

TECHNICAL ANNEX

EU Children of Peace

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	- For overall Policy: ECHO/B1 - For geographical issues: Relevant ECHO geographical unit
Contact persons at HQ	Judit Barna, judit.barna@ec.europa.eu Marta Ausin Garcia for communication/visibility, marta.ausin-garcia@ec.europa.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 15 800 000

Specific Objective 5 - Complementary and Thematic Activities and Transport HA-FA: EUR 15 800 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 15 800 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- Indicative amount: up to EUR 15 800 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time.)
- All interventions are described under section 3 of this HIP.
- Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016¹ Actions can start from 01/01/2016
- The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 24 months

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.

- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form ²
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 31/01/2016³

3.2. Operational requirements:

3.2.1. Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- Relevance to the priorities defined in the HIP.
- Quality of the needs assessment and how it informs the choice of response(s) as well as targeting criteria.
- Effectiveness of approach and intervention logic to achieve outcomes in terms of enable access to safe and quality education (could be formal-, non-formal, informal education at pre-school, primary and secondary level or vocational training) for children affected by conflict and complex emergencies.
- Efficiency in terms of resources used to achieve outputs and outcomes.
- Applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region.
- Response to protection needs that prevent boys and girls of different ages to access education as well as ability to foster an enabling environment that will ensure access to safe, high-quality, child-friendly, flexible, relevant and protected learning opportunities.
- Complementarity with the strategies outlined in the regional/national HIPs.
- Complementarity and synergies with available development priorities, absence of overlaps.
- Coordination with relevant humanitarian and if appropriate development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global and Country-based Education Cluster, UNHCR, Child Protection AoR, Child protection sub-groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education)
- Incorporation of lessons learned and good practices.
- Strengthening of community based structures.

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

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_document.pdf

ECHO Visibility

<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

Remote Management

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

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

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

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

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

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS), gender and age analysis 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 and Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age *mainstreaming* is of paramount importance to ECHO. Gender and age matter in education in emergency because girls and boys are affected by crises in different ways, also depending on their age. Emergencies will often change girls and boys educational needs and ability to access safe quality education. Therefore, in emergencies a gender responsive education program is crucial to ensure that boys and girls of all ages have access to relevant and protective education opportunities.

The needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and - consequently - assistance must be adapted to ensure equal access to safe education. Context-specific gender-sensitive needs assessments and gender analysis must be conducted to avoid vulnerability-related assumptions (e.g. girls should not be considered the most vulnerable groups by default) and to ensure a more effective targeting. On the basis of the identified needs, practical examples of assistance adapted to the needs of different gender and age groups must also be provided in the Single Form. Actions *targeting* one specific gender and/or age group - particularly when one group is clearly more vulnerable than others —may in some instances be deemed necessary (e.g. unaccompanied minors or adolescents): such actions should respond to a clear need that has been identified through a gender and age analysis and cannot be adequately addressed through mainstreaming. While assistance may specifically target one group, the participation of other groups may prove crucial for reaching the expected impact.

Children are the primary target for the EU Children of Peace. The Commission adheres to the UN Convention on the Right of the child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18 years. Gender Equality Programming (GEP) 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](#)

Protection: Partners should ensure that the context analysis is protection-sensitive by taking into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities of the affected population. Using this model is crucial in designing an appropriate response..

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in traditional assistance programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. This approach is closely linked to the principle of 'do no harm', and also extends the commitment of safe and equal access to assistance as well as the need for special measures to ensure access for particularly vulnerable groups. All proposals MUST demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

Integration of protection concerns should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement-hosting contexts (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

While humanitarian assistance often focuses on community-level interventions, it is important to remember that, in order to fully address many protection issues, it is also necessary to consider the relevance and feasibility of advocacy (structural level) interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities.

In an emergency context it is essential that the learning environment is secure, safe and promotes the protection and psychosocial wellbeing of learners, parents, teachers and other education personnel. Flexibility in delivering education is vital and the means of providing education need to be adapted to the specific context and the specific needs of each child. Waiving documentation requirements (such as certificates of citizenship, birth or age certificates, identity papers or school reports) might be necessary. Education activities could also present an opportunity to facilitate obtaining these types of documentation. All education content need to take into consideration fairness as it could otherwise cause harm, this could include reviewing the curriculum and content in textbooks, providing teachers support on methods to involve children and conflict resolution and offer students lessons on tolerance. Support to enhance the wellbeing of children should be considered in context where education personnel is not appropriately equipped to do so, this could entail training in how to identify children's needs, child-centred learning strategies, psychosocial support and inclusive learning practices. Education programs should support and foster protective and supportive learning

environments, by adapting education facilities to ensure safe and secure access, also on the way to and from school. It could also require need for strengthening pre-existing child protection and social support systems and adding a referral/case management component. Ensure that mitigating efforts are in place to protect schools from attack and risk of children being targeted for recruitment should also be considered.

Strengthening coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in education 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: Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

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 to the targeted children and their families and their livelihoods and assets. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the education intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to and operational capability in managing risk. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated into programme decision making and design.

Resilience:

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. This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services, development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc.); iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

Community-based approach: In all sectors, interventions should adopt, wherever possible, a community-based approach in terms of defining viable options to effectively help increasing resilience and meeting basic needs among the most vulnerable.

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

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

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

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

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

- All proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria. Different needs of boys and girls of different age groups should be analysed and appropriate targeting should result from this analysis;
- Emergency education responses should be harmonised with and should strengthen national education programmes, including early childhood development and vocational and livelihood programmes (INEE)
- Actions should target children affected by conflict or complex emergencies. Both, ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies, other situations of violence, early

recovery phases and more longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps could be supported. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention may also be supported

- ECHO will consider supporting formal and non-formal education (including accelerated learning programs – ALP), at pre-school, primary and secondary level. Formal education⁴ will be prioritized when available and safe for children. Non-formal education⁵ will be funded in specific context and based on specific needs for a specific age groups (for example accelerated learning programs and catch up classes for youth), if proven suitable.
- Informal education⁶ and life skills trainings for children can be considered for funding: the contents for children of different sex and age groups should be specified in the proposal;
- Vocational training for youth (under the age of 18) could be considered in certain contexts of protracted displacement, if proven suitable based on analysis of the labour market and assessment of employment opportunities.
- When projects are designed to respond to the education needs of refugee children, , teaching language and other possible issues (e.g. recognition of curriculum) that could impact on children's access to education systems in their country of origin must be carefully assessed and partners should strive to advocate for formal recognition certification.
- Qualification of teachers must be carefully assessed and – whenever possible – support to existing national education systems should be prioritized: payment of/contribution to teachers' salaries could be funded.
- The quality of education provided is of paramount importance; therefore capacity building opportunities for teachers and other education personnel will be considered for funding under this HIP.
- Linkages between education, and protection: Under this HIP ECHO could support activities that will respond to the protection needs that prevent boys and girls of different ages to access safe quality education. The aim would be to foster an enabling environment that will ensure access to safe, high-quality, child-

⁴ Formal education: *An educational system with hierarchic structures and a chronological progression through levels or grades with a set beginning and end. Formal education usually takes place in an institution and involves some kind of assessment leading to a certificate of qualification* (Save the Children: http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

⁵ Non-formal education: *A flexible approach to education using alternative modes of delivery outside the formal system. The content offered by non-formal education programs may be identical to that available in school or it may be different, as in the case of literacy programs and popular education initiatives that do not lead to certificates* (Save the Children: http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

⁶ Informal education: *A process of learning through everyday experiences and the transfer of knowledge, skills and attitudes through traditional culture, families, communities, and media* (Save the Children: http://www.unicef.org/eapro/Education_Field_Guide.pdf).

friendly, flexible, relevant and protective learning opportunities. This could include provision of psychosocial support; mine risk education and provisions of life skills (such as vital health- nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness). Child friendly spaces could be considered for funding if there are clear links to schools and education programs, for example by preparing children and youth to re-enter formal education and/or provide informal education. Partners are also encourage to explore other ways to enhance children's well-being and protection, such as teachers training on identification of psychosocial needs of children of different ages; strengthening pre-existing child protection and social support systems and adding a referral/case management components; skill trainings for adolescents and trainings for caregivers on good parenthood.

- Linking education activities to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered. This could include provision of adequate quantities of safe water and sanitation facilities according to Sphere standards or school-based health programmes.
- Support to community based structures: whenever possible, special attention should be put in enhancing the capacity of existing community based structures rather than establishing new ones in order to maximize the existing resources and avoid fragmenting the involvement of the community into child related issues. Involvement of parents or legal caregivers (whenever possible) in children's education should be taken into consideration (e.g. parents – teachers associations)

All actions funded under the EU Children of Peace initiative should in their design adhere to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian action](#).