



**European Commission  
DIRECTORATE GENERAL HUMANITARIAN AID  
AND CIVIL PROTECTION  
ECHO**

**Annex 1 to Humanitarian Implementation Plan Caribbean / DIPECHO  
ECHO/DIP/BUD/2011/92000 and to the global decision *ECHO/DIP/BUD/2011/01000*.**

Operational Recommendations  
for DG ECHO partners wishing to submit proposals for the

**The 2011-2012 DIPECHO ACTION PLAN FOR THE CARIBBEAN**

Anguilla (OCT), Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba (OCT), Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cayman Islands (OCT), Cuba, Curacao (OCT), Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat (OCT), Saint Lucia, Saint Marteen (OCT), Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands (OCT), British Virgin Islands (OCT).

**Deadline for submitting proposals: 15 April 2011**

For information regarding the Country Document of the Dominican Republic and the Report of the DIPECHO VII Regional Meeting, please contact the ECHO Field Office for the Caribbean at [Santo-domingo@echocaribbean.eu](mailto:Santo-domingo@echocaribbean.eu)

## Table of contents

<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	
1.1. Programming Imperatives	4
1.2. General Recommendations	6
1.3. Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors	7
1.4. Recommendations in terms of contributions for the Region.	8
<b>2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. TENTATIVE CALENDAR FOR THE ACTION PLAN</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>ANNEX 1. SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL TO DG ECHO</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: USEFUL LINKS FOR APPLICANTS</b>	<b>15</b>

## **Background**

This document has been prepared to complement the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) with specific recommendations and rules to be followed by the applicants to the DIPECHO Action Plan in the Caribbean.

These recommendations reflect the outcomes of the regional event “ Exchange of experiences for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean “ held on February 2011 , which included presentations from partners , experts, national emergency management organizations other stakeholders in the region and outcomes from national consultative meeting and Country Document.

Previous experience and lessons learned, current perspectives of EU co-operation in the field of Disaster Risk Reduction and evaluation of remaining needs in the field of Disaster Preparedness in the region have also been taken into account in setting the priorities for the 2011-2012 DIPECHO Action Plan in terms of risk areas and objectives, taking into account the specific humanitarian mandate established by the Humanitarian Aid Regulation, that focuses on preparedness activities, and DG ECHO 2010 operational strategy in this field.

The forthcoming Action Plan also takes account of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters and reconfirms the commitment to regional initiatives to contribute to make schools and hospitals safer and cities resilient in disaster prone areas.

*Links to all relevant documents and tools developed to help in the application process can be found at the end of these guidelines.*

# 1. OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

## 1.1. Operational imperatives

A series of programme planning and implementation priorities **must be considered by all projects** submitted under the 2011-2012 DIPECHO Action Plan for the Caribbean to be considered eligible for funding.

### Principles

1. The DIPECHO Programme contributes to the implementation of the ***Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA)***. This is the reason why all proposed disaster preparedness actions should look at supporting the ongoing implementation measures of the HFA in the region.
2. A key element in DIPECHO is the development of ***Key contributions in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) so as to identify successful models for replication*** elsewhere by national/sub-national authorities or other funding instruments of the European Commission, other donors. This approach should remain at the centre of any DIPECHO intervention.
3. The ***starting point for the intervention logic of any DIPECHO supported project must be the hazard itself***, and not a problem that is essentially structural in nature, de-linked from a disaster event. This entails a ***thorough analysis of the natural disaster context*** (at the appropriate scale) that generates the following:
  - A typology of hazards in evidence,
  - the determination of the range of negative consequences of these hazards (some of which can be termed disasters),
  - an analysis of these negative consequences and a prioritisation of those considered most important by the population(s) at risk,
  - a breakdown of the needs ensuing from these hazards and the identification (prioritisation) of those which can most appropriately be addressed by DIPECHO. (The breakdown can be structured as follow State, Impact, Pressure, Response capacities to hazards).
4. The ***partner must demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy at the time of proposal submission*** that will ***ultimately conclude with phase-out and or handover***, either to the target community/institution, the appropriate authorities, or an appropriate longer-term funding instrument, such that ***sustainability and replicability*** of actions undertaken is maximised. In this sense plans proposed by the stakeholders to whom the project will be handed are welcomed (eg inclusion of DRR allocation in municipal budget).
5. The strategic dialogue that results in the conception and design of DIPECHO funded DP projects will have to ***successfully merge technical-scientific knowledge with local knowledge*** in a socio-culturally appropriate manner, thereby assuring an acceptable, effective system that capitalises knowledge and capacities and consequently maximises ownership and access to proper information.
6. As per DG ECHO's priorities, an active effort to ensure ***involvement of women, children, the elderly, ethnic minorities, vulnerable groups such as disabled*** is strongly encouraged.

