

TECHNICAL ANNEX SYRIA REGIONAL CRISIS

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/ B.4

Contact persons at ECHO HQ

Team Leader: Alessandro VALDAMBRINI: Alessandro.VALDAMBRINI@ec.europa.eu

Regional Operational Coordination: Roxane HENRY: Roxane.HENRY@ec.europa.eu

Syria:

Maria Agustina FLORES: Maria.Flores@ec.europa.eu

Martina GHELARDUCCI: Martina.Ghelarducci@ec.europa.eu

Elena FRANCESHINIS: Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu

Marcel PIEPER: Marcel.PIEPER@ec.europa.eu

Lebanon: Devrig VELLY: Devrig.Velly@ec.europa.eu

Jordan: Benjamin THIBERGE: Benjamin.Thiberge@ec.europa.eu

Egypt: Elena FRANCESHINIS: Elena.FRANCESCHINIS@ec.europa.eu

Contact persons ECHO field

Syria:

Youcef HAMMACHE: Youcef.Hammache@echofield.eu

Syria Damascus and Cross-border from Jordan and Lebanon

Julien BUHA-COLLETTE (Julien.Buha-Collette@echofield.eu)

Olivier BEUCHER: Olivier.Beucher@echofield.eu

Syria Cross-border from Turkey and Iraq:

Taheeni THAMMANNAGODA: Taheeni.Thammannagoda@echofield.eu

Cedric PERUS: Cedric.Perus@echofield.eu

Lebanon:

Massimiliano MANGIA: Massimiliano.Mangia@echofield.eu

Daniela DURSO: Daniela.Durso@echofield.eu

Jordan:

Matteo PAOLTRONI: Matteo.Paoltroni@echofield.eu

Egypt:

Aldo Biondi: Aldo.Biondi@echofield.eu

Regional:

Claudia AMARAL: Claudia.Amaral@echofield.eu

Davide ZAPPA: Davide.Zappa@echofield.eu

2. Financial info

Indicative Allocation: EUR: 379 400 000.

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR: 379 400 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 379 400 000

2. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

Proposals can be submitted at any moment during the year. However, no formal request for proposals can be made before the publication of the HIP. No agreement can be signed either before the publication of the HIP or before the adoption of the decision.

2.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 200,000,000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time. More information will be available upon adoption of the general budget of the European Union for the year 2016).
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. All interventions as described in Section 3 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016¹. Actions will 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 Form²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 31 / 01 / 2016.³

Assessment round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 130 000 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time).

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.

- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. All interventions as described in Section zero of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁴. Actions will start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners Priority will be given to actions already started in the ground funded by ECHO. For Jordan priority will be given to partners with presence at the Jordanian Eastern border with Syria.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 29/04/2016.⁶

Assessment round 3 – JORDAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 20 000 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in Section 3.2.2.2.8 of the present HIP Technical Annex.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2017⁷. Actions may start from 01/01/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners Priority will be given to partners with demonstrated response capacities in Jordan.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form⁸
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information for Jordan: by 31/03/2017.⁹

Assessment round 3 - EGYPT

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 800 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in Section 3.2.2.2.9 of the present HIP Technical Annex.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2017¹⁰. Actions may start from 01/01/2017.

⁴ 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.

⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁹ 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.

- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners registered and allowed to work in Egypt. Priority will be given to actions already started on the ground.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form¹¹
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information for Egypt: by 28/02/ 2017.¹²

Assessment round 3 - SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 25 600 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in Section 3.2.2.2.10 of the present HIP Technical Annex.
- c) Costs may be eligible from 01/01/2017¹³. Actions may start from 01/01/2017.
- 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 Form¹⁴
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information for Syria: by 15/02/ 2017.¹⁵

2.2. Operational requirements:

2.2.1. 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, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹² 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.

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹⁵ 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.

may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed

2.2.2. *Operational guidelines:*

2.2.2.1. 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>

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/food_assistance/them_policy_doc_foodassistance_en.pdf

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>

10 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

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

<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.

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.

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: Partners should ensure that the context analysis is protection-sensitive by taking 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 of the affected population. Using this model is crucial in designing an appropriate response.

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: In order to minimize unintended and/or detrimental implications of inappropriately designed or poorly implemented actions, partners must respect the 'do-no-harm' principle.

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.

All ECHO beneficiaries and activities should be appropriately protected from hazards and shocks – according to their likelihood of occurrence, intensity and possible impact. ECHO uses two complementary methods for DRR: 1) **Integrated DRR** is where ECHO humanitarian interventions are risk informed 2) **Targeted DRR** refers to specific DRR risk reduction actions – that cannot be "integrated" into ECHO response projects (see above) but that will strengthen a system to avoid future humanitarian needs by reducing risk to vulnerable populations.

