHO emergency instruments (including Crisis Modifiers) should be sought not only in terms of sectors and geographic coverage but also appropriateness/added value of financial instrument to the magnitude of the crisis.

While humanitarian needs resulting from the current drought crisis are expected to continue in 2018 and will have to be addressed as priority together with new shocks, the ongoing consequences of the previous droughts and their related early recovery phase will also have to be addressed, through a comprehensive prioritization exercise and in synergy and linkages with existing development initiatives – in line with the nexus approach.

ii) Forced displacement

Assistance to refugees/asylum seekers and IDPs remains imperative in DG ECHO's strategy in Ethiopia. Priority will continue to be given to life-saving interventions.

In line with the emergency response pillar, IDP focused interventions will address issues such as internal displacement mapping, identification of most urgent needs and access to services, awareness raising (only when the impact of, or changes deriving from, awareness are thoroughly assessed) and advocacy, causal analysis on displacement potentially leading to prevention of further displacement or conflict, as well as voluntary, safe and dignified durable solutions for protracted displacement, coordinated with ongoing development programs. Protection monitoring activities will be considered for funding when part of a multi-sectoral intervention or in areas where access to basic services is ensured, in line with ethical principles of protection-related data collection: the information management mechanism should be clearly defined in the proposal and a response component should be included (through direct assistance or referral). Referral pathways should be submitted at the time of the proposal when the partner has some level of presence in the area; for new areas, the referral pathway should be submitted at the most by 2 months after the starting date of the action.

All IDP-focused interventions should be built on a solid conflict analysis to avoid the exacerbation of already existing inter-communal tensions or social exclusion dynamics. Integrated protection actions will be prioritized.

With regards to refugees, support will prioritize assistance to the new influx of refugees, while also considering – on a case by case basis – the basic needs and protection of protracted refugee populations not addressed by long-term interventions. Ensuring complementarity and integration with existing durable solutions programs supported by development partners is paramount.

Actions focusing on registration and documentation of refugees and asylum seekers, as well as comprehensive response to victims of violence will be considered for funding. Preventive actions aimed at delivering short-term tangible outcomes will be prioritized over longer-term actions focusing on behaviour change.

All proposed actions must demonstrate that the target population is clearly aligned with the latest biometrics-verified figures.

In general, camp maintenance services will not be a priority. DG ECHO may decide to support these services if deemed absolutely necessary so as not to lose the gains achieved in the past.

Education in Emergencies, specifically access to safe and quality non-formal primary and secondary education, will be prioritised in areas of continuous influx of refugees not supported by the Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP).

Support to host populations surrounding the refugee camps may be considered on a case by case basis, taking into consideration other planned long term actions supported or to be supported by the World Bank, EU and/or others. Attention should be put on decreasing tensions and prevent conflicts between displaced and host population.

Crisis modifiers Partners implementing humanitarian interventions in response to natural disasters, displacement or other emergencies should consider the integration of a crisis modifier (CM) into their actions to respond to rapid-onset crises such as floods, epidemics and conflict-induced displacement. Multi-risk analysis and detailed scenario planning should be developed. CM can be used for short term emergency water trucking, health, livestock vaccination, nutrition, shelter and NFI; CM should be triggered within a few days of the alert to provide short term assistance (1-4 weeks). In the single form, the CM should be the object of an ad-hoc result and budget line. Indicators should provide elements to assess the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance.

Additional priorities

Coordination initiatives will remain key elements of DG ECHO strategy in Ethiopia and should follow a principled approach. Coordination, assessment capacity and pro-active information sharing on the context of the crisis and the needs of affected populations; joint programming of the response as well as advocacy based on basic humanitarian principles will be supported.

In view of possible deterioration of the current security situation and related restrictions of humanitarian space, access to the beneficiary populations for project implementation and monitoring, as well as respect of the humanitarian principles, will be preconditions for funding.

c) Kenya

DG ECHO's support for Kenya in 2018 will focus on assistance to refugees living in camps as well as the most vulnerable drought-affected populations in the hardest-hit counties in ASAL areas.

