7.1 Indicative Decision Tree

Beyond the general entry criteria specified in the main text, the following annex provides further guidance on which types of S&S interventions may be considered for DG ECHO funding, and which conditions should be in place.

Option 1 considers short term responses to an acute crisis in support of a population recently displaced and/or on the move. For example, see case study 1 (EU Civil Protection assistance in response to the Nepal earthquake).

Option 2 considers fully-fledged S&S responses to ongoing humanitarian crises, either as stand-alone interventions or as a component of a multi-sector intervention. For examples of recent Commission-funded interventions, see case studies 2 (Linking relief with reconstruction and development in Haiti, page 9), 4 (People-centred supportive approach in the Philippines, page 16), 5 (Shelter support in urban settings of Lebanon), 6 (Financial assistance for shelter repairs in Gaza, page 25), 7 (Financial and technical assistance to typhoon-affected families in Vietnam, page 32), 9 (Innovative approaches to coordination and assessment in Somalia, page 36) and 10 (Promoting S&S innovation in the Caribbean region, page 38).

Option 3 considers disaster preparedness or disaster risk reduction actions of which S&S is a core component. For an example, see case study 8 (Saving lives through timely resettlement and temporary shelter solutions in exposed areas of Bolivia, page 33).

Option 4 considers a necessary but limited S&S intervention which is required to facilitate a primary (and possibly more critical) humanitarian action such as protection. See case study 3 (Shelter, settlements and the centrality of protection, page 14) for an example.

Finally, Option 5 considers institutional S&S capacity-building interventions, directly benefiting Commission humanitarian implementing partners. Examples of past interventions include supporting the Global Shelter Cluster to provide surge support to enhance coordination and/or assessments capacity at (sub) country level, pre-positioning of S&S items in strategic partners’ regional logistic hubs, and the development and testing of innovative shelter technologies and products.
Assuming that: a) an assessment has confirmed humanitarian S&S needs which are consistent with the objective of the applicable funding decision; b) addressing these needs is achievable through standard humanitarian and/or civil protection means and; c) the implementing partner(s) are equipped and competent to address these needs; and d) the proposal respect basic humanitarian principles, and then ask:

Does the proposal seek to directly address the S&S needs of the population at risk?  

If YES, go to option 2  

If NO, go to option 1

Does the proposal seek to build institutional S&S capacity with direct benefits for the Commission’s humanitarian implementing partners?  

If YES, go to option 3  

If NO, go to option 5

Is the (relevant S&S part of the) proposal a short-term response to an acute crisis in support of a population recently displaced and/or ‘on the move’?  

If YES, go to option 4  

If NO, do not fund

Does the proposal promote four or more of the following S&S approaches to which the Commission is committed?  

1. People-centred: recognising the resources, capacity, rights, choices and responsibilities of crisis-affected populations in addressing their S&S needs, and considering the S&S strengths and vulnerabilities of different profiles of the population.  
2. Balancing provision and support: promoting as quickly as possible actions that support beneficiaries to become self-dependent, and that decrease the need for prolonged provision of temporary S&S skills, services and materials.  
3. Incremental action: emphasising the need for a continuous S&S recovery process by supporting existing capacities, coping mechanisms, resources and markets, and promoting durable solutions based on locally available and affordable options.  
4. Risk-informed and environmentally friendly: making S&S more resilient and safer from hazards and risks by building shelter back better, and informing settling (back) better taking into account the surrounding environment.  
5. Settlement informed: addressing shelter and settlements holistically and tailoring the shelter response to the characteristics of the local settlement, such as adapting responses for urban settings.  
6. Multi-dimensional and integrated around the centrality of protection: considering all potential individual, collective and/or host shelter solutions and addressing not only sector-specific needs but also those linked to other basic services, and coordinating across sectors, actors and response phases.  
7. Displacement sensitive: promoting ‘transitional settlement’ for displaced populations, ‘transitional reconstruction or rehabilitation for directly affected non-displaced populations, while being sensitive to the needs of indirectly-affected or host populations.

If YES, go to option 5  

If NO, go to option 1

Is the (relevant S&S part of the) proposal a full S&S response to an ongoing crisis (as a stand-alone or a component of a multi sectoral intervention)?  

If YES, go to option 2  

If NO, go to option 3

Is the (relevant S&S part of the) proposal a pre-disaster intervention either as part of DRR or in preparedness to an anticipated crisis?  

If YES, go to option 3  

If NO, go to option 4

Is the (relevant S&S part of the) proposal a necessary but limited response allowing other humanitarian action to be implemented?  

If YES, go to option 4  

If NO, do not fund

95 - These principals are not exhaustive and may vary according to the context. Whilst some may not be achievable early in the response, the implementing partner is expected to continuously assess which ones can be realistically adapted as early as possible and take swift corrective action where appropriate.

96 - That is, promoting a majority (four or more) of these approaches.