### Complementarity and coordination

7. Many countries have developed ***National Disaster Management Legislation, Policies and Plans*** to which preparedness and mitigation (and prevention) strategies contribute. All

- proposed actions should be aligned with them and should contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at the appropriate sub-national and local levels.
8. ***In the same sense***, all submitted projects must be developed with ***cognisance of*** and ideally contribute to the strategic objective of ***all ongoing and planned instruments of donor cooperation*** in the third country, including DG ECHO or other EU initiatives, where relevant.
  9. In recognition of the complementary nature of DP programming and its contribution to protecting cumulative development gains accrued thus far, all community-based DIPECHO strategies are to be preferably ***developed within the context of an ongoing, established development strategy*** with the target community. In fact, DIPECHO support should not be ***seen as a start-up fund*** whenever possible.
  10. Applicants should provide details of the ***coordination mechanisms*** existing both ***at local, sub-national and national levels*** taking into account linkages with other ongoing initiatives.

#### *Involvement of supranational, national and local institutions*

11. A key interface in the development of DP strategies is the ***National Disaster Management institutions***, which in many countries are responsible for the articulation of a national risk reduction policy. However, this does not preclude a ***multi-ministerial*** planning/programming dialogue.
12. The implementation of a successful DP strategy is dependent upon the sustained investment of all stakeholders at multiple levels before, during and upon completion of the project cycle. This entails as complete an involvement of communities and relevant authorities as is feasible throughout the entire project cycle, from problem/hazard/risk identification, to project conception and design. Likewise, ***relevant public entities, officials and stakeholders at the appropriate levels must be consulted and involved at all stages*** of the action (design, preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, follow-up and hand-over where feasible) to ensure sustainability and replicability.

#### *Miscellaneous*

13. It is imperative that strategies ***encompass low cost solutions and technical assistance designs*** that accurately reflect the degree of sustained budgetary commitment that can ***realistically*** be expected from national, sub-national and/or local budgets.
14. Applicants must systematically consider the ***capitalisation of experiences*** and their dissemination in widely and appropriate manner. These activities should be explicitly envisaged under the activities and in the work plan of each proposal.
15. Small-scale mitigation works and infrastructure are to remain ***complementary*** (both in terms of contingency plan priority and resource allocation). Proposals that seek merely to address structural issues, for example, of food insecurity or inadequate delivery of basic services, ***will not be considered eligible***. Actions of this type will need to clearly demonstrate logic within the development of a DRR strategy that is both complementary and enhances sustainability.
16. ***Climate change adaptation*** cannot be the sole focus of a specific and ad hoc DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate it in risk analysis when relevant and look at links between DRR activities and institutions in charge of the monitoring climate change (CC).
17. Partners should integrate in proposals and budgets their participation in joint activities with other DRR stakeholders and DIPECHO partners (e.g. Disaster Reduction Day, consultative processes, regional and national DIPECHO meetings, participation in DRR fora, etc.) from the beginning of the Action Plan. Considering the demonstrative value of DIPECHO projects, DG ECHO promotes the presentation of DIPECHO experiences in other DRR

fora in order to maximise the dissemination of experiences and consequently to scale up the results

18. Baseline surveys at the beginning and at the end of the project at community and institutional level should be carried out in order to measure achievements of the project (e.g. KAP surveys).