Refugees: DG ECHO will continue to support the Kenya Refugee Operations, with a focus on emergency/life-saving programming. Geographically, the encamped refugee population in Dadaab and Kakuma will continue to be prioritised. The population of Kalobeyei will also be included as long as this remains an emergency set up, and not a settlement as initially planned.

Despite the announcement by the Kenyan government to close Dadaab (initially in November 2016, then by May 2017), the camps are still hosting approximately 250 000 refugees, most of whom are likely to remain in Kenya at least for the time being and

given the current situation in Somalia. Additionally, the number of refugees present in Kakuma / Kalobeyi is on the rise (currently over 181 000), due to steady influx from South Sudan and relocation of non-Somalis from Dadaab. Assistance to these populations, especially to the most vulnerable as well as new arrivals, will be continued, with a foreseen decreased involvement in Kalobeyi over time once the settlement becomes economically integrated and with livelihoods perspectives, as initially planned. Humanitarian services in Kalobeyi may be considered, though this has to be well elaborated in line with the development orientation of the settlement. Partners must provide a clear exit strategy at the onset. Synergies with actions funded by other donors and other EU-funded instruments should be demonstrated and overlap must be avoided.

Emphasis should be placed on **protection** and **safeguarding asylum**, especially since registration of new arrivals has been put on hold for several months. An accelerated influx of refugees (either from South Sudan or Somalia) cannot be excluded and should be closely monitored in view of a potential response, including support to new settlement options. Protection interventions focusing on assistance to victims of violence should prioritize early identification of cases and the provision of life-saving assistance for incidents that happened in the Country of Origin and in Kenya, and take into account gender and age groups, building on a deep analysis of the different protection needs of populations living in the camps. Physical protection of extremely vulnerable cases will also be considered for funding, when a clear exit strategy (e.g. safe reintegration into the community or relocation) has been foreseen. Actions including an advocacy component for the respect of Refugee Law provisions by Kenyan authorities will also be considered for funding. Mechanisms to enhance and ensure Accountability towards Affected Population (AAP) must be included in each response.

Education in Emergencies will also be considered for funding, focusing on safe access to quality formal and non-formal primary education. As for the South Sudanese refugee population, considering both the low literacy level and the heavy disruption of education services in South Sudan, special focus will be put on Accelerated Learning Programs aimed at enhancing enrolment rate, reducing the education gap of older students and tackling classroom congestion. In Dadaab, EiE interventions must consider the ongoing return process so as to minimise disruption of services and child protection risks such as family separation. Strong involvement of learners' families and/or caregivers and strong coordination with other actors in the camps (especially those directly involved in the return process) will be a minimum requirement for funding.

Durable solutions for refugees in protracted situations will be emphasized including support to assisted returns provided that this meets the principles of voluntariness, safety, dignity and to areas of choice. Support will also be conditional to the accuracy of information provided to refugees about the return process, the security situation and the availability of services and livelihoods opportunities in the areas of return. In the current context of returns assistance, protection monitoring should also include cross border assessment of the effectiveness of the process including durability of the returns. Alternative and/or innovative approaches contributing to building the self-reliance of the displaced population can be supported.

Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs): In 2018, DG ECHO's response will focus on humanitarian needs arising from the drought situation. Priorities include targeting the areas most affected by drought (pastoral and marginal agricultural areas) with a focus on emergency / life-saving programming through support to the UN critical pipeline for nutrition, and through Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) addressing basic needs including food. DG ECHO will prioritize actions demonstrating (1) effective coordination with the GoK (at both county and national levels) and coherence with other relevant actors and (2) a high level of cost-efficiency. Partners implementing cash transfers should consider developing mechanisms for horizontal and vertical scale-up. Triggers for engagement and disengagement and targeting criteria should be harmonised with those of national/county safety nets.

DRR, resilience and preparedness for rapid response

After several years, DG ECHO has disengaged from stand-alone DRR actions in the ASALs. Partners responding to drought emergencies in the ASAL are encouraged to consider the integration of a crisis modifier (CM) into their actions to respond to rapid-onset crises such as floods, epidemics and conflict-induced displacement. Multi-risk analysis and detailed scenario planning should be developed. CM can be used for short-term emergency water trucking, health, livestock vaccination, nutrition, shelter and NFIs. CM should be triggered within a few days of the alert to provide short term assistance (1 to 4 weeks), and should be used in complementarity with NDMA, HSNP and NDOC to fill the time gap before their activation. In the single form, the CM should be the object of an ad-hoc result and budget line. Indicators should provide elements to assess the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance

d) Somalia

DG ECHO's strategy for Somalia will be four pronged:

1. DG ECHO funding in Somalia will continue to focus mainly on **life-saving programmes** for populations affected by acute crises (conflict and drought), based on independent needs assessments, access and respect of humanitarian principles. Innovative ways of accessing difficult to reach populations will be considered.
2. **Recovery activities** will be funded, provided access and monitoring are feasible. Priority will be given to drought related recovery initiatives. Moreover, durable solutions for displaced populations will be considered, including local integration and informed and voluntary returns to places of origin or choice when conducted in safety and dignity. The IDP population from the 2017 drought will be prioritised over the longer term protracted IDP population but this second group will also be considered based on vulnerability and funding availability. Funding for standardised return packages will be considered and returns should be undertaken to locations where programmes to improve the area of return are ongoing. For voluntary returns to inaccessible areas and also for those returning to areas where existing programmes are ongoing, the action must include strong mechanisms to monitor the conditions of individuals/HH upon their return.
3. **Linkages with middle and longer term programmes** Due to the protracted and overlapping nature of crises in Somalia, partners must clearly explain their intervention strategy based on identified needs (acute or protracted) and the level of

coverage of these needs by the proposed action. An explanation of linkages with other actors and between their humanitarian aid with resilience programmes and longer-term actions is essential.

4. **Preparedness for Response and Early Action.** Alongside mainstreaming of DRR, partners are encouraged to include a crisis modifier in their projects, designed to be triggered within a few days of new, small-scale, man-made or natural disasters for a short term intervention. The rapid response is intended for immediate life-saving interventions, such as food, water, health, emergency shelter, and protection. In the single form, the CM should be the object of an ad-hoc result and budget line. Indicators should provide elements to assess the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance.

Geographic prioritisation will be based on the ability to access the most vulnerable amongst the conflict and drought-affected populations in south and central Somalia and other areas exposed to drought and other disasters (e.g. north east and west). Within these geographic areas prioritisation will be based on the IPC classification and nutrition data (FSNAU/other studies) as well as the sub-national INFORM risk index and other hazard-specific maps and information, as well as direct local level assessments carried out by DG ECHO and its partners.

Targeting those most in need of humanitarian assistance is essential and actions which identify vulnerabilities through profiling of different groups will be prioritised (pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, urban poor, protracted IDPs, recent conflict or drought-displaced, evictees, victims of violence, etc.).

DG ECHO will encourage *integrated multi-sector actions* (either within one agency or integrated, well-coordinated actions across partners). Food security and nutrition, health and WASH programmes should go hand in hand where appropriate and feasible. Consortia between partners for specific parts of the response are encouraged (see cash transfer programme, below).

Education in Emergencies may be considered as part of a multi-sector action with a clear tailored response to an emergency context or/and as stand-alone projects responding to a situation of displacement (through the provision of Temporary Learning Spaces (TLS), formal and non-formal education adapted to children on the move, Accelerated Learning Programs (ALP), catch-up programmes, psycho-social support with strong linkages to child protection services. All education in emergency actions should be designed taking into account a conflict sensitive approach. Interventions should consider sustainability through community-based management of education services or handover to education authorities where feasible.

Highlighted sectors and focal areas:

- In Somalia, the protection crisis requires particular attention: while protection mainstreaming principles must be clearly incorporated in all interventions, specific funding for targeted actions (stand-alone and integrated) will also be considered. Interventions focusing on comprehensive assistance to victims of violence, and displacement tracking, will be prioritized, as well as protection monitoring and analysis to inform the design of humanitarian responses and strategies. Protection

monitoring activities should also include a response component (either direct or through referral).

- The cash transfer programme may be continued for the most food insecure population, including recovery, aligned with the larger recovery/resilience building programmes and with a possible transition towards the establishment of a safety net system by the development donors.
- Addressing the high levels of malnutrition remains a priority (prevention and treatment) as well as actions aiming at addressing the causes of malnutrition.
- In view of the deficient health services and infrastructure in Somalia and the need for life-saving support, health programmes may be considered in critical geographic areas and in specific domains (such as emergency surgery, mother and child health care, prevention and response to epidemic outbreaks, etc.). Partners are recommended to follow a common approach with a joint strategy and logical framework.
- For the WASH sector, and in complement to the emergency water component of the multi-purpose cash, actions aiming at improving access to, supply and quality of water will be considered, particularly in areas with increased exposure to AWD/cholera and high malnutrition rates. The community management aspect of water provision systems should be included.

In Somalia, partners must pay particular attention to the provisions of the '*ECHO Instruction Note for ECHO staff on **Remote Management***' in terms of its requirements for independent assessment, staff qualifications and experience, monitoring capacity, respect of humanitarian principles, security management and the life-saving imperative. Partners must maintain efforts to increase acceptance by communities and parties to the conflict through their conduct, demonstrated neutrality and quality service provision.

e) Uganda

While both protracted and new caseloads co-exist in Uganda, priority will be given to **new influxes** in acute situations. Given the current massive South Sudanese refugee influx into Uganda a specific attention will be given to them. However, DG ECHO will continue to monitor other refugee caseloads and may consider an intervention in case of unforeseen crises. Any response will be based on a clear targeting and vulnerability assessment.

DG ECHO's support in 2018 for Uganda will focus on:

- Life-saving multi-sectoral assistance:
 - Specific attention will be paid the Health sector that has been so far heavily under-funded to match the needs. The funding to the WASH sector will build sustainable water supply and access and, improve sanitation conditions in the settlements. Water trucking is only to be considered when opening new settlements and for a limited period of time while more durable options will have to be developed in the proposal. Preparedness plans addressing continuous influx of refugees needs to be developed.
 - Any Protection interventions will be tailored to the targeted people (gender/age groups). Partners will prioritize in their projects registration and documentation, legal protection, child protection and assistance to victims of

violence. The assistance to victims of violence will cover the early identification of cases and related provision of aid no matter where these incidents have happened. Preventive protection interventions will aim to reach tangible outcomes to be delivered within the timeframe of the action (e.g. integrated protection actions). Mid-to long-term behaviour change strategies will only be supported when being part of a larger programme.

Education in Emergencies (EiE): Due to recent contributions to the EiE sector and the low literacy rate and the heavy disruption of education services in South Sudan, the focus for funding will be on the establishment of/support to Accelerated Learning Programs. Partners will make sure that connection is made with the formal education.

It is requested to all partners to work towards:

- A coordinated and integrated response supported by a gap analysis to be presented in the proposal.
- Complementarities with development actors to support self-reliance of the refugees, in particular with the EUTF and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework. Medium-term strategy will be developed.
- A Consortium approach if it gives a real added value and brings effectiveness to the humanitarian response: promotion of standardised approaches, better coordination, fluid and structured communication, stronger advocacy in the dialogue with the local authorities.