

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

Operational Guidance for funding proposals in Kenya, 2012

Table of contents
1) RATIONALE2
2) OVERALL PRINCIPLES
3) ADJUSTING INTERVENTIONS TO CONTEXTS4
3.1 A changing context
3.2 ECHO's areas of intervention
a) Arid Lands5
b) Refugees6
4) SECTORAL SPECIFICITIES TO CONSIDER IN RESPONSE DESIGN6
a) Nutrition
b) Food Security and Livelihoods
c) Health 9
d) Water and Sanitation, Hygiene promotion10
e) Protection
5) COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY

1. RATIONALE

DG ECHO's strategic objectives included in the regional HIP for 2012 for the Horn of Africa (HoA) are:

- a) People affected by crisis, whether man-made or natural, are assisted in a timely fashion and offered adequate protection through humanitarian assistance, including improved emergency preparedness.
- b) Local resilience is strengthened through Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) activities preparing targeted vulnerable and at-risk communities to better cope with drought and other natural disasters.

For Kenya, this strategy will be more specifically targeting:

a) Refugee populations and host communities trough the provision of multi-sectoral assistance, with a focus on life-saving services and protection for the most vulnerable groups such as new arrivals from Somalia.

b) Vulnerable populations in disaster prone /crisis affected/ area's of the country.

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 2012¹, 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, aiming 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 and the Finanaicla and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).

The recommendations are complementing DG ECHO policies and guidelines on visibility -Food assistance - Cash and vouchers - Water and sanitation - Children in conflict – Gender – Protection - Medical care in emergencies³.

¹ These uncertainties are mainly related to three factors: a) the performance of the rainy seasons; b) the regional consequences of the Somali crisis; c) food prices

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

³ These documents are available on ECHO website.

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 staff⁵
- **Do-no-harm**: in order to minimize unintended and/or detrimental implications of inappropriately designed or poorly implemented actions, partners should as a minimum requirement respect the 'do-no-harm' principle.
- Accountability: Despite operational constraints leading to a reduced presence in the field, partners remain accountable for their operations and should therefore ensure the following: (accountability towards donor and beneficiaries)
 - A system enabling management and monitoring of operations
 - A system to report on activities and outcomes
- **Needs assessment** including a basic set of compulsary indicators (SMART) with a clear identification of the beneficiaries:
 - Indicators on access to primary healthcare (freq. rates ; vaccination coverage); wash ; prevalence of malnutrition; food security, etc.
 - Needs assessments: : with effective use of analytical tools such as baselines surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS), beneficiary profiling; gender aspects, etc. Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis (MIFIRA), HESPER (perceived needs scale) are also encouraged.
- **Response Analysis**: All proposals should include a well articulated response analysis, built on the needs assessment, that clearly informs response choices and modalities.
- **Improved quality of humanitarian response**: when a proposal is the continuation of 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 stakeholder, incl. government staff at county level, prioritizing 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 their areas of

⁴ http://europa.eu/lesislation summaries/humanitarian aid/rl3008 en.htm

⁵ <u>http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/actors/fpa/fact sheets final en.pdf.</u>

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 crosssectoral programming of responses are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and costeffectiveness. 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) integratation of a disaster risk reduction approach and in particular a drought risk reduction approach for interventions targeting 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 A changing context

In the Arid Lands of northern Kenya, whilst the humanitarian situation has overall improved following the short rainy season, 3.75 million people still rely on General Food Distributions according to WFP. Acute malnutrition rates have historically been high in these areas, with huge

seasonal peaks and variations between years depending mainly on the rainy season performances. In-kind food aid has been largely used as a default response in 2011 (like previous years) sometimes to the detriment of other often more appropriate interventions.

Despite the fact that the relatively good short rains of 2011 are expected to improve food security across the country and improve GAM rates, recovery will be a long process as the 2011 drought has severly eroded the productive assets of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the arid zones. In common with previous droughts, many pastoralists have lost their herds entirely and have effectively left the pastoral livelihood and have settled in more urban/ semi-urban situations often with little opportunity to start new ways of living. In a context of high food prices and relatively high inflation rates, vulnerability to shocks are likely to remain high.

In this current post-drought phase, partners will be expected to identify and target most vulnerable groups, promote livelihoods recovery; customised their response according to each group needs and consider and monitor market capacity.

