

## THEMATIC POLICIES ANNEX

### GENERAL PRINCIPLES, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

This thematic policy annex to the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) outlines the general principles, policy framework, assistance modalities, cross-cutting issues as well as thematic guidelines that need to be taken into account by DG ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO.

Complementary information is available in the links provided below.

DG ECHO invites its partners to reflect the guidance provided in these documents in the preparation of their proposals.

-----

### PRINCIPLES

**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 the safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets are being considered, as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. There is growing concern about transfer of risks to local and national responders, particularly in remote management contexts. DG ECHO partners are encouraged to identify and mitigate risks, but also to provide specific reporting on how they have been addressed.

DG ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety and security of staff.

**Accountability:** local populations and beneficiaries are the main groups to whom DG ECHO should be accountable. 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:

- Identification of beneficiaries and needs through robust, comprehensive methods conducted in a coordinated manner with humanitarian partners ;
- Management and monitoring of operations, 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.

- Imperative consideration to minimise the environmental footprint of assistance.
- Consideration of risks and hazards, ensuring adequate protection for operations and vulnerable populations, to fully minimise risk and not increase vulnerability.
- All action should be "conflict sensitive" and be designed accordingly.

**Strengthened coordination:** Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms, through meetings but also through coordinated field assessments, technical groups and joint planning activities. Partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate it in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should share views on issues of common interest with other actors present in the field. Enhanced coordination offers the opportunity to reduce the fragmentation of humanitarian action by conducting joined up assessments across sectors (including market analysis), common targeting methods, registration, response analysis and monitoring and evaluation.

Effective coordination is essential. DG ECHO supports the **Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Transformative Agenda (ITA)** and expects its partners to demonstrate their engagement in implementing its objectives and to take an active part in coordination mechanisms (e.g. Humanitarian Country Team, clusters and technical working groups).

**Civil-military relations:** In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that guarantees the security and integrity of humanitarian actors and principles in all circumstance/at all time.

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

**Community-based approach:** In all assistance sectors, interventions should adopt, wherever possible, a community-based approach 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.

**Policy framework – 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 effectiveness and efficiency. While many of the commitments require further work on a global level, progress can already be achieved. In addition to the commitments covered by specific sections in this annex (e.g. 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 (including by making use of digital technology and innovation to be more cost-effective or providing clear, comparable cost structures) as well as contributing to joint and impartial needs assessments. In this context, partners should adopt a context-specific approach to joint needs assessments, demonstrating how they contributed to the exercise via data collection, data sharing and joint analysis.

**Local organisations and service providers** have an indispensable role in responding to humanitarian needs. In the majority of cases, DG ECHO funds are translated into services and assistance provided via local actors. DG ECHO will continue to ask for strategic partnerships of FPA/FAFA partners with local actors in line with the Grand Bargain commitments. Such partnership-based relationships go beyond project-based arrangements and support the organisational growth of the local organisations, enabling them to invest in core systems. Initiatives led by local actors with an international agency receiving funding and providing a specific type of expertise could be piloted to generate good practices in the areas of access to funding for local and national actors, effective partnerships, organisational sustainability and enhanced coordination capabilities while linking to broader policy and sectoral objectives.

**Digitalisation, Innovation and the private sector:** Digital approaches/solutions built up into the design and the proposed implementation of humanitarian actions will represent an asset when funding requests from partners are assessed. Innovation can play an important role in how effectively and efficiently humanitarian actors can respond to emergencies. Harnessing the technological innovation, technical skills and expertise of the private sector and academia is vital. 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.

**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 that includes contingencies and crisis modifiers for risks that may occur over the timeframe. These should include, exit scenarios, taking a LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) approach to build resilience, reduce risk and avoid re-occurrence.

## **PREFERRED ASSISTANCE MODALITIES**

**Cash transfers:** In line with the Grand Bargain commitments, DG ECHO will endeavour to increase the use of cash transfers, when appropriate, in the interests of the beneficiaries and for cost-efficiency and effectiveness gains. Cash transfers provide affected populations with choice and more control over their own lives. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons behind the choice of a specific transfer modality through a robust response analysis (see section below). Partners are encouraged to consider first using multipurpose cash transfers (unrestricted cash transfers used by beneficiaries to meet their basic needs). Unless duly justified by operational concerns, DG ECHO will support cash delivery systems based on an interoperable registry of eligible beneficiaries, regularly verified and updated.