97 - That is, promoting three or fewer of these approaches.
Option 1: A short-term response to an acute crisis in support of a population recently displaced\(^{98}\) and/or 'on the move'

**Sudden shock and acute needs**: Is there objective and substantiated evidence of a sudden loss of access to basic shelter and of grossly-inadequate S&S conditions or related goods and services, which fall below globally- or nationally-accepted humanitarian standards, as a direct result of the ongoing crisis, and where local coping capacity is insufficient?

- NO
- YES

**Imminent high mortality/morbidity risks**: Is (part of) the population at a high risk of succumbing to or seriously suffering from illnesses, injuries and/or abuses because of its direct exposure to the local environment, climate and/or protection threats?

- NO
- YES

**Outcome**: Taking these grave threats into account, does the proposal ensure timely access to safe shelter goods and services and secure settlement, particularly for the most vulnerable segment of the targeted population?

- NO
- YES

**Exit**: Given the limited capacity of humanitarian action to address S&S needs to consolidate the recovery in the sector, is there an acceptable short-term exit strategy that can be satisfactorily achieved, and which takes into account the potential, plans and comparative advantages of other relevant S&S stakeholders?

- NO
- YES

---

98 - For one month or less usually.
99 - For a maximum of three months usually.
Option 2: A fully-fledged S&S response to an ongoing humanitarian crisis, either as a stand-alone intervention or as a component of a multi-sectoral intervention

i) Conceived as a response to an acute or post-acute crisis (less than 12 months after disaster event).

Sudden shock and acute needs: Is there objective, substantiated evidence of a sudden loss of access to basic shelter and of grossly-inadequate S&S conditions or related goods and services, which fall below globally- or nationally-accepted humanitarian standards, as a direct result of the ongoing crisis, and where local coping capacity is insufficient to cope with the situation?

Outcome: Does the proposed intervention address these needs and ensure timely and secure access to shelter, related goods, services and settlements to the target population?

Exit: Given the limited capacity of S&S humanitarian action to consolidate the recovery in the sector, is there an acceptable short-term exit strategy that can be satisfactorily achieved and which takes into account the potential, objectives, strategies and comparative advantages of more permanent S&S stakeholders?

Displaced and returnees: Is the target population displaced or recently returned (less than 12 months) to its place of origin?

Deterioration of context: Have S&S conditions in the displaced settlement(s) deteriorated to the point of critically endangering the health and/or protection status of the displaced and/or severely affecting their dignity?

Recovery/Development gap: Is there a persistent lack of capacity or willingness of other donors/actors which prevents these needs from being addressed? Can this gap be realistically and temporarily bridged by a humanitarian action?\(^\text{100}\)

Outcome: Does the proposed action promote locally appropriate, durable and affordable access to shelter solutions, and effectively strengthen the resilience and self-reliance of the targeted population/authorities?

Scope: Is the proposed action limited to basic repairs and/or preventative maintenance of existing shelters and/or critical settlements infrastructure (i.e. access) at the local camp/community level, and/or to bring about new or additional shelter solutions due to a changing context (e.g. to cope with a population increase) in the same settlement(s)?

Exit: Is there a well-conceived short-term exit strategy which allows the outcome of the action to be achieved? Does that exit strategy contribute to the gradual disengagement strategy of humanitarian aid and engagement of key development/long-term actors? Is this action likely to raise awareness on the S&S needs of the population and raise commitment from other actors to intervene?

\(^\text{100}\) Where DG ECHO’s comparative advantages as a donor are clear and LRRD conditions are in place (see Case Study 2, p. 9).
Option 3: A disaster preparedness or a DRR action of which S&S is a core component

Vulnerability of population: Are (some) shelters and/or the related settlement infrastructure of the target community highly vulnerable to natural and/or man-made hazards?

YES

Participation of population: If the target population has not been displaced, is there evidence of its interest and willingness (including that of local authorities) to contribute actively to the proposed S&S action?

YES

Risk and impact of anticipated threat: Is the likelihood and impact of an anticipated threat on the local S&S infrastructures, assets and related goods and services very high? Is the expected destruction, damage or lack of access to basic shelter and settlements potentially life-threatening and/or cause for severe suffering for a large portion of that population?

NO -> Do not fund

YES

BSBB: Is there a sound strategy seeking to build the population’s resilience by introducing quality shelter solutions based on the principle of Building and Settling Back Better (BSBB), which is adapted according to the capacity, threats, risks and vulnerability of the context?

NO

YES

Outcome: Does the action intend to facilitate the achievement of longer-term (even if not necessarily permanent) S&S solutions in a reasonable timeframe (even if not providing these solutions in full)?

NO

YES

Exit strategy: Is there a viable exit strategy with clear and present potential for individual, community, civil society or institutional uptake, learning and replication?

NO

YES

Consider funding101

101 - In line with the corresponding funding decisions, where DG ECHO’s comparative advantages as a donor are clear, and where LRPO conditions are in place (see Case Study 2, p. 9).