



European Commission
DIRECTORATE GENERAL FOR HUMANITARIAN AID
AND CIVIL PROTECTION
(DG ECHO)

Operational Recommendations for funding proposals
In Kenya, 2011

Table of contents

1) RATIONALE.....	2
2) OVERALL PRINCIPLES.....	3
3) ADJUSTING INTERVENTIONS TO CONTEXTS.....	5
3.1 ECHO's areas of intervention in refugee contexts.....	5
3.2 ECHO's areas of intervention in the Arid Lands of Kenya.....	5
a) Geographical targeting.....	5
b) Possible contexts encountered and subsequent ECHO response.....	6
4) SECTORAL SPECIFICITIES TO CONSIDER IN RESPONSE DESIGN	10
a) Nutrition	10
b) Food Security and Livelihoods	12
c) Health	13
d) Water and Sanitation, Hygiene promotion	14
5) COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY	16

1. RATIONALE

DG ECHO strategy for 2011 in Kenya, explained in the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP), is twofold: on the one hand, a specific objective will be to improve the humanitarian situation of the refugee population in camps and their host community in Kenya through the provision of multi-sectoral assistance, with a particular focus on specific vulnerable groups (new arrivals from Somalia and Sudan, specific protection cases). On the other hand, DG ECHO will aim at saving lives and protecting livelihoods of vulnerable populations in arid districts in Kenya. Saving lives will imply a focus on management of acute malnutrition while ensuring adequate access to food to specific socio-economic groups experiencing food deficits to prevent further deterioration of the nutrition status of the population. Protecting livelihoods is also considered through supporting populations affected by weather hazards to safeguard essential livelihood assets and/or stabilizing conditions to promote rehabilitation and restoration of self reliance. Given all uncertainties in 2011¹, DG ECHO strategy remains flexible and subject to changes if the evolution of the humanitarian situation requires.

The present document has been prepared in order to complement the overall framework of DG ECHO strategy and to guide discussions with partners seeking DG ECHO funding support. It identifies operational recommendations in health, nutrition, water & sanitation, and food assistance, significant to increase the impact and coherence of the proposed interventions.

The inclusion of the operational recommendations in a proposal to DG ECHO does not imply a warranty for funding. Every proposal will be appraised on a case by case basis, against the prevailing context and the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA)².

The recommendations are complementing DG ECHO policies and guidelines on visibility - Food assistance³ - Cash and vouchers - Water and sanitation - Children in conflict – Gender – Protection - Medical care in emergencies.

¹ These uncertainties are mainly related to four factors: a) the performance of the rainy seasons; b) the regional consequences of the Somali crisis; c) the potential additional refugees influx following the referendum in Sudan; d) food prices

² Helpdesk for partners available at: <http://www.dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu>

³ DG ECHO Communication on Humanitarian Food Assistance is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/food_assistance_en.htm

2. OVERALL PRINCIPLES

A set of overall principles will guide DG ECHO support when addressing the needs of refugees and local communities in Kenya:

- ⇒ **The humanitarian principles** of neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid⁴, remain paramount for DG ECHO.
- ⇒ **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 information on how safety and security of staff and assets is being considered; identification and analyse of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks when required. DG ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.⁵
- ⇒ **Do-no-harm:** in order to minimize unintended and/or detrimental implications of inappropriately designed or poorly implemented actions, partners should present their proposed operation with a ‘do-no-harm’ approach.
- ⇒ **Accountability:** Despite operational constraints leading to a reduced presence in the field, partners remain accountable for their operations and should therefore ensure the following:
 - Clear identification of the beneficiaries
 - A system enabling management and monitoring of operations
 - A system to report on activities and outcomes
 - Independent needs assessments: evidence on the respect of minimum quality standards: the effective use of analytical tools such as baselines surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS), beneficiary profiling; gender aspects, etc. The use of specific tools such as Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA), Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis (MIFIRA) are also encouraged.
- ⇒ **Improved quality of humanitarian response:** when a proposal refers to an action supported by DG ECHO in previous years, the proposal should be substantiated by results and impact analysis of previous interventions and relevant lessons learnt.
- ⇒ **Training and capacity building:** Whenever possible, partners should emphasize their role in terms of capacity building and involvement of relevant staff, implementing partners, local communities and other stakeholders, prioritising managerial and technical capacities while upholding humanitarian principles.
- ⇒ **Emergency preparedness and response (EP&R):** DG ECHO expects partners to actively contribute to support effective preparedness and response to emergencies in