DG ECHO's Cash Guidance note applies for cash transfers of approximately EUR 10 million and above. As far as possible, support functions (including needs assessment, targeting, beneficiary registration) should be separated from actual transfers in order to enhance efficiency, transparency and accountability.

For the delivery of smaller-scale cash transfers (less than EUR 10 million), DG ECHO encourages the application of the Guidance note's principles of coordination,

harmonisation and multi-partner approach, particularly where this gives greater operational flexibility with an appropriate distribution of tasks according to mandate.

[https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/guidance\\_note\\_cash\\_23\\_11\\_2017.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/guidance_note_cash_23_11_2017.pdf)

**Integrated programming** or integrated multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas is encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness whenever possible. This can be done using joint and multi-sector assessments and identification of causes/problems/risks and effective/combined solutions. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

**Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers** is mandatory. 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. Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) first where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers. In such approaches, the value of transfer should be based upon a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), while taking into account the contribution made by households, and available resources. In addition to in-kind assistance, vouchers and cash, the provision of specialised expertise and technical support is a key support modality. This is particularly true for WASH as well as for shelter and settlements interventions. For in-kind transfers local purchases are encouraged when possible.

### **Remote Management**

[http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions\\_implementation/remote\\_management/start](http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start)

## **SPECIFIC SECTOR POLICIES**

### **Food Assistance**

DG ECHO aid in the food sector reached on average 16-17 million people per year. The absolute number of amounts spent in the food security and livelihoods sector has increased between 2012 and 2016 (by 35%, from 398.5 million in 2012 to 538.2 million in 2016). About one third of the EU annual humanitarian aid budget is used to provide food assistance, making the EU one of the world's major donors in this sector.

The EU food assistance is adapted to each specific crisis situation, including the choice of the most appropriate delivery modality, be it cash, voucher or essential food items during critical times, or livelihoods protection activities, in full respect of the do no harm principle. There has been an increasing use of the cash and vouchers approach in food assistance programming.

DG ECHO is fully committed to providing humanitarian food assistance to victims of food crises around the world and is investing massively in the response to the countries facing risk of famine (Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen) in an integrated approach.

All suggested interventions should be in compliance with DG ECHO Thematic Policy Document on food assistance:

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

## **Nutrition**

Through its engagement in nutrition in emergencies, DG ECHO has been a major contributor to the treatment and prevention of acute undernutrition. This engagement has been formalized through a Nutrition policy in 2013, a staff working document of the European Commission in 2014, and translated in an increased funds allocation dedicated to specific nutrition programmes, that has reached EUR 132 million in 2017. DG ECHO also keeps a crucial role in the progress of the sector, by supporting coordination of nutrition in emergencies and the development as well as the wide use of tools (standardised survey methodologies, nutrition causal analysis, coverage surveys) and innovative approaches to inform improved programming, always with the same objective in mind: make nutrition programming more effective and more accessible to the ones in need.

This is in this regard and in the light of recent findings that the use of the continuum of care between Severe and Moderate Acute Malnutrition is being promoted by DG ECHO. This is consistent with our determination to question the current divide in acute under-nutrition and propose alternative ways to efficiently address cases affected by acute under-nutrition in the current context of increased needs and limited funding.

All suggested interventions should be in compliance with DG ECHO Thematic Policy Document on 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)

DG ECHO promotes Infant and Young Child Feeding Practices (IYCF) activities as best practices on prevention of under-nutrition. DG ECHO's policy in this regard is outlined in the following document:

*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**

Providing around EUR 200 million for humanitarian health programmes per year, accounting for 20% to 30% of global humanitarian health funding, DG ECHO is committed to providing needs-based, high-quality and context-specific health services to people affected by humanitarian crises. As health outcomes depend on multiple sector interventions, particularly WASH, nutrition, food security and shelter, multi-sectorial integrated approaches are encouraged. Looking to further improving humanitarian responses, DG ECHO puts emphasis on innovation and research, resilience, disaster risk reduction and preparedness as well as on local capacity building. All suggested interventions should be in compliance with DG ECHO Thematic Policy Document on health:

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

## **Water sanitation and hygiene**

As one of the largest donors in humanitarian Water and Sanitation, Hygiene (WASH), DG ECHO has contributed significantly to improving access to water, sanitation and hygiene services for people affected by humanitarian crises. As part of its approach, based on the close links of WASH services with other sectors (such as in health, nutrition, food assistance, protection or shelter), DG ECHO highly encourages integrated programming as the inclusion of WASH-related services in other sector interventions can increase the impact and effectiveness of these interventions. Given the technical aspects of WASH assistance, technical support and expertise constitute vital components of DG ECHO's assistance. All suggested interventions should be in compliance with DG ECHO Thematic Policy Document on WASH:

[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)

## **Shelter and Settlements**

DG ECHO's approach to shelter and settlement acknowledges the increased needs for humanitarian shelter and settlement interventions and their importance for efficient and effective post-disaster responses and anticipatory actions. Given the strong links with other sectors, shelter and settlement interventions go beyond providing shelter and are also of central importance to providing protection, strengthening health and re-establishing livelihoods. Promoting a people-centred and supportive approach, a key component of DG ECHO's approach encompasses the provision of technical support and expertise. Building on best practice, DG ECHO published a set of Humanitarian Shelter and Settlements guidelines in 2017 and all suggested interventions should be in compliance with this Thematic Policy Document:

[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)

## **Preparedness for Response and Early Action**

As part of DG ECHO's commitment to protect operations from risks, to mainstream disaster preparedness in EU-funded humanitarian operations, and to contribute (to the extent possible) to building resilience, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to the range of hazards and threats affecting people at the village/community level (natural hazards, economic or 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 all 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 risk assessments and 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.

The resilience marker incorporates the considerations and questions required to optimise context specific opportunities to do no harm, for risk informed operations and contribution to longer term resilience, nexus and LRRD strategies whilst maintaining humanitarian principles.

[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)

For targeted DP interventions (those actions that cannot be integrated into a humanitarian response), 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 basic service and assistance delivery and increased protection for vulnerable populations (e.g. social safety net schemes), 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 contexts, the development of national and local competencies for early action and locally owned Rapid/Emergency Response Mechanisms (ERMs) 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)**

The objective of EiE actions is to promote access to safe, inclusive and quality learning opportunities by responding to multiple barriers (e.g. academic, language-related, financial, social, institutional, physical/infrastructural) children face in crises. 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. DG ECHO EiE actions work towards three outcomes in line with the *INEE Minimum Standards*<sup>1</sup>:

- **Outcome 1:** Children<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) (2010): Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery.

<sup>2</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

- **Outcome 3:** Education services are strengthened through preparedness, response and recovery interventions

EiE actions will focus on non-formal and formal education in the context of primary and secondary levels of education, with a specific focus on out-of-school, forcibly displaced children and vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, in particular girls and adolescents. Actions to protect education from attacks, integrate education into rapid response mechanisms, and provide pathways (back) into formal education will be prioritised. Tailored support to teachers will be supported. Child protection must be considered as both a core component and key outcome of EiE response, and child safe-guarding mechanisms must be established. All EiE actions are expected to equip children with life-saving and life-sustaining skills and be designed and implemented according to the principles of conflict sensitive education (CSE) and reflect relevant legal frameworks for protection. Beyond protection, EiE actions will promote an integrated approach with relevant sectors to ensure holistic responses to children's needs.

In order to promote coordination, harmonization and effective prioritization within the EiE response, partners implementing EiE actions are expected to participate in, and contribute to, national and/or sub-national sector coordination activities.

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. Communication on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises \(COM\(2018\) 304 final\)](#)

DG ECHO Operational Guidance on Education in Emergencies (forthcoming)

### **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. It ensures that humanitarian projects reach the most vulnerable, respond adequately to their specific needs and do no harm. 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 accordingly.

To this end, all project proposals/reports must demonstrate the **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.

The European Commission's **gender policy 'Gender in Humanitarian Aid: Different Needs, Adapted Assistance'**, of July 2013, for more information:

[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 aimed at *assessing* how strongly DG ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. The marker consists of four criteria and is *applied throughout the action management* cycle namely at proposal, monitoring and final report stage. The four criteria of the Gender-Age Marker include: 1) gender and age analysis/sex and age disaggregated data (SADD); 2) assistance adapted to the specific needs and capacities of different gender and age groups; 3) prevention and mitigation of negative effects; and 4) adequate participation. Depending on how many criteria are met, a general mark is determined, ranging from '0' (meaning that 'the action barely incorporates gender and age') to '2' (meaning that 'the action strongly incorporates gender and age').

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)

### **Sexual- and Gender-Based Violence**

All humanitarian interventions funded by DG ECHO must take into consideration, together with other protection concerns (see *protection* paragraph), any risk of **sexual- and gender-based violence (SGBV)** and should develop and implement appropriate strategies to actively prevent such risks.