In addition to the priority areas of the arid Counties, other potential shocks could occur in Kenya, not least the potential for conflict in an election year, and the possibility of rapid onset emergencies like epidemics.

Regarding refugees living in Kenya, the country currently hosts more than 600,000 of them, the wast majority coming from Somalia. In 2011, the influx of refugees increased with more than 160,000 new arrivals. The needs of new arrivals were particularly severe as most Somalies fled a combination of conflict and drought, with famine declared in 6 areas of south Somalia at the height of the crisis. Malnutrition rates remain above emergency thresholds with corresponding high mortality particularly in the newer camps.

The high number of refugees makes basic care and maintenance assistance a challenge in itself. There is a need to review existing care and maintenance assistance with a view to innovation and efficiency, while at the same time considering surrounding host communities. Following the Kenyan military operation into south Somalia, insecurity increased in the whole of north-eastern province and particularly in and around the Dadaab refugees camps. Non-essential assistance were suspended and a new security regime is being put in place. There is a need for partners to be able to adapt to a continued fluid security conditions, and increase their capacity for implementation despite adverse operating conditions.

3.2 ECHO's areas of intervention

a) Arid Lands:

DG ECHO will concentrate its support to those geographical areas most vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition. Targeted areas should be the ones that are chronically marginalised, highly exposed to drought and characterised by insufficient access to basic services (health, nutrition, WASH). 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) (iii) with low coverage of basic health interventions and access to drinkable water and (iii) where populations are affected by aggravating factors such as recurrent external and climatic shocks (drought, epidemics, floods to a lesser extent).

b) Refugee population:

The refugee situation remains uncertain. There are certainly the potential for further large influxes, but possibly also a small window of opportunity for return. ECHO funded actions will have to be able to adapt and revise planned responses depending on the developing context. If any support to return becomes feasible, such support must include that movements are voluntary, safe, informed and to the possible extend sustainable.

- Priority will continue to be given to actions addressing basic life-saving services in Dadaab refugee camps and for specific gaps in basic life-saving services in Kakuma refugee camp.
- Partners that can demonstrate a comparative advantage in terms of quality, efficiency, innovation and especially in current situation access will be prioritised
- Emphasis will continue to be given to strengthening the protection for vulnerable groups of refugees either through vertical or horizontal (mainstreamed) activities.
- Food security will be prioritised in order to stabilise and improve nutritional status through most appropriate food assistance modality; food aid, voucher or cash transfers or likely a combination thereof. Partners will be required to provide a response analysis in this respect.
- Emergency preparedness to address and control disease outbreaks; to assist new arrivals and to respond to changed population movements will be given priority.
- Risk management and contingency plans will be required for all actions in Dadaab refugee camps.

Innovations and alternative solutions to the world biggest protracted refugee situation will be welcomed. Response options to investigate will also include exploring the increased involvement of Kenyan line departments in service provision; support ways of further economic integration between refugees and host communities – ultimately increasing the net benefit for host communities.

4. SECTORAL SPECIFICITIES TO CONSIDER IN RESPONSE DESIGN

Promotion of integrated programming designed around multi- and cross sectoral analysis will be prioritised. Implementation of approaches that provide health, nutrition service, water and sanitation and food security with the ultimate goal of reducing acute malnutrition is encouraged.

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 all activities in highly vulnerable areas and for development. Partners will be required to fully participate to the sectoral coordination fora.

Based on the analysis of the context and of possible complementary response carried out by other stakeholders, interventions in the operational sectors⁶ 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 international standards.
- 2) Access to nutritional support through DG-ECHO supported projects should remain free of charge, and should be reinforced by access to free health services.
- 3) The target groups are all acutely malnourished individuals, especially severely. Active detection will have take place for **children below the age of five years.** 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.

Needs assessment and contigency planning:

- 4) Regular nutritional surveillance/rapid assessments that provide comparable information on seasonal/annual trends will continue to be prioritised. 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.
- 5) DG ECHO will require more emphasis is given at proposal stage to the causal analysis and the stakeholders' analysis. Specific assessment of capacities of the health facilities and local health authorities should also be reflected in the proposal.
- 6) 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.
- 7) 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.
- 8) 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.
- 9) Partners should also be prepared to face shortcoming of supplies or poor access due to weather conditions and develop **contingency planning accordingly.**

Management of Acute malnutrition

10) Provision of quality nutritional services in accordance with nationally and internationally accepted guidelines, is mandatory.