⁴ http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/humanitarian_aid/r13008_en.htm

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/actors/fpa/fact_sheets_final_en.pdf

their areas of operation, including their participation in coordination at all levels. Support to EP&R can be formulated as a specific result in proposals or be mainstreamed. The response should take into account logistic and access constraints.

- ⇒ **Strengthening cluster / coordination mechanisms:** Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups, such as the Kenyan Nutrition Technical Forum.
- ⇒ **Integrated approaches:** Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area. To be noted that proposals to ECHO do not have to be multisectoral, but that the approach should be sought for through complementarity with funds from other donors or other partners active in the area.
- ⇒ **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR):** As part of the commitment of DG ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect the exposure and the vulnerability of the targeted population to natural hazards such as drought, floods, epidemics, etc. This analysis should be used as a base to introduce relevant disaster risk reduction activities at local level.
- ⇒ **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. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritized by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.
- ⇒ **Consortium:** The consortium of agencies with technical expertise among and across sectors will be welcomed.
- ⇒ **Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD):** LRRD processes will continue to be supported, particularly in relation to a) increasing interest of development partners and the Government of Kenya on nutrition issues; b) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc. c) integrate a disaster risk reduction approach and in particular a drought risk reduction approach for interventions targetting arid areas of Kenya. In that regard, DG ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership of local actors whenever possible: community mobilization, gradual transfer of responsibilities to communities, local NGOs or relevant line ministries. Where relevant, actions should have a strong link with recovery and development instruments in place in Kenya.

3. ADJUSTING INTERVENTIONS TO CONTEXTS

3.1 ECHO's areas of intervention in refugee contexts

- Food assistance: Distribution of **in-kind food aid** will continue to be an essential life-saving response to people affected by crisis. In particular, General Food Distribution (GFD) will continue to be supported for refugee populations in Dadaab and Kakuma camps. DG ECHO could also contribute to **innovative approaches to food assistance** in these protracted contexts (i.e cash and voucher based projects⁶).
- Nutrition: Interventions targeting **management of acute malnutrition for children below the age of five years, and pregnant and lactating women**, will continue to be supported. Provision of quality nutritional services in accordance with nationally and internationally accepted guidelines is mandatory. Partner organisations should aim at improving or maintaining the nutrition status for all refugees, with a particular attention to specific vulnerable cases (such as new arrivals leaving outside the camps).
- WASH & NFI: DG ECHO will continue providing support to **care and maintenance activities in the water and sanitation** and possibly shelter & NFI sectors, in compliance with the main findings from the recent last Joint Assessment Mission and DG ECHO regular monitoring missions in Dadaab. Priority will be put on the reduction of water loss and control of the water network. A 'buffer' to respond to needs of an increased existing camp population and for the spontaneous settlers outside the camps will also be envisaged. Other programming of support to WASH projects in Kakuma should await definition of the evolution of the situation (post-July 2011 / end of CPA in South Sudan) in order to ensure the best use of resources.
- Health: **Improved access to and usage of quality life-saving health interventions will be supported in Dadaab**. Essential components of Primary and secondary Health Care will be prioritized, along with epidemic outbreak prevention and control activities. Support to health programmes in Kakuma will not be considered as a priority unless a clear worsening of the refugees health status is declared and properly documented.
- Other support: In terms of **protection**, the situation in Dadaab is not satisfactory as underlined by recent Human Rights Watch reports. DG ECHO will provide a specific support in that sector whilst maintaining a close dialogue and advocate with the EU Delegation⁷ for an appropriate approach to protection in these camps.

⁶ Cf. details on the Cash and Learning Partnership (CaLP) at <http://www.cashlearning.org/>

⁷ DEVCO Regional Protection Programme focuses on providing physical security to Somali refugees, education to refugee children, resettlement of refugees with specific needs and on strengthening the protection of children against different sorts of exploitation and abuse.

