

TECHNICAL ANNEX

AFGHANISTAN, PAKISTAN¹

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2016/01000 and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

The activities proposed hereafter are subject to any terms and conditions which may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge ECHO/C/4

- Contact persons for **Afghanistan**

In HQ: Daniel WEISS (daniel.weiss@ec.europa.eu)

In the field: Esmée DE JONG (esmee.de-jong@echofield.eu)

Philippe BONHOURE (philippe.bonhoure@echofield.eu)

Marco MENESTRINA (marco.menestrina@echofield.eu)

- Contact persons for **Pakistan**

In HQ: Philippe MAUGHAN (philippe.maughan@ec.europa.eu)

In the field: Olivier ROUSSELLE (olivier.rouselle@echofield.eu)

Caroline BIRCH (caroline.birch@echofield.eu)

Shohreh NAGHCHBANDI

(shohreh.naghchbandi@echofield.eu)

- Contact person for **Afghan refugees in Iran:**

In HQ Lâle WIESNER (lale.wiesner@echofield.eu)

In the field Olivier ROUSSELLE (olivier.rouselle@echofield.eu)

¹ Afghan refugees in Iran are also covered by this HIP and its Technical Annex.

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 72 500 000

Specific Objective 1- Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 70 300 000

Indicative allocation to Afghanistan EUR 47 000 000

Indicative allocation to Pakistan EUR 23 300 000

Specific Objective 2 – Natural disasters: HA-FA: EUR 2 200 000

Indicative allocation to Afghanistan N/A

Indicative allocation to Pakistan EUR 2 200 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 10 650 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP – Afghanistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Iran may be covered under this allocation and under this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Pakistan are covered by the allocations and assessment round for Pakistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016². Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: UNOCHA, UNHCR, ICRC, INSO - the related activities present specific characteristics that require a particular type of body on account of its technical competence, its high degree of specialization or its administrative power
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form³
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **03/12/2015**⁴

² 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.

³ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁴ 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.

Assessment round 2 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 14 350 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP – Afghanistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Iran may be covered under this allocation and under this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Pakistan are covered by the allocations and assessment round for Pakistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁵. Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action: up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁶
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **18/01/2016**⁷

Assessment round 3 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 5 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP related to documented and undocumented Afghans in Iran.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁸. Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action: up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁹
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **30/06/2016**¹⁰

⁵ 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.

⁶ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹⁰ 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.

Assessment round 4 for AFGHANISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 8 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP including those related to documented and undocumented Afghans in Iran.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016¹¹. Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action: up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners with a presence in Afghanistan or Iran
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹²
- g) Indicative dates for receipt of the above requested information: **29/01/2017** (for Afghanistan) and **15/01/2017** (for Iran)¹³.

Assessment round 1 for PAKISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP Pakistan section if starting from 1/01/2016. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Pakistan may be covered under this allocation and this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Iran are covered under the allocations and assessment rounds for Afghanistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016¹⁴. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ICRC, UNOCHA, UNHCR.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **18/01/2016**¹⁶

¹¹ 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.

¹² Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹⁶ 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.

Assessment round 2 for PAKISTAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 16 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 of the HIP Pakistan section. The humanitarian needs of Afghan Refugees in Pakistan may be covered under this allocation and this assessment round. Afghan Refugees in Iran are covered under the allocations and assessment rounds for Afghanistan.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/ 2016¹⁷. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹⁸
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **29/02/2016**¹⁹

Assessment round for Education in Emergencies Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran

- h) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 500 000.
- i) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in point 3.4 and 0 of the HIP.
- j) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/ 2016²⁰. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- k) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- l) Potential partners: pre-selected partners ACTED-FR, NRC-NO, HOPE'87-AT and UNHCR

Assessment for Disaster Preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction

A number of targeted Disaster Preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction projects are on-going in 2015-2016 in Afghanistan and Pakistan under 2015 financing decisions. No additional allocation is foreseen for the two countries under this

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ 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.

decision. Where relevant and feasible, partners are strongly encouraged to integrate disaster risk reduction and resilience building measure in humanitarian aid actions.

