

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### CARIBBEAN

#### 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/C4 (Asia, Latin America, Caribbean, Pacific)

Contact persons

at HQ

Name: Ulrika Conradsson (Desk Officer for the Caribbean)

e-mail: [ulrika.conradsson@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ulrika.conradsson@ec.europa.eu)

in the field

Name: Virginie Andre (Technical Assistant in the field for the Caribbean)

e-mail: [virginie.andre@echofield.eu](mailto:virginie.andre@echofield.eu)

Name: Jordi Torres Miralles (Technical Assistant ECHO Haiti)

e-mail: [jordi.torres-miralles@echofield.eu](mailto:jordi.torres-miralles@echofield.eu)

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 15 000 000

*Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:*

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises:                      HA-FA:EUR 4 500 000

Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters:                      HA-FA: EUR 7 800 000

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO:                                      Dis. Prep.: EUR 2 700 000

Total:    HA-FA-DP: EUR 15 000 000

### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1. Administrative info

##### **Assessment round 1: HAITI/food assistance and livelihoods**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 500 000 (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 3.4 of the HIP related to Haiti.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>1</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is to 12 months for response projects and up to 18 months for projects related to resilience-building.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 07/12/2015<sup>2</sup>.

##### **Assessment round 2: HAITI/other sectors**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 000 000 (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 3.4 of the HIP related to Haiti except food assistance and DRR.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016. Actions may start from 01/02/2016.
- c) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months for response projects and up to 18 months for projects related to resilience-building.
- d) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>3</sup>.
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 25/01/2016<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>4</sup> 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 3: CARIBBEAN/Disaster Risk Reduction**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 000 000 (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 3.4 of the HIP related to Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016. Actions may start from 01/02/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months for projects related to resilience-building.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>5</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 18/01/2016<sup>6</sup>.

### **Assessment round 4: Hurricane Matthew, Haiti, WASH**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 500 000.
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the need described in section 0 of the revised Humanitarian Implementation Plan and in line with sections 3.2.2.2 of the Technical Annex.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 04/10/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: Preselected partner: UNICEF due to the urgent character of the concerned activities.

### **Assessment round 5: Hurricane Matthew, Haiti, Food Assistance, Nutrition, Livelihood Support, Education, Shelter**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000.
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 of the revised Humanitarian Implementation Plan and in line with sections 3.2.2.2 of the Technical Annex.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 15/11/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: Preselected partner: CARE due to the urgent character of the concerned activities.

---

<sup>5</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>6</sup> 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.

## **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, 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 may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed.

### *3.2.2. Operational guidelines:*

#### **3.2.2.1. General Guidelines**

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

*The EU resilience communication and Action Plan*

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

*Food Assistance*

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

*Nutrition*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04\\_nutrition\\_addressing\\_undernutrition\\_in\\_emergencies\\_en.pdf](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>

*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](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](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](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](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](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](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, 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.
- The proposal includes contingency planning. "Crisis modifiers" should be considered in DRR activities to allow a shift to more "emergency-type" interventions in case of need and when possible, where it can be effective and brings an added value. An action should therefore have some kind of clear contingency plan. This is the case when a crisis emerges that may require funds to be used in a different way to respond to new arising needs that are different from those explicitly mentioned in the original plan of action.

ECHO focuses on **vulnerability and not just on hazards**. The entry point remains Natural Hazards. However DRR should be considered in all contexts, including fragility and conflict, where natural hazards pose an additional threat and may impede delivery of humanitarian assistance or protection and well-being of beneficiaries.

In DRR stand-alone and integrated projects ECHO partners are encouraged to be informed about and to use EU Civil Protection expertise if available. For instance, this may be done by liaising with ongoing activities by the EU Civil Protection such as an advisory mission already agreed between the government and the EU. It may also include advocacy with local authorities, during seminar or other events envisaged by the action, on the potential support that the EU Civil Protection can offer in a determined context

**Strengthening coordination:** Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. The partners should actively engage with the relevant local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.



**Integrated approaches:** Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

**Resilience<sup>7</sup>:** 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 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.

**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

---

<sup>7</sup> *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).*

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.

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<sup>8</sup> 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;
- 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

---

<sup>8</sup> **MPCT:** 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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers_en)

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.

**Education in emergencies:** ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education 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 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.

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. Specific guidelines

##### **Haiti**

All actions funded have to ensure significant impact on responding to acute humanitarian needs of most vulnerable households while contributing to the overall goal of resilience-

building to the largest extent possible. Actions should seek, when feasible, to promote institutionalization.

In the following sections specific guidelines for programming under the HIP 2016 are described.

### *Food assistance and livelihoods*

- Response to acute needs in terms of severe food insecurity based on information and analysis done at national and local level should be the main entry point
- In addition interventions should be complemented whenever possible with supportive actions aiming to improve capacities of people affected in order to be better prepared and reduce vulnerability to shocks.
- Targeting of areas and beneficiaries based on food security indicators should be ensured. Areas most affected by acute food insecurity will be prioritized, based on Acute IPC analysis results (areas and households considered in Phase 3 (crisis situation) will be the priority).
- Food security and livelihoods information and analysis should be used for project design and monitoring and evaluation (livelihood profiles, IPC information, food security assessments etc).
- Interventions should be risk-informed and consider all potential threats that can increase food insecurity of most vulnerable.
- It is encouraged that all interventions include nutrition sensitive components (e.g. support nutrition monitoring systems at community level (screenings) and referral in intervention areas in order to contribute to information systems, nutrition promotion, IYCF-E, etc).
- Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all food security and livelihood projects
- All interventions have to be designed according to a thorough “risks and assumptions analysis” and the evolution of the situation against those risks and assumption has to be closely monitored in order to ensure prompt and timely adjustment of the project’s activities in case the situation and needs evolve differently. The use of existing early warning mechanisms should be promoted as well as reinforcing local institutions and actors.
- Emergency/ response actions have to be articulated taking into account the following considerations:
  - Targeting of beneficiaries should be done based on the impact of the crisis and targeting methodologies should ensure quality targeting of the people with severe food insecurity and verification by partners should be included. Methodologies should be used that have proven their validity such as the Frequency List developed by the CNSA<sup>9</sup>, and existing tools in Haiti (livelihood profiles, etc.).
  - Food assistance responses should ensure that adequate food consumption is ensured. The food gap that actions aim to cover has to be well justified: in terms of value or the amount of the food assistance provided; it should be at least 75% equivalent to the **basic food basket according to food prices in local markets**

---

<sup>9</sup> CNSA has validated the « Frequency List » methodology for emergency response interventions.

- in the targeted intervention areas.** In terms of period covered (number of months), it should prioritize crisis periods.
- The methodology chosen to provide the assistance or a combination of different ones should be adapted to the context and to the beneficiaries. All suggested interventions have to answer the following questions “Why not cash?” “Why not in-kind?”
  - The choice of the modality has to be based on market analysis and be context specific (please refer to general guidelines, **Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers**) Partners should ensure proper follow up of market prices.
  - The value or amount of the assistance provided should be the same for all the targeted beneficiaries whatever the modality chosen.
  - When water access has been critically affected; **emergency actions** aiming to improve water access in terms of quantity and quality according to minimum standards are encouraged. Priority will be given to ensure water supply for human consumption. However, water supply for other purposes can be considered if crucial to protect highly vulnerable households’ assets (e.g. water for livestock).
- Food assistance activities should also contribute to the resilience of affected people in order to be better prepared and reduce vulnerability to shocks through livelihood protection. The following proposed activities could be considered:
    - A holistic approach with regard to livelihoods should be promoted in order to build the resilience of the most vulnerable families, considering livelihood profiles<sup>10</sup> of the targeted areas in order to focus interventions on protecting livelihoods of most vulnerable households.
    - Other activities (not exhaustive) are: support to small producers with adapted seeds (diversification is advised in order to increase production probabilities); support for improving adapted agriculture practices based on local knowledge and considering risk analysis; household gardening activities linked with water supply improvement, training on livelihoods and DRR topics, training on nutrition integrating hygiene practices and household environments, actions aiming to promote highly food insecure households’ recapitalization reinforcing animal assets and integrating DRR, improving access to fodder, water and health for livestock, soil conservation, disaster mitigation or watershed management purposes.
    - Rehabilitation of highly sensitive water systems can be considered as well as building rainwater harvesting ones in places where this is the fastest and most cost-effective option. Promoting governance of water systems in close coordination with local institutions and establishing strong synergies with longer-term actions will be crucial. Integrating water governance actions with other actions adopting a more holistic natural resources management approach is highly encouraged.
    - Reinforcement of information systems about available resources linked to food and nutritional security
    - Systematic information sharing in order to feed national information systems.

---

<sup>10</sup> CNSA and partners : Haïti : Profils des moyens d’existence en milieu rural. Mars 2015

- Support to coordination mechanisms including technical support to the operations implemented, to dissemination of lessons learnt and good practices through active participation in coordination fora (sectoral and multi-sectoral) at departmental and national levels (sectoral tables, IPC exercises, GTSAN...)
  - When relevant, realization of studies linked to food security: HEA, EFSA, EMMA.
  - Comprehensive mapping of initiatives (former, ongoing, future) in the area of intervention in order to identify and optimize synergies and complementarities
  - Strategic LRRD with development initiatives should be sought<sup>11</sup>.
  - Awareness and advocacy for integration of the lessons learnt and good practices into development strategies and programmes
  - Integration of advocacy initiatives in coordination with other actors as well as coordination platforms<sup>12</sup>.
- Food assistance projects that include a resilience approach component will have to articulate with and complement drought preparedness interventions that will be supported under the DRR component of this HIP.

### ***Cholera (Health and WASH)***

ECHO's support to cholera will first and foremost ensure a timely and effective joint rapid response health/wash to the outbreaks in order to cut transmission. Actions related to the response to the on-going outbreak should:

- Maintain and strengthen an operational approach, combining coordinated actions in health and WASH sectors
- Maintain the absolute priority to rapid response to cholera alerts and outbreaks.

In health, particular attention should be given to:

- Strengthening the epidemiological surveillance system, using both institutional and community based systems
- Systematically using cholera laboratory confirmation tests (at least 1 test each 10 suspected cases per outbreak) in order to facilitate decision-making.
- Maintaining and strengthening the quality treatment of cholera patients, free and up to standards as well as respecting adequate protocols.

In WASH, particular attention should be given to:

- Harmonized "Sanitary belt" rapid response strategy at community should be systematically adopted by all partners in each intervention.
- Harmonized monitoring and evaluation systems should be adopted. (e.g Post-distribution and post sensitization monitoring surveys should be systematically done).
- Innovative cholera prevention sensitization approaches going beyond risk knowledge-based methodologies.

---

<sup>11</sup> Take into consideration initiatives mentioned in section 4 of HIP 2016 document. Special attention will be given to strategic synergies /complementarity with EU Delegation FSTP program.

<sup>12</sup> For NGO's ; CCO and CLIO

- NFIs distributed should cover needs for a six-week period, corresponding to the average duration of an outbreak. They should also ensure adequate water storage capacity at household level to allow proper hygiene practices.
- WASH facilities and services in cholera treatment centres must be up to standard, ensure continuous and adequate supply of chlorinated water, and ensure continuous and adequate access to sanitation facilities as well as implementation of adequate hygiene and isolation practices.
- Specific targeted preventive WASH and health measures linked with longer-term initiatives aiming at sustainable interventions could be envisaged and prioritized in areas of persistence.

In addition, other interventions could be considered aiming at reinforcing coordination, strengthening the EWS and surveillance system, autonomous supply systems (medical and water/sanitation), the rapid response performance of national institutions and quality case management, improving water/sanitation/hygiene conditions in key facilities/locations identified as recurrent sources of cholera outbreaks.

### ***Displacement***

The problematic of displacement linked to the earthquake is increasingly complex for the remaining caseload of IDPs and camps. For all intervention, the objective of finding durable solutions to the displacement should prevail. This requires the appropriation and leadership of key Haitian institutions, close coordination and synergies with other actors in particular development actors as well as respect of the principle of voluntariness of any proposed solution and targeting based on criteria of vulnerability (such as risk of eviction, risk of natural disasters, protection issues etc.).

Interventions related to camps could include the following components, based on a thorough analysis of the evolving situation and needs and a clearly demonstrated foreseen impact and added-value of the intervention:

- Support to relocation (in neighbourhood of origin or in province) through the rental subsidy cash grant when necessary, with a prioritization of vulnerable cases (elderly, persons with handicap, protection cases, etc.).
- Support to reintegration through income-generating activities, training (vocational, literacy, life-skills, business plan, hygiene, protection, etc.) and family coaching.
- Ensuring basic wash services in camps if/when a clear exit strategy is ensured.
- Production of information and diagnostics with regard to camps integration when/if a clear and tangible handover to development initiatives is ensured
- Documentation of lessons learned, good practices and tools
- Integration of DRR tools for most vulnerable families or risk mapping in particular for camps vulnerable to natural events

### ***Protection***

The issue of forced eviction can potentially be critical in 2016, and particular attention will have to be paid to camps at high risk of forced eviction as well as camps with temporary shelters to ensure surveillance, mediation and adequate support to victims (counselling, accommodation, legal, administrative support).

The response to other protection issues such as gender-based violence, child protection, documentation of earthquake-affected vulnerable populations in Port-au-Prince, could also be promoted.

In an urban context where basic humanitarian needs have underlying structural causes like extreme poverty, a holistic approach is important aiming at addressing the vulnerabilities of the population in order to build their resilience to shocks. While supporting durable reintegration of IDPs, the extremely vulnerable in the host communities should also be considered to the extent possible together with reinforcing social/community cohesion and building the capacity of existing community structures.

### ***Coordination***

Coordination of humanitarian response will be supported with the objective of ensuring respect of humanitarian principles and humanitarian space. With a resilience perspective, coordination should also promote strategic linking of relief, rehabilitation and development initiatives.

Coordination with national authorities and other stakeholders (such as development actors) is crucial to ensure sustainability of the interventions and appropriation. Active participation in coordination mechanisms at central and departmental/local levels is essential.

### ***Response to Hurricane Matthew in Haiti***

The funds should be used mainly to cover the needs in the WASH sector providing save access to water as well as increasing the level of sanitation and hygiene in the most affected areas. These will integrate emergency water supply taking into account cholera alerts, coverage of emergency sanitation needs with focus on temporary shelters. Mandated international organizations as well as international non-governmental organizations (INGO) already present in the areas of response would be the obvious partners to implement the necessary assistance. The interventions will be based on the current ECHO funded cholera response setup in the southern departments and in complementarity with other donors. Additional resources will be used to cover immediate food, education and shelter needs of Matthew affected individuals, considering those displaced living in temporary shelters as a priority. This group is particularly vulnerable as individuals are exposed to major protection threats such as forced evictions, gender based and children focused violence. These individuals will benefit from a high quality package allowing them cover their immediate food needs, reinforce their livelihoods, repair their damaged houses and allow children go back to school. Such an approach will contribute to mitigating the risk of massive displacement from Matthew-affected zones to Port au Prince or other urban areas. A special focus will be dedicated to protection issues, highly sensitive in the post-Matthew and electoral context. Interventions will target areas with solid LRRD opportunities with EU Delegation programming.



### ***Caribbean - Disaster Risk Reduction***

All actions funded have to contribute to the overall goal of resilience building to the largest extent possible. Actions should be in line with the existing national resilience strategies and seek to promote institutionalization.

The actions must complement the current DIPECHO programme for 2015-2016, aiming at providing most vulnerable populations and communities with sound technical solutions to improve their preparedness for natural hazards.

Targeted Disaster Risk Reduction actions should also contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

Actions should focus on areas with vulnerabilities and high exposure to natural hazards but also where there are opportunities for sustainability and scaling up.

Proposals should consider contingency planning. "Crisis modifiers" should be considered in DRR activities to allow a shift to more "emergency-type" interventions in case of need and when possible, where it can be effective and brings an added value.

Integration of technical/scientific institutions/universities in project activities is encouraged.

Actions must demonstrate clearly defined overall intervention strategies that will ultimately conclude with phase-out and/or handover, either to the target community/institution, the appropriate authorities, or longer-term funding instrument, so that sustainability and replicability is maximized.

Evidence should be provided so that political commitment and institutional engagement allow the continuity or scaling-up of operations beyond the proposed project. Links should be made with existing mechanisms to access public funds for DRR beyond the duration of the proposed project.

Collaborative strategic formulation and planning between partners promoting complementarity is encouraged, and can take the form of consortia or alliances.

### **Priorities in terms of geographical areas and hazards**

#### **a. Geographical areas**

##### **1) Haiti, Dominican Republic, Cuba:**

*More detailed recommendations on DRR priorities are available in the regional DIPECHO workshop report (Haiti) and in the Country Document (Dominican Republic). Some key points<sup>13</sup>:*

For the three countries, drought preparedness has been identified as a priority. An effective intervention should combine water management, livelihoods protection and

---

<sup>13</sup> Country Documents are available at <http://dipecholac.net/contenido/120-documentos-pais.html>

disaster risk reduction. Countries collaboration regarding monitoring and experiences in drought management should be sought.

Three areas have been identified as key regarding drought preparedness:

- Improve knowledge on Drought hazard (Information management, Impact assessment, Raise awareness)
- Implement good practices at community level (by selecting representatives' areas and Early Warning Systems)
- Scaling-up of good practices (through adapted protocols)

The implementation and progress of actions related to these three areas is different country from country and might require an approach that would take several phases.

For Haiti, complementary interventions might be considered aiming at building and strengthening the capacities of the Civil Protection Directorate, in line with the road map for reinforcing the National System for Disaster Risk Reduction.

Indicative amount Cuba: EUR 500 000

Indicative amount Dominican Republic: EUR 500 000

Indicative amount Haiti: EUR 2 M<sup>14</sup>

Preference will be given to at least 15 % co-financed proposals.

## **2) At regional level:**

While Haiti, Cuba and Dominican Republic are prioritized, regional actions including other Caribbean countries can also be considered so as to foster collaboration between countries regarding Drought preparedness measures.

Regional projects go beyond the mere sum of national projects and should have an outreach component. They should be defined taking into consideration existing regional or global initiatives and involving national stakeholders in identification and formulation. Regional actions are also expected to support articulation with local and national ones, promoting exchanges of experiences and coordination.

Regional contributions are not limited to regional projects, but can be delivered through a result, a product, an activity of a local project that responds to a regional interest in a specific sector.

Based on past regional consultation processes, some priorities to identify initiatives of added value for the region and/or for a group of countries have been recommended for future actions<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> These indicative amounts are subject to quality of proposals received

<sup>15</sup> Detailed workshop report available at: <http://www.dipecholac.net/docs/files/788-national-and-regional-drr-opportunities.docx>

Actions proposed should look for regional cooperation, exchange of information, capacity building and training and advocacy at national and regional level.

## **b. Hazards**

As stated in section 3.4 of the HIP, specific interventions to build local capacities in drought preparedness are to be considered. The objective of this ECHO funding in DRR will be to strengthen the response, coping and recovery capacities of communities exposed and vulnerable to droughts through disaster management integrated approaches, building on what already exists. In the medium term, national and regional institutions should have increased their capacity to manage droughts and wider awareness and advocacy should be carried out on adopting preventive approaches to drought management.

Examples of activities that could be included (indicative, not exhaustive):

Local Disaster Management:

- Establish community systems for drought preparedness and water management in specific vulnerable areas. Elaboration of participatory risks, vulnerabilities and livelihood mapping with communities in order to contribute to decision-making and develop community action plans for drought preparedness.
- The various activities should improve and reinforce existing information systems. In terms of project design, strategic planning and programming should be undertaken in a fully participative manner in order to ensure synergy with other disaster risk reduction strategies and other food security or water management programmes in the targeted area.
- Build local capacities and provide training on good practices (such as diversification, improved adapted agricultural practices, soil conservation techniques, etc) and strategies based on established community systems for drought preparedness and water management
- Create and/or consolidate existing local early warning systems, particularly regarding hazards/climate and food security and nutrition monitoring, and reinforce the communication of early warning information to communities.
- Strengthen the link between early warning information, regional/municipal disaster management and contingency plans.

Institutional linkages, advocacy, information, education and communication:

- Systematization of tested tools and lessons learnt from existing experiences.
- Standardize and better coordinate the development and use of advocacy and communication tools, Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) materials, and training systems.
- Effective information management and exchange requires strengthening dialogue and networks among stakeholders (Emergency and Development actors) in order to foster consistent knowledge collection and message dissemination as well as coordinated actions.
- Ensuring that relevant institutions take ownership of tools to manage drought and reinforce local resilient strategies by including them systematically in local plans and budgets.

- Evidence based advocacy through the dissemination of tested tools and lessons learned to a wider humanitarian community and development stakeholders in order to inform development policies, strategies and programmes by increasing the awareness of decision makers of the need to invest adequately in drought preparedness.
- Capacity building of state and non-state actors on the tools and strategies developed.
- Support coordination mechanisms (at national and regional levels) and promote synergies with long term programming and coordination with donors. Proposed linkages between national and relevant regional initiatives should be clearly stated in the proposals.

#### Livelihood protection:

Support the adoption and multiplication of preparedness activities regarding the management of drought and improved resilience of livelihoods including:

- Good practices in farming production and natural resources management: activities to be considered are strengthening of agricultural production with agro-forestry, vegetable gardens and seed production using adapted techniques for soil and moisture conservation. It is important to make the link to integrated water resources management of the micro-basin (rain) water conservation, spring conservation, etc.
- Management capacity and sustainability of water systems at community and municipal level ensured through strategic alliances and dissemination of good practices.

#### **c. Possible intervention modalities**

- National project (one operation, one agreement)
- Multi-country projects (same organization with several countries targeted and one agreement)
- Trans-border initiatives between Haiti and Dominican Republic (cross border river basin, shared hazards along the borders...)
- Regional projects (one operation with several countries targeted - including regional products - in one agreement)