⁷See 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*

- 11) In order to avoid that integration of nutrition into the health system impacts negatively on the quality of the operations, DG ECHO-funded 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.
- 12) Seeking to improve the outcome of nutrition programmes, emphasis will be paid to the implementation of **rigorous programme monitoring**. Once rolled out, partners will be encouraged where relevant to use the Minimum Reporting Package (MRP). In addition, the adoption of **innovative strategies** for management of moderate acute malnutrition will require proper documentation so as to enhance learning and future strategy development.
- 13) 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.
- 14) **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)

- Food Assistance: all projects will be expected to include a well articulated response analysis, built on the needs analysis, that clearly identifies the most appropriate reponse and modality. Links and eventual merging with the Hunger Safety Net Programme will be expected for food assistance projects in the appropriate arid zones. Responses will be compliant with the DG ECHO Communication on Humanitarian Food Assistance.
- 2) **Food assistance** options such as food distributions, food vouchers, cash for assets or cash transfers should be well justified according to context and vulnerable groups targeted and take into due consideration the capacity of local markets.
- 3) Support with **in-kind food assistance** can be considered for life-saving actions responding to new displacements or to severe, transitory food insecurity due to natural disasters. It is recommended that partners use the decision tree in the Guidelines in Cash and Vouchers to justify the use of in-kind food distributions. Responses may include relief food assistance as well as therapeutic and supplementary feeding (see also the nutrition section).
- 4) For Cash-based transfers (including vouchers) a sound situation analysis including a mandatory market study and risk assessment⁷ should provide the justification. Particular attention should be given to conditions and criteria for both conditional and unconditional cash transfers. Cash based transfers should be an option for the most vulnerable without the possibility to work. Cash for work or for assets is preferable in many cases in recovery phase
- 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

⁷ DG ECHO guidelines on Cash and Vouchers: <u>http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/sectoral/cash_en.htm</u>

the food security monitoring and/or to gain understanding on the evolution of the livelihoods, particularly in the Arid Lands⁸.

- 6) Short term food security and livelihood support in recovery phase is an important transition from food and voucher assistance (such as distribution of livelihood inputs and services) may be supported, principally to strengthen essential coping capacities and opportunities. Most vulnerable groups especially women headed families or elderly should receive special attention. This should be done on the basis of defined and documented needs, while taking into account impact evaluations of previous activities.
- 7) **Pastoralists in Transition:** Priority should be given to the group of pastoralists with "minimal" livestock holdings and to those who have left the pastoralist livelihood due to asset depletion during the recent drought. Response should be adapted or customised for each group needs.
- 8) **Emergency livestock activities** (destocking, limited and well designed restocking, animal health activities, fodder and water provision) can 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 LEGS⁹. Restocking interventions should be designed to support where relevant traditional and customary, community based mechanisms and to consider environmental issues, both short and long term.
- 9) 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.
- 10) Emphasis will be placed on quality targeting and monitoring.
- 11) 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 Dadaab refugee 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 the existing public health system** will be part of an integrated package of activities to reduce levels of acute malnutrition and its related mortality and morbidity. In such context ECHO supported programmes should pay attention to ensure maximum ownership of the MoPH.
- 3) Support to specialized organizations should be considering in relation to disease 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.

⁸ The use of specific tools such as Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA) or Market Information and Food Phsecurity Response Analysis (MIFIRA) might also be supported by ECHO.

⁹ Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

- 4) Partners should be encouraged to participate to advocacy effort to ensure that policies to reinforce the delivery of basic (health) services are developed and implemented (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 for¹⁰. 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.
- 5) Partners should be encouraged to participate in national health forums, aimed at maximizing coordination and collaboration within the health sector.
- 6) 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**¹¹.
- 7) **Mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS** activities in line with the DG ECHO HIV guidelines will be expected from all DG ECHO supported projects.

d) Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion (WASH)¹²

- 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 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.
- 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 diseases¹³.
- 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). All WASH projects should include a hazard analysis and a DRR approach adopted to mitigate identified risks. In line with a "build back better" approach, interventions in a post drought context should contribute to improve the water availability in times of drought¹⁴.
- 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.
- 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

¹⁰ For additional information, see the campaign "Hospitals safe from disasters", <u>http://www.safehospitals.info/</u>

¹¹ In accordance with internationally accepted guidelines such as WHO/UN, MSF, Sphere, etc.

¹² All WASH interventions should be in line with DG ECHO guidelines available at <u>http://ec.europa.eu/echo/policies/evaluation/watsan2005.htm</u>

¹³ In principle, a large quantity of reasonably safe water is preferred to small quantities of high quality water. ¹⁴OThis aspect should include a support to an improved management of water resource as well as reaction to early warning systems

and overuse. In areas of serious groundwater depletion, a disaster risk reduction / preparedness approach is required.

- 6) Sufficient **supervision and quality control** of WASH interventions should be guaranteed to ensure that the most appropriate solutions for the context serve the beneficiaries for as long as possible.
- 7) **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 coordination level.
- 8) Interventions should take into consideration and build upon the **existing techniques**, **knowledge and practices among the targeted communities** as a starting point. Introduction of new systems/techniques should be avoided, except when medium/long term monitoring and support is possible or if the scale of the crisis makes it a necessity.
- 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) 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. 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.
- 11) In the refugee camps, ECHO will support acitivities aiming at a) the reduction of water loss and control of the water networks; 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.
- 12) Camp latrines: In order to avoid misunderstandings and rejection by the beneficaries, a single latrine design should be adopted involving the direct participation of the users inboth design and construction.

e) Protection

1) **Mainstreaming of protection** concerns in line with the DG ECHO guidelines is expected in all interventions within the priority sectors. In this regard partners should ensure that the four protection principles outlined in the 2011 Sphere Standards are reflected in their projects, and that basic protection mainstreaming principles – equal, safe and dignified access to assistance as well as measures to ensure the same for particularly vulnerable groups – are considered and respected in assessments, planning and implementation of assistance. Thus all types of projects should as a minimum consider the following question: What can we do to ensure

that the intervention reduces the protection risks of all (by gender (women, girls, men and boys), ethnic group, age, disability, religion, etc.) benefitting from this project? Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples:

- In Nutrition: Are project strategies diversified to take into account the needs according to different types of vulnerabilities; do all have equal access?
- In FA/FSL: Are project strategies diversified to take into account the needs according to different types of vulnerabilities; do projects enhance the resilience of various types of beneficiaries to avoid turning to dangerous coping mechanisms?
- In Health: Will all intended beneficiaries have safe and equitable access to health facilities and services; will health services respond appropriately to the needs of victims of violence (sexual or other) and abuse?
- In WASH: Are locations of water points and latrines safe for all; do all have equal access?
- 2) **Specific (vertical) protection activities** reducing the risk, mitigating the impact of, or addressing particular protection needs can be supported provided that they designed in the context of a humanitarian emergency rather than to address a structural problem linked to cultural practices or systemic problems. These could include activities addressing e.g. Sexual and Gender Based Violence; Registration and protection of newly arrived refugees; Separation of children and families; Displacement monitoring, e.g. IDP profiling, population movements; Protection issues linked to return/repatriation, etc.

5. COMMUNICATION AND VISIBILITY¹⁵

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 risk being unable to help those in need.

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. ECHO is however encouraging partners with internal communication capacity **to be more creative and strategic when it comes to communication actions**.

Strategic communication 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. This can also be achieved with the technical support of the Regional Information Office in Nairobi. In addition to providing technical support, ECHO staff can provide sound bites and quotes for multimedia products produced by partners.

In Kenya, media access is fairly open, which means journalists can easily travel to visit interesting projects. Another comparative advantage is that many foreign correspondents, including European journalists, are based in Nairobi and thus can be invited on press trips that cover ECHO-funded projects.

¹⁵ The new ECHO visibility guidelines: <u>http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/visibility_en.htm</u>. For further information, the Regional Information Officer at ECHO Office in Nairobi (Kenya) can be contacted (tel +254 20 2439)

Because drought is a recurring problem in Kenya, it is also important to facilitate media access to Disaster Relief and Rehabilitation projects and to pass on messages on how partners help communities prepare for recurrent drought cycles. ECHO experts can endorse partner's work by making themselves available to journalists and passing a 'donor' message. If a partner produces a professional media product, ECHO regional office will share it with Brussels and feature it as a partner's communications output on the ECHO website.

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 \in 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 but strongly recommended if there is in-house capacity at the partner's level. 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 <u>http://ec.europa.eu/echo/about/actors/fpa_en.htm</u>
- 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.