

TECHNICAL ANNEX

IRAQ

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

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

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

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge ECHO/B.4

Contact persons at HQ:

- **Team Leader:** Valentina DE BERNARDI Valentina.DE-BERNARDI@ec.europa.eu

- **Desk Officer:** Alessia CORSINI: Alessia.CORSINI@ec.europa.eu

Contact persons in the field:

- Javier RIO NAVARRO (Javier.rio-Navarro@echofield.eu);
- Nicholas HUTCHINGS (Nicholas.Hutchings@echofield.eu);
- Luigi PANDOLFI (Luigi.Pandolfi@echofield.eu).

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 134 100 000

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 134 100 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 134 100 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 50 000 000 (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.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01 2016¹. Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form².
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 29/01/2016³.

Assessment round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 24 100 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time).
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 0 and 3.4 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016.⁴ Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to actions already in the process of being contracted, funded by ECHO.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form.⁵
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information by 29/04/2016⁶.

Assessment round 3

- h) Indicative amount: up to EUR 30 000 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time).

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

² Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

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

⁴ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁶ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- i) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 0 and 3.4 of the HIP.
- j) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016.⁷ Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- k) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- l) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to actions already in the process of being contracted.
- m) Information to be provided: Single Form.⁸
- n) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information by 29/07/2016⁹.

Assessment round 4

- o) Indicative amount: up to EUR 30 000 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time).
- p) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in Section 0 and 3.4 of the HIP.
- q) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016.¹⁰ Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- r) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- s) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners. Priority will be given to actions already funded by ECHO.
- t) Information to be provided: Single Form.¹¹
- u) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information by 10/11/2016¹².

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;

⁷ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

⁸ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

⁹ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

¹⁰ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

¹¹ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

¹² The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- 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

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

Health

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

Civil–military coordination

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

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

Gender

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

Disaster Risk Reduction

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_d

[oc.pdf](#)

ECHO Visibility

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

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.
- Specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:
 - Section 9.1.A, Standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on EU funded relief items and equipment; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the Action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the Implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed-upon in the individual agreements.
 - Section 9.1.B, Standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.
 - Section 9.2., above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

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

Remote Management

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

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

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

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

exposure to risks. ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

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

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

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

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

Protection: 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 in Emergencies: ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education¹³ in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps. Innovative solutions will be supported, in particular actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention.

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

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

¹³ 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.

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 are encouraged when possible.

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

3.2.2.2.1 Protection

In addition to the general principles reflected above, the following applies to Iraq:

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

Interventions designed to *reduce and mitigate the protection risks of human-generated violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons in Iraq* might be supported either in the form of stand-alone programmes or in an integrated manner by achieving protection outcomes through other programme activities and protection sensitive targeting. The application of an integrated protection programming approach is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice.

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

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals: Registration for refugees, asylum seekers and IDPs as well as separated and un-accompanied minors with the respective authorities; birth registrations for refugee, IDPs and other conflict-affected children; support to restoration of lost personal documentation; replacement of civil documentation related to national/regional social safety nets and social protection schemes, such as the Public Distribution System of the Iraqi Ministry of Trade, the Emergency Cash Assistance of the Iraqi Ministry of Displacement and Migration and the Pension Scheme of the Iraqi Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs; restoration of family links, family tracing and reunification (only by specialised agencies); and monitoring of detention conditions (only by specialised agencies).

Information Management: Population movement tracking for displaced populations; real time monitoring and communication of violations and threats to trigger, on a case by case basis, specialized protection response and follow up actions by relevant clusters' partners, feed a trend analysis that informs response programming and advocacy and identify victims of violence, subsequently addressed by appropriate case management, as outlined below.

Advocacy: Evidence based, bottom up informed and prudent advocacy and communication, on grave violations of International Humanitarian, Human Rights and Refugee Law, is encouraged and will be supported.

Dissemination and application of International Humanitarian Law (IHL): activities aiming at IHL dissemination, targeting all parties to the conflict, at all levels of the chain of command, will be encouraged. Awareness raising and civil education on basic principles of IHL should extend to all relevant stakeholders: humanitarian community, civil society, tribal leaders, political representatives of government affiliated militia, senior policy advisors and other government officials. Partners, directly engaging with armed groups on the respect and application of the rules of war, should have proven experience in the domain and the use of already existing tools for dissemination should be prioritized.

Durable solutions (DS): specific activities aiming at facilitating unforced, well-informed, safe and dignified durable solutions might be considered when targeting extremely vulnerable cases. For the time being, this will mainly focus on support to preparatory activities linked to voluntary return or (re)integration, informed by Iraq's Humanitarian Country Team agreed upon framework, for safeguarding the voluntary, non-discriminatory nature of returns and defined humanitarian assistance to these population groups. This might include legal assistance and support to restoration of personal documentation; information dissemination on DS possibilities where this option is available to refugees, protracted IDPs and voluntary returns. Punctual support to refugee resettlement schemes could be considered.

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

- Medical assistance: must be provided as quickly as possible, by skilled staff, and according to internationally recognized protocols. Medical assistance for victims of rape must be provided within a 72h frame. Ensuring availability of PEP kits for both adults and children is absolutely essential.
- Mental Health and Psycho-social/Psychological support: should be provided by sufficiently trained providers¹⁴.
- Participation in coordination structures (i.e. particularly Health, Protection, Child Protection, GBV Cluster/WG) is essential and clear, comprehensive referral pathways must be foreseen within the proposal.
- Legal recourse: information on possibility to access to legal recourse should be provided whenever contextually feasible.
- GBV specific: Services must be available to men, boys, women and girls. Proposals must specify the main type of GBV issue(s) they seek to address. Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies might be funded, and male targeting and involvement in these activities are crucial.

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

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

Housing, Land and Property Rights (HLP): Security of tenure for people displaced in private housing and preventing/addressing forced evictions could be considered. ECHO's support to HLP related activities will only be considered if linked to defined exit strategies for the initial humanitarian involvement.

Community-based protection interventions (including service provision) – activities aiming to increase self-protection capacities of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promoting cohesion with host communities would be considered. This might include support to community based protection committees and networks; site management platforms, community-hub for crisis-affected populations to access vital information, protection awareness and safe spaces for legal counselling and assistance,; social cohesion initiatives in host communities, within conflict sensitive approaches

¹⁴ Partners' proposals should specify the educational level of the service providers they engage, and service providers of psycho-social support should preferably as a minimum have the educational level of social workers

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

3.2.2.2.2 Health

Support to humanitarian health assistance should be based on improving access to basic, quality health services, for the most vulnerable populations in need.

- Utilization by the most vulnerable of basic health services needs to be monitored and reported. Free access to healthcare remains a key principle for ECHO.
- Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives (during the period of assistance) should be prioritized: Primary Health Care covering communicable diseases as well as mother and child care, but also provision of emergency health care, including obstetric care, and emergency psycho-social support. Postoperative and rehabilitation services, for injured and war wounded, comprehensive care, for victims of SGBV, and preventive and cost-efficient care, for chronic and non-communicable diseases, might also be considered.
- Actions should be based on a quantitative needs analysis (to be repeated at regular intervals). Health Data, disaggregated according to sex and age, should be collected and analysed. Continuations of previously funded projects should highlight the advances made and changing needs over the past period(s).
- Support to health facilities in under-served, conflict affected locations will be considered, including through remotely managed operations abiding by ECHO's remote management guidance (above.)
- Direct support by specialized agencies to secondary health services and structures will only be considered against life-saving, clearly identified critical coverage gaps of the existing health infrastructure.
- Vaccination campaigns against preventable diseases will be supported, in areas where coverage has been disrupted due to ongoing fighting or sudden displacement influx.
- Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to medical waste management; safety (quality) of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (e.g. ambulances; drugs).
- The functionality of existing Early Warning, Surveillance and Response systems (like the EWARN system in Iraq) should be systematically assessed and, in case of need, reinforcement actions proposed. Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted, to cater for conflict specific capacity gaps (mass casualty, war wounded protocols). Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.

- Operations and services provided through Mobile Units or Clinics should, strictly, abide with the commonly agreed SOPs endorsed by Iraq's Health Cluster.
- Identification of functional referrals pathways, for conditions outside the remit of the specific action and referral follow ups, should be an integral part of any proposal.
- In camp settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities.
- Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. IcSP and ENI) needs to be established and opportunities for LRRD fully explored.
- As part of the Transformative Agenda, ECHO expects partners to collaborate with the health cluster and sector working groups, as well as to integrate other relevant inter-cluster actions (i. e. WASH).

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

3.2.2.2.3 Basic-Need Response

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

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

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

- i. Emergency disbursements of Multi-Purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) to newly displaced populations fleeing conflict areas should be promoted, wherever the minimum protection and market related conditions are met.
- ii. Extremely vulnerable protractedly displaced populations, resorting to extreme negative coping mechanisms, can be supported by multi month unconditional assistance. An exit strategy and transition of humanitarian caseloads to government led or community based social protection schemes have to be included in the response.
- iii. Response should be based on sound assessments, ideally multi-sectorial, allowing for a timely adjustment of the response. Proposals should also include a market analysis component, a detailed description of the transfer mechanism, risk analysis and mitigation measures and proposed accountability mechanisms Existing tools adopted by, but not limited to the Cash Working Group (CWG) must be used
- iv. The general rule should favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households. All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms, in order to ensure greater coverage of basic needs at household level and improved consistency of the

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

Basic-Needs Response requires a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimised through excellent coordination and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessment, beneficiary registration, targeting, common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring. Cash transfers in emergencies should align with existing social protection systems where possible and appropriate.

3.2.2.2.4 Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA)

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

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

All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based: proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment, analysis of post distribution monitoring reports and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria.

- i. All proposals should clearly identify food gaps, and include well identified food outcomes and indicators relevant for the action.

- ii. The general rule is to favour support to operations that target the most vulnerable households with well-identified basic humanitarian food and nutrition needs.
- iii. All partners are encouraged to use joint targeting through existing structures and coordination mechanisms in order to ensure greater coverage and improved consistency of the response. Due to the high caseload of IDPs and refugees, and the limited availability of resources, partners should not work with static beneficiary lists over longer periods of time and rather adopt a more dynamic approach as new IDPs continue to be identified. Clear justification need to be provided where blanket approaches are proposed.
- iv. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality, depending on the context.
- v. More specifically, under this financial decision, ECHO will continue supporting emergency interventions through the Emergency Food Rations. However quick transition to more substantive and targeted forms of assistance should be promoted
- vi. Support to Regular Food Assistance (dry rations) will only be supported in locations where cash based assistance is not fit for purpose. Continuous facilitation of re-registration and effective inclusion of beneficiaries into government run social protection schemes (i. e. PDS) has to be factored in, encouraging the progressive transition of humanitarian caseloads to State run Social Protection schemes and/or development focused actions.
- vii. Direct assistance to IDPs not registered with MoMD will be considered.
- viii. Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group.
- ix. Partners are referred to ECHO policy Document on [Humanitarian Food Assistance](#).
- x. ECHO will continue advocating for further linkages between food assistance interventions and nutrition outcomes and programmes, including immediate practical actions to adequate feeding and care practices. Partners are referred to the Infant and Young Child Feeding in Emergency ([IYCF-E](#)) guidance that recalls the fundamentals of IYCF-E and provides practical guidance to ensure that IYCF-E concerns are taken into account across sectors and throughout all stages of humanitarian programming.
- xi. HFA, protection and gender: in the spirit of ‘do no harm’ partners should ensure that a good analysis is carried out concerning the impact of a proposed action on the protection of vulnerable groups within the target population. For this purpose partners are encourage to refer to the [Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming](#).

3.2.2.2.5 Wash and shelter

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

- All interventions should be context-specific and evidence-based, well defined in a situation and response analysis, based on needs assessments and continuous needs monitoring, aimed at rapidly addressing and responding to regular changes in the

context. All actions are to be informed by integrated Shelter/WASH/Site management assessments.

- Integration of the two technical sectors should be promoted, wherever possible. Given the (peri) urban operating environment, with majority of IDPs living in out of camp settings (such as unfinished housing units and larger collective shelters), combined interventions should maximize interchangeability of site material.
- ECHO will continue supporting lifesaving/emergency response operations, however swift transition to second line interventions as per cluster recommendations is strongly encouraged.
- Targeting of the most vulnerable households and population groups for water, sanitation, hygiene (WASH) and Shelter interventions, should be based on identified needs, disaggregated by sex and age, and be well documented and justified.
- Safer areas, in the fringes of conflict zones, nearby districts, hosting high numbers of newly displaced people, and IDPs in protracted displacement will also be considered for further support. Rehabilitation, quick fixes, maintenance and repair of existing basic services, such as water, sanitation and shelter upgrades, will be prioritised¹⁵, taking into consideration any contributing factors or constraints, such as, seasonal shortages and changes.
- The selection of the technology and technical approach to support basic services, such as water, sanitation and shelter, should be unbiased, transparent and evidence-based, supported by a comparative analysis which takes into account cost effectiveness and efficiency (i.e. use of scored and weighted selection criteria / matrix etc.).
- As a key component of programme delivery for WASH and Shelter interventions, the use of market analysis to better understand the potential application of innovative transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) could be taken into consideration. This may require an increase in the capacity of partners to properly identify and select applicable transfer modalities, along with any associated constraints and learning required to justify the technical soundness, effectiveness and efficiency of these actions. Synergies with MPCA programs are strongly encouraged.
- An integrated programming approach, based on the linkages between WASH, Health, Shelter, Site management and Protection, will be prioritized, to ensure coordinated, multi-sectoral response focused on effectiveness and efficiency.
- All interventions should be grounded in sound coordination between other sectoral and inter-sectoral partners, to ensure effective and efficient emergency response, preparedness and contingency planning. Focus should be on the ability to, rapidly and predictably, provide assistance to regular changes in the context, based on continuous needs assessments and gap analysis.
- Partners are encouraged to exchange the many valuable experiences and lessons learnt documenting and disseminating evidence-based best practices.

• ¹⁵ For the case of water provision and supply, water trucking should be envisaged as a last resort, lifesaving intervention that is well planned and executed with a defined exit strategy.

3.2.2.2.6 Visibility and Communications

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

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

However, we also highly encourage partners with strong and ambitious communications ideas and with a demonstrated media/communications capacity to apply for above-standard visibility (<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/above-standard-visibility-template/>).

ECHO can provide additional budget should a partner want to carry out such more elaborate communication actions.

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

Above-standard visibility/communication is *additional* to standard visibility. Therefore, in all projects, standard visibility will still need to be implemented, including on-site display of ECHO's visual identity, based on the specifications in the Single Form.

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

3.2.2.2.7

ECHO partners are required to include in the submission of proposed actions the following operational annexes:

- Up-dated, organisation's organigram, relevant to ECHO action.
- Microplanning matrices, specifying site specific actions, endorsed by the respective clusters.
- Detailed action specific budgets, including unit costs and the number of months per line.