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework (with clear baselines and SMART indicators); relevance of the intervention and coverage; feasibility; applicant's and IP's implementation and field monitoring capacity and knowledge of the country/region; security management; quality of contingency plans and co-funding levels
- 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
- Context analysis to consider activities implemented by other actors in the same area, be they humanitarian or development ones, including projects targeting Afghan refugees.

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>

Nutrition

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04_nutrition_addressing_undernutrition_in_emergencies_en.pdf

Cash and vouchers

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

Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash –Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers_en

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

Health

<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_policy_doc_en.pdf

Gender

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid_en

Disaster Risk Reduction

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

ECHO Visibility

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

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.
- Specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:

- Section 9.1.A, Standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU funded relief items and equipment; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the Action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the Implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed-upon in the individual agreements.
- Section 9.1.B, Standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.
- Section 9.2., Above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

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

Remote Management

http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start

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 and must be evident in every operation supported by ECHO

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 on-going actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

Remote management arrangements: ECHO does not fund actions using remote management, other than in exceptional circumstances, where access to a crisis zone is temporarily limited due to security concerns or bureaucratic obstacles. It will only be accepted as a temporary measure and never as a continued "modus operandi" for the entire action. This mode of operations should therefore only be proposed as a last resort, and in the context of life- saving activities. ECHO will only fund actions whose activities can be supervised on a regular basis by the partner staff with appropriate qualification, and when ECHO staff can conduct regular monitoring visits.

Consistently with the above, and with humanitarian access being challenged, ECHO will carefully monitor access conditions of humanitarian actors in function of respect of basic humanitarian principles related to conflict situations (independence, impartiality, neutrality), do no harm *vis a vis* national staff members (transfer of security risks) and basic accountability conditions.

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.

In the same vein, and considering the particularly challenging operational conditions in some areas, partners are reminded that they shall inform immediately the Commission of any incidents, events or irregularities (such as occurrences related to the Partner's status in Pakistan or aid misappropriation) likely to hamper or delay access and the implementation of the action.

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 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. In such contexts, proposals must present a clear analysis of how threats against as well as vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population impact their protection, and how this is incorporated in the response.

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 and Afghanistan as well as Pakistan's proneness to natural disasters, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, 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.

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 de-confliction 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.

Resilience²¹: ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while taking opportunities to increase their **resilience** – to reduce on-going and future humanitarian needs and to assist a durable recovery. 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 (see template). 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 mobilization, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarities 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

²¹ *Resilience opportunities differ according to context. However, these opportunities should be considered in all locations. HIPs, designed after consultation with partners, should explain broad resilience parameters and expectations of partners. ECHO partners are required to fill in the "Resilience Marker" in the e-Single Form. Four guiding questions are presented. For each of these questions, for example "does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses, and vulnerabilities," the technical annex should indicate expectations (i.e. what may be considered as adequate according to the situation).*

help increasing resilience and meeting basic needs among the most vulnerable. Community inclusion should be considered at all stages – design and implementation. Community ownership of the process is more effective and is encouraged. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritised by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

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. DG ECHO does not advocate for the preferential use of either cash, voucher-based or 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

AFGHANISTAN

MULTI-SECTOR RAPID RESPONSE: Humanitarian response to those immediately affected by conflict and natural disasters remains the priority for ECHO in Afghanistan. Emergency Response shall cover the relevant sectors including food, emergency shelter, non-food items and WASH. Individual protection assistance where required should be provided.

All actions must follow the tools and guidelines developed under the *Emergency Response Mechanism (ERM)* including the *ERM Common Rationale* available from ECHO Kabul. This provides minimum standards and tools for assessment (rapid and household level), response options and tools, post-distribution monitoring, and reporting. Where transitional shelter is considered, the *Emergency Shelter Guidelines* developed by ECHO partners for Afghanistan must be followed.

