

TECHNICAL ANNEX

IRAQ

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

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

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge: ECHO/B.4

Contact persons at HQ:

Team Leader: Jean-Yves Terlinden, Jean-Yves.Terlinden@ec.europa.eu

Desk Officer: Alessia.Corsini@ec.europa.eu

Contact Persons in the field

Javier RIO NAVARRO (javier.rio-navarro@echofield.eu)

Nicholas HUTCHINGS (Nicholas.hutchings@echofield.eu)

Luigi Pandolfi (luigi.pandolfi@echofield.eu)

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 82,500,000 (of which an indicative amount of EUR 5,000,000 for Education in Emergencies)

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 82,500,000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 82,500,000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

Proposals can be submitted at any moment during the year. However, no formal request for proposals can be made before the publication of the HIP. No agreement can be signed either before the publication of the HIP or before the adoption of the decision.

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 42,500,000 (*subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time. More information will be available upon adoption of the general budget of the European Union for the year 2017*).
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round are described in the 2017 HIP for Iraq.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2017.¹ Actions can start from 01/01/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and 24 months for Education in Emergencies Actions.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated presence and operational capacity in Iraq.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 31/ 01/ 2017

Assessment round 2

- h) Indicative amount: up to EUR 30,000,000 (*subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time*).
- i) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round are described in the 2017 HIP for Iraq.
- j) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2017.³ Actions can start from 01/01/2017.
- k) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and 24 months for Education in Emergencies Actions.
- l) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated presence and operational capacity in Iraq.
- m) Information to be provided: Single Form⁴
- n) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 30/ 06/ 2017

¹ 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.

² Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

³ 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.

⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

Assessment round 3

- o) Indicative amount: up to EUR 10 000 000.
- p) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round are described in the 2017 HIP for Iraq.
- q) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2017.⁵ Actions can start from 01/01/2017.
- r) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and 24 months for Education in Emergencies Actions.
- s) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to partners with well-established operational capacity and the ability to provide urgent emergency first-line services to populations affected by ongoing military operations in Iraq, victim assistance to survivors of violence and, potentially, support to families prevented from returning.
- t) Information to be provided: Single Form⁶
- u) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 03/ 11/ 2017

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- o The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- o Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- o In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed
- o Other elements that may be taken into account in the appraisal, based on context, relevance and feasibility, e.g.: coordination, security, monitoring and control management, access arrangements, lessons learned, exit strategy, comparative advantage, added value, sustainability.

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 Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

3.2.2. Operational guidelines:

This section outlines the general and specific operational guidelines which need to be taken into account by ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by 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 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.

Do no harm: Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

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

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

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

Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers is mandatory. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. However, in line with World Humanitarian Summit commitments, ECHO will endeavour to increase cash-based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains. The questions 'why not cash' and 'if not now, then when' should be asked before modalities are selected. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the 'Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors' and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed. 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 transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible.

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

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

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. Partner should also provide information on how they will comply with cluster technical guidance documents, or explain why they plan to deviate in from such standards. 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>

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

All ECHO beneficiaries and activities should be appropriately protected from hazards and shocks – according to their likelihood of occurrence, intensity and possible impact. ECHO uses two complementary methods for DRR: 1) **Integrated DRR** is where ECHO humanitarian interventions are risk informed 2) **Targeted DRR** refers to specific DRR risk reduction actions – that cannot be "integrated" into ECHO response projects (see above) but that will strengthen a system to avoid future humanitarian needs by reducing risk to vulnerable populations.

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

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

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf

Education in Emergencies: ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education⁷ in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps. Innovative solutions will be supported. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention may also be supported, particularly in relation to rapid onset emergency contexts or in the case of transit/short term displacement.

It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programs. It is vital to ensure that children can access education where they feel safe and protected. Therefore, education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include enabling activities like psychosocial support; mine risk education and provision of life-skills, such as vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school, but also strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies, including the recruitment and capacity building of teachers. To reduce the vulnerability of children affected by conflict, actions in the field of education in emergencies and especially conflict situations, should reflect protection, relevant legal frameworks (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law), education in mediation and conflict resolution, child protection (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors and former child soldiers), community-based educational activities and the promotion of peaceful reconciliation. Hence, education projects could include components of child protection and peace education (i.e. mediation, conflict resolution, etc.).

In order to ensure holistic response, linking education to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered.

Activities must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances.