## 1.2. General Recommendations

The following are non sector recommendations for the applicants and not conditions that have to be necessarily fulfilled.

1. Collaborative strategic formulation and planning between potential DIPECHO partners that promote joint projects (consortia) or joint initiatives implemented through several projects, as well as consortia or multi country operations are strongly encouraged.
2. Foreseeable administrative, logistic and operational constraints as well as the ones linked to change of authorities involved in the project or time needed for institutional agreements should be integrated in the proposal timeframe, being realistic and not over ambitious in the formulation.
3. Applicants should consider one or more of the proposed sub-sectors, based on their experience, mandates and specialisation.
4. Partners are encouraged to consider Sphere minimum standards, indicators and guidance notes so as to ensure the quality of the DRR actions proposed.
5. Synergy with supranational and global DRR strategies such as the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) is encouraged mainly in the case of regional projects. In this sense, proposals including activities contributing to the ISDR campaigns (Resilient Cities, Safe Hospitals and Schools) will be welcomed.
6. Priority to institutional linkages and advocacy: the small scale and pilot actions at community level will reach a maximum effectiveness if the outputs and outcomes feed the development and implementation of DRR policies and strategies. Priority should be given to this aspect; to create a link between the findings of community-based operations and existing development policies and strategies. Consortia of different partners or projects oriented to work on this specific aspect are welcome.
7. Recognising that many of the project main objectives can only be achieved over the long term, DIPECHO can also consider proposals for DRR strategies that are multi-phased in nature base on case by case analysis (i.e. entail a series of phases financed over  $\geq 1$  Action Plan)<sup>1</sup>.
8. The management, dissemination and use of existing DRR material and tools developed under previous DIPECHO Action Plans or other DRR programmes is prioritised. Development of new documents should be limited to the cases when there are no similar tools or when no experiences have been already systematised. Otherwise, capitalisation does not mean reporting on the successes and failures of a project, but should be focused on the lessons learnt or methodologies used that can provide new elements for replication.
9. It is recommended to start preparatory activities such as preparation of strategic alliances, agreements with institutions and partners, recruitment, terms of reference, etc. once the project has been recommended for approval in order to gain implementation time. In this sense, the eligibility date can be fixed before the start date of implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although willing to accept 18 months proposals that comprise a component part of a multi-phased strategy of engagement, DIPECHO financing is subject to the same financial regulations that govern DG ECHO funding. Consequently, DIPECHO can offer no guarantee that funding will be made available for subsequent phases of the strategy.

10. Regional projects should be defined taking into consideration existing regional or global initiatives and involving national stakeholders in the definition and formulation of the operations.
11. Integration of technical and scientific institutions as well as Universities in projects' activities is encouraged.

### **1.3. Priorities in terms of geographical areas, hazards and sectors.**

The Caribbean region regularly experiences natural disasters, particularly the hurricane season that lasts for six months (i.e. from June to November), with tropical storms often taking the form of a hurricane. The region is also prone to floods, flash floods, tsunamis, landslides and mudslides. Some islands experience earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. The physical risk is combined with socioeconomic factors, such as high population density, fast demographic growth, inequality and great poverty; it is the combination of these factors which affect vulnerable communities with limited coping capacity in the event of a disaster.

Four thematic considerations will be prioritized:

1. Floods and hurricanes (All region)
2. Exposure to natural hazards of densely populated urban areas with vulnerable communities (Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Jamaica)
3. Earthquakes & Tsunamis (Dominican Republic, Cuba, Jamaica & Haiti)
4. Drought (Haiti, Eastern Caribbean & Cuba)

Key specific Messages from work group exercises. (the 5 main sub-sectors are detailed in the HIP)

Maps and DRR:

- Promote within projects, "human scale" mapping (at least 1:5000).
- Avoid confusing the technical tool with the technical scientific approach.
- Encourage communities' hazards mapping to lead national priorities. Use the bottom-up approach.