Proposals and target areas must be justified with reference to humanitarian needs at the provincial level with adequate analysis of the needs and trends in disasters, conflict, displacement and humanitarian needs. Pre-positioning of adequate supplies and response capacity must be aligned with the resulting analysis. Access, differentiated by quality of access, must be differentiated at least down to the district level and provided as a map. Access to only the district centre should be highlighted and justified.

The response modality must be adequately justified in the proposal with reference to timeliness, efficiency, effectiveness and market assessment. In all interventions the use of cash is encouraged, in line with the ECHO Cash & Voucher guidelines and the *Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs*. Wherever conditional cash transfers are identified as a potential response option, a provision for unconditional cash transfers or light conditionality must be included for the extremely vulnerable groups.

REFUGEES: Afghan refugees in Iran and Pakistani refugees in Afghanistan are covered under the Afghanistan budget allocation while Afghan refugees in Pakistan are covered by the Pakistan component of the HIP.

For Afghan refugees in Iran, the focus of interventions shall be in line with the sectors of intervention approved by Iranian authorities. It may include but not limit to the support to voluntary repatriation of refugees and the coverage of essential humanitarian needs for the most vulnerable refugees - *protection services, food assistance, health care, WASH, Shelter & NFI, education and advocacy*.

Pakistani refugees in Afghanistan will also be considered under this HIP. Given the protracted nature of the displacement, focus will be on the provision of minimum humanitarian support including water, shelter and food assistance based on vulnerability criteria.

HEALTH: ECHO will support health actions related to the provision of adequate healthcare to those most affected by conflict, disasters and epidemics. In particular war-wounded treatment including First Aid, stabilisation, transportation, trauma-care and mass casualty management will be the primary focus. Emergency psychosocial support and post-surgery rehabilitation, including physical rehabilitation are also supported. Furthermore, responding to public health outbreaks, building emergency response capacity within the national system by pre-positioning supplies, developing plans and building capacity will be supported.

All projects shall clearly elaborate on linkages with the national health care systems (EPHS/BPHS) and distinguish clearly services that should be provided under the national system and what is proposed in addition in the proposed action. ECHO will not support actions that seek to duplicate existing EPHS/BPHS services or provide funding for under-funded providers.

In accordance with ECHO policy all health care provision must remain free of charge. Any exceptions to ECHO policy on this shall be justified explicitly by the Partner in the proposal.

NUTRITION: Nutrition needs should be identified through quality and representative surveys and surveillance systems corresponding to national and international guidelines, must have been conducted recently and specifically in the targeted areas, demonstrating needs above emergency thresholds. The National Nutrition Survey of 2013 is not accepted as sufficient.

Actions must be targeted towards the most conflict affected populations meeting emergency standards and that are not able to reach services provided through the national health system. As for health actions, all projects shall clearly elaborate on linkages with the national health care systems (EPHS/BPHS) and distinguish clearly services that should be provided under the national system and what is proposed in addition in the proposed action, while identifying potential exit strategies.

Interventions will be guided according to nutrition needs, particularly prevalence of acute under-nutrition according to threshold and guided by the analysis of risks, vulnerabilities and the resilience approach. Where conflict affected people are displaced to urban or peri-urban areas, partners are required to clearly incorporate the urban dimension in their needs assessment and response analysis.

EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES: Education in Emergencies will be supported where conflict and conflict displacement prevent education provision. All actions must follow the relevant national guidelines for community-based education and accelerated learning with linkages to the national education system. Remoteness and other development-deficits will not be considered.

ACCESS: In order to ensure that principled humanitarian assistance is provided in Afghanistan, further efforts to increase humanitarian access are necessary. ECHO maintains the direct management and monitoring approach in Afghanistan with a detailed explanation of the level and quality of access pre-requisite for proposal selection. All actions are expected to support the expansion of humanitarian access in line with the humanitarian principles. All access propositions must provide clear analysis of outcomes with measurable indicators for outputs and impacts.