Coordination is essential and all education in emergencies projects need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian and if appropriate development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Education Cluster, Refugee Working Groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education).

All actions funded on education in emergencies should in their design adhere 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

⁷ The Commission adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Emergencies also tend to change gender dynamics.

The needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and - consequently - assistance must be adapted to ensure equal access and that specific needs are addressed. 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 minors 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.

All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

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

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/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, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to reduce the potential for conflicts of interest. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

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. ECHO is willing to support

innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30 000 within a grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues on 1) development of indicators to measure impact of integrated protection programming with other sectors; 2) Approaches for monitoring and evaluating integrated protection programmes; 3) Training and human resources needs for integrated protection programming; and 4) Implementation of integrated protection programming in areas of difficult access. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.⁸

Please refer to the chapeau on ECHO Iraq's basic needs approach for further details on ECHO Iraq's approach to integrated programming to address basic needs.

Protection: Programme design should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population and the response 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. Integration 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, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. It refers to the imperative for each and every humanitarian actor to prevent, mitigate and respond to protection threats that are caused or perpetuated by humanitarian action/inaction by ensuring the respect of fundamental protection principles in humanitarian programmes – 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, ensuring meaningful access, ensuring accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

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. The use of integrated protection programming approaches is also strongly encouraged.

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf

⁸ See Annex 4 on p. 49 and forward in http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf

Resilience: 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, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

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

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (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 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, working in a comprehensive manner, each under their mandate – and should be supported by ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide. Investment in social protection mechanisms is an opportunity tackling the challenges faced by humanitarian crises and contributes to a reduction in the chronic humanitarian caseload, especially in the context of extreme fragility. 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. 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.

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

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. This also means that in mixed displacement scenarios, ECHO will promote a needs based approach which is required to ensure conflict sensitive programming at both household and community level. Please refer to the chapeau on ECHO Iraq’s basic needs approach for further details.

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

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/ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations 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 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 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

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

3.2.2.2.1 Protection

In addition to the general principles reflected above, the following applies to Iraq: Maintaining a clear focus on protection in the humanitarian response in Iraq is a key feature of ECHO's strategy. This particularly refers to the application of International Humanitarian, Human Rights and Refugee Law. Decisions on specific activities to support will be based on a clear and comprehensive analysis of protection risks which takes into account the main threats facing populations in need, their vulnerabilities and capacities – this should support targeting and prioritisation as well as much more robust response analysis. Please see the ECHO Humanitarian Protection Technical Guidance Note for more details.

Above and beyond specific protection interventions and activities, proposed actions should seek to employ a humanitarian strategy which ensures that partners are meeting their responsibilities as outlined under international legal frameworks referred to above, and in accordance with the humanitarian imperative and principles that should guide any response. This means that partners should seek to gain access to populations most in need, and support populations' access to safety, and adequate life-saving assistance. Accordingly, partners' humanitarian access and assistance will contribute to first line protection objectives including protection of civilians, respect for IHL, IHRL and IRL, protection by presence and others. Please refer to the chapeau on ECHO Iraq's basic needs approach for further details.

Interventions designed to reduce and mitigate the protection risks of human-generated violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons in Iraq might be supported either in the form of stand-alone programmes or in an integrated manner by achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection sensitive targeting. The application of an integrated protection programming approach is highly encouraged. Specific protection interventions that will be prioritized are listed below along with technical requirements and recommendations:

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals: Registration for refugees, asylum seekers and IDPs as well as separated and un-accompanied minors with the respective authorities; birth registrations for refugee, IDPs and other conflict-affected children; support to restoration of lost personal documentation; replacement of civil documentation related to national/regional social safety nets and social protection schemes, such as the Public Distribution System of the Iraqi Ministry of Trade, the Emergency Cash Assistance of the Iraqi Ministry of Displacement and Migration and the Pension Scheme of the Iraqi Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; restoration of family links, family tracing and reunification (only by specialised agencies); and monitoring of detention conditions (only by specialised agencies).

Monitoring and Information Management: Population movement tracking for displaced populations; real time monitoring and communication of violations and threats to trigger, on a case by case basis, specialized protection response and follow up actions by relevant clusters' partners, feed a trend analysis that informs response programming and advocacy and identify victims of violence, subsequently addressed by appropriate case

management, as outlined below. All protection monitoring should be accompanied by at least dissemination of information to the affected population on relevant legal frameworks, rights and entitlements and concrete possibilities for assistance. Field-level interventions aimed at facilitating access to services, linking the most vulnerable population to available support, will be prioritized. In addition, any form of protection monitoring and population tracking should also have a strong link with site management interventions and the CCCM cluster, to ensure a strong link between service mapping, identification and referral of specialised needs – all of which are relevant to first line protection and CCCM interventions.