Communications and DRR

- DRR communication strategies should not be based solely on Projects. Existing DRR communication strategies should be analysed in order to identify gaps
- Messages and ways to communicate need to be driven from communities. Homogeneous key messages to avoid confusion.
- In order to address a wider society, the awareness campaigns could utilise a wider or multi sector approach and not be based solely on the disaster and disaster risk reduction
- Need to move away from the concept of "disaster" and integrate DRR in development approach where prevention / mitigation practices contribute to resilience .

Lessons from 2010 Emergencies

- Set up a national network with effective communication and accurate vulnerable zone mapping
- Early Warning Systems to be strengthened
- Inclusions of stakeholders ( NGOs, Donors) in a cluster System.
- Train, aware and educate institutions, governments, NGOs and communities.
- Enhance leadership of National DRR Authorities.
- More multidisciplinary rapid response teams
- Improve the capacities and communication at sub-regional level.
- Inclusion of assessment teams for DRR and environmental protection in the Response Teams.

#### Indicators and DRR

- Indicator training for the Caribbean
- 1 or 2 common indicators for all projects and guidelines for measuring them

### **1.4 Recommendations in terms of contributions for the Region.**

These contributions should not be necessarily implemented by regional projects, all projects can take into account the following points and should highlight when appropriate, the project components that potentially can contribute to these regional needs and recommendations.

**Regional components** will also include networking, information management, training, communication and awareness raising as well as compilation and dissemination of lessons learned, and harmonisation of approaches.

**The following DRR Recommendation has been presented by CDEMA** (Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency) during the DIPECHO Regional seminar.

#### **Information management and exchange**

- Increase the level information sharing and cooperation on CBDM strategies and methodologies by participants in the region.
- Promote the use of regionally developed and culturally appropriate CBDM training materials – standards
- Promote cooperation and collaboration between civil society actors and their National Government agencies active in CBDM

#### **Risk Mapping.**

- Develop and pilot a method for mapping hazards and targeting vulnerable communities which includes a set of core indicators for determining communities in greatest need of CBDM intervention
- Conduct participatory, community hazard/risk assessments to provide a comprehensive picture of major hazards, as well as community vulnerabilities and capacities

#### **Public awareness and preparation**

- Promote the implementation of community disaster preparedness programs using regionally proven tools and methodologies to minimize the effects of hazards and increase community resilience.
- Develop training materials in disaster risk reduction for communities and individual households.
- Raise awareness amongst planners, policy makers and practitioners about CBDM and risk reduction through the documentation and dissemination of CBDM projects.
- Develop public awareness material and media campaigns to sensitize the public about community and household mitigation and preparedness measures

#### **Monitoring and evaluating**

- Capacity Building at all levels as an important cross-cutting theme.
- Develop and utilize regionally agreed upon indicators to measure progress towards achieving CDM outcomes.
- Conduct evaluations of CBDM projects to determine when communities have increased their capacity to mitigate risks and respond to disasters.



## 2. MAIN SELECTION CRITERIA

### 1. Relevance

- 1.1 How relevant is the proposal to the **objectives** and one or more of the **priorities** of the call for proposals.
- 1.2 How relevant to the particular **needs and constraints** of the target populations and country/countries or region(s) is the proposal.
- 1.3 Has the proposal been **discussed** and agreed with the local authorities responsible for risk management?
- 1.4 Is this project proposal part of the applicant's **strategy** in the country and does it contribute to an ongoing **strategy** of engagement in the target area?
- 1.5 Does the project target the **most vulnerable populations** and regions?
- 1.6 Does the action fit within the established **DRR legal, policy and planning frameworks** and contribute to their implementation and consolidation, in particular at local level? Does the proposal refer to the **HFA**, its priorities and if possible its core indicators? Does the project take into account: **gender, children, elderly people, environmental, cultural issues and disabilities**.
- 1.7 Does the project take into account (when relevant) the **security** and/or **access context**? What are the contingency plans?