COORDINATION, ADVOCACY AND COMMON SERVICES: Coordination must deliver timely and effective coordination of the response to most acute humanitarian needs, in particular the needs of conflict and natural disaster affected. Multi-sector coordination of multi-agency responses in the immediate aftermath of shocks and in respect of humanitarian principles will be the focus of ECHO support.

Clusters are supported when aligned with the IASC guidelines delivering timely and effective coordination aligned with the multi-sector rapid response strategy of ECHO. Funding for cluster leads and co-leads must also demonstrate organisation HR capacity and strategic outlook on the cluster development.

It is foreseen to continue to support common services including safety & security advice and humanitarian flight services. Such services must operate inclusively and in respect of the humanitarian principles. Proposals must demonstrate effective alignment with the needs of the humanitarian partners.

PAKISTAN

PROTECTION: All population movements accompanied by humanitarian actors will be supported by ECHO as far as they are voluntary, safe and sustainable in compliance with international conventions and standards and needs are independently assessed. Strong

protection monitoring mechanisms should be put in place as there is a crucial need to monitor the movements and protection needs of displaced populations.

In the case of IDPs, partners will be requested to elaborate on strong targeting based on vulnerabilities (lack of documentation) and de-linked from registration status. In particular, actions must clearly differentiate between activities targeting recently displaced populations vs. individuals in protracted displacement, drawing upon specific needs, risks and vulnerabilities in both the needs assessment and intervention sections of the proposed actions.

Any proposed capacity building activities will be confirmed only if informed by a sound capacity analysis which identifies needs, priorities and gaps.

All protection mainstreaming aspects must be taken into account in all proposed actions and articulated upon by the partners

For the protracted Afghan refugee situation, ECHO's emphasis will be put on protection and safeguarding asylum space while searching at alternative self-reliance measures to be developed. ECHO will likewise consider: strengthened search for durable solutions that include local integration, voluntary return and resettlement, as well as innovative interim solutions such as work visa; actions in line with regional approaches to promote increased refugee self-management and self-reliance; specific protection needs of vulnerable refugees living on and off-refugee villages, also linked to recent deterioration in security and possible arrests and restrictions of movement linked to PoR cards' expiration.

WASH: support to preparedness and response through provision of emergency water supply, sanitation and hygiene promotion with adequate stocks of pre-positioned supplies. NFIs, including hygiene kits, are only to be distributed in initial phase of displacement or any emergency.

Focus will be on the rehabilitation and the repair of existing WASH systems/facilities before constructing new ones and on re-establishing institutional, social and organisational structures to manage WASH services. There should be focus more on behavioural change related to sanitation and hygiene. All WASH services to be context specific, reflect protection and gender concerns and be DRR-sensitive. Coherence in the delivery of services in IDP-hosting settings will be required (actor mapping).

Water distribution schemes must ensure that the quality of water at the end user level is safe.

SHELTER: can be an integral part of the initial phase of the response strategy (fresh displacement, natural disaster), etc. shelter designs to be context specific and reflect protection needs, temporary, transitional, semi-permanent shelter with DRR mainstreamed.

HEALTH: all projects shall incorporate and elaborate on the linkages with provincial/district-level government health systems and on-going initiatives (e.g. PC-1), etc.

Particular attention should be paid to maternal and child health (MCH), including Basic Emergency Obstetric Care (BEmOC), expanded programme on immunisation (EPI) and integration of health and nutrition services. Proposed health indicators shall be in accordance with ECHO health key result indicators (KRI) in the Single Form and, among those, consider the following ones as a minimum: number of new healthcare consultations, number of antigens administered (i.e. number of vaccinations performed), number of child deliveries monitored by skilled medical staff, number of SGBV cases treated according to international guidelines within 72 hours.

In case of primary healthcare interventions, strong referral mechanisms should be in place to relevant secondary and tertiary care providers.