Possible support to protection programmes in Kakuma will also be considered, may the situation worsen following the end of the CPA in South Sudan. Concerning **education**, DG ECHO will continue liaising with development actors as well as relevant authorities for better tackling education needs in Dadaab. Direct funding support from ECHO will only be envisaged as a last resort option.

3.2 ECHO's areas of intervention in Arid Lands of Kenya

a) Geographical targeting:

Priority areas of operation for ECHO are located in the arid lands of Kenya. ECHO may also decide to intervene in other areas responding to a very specific crisis that must be documented with a satisfactory food security/nutrition assessment.

DG ECHO will concentrate its support to the geographical areas the most vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition. Targeted areas should be the ones that are chronically marginalised, highly exposed to drought and characterised by low health services coverage and poor access to water. The focus should be where (i) these underserved populations experience high level of food insecurity either on a transitory or permanent basis depending on socio-economic groups, (ii) where high malnutrition rates prevail, above the internationally recognised emergency threshold (15% GAM) and (iii) where populations are affected by recurrent external and climatic shocks such as drought (and to a lesser extent floods).

b) Possible contexts encountered and subsequent ECHO response:

While a high level of vulnerability exists in normal times and across such geographical areas, the severity and scale of humanitarian needs do vary from one part to another and change drastically when adverse climatic conditions strike. ECHO has identified four different contexts that would prompt different level and types of interventions as well as different modalities. The description of these contexts aims at better structuring ECHO's responses according to various levels of humanitarian needs.

Context 1: "No major trouble"

This context is defined by the absence of negative external factors and when a) there is an overall acceptable level of food security; b) GAM rates are below 15%; c) there is no indication that level of malnutrition deteriorates.

⇒ ECHO response:

- In the framework of the proposed ECHO strategy, this context does not warrant any specific actions outside a close monitoring of the food security situation as well as constant advocacy efforts for a better consideration of nutrition issues and a strengthening of the health system.

Context 2: "Persistent high GAM rates"

This context is defined by GAM rates above the international emergency threshold of 15% with no factors aggravating the food security situation. This context could also be associated to a period of recovery following drought episodes.

⇒ **ECHO response:**

- In such context, ECHO interventions should **focus on treating malnutrition** and should not go without a **strong advocacy component** to place nutrition higher on the development agenda as ECHO has a limited comparative advantage to act under such context as it needs a long term structurally embedded component. Meanwhile such a commitment is made and met, GAM rates are above emergency thresholds, hence justifying ECHO intervention.
- In areas where populations are just exiting from a period of drought and are entering in an early recovery phase, ECHO should consider **boosting the animal health and restocking of small livestock and carrying animals**. Priority should be given to the group of pastoralists with "minimal" livestock holding and to the pastoralists drop out who still own few small ruminants. Both preventive and curative interventions could be considered simultaneously.
- ECHO would advocate for an efficient **linkage between nutrition programmes and general food distribution (GFD)**. In the absence of GFD, ECHO would consider ensuring protection ration for households with one child admitted in nutrition programmes.
- If a specific health problem plays an essential role in the development of a specific nutritional crisis, **ECHO may consider support to health interventions**.
- Following a "build back better" approach in a post drought situation, **lessons from the impact of the drought to the targeted communities should be learnt and factored in the design of the post drought operations**. The aim is to contribute to increasing the resilience of the communities targeted, improving their preparedness and reducing their vulnerability (ex: poor management of the water resource available, inappropriate reaction to early warning signals, etc...). The effectiveness of the existing local disaster management plans should be reviewed updated and improved when/where necessary.

Context 3: "Deteriorating situation in high malnutrition prevalence areas"

This context is defined by GAM rates above the international emergency threshold of 15% and a deteriorating food security situation. This is when a meteorological drought⁸ deepens into an agricultural⁹ and hydrological¹⁰ drought and when it starts affecting the supply and demand for some commodity or economic good (e.g. water, livestock forage)¹¹. Other aggravating factors such as higher level of morbidity can also be observed.

