

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### SOUTH ASIA

#### 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

Contact persons at HQ

India and Sri Lanka: Maria João Ralha,  
[maria.ralha@ec.europa.eu](mailto:maria.ralha@ec.europa.eu)

Bangladesh: Anne-Francoise Moffroid,  
[anne-francoise.moffroid@ec.europa.eu](mailto:anne-francoise.moffroid@ec.europa.eu)

Bhutan and Nepal: Anne Marie Renner,  
[anne-marie.renner@ec.europa.eu](mailto:anne-marie.renner@ec.europa.eu)

In the field

India: David Sevçik

[david.sevçik@echofield.eu](mailto:david.sevçik@echofield.eu)

Bangladesh: Michelle Ciccic

[michelle.ciccic@echofield.eu](mailto:michelle.ciccic@echofield.eu)

Nepal: Joëlle Goire

[joelle.goire@echofield.eu](mailto:joelle.goire@echofield.eu)

Bhutan: Piush Kayastha

[piush.kayastha@echofield.eu](mailto:piush.kayastha@echofield.eu)

Sri Lanka: Tapan Mahapatra

[tapan.mahapatra@echofield.eu](mailto:tapan.mahapatra@echofield.eu)

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 17 800 000

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises:	HA-FA: EUR 5 600 000
Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters:	HA-FA: EUR 6 100 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 6 100 000
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 17 800 000

## 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

### 3.1. Administrative info

#### **BANGLADESH - Humanitarian Response Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 6 800 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round.
- 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 up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>2</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 04/01/2016<sup>3</sup>

#### **BANGLADESH - Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Risk Reduction, Resilience: Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 700 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>4</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners

---

<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> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>3</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>4</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.

- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>5</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 04/01/2016<sup>6</sup>

### **BANGLADESH - Humanitarian Response Assessment round 2**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000 (
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP (Bangladesh – Cyclone Roanu)
- c) Costs will be eligible from 17/05/2016<sup>7</sup>. Actions may start from 17/05/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners operational in Cyclone Roanu affected areas
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>8</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 30/06/2016<sup>9</sup>

### **BHUTAN – Disaster Preparedness, Disaster Risk Reduction, Resilience: Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 300 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>10</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>11</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 29/02/2016<sup>12</sup>

---

<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

<sup>7</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>8</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>9</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>10</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>11</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>12</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

### **NEPAL – Humanitarian Response : Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 400 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>13</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>14</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 31/01/2016<sup>15</sup>

### **NEPAL - Disaster preparedness, disaster risk reduction, resilience - Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 3 100 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>16</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>17</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 31/01/2016<sup>18</sup>

### **SRI LANKA- Humanitarian Response Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 500 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0 of the HIP (Sri Lanka- Cyclone Roanu)
- c) Costs will be eligible from 17/05/2016<sup>19</sup>. Actions may start from 17/05/2016

---

<sup>13</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>14</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>15</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>16</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>17</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>18</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

- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners operational in Cyclone Roanu affected areas
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>20</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 30/06/2016<sup>21</sup>

### **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)

---

<sup>19</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>20</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>21</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

*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*

<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)

*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/>.

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.

**Education:** ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education<sup>22</sup> in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in

---

<sup>22</sup> 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.



refugee/IDP camps Innovative solutions will be supported, in particular actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention.

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

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

**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.

**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 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 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 is encouraged when possible.

### 3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

Inclusion of marginalised groups (Dalits, tribes, other minorities, people living with disabilities, women, the elderly) must be properly and systematically addressed in all projects and sectors. These groups live in hazard-prone areas, are disproportionately at risk, and are often excluded from government schemes and relief efforts, further entrenching their vulnerability. The EU financed the IDSN's 2013 report Equality in Aid, and subscribes to its recommendations:

[http://idsn.org/fileadmin/user\\_folder/pdf/New\\_files/Key\\_Issues/Disaster\\_response/EqualityInAid\\_web\\_version.pdf](http://idsn.org/fileadmin/user_folder/pdf/New_files/Key_Issues/Disaster_response/EqualityInAid_web_version.pdf)

European Parliament resolution of 10 October 2013 on caste-based discrimination:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT%20TA%20P7-TA-2013-0420%200%20DOC%20XML%20V0//EN>

If relevant from an operational point of view, and in order to promote coherence and synergies, consortia among partners may be established.

ECHO's Regional Office for in New Delhi Asia has developed a Geo-database for the reporting of all projects containing a WASH, Shelter or Livelihoods component. Partners working in **India** and **Bangladesh** are requested to continuously update this database for these sectors and to present a completed dataset, including geo-referenced photographs, with their final report.

### **Disaster preparedness, disaster risk reduction, resilience**

#### **I. Key requirements**

All proposals must indicate planning and implementation priorities; some of these have been identified during the Lessons Learnt Workshops held at the end of the DIPECHO 7th Action Plan (2013-14). The starting point for disaster preparedness, disaster risk reduction and resilience building projects may be the common models developed in the previous DIPECHO cycles, or the clearly identified need for specific targeted actions, informed by strong analysis of the local context, gaps and opportunities in the DP/DRR landscape.

1. DP/DRR/resilience strategy: The proposals must demonstrate a clearly defined DP/DRR/resilience strategy. The proposed Action should be coherent with and complementary to the broader national or regional DRR/resilience agenda, including through DRR mainstreaming in humanitarian response and development. The Action should not be the sole DRR/resilience component of the Partner's portfolio. Furthermore, the Action should seek to contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

2. Compliance with local specificities: DP/DRR/resilience Actions must be designed to ensure that the DP/DRR models promoted incorporate technical tools, local customs and traditions, as well as local administrative settings. Actions must be closely coordinated with national DRR/resilience policies, involving all relevant national entities, with the objective of maximising ownership, institutionalization, replication and sustainability.

3. Specific recommendations for the common models developed under the 7th DIPECHO Action Plan (2013-14) for community-based disaster preparedness (CBDP) and school-based disaster preparedness (SBDP): As a first step, the common models drafted under the 7th Action Plan, both on CBDP and SBDP, must be further revised, simplified and adapted to the reality of local capacities and resources. Increasing the affordability of the models promoted must remain a priority.

4. Urban DRR/resilience: More attention must be paid to the needs of the growing urban population in South Asia. Pilot urban approaches, including through CBDP, SBDP and reinforcing health systems' preparedness for major disasters (in line with UNISDR's Safer Hospitals campaign), should be further pursued and developed to match the reality of population distribution.

5. Context and needs assessment: Include an assessment of risks and vulnerable groups, as well as an analysis and mapping of stakeholders' mandates, actual roles and relationships and relevant entry points.

6. Exit strategy: Proposals should include an exit strategy, through the handover of responsibilities to local stakeholders. Partners must develop strategies in the short, medium and long-term, in which DP/DRR/resilience actions are time-bound and provide a clear and demonstrable impact. Reinforced linkages with development strategies should be used to ensure longer-term support and capacity-building to local stakeholders, allowing ECHO to progressively withdraw.

## **II. Technical requirements and information**

### **1. Project Management:**

A Project Manager, with previous international experience as project manager in DP/DRR/resilience programmes, will be compulsory from the start date of the Action.

### **2. Intervention modalities:**

Two options are possible: (1) National project (one or more organisation(s), one proposal, one agreement) (2) Multi-country/regional project (one or more organisation(s), two or more countries targeted, one proposal, one agreement). Multi-country/regional projects should go beyond the mere sum of national initiatives and should have an outreach component. They should take into consideration existing regional or global initiatives and involve relevant stakeholders from targeted countries (including other ECHO partners) in the definition and implementation of the operations. The value added of the multi-country/regional approach should be explicit.

### **3. Legal frameworks and national institutions:**

Most South Asian countries are in the process of developing institutional and legal DP/DRR/resilience frameworks. All proposals should align with and contribute to the implementation of these frameworks at all appropriate levels, from national to local, and seek to promote effective synergies between them, to the extent possible.

### **4. Coordination:**

Partners must engage in regular and robust coordination among themselves and with other DP/DRR/resilience actors in the country/region, with the view to develop operational and advocacy synergies while contributing to national DRR platforms. To the extent possible, Partners should participate in joint activities and actively seek opportunities to join efforts with other organisations. Such activities should not be limited to advocacy and public awareness raising.

#### 5. Technical expertise:

Actions focusing on specific sub-sectors, such as Early Warning Systems (EWS), resilient livelihoods, etc., must demonstrate a relevant technical expertise, the availability of tested and approved technologies, as well as a coherent DP/DRR/resilience strategy.

#### 6. Capitalization and sharing of expertise:

Partners must ensure the capitalisation and dissemination of successful experiences in a systematic manner, including through case studies which demonstrate the actual impact of current and previous DIPECHO Actions. The management, dissemination and use of DP/DRR material and tools developed under previous DIPECHO Action Plans or other programmes, including in other countries, is a priority. Development of new tools and documents should be limited to cases where such tools or experience have not yet been explored or created.

#### 7. Mitigation works:

Small-scale mitigation works and infrastructure must remain an outcome of the DP/DRR/resilience participatory process at community level. Such works must be in line with realistically expectable replication, through local government services or other development initiatives, unless clear and urgent humanitarian needs are identified.

#### 8. Baseline and end line surveys:

Such surveys are essential to demonstrate achievements and are thus strongly recommended. Baseline surveys shall not be limited to communities, but also target government services and civil society.

#### 9. Financial matters:

ECHO's financial contribution will, in principle, not exceed 85% of the total eligible costs of the Action.

### **III. Priorities per country**

DIPECHO National Consultative Meetings (NCM) were held in July and August 2014 in Colombo, Dhaka and Kathmandu. The following points reflect ECHO's priorities as well as recommendations made by Partners at the NCMs and at the regional Lessons Learnt Workshop (LLW) of the 7th DIPECHO Action Plan, held in July 2014 in Kathmandu.

All Partners should be aware of the LLW report and respective NCM reports, so that the recommendations are reflected in the proposals.

#### **Bangladesh**

For disaster preparedness, disaster risk reduction and resilience building activities, proposals must be based on a sound needs assessment, rapid reaction capacity, confirmed field presence and an element of co-funding. Strong linkage with local disaster management committees in liaison with their Risk Reduction Assessment Planning is also required.

As far as general coordination and assessment methods are concerned, ECHO supports the Joint Needs Assessment (JNA) approach developed in Bangladesh by all stakeholders and the Government of Bangladesh.

### **Operational priorities:**

In order to promote sustainability and replication it is crucial that all projects explicitly incorporate strategies for transition and continuation by other stakeholders, in particular the government. Such linkage and efforts to promote institutionalization are a pre-requisite. Targeted actions are envisaged to contribute concretely to a broader resilience agenda by supporting in particular resilient livelihoods. Thematic priorities are the following:

#### **Community-Based Disaster Preparedness:**

- Develop an advocacy strategy with all relevant stakeholders from civil society, government agencies and line ministries, cluster system and donors, aimed at:
- Incorporating risk assessment as a pre-condition for planning within government ministries (E.g. Ministries of Agriculture, Education, Health, and Social Welfare):
- Enhanced multi-hazard, multi-sectorial assessment and development planning (Union Master Plan) and harmonised training module adapted for the urban context:
- Integration and synergies between the SBDP, resilient livelihoods and CBDP components.

#### **School Based Disaster Preparedness:**

- Identify ways to expand the number of students reached, for example through the non-formal education system, the non-governmental school system, pre-primary schools, or madrasas;
- Conduct further capacity building on SBDP and Education in Emergencies, through teacher and education officials training institutes (pre-service, foundation, textbook/curriculum-based, and in-service training);
- Based on DIPECHO VII model, replicate disaster-resilient SLIP/UPEP22 nationwide.
- School Level Implementation Plan (SLIP) and Upazilla Primary Education Plan (UPEP)

#### **Resilient Livelihoods:**

- Engage the private sector, community-based organisations, and livelihoods collectives (farmer groups, traders, millers, etc.);
- Mainstream resilient livelihoods planning into the sectorial annual development plans;

- Extend work to most vulnerable regions of Bangladesh (e.g. Satkhira, Cox's Bazaar and Chittagong Hill Tracts);
- Integrate disaster resilient livelihoods into Agriculture Extension Officers' plans.

### **Bhutan**

Given the limited DIPECHO portfolio and very small humanitarian community, National Consultative Meeting have not been held in Bhutan. However, the following recommendations should be considered by ECHO partners intending to apply for funding:

- The focus will be on Community health focused Disaster Preparedness projects to be developed as much as possible with a multi-hazard approach (earthquakes, storms, landslides, fires, floods and GLOF23);

#### **Health Disaster Preparedness:**

- Establishment of an Incident Command System at the Ministry of Health and Population. The command system should enable the Ministry to organize resources, staff and facilities in order to remain operational during an emergency.
- Institutionalise disaster management training (Mass Casualty Management, Hospital Preparedness for Emergency, Protocol, health professionals' roster and early deployment referral mechanism) through the national health training centre.
- Strengthen the operational capacity of the newly established Health Emergency Operation Centre (HEOC) to enhance coordination and communication with the referral hospitals and the National Emergency Operation Centre (NEOC).
- Integrate Incident Command System in Mass Casualty Management Plan and test the plan.
- Provide technical support to develop a plan for hospitals to reach out to communities, especially when there are a high number of affected people in these communities, for example during epidemics.
- Include health sector preparedness activities into local level planning process (LDRMP) including open spaces planning in Kathmandu valley.
- Mainstream health sector preparedness into the existing urban CBDRM.
- Coordination with other DRR stakeholders, including the relevant national authorities, should be considered as a priority from project design stage until completion of the Actions.

### **Nepal**

#### **Hazard and geographic priorities:**

The priority areas are earthquake affected areas. Hazards are earthquake landslides and floods.

Actions should include a strong focus on LRRD, in particular to the Earthquake Recovery and Reconstruction Framework. Institution building to facilitate an exit strategy is also to be included. Target actions may be envisaged that contribute concretely to the overall resilience agenda.

#### **Operational priorities:**



Partners should focus efforts on replicating the previous achievements in the diverse sectors and in a collaborative manner, while taking into consideration national priorities for reconstruction and recovery. This implies the following:

- Promote building back better techniques at the community level by sector- water and sanitation, food security and livelihood, health, education and shelter
- Develop local people's skills and capacities for recovery and reconstruction to make livelihood more resilient
- Strengthen DRR policy and institutional set-up at community, local and national level
- Promote replication of the inclusive CBDP model developed in previous actions by local stakeholder (national and local levels, civil societies) in view of greater homogeneity and affordability