Free access and expanded coverage to basic health care remains a key principle for ECHO. Any exceptions to ECHO policy on this shall be justified explicitly by the Partner in the proposal.

FOOD: Type of response including choice and value of transfer (cash or vouchers) for FSL of the foreseen intervention should be clearly justified by linking with objectives, acuteness of crisis, cost effectiveness and efficiency, timeliness and robust market assessment. Wherever conditional cash transfers are identified as a potential response option, a provision for unconditional cash transfers or light conditionality must be included for the extremely vulnerable groups.

NUTRITION: Nutrition needs should be identified through quality and representative surveys and surveillance systems corresponding to national and international guidelines.

Interventions will be guided according to nutrition needs, particularly prevalence of acute under-nutrition according to threshold and guided by the analysis of risks, vulnerabilities and the resilience approach.

Effectiveness of interventions should be appropriately monitored and evaluated to remodel intervention strategies and approaches as needed.

As displaced populations in informal settlements and urban areas are particularly vulnerable to disasters and renewed displacement, partners are required to clearly incorporate the urban dimension in their needs assessment and response analysis if they intend to implement in urban or semi-urban settings.

SINDH-SPECIFIC Multi- sectoral interventions

- Proposed interventions should have a clear focus on the districts affected by natural disasters of Sindh. Foreseen interventions should need to demonstrate capacity to monitor and respond to any emerging crisis (floods) within the targeted localities and cover the lean season.
- Understanding the causes of under nutrition and enabling environment is crucial to identify the appropriate combination of activities to address under-nutrition. Adopting a multi-sector nutrition sensitive approach and coordinating humanitarian and development actions are thus essential. Nutrition sensitive interventions should

be closely linked with CMAM and IYCF. Increasing attention should be given to resilience through livelihood restoration, as conditions stabilize.

- Priority entry points in term of sectors/basic services needed should be food security/livelihoods, nutrition and WASH (given the pre-existing prevalence of under-nutrition and food insecurity in the country and particularly in the affected areas).
- It is crucial that a deeper understanding of underlying nutritional vulnerabilities in Sindh is generated through the foreseen intervention. In the light of this, partners will be required to undertake in depth vulnerability (Household Economy Analysis, Cost of Diet), causality (Nutrition Causal Analysis, beneficiary profiling, IYCF studies) and programmatic (Nut/FSL/WASH coverage, linkages, and quality) analysis, to further contribute to resilience building of the most vulnerable individuals and households.
- Maintain systematic monitoring on evolution of the nutrition situation in the respective project localities.
- Partners shall clearly articulate on the processes and mechanisms foreseen to reduce exclusion errors and ensure equitable targeting (irrespective of possession of civil documentation).
- Robust accountability should be maintained *vis-à-vis* the communities (information and grievance mechanisms).
- Nutrition sector capacity building activities should be informed by sound capacity needs analysis.
- Elaborate role/added value in support to the upcoming nutrition PC-1 process
- Overall: the urgent need to strengthen sectoral (Nutrition) and inter-sectoral coordination (FSL, WASH) information management and situation analysis.
- Nutrition sensitive interventions should be closely linked with CMAM and IYCF. Increasing attention should be given to resilience through livelihood restoration, as conditions stabilize.
- Type of response including choice and value of transfer (cash or vouchers) for FSL of the foreseen multi-sectoral intervention should be clearly justified by linking with objectives, acuteness of crisis, timings and robust market assessment. Wherever, conditional cash transfers are identified as a potential response option, a provision for unconditional cash transfers or light conditionality must be included for the extremely vulnerable groups. Any cash for training should be outcome oriented.
- Clear linkages should be developed between WASH and nutrition outcomes at the stage of initial assessment and followed throughout the action. Focus on rehabilitation and repair of existing WASH systems/facilities before constructing new ones and re-establish institutional, social and organisational structures to manage WASH services. There should be more focus on behavioural change related

to sanitation and hygiene. All WASH services to be context specific and must reflect protection concerns. Prevalence of waterborne diseases should be monitored prior to implementation and at key junctures during the action as a key indicator for nutrition outcomes.

COORDINATION, ADVOCACY AND COMMON SERVICES: Coordination must focus on timely and effective coordinated multi-agency response, sector-specific assessment and response analyses and foster respect of humanitarian principles and preservation of the humanitarian space as main overarching objectives.

CONTINGENCY PLANNING: Emergency preparedness within the proposed action must be ensured with adequate stocks of pre-positioned supplies. Cash based interventions should be encouraged.

AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

Response analysis - Cash and Voucher and Multi-Purpose Cash-based Assistance (MPCT)

The choice of modality for a resource transfer should be common across sectors and follow the same essential response analysis described in ECHO's Cash and Vouchers Guidelines. DG ECHO recommend to consider the use of cash based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible. In any case, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. It is strongly recommend for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#). This includes the use of the decision tree and respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.²²

While single-sector cash transfers are to be promoted where appropriate, cash is increasingly being used to address multiple humanitarian/ basic needs. Partners are referred to *Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash –Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs* (http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles_en.pdf) for more details of ECHO's position.

A number of essential steps would be expected in the design of a MPCT project:

- Multi-sectoral assessment to determine priority needs of people in need of assistance;
- Analysis of markets and services to understand which prioritised needs can be met through purchase, and to what extent can markets and services adapt to absorb higher demand;
- Calculation of a minimum expenditure basket on the basis of the needs that can be met from the market/ services. This may include standard (SPHERE) quantities or qualities of the need that is intended to be purchased by a beneficiary, such as food (2100 Kcal); water (15l/p/d) etc.
- Development of a targeting system and targeting criteria;

²² See section 1.2 and 2.3.3 of the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#).

- Understanding of the deficit that targeted families are experiencing or put another way, to what extent can targeted families meet their basic needs? This might involve an HEA-type analysis, or a simple estimate of income (usually derived through estimating average expenditures);
- Estimate the value of transfer that will enable targeted households to meet their basic needs alongside their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB minus income);
- MPCT require a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimised through excellent coordination and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessment, beneficiary registration, targeting, a common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring.
- MPCT in emergencies should exploit social protection systems where possible and appropriate.
- In terms of accountability, partners should use standard outcome indicators for each of the sectors included in the MPCT at the specific objective level of the logframe. A more general well-being indicator such as CSI would also be helpful as a means to determine whether broader improvements to the lives of beneficiaries have been achieved.
- Protection and gender analysis should be integral to the design and implementation of MPCT.

KEY RESULT INDICATORS all partners should ensure that proposed indicators are in accordance with ECHO Key Result Indicators (KRI) in the Single Form where relevant. Key Result Indicators should be complemented by context and operation specific custom indicators. The use of only custom indicators in sectors where KRI apply should be justified explicitly in the proposal.

ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education²³ in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps Innovative solutions will be supported, in particular actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention.

It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programs. It is vital to ensure that children can access education where they feel safe and protected. Therefore, education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include psychosocial support; mine risk education and provision of life-skills, such as vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school, but also strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies,

²³ The Commission adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

including the recruitment and capacity building of teachers. To reduce the vulnerability of children affected by conflict, actions in the field of education in emergencies and especially conflict situations, should reflect protection, relevant legal frameworks (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law), education in mediation and conflict resolution, child protection (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors and former child soldiers), community-based educational activities and the promotion of peaceful reconciliation. Hence, education projects funded under this HIP could include components of child protection and peace education (i.e. mediation, conflict resolution, etc.).

In order to ensure holistic response, linking education to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered.

Activities shall be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances.

Coordination is essential and all education in emergencies projects need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian and if appropriate development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Education Cluster, Refugee Working Groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education).

All actions funded on education in emergencies should in their design adhere to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [IASC Minimum Standards for Child Protection](#).