### 2. Methodology

- 2.1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (intermediaries, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)? Have the **needs** of the **target groups** proposed and the final beneficiaries been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? To what degree have the target beneficiaries been involved in project conception, design and development, from the moment of problem identification?  
Are the **target groups' and final beneficiaries' level of involvement and participation in the operation** satisfactory.
- 2.2. How coherent is the overall design of the operation (**logical framework**)? Are the **activities** proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the local constraints, the objectives and expected results? Is the **Action Plan** clear and feasible? Are the technical **human resources** allocated to the operation adequate? Is the presence of **experienced** coordinator and administrative staff ensured in order to provide with a proper follow-up of the action?
- 2.3. Does the proposal contain **objectively verifiable indicators** for the outcome of the operation?

### 3. Sustainability

- 3.1 Are the expected results of the proposed operation **sustainable**: Financially, Institutionally, Locally and at policy level. Is the operation likely to have a tangible **impact** on its target groups. Is the proposal likely to have **multiplier effects**?

### 4. Budget and cost-effectiveness

- 4.1. Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?
- 4.2. Is the proposed expenditure **necessary** for the implementation of the operation?
- 4.3. Are **material** resources and **services needed properly described**?
- 4.4. Are Means and Costs related to results and activities sufficiently explained?

## 3. FINANCIAL QUESTIONS

- There is no specific pre-allocation per country. However, some general orientations will be taken into consideration when approving an action in each country (see above in point 4 and information sessions) to ensure the achievement of DG ECHO's strategic priorities both at country and regional levels.

- As a general policy priority will be given to co-financed projects, in order to maintain the perspective of contributing to a strategy elaborated by a partner. DG **ECHO's contribution will not exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the action**. It is expected that the balance of at least 15% of the total eligible costs will be financed from the partners' own resources, or from sources other than the European Community budget. This priority will be applied in the overall appraisal of submitted proposals.
- The proposal, both in the narrative and financial documents, should reflect the full amount proposed (ie the co-financing and the contribution requested to DG ECHO, without separate earmarking).
- ECHO does not advise carrying out internal audits in the framework of DIPECHO projects.

#### **4. CALENDAR OF THE ACTION PLAN**

- 15 November 2010: Partners meeting in Brussels for the official announcement the VIII Action Plan for the Caribbean
- 1 January 2011 Starting date of the Global DIPECHO Funding Decision
- 13 January 2011 publication of HIP
- 15 March publication operational recommendations
- 15 April 2011: Deadline for submitting proposals.
- April-May 2011: Selection of proposals.
- 15 May 2011: Tentative start date for projects
- 12 October 2011: International Disaster Risk Reduction Day
- 31 December 2012: End date of the DIPECHO Global Funding Decision.

## **Annex 1: Submitting a proposal to DG ECHO.**

To allow a swift processing of project proposals, the following recommendations should be taken into account when designing and submitting a project.

In non emergency situation and to avoid a gap between the eligibility date of the activities and the signature of the grant agreement, partners should expect a period no less than 45 days between the initial discussions and their finalization, to allow sufficient time for the field discussion and review and HQ appraisal process.

Proposals should be submitted using the Single Form at the latest **15 April 2011**. Proposed starting date of the projects is **15 May 2011 to 01 July**.

The Single Forms must be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL with copy to [Bernard.Boigelot@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Bernard.Boigelot@ec.europa.eu) (Desk Officer **for the Caribbean**) to [Eduardo.FERNANDEZ-ZINCKE@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Eduardo.FERNANDEZ-ZINCKE@ec.europa.eu) (Team Leader Latin America and Caribbean Desk Officer Colombia, **Cuba**), and to [Santo-domingo@echocaribbean.eu](mailto:Santo-domingo@echocaribbean.eu) (ECHO Field Office for the Caribbean) and for Haitians submissions to [Anne-Francoise.Moffroid@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Anne-Francoise.Moffroid@ec.europa.eu) (Desk Officer **for HAITI**) and to [daniel.urena@echohaiti.eu](mailto:daniel.urena@echohaiti.eu) . (ECHO field office for Haiti)

All partners are requested to read and make use of the **DG ECHO Single Form guidelines**, available at [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm).