Moreover, in line with its life-saving mandate, DG ECHO urges the establishment of quality, comprehensive and safe **SGBV response services** since the onset of emergencies. In line with the multi-sectorial approach, response should include medical care, psychological support, referral to legal services and, if possible, livelihood support or socio-economic assistance. In relation to safety concerns, concrete actions to ensure survivors' physical safety should also be identified.

Services should be accessible to all survivors, in line with the principle of non-discrimination, and efforts made to provide support to secondary victims who have witnessed or been forced to perpetrate violence. All programs focusing on GBV response should be designed and implemented in a way that ensures that survivors' wishes safety and dignity remain at the centre of the response. SGBV prevention and response programs should be built upon a solid knowledge of the context of intervention and respect of ethical and safety considerations regarding the collection, storage and sharing of data must be demonstrated. Moreover, sensitisation and awareness-raising strategies must be pursued to enhance knowledge of SGBV cause and consequences as well as available service provision, with the ultimate aim to enhance help-seeking behaviors, and to fight stigma against victims of rape. Further details are available in DG ECHO's 2013 Gender policy.

### **Protection**

All programme design and targeting should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population using if possible the risk equation

model as a tool for this analysis.<sup>3</sup> The analysis should bring out external and internal threats, as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract these 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. Protection should be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement-hosting context, in conflict, when social exclusion is a known factor, and where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance.

An **integrated protection programming approach** is highly encouraged. 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>4</sup>

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 and is a key for “safe programming”. This implies prioritising safety and dignity, avoiding causing harm, and ensuring meaningful access, accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these four principles in all their substantive sections.

Targeting of humanitarian assistance should take 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.

[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)

## **Disability-inclusion**

---

<sup>3</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>4</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).

Disability-inclusion: In line with the CRPD and 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. Partners must demonstrate how they plan to identify, remove, reduce and mitigate barriers preventing meaningful access to and full and effective participation of people with disabilities in humanitarian assistance and protection programming. Linked to the above guidance on protection, it is recommended to actively use the four aspects of protection mainstreaming to address the barriers and strengthen enablers/capacities to overcome these.

## **Resilience/Humanitarian-Development Nexus**

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. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, DG ECHO's 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. Humanitarian action will be more effective by better understanding needs, risks and opportunities and seeking complementarities with development actors and peace-building promoters when relevant. It is also highly recommended that response analysis also include a conflict sensitivity lens.

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. DG ECHO's 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. The resilience marker incorporates these considerations, to ensure that resilience-building opportunities are used to the greatest extent possible, without compromising the humanitarian principles.

Good coordination and, where possible, strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities are essential to a resilience or humanitarian-development Nexus approach, particularly in relation to the increasing interest of development partners and governments to take early action in predictable and protracted crises.

Preparedness for response and early action, as described above, is an important element of DG ECHO's contribution to resilience/humanitarian-development Nexus/Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) programming.

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, DG DEVCO, DG 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's 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 of multi-purpose cash transfers for 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 the humanitarian principles, DG ECHO's 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/en/what/humanitarian-aid/resilience>

[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**

DG ECHO's approach to resilience, and the intent of its Resilience Marker, is to ensure that resilience-building opportunities are used to the greatest extent possible, without compromising the humanitarian principles. Four steps are key:

- 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 attention to and inclusion of resilience considerations in project proposals, implementation and assessment. The marker is used for all DG ECHO's projects – apart from those that may be deemed "Non-applicable" because of the urgency of the crisis, 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)

### **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)

### **DG ECHO Visibility**

Partners will ensure full compliance with **visibility** requirements and acknowledge the funding role of and partnership with the EU/DG ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

- The communication and visibility provisions of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organisations or international organisations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.
- Specific visibility requirements agreed upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:
  - Section 9.1.A, standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU-funded relief items and equipment; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed upon in the individual agreements.
  - Section 9.1.B, standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.
  - Section 9.2., above standard visibility: applicable if requested and if agreed with DG ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

For standard visibility activities, partners may, in principle, allocate a budget of up to 0.5% of the direct eligible costs of the action with a ceiling of EUR 8 000. However, for individual agreements equal or above EUR 5 million no absolute ceiling applies. Hence, in such cases, the standard visibility budget may go up to 0.5%, even when this amount exceeds EUR 8 000. In the latter case, partners must provide an overview of planned visibility activities and a budget breakdown.

Further explanation of visibility requirements and reporting as well as best practices and examples can be consulted on the dedicated DG ECHO visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>