⇒ ECHO response:

In such a context, ECHO should **step up its intervention to address malnutrition** through contributing to an **increased food intake** to prevent children from becoming malnourished and through **increasing the support to structures** treating malnourished children to enable a bigger caseload to be accommodated. This should be done with a strong involvement of the local health authorities and be elaborated from a comprehensive assessment of the health facility. The implementation of systematic **coverage surveys** will be encouraged.

- From a **nutrition perspective**, ECHO may consider: a) increasing support to outreach capacity; b) supporting stabilisation centres and possibly secondary health care structures; c) complementing nutrition interventions with relevant primary health care activities; d) strengthening the active case-finding capacity; e) enhancing defaulters' follow up; f) ensuring the linkage between nutrition enrolled children and other programs (e.g. GFD) or a protection ration.
- In terms of **Food Security and Livelihood**, ECHO would contribute to **support access to food of specific vulnerable groups** that would experience food deficit¹². Various modalities could be envisaged to fill these gaps. **Voucher schemes and cash based interventions** will be highly encouraged where appropriate. ECHO will also consider **timely livestock related interventions** to protect livelihood assets of affected populations¹³. Several response options should be considered at this stage (accelerated offtake, animal health provision of feed and water), knowing that they should ideally complete/be part of the disaster management plans at decentralised level -from district to communities-.

⁸ Usually defined by a precipitation deficiency over a pre-determined period, *Drought Risk Reduction framework and Practices, ISDR, 2009*.

⁹ Usually defined by the lack of availability of soil water to support crop and forage growth over a specified period of time.

¹⁰ Usually defined by deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies relative to average conditions.

¹¹ this situation defines a "socio-economic drought".

¹² Food gaps will need to be quantified and demonstrated based on a socio-economic analysis (i.e FBM, EMMA, MIFIRA, etc)

¹³ The situation described in context 3 is equivalent to the "alert" and "alarm" phase in LEGS (Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, available at <http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>)

- If a specific health problem plays an essential role in the development of a specific nutritional crisis, **ECHO may consider support to specific health interventions**. Furthermore, in recognition of the important causal roles played by certain diseases and health conditions vis-à-vis malnutrition, ECHO may consider support to relevant primary health care activities – all with a clear nutrition objective, and according to health facility mappings and causal analyses. Efforts should be implemented so that health facilities could be maintained functional to provide health care services during this period.
-

Context 4: "full-scale crisis"

This context is defined by GAM rates above the international emergency threshold of 15% and a deteriorating nutritional situation (e.g. evidence through admission trends). At this stage, all criteria for a socio-economic drought are met and the food insecurity is severe and at scale. This level of crisis was reached in the recent past when two consecutive rainy seasons failed in a reduced resilience owing to the increased food prices the year before.

⇒ **ECHO response:**

- In this context, the top priority is to **boost access to food of the affected populations**, with targeted transfers considering lifting associated conditionalities to the transfer and also considering support to general food distribution if other targeted interventions are judged inadequate.
- ECHO's interventions will continue aiming at **preserving the nutritional status of affected population**, enhancing the treatment capacity and possibly at scale prevention through temporary Blanket supplementary feeding program (BSFP) of most vulnerable groups (under-5 and pregnant and lactating mothers), with similar consideration in health as in context 3.
- ECHO will also endeavour to **protect the key livestock assets of drought crisis affected communities**¹⁴. At this stage, ECHO will consider supporting emergency offtake, animal health and provision of feed and water. As part of animal health interventions, ECHO would consider supporting clinical treatments of sick animals combined with mass endo and ecto-parasite treatments for vector control. ECHO would not consider supporting any vaccination programme at this stage since animals are already weak and immuno-compromised.
- In the **WASH sector**, ECHO will focus on a) basic and appropriate WASH rehabilitation in priority health structures supported by the nutrition intervention NFI to facilitate and reinforce the messages; b) promotion of the most priority hygiene messages in targeted health structures; c) possible WASH 'outreach'

¹⁴ The situation described in context 4 is equivalent to the "emergency" phase in LEGS.

interventions targeting the communities most affected by malnutrition. **Water trucking will only be considered as a last resort**, life saving intervention requiring a clear and concrete exit strategy such as the parallel rehabilitation of an existing water source (possibly through cash for work, vouchers modalities, etc.)