In the context of DG ECHO's mandate, the actions supported will have a **short-term nature (up to 18 months implementation period)**. For this reason DG ECHO partners should design their actions in order to ensure that the proposed objective can be **achieved** and **measured** by "SMART" indicators in this timeframe.

The **logframe and the intervention logic** (section 4.3.2 of the Single Form) are of upmost importance in the appraisal of project proposals. DG ECHO partners are then requested to pay careful attention to **DG ECHO guidelines on the Single Form**, p 10 to 15.

Linked to their presentation, DG ECHO partners are strongly encouraged to define already clearly at proposal stage which **contingency measures/activities** are foreseen in case of materialisation of a pre-identified risk. DG ECHO partners should define at proposal stage the circumstances in which contingency measures would be implemented (which data would be used to launch the contingency measures); and what would be the actions planned under these circumstances (see section #8.1 of the Single Form).

The **costs** of the project submitted to DG ECHO are presented in the Single Form in:

- The description of the results
- The section 4.2.3.4 of the Single Form (table "Other costs).
- The section 11 of the Single Form (Financial Overview)

It is important to recall that:

Sufficient information has to be provided in the description of the results (description of activities and related means) so that the costs allocated to the result can be understood. All costs related to a particular result have to be included (ie. logistics, monitoring, supervision, etc..)

The table "**Other Costs**" under section 4.2.3.4 of the Single Form should only include costs that cannot be allocated to or dispatched between the results. Ex: visibility, office costs in the capital, evaluation etc...

The financial overview will comprise annex II to the grant agreement. However, its design regarding the selection of headings to the different lines of the table is left to the choice of the partners as long as:

- The same table is used throughout the project (proposal and reporting stages)
- DG ECHO can identify clearly what is being spent in terms of personnel costs and visibility.

DG ECHO partners are strongly encouraged to include the required technical expertise in each of the sectors concerned and DG ECHO will pay particular attention to this aspect regarding the feasibility of the proposed operation.

As a general policy, DG ECHO gives **priority to co-financing**, compared to 100% financing. This priority will be applied in the overall appraisal of the proposals submitted to DG ECHO in the framework of this funding decision. In order to maintain DG ECHO's perspective of contributing to a strategy elaborated by a partner, the co-financing expected from the partner should be at least 15% of the total costs of the operation.

Proposals should include provisions for actions aiming at **documenting, disseminating and replicating lessons learned and good practices; as well as integrating them** in strategies beyond the project perspective, at country and regional levels. This implies participating to and/or supporting the organisation of *ad hoc* events or processes within the implementation period of the projects.

## Annex 2: Communication and visibility

The Single Form contains three sections to develop the communication and visibility plan of a DG ECHO funded project. It is recalled that under Article 6.1 of the General Conditions, “The humanitarian organization shall contribute to the visibility of the humanitarian operations financed by the European Community, provided that this does not harm the organization's mandate or the safety of its staff.”

The need for effective communication is also linked to a number of specific factors:

- ⇒ *The obligation to be transparent.* DG ECHO manages public funds and has a duty to inform EU citizens about how the money is spent. Few EU citizens are aware that the Commission is one of the world’s largest humanitarian donors.
- ⇒ *“Getting closer to the citizen”.* This is a Commission commitment that entails pro-active communication efforts. Most EU Member State citizens support the idea of aiding the world’s most vulnerable people through relief assistance. They should be informed that this support is carried out in the work of DG ECHO and its implementing partners.
- ⇒ *Underlining European solidarity.* People living in countries affected by crises (victims, host populations and opinion leaders) should be aware of the EU’s solidarity expressed in concrete terms through humanitarian aid. Messages such as the impartiality of aid, the fact that it is needs-based, and its non-discriminatory nature are particularly significant.
- ⇒ *Highlighting a ‘badge of quality’:* Given the stringent criteria for acceding to the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA), partner organizations can benefit from publicizing their quality relationship with DG ECHO.

**Visibility** represents the mandatory display of the visual identity of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid department, wherever the partner’s own logo is being displayed, in the field or elsewhere; this includes on its website and equipment, (in cases where equipment or vehicles and major supplies have been purchased using funds provided by the Commission), publications about the project financed by the Commission, etc.). The visibility should appear, but only provided that this does not harm the organization's mandate or the safety of its staff, (Art 6.3 general conditions). The size of the visual identity will depend on the context and the space available.

It is to be noted that DG ECHO visibility items are to be budgeted within programme budgets and the DG ECHO field offices do not provide those items, unless in exceptional circumstances.

The decision to avoid visibility for security reason is to be discussed on a *case-by-case* basis with DG ECHO and requires approval by ECHO HQ. There are no automatic waivers.

Basic visibility also entails highlighting or at least, acknowledging, the European Commission as the donor in media interviews, press releases, or any other situation where the partner communicates about a funded project.

However, partners should exercise caution and ensure that **visibility actions do not undermine the project’s ownership in the community**. As much as possible, the community’s role in the implementation of the project should be acknowledged in the visual displays.

**Communication** represents a proactive dissemination of data and key messages to identified target audiences. Communication plans and budgets are welcome and should be discussed with DG ECHO at the proposal level, to define where ECHO can assist at best.

Since the principle of effectiveness applies as much to communication as to any other element of the project, pro-active information and communication activities are optional.

### ***Changes in visibility, information and communication funding***

The European Commission Humanitarian Aid department has set a limit to funding that partners can allocate to visibility, information and communication in humanitarian operational agreements. This is now pegged at 0.5% of the direct eligible costs with a maximum of EUR 8,000. However, exceptions may be allowed in the following circumstances:

- the partner has communication experience and expertise, and is keen to exploit the benefits of joint actions and visibility;
- the partner wishes to propose an impact oriented communication activity that would need a larger budget.

The partners should contact the relevant Regional Information Officer when designing such activity.

**Reporting** on visibility, information and communication has also changed. Partners should now include, with the final reports supporting documents such as photos of stickers on vehicles or supplies and of signboards, photos of ‘branded’ visibility items (tee-shirts, caps etc.), copies of press releases and press cuttings, etc.

### **Annex 3: Useful links for applicants**

- 📖 Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) for NGOs and International Organisations  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm)
  - Application form (Single Form)
  - GUIDELINES FOR SINGLE FORM AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION
  - FPA FACTSHEETS, FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS, INTERACTIVE TRAINING AND HELP-DESK
  - FPA REGULATIONS AND DOCUMENTS; GENERAL CONDITIONS
  - [COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY TOOLKIT](#)

- 📖 Guidelines for the submission of e-single form with APPEL  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/etools\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/etools_en.htm)

- 📖 Country Document of the Dominican Republic with national priorities (Spanish)

Report of the DIPECHO Regional Seminar of the VII Action Plan

- 📖 [DG ECHO's Policies and Evaluations](#)

[DG ECHO's review on Water and Sanitation in 2005](#)

- 📖 [Council Regulation No 1605/2002 of 25/06/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Union](#) (OJ L 248, 16/09/2002) and Commission Regulation No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation No 1605/2002

#### **OTHER INFORMATION**

- 📖 GENERAL INFORMATION ON [DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN DG ECHO](#)

- 📖 [EU Strategy on supporting Disaster Risk Reduction in developing countries](#)

- 📖 EU Regional Programming Document for Latin America and the Caribbean [LAC RPD](#)  
European Union External Action Services Country Index [EU per Country](#)

- 📖 [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/thematic\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/thematic_en.htm)

- 📖 [International Strategy for Disaster Reduction](#), Hyogo Framework for Action  
UN ISDR [2010-2011 World Disaster Reduction Campaign](#)  
World Campaign on [Safe Hospitals](#)  
World Campaign on [Disaster risk reduction begins at school](#)  
World Campaign on resilient cities [My city is getting ready](#)