Advocacy: Evidence based, bottom up informed and prudent advocacy and communication, on grave violations of International Humanitarian, Human Rights and Refugee Law, is encouraged and will be supported. This advocacy work must be informed by a partner's programme in the relevant geographical area and sector, thus the advocacy work must be based on evidence generated through their own programming.

Dissemination and application of International Humanitarian Law (IHL): activities aiming at IHL dissemination, targeting all parties to the conflict, at all levels of the chain of command, will be encouraged. Awareness raising and civil education on basic principles of IHL should extend to all relevant stakeholders: humanitarian community, civil society, tribal leaders, political representatives of government affiliated militia, senior policy advisors and other government officials. Partners, directly engaging with armed groups on the respect and application of the rules of war, should have proven experience in the domain and the use of already existing tools for dissemination should be prioritized.

Durable solutions (DS): specific activities aiming at facilitating voluntary, well informed, safe and dignified durable solutions might be considered when targeting extremely vulnerable cases. For the time being, this will mainly focus on support to preparatory activities linked to voluntary return or (re)integration, informed by Iraq's Humanitarian Country Team agreed upon framework, for safeguarding the voluntary, non-discriminatory nature of returns and defined humanitarian assistance to these population groups. This might include legal assistance and support to restoration of personal documentation; information dissemination on DS possibilities where this option is available to refugees, protracted IDPs and voluntary returns.

Programmes to **assist victims of all kinds of violence**, including GBV, can be supported along the following lines:

- Medical assistance: must be provided as quickly as possible, by skilled staff, and according to internationally recognized protocols. Medical assistance for victims of rape must be provided within a 72h frame. Ensuring availability of PEP kits for both adults and children who are victims of GBV is absolutely essential.
- Mental Health and Psychological support: should be provided by sufficiently trained service providers.
- Participation in coordination structures (i.e. particularly Health, Protection, Child Protection, GBV Cluster/WG) is essential and clear, comprehensive referral pathways must be foreseen within the proposal.

- Legal recourse: information on possibility to access to legal recourse should be provided whenever contextually feasible.

-Case management services for survivors. Structured Psycho-Social Support services will also be considered at the individual and group level.

Child Protection: Particularly activities addressing separation of children and families and unaccompanied children, including BID processes. Tracing activities might only be supported through partners with specialised experience herein, and partners must document that they have the necessary capacity to link up with similar relevant agencies across the region to ensure that cross-border tracing is conducted if necessary. All of the above will often require specialised case management services. Special attention will be paid to addressing recruitment of children, and children who have been involved in armed conflict. Addressing psycho-social needs of children might be considered provided quality of services and comprehensive referral pathways are ensured. Child protection should to the greatest extent as is possible be integrated into all Education in Emergency interventions, as outlined below.

Housing, Land and Property Rights (HLP): Security of tenure for people displaced in private housing and preventing/addressing forced evictions could be considered. ECHO's support to HLP related activities will only be considered if linked to defined exit strategies for the initial humanitarian involvement. This should also be well integrated into site establishment, upgrade and management activities as detailed below.

Community-based protection interventions (including service provision) – activities aiming to increase self-protection capacities of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promoting cohesion with host communities would be considered. This might include support to community based protection committees and networks; site management platforms as outlined in the site establishment, upgrade and management approach section below, or community-hubs for crisis-affected populations. They must include the direct provision of vertical protection services mentioned in this section.

3.2.2.2.3 Multi-Purpose Assistance

ECHO encourages the use of Multi-Purpose Assistance (MPA) to respond simultaneously to a range of needs in a dignified manner, and in the respect of people's preferences and priorities. Whenever feasible and appropriate, MPA should be done through unconditional and unrestricted cash transfers (MPCA), which have been proven to be highly effective and efficient. Partners are referred to 10 Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs for more details of DG ECHO's position. Proposals should incorporate a well-articulated response analysis that builds on needs assessment, and clearly informs the choice of response(s) and modalities:

Emergency disbursements of Multi-Purpose Cash Transfers (MPCT) to newly displaced populations fleeing conflict areas should be promoted, wherever the minimum protection and market related conditions are met, building on initial pilots and successes in 2016.