4. SECTORAL SPECIFICITIES TO CONSIDER IN RESPONSE DESIGN

Based on the analysis of the context and of possible complementary response carried out by other stakeholders, interventions in the operational sectors¹⁵ of "Nutrition", "Food Assistance, short term food security and livelihood support", "Health", "Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion" should pay attention to the following aspects for their design:

a) Nutrition

- 1) As a general rule, nutrition operations should contribute to the **reduction and stabilization of morbidity and mortality** by employing internationally recognized and proven effective curative and preventative measures addressing moderate and severe acute malnutrition during emergencies.
- 2) Provision of quality nutritional services in accordance with nationally and internationally accepted guidelines is mandatory. The target groups are **children below the age of five years, and pregnant and lactating women**. Interventions targeting management of acute malnutrition for other vulnerable groups (elderly, adolescents, adults etc) will be considered under extreme humanitarian conditions that warrant population-wide selective feeding interventions.
- 3) **Integrated approaches**, designed around holistic multi-sectoral causal analysis¹⁶, will be promoted.
- 4) Access to nutritional support through DG ECHO supported projects should remain **free of charge**, and should be reinforced by access to free health services.
- 5) In order to avoid that integration of nutrition in to the health system impacts negatively the quality and impact of the operations, DG ECHO-funded

¹⁵ See the complete list of operational sectors defined by DG ECHO in the Guidelines for the use of the Single Form: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm

¹⁶ As per DG ECHO communication HFA approaches that provides health, nutrition services, water and sanitation and food security with the ultimate aim of reducing acute malnutrition through holistic programming will be encouraged.

interventions should seek to fill the gaps left by the shortfalls of the Kenyan system depending on the context (caseloads, prevalence, perspectives...) in a coordinated approach with the local health authorities supporting the need to build the capacity of the health personnel. In the same vein, partners will be requested to respect the framework of integration and the national **Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition** (IMAM) guidelines.

- 6) Seeking to improve the outcome of nutrition programmes, emphasis will be paid to the implementation of **rigorous programme monitoring**. In that regard, partners are expected to remain well-informed about the forthcoming launch of the Minimum Reporting Package (MRP) initiative.
- 7) Partners should adopt **context specific strategies**, in regard for instance to outreach capacity and referral system in order to optimise coverage, especially in preparation for and during the hunger gap.
- 8) DG ECHO will require more emphasis is given at proposal stage to the causal analysis, the stakeholders' analysis. Specific assessment of capacities of the health facilities and local health authorities should also be reflected in the proposal.
- 9) DG ECHO will promote and support initiatives aiming at **measuring the impact** of the nutritional programmes. Coverage surveys should be systematised. When relevant, in-depth analysis of factors associated to poor performance in nutritional projects (high defaulter rates, low recovery rates, significantly low coverage rates) should be undertaken. Assessment of beneficiary household profile will also be encouraged to understand the key determinants of malnutrition including socioeconomic information, access to health care, food aid and safe-water, child care practices, sources of food, income, and coping strategies.
- 10) There is not yet a satisfactory **nutrition surveillance** system – that would require long-term commitment out of ECHO's capacity. DG ECHO will continue supporting nutrition assessments/surveys that provide comparable information on specific nutritional crises, and on seasonal and annual trends. Collected nutrition information should be followed by a thorough analysis and should feed into contingency planning – intentions which should be demonstrated by the partner already at proposal stage.
- 11) ECHO will support coordinated approach to strengthen **advocacy**, targeting both development partners and, relevant government bodies at central and district levels to progressively engage in nutrition activities in high malnutrition prevalence areas and for development.
- 12) Partners will be required to fully **participate to the Nutrition Technical Forum**. Partners are encouraged to participate in the mapping exercise for available resources at dispensary level.

