

TECHNICAL ANNEX

EU Children of Peace

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2015/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge	- For overall policy: ECHO A.4; - For funding decisions/geographic issues: relevant ECHO geographic Units; - For Communication/visibility: Unit ECHO A.2
Contact persons at HQ	Hanna Persson for policy/funding decisions/geographic issues issues (email: hanna.persson@ec.europa.eu) Marta Ausin Garcia for communication/visibility issues (email: Marta.AUSIN-GARCIA@ec.europa.eu)

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation HA: EUR 11 000 000

Transport/Comp. activities HA-FA: EUR 11 000 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 11 000 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 11 000 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time.
- b) All interventions are described under section 0 and 3 of this HIP.

- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2015¹. Actions will start from 01/01/2015.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 13/03/2015³

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP);
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of up-to-date needs assessment and of the logical framework with baselines and SMART indicators, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicants' and implementing partners' implementation and field monitoring capacity, knowledge of the country/region and the co-funding level. On the latter, please take note that co-funding is the rule and 100% an exception that will need to be duly justified.
- In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed.

3.2.2. Operational guidelines:

3.2.2.1. General Guidelines

In the design of your operation, ECHO policies and guidelines need to be taken into account:

The EU resilience communication and Action Plan

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

Food Assistance

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

¹ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

² Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

³ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

Nutrition

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/201303_SWDUndernutritioninemergencies.pdf

Cash and vouchers

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>

Protection

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

Children in Conflict

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf

Emergency medical assistance

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

Civil–military coordination

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_SWD.pdf

Gender

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/Gender_SWD_2013.pdf

Disaster Risk Reduction

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf

Health guidelines

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health2014_general_health_guidelines_en.pdf

ECHO Visibility website – visibility and communication manual

<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

http://www.echo-visibility.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/2014_visibility_manual_en.pdf

A set of overall principles needs to guide every operation supported by ECHO.

The humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, and strict adherence to a "**do no harm**" approach remain paramount.

The safe and secure provision of aid: the ability to safely deliver assistance to all areas must be preserved. ECHO requests its partners to include in the project proposal details on how safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets is being considered as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

Accountability: partners remain accountable for their operations, in particular:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) or beneficiary profiling;
- Management and monitoring of operations, and having adequate systems in place to facilitate this;
- Reporting on activities and outcomes, and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

Remote management: ECHO does not fund actions using remote management, other than in exceptional circumstances, where access to a crisis zone is limited due to security concerns or bureaucratic obstacles. This mode of operations should therefore only be proposed as a last resort, and in the context of life-saving activities.

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Thus, the assistance needs to be adapted to their specific needs - otherwise it risks being off-target, failing its objectives or even doing harm to beneficiaries. It is also a matter of compliance with the EU humanitarian mandate and the humanitarian principles, in line with international conventions and commitments. All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For

more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf

Protection Mainstreaming: Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in traditional assistance programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. This approach is closely linked to the principle of 'do no harm', and also extends the commitment of safe and equal access to assistance as well as the need for special measures to ensure access for particularly vulnerable groups. All proposals **MUST** demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

Integration of protection concerns should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement- hosting context (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

While humanitarian assistance often focuses on community-level interventions, it is important to remember that, in order to fully address many protection issues, it is also necessary to consider the relevance and feasibility of advocacy (structural level) interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities.

Do no harm: Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their livelihoods and assets. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to and operational capability in managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention. The DRR approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard occurrence, and include contingency arrangements for additional or expanded activities that might be required. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated

into programme decision making and design, even where the humanitarian operation is not the result of a specific hazard.

For targeted DRR interventions, the information in the Single Form should clearly show that:

- all risks have been clearly identified, including their possible interactions;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes the role of the state and non-state actors in disaster reduction and climate change adaptation from national to local levels;
- the measures planned are effective in strengthening the capacity of communities and local authorities to plan and implement local level disaster risk reduction activities in a sustainable way, and have the potential to be replicated in other similar contexts;
- the intervention contributes to improving the mechanisms to coordinate disaster risk reduction programmes and stakeholders at national to local levels.
- demonstrate that the action is designed including the existing good practice in this field;
- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure evidence of the impact of the action and good practice are gathered, and effectively disseminated.

Strengthening coordination: 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 and joint planning activities. The partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.

Integrated approaches: Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas 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.

Resilience: ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while increasing their **resilience** in line with EU resilience policy. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen livelihoods and capacities. ECHO encourages its

partners to develop their contextual risk and vulnerability analysis and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified. This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services, development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc.); iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

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 prioritised by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers is mandatory. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. ECHO does not advocate for the preferential use of either (i) cash/voucher-based or (ii) in-kind humanitarian assistance. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the 'Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors' and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed.

For in-kind transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible.

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

All actions funded under the EU Children of Peace initiative should in their design adhere to the INEE Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, as well as the Child Protection mainstreaming manual.

Please see <http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/Toolkit.php?PostID=1002> and www.ineesite.org/uploads/files/resources/CP_Mainstreaming_InterAgencypdf.pdf for more information.

3.3. EU Children of Peace visibility and communication requirements

The standard visibility requirements as established in the ECHO Visibility Manual apply fully to all EU Children of Peace projects. Please see www.echo-visibility.eu for more information.

In particular, partner organisations shall engage in social media promotion of the initiative, i.e. regular posting and sharing of the products on diverse outlets. Dissemination strategy should, apart from relevant regional websites, include the main websites of the partner organisations. Focus is to be placed notably on World Humanitarian Day and World Children's Day.

In addition, partner organisations can carry out one or more of the activities listed below (optional):

1. A **media visit** with an international journalist or a European correspondent in the region;
2. A **photo story** with a selection of at least 7 high-quality pictures (at least 300 dpi), preferably taken by a professional photographer, and accompanied by captions describing the specific project and its impact on the lives of children;
3. A **blog** or field story in the form of a blog of 500-700 words accompanied by the author's picture. Where the language spoken in the field is other than English, the material should be translated in English. Please visit ec.europa.eu/echo/en/field-blogs for examples.

The communication costs for partners wishing to carry out all of the above listed activities may exceptionally reach a maximum of 2.5% of the overall ECHO funding for each specific project. Partners carrying out all activities listed above must submit a communication plan for approval by ECHO.

For partners implementing only standard visibility and social media promotion, standard visibility costs will apply (up to 0.5% with a maximum of EUR 8 000).

Each partner organisation should nominate a contact point who will regularly manage and follow up with communication and visibility issues.

Communication materials produced should raise awareness among the wider European public and locally of the EU/ECHO support for children affected by conflict and the importance of their access to education. They should also sensitise the public that more funds need to be invested in the education of conflict-affected children by development and humanitarian stakeholders alike.