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. Response analysis to support modality selection for all types of assistance provided is mandatory. DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. For in-kind transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible. While DG ECHO recommends to consider the use of cash-based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. 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 market situation, cost efficiency and effectiveness. It is strongly recommend for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Thematic Policy Document n° 3](#). This includes the use of the decision tree and respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.¹⁶

Resilience: 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

¹⁶ See section 1.2 and 2.3.3 of the DG ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#).

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 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. 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.

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/>.

2.2.2.2. General sector recommendations

3.2.2.2.1 Protection

In addition to the general principles reflected above, the following applies to the Syria crisis context:

Maintaining a clear focus on protection in the humanitarian response to Syria and its neighbouring countries is a key feature of DG ECHO's strategy. This particularly refers to the application of International Humanitarian, Human Rights and Refugee Law. Decisions on specific activities to support will be based on a clear and comprehensive analysis of protection threats, vulnerabilities and capacities leading to a prioritization of the appropriate responses.

Interventions designed to *reduce and mitigate the protection risks of human-generated violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons in the Syria crisis* might be supported either in the form of stand-alone programmes or in an integrated manner by achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection sensitive targeting. The application of an integrated protection programming approach is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. DG ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30,000 within an existing grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues, including those listed in the [Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming](#).

Specific protection interventions that will be prioritized are listed below along with technical requirements and recommendations:

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals: Registration for refugees and asylum seekers as well as separated and un-accompanied minors; birth registrations for refugee and other conflict-affected children; support to restoration of lost personal documentation; restoration of family links, family tracing and reunification (only by specialised agencies); and monitoring of detention conditions (only by specialised agencies).

Information Management: Population movement tracking for IDPs; Monitoring of violations to feed a trend analysis that informs response programming and advocacy, and

identifies victims of violence subsequently addressed by appropriate case management as outlined below.

Advocacy: Informed and prudent advocacy and communication on grave violations of International Humanitarian, Human Rights and Refugee Law is encouraged and will be supported.

Dissemination of International Humanitarian Law: activities aiming at IHL dissemination in conflict affected area mainly in Iraq and Syria will be encouraged. Partners directly engaging with armed groups on the respect of the rule of war should have proven experience in the domain, and the use of already existing tools for dissemination should be prioritized.

Durable solutions (DS): specific activities aiming at facilitating unforced, well-informed, safe and dignified durable solutions might be considered when targeting extremely vulnerable cases. For the time being this will mainly focus on support to preparatory activities linked to resettlement. This might include legal assistance and support to restoration of personal documentation; information dissemination on DS possibilities where this option is available to refugees; direct assistance in country of temporary residency.

Programmes to assist victims of all kinds of violence, including GBV, can be supported along the following lines:

- Medical assistance: must be provided as quickly as possible, by skilled staff, and according to internationally recognized protocols. Medical assistance for victims of rape must be provided within a 72h frame. Ensuring availability of PEP kits for both adults and children is absolutely essential.
- Mental Health and Psycho-social/Psychological support: should be provided by sufficiently trained providers¹⁷.
- Participation in coordination structures (i.e. particularly Health, Protection, Child Protection, GBV Cluster/WG) is essential and clear referral pathways must be foreseen within the proposal.
- Legal recourse: information on possibility to access to legal recourse should be provided whenever contextually feasible.
- GBV specific: Services must be available to men, boys, women and girls. Proposals must specify the main type of GBV issue(s) they seek to address. Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies might be funded, and male targeting and involvement in these activities are crucial.

Use of Cash Based Intervention (CBI): cash based interventions may be considered as an assistance modality, and as such they may be used as one of a range of complementary activities to achieve protection specific results. The logical causality and the process leading to the protection outcome through the use of CBI need to be clearly and explicitly identified in the proposal by the partner. Economic assistance as direct compensation for protection violations experienced will not be funded.

Child Protection: Particularly activities addressing separation of children and families and unaccompanied children, including BID processes. Tracing activities might only be

¹⁷ Partners' proposals should specify the educational level of the service providers they engage, and service providers of psycho-social support should preferably as a minimum have the educational level of social workers

supported through partners with specialised experience herein, and partners must document that they have the necessary capacity to link up with similar relevant agencies across the region to ensure that cross-border tracing is conducted if necessary. Special attention will be paid to addressing recruitment of children. Addressing psycho-social needs of children might be considered provided quality of services and comprehensive referral pathways are ensured.

Housing, Land and Property Rights: Security of tenure for people displaced in private housing and preventing/addressing forced evictions might be considered.

Community-based protection interventions – activities aiming to increase self-protection capacities of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promoting cohesion with host communities might be considered. This might include support to community based protection committees and networks; community-hub for crisis-affected populations to access vital information, protection awareness and legal information, safe space and counselling; social cohesion initiatives in host communities.

Information dissemination: dissemination of information to the affected population on relevant legal frameworks, rights and entitlements in the country of displacement and asylum and concrete possibilities for assistance. Field-level interventions aimed at facilitating access to services, linking the most vulnerable population to available support, will be prioritized.

3.2.2.2.2 Health

Support to humanitarian health assistance should be based on improving access to basic health services of quality for the most vulnerable population and war wounded victims.

- Utilization by the most vulnerable of basic health services needs to be monitored and reported. Free access to healthcare remains a key principle for ECHO.
- Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives (during the period of assistance) should be prioritized: Primary Health Care covering communicable diseases as well as mother and child care, but also provision of emergency health care, including obstetric care, and emergency psycho-social support. Postoperative and rehabilitation services for injured and war wounded, comprehensive care for victims of SGBV, and preventive and cost-efficient care for Chronic and non-communicable diseases can also be considered.
- Actions should be based on a quantitative needs analysis (to be repeated at regular intervals). Health Data, disaggregated according to sex and age, should be collected and analysed. Continuations of previously funded projects should highlight the advances made and changing needs over the past period(s).
- Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to medical waste management; safety (quality) of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (ambulances; drugs;..).
- The functionality of existing Early Warning, Surveillance and Response systems (like the EWARS inside Syria) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce proposed.

- Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.
- In refugee settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities.
- Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. IcSP and ENI) needs to be established and opportunities for LRRD fully explored.
- As part of the Transformative Agenda, ECHO expects partners to collaborate with the health cluster and sector working groups.

The above mentioned points reflect ECHO priorities in the health sector. Partners are invited to discuss needs and interventions with ECHO offices.

3.2.2.2.3 Basic-Need Response

By way of promoting comprehensive approach and efficiency gains, DG ECHO supports a basic-need approach, through a combination of modalities, preferably multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT), as cash allows beneficiaries to meet a wide range of needs in a dignified manner.

Partners are referred to [*10 Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs*](#) for more details of DG ECHO's position.

Proposals should incorporate a well-articulated response analysis that builds on needs assessment, and clearly informs the choice of response(s) and modalities:

- i. In Syria neighbouring countries, where refugees have been facing multiple needs for a long period, making use of extreme negative coping mechanisms, and where access to livelihood opportunities have been limited, unconditional assistance (i.e. not tying assistance to something the beneficiaries would need to do, be it work or other conditions) should be the first option to be considered. Note that the drawbacks of conditioned assistance are the cost to implement or monitor the conditions, the risk to exclude vulnerable households and therefore miss the desired impact, and the risk of poor quality or irrelevant works.
- ii. Response should be based on sound assessments, ideally multi-sectorial, allowed for a timely adjustment of the response. Proposals should also include a market analysis component that covers the components of the response (such as shelter, WASH, primary health, food etc). Existing tools must be used (and in some countries revamped) with this in mind; it is generally unlikely that additional tools are necessary.
- iii. The general rule should favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households. All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms in order to ensure greater coverage of basic needs at household level and improved consistency of the response. Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed.
- iv. DG ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality, depending on the context.

- v. DG ECHO support common platforms for the delivery of cash assistance, to enhance the cost efficiency of the action.
- vi. Any assistance should enable targeted households to meet their basic needs, taking into account their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB, minus income or production from own sources), therefore the value of the assistance should be decided upon sound analysis and agreed with the wider humanitarian community.
- vii. Furthermore, any response should include a strong component of predictability (frequency and duration) for better efficiency and effectiveness, and explore possible transition/exit strategies through linkages with national or international instruments.
- viii. While the protection of livelihoods is a principal objective of humanitarian assistance, opportunities are today extremely limited in hot countries primarily due to limitations of some national legislation and policies. It is therefore recommended that, in coherence with country strategies, DG ECHO engagement should rest primarily on advocacy.

Basic-Needs Response requires 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, common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring. Cash transfers in emergencies should align with existing social protection systems where possible and appropriate.

3.2.2.2.4 Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

Food assistance interventions will be primarily supported to save lives as a response to severe, transitory food insecurity due to natural and/or man-made disasters, preferably as an integral part of a basic needs response.

Partners applying for DG ECHO funding should highlight linkages and integration with other sectors either within their proposed actions or with other actions. Whenever possible, food assistance should be integrated within a multi-sectoral approach to the crisis (refer also to the section above on Basic-Needs Response), for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

- i. All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based: proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment, and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria.
- ii. All proposals should clearly identify food gaps, and include well identified food outcomes and indicators (KRIs) relevant for the action.
- iii. The general rule should favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households with well-identified basic humanitarian food and nutrition needs.
- iv. All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms in order to ensure greater coverage and improved consistency of the response. Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed.
- v. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality, depending on the context.

- vi. Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- vii. Partners are referred to DG ECHO policy Document on [Humanitarian Food Assistance](#).
- viii. DG ECHO will continue advocating for further linkages between food assistance interventions and nutrition outcomes and programmes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices. Partners are referred to the Infant and Young Child Feeding in Emergency ([IYCF-E](#)) guidance that recalls the fundamentals of IYCF-E and provides practical guidance to ensure that IYCF-E concerns are taken into account across sectors and throughout all stages of humanitarian programming.
- ix. HFA, protection and gender: in the spirit of ‘do no harm’ partners should ensure that a good analysis is carried out concerning the impact of a proposed action on the protection of vulnerable groups within the target population. For this purpose partners are encouraged to refer to the [Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming](#).

3.2.2.2.5 WASH AND SHELTER

ECHO supports comprehensive and complementary water, sanitation and shelter through the promotion of an integrated approach to mitigate public health risks and restore the dignity to the vulnerable population

- All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based that is well defined in a situation and response analysis, based on needs assessments and continuous needs monitoring aimed at rapidly addressing and responding to regular changes in the context.
- Targeting of the most vulnerable households and groups for water, sanitation, hygiene (WASH) and Shelter interventions, should be based on identified needs, disaggregated by sex and age, and be well documented and justified.
- Rehabilitation, maintenance and repair of existing basic services, such as water, sanitation and shelter, will be prioritised¹⁸, taking into consideration any contributing factors or constraints, such as, winterisation, water shortages and scarcity due to seasonal changes.
- The selection of the technology and technical approach to support basic services, such as water, sanitation and shelter, should be unbiased, transparent and evidence-based, supported by a comparative analysis which takes into account cost effectiveness and efficiency (i.e. use of scored and weighted selection criteria / matrix etc.).
- Partners are encouraged to demonstrate justification for costs to achieve outcomes for WASH and Shelter interventions supported by a comparative analysis which takes into account cost effectiveness and efficiency (i.e. cost per person / HH, cost to cover gaps / needs etc.).
- As a key component of programme delivery for WASH and Shelter interventions, the use of market analysis to better understand the potential application of innovative

¹⁸ For the case of water provision and supply, water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort, lifesaving intervention that is well planned and executed with a defined exit strategy.

transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) could be taken into consideration. This may require an increase in the capacity of partners to properly identify and select applicable transfer modalities, along with any associated constraints and learning required to justify the technical soundness, effectiveness and efficiency of these actions.

- An integrated programming approach, based on the linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter and Protection to ensure coordinated, multi-sectoral response focused on effectiveness and efficiency.
- All interventions should be grounded in sound coordination between other sectoral and inter-sectoral partners, to ensure effective and efficient emergency response, preparedness and contingency planning. Focus should be on the ability to rapidly and predictably provide assistance to regular changes in the context, based on continuous needs assessments and gap analysis.
- Partners are encouraged to exchange the many valuable experiences and lessons from countries affected by the Syria conflict, internally and externally, documenting and disseminating evidence-based best practices.

3.2.2.2.6 Education in Emergencies

ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education¹⁹ 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 particularly be supported. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention may also be supported.

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, 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.

¹⁹ 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.

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](#).

3.2.2.2.7 Visibility and Communications

Standard visibility (<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>) is a contractual obligation for all ECHO-funded projects. ECHO makes available up to 0.5% of eligible costs to cover expenses related to the implementation of standard visibility requirements (with a maximum of EUR 8,000). It entails:

1. display of the EU humanitarian aid field visual identity. The size and prominence of the EU visual identity will depend in the specific context (e.g. the amount and proportion of EU funding).
2. written and verbal recognition of the EU's role in global humanitarian aid, in partnership with the agency implementing the action, when referring to an EU funded project in media interviews, press releases, webpages, social media, blogs, articles about the project, etc.

However, we also highly encourage partners with strong and ambitious communications ideas, aiming at reaching principally EU audiences, and with a demonstrated media/communications capacity to apply for above-standard visibility (<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/above-standard-visibility-template/>). ECHO can provide additional budget should a partner want to carry out such more elaborate communication actions. Communication actions must always be designed to fit the target audiences, the key messages, the concrete project and the capacity of the partner. Relevant actions could include for example audio-visual productions, journalist-visits to project sites, poster-campaigns, exhibitions or other types of events with an important outreach to the European public and media.

A separate communications plan, costed, with an estimated audience reach and a timeline, must be submitted and approved by ECHO's Communication Unit (ECHO.A2) prior to the signing of the contract. The plan must be inserted as an annex in the Single Form (under point 9.2). Partners will normally maintain contact to the Communication Unit and/or the relevant [Regional Information Officer](#) in the course of the implementation of the plan.

Above-standard visibility/communication is *additional* to standard visibility.

Therefore, in all projects standard visibility, including on-site display of the ECHO visual identity will still need to be implemented based on the specifications in the Single Form.

Communication actions must always be designed to fit the target audiences, the key messages, the concrete project and the capacity of the partner. Relevant actions could include for example audio-visual productions, journalist-visits to project sites, poster-campaigns, exhibitions or other types of events with an important outreach to the European public and media.

3.2.2.2.8. JORDAN

Programming priorities

ECHO's priorities in 2017 focus on the provision of timely, adequate and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas and to refugees living in camps or in hosting communities based on the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF). Despite significant achievements following the London Conference in early 2016 and the signature of a Compact agreement between the EU and the Government of Jordan, the humanitarian space for Syrian refugees in Jordan continues to erode, with cases of forced encampment or *refoulement* to Syria. In mid-2016, Jordan tightened its border policy management, leading to a full closure of the borders with Syria. ECHO interventions will also focus on new arrivals in 2017, if confirmed, throughout the thematic priorities described below.

Thematic priorities

Protection

Protection should be an integral part of all ECHO projects, not only as a mainstreaming component, but also as part of an integrated programming approach. Activities aiming to i) provide legal documentation enabling refugees to access available services, ii) increase economic and social opportunities for refugees, particularly for those living in the hosting communities and iii) related advocacy would be considered. To enhance an overall coordinated response, based on harmonized targeting and robust referral systems, ECHO will consider funding a protection-focused consortium. Proposed target groups for the intervention could include people living in transit centers, camps, hosting communities as well as those stranded at the Berm.

ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions among the following:

At the Berm and in transit centers

- Advocacy for refugee's access to the Jordanian territory, prevention of *refoulement* as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to Syrian refugees stranded at the Berm and for those stuck in transit centers.
- Registration and profiling of the asylum seekers stranded at the Berm.

In camp settings

- Ensure a robust referral system is in place to capture and track all types of protection cases, and follow up of referred cases ensuring access to services.
- Advocacy towards the camp management and towards the relevant Jordanian authorities to expedite refugees' (originating from the Berm) screening in Azraq camp, to guarantee their freedom of movement and access to the necessary services including basic needs, health, and protection.
- Whilst GBV issues could be addressed, related services should be delivered through the reproductive health (RH) angle.

In the hosting communities (a proposal from a protection consortium would be advisable)

- Continuation of the 2016 protection monitoring exercise aiming at protection needs identification and the provision of protection services.
- Provision of protection services, especially for refugees lacking proper documentation and/or registration to enable access to all available services.
- Redress legal support for protection cases beyond basic legal advice.

Basic-needs assistance

Promoting a comprehensive approach and efficiency, ECHO supports basic-needs assistance (BNA²⁰) allowing the most vulnerable refugees, inclusive of any new arrivals, particularly in the hosting community, to meet in a dignified manner a wide range of their needs. In Jordan, refugees are facing multiple needs since several years, resorting to extreme negative coping mechanisms. Viewing refugees' limited access to livelihood opportunities, a multi-purpose approach should be proposed in response to the multiple needs faced by refugees in Jordan.

Nonetheless, given the need for more predictable / longer-term funding mechanisms / instruments and the need for transitioning the basic needs approach into a social protection-type of scheme, ECHO will consider:

- Proposals aiming at the provision of basic-needs assistance (here referred as 'regular BNA') to the most vulnerable refugee households in urban contexts. Proposals must envisage clear targeting and verification mechanisms, to ensure caseload punctual update, sound outreach and referral system to reduce exclusion errors. Proposals must also contain clear transition strategies and linkages with other longer-term development instruments.
- Proposals aiming to assist refugees excluded or temporarily unable to access the regular BNA, identified as socio-economically vulnerable. Those interventions should:
 - provide an adequate BNA as consistent as possible with the regular BNA;
 - should be considered as a temporary measure (up to 3- 6 months maximum);
 - be delivered in close conjunction with legal and/or protection support to facilitate their access/admission to the regular BNA

Protection monitoring and referral systems should be privileged mechanisms to ensure - those falling through the cracks are captured, and to facilitate their access to these schemes. Partners should note that the BNA must not to be combined in proposals with any sectorial intervention utilizing cash as a response modality, as this will contribute to a negative assessment.

Health

ECHO will consider funding specific health interventions among the following:

In the hosting communities

- Proposing gradual phase out from the health support and transition to longer term instruments, in view of the 2016 decree of providing maternal health support.
- Strengthen referral mechanisms and health assistance in mental health and psychosocial support' (MHPSS), physical rehabilitation services, as well as secondary health care for refugees.
- Partners should quantify coverage and gaps in access to health services as well as evidence access barriers for primary and secondary health care.

In camp settings

- Ensure that refugees, inclusive of new arrivals, have access to direct health services according to their needs with focus on reproductive health. GBV services must be delivered under the RH angle.

²⁰ BNA refers to a regular and unrestricted cash transfer (MPCT) provided on a monthly basis to the most in-need refugees assessed on basis of socio-economic vulnerability indicators.

- Ensure that functioning and robust referral mechanisms are capturing and tracking type of cases, waiting time, and other challenges; especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery, end result, etc.).

Shelter & NFIs

ECHO will consider funding specific interventions among the following:

In the hosting community -

- Timely winterization activities based on a sound targeting methodology, that focuses on the most vulnerable.
- Coordination arrangements must be detailed, ensuring that a proper referral system is in place²¹.

In camp settings -

- Winterization activities, including shelter upgrades with appropriate delivery modality given the specific context should be described. Likewise, the methodology to ensure proper targeting and follow up must be fully described. Priority should be given to the most vulnerable individuals.

The use of cash based and/or in-kind (NFIs) distribution modalities, if supported by a comparative analysis, which takes into account cost effectiveness and efficiency, will be considered by ECHO. .

WASH is not identified as a priority sector for ECHO funding, although special consideration could be proposed if immediate life-saving needs arise in specific locations.

Education in Emergency (EiE)

ECHO will consider supporting educational activities both in the hosting communities and in refugee camps. Innovative approaches will be particularly welcomed. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in view of a hand-over to 'development' intervention may also be considered. It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programmes, thus this dimension has to be specifically addressed. Any proposed activity must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other circumstances. Specifically:

- Provision of life-skills supporting children to access education where they feel safe and protected could be considered.
- Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors, children at work...),
- Activities strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies.
- Coordination will be essential and all proposals including education in emergencies must detail coordination arrangements and should support priorities set with 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).

²¹ This should be in coordination/through the WG (BNA) and RAIS II

3.2.2.2.9. EGYPT

In **Egypt**, due to the deteriorating conditions of the refugees and the increasing number of new arrivals, ECHO intends to consolidate its small-scale niche response initiated in 2016, focusing on *core humanitarian needs*. The response strategy is two-fold: strengthening protection, including child protection for the most vulnerable and enhancing access to emergency health and education services, including through education in emergency, whilst boosting oversight on new dynamics and trends, notably the refugees-migration nexus. Whilst the Syrian refugees remain ECHO's entry point, the most vulnerable among other refugees groups and their hosting communities may also be assisted.

Programming priorities

Egypt remains a country of destination and transit for asylum seekers, refugees and migrants. Year 2016 was characterized by an upward trend of new arrivals. ECHO funding will aim at consolidating the small-scale niche response initiated in 2016, focusing on core humanitarian needs. Whilst the Syrian refugees remain ECHO's entry point, assistance to the most vulnerable among other refugees groups and their hosting communities will be considered. Project proposals should adhere to the overall ECHO response strategy aimed at strengthening protection for the most vulnerable whilst at the same time enhancing access to emergency health and education services, including through education in emergency. The use of multi-purpose cash transfers for particularly vulnerable groups through common platforms will be considered if supported by a comparative analysis which take into account cost efficiency and effectiveness.

Given the urban concentration of the refugee population in Egypt and the recent dynamic around the refugees-migration nexus, ECHO partners should submit proposals that clearly demonstrate robust complementarities and synergies with other EU instruments such as RDPP/AMIF for protection and mix-migration, the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI); the MADAD Trust Fund, the EU Trust Fund for Africa (North-Africa window), as well as with any other action under the 3RP-Egypt.

Thematic priorities

Protection

Given the upward trend for new arrivals, the increasing number of UASC and irregular entries, as well as the sharp increase of number of refugees detained for attempted irregular migration, strengthening core protection activities for the most vulnerable remains the paramount objective of ECHO.

ECHO will consider funding specific protection interventions among the following:

- Documentation, status determination and protection of individuals
- Information management and advocacy aimed at extending residence visa and facilitating free and safe access to basic services
- Child protection
- Programs to assist victims of all kind of violence including GBV
- Community-based protection interventions

Project proposals aiming at enhancing access to basic services as main objective, should give due consideration to protection mainstreaming.

Health

Whilst refugees in Egypt have overall legal access to public health services, several structural causes (e.g. poor quality of services), thus requiring developmental investments, limit their capacity to benefit from them.

ECHO will consider for funding proposals that facilitate access to emergency health services, particularly maternal and reproductive health, for those refugees without financial means to afford health fees as well as for those victims of discrimination and marginalization. Hosting communities may also benefit from these interventions, as long as the most vulnerable groups or individuals are targeted. Proposals under this sector should specifically envisage a gradual phase out and transition to longer term instruments. Although local capacity building is paramount, ECHO funding should not be used to promote standing alone capacity building schemes.

WASH, Food Assistance and Shelter are not identified as priority sectors for ECHO funding, although special consideration could be given if immediate life-saving needs manifest in specific locations.

Education in Emergency (EiE)

ECHO will consider supporting project proposals that facilitate access to the public education system and/or retention to contrast/limit the high levels of school dropout. Proposals targeting areas with the highest concentration of refugees and levels of school dropout as well as particularly vulnerable groups will be prioritized, whilst the creation of parallel systems must be avoided. Coordination with development partners, other EU instruments and GoE's line ministries must be specifically addressed in proposals, as well as the alignment to the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM) principles, and to globally recognised minimum standards for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and Child Protection.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied and separated minors. They could also entail improving the quality of education, the lack of which contributes to dropouts. The scope could also be enlarged beyond children (under 18 years old) to include youth and young adults if appropriately justified.

ECHO will consider funding specific EiE interventions among the following:

- Transition to formal education systems such as community based pre-school as well as actions strengthening or complementing the formal education system by enhancing its capacity facilitating safe access or improving the quality of education.
- Either specific EiE actions and/or multi-sectoral responses that closely link EiE with protection and supporting actions such as psychosocial support, inclusive of provision of life skills training. Proposals must describe in detail how education activities are to be carried out in close connection with protection programmes, also to ensure that children access education where they feel safe and protected.

3.2.2.2.10. SYRIA

Programming priorities

ECHO in Syria in 2017 will focus on addressing basic needs of the most vulnerable people and communities in a timely, principled and quality manner through the most appropriate modalities or entry points, ensuring provision of integrated and flexible essential life-saving assistance (first line response) as well as coordinated and targeted multi-sectorial post-emergency responses (protracted needs).

All proposed interventions should be context-specific (geographic or community) and evidence-based, with a well-defined situation and response analysis, with detailed access strategy and contingency/preparedness planning considerations. Robust primary needs assessments and continuous needs monitoring arrangements, aimed at responding to regular changes in the context, to rapidly address the needs of the most vulnerable households and groups, must be outlined. Adherence to humanitarian principles, inclusive of “do no harm”, should be described in proposals.

Effective and transparent operational coordination (at hub and inter-hub level) remains a critical requisite for inside Syria proposals; likewise accountability mechanisms should be enhanced through adequate platforms based on Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) and Information Management (IM) capacities and systems aimed at quality evidence-based analysis, outcomes evaluation, supporting integrated interventions and coordinated response in all its elements.

Thematic priorities

Basic needs assistance

By way of promoting comprehensive approach and efficiency gains, ECHO will support basic needs assistance, through a combination of modalities, including multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT), as cash allow beneficiaries to meet a wide range of needs in a dignified manner.

The basic needs assistance proposed should be in line with the following principles:

- Well-articulated multi-sector response analysis that builds on comprehensive needs assessment, and clearly informs the choice of response(s) and modality(ies) to be duly justified according to the needs and vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- Detailed and adequate targeting and prioritization mechanisms with focus on most vulnerable individuals.
- Flexible and reactive operation with capacity to scale up in shortest delay.

Within the overall country strategy, a basic-needs response requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimized through effective operational coordination platforms and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessments, targeting, joint delivery mechanism and monitoring. These dimensions should be clearly addressed in proposals.

Protection

ECHO will prioritize a clear focus on protection in the humanitarian response within Syria, linked to the application of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), International Human Rights (IHRL) and Refugee Law (IRL). Interventions designed to reduce and mitigate the protection risks of man-made violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons in Syria will be supported in the form of either stand-alone or integrated programmes aimed at achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection-sensitive targeting. Decisions on specific activities to be supported will be based on an up-to-date and comprehensive protection risk analysis and vulnerabilities as well as operational capacities and expertise. These dimensions must be specifically described in all proposals.

Specific protection interventions that will be considered for funding include:

- Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals (such as, but not limited to, registration for refugees, returnees and asylum seekers, legal aid for displaced and conflict-affected population, family tracing and monitoring of detention conditions);
- Information Management (such as, but not limited to, forced internal displacement tracking systems or protection monitoring);
- Advocacy (such as, evidence-based advocacy on grave violations of IHL (e.g. on protection of medical staff and facilities or other types of public infrastructure, essential for the survival of the population); IRHL and IRL
- Dissemination of IHL
- Assistance to victims of all kinds of violence, including SGBV, along with child protection from all kind of exploitation, violence and abuse (particularly activities addressing separation of children and families, unaccompanied children, recruitment of children in armed groups, and psycho-social needs of children).
- On account of the degree of contamination by land-mines, Unexploded Ordnances (UXOs) and Improvised Explosive Device (IEDs) in some areas, a comprehensive approach to Mine Action (including Humanitarian Demining / marking; Assistance to Victims, Mine Risk Education) will be considered either as a stand-alone project or part of an integrated approach.

Health

Improving access to basic qualitative health services delivery for the most vulnerable population and war wounded victims will be considered for funding by ECHO. Specifically:

- Comprehensive Primary Health Care, inclusive of communicable diseases as well as mother and child care, but also provision of emergency health care, including obstetric care, and emergency psycho-social support. Preventive and cost-efficient care for chronic and non-communicable diseases may also be considered.
- Comprehensive health services and referral for injured and war wounded, including first line responders, postoperative and rehabilitation care.

- Comprehensive care for victims of SGBV, including Clinical Management of Rape (CMR) and Psycho-social support²², should be integrated as much as possible in all proposed health facilities.
- The functionality of existing Early Warning, Surveillance and Response systems (like the Early Warning and Alert Response Systems EWARS inside Syria) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed.
- Mainstreaming disability in humanitarian operations inside Syria.

Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

Food assistance interventions will be prioritized as saving-lives response to severe, transitory food insecurity, preferably as an integral part of a multi-purpose response for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

- All proposals should clearly identify food gaps, and include well identifies food outcomes Key Objective Indicators (KOIs) and Key Result Indicators (KRIs) relevant for the action.
- The general rule should favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households with well-identified basic humanitarian food and nutrition needs.
- All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms. Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed (ie. sudden emergency)
- Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- Proposals should advocate for linkages between food assistance interventions and other sectors, i.e. protection and nutrition outcomes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices.

WASH, Shelter and NFI

ECHO will prioritize proposals clearly embedding an integrated programming approach, based on the linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter and Protection, to ensure coordinated, multi-sectoral response focused on effectiveness and efficiency. Partners are encouraged to demonstrate justification of costs based on technical details, such as minimum quality standards based on international guidelines (i.e. Sphere), etc.

- For water and sanitation, rehabilitation, maintenance and repair of existing basic services, such as water and wastewater systems, in the emergency and post-emergency phase, will be prioritized. Investment in water and wastewater infrastructure should be supported by a quality assurance mechanism that includes detailed technical specifications (e.g. Bill of Quantities –BoQs-), establishment of Water Safety Plans (WSP)²³, Operation and Maintenance (O&M), and strengthening technical and regulatory capacity at local level.

²² Focused non-specialized support (PSS) – in the form of e.g. individual or group counseling – may be provided at community centers, schools, etc. provided that this is done by trained staff supervised by a qualified psychologist.

²³ WSP focus on ensuring safe, drinkable water throughout the safe water chain, from source to point of consumption. WSP are centred on proper system assessment; effective operational monitoring; and management and communication to ensure proper adherence to procedures.

- Partners must demonstrate in proposals their capacity to evaluate and assess the impact of investments to water and wastewater systems, by providing data related to improvements to access and availability based on pre and post-implementation status of the system. Water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort, lifesaving intervention that is well planned and executed with a defined exit strategy for the emergency phase. This should be accompanied by a detailed water quality monitoring protocol.
- Standalone Hygiene promotion (HP) activities will not be considered. In the frame of a water & sanitation project, HP will be only considered if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonized messages and communication channels in line with the national WASH Cluster guideline. For Shelter, only emergency interventions, such as, basic shelter upgrades, sealing off kits or emergency shelter comprehensive package will be considered.
- No routine distribution of Non Food Items (NFI) and hygiene items will be considered. This will exclusively be considered for emergency response to specific emergencies (Sudden displacement for example).

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

ECHO will prioritize education activities that enable children's access to quality education in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and immediate post-emergency phases. Innovative solutions will particularly be considered.

- It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programmes. In addition the design of any EiE interventions must fully adhere to protection mainstreaming principles, including, but not limited to, do-no-harm considerations.
- Partners must ensure that there is no overlap with education interventions that could be funded by DG NEAR.
- Priority will be given to education activities that entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school through various modalities (this could include e.g. support to informal education, distance learning) and to mine risk education. Activities shall be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances like access to safe and secure learning space.
- All education in emergencies proposals need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian mechanisms

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and information management (IM)

Following a countrywide approach, ECHO will consider proposals paying particular attention to M&E and IM components that both build upon and help improve existing capabilities and systems in accordance with guidelines and standards adopted by inter-agency working groups. In this respect, M&E and IM tools should be:

- Harmonized and compatible in order to enable IM and M&E systems to produce comparable information and data.

- Time-sensitive in order to allow for appropriate analysis of information/data, early emergency response, and decision-making when and if programme adjustments are required as well as the development of a solid base of “lessons learnt” that should feedback into the programme cycle and help inform longer-term strategies.
- Efficient and cost-effective making full use of existing capacities and technical/technological resources. The use of new, additional capabilities or resources must be clearly justified.