- 13) Within the coordination mechanism priorities, partners should also contribute towards a concrete **emergency preparedness and response plan** in view of any potential nutritional crisis; this includes the establishment of a reliable supply system of adequate medical and nutritional products and the provision of relevant human resources for scale-up of response as well as support to the facilities delivering nutritional services so that they could be well functional during a period of crisis. Linkages with the Drought Management Initiative – and District Contingency Plans- should be sought.
- 14) The adoption of **innovative strategies** for management of moderate acute malnutrition will require proper documentation so as to enhance learning and future strategy development. Partners proposing to use new Ready-to-Use Foods (RUFs) will be required to document effectiveness and be ready to share real time monitoring.
- 15) When the scale up of existing supplementary feeding programs is not appropriate, **support will be considered to blanket supplementary feeding programs** – as a preventative measure to mitigate an emerging nutrition crisis, or as an emergency response strategy during periods of high prevalence of acute malnutrition.
- 16) **Nutrition education**, as part of a comprehensive nutrition approach, should target entire communities. The nutrition education package should emphasise context specific topics on prevention and management of malnutrition.

b) Food Assistance, short term food security and livelihood support (FA/FSL)

- 1) **Short term food security and livelihood support** (such as distribution of livelihood inputs and services) may be supported, principally to strengthen essential coping capacities and opportunities. This should be done on the basis of defined and documented needs, while taking into account impact evaluations of previous activities.
- 2) **Emergency livestock activities** (destocking, limited and well designed restocking, animal health activities, fodder and water provision) will be supported in the arid lands where livestock are proven to be a vital asset for the most vulnerable people. The feasibility and appropriateness of the interventions will have to be carefully considered and documented using the minimum standards developed by LEGS¹⁷. Restocking interventions should be designed to support where relevant traditional and customary, community based mechanisms. Priority should also be given to the group of pastoralists with "minimal" livestock holding and to the pastoralists drop out who still own few small ruminants.

¹⁷ Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

- 3) ECHO will continue advocating for further **linkages between nutrition programmes and food assistance interventions**. Partners applying for ECHO funding will have to highlight such linkages within their proposed actions or with other actions funded/implemented by other partners/donors.
- 4) **Innovative approaches** meant to increase cost-efficiency (specifically to prevent loss-of-value of food aid commodities that are sold) and to improve effectiveness will be encouraged. For instance, operations should seek opportunities to replace or compliment in-kind contributions through **vouchers** (for food, milk, health services, veterinary costs, etc.) and/or **cash**¹⁸ on the basis of a sound situation analysis including a mandatory market study and risk assessment¹⁹. Particular attention should be given to conditions and criteria for both conditional and unconditional cash transfers.
- 5) ECHO will encourage efforts for an **improved analysis on the impact** and adequacy of food assistance responses. In this sense, ECHO will support studies/analysis aiming to improve the food security monitoring and/or to gain understanding on the evolution of the livelihoods, particularly in the Arid Lands²⁰.
- 6) Emphasis will be placed on **quality targeting and monitoring**.
- 7) All projects should mainstream **environmental and protection aspects** including; the integration of environmental components; analysis of the potential negative environmental impacts of projects; and analysis of protection risks associated with any livelihood or coping activities that are supported.

c) Health

- 1) **Improved access to and usage of quality life-saving health interventions** will be supported in Dadaad camps and possibly considered in Kakuma provided that serious gaps are identified. Essential components of Primary and secondary Health Care will be prioritized, along with epidemic outbreak prevention and control activities.
- 2) In rural areas, support to health programmes will be envisaged only **in complement to nutrition related interventions**. In such context ECHO supported programmes should pay attention to ensure maximum ownership of the MOH.

¹⁸ ECHO evaluation and review reports on cash and vouchers is available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/thematic_en.htm#cash.

¹⁹ DG ECHO guidelines on Cash and Vouchers: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/sectoral/cash_en.htm

²⁰ The use of specific tools such as Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA) or Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis (MIFIRA) might also be supported by ECHO.

- 3) **Support to health programmes in complement to nutrition interventions** will predominately be through the primary healthcare system, yet limited support to carefully selected secondary health care services may be considered.
- 4) Support to specialized organizations should be considering in relation to epidemic outbreaks. Such considerations must include an analysis of the scale of the outbreak vis-à-vis the capacity of the national authorities and its partners. Potential support to activities relating to outbreak investigation, outbreak control, and case management should be prioritized.
- 5) Partners should be encouraged to participate to **advocacy effort** to ensure that a clear policy (human resource, incentive to health staff, etc) is developed to support the public health system, particularly in the arid Lands. Solutions for an appropriate design of the facilities to cope with water stress and scarcity should be promoted and advocated for²¹. All PHC services/interventions are expected to **build synergies with the major national health programs** (EPI, HIV/AIDs, TB, Malaria, safe motherhood, IMAM...) exploiting all opportunities to facilitate access to these programs.
- 6) Partners should be encouraged to participate in national health forums, aimed at maximizing coordination and collaboration within the health sector.
- 7) In all health projects **the quality of drugs** should be ensured in accordance with ECHO FPA procedures (see updated list of ECHO recognized humanitarian procurement centres -HPC). Moreover, access to health through DG ECHO supported projects should remain **free of charge**²².
- 8) **Mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS** activities in line with the DG ECHO HIV guidelines will be expected from all DG ECHO supported projects²³.

d) Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion (WASH)

All WASH interventions should be in line with DG ECHO guidelines available at <http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/watsan2005.htm>

- 1) In the Arid Lands, priority will be given to the **provision of water to health structures**, followed by provision of water to people suffering from acute water shortage, and finally water for livestock. ECHO will only support comprehensive and complementary water, sanitation and hygiene activities in order to contribute to a positive impact on public health and livelihoods.

²¹ For additional information, see the campaign "Hospitals safe from disasters", <http://www.safehospitals.info/>

²² In accordance with internationally accepted guidelines such as WHO/UN, MSF, Sphere, etc.

Interventions should always prioritize quality over quantity

²³ Section 6 of DG ECHO guidelines on HIV/AIDS, October 2008

- 2) The main focus will be on support to **preparedness and response through short term emergency** water supply, sanitation, and hygiene promotion activities in order to minimize the risks of increased morbidity and mortality due to lack of water and/or water-related diseases²⁴. In the refugee camps, ECHO will support activities aiming at a) consolidating the reduction of water loss and control of the water network ; b) responding to additional needs of an increased existing refugee population. Daily operational care & maintenance will not be considered a humanitarian priority unless there is a clear and unforeseen shortfall in the basic resources for running the services.
- 3) **Projects with a medium/long-term goal** (such as irrigation activities, water pans to be used for the next rainy season, etc) will only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Rehabilitation of existing surface water catchment structures may be considered as part of a food security intervention (i.e cash for work for desilting pans). In line with a "built back better" approach, interventions in post drought context should contribute to improve the water availability in times of drought²⁵.
- 4) **Rehabilitation/repair** of existing water points and sanitation facilities will be prioritized. The creation of new water points should be the exception and subject to sound justification of its appropriateness and environmental impacts. Universal water coverage is not a DG ECHO objective.
- 5) The **monitoring of water quality**, both at water source and at household level should be included in the provision of safe water supply. Systematic monitoring of groundwater levels is also encouraged and partners should propose actions to mitigate the risk of water depletion and overuse. In areas of serious groundwater depletion, a disaster risk reduction / preparedness approach is required.
- 6) **Hygiene promotion** should be carried out in line with ECHO technical issue papers on Hygiene Promotion in humanitarian aid projects. Priority messages should be hand washing; water storage and handling; and latrine use. KAP surveys should be included as a standard tool to provide evidence of positive behaviour change in hygiene practices, as well as to analyse individual water use; transport and storage practices; hand-washing; and latrine usage. Hygiene promotion materials should be consistent and agreed at WASH cluster level.
- 7) In the Arid Lands, projects in the WASH sector should include benchmarks leading to a **feasible exit strategy that include community management of water resources**. Priority will also be given to projects that fit in with the district contingency plans. Community-based activities for maintenance of water systems (training of pump mechanics, provision of tools and spare parts) should be included. Community mobilization for latrine construction and solid waste

²⁴ In principle, a large quantity of reasonably safe water is preferred to small quantities of high quality water.

²⁵ This aspect should include a support to an improved management of water resource as well as reaction to early warning systems

management along with increased ownership of interventions by gradually transferring implementation of activities to local actors. This process should be described in the Single Form. Operation and maintenance systems shall focus on community level management for minor repairs. Cost recovery systems to support water supply systems must ensure that vulnerable groups are not subject to exclusion.

- 8) Following this line, interventions should taken into considerations the **existing techniques, knowledge and practices among the targeted communities** as a starting point. Introduction of new systems/techniques should be avoided, except if the scale of the crisis makes it inevitable.
- 9) **Water trucking** should only be considered as a last resort, life saving intervention requiring a clear and concrete exit strategy such as the parallel rehabilitation of an existing water source, possibly considering cash for work, vouchers etc.
- 10) Like in any other sector, emergency water interventions should respect the principle of "do no harm"²⁶. **Mitigation measures** to address the risks identified have to be presented by partners in the Single Form.
- 11) WASH proposals should be **cost-efficient** (lowest cost possible to achieve the defined outcome) and for livelihood related water project be also **cost-effective** (economic potential benefit higher than the cost of the project. For the cost efficiency it is necessary to demonstrate that the most appropriate technology is being considered and that the market is open enough for the procurement processes to be competitive. For the cost effectiveness of livelihood related projects it is necessary to demonstrate, even though scenarios and realistic assumptions, that the benefit exceed the cost in the short or long-term (i.e value of stock saved at end of drought higher than the cost of providing water).

5. COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY²⁷

Providing visibility for the European Commission is not an option, it is a contractual obligation in the context of humanitarian projects financed by the European taxpayer.

Making ECHO's actions visible ensures that work is understood and supported. Without this support we take the risk of being less able to help those in need.

²⁶ The following four risks and/or opportunities must be assessed and taken into consideration for most ECHO funded water projects: a) Impact on water community management (i.e. put another genset where a water committee is supposed to have the means to manage the existing one?); b) Impact on dependency and population movements (i.e. are we encouraging or preventing desirable or undesirable migrations?); c) Impact in terms of natural resources management; d) Impact on conflicts

²⁷ The new ECHO visibility guidelines: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/visibility_en.htm
For further information, the Regional Information Officer at ECHO Office in Nairobi (Kenya) can be contacted (tel +254 20 280 2439)

The basic visibility rule is that the partner must add the visual identity of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid, wherever their own logo is being displayed, in the field or elsewhere.

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.

The Commission recognises that factors such as lack of security or local political sensitivities may curtail activities in some crisis zones. In extreme cases, it may be necessary to avoid visibility in the field. In such circumstances, a case-by-case exemption should be agreed in advance with ECHO..

Partners can allocate 0.5% of the direct eligible costs of an action, with a maximum of € 8,000, to visibility, information and communication.

Exceptionally, larger communication actions could be funded, such as when the partner has communication experience and expertise, and is keen to exploit the benefits of joint actions and visibility; when the partner wishes to propose an impact-oriented communication activity that would need a larger budget; or when the partner contacts ECHO Information when designing such activity.

Communication activities are optional. For pro-active information and communication linked to projects, appropriate activities may be identified, wherever possible. Activities that can have a big impact on large audiences are not necessarily expensive (for example, obtaining media coverage through inviting a journalist to visit a project or providing pictures/testimonies to editors).

ECHO now has a stricter approach on visibility, information and communication in the reporting phase. Partners should include, with the final report for liquidation, supporting documents such as photos of stickers on vehicles and signboards, photos of “branded” visibility items (T-shirts, caps etc.), copies of press releases and press cuttings, etc.

Annex I

APPLICANTS CHECK LIST

- ☐ The application has been filled in full using the E-Fichop http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm
- ☐ The logical framework and the activity schedule of the action (work plan) have been inserted in the proposal
- ☐ The application contains a financial overview of the total eligible costs, including both the contribution requested from the European Commission and the co-financing share in EUR.
- ☐ A financial overview is also submitted and includes only eligible costs, not in-kind contributions.