Extremely vulnerable protractedly displaced populations, resorting to extreme negative coping mechanisms, can be supported by multi month unconditional assistance. An exit

strategy and transition of humanitarian caseloads to government led, community based social protection schemes, or other appropriate transition options, have to be included in the response.

Response should be based on socio-economic vulnerability assessments which have been tailored to the Iraq context, and should not be prejudiced by specific sectoral or organisational supply driven priorities. Proposals should also include a market analysis component, a detailed description of the transfer mechanism, risk analysis and mitigation measures and proposed accountability mechanisms. Existing tools adopted by, but not limited to the Cash Working Group (CWG) must be used.

ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality, depending on the context.

ECHO will prioritise efforts to further develop common beneficiary databases and cash assistance platforms in order to establish a common system for delivering humanitarian cash that can ensure that we avoid duplication of assistance, ensure cost efficiency, and promote long term efforts to coordinate with and transition to government social safety net programmes.

Any assistance should enable targeted households to meet their basic needs, taking into account their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB, minus income or production from own sources), therefore the value of the assistance should be decided upon sound analysis and agreed with the wider humanitarian community.

3.2.2.2.4 Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

Food assistance interventions will be primarily supported to save lives, as a response to severe, transitory food insecurity, due to natural and/or man-made disasters, preferably as a component of a multi sectoral cash assistance, or complimentary to such assistance. A gradual transition to cash based solutions with a preference to unconditional transfers should be promoted.

- All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based: proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment, analysis of post distribution monitoring reports and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria.
- All proposals should clearly identify the severity of the food and nutrition needs, with ECHO prioritising severe food insecurity only.
- Whenever food insecurity is characterized by limited access to food, partners are encouraged to explain why it is not possible or relevant to consider other broader livelihood and income generating interventions to address the identified food insecurity.
- Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed.
- ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality, depending on the context.
- More specifically, under this financial decision, ECHO will continue supporting emergency interventions through the Emergency Food Rations. However quick transition to more substantive and targeted forms of assistance should be promoted in situations of protracted displacement.

- Support to Regular Food Assistance (dry rations) will only be supported for a limited period of time, and in locations where most adapted modality of assistance to respond to identified food needs are not feasible. Continuous facilitation of re-registration and effective inclusion of beneficiaries into government run social protection schemes (i. e. PDS) has to be factored in, encouraging the progressive transition of humanitarian caseloads to State run Social Protection schemes and/or development focused actions.
- Direct assistance to IDPs not registered with MoMD will be considered.
- Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- Partners are referred to ECHO policy Document on Humanitarian Food Assistance.

ECHO will continue advocating for further linkages between food assistance interventions and nutrition outcomes and programmes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices. Partners are referred to the Infant and Young Child Feeding in Emergency (IYCF-E) guidance that recalls the fundamentals of IYCF-E and provides practical guidance to ensure that IYCFE concerns are taken into account across sectors and throughout all stages of humanitarian programming.

HFA, protection and gender: in the spirit of ‘do no harm’ partners should ensure that a good analysis is carried out concerning the impact of a proposed action on the protection of vulnerable groups within the target population. For this purpose partners are encourage to refer to the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming.

3.2.2.2.5 Integrated approach to WASH / Shelter and CCCM

ECHO Iraq supports and promotes an integrated approach to WASH, Shelter and CCCM (as required). All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based, well defined in a situation and response analysis, based on needs assessments and continuous needs monitoring, aimed at rapidly addressing and responding to regular changes in the context. This applies equally to all site typologies and classification of IDPs (e.g. people on the move, transit centres, in-camp – including emergency camps - and out-of-camp - collective centres, unfinished buildings), caseload type (e.g. protracted and newly displaced), severity of needs (out-of-camp response defined by minor, medium or severe to classify rehabilitations and repairs) in Iraq.

ECHO will continue supporting lifesaving/emergency response operations for out-of-camp and in-camp settings, with the ability to swiftly transition to second line interventions strongly encouraged. Due to predictability associated with length of displacement, the ability to swiftly transition to more durable, second line interventions that support upgrades and sustainability of water supply and sanitation systems, along with shelter solutions and site management governance systems has historically resulted in efficiency gains and the ability to better meet the needs of the affected population.

In particular, for out-of-camp settings, considering the scale of the displacement, targeting and proposed response interventions will be important and should be justified

on the basis of displacement, demographics and socio-economic vulnerability criteria. This should be supported by a standardised monitoring system⁹ to track and assess post-implementation status and occupancy rates, using an agreed upon tool, frequency and sampling methodology.

As a key component of programme delivery for WASH, Shelter and CCCM interventions, the use of market analysis and the private sector, to better understand the potential application of innovative transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) could be taken into consideration. This may require an increase in the capacity of partners to properly identify and select applicable transfer modalities, along with any associated constraints and learning required to justify the technical soundness, effectiveness and efficiency of these actions. Synergies with MPCA programs are strongly encouraged, as well as a detailed review of the need for technical input and oversight to ensure quality, as this cannot be compromised, regardless of modality. Sound monitoring of interventions also cannot be comprised, regardless of modality and must ensure the application of indicators to measure both outcome and outputs for the sectors that are intended to have provided assistance for under MPCA programs.

An integrated programming approach, based on the linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter, Site management and Protection, will be prioritized, to ensure coordinated, multi-sectoral response focused on effectiveness and efficiency. This goes the heart of incorporating site management, and the need for regular monitoring, service mapping and referral mechanisms, and guaranteeing links to other core sectors. In addition, ECHO will continue to support and promote the establishment of integrated multi-sector needs assessment documents and common targeting, preparedness and implementation methodologies to be led and endorsed through the cluster system.

3.2.2.2 Health

Support to humanitarian health assistance should be based on improving access to basic, quality essential lifesaving and high-impact services, for the most vulnerable populations in need.

Utilization by the most vulnerable of basic health services needs to be monitored and reported.

Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives (during the period of assistance) should be prioritized: comprehensive Primary Health Care covering communicable diseases as well as mother and child care, essential nutritional services for new-born and children, emergency reproductive care, and emergency psycho-social support and epidemic response. Postoperative and rehabilitation services, for injured and war wounded, comprehensive care for victims of SGBV (including Clinical Management of Rape), and preventive and cost-efficient care for chronic and non-communicable diseases, might also be considered. As well communicable diseases outbreak response

⁹ This aligns with ECHO's policy Shelter and Settlements, support provided is that of a process not a product, so it simply does not end once the rehabilitations and repairs have been completed, need to better understand what happens to occupancy rate post-implementation
ECHO/IRQ/BUD/2017/91000

via identification and notification, case management, and support to early warning system may be considered.

Direct support to secondary health services and structures will only be considered against life-saving, clearly identified critical coverage gaps of the existing health infrastructure. Among secondary health services Emergency and urgent surgical care and Paediatric intensive care services may be considered;

Actions should be based on a quantitative and qualitative needs analysis aiming to reduce mortality and morbidity among the most vulnerable populations (population with restricted access to essential primary health care, living in conflict affected zones and in outbreak prone areas with low immunization coverage);

Health Data, disaggregated according to sex and age, should be collected and analysed. Continuations of previously funded projects should highlight the advances made and changing needs over the past period(s).

Support to health facilities in under-served, conflict affected locations will be considered, including through remotely managed operations (hard to reach or non-government controlled areas) abiding by ECHO's remote management guidance (above.)

Support to routine immunization system and catch-up immunization campaign in areas where coverage has been disrupted due to ongoing fighting or sudden displacement influx, in hard to reach or non-government controlled areas will be supported;

Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to medical waste management; safety (quality) of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (e.g. ambulances; drugs).

The functionality of the existing Early Warning, Surveillance and Response Network in Iraq should be systematically assessed and, in case of need, reinforcement actions proposed. Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted, to cater for conflict specific capacity gaps (mass casualty, war wounded protocols). Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.

Operations and services provided through Mobile Units or Clinics should, strictly, abide with the commonly agreed SOPs endorsed by Iraq's Health Cluster and focus on areas critically underserved by pre-existing health system;

Identification of functional referrals pathways, for conditions outside the remit of the specific action and referral follow ups (access to secondary services, counter referral, patients follow-up) should be an integral part of any proposal.

In camp settings, health services should be equally and impartially accessible to surrounding host communities.

Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. IcSP and ENI) needs to be established and opportunities for LRRD fully explored. As part of the Transformative Agenda, ECHO expects partners to collaborate the health

cluster and sector working groups, as well as to integrate other relevant intercluster actions (i. e. WASH).