

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### Enhanced Response Capacity Funding

#### 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 ECHO <sup>1</sup> C1
Contact persons at HQ	Matthew Sayer (matthew.sayer@ec.europa.eu)

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Indicative Allocation: EUR 3 500 000

Breakdown as per Worldwide Decision:

Specific Objective 5 - Transport/Complementary activities	HA-FA: EUR 3 500 000
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 3 500 000

#### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

##### 3.1. Administrative information

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 500 000.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 28/02/2018.<sup>2</sup> Actions can start from 28/02/2018.
- c) The expected duration for the Action is up to 24 months.
- d) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form for global capacity building actions<sup>3</sup>, medium to long term indicative budget and work plan.
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 28/02/2018<sup>4</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>3</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL; medium to long term indicative budget and work plan are to be attached to the Single Form in APPEL.

<sup>4</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

## 3.2. Operational requirements:

### 3.2.1. *Assessment criteria:*

- Relevance to the priorities defined in the HIP and relevance to general ECHO policies.
- Quality of the needs assessment/problem statement.
- Systemic scope and global nature, i.e. geared towards capacity building benefitting the humanitarian eco-system as a whole and/or all actors involved in humanitarian relief.
- Incorporation of lessons learned and good practice.
- Knowledge management well-defined, sustainable and open; willingness to proactively share lessons and evidence.
- Synergies with other initiatives, absence of overlaps.
- Inclusiveness (consortia or coordination agreement, quality and number of partners) to ensure the broadest coverage of a given sector or subject and the potential uptake.
- Coordination with relevant humanitarian governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Clusters, communities of practice).
- Demonstrated backing from a range of relevant actors, namely donors i.e. co-financing from other donors (or prospect thereof).<sup>5</sup>
- Realistic indicative medium to long term financial plan (estimated budget including funding sources).<sup>6</sup>
- Effectiveness of approach and intervention logic to achieve outcomes (specific objective) in terms of improved humanitarian response capacity.
- Efficiency in terms of resources used to achieve outputs and outcomes.
- Monitoring and evaluation framework (including indicators and sources of verification) well defined, appropriate, relevant and realistic/feasible in order to ensure clear measurability of outputs and outcomes.
- Clear institutional ownership by organizations putting forward the proposal.

---

<sup>5</sup> Only in exceptional cases, ECHO will contribute with more than 85% to the overall budget of an action submitted under for funding under this HIP.

<sup>6</sup> Partners are expected to submit a budget estimation covering the next 3-5 years as appropriate.

### 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 level<sup>7</sup>;
- 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> See footnote related to the quality of needs assessment and the Grand bargain-related section below.

**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.

With regard to digitalisation/technology in humanitarian response, DG ECHO will pay particular attention to new technological solutions to support efficiency, improved transparency and accountability.

DG ECHO seeks to provide focused support to initiatives working on digital identities and data as a global public good. Initiatives should focus on responsible engagement, improved data sharing and inclusiveness of big data analysis within the humanitarian community, while respecting concerns around data privacy and competition.

DG ECHO will also support initiatives which try to tackle the digital divide specific to crisis settings and ensuring continued access to digital services by those most in need.

Initiatives bringing together humanitarian actors, businesses and other relevant stakeholders to co-develop innovative technological solutions to address humanitarian needs in the most effective and efficient manner can be supported.

Finally, initiatives, integrated with existing coordination mechanisms, which seek to harness technology for better, agile monitoring and management of operations will be supported.

**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 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](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's<sup>8</sup> education while ensuring inclusive and quality education<sup>9</sup>. 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
- **Outcome 3:** Education services are strengthened through preparedness, response and recovery interventions in line with the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*<sup>10</sup>

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

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery.

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 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](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](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/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid\\_en](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.<sup>11</sup> 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 the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the DG ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document.<sup>12</sup>

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

---

<sup>11</sup> 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

<sup>12</sup> 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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf).

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

**Resilience<sup>13</sup>**: 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 and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified. This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, DG ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: 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.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Resilience opportunities differ according to context. However, these opportunities should be considered in all locations. HIPs, designed after consultation with partners, should explain broad resilience parameters and expectations of partners. DG ECHO partners are required to fill in the "Resilience Marker" in the e-Single Form. Four guiding questions are presented. For each of these questions, for example "does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses, and vulnerabilities," the technical annex should indicate expectations (i.e. what may be considered as adequate according to the situation).*

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 DG 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/Communication_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff\\_working\\_document\\_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](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:

○

T

he 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](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](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](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](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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/eu-aid-volunteers_en)

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/ss_consolidated_guidelines_final_version-20-02ev.pdf)

### 3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

Partners should submit together with the proposal an indicative medium to long term financial overview which estimates the resource needs over 3-5 years, i.e. beyond the ECHO funding period, as relevant. This should include a discussion of the options to cover these needs for example through cost recovery, contributions of participating partners or funding through other donors. The partners are free to choose the most appropriate format of this indicate overview.

In terms of inclusiveness, ECHO seeks to encourage initiatives which involve a broad range of actors engaged in humanitarian response – for example civil protection, the private sector, academia, scientific research, military, and key regional organisations. Relevant partnerships with private, research or public bodies is a particular priority for activities relating to digitalisation, new technologies and data sharing.

Open and effective knowledge sharing within and beyond the humanitarian sphere is considered primordial for their success. In order to ensure the maximum reach and uptake, material produced by the projects should be shared on recognized, existing platforms instead of creating new, project-driven internet presence. A concept to ensure ownership and accessibility of the material beyond the project duration should be elaborated. This includes options for future updates, if applicable.

Proposals including a training component should include monitoring system/logframe with indicators for participants' reaction, learning and behaviour change according to the Kirkpatrick model or similar. This includes baselines as well as systematic end of training and ex-post monitoring.

Projects will be subject to a monitoring mission by ECHO staff at least once and preferably, if applicable, in form of joint monitoring missions to field locations with headquarters representatives of the partner organizations. As a donor, ECHO might become observer in project advisory boards.