

TECHNICAL ANNEX

SYRIA REGIONAL CRISIS

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2022/01000 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 that may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge	DG ECHO ¹ /C3
Contact persons at HQ	Team Leaders: Dina SINIGALLIA (Syria) Dina.SINIGALLIA@ec.europa.eu Matthew KEYES (Lebanon, Jordan) Matthew.KEYES@ec.europa.eu Desk Officer for Regional, Thematic and Operational Issues: Roxane HENRY: Roxane.HENRY@ec.europa.eu Syria: Joe GALBY: Joe.GALBY@ec.europa.eu Inaki AREVALO MILLET Inaki.MILLET@ec.europa.eu Manuela FISCHANGER Manuela.FISCHANGER1@ec.europa.eu Simona SELIŠKAR Simona.SELISKAR@ec.europa.eu Lebanon: Leire ALONSO VICINAY Leire.ALONSO-VICINAY@ec.europa.eu Magali LE-LIEVRE: Magali.LE-LIEVRE@ec.europa.eu Jordan: Magali LE-LIEVRE: Magali.LE-LIEVRE@ec.europa.eu Syria: Luigi PANDOLFI Luigi.PANDOLFI@echofield.eu Syria Damascus: Jacob ASENS MOLAR Jacob.Asens@echofield.eu
in the field	

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
ECHO/SYR/BUD/2022/91000

Giuseppe SCOLLO

Giuseppe.Scollo@echofield.eu

Syria cross-border from Turkey:

Pedro ROJO GARCIA

Pedro-Luis.ROJO-GARCIA@echofield.eu

Anne MULLER

Anne.Muller@Echofield.Eu

Syria cross-border from Iraq:

Loubna ABOU CHAKRA

Loubna.ABOU-CHAKRA@echofield.eu

Lebanon:

Esmee DE-JONG

Esmee.De-Jong@echofield.eu

Beatriz NAVARRO RUBIO

Beatriz.Navarro-Rubio@echofield.eu

Jordan:

Jean-Marc JOUINEAU

Jean-Marc.Jouineau@echofield.eu

Branko GOLUBOVIC

Branko.Golubovic@echofield.eu

Regional Office:

[Yorgos KAPRANIS \(Head of the Regional Office\)](#)

Yorgos.Kapranis@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: EUR 239 497 177 of which an indicative amount of EUR 22 500 000 for Education in Emergencies.

In line with DG ECHO's commitment under the Grand Bargain initiative, pilot Programmatic Partnerships have been launched in 2020 and 2021 with a limited number of partners. An indicative amount of EUR 4 000 000 will be dedicated to these Programmatic Partnerships in 2022. In addition, new Programmatic Partnerships could be signed in 2022 with partners under indirect management. Part of the allocation of this HIP could therefore also be attributed to these new pilot Partnerships.

Breakdown per Actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros):

² The Commission reserves the right not to award all or part of the funds made or to be made available under the HIP to which this Annex relates, or to allocate part of the funding to interventions with a regional or multi-country approach.

Country(ies)	Action (a) Man-made crises and natural hazards	Action (b) Initial emergency response/ small-scale/ epidemics	Action (c) Disaster Preparedness	Actions (d) to (f) Transport / Complement ary activities	TOTAL
SYRIA	150 000 000				150 000 000
LEBANON	76 827 689		1 000 000		76 827 689
Coordination & Visibility*	169 488				169 488
JORDAN	12 500 000				12 500 000
Total					239 497 177

**In the framework of the Pilot Programmatic Partnership with IFRC (Lebanon)*

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

Proposals (single forms) can be submitted at any moment during the year. However, no formal request for proposals can be made before the publication of the HIP. Agreements can only be signed after adoption of the Worldwide Decision and release of the HIP to partners (both conditions need to be satisfied cumulatively).

a) Co-financing:

Under the EU Financial Regulation, grants must involve co-financing; as a result, the resources necessary to carry out the action must not be provided entirely by the grant. An action may only be financed in full by the grant where this is essential for it to be carried out. In such a case, justification must be provided in the Single Form (section 10.4).

b) Financial support to third parties (implementing partners)

Pursuant to Art. 204 FR, for the implementation of actions under this HIP, partners may provide financial support to third parties, e.g. implementing partners. This financial support can only exceed EUR 60 000 if the objectives of the action would otherwise be impossible or excessively difficult to achieve. Such situations can occur in cases where only a limited number of non-profit non-governmental organisations have the capacity, skills or expertise to contribute to the implementation of the action or are established in the country of operation or in the region(s) where the action takes place.

Ensuring broad geographical/worldwide coverage while minimising costs and avoiding duplications concerning in particular presence in country, prompted many humanitarian organisations to network, e.g. through families or confederations. In such a context, the situations referred to above would imply that the partner would rely on other members of the network. In such cases, justification must be provided in the Single Form.

c) Alternative arrangements

In case of country or crisis-specific issues or unforeseeable circumstances, which arise during the implementation of the action, the Commission (DG ECHO) may issue specific ad-hoc instructions which partners must follow. Partners may also introduce via the Single Form duly justified requests for alternative arrangements to be agreed by the Commission (DG ECHO) in accordance with Annex 5 to the Grant Agreement.

d) Field office costs

Costs for use of the field office during the action are eligible and may be declared as unit cost according to usual cost accounting practices, if they fulfil the general eligibility conditions for such unit costs and the amount per unit is calculated:

- i. using the actual costs for the field office recorded in the beneficiary's accounts, attributed at the rate of office use and excluding any cost which are ineligible or already included in other budget categories; the actual costs may be adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, if they are relevant for calculating the costs, reasonable and correspond to objective and verifiable information

and

- ii. according to usual cost accounting practices which are applied in a consistent manner, based on objective criteria, regardless of the source of funding.

e) Actions embedded in multiannual strategies

Funding under this HIP may be used to finance actions implemented in the framework of multiannual strategies, as and when provided for in the HIP.

f) Regional and multi-country actions

Regional/multi-country actions can be supported under this HIP (and where relevant in conjunction with other HIPs³), where they are proven more suitable/effective than country-based interventions to respond to identified needs, taking into account the operating context, the strategy and the priorities set out in the HIP (or respective HIPs), the operational guidelines provided in section 3.2.2. of this Annex, as well as the applicant organisation's capacities. The proposals should specify the breakdown between the different country allocations.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE INFO

Allocation round 2 SYRIA

³ For multi country actions falling under more than one HIP, partners are requested to submit only one proposal in APPEL. The single form should refer to the HIP that covers the majority of targeted countries.

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 15 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions related to this assessment round: support will focus on food security. Funds can be used to boost ongoing responses, to preposition food and nutrition commodities, as well as support underlying logistics.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022⁴
- d) Potential partners: Based on its comparative advantage, expertise and presence, notably its capacity to rapidly provide assistance at scale throughout Syria, the World Food Programme (WFP), has been pre-selected for this allocation round. No other applications will be received.
- e) Information to be provided: Modification request of ongoing actions ⁵
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 24/10/2022.

Allocation round 1 SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 135 000 000.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022⁶
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Disaster Preparedness. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under the 2021-2027 Multi annual Financial Framework, can be submitted as modification requests for the ongoing action with a time extension of up to 24 months and a total duration of the modified action of up to 48 months. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multiannual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 3 above)⁷. Education in Emergencies actions should have an initial duration of at least 24 months, unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration.
- d) Potential partners⁸: All DG ECHO Partners. Pre-selected Partners: ACTED (continuation of Programmatic Partnership project).
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modification request of ongoing actions ⁹

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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

⁶ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

⁷ Additional guidance may be issued by DG ECHO in this respect, as appropriate.

⁸ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

⁹ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: [by 13/12/2021¹⁰]

Allocation round 4 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 000 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions related to this assessment round: support will focus on food security. Funds will be used to increase multi-purpose cash assistance for vulnerable refugees and Lebanese.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022¹¹
- d) Eligible partners: based on their comparative advantage, expertise, presence and capacity, notably to rapidly provide assistance at scale for all vulnerable populations, UNHCR and Mercy Corps Netherlands (MCNL) have been preselected for this application round. No other applications eligible.
- e) Information to be provided: Modification request of ongoing actions¹²
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 31/10/2022.

Allocation round 3 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 997 177
- b) Cost will be eligible from 01/04/2022⁴
- c) Potential partner: IFRC. The funding will be allocated to the pilot Programmatic Partnership action ‘Accelerating local action in humanitarian and health crises’ in the following country: Lebanon
- d) Information to be provided: Single form⁷

Allocation round 2 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 20 000 000
- b) Costs of new actions will be eligible from 01/01/2022.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 12 months. Modification requests, which would complement ongoing operations, should have a maximum time extension of up to 12 months and a total duration of the modified action of maximum 48 months.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

¹² Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.
ECHO/SYR/BUD/2022/91000

- d) Potential partners: all potential DG ECHO partners with proven operational capacity in the country. Strong preference for partnerships with local organisations.
- e) Support will focus on areas and communities with proven high food insecurity, highly insufficient access to health care and/or with specific protection concerns. Most specifically:
 - i. Health: increased access to non-Covid care, including support to primary health care emergency services/community health and access to secondary health care. Innovative cash-for-health piloting could be considered in case of clearly identified health outcome. Human resources for health.
 - ii. Basic needs: Multipurpose Cash Assistance (MPC) for the extremely vulnerable families outside government social safety nets and -if needed- ensure referrals (Cash plus approach). Food assistance, including in-kind only if market availability is at stake and cost efficiency allows.
 - iii. Protection: Legal support and advocacy for stateless population including referrals. The extension of protection services, including legal assistance, case management, safe shelters for GBV survivors, and aid for those evicted.
 - iv. Support services: coordination, accountability to affected populations, access and assessments.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form for a new proposal or modification request for an on-going DG-ECHO funded operation.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 03/05/2022¹³.]

Allocation round 1 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 50 000 000.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022¹⁴
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Disaster Preparedness. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under the 2021-2027 Multi annual Financial Framework, can be submitted as modification requests for the ongoing action with a time extension of up to 24 months and a total duration of the modified action of up to 48 months. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multiannual strategies provided for by the

¹³ See footnote 8 above.

¹⁴ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

HIP (see point e) of section 3 above)¹⁵. Education in Emergencies actions should have an initial duration of at least 24 months, unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration.

- d) Potential partners¹⁶: All DG ECHO Partners
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of ongoing actions¹⁷
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 14/02/2022¹⁸

Allocation round JORDAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 12 500 000.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2022¹⁹
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months, including for Actions on Disaster Preparedness. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under the 2021-2027 Multi annual Financial Framework, can be submitted as modification requests for the ongoing action with a time extension of up to 24 months and a total duration of the modified action of up to 48 months. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multiannual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 3 above)²⁰. Education in Emergencies actions should have an initial duration of at least 24 months, unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration.
- d) Potential partners²¹: All DG ECHO Partners
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of ongoing actions²²
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 19/02/2022²³

4.1. Operational requirements:

4.1.1. Assessment criteria:

- 1) Relevance

¹⁵ Additional guidance may be issued by DG ECHO in this respect, as appropriate.

¹⁶ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

¹⁷ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ 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. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.

²⁰ Additional guidance may be issued by DG ECHO in this respect, as appropriate.

²¹ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

²² Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

²³ 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.

- How relevant is the proposed intervention and its compliance with the objectives of the HIP?
 - Has the joint needs assessment been used for the proposed intervention (if existing)?
 - Has the proposed intervention been coordinated with other relevant humanitarian actors?
- 2) Capacity and expertise
- Does the partner, with its implementing partners, have sufficient expertise (country / region and / or technical)?
 - How good is the partner's local capacity / ability to develop local capacity?
- 3) Methodology and feasibility
- Quality of the proposed response strategy, including intervention logic / logframe, output & outcome indicators, risks and challenges.
 - Feasibility, including security and access constraints.
 - Quality of the monitoring arrangements.
- 4) Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements
- Extent to which the proposed intervention is to be implemented in coordination with other humanitarian actors and actions (including, where relevant, the use of single interoperable registries of beneficiaries).
 - Extent to which the proposed intervention contribute to resilience and sustainability.
- 5) Cost-effectiveness/efficiency/transparency
- Does the proposed intervention display an appropriate relationship between the resources to be employed, the activities to be undertaken and the objectives to be achieved?
 - Is the breakdown of costs sufficiently documented/explained?²⁴

In case of actions ongoing in the field, where DG ECHO is requested to fund the continuation thereof, a field visit may be conducted by DG ECHO field expert (TA) to determine the feasibility and quality of the follow-up action proposed.

No award will be made to NGO partner organisations which have not complied with their obligations concerning the submission of audited financial statements (i.e. which would not have submitted those in due time to the Commission without a proper justification) or which would appear not to offer sufficient guarantee as to their financial capacity to implement the proposed actions (in light of their liquidity and independency ratios as appearing from their latest available annual statutory accounts certified by an approved external auditor).

²⁴ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section 10).

Partners are expected to consider context-specific environmental arrangements to reduce the environmental footprint of the proposed actions, while preserving their effectiveness.

4.1.2. Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:

This section outlines the specific operational guidelines that DG ECHO partners need to take into account in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. It also lists and explains the assessment criteria – based on those outlined in section 3.2.1 - that DG ECHO will apply in the specific context of the HIP to which this Technical Annex relates when assessing proposals submitted in response to the related HIP.

The HIP Policy Annex should be consulted in parallel.

Where assistance is to be delivered in the form of cash transfers, particular attention will be paid to the principles laid down in DG ECHO's cash guidance note, which will form the basis for the assessment and selection of partners, in particular in the case of large-scale transfers. Partners will be expected to demonstrate a satisfactory efficiency ratio and, to the extent possible and taking into account the operational context, partners will be assessed on their ability to work based on common targeting criteria, single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework. In line with the cash guidance note, DG ECHO will expect partners to strive for segregation of duties and full transparency on the costs of implementation. Furthermore, partners should ensure that the efficiency ratio is maintained throughout the action, unless otherwise approved by DG ECHO. For the delivery of smaller-scale cash transfers, DG ECHO will assess proposals paying particular attention the Guidance note's principles of coordination, harmonisation and multi-partner approach.

For **Education in Emergencies actions**, priority will be given to funding projects which target at least 50 % girls, unless there is a context-based justification for different targeting.

For cash in education projects, attention should be paid to the sustainability of the interventions and, where possible, linkages to longer-term livelihood solutions.

SYRIA

Programming Priorities

DG ECHO will continue to focus on the most urgent unmet humanitarian needs. DG ECHO partners are expected to continue prioritising life-saving activities in situations where populations cannot access any assistance or services due to conflict, disaster and/or displacement.

The provision of essential items and services through humanitarian interventions should be coordinated with mid-/long-term support strategies and public systems, to better ensure the sustainability of the services and assistance provided.

Principled humanitarian assistance, protection, and advocacy (on IHL, IHRL and humanitarian principled action) are required, in the best interest of the affected population.

For all sectors of intervention, assistance must be delivered through the most appropriate, cost-effective, and efficient modalities and entry points (including through enhanced partnership with local humanitarian actors), in a timely, principled and quality manner. More sustainable approaches, including those aimed at strengthening the resilience of vulnerable populations, may also be considered where they contribute to the achievement of the DG ECHO strategy and target the people most in need.

Where operationally justified and feasible, DG ECHO welcomes the setting up of consortia where they contribute to enhanced coordination, a more integrated multi-sectorial response and increased cost-efficiency and effectiveness.

In a context of competing priorities and increased needs, cost-efficiency is a top priority for DG ECHO. Specific attention will be paid to the ratio between programme costs and support costs.

In line with the operational response strategy presented in the Humanitarian Implementation Plan, DG ECHO will prioritise the following sectorial priorities across the country.

Contextual specificities may also be considered in prioritising specific sectors and activities in each operational hub, with the aim to maximise the impact and effectiveness of DG ECHO humanitarian response, including bridging the humanitarian development NEXUS wherever possible.

All sectors should include protection mainstreaming into their activities through the use of the protection mainstreaming key outcome indicator (KOI) to ensure protection mainstreaming considerations are implemented and monitored at all stages and are operationalised as adaptations/corrective measures in programming. DG ECHO's partners are requested to ensure a risk and threat mapping of targeted communities and to include protection mainstreaming in the design of interventions.

Thematic priorities

FLER/Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Preparedness (DP)

Considering the need to ensure a flexible and rapid response to sudden onset disasters in a volatile context, DG ECHO will continue to promote in-built multi-sectorial emergency response through its First Line Emergency Response (FLER) approach, in line with DG ECHO's Emergency Response Mechanism (ERM)²⁵, and the use of Crisis Modifiers (CM).

FLER shall be limited to areas affected by continuous high level of insecurity, recurrent forced displacements, and extreme weather events or epidemics. FLER shall cover lifesaving needs for one month, extendable to three months if no other assistance is available.

The FLER approach is an instrument aimed at facilitating a first emergency response to unexpected shocks such as a) sudden displacement, b) natural disasters or c) epidemics. FLER activities should be considered as a single result under the DRR/DP sector. FLER

²⁵ On the DG ECHO's ERM approach see the relevant section below.

cannot be used to cover gaps in regular programming. It should cover basic needs, including food, emergency shelter, Non-Food Items, via multi-purpose cash or in-kind assistance where possible, complemented with WASH assistance and support to access to health and protection services.

In areas where the conflict situation is protracted, partners are encouraged to introduce Crisis Modifiers to be able to quickly mobilise resources from on-going actions and respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations. CM should be triggered based on pre-agreed thresholds. Partners are invited to dedicate a specific result to the CM, under the DRR/DP sector as well.

Both FLER and Crisis Modifier mechanisms should be based on a multi-risk analysis and scenario planning. Partners are expected to provide sufficient information and justification regarding the triggers, timeline and modality to be used for the rapid response. Both FLER and CM should initiate a response within 72 hours after the shock.

PROTECTION

DG ECHO places the protection of affected populations at the centre of its response, and protection service delivery as a priority, whether at individual or community level. Safeguarding measures and accountability mechanisms should be established across the response.

Interventions can be designed in the form of a) stand-alone protection actions or b) integrated protection programming.

Specific activities proposed must be based on up-to-date and comprehensive protection risk analysis as well as demonstrated capacities and expertise to provide quality services following a Do No Harm approach. Access and working modalities should be elaborated in all funding proposals. To ensure quality of specialised protection services and safety of service providers and beneficiaries, DG ECHO could consider supporting capacity-building activities, provided that a structured capacity building plan and coaching is included in the proposal.

To ensure the response is timely, efficient, and effective, partners should be able to demonstrate and assess the impact of their interventions, as well as the quality of services provided and the relevance of the proposed action. Further, partners are expected to contribute to a comprehensive service mapping and referral mechanism within their specific areas of intervention. All protection activities should be part of the inter-agency protection mechanisms already in place in Syria.

Specific protection interventions that could be considered include, among others:

Prevention and response to violence, including but not limited to GBV. Such interventions should be built upon a solid knowledge of the context and respect of ethical and safety considerations. Awareness raising only activities will not be considered. Partners are expected to prioritise the provision of quality, comprehensive and safe specialised protection services, accessible to all affected people, ensuring that survivors' wishes, safety and dignity remain at the centre of the response. Activities which can be supported include case management for survivors of GBV and other protection violations; safety options, legal aid and counselling, when possible; Mental Health and Psycho-Social

Support (PSS). All PSS activities must demonstrate an improvement in well-being through relevant and SMART indicators. Referral to adequate medical services should be made available to GBV survivors.

Child Protection: case-management and provision of specialised services such as family tracing and reunification for unaccompanied and separated children; alternative care, Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support for children at risks and victims of protection violations. Support to programmes focusing on children associated with armed forces and armed groups and children deprived of their liberty could also be considered, provided that partners can demonstrate adequate access and technical expertise.

Partners including case management in their funding proposal should confirm availability of services, provide relevant service mapping, and demonstrate the existence of referral pathways, including to healthcare providers.

Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) activities will be considered, including assessment, mapping and marking, humanitarian demining/removal and assistance to victims and risk education / Mine Risk Education (MRE). While DG ECHO recognises the importance of clearance activities and the need to strengthen and promote a comprehensive approach to HMA, partners are encouraged to identify alternative, more sustainable sources of funding.

For **people deprived of liberty**, activities may include monitoring of detention conditions; provision of protection services for people in detention and to others deprived of their liberty, re-establishment of family links; specific Mental Health/Psycho-Social Support targeting victims of torture and abuse.

Access to civil documentation, family tracing and reunification will be supported. However, DG ECHO will not support House, Land and Propriety-related interventions (HLP) with protection funding, while HLP considerations should be considered and properly integrated in all shelter and CCCM programmes.

Dissemination and promotion of compliance with IHL and IHRL will also be considered by DG ECHO. A clear advocacy plan, including key/concrete activities, outputs and outcomes, should be provided.

Cash for protection will be considered only if part of a broader response (e.g. case management) and only when the linkages between the use of cash and protection outcomes is clearly demonstrated.

HEALTH

DG ECHO will prioritise life-saving healthcare actions through the provision of quality health services.

Primary Health Care (PHC) network should deliver Essential Package as defined by the Whole of Syria (WoS) Health Cluster. The needs of Persons with Disabilities (PwDs) should be adequately taken into account while mental health and rehabilitation services for PwD should be considered.

Mobile clinics should be considered as last resort, when duly justified. Active participation and contribution to health surveillance systems (EWARN and/or EWARS) is highly recommended.

To ensure the Do No Harm principle, WASH and Protection components should be part of any Health action.

As per contractual certification, the quality of medical supply should comply with the highest standards of quality. With limited response resources available and increasing needs, partners must ensure there is no duplication in the response, including by creating synergies with existing health networks and with a view to strengthen complementary of critical services.

DG ECHO may consider supporting Secondary Health Care (SHC) services and structures where justified by the criticality and life-saving nature of identified gaps and needs.

For both PHC and SHC, partners are expected to include in their proposals: a) a clear mapping of existing health facilities and b) analysis on the added value of the proposed health action.

In terms of nutrition, unless emergency thresholds are reached, screening of acute malnutrition should be integrated in health interventions, as well as the treatment of Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) and Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) (if cases are detected).

In the context of COVID-19, the impact and consequences on health provision and workforce need to be closely monitored.

DG ECHO will continue to address and respond to the needs arising from the ongoing COVID 19 pandemic. Partners will need to identify targeted and mainstreamed activities aiming at preventing the spread and responding to the crisis, together with specific budget allocation and targets.

WASH, SHELTER and winterization

Activities in WaSH, Shelter and winterization interventions need to be justified by a proper needs assessment. The systems' design should include technical specifications and Bill of Quantities (BoQs) in line with international guidelines (e.g. SPHERE standards) as well as specific DG ECHO policy guidelines.

WASH

DG ECHO will prioritise interventions aiming at delivering safe drinking water and sanitation. Components can include:

1. Safe water supply, through a) water trucking -as last resort, b) operation and maintenance of existing water networks and c) partial systems' repairs that could include small-scale extension of water transportation/distribution networks (including water supply systems' operation and maintenance cost after rehabilitation) and d) rainwater harvesting. Partners are requested to include in their proposals:
 - I. Foreseen water quantity. (Litres per person per day (L/P/D) to be provided

- with due justification). Duration of the envisioned water supply services with detailed exit strategy.
- II. Total cost per m3 (at distribution place). Water quality protocol (including the frequency/sample size at source, distribution, and collection points). Energy supply source: priority would be given to renewable energy supply systems when feasible. Operation & Maintenance plan.
 - III. In case of light rehabilitation or small-scale extension of water networks: description of required works (based on damages) and total costs. More detailed documentation in terms of technical designs/specifications, and related BoQs will have to be provided before the implementation of works. Partner's assessment on a) ownership and b) potential sustainability of all water supply systems proposed (including fees collection).
2. Sanitation: Sanitation interventions in camps will be prioritised. A maintenance plan and associated costs should be included in all proposals. Community incentives could be considered for maintenance and cleaning of sanitation facilities, where duly justified. Waste water management and/or solid waste management can be supported, particularly when partners can demonstrate its direct relation to life-threatening health conditions and risks such as communicable diseases. Cost per beneficiary should be included in proposals, as well as duration of the support foreseen.
 3. While stand-alone Hygiene Promotion (HP) activities will not be considered, they may be considered within a water and sanitation and COVID 19 response project if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonized messages and communication channels in line with specific WASH Cluster and WHO guidelines.

SHELTER and winterization

DG ECHO will consider the following components:

1. Small-scale rehabilitation of houses (up to a maximum EUR 1 000 per household), targeting extremely vulnerable families, preferably for people owning the unit. In case of rented housing, partners should ensure at least 12 months free stay for the direct beneficiaries (occupants).
2. Transitional/Temporary Shelter Units (TSU) may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Partners including this type of shelter should specify:
 - a. Site plan, including drainage
 - b. Design of the TSU and duration needed for its set up
 - c. Total cost of the TSU in Euros
 - d. Expected lifespan
 - e. Cost of connections to sewage, drainage, and water supply (if available/feasible).
3. Small-scale rehabilitation of collective centres, while taking COVID 19 preventive and mitigation measures into consideration.
4. Replacement of tents could also be considered, where duly justified. Plans for old tents placement and possible recycling should be shared with DG ECHO when appropriate.
5. Regarding winterization, DG ECHO will prioritise MPCA as the main modality. Other modalities could be considered with a solid justification.

FOOD ASSISTANCE

DG ECHO will prioritise targeted support to address severe levels of household food insecurity based on the main outcome indicators (FCS, CSI) to be provided using the most suitable intervention modalities following joint, impartial, evidence-based needs assessments and response analysis. Multipurpose cash assistance is to be considered from the outset, while securing effective sectorial referral systems. While the use of cash is favoured by DG ECHO, any modality of intervention must be justified through a sound and detailed risk analysis. Market assessments and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the situation and risk analyses, and in the targeting process.

DG ECHO may consider the provision of livelihood support and/or market-based programming as long as it is prompted by emergency needs and meets humanitarian objectives within an appropriate and defined timeframe. These actions should be pilot actions with a comprehensive learning component aiming to document the benefit and contribution to reaching humanitarian outcomes and reducing humanitarian needs.

Cash transfer in Basic Needs Approach (BNA)

DG ECHO prioritises a Basic Needs Approach (BNA), which seeks to address needs in a coordinated and demand-driven way, to ensure long-term survival and minimum living standards. Within the BNA, DG ECHO prioritises multi-purpose cash assistance (MPCA) to meet basic needs, complemented by other modalities, and timely referrals, to meet specific sectorial outcomes. The Transfer Value should be defined based on an estimation of the gap between the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and beneficiaries' resources and be sufficient to cover or contribute to recurrent basic needs. DG ECHO promotes a common programming approach to reduce fragmentation, with streamlined systems created to avoid duplication and parallel ways of working. DG ECHO will systematically assess the cost-efficiency, using the Total Cost to Transfer Ratio (TCTR), alongside analysis of the effectiveness of the overall humanitarian response.

Markets should be monitored consistently to inform and adapt assistance, irrespective of the modality. In contexts of high inflation and currency depreciation/devaluation, partners should put in place triggers to adapt cash assistance based on market monitoring data and design programmes from the outset to anticipate potential inflationary shocks.

All cash interventions should comply with DG ECHO's cash thematic policy, including the sector-specific considerations in Annex 2 of that document. In addition, programmes above EUR 10 million should comply with the Large-scale cash guidance note.

EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES (EiE)

With the aim to support safe and sustained access to quality education, DG ECHO will target out-of-school children (OOSC) and at risk of dropping out, to promote their successful (re)integration into the education system.

DG ECHO will prioritise Non-Formal Education (NFE), in line with applicable sector frameworks, to provide relevant and effective pathways to enter, re-enter or stay in formal education. Targeted approaches, with corresponding indicators and reliable/valid measurement, to ensure retention, progression, transition to formal education and learning

outcomes according to defined standards must be demonstrated. Partners are encouraged to establish internal and/or external referrals to vocational and livelihood programmes, where appropriate.

Non-formal education may include accelerated/self-learning programme, catch-up, remedial or homework support, as well as activities, which help children/adolescents receive proper certification of education. The technical rationale of each pathway will need to be demonstrated (targeting, pedagogical approach/relevance, etc.). Back to school activities will be considered where their added value, relevance and efficient modality are demonstrated, based on contextualised evidence of need. All NFE activities will need to ensure complementarity with formal education, not risking undermining or replacing it in any way.

Specific EiE interventions which can be considered include:

Training of teachers involved in NFE activities with a view to strengthen their capacity to deliver EiE programming. Guidance and other forms of professional support/quality assurance of teachers, along with activities focused on teachers' wellbeing could also be considered. Capacity development should be based on identified teachers' needs and its effectiveness, in terms of knowledge/skills gained and applied in the classroom. Strengthening of technical, pedagogical aspects to improve learning outcomes is also encouraged.

Light repairs (i.e. not related to structural damages) of school facilities/learning spaces and rehabilitation of basic WASH services can be justified, provided they are needed to ensure access to and availability of services and minimum standard of safety and protection for children returning to school. Quality assurance mechanisms for these activities include needs and damage assessments, cost estimates, description of works, BoQs. WASH in schools will need to respect education sector requirements, as appropriate.

Stand-alone provision of teaching and learning packages for children and teachers involved in NFE activities may be considered, where the lack of such materials would constitute a barrier to reintegration of children and to positive education outcomes. The content of the package should be specified in the proposals.

Cash for education may be considered only where an appropriately contextualised and technically solid needs assessment and response modality would demonstrate that such support is effective and efficient to address/minimise barriers to education. Do no harm, coordination and exit strategy/sustainability, to ensure continued education participation, will need to be duly considered in proposals.

All activities, including psycho-social support/social and emotional learning will need to specify objectives, based on contextualised evidence of need, with corresponding structure and outcome measurement.

EiE interventions must ensure that child protection-related issues are timely and effectively responded to by professional actors, either directly when partners have demonstrated relevant capacities – or through referrals. In this regard, integrated EiE and Child Protection actions are strongly encouraged: school-based protection activities must be built upon a sound risk analysis and should address the most life-threatening protection risks. Integrated programmes may be funded under EIE funding streams if the target outcomes and populations are the same for both sectors.

Partners will need to indicate the selection criteria in terms of areas of intervention/schools based on severity of education needs and gaps identified, and beneficiary selection will need to be based on reliable/triangulated evidence of education needs. Partners are also expected to provide reliable baselines and targets.

The proposed duration of projects is to match the achievement of targeted outcomes.

SUPPORT SERVICES

Contributions can be provided towards the support to common services including enabling safe access, safety & security advice, humanitarian flight services as well as data collection analysis and sharing of information. Such services must operate inclusively and in line with humanitarian principles. Solid information and complaint mechanisms for beneficiaries should be integrated in any action proposed to DG ECHO. Proposals must demonstrate effective alignment with the needs of the humanitarian partners.

LEBANON

Programming priorities

Building on the objectives set out in previous DG ECHO strategies, programming priorities in 2022 will aim to keep strengthening the protection space and dignity of refugees seeking safety in Lebanon while addressing new crises that are negatively affecting the vulnerability of the Lebanese population as a whole. Within this context, the strategy will be an integral part of the broader EU response in Lebanon, designed in synergy with interventions funded under other EU instruments considering the humanitarian analysis from different assessments including the Multi-sector Needs Assessment (MSNA).

The 2022 strategy will focus on the following key programmatic pillars:

- Access to basic needs, including public services, to address the compound impact of the COVID 19 outbreak and the economic and financial crisis, which further induces socio-economic vulnerability of the most at-risk population.
- Protection space for refugees, including International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law (IHRL) and legal assistance.
- Disaster preparedness and response.

Partners must demonstrate compliance with all protection mainstreaming elements, namely “safety, dignity and avoiding causing harm”, including applying conflict sensitivity in project design and implementation, “meaningful access”, accountability towards affected populations (AAP), including PSEA, as well as meaningful participation.

Contingency planning should be clearly defined in the action. Partners should demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed actions not least through enhanced synergies and engage in strong analysis and advocacy in their actions.

DG ECHO requires partners to demonstrate the impact of the projects on the environment and to present greening solutions mainstreamed throughout.

Thematic priorities

Basic needs

DG ECHO continues to support a single multipurpose cash (MPC) programme to meet basic needs, complemented by other modalities and reinforcement of referral mechanisms, to meet specific sectoral outcomes. All cash interventions should comply with DG ECHO's cash thematic policy, including the sector-specific considerations in Annex 2 of that document. In addition, programmes above EUR 10 million should comply with the large-scale cash guidance note.

This programming must be based on a common programming approach, organized under the Louise Platform, with the aim of reducing fragmentation and work with streamlined systems created to avoid duplication and parallel ways of working. This includes common targeting criteria, single or interoperable beneficiary registries, a single payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework.

Given the high inflationary volatility and social tension associated with cash assistance, all programming should be risk informed and targeted based on well-defined socio-economic vulnerability of individuals and groups.

The implementation of the cash modalities is to be in line with the HCT two-phased approach for cash transfer in humanitarian action, with the adoption of either dollarization or value for money approaches taking into account the associated risk and mitigation measures, in particular in relation to protection of beneficiaries.

The Transfer Value should be defined based on an estimation of the gap between the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and beneficiaries' resources and be sufficient to cover or contribute to recurrent basic needs plus other specific needs arising.

DG ECHO will systematically assess the cost-efficiency, using the Total Cost to Transfer Ratio (TCTR), alongside analysis of the effectiveness of the overall humanitarian response.

The sectoral and multi-sