

**TECHNICAL ANNEX**  
**SOUTHERN AFRICA AND INDIAN OCEAN**  
**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/2 (East and Southern Africa, Great Lakes)

Contact persons at HQ: Flavio BELLO  
Head of Sector for Southern Africa and Indian Ocean  
[Flavio.Bello@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Flavio.Bello@ec.europa.eu)

In the field: Andrea AMBROSO  
Disaster Risk Reduction & Food Assistance Advisor  
ECHO Regional Office Nairobi  
[Andrea.Ambroso@echofield.eu](mailto:Andrea.Ambroso@echofield.eu)

Dominique FERON  
Rapid Response Coordinator  
ECHO Regional Office Nairobi  
[Dominique.Feron@echofield.eu](mailto:Dominique.Feron@echofield.eu)

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 5 000 000

*Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:*

Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters: Humanitarian Aid: EUR 600 000

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO Disaster Preparedness: EUR 4 400 000

Total: EUR 5 000 000

### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

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

#### 3.1. Administrative info

##### **Assessment round 1**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 000 000 (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) This assessment round corresponds to the need described in section 3.4 and 3.2.2 (operational guidelines) for Southern Africa and Indian Ocean.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>1</sup>.
- 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>2</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 15/01/2016.

#### 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.

---

<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 (e-Single Form)

### **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 when applicable:

*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>

*MPCT: Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash –Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs:*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers_en)

*Nutrition*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04\\_nutrition\\_addressing\\_undernutrition\\_in\\_emergencies\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04_nutrition_addressing_undernutrition_in_emergencies_en.pdf)

*Cash and vouchers*

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>

*Protection*

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

*Children in Conflict*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children\\_2008\\_Emergency\\_Crisis\\_Situations\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf)

*Health*

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

*HIV Guidelines:*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health\\_HIV\\_guidelines\\_ECHO.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health_HIV_guidelines_ECHO.pdf)

*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/files/policies/sectoral/gender\\_thematic\\_policy\\_document\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_thematic_policy_document_en.pdf)

*Disaster Risk Reduction*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention\\_preparedness/DRR\\_thematic\\_policy\\_document.pdf](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](http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start)

*European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid:*

[http://europa.eu/lesislation\\_summaries/humanitarian\\_aid/rl3008\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu/lesislation_summaries/humanitarian_aid/rl3008_en.pdf)

*ECHO position paper on User Fees for Primary Health Care Services:*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health\\_2009\\_note\\_on\\_user\\_fees.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/health_2009_note_on_user_fees.pdf)

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 on-going 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 and built upon their specific capacities - 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, ECHO/-SF/BUD/2016/91000

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)

Considering the specificity of the context, actions should also take into consideration windows of opportunities to challenge gender roles which lead to gender inequality. More information about EU's commitment towards gender equality can be found in "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016-2020"

**Protection:** Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in traditional assistance programs 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.

As a practical example, DRR/contingency/evacuation plans shall bear a specific attention to different exposure to natural hazard and related vulnerability of different gender and age groups and those with specific needs in the community.

Integration of protection concerns should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement – emergency evacuations and resettlement where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population. In such contexts, proposals must present a clear analysis of how threats against as well as vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population impact their protection, and how this is incorporated in the response.

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

**Do no harm:** Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

**Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR):** As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the different groups of 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 mainstreaming and approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, shelter and habitat 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.

According to INFORM (Global Index for Risk Management), the Region is highly exposed to natural hazards (drought, flood, cyclones); However, other specific hazards like locusts and epidemics (cholera) shall not be overlooked; aggravating factors are high levels of Multi-Dimensional Poverty, highly climate-dependent productive systems, poor infrastructures and weak response capacities.

A number of hazard specific maps (i.e flood-prone areas) and data bases are constantly updated and available. Geographic and temporal distribution of hazards shall be analysed in relation to exposure, vulnerability and coping capacity of the different population groups and individuals for an informed prioritization and design of the interventions.

Risk-informed interventions in the Region are a must.

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:

- i. Integrated DRR** is where ECHO humanitarian interventions are risk informed considering all existing and future risks; moreover, interventions should be designed in order to be durable and disaster proof and attentive in not increasing exposure and vulnerability of beneficiaries.
- ii. 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.

**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 Memorandum 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.).

**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.

The risk analysis for ad hoc DRR interventions shall be multi-sector. Partners with different competencies shall pool together to increase the capacity of consortia to develop systemic, integrated and multi-sector approaches.

**Resilience:** In line with the 2012 EC Communication, resilience shall be systematically embedded into the HIPs. Enhancing the “*ability of an individual, a household, a community, a country or a region to withstand, to adapt and to quickly recover from stress and shocks*” requires a two-fold medium-long term vision based on understanding exposure, reducing vulnerabilities and strengthening the capacity to cope with future ones.

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 ongoing 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 with integration of DRR into development programs.

The role of humanitarian partners to contribute to development/resilience strategies will be crucial. Vice versa, development actors shall not just focus on the capitalization of the potentialities of most promising individuals, communities and regions, but also ensure the inclusiveness in the development process of the most vulnerable groups, including marginal urban dwellers and poor rural communities.

In situation of exposure to rapid on-set natural hazards, infrastructures mitigating the impact of floods and cyclones are paramount to create resilient cities. Humanitarian actors engaged in DRR shall advocate for the need of long term investments to improve drainage systems, road networks, and health and education facilities capable to withstand extreme events and continue functioning during emergencies. Particularly in urban contexts, risk informed land planning is important to contribute increasing the resilience of cities.

At national institutional level, partners shall engage with administrations to support local and national preparedness, response mechanisms, contingency plans and decentralization processes. At regional level, partner initiatives shall work on rising awareness on subnational levels of risks based on the INFORM methodologies.

**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 prioritized 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. 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

#### **NUTRITION**

Need assessment: Nutrition programming will be implemented where nutrition needs are clearly identified, but also where justified by the analysis of the risks and vulnerabilities. Despite the very high level of chronic malnutrition in some areas, ECHO focus will remain on acute under-nutrition and its treatment. Chronic malnutrition can be taken into account as aggravating factor of acute, rather than standalone criteria for intervention.

Nutrition needs should be informed by quality and representative surveys or surveillance systems.

Although weight-for-height (WHO 2006) is still the internationally agreed indicator to estimate the prevalence of under-nutrition, MUAC-based assessments can be used to trigger nutrition operations in specific circumstances after consultation with the ECHO.

The conduction of nutrition causal analysis is encouraged to help identify the main determinants of under-nutrition and guide the development of multi-sector projects.

Implementation: The nutrition programs implemented by ECHO's partners will thrive to reach good coverage and good treatment performance, as defined by the Sphere standards, for the ultimate benefit of affected communities.

Nutrition interventions will be implemented following the national guidelines, if available. When circumstances do not allow, the partner should consult and get an approval from ECHO.

The integration of nutrition programming into the existing health services is strongly encouraged, as nutrition screening and therapeutic treatment should ideally be provided as a routine health service along with other preventive and curative activities. With this objective in mind, the partner is also encouraged to develop a relevant support and capacity building strategy.

The decision to intervene in substitution or in integration with the health system should be informed by the comparative advantages between the immediate impact of the program on the beneficiaries and affected communities, and the consideration of sustainability of nutrition programming in the long run.

Treatment of acute malnutrition and its complications should be provided free of any charge for the beneficiaries.

Project costs will be systematically checked to ensure cost-effectiveness (for example the cost of a CMAM program per SAM children treated).

Nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific actions: Whenever possible, the integration of nutrition actions into others sectors is promoted to ensure a holistic and multi sector approaches to prevent under-nutrition and reduce vulnerabilities.

Actions relevant to other sectors should also be considered for integration into nutrition projects whenever possible,

Examples of these reciprocal integrations include, but are not limited to:

- ✓ Food-based interventions (targeted food assistance, inclusion of complementary feeding in food assistance, BSFP) in contexts where access to adequate foods is a main determinant of under-nutrition;
- ✓ Provision of free health care to the individuals the most vulnerable to under-nutrition;
- ✓ Wash In Nut;
- ✓ Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention (SMP) in context where malaria is a key determinant of under-nutrition;
- ✓ Emergency preparedness interventions, in context affected by recurrent nutrition crises.

Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF): It's strongly recommended to assess and promote IYCF practices in all nutrition programs, so to reduce incidence of malnutrition.

The specific nutrition needs of infants, young children and women should be considered at all stages of the project cycle and across all sectors.

Coordination, LRRD: When cluster system has been activated, participation to and data sharing with the Nutrition Cluster is strongly recommended. The same apply to other fora for coordination usually by Government or UN, when cluster system is not in place.

The partner should clearly develop, since the designing phase, the exit strategy criteria and involve as much as possible the national institutions and development actors and donors to ensure the durability of the funded actions.

## **DISASTER RISK REDUCTION**

Alongside mainstreaming of DRR, it remains imperative to continue ensuring that Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management are scaled-up through ad-hoc targeted interventions. During the past years, ECHO, through the DIPECHO financing mechanisms, has been investing heavily in DRR. Better awareness, positive adapted experiences and on-going institutionalization processes are visible but yet to be systemic.

Actions supported by ECHO shall focus on early warning systems, national and local institutional process, capacity building, DRR/contingency/evacuation plans, contingency measures and software activities.

Partners shall be capable to show the effectiveness of ECHO “seed money” in terms of buy-in and capacity of national and local institutions and development actors to adopt, replicate and scale-up approaches.

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 at regional, national and 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 programs and stakeholders at national to local levels;
- demonstrate that the action is designed including the existing good practice in this field and capitalizes on the experience of the previous DIPECHO program;
- 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.

### **CRISIS MODIFIER – Rapid Response**

In consideration of the current El Niño situation the warming of Indian Ocean temperatures and historical records, extreme weather events are likely to occur, particularly in the eastern part of the Region.

Partners should be prepared to respond quickly and flexibly to new emergency needs, in a well-coordinated and multi-sector approach through "crisis modifier", rapid response financial and operational mechanisms<sup>3</sup> to be activated rapidly in case of a new situation. Partners should include additional or expanded activities that may be required to respond to new crises, including a planned financial allocation. The crisis modifier will enable to switch easily from the preparedness to emergency mode and react swiftly to any natural rapid onset crisis either by switching budget lines or using ad hoc emergency funding component.

The intervention strategy of crisis modifiers will be addressing first-days immediate, life-saving and essential needs in the sectors of protection, food assistance, nutrition, health, WASH, shelter and NFIs according to priorities set through humanitarian coordination platforms and analysis of gaps and needs. This may also include rapid need assessments to help prioritising larger scale humanitarian responses and coordination.

---

<sup>3</sup> Already adopted and tested in other regions (i.e Great Horn of Africa).

Partners shall ensure that staff and logistic and operational structures of organization have the capacity required to implement a timely and effective response.

Indicators on timely response should be included together with well-designed SOPs with triggers, thresholds for response, logistic and operational procedures.

### **HUMANITARIAN FOOD ASSISTANCE (HFA)**

Interventions will be supported to save lives and to protect productive assets as a response to severe, transitory food insecurity due to natural and/or man-made disasters.

- 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. The choice and value of transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) must be based on a sound analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group. Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis (partners are referred to the decision tree in the Cash and Vouchers Guidelines).
- Pasture degradation coupled with livestock disease outbreak could impact negatively in areas reliant on livestock. Support to this sector may be justified in terms of protection of livelihood. Innovative transfer modalities and synergies with other longer term livestock programs shall be sought.
- Emergency livestock activities can be supported where livestock are proven to be a vital asset for the most vulnerable people. Priority must be given to households with "minimal" livestock holdings and to those who have left the pastoralist livelihood due to asset depletion during the recent droughts and to link these interventions to longer term development. The feasibility and appropriateness of the interventions will have to be carefully considered and documented using the minimum standards developed by the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards<sup>4</sup> (LEGS) and considering existing early warning systems and documented gaps.
- Agricultural inputs, such as seeds and tools, can be considered where there is a clear link between the shock and the loss of such assets, and where they are important for livelihood recovery. A robust analysis of seed systems such as a Sustainable Seed System Assessment (SSSA) should be conducted to make the appropriate choice of modality (in-kind, cash or vouchers) and especially to ensure that seed systems (private and public) are not undermined by an in-kind provision of seeds.
- Food utilization is a pillar of food security that should be an inherent part of any food assistance project. Components such as hygiene, appropriate feeding practices, proper energy source and technology for adequately processing, cooking and conservation of food/ making and safe water should be considered alongside food access and availability.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.livestock-emergency.net>

- ECHO will continue advocating for further linkages between food assistance interventions and nutrition outcomes and programs. In the case of a food assistance distribution (using any modality) the partner should ensure that appropriate complementary/ supplementary foods assistance is in place as part of a nutrition program to treat or prevent under-nutrition of vulnerable groups
- Partners applying for ECHO funding should highlight linkages with other sectors either within their proposed actions or with other actions. Where possible, food assistance should be integrated within a multi-sectoral approach to the crisis (see also the below section on MPCT (Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer). Alternative resource transfer modalities should be considered combining the capacity of markets to contribute to meet humanitarian needs. The present and potential role of the private sector is paramount both with regard to electronic/mobile technologies and in the marketing of food and livelihood commodities and it shall be attentively considered in the intervention strategy.
- The use of the HFA checklist is strongly encouraged to ensure that all the necessary dimensions of interest are coherently taken into account for proposal submitted to the attention of ECHO.
- HFA, protection and gender: in the spirit of 'do no harm' partners should ensure that a good analysis is carried out concerning the impact of a proposed action on the protection of vulnerable groups within the target population. For this purpose partners are encouraged to refer to the "Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming". ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Accountability, feed-back, complaint mechanisms must be detailed in the intervention strategy.
- Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30,000 *within an existing* grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues, including those listed in this guidance.

In addition to the above, partners shall consider the following elements specific to the Southern Africa Region:

- Actions shall be tailored in order to get best value for money and target critical severe food insecurity situations eventually aggravated by other factors like, risk of cholera outbreaks, displacements and loss of harvest from last year flooding/cyclones, deteriorated conditions of livestock, livestock diseases and acute under-nutrition.
- Food assistance shall ensure that synergies are created with ECHO-funded DRR actions and added value in protecting achievements of DRR/resilience processes.
- Chronic/recurrent food insecurity in the region is heavily determined by structural aspects and overreliance on rain-fed subsistence farming; the failure of cropping season in lands with a marginal vocation for agriculture or due to structural feebleness of the farming system is not sufficient to justify the support of ECHO.

- Nonetheless, conditional transfer of resources programs can contribute in strengthening the agriculture production capacity if linked with the creation of productive assets. The quality and technical standards of structures created will have to be properly considered.

### **CASH & VOUCHER and MULTI-PURPOSE CASH-BASED ASSISTANCE (MPCT)**

The choice of modality for a resource transfer should be common across sectors and follow the same essential response analysis described in ECHO's Cash and Vouchers Guidelines. ECHO recommend to consider the use of cash based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible. In any case, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. It is strongly recommend for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the ECHO *Cash and Voucher Guidance*. This includes the use of the decision tree and respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.<sup>5</sup>

While single-sector cash transfers are to be promoted where appropriate, cash is increasingly being used to address multiple humanitarian/ basic needs. Partners are referred to *Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash –Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs* ([Link](#)) for more details of ECHO's position.

A number of essential steps would be expected in the design of a MPCT project:

- Multi-sectoral assessment to determine priority needs of people in need of assistance;
- Analysis of markets and services to understand which prioritized needs can be met through purchase, and to what extent can markets and services adapt to absorb higher demand;
- Calculation of a minimum expenditure basket on the basis of the needs that can be met from the market/ services. This may include standard (SPHERE) quantities or qualities of the need that is intended to be purchased by a beneficiary, such as food (2100 Kcal); water (15l/p/d) etc.
- Development of a targeting system and targeting criteria;
- Understanding of the deficit that targeted families are experiencing or put another way, to what extent can targeted families meet their basic needs? This might involve an HEA-type analysis, or a simple estimate of income (usually derived through estimating average expenditures);
- Estimate the value of transfer that will enable targeted households to meet their basic needs alongside their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB minus income);

---

<sup>5</sup> See section 1.2 and 2.3.3 of the ECHO [Cash and Voucher Guidance](#).

- MPCT require a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimized through excellent coordination and the establishment of a single program approach that streamlines assessment, beneficiary registration, targeting, a common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring.
- MPCT in emergencies should exploit social protection systems where possible and appropriate.
- In terms of accountability, partners should use standard outcome indicators for each of the sectors included in the MPCT at the specific objective level of the logframe. A more general well-being indicator such as CSI would also be helpful as a means to determine whether broader improvements to the lives of beneficiaries have been achieved.
- Protection and gender analysis should be integral to the design and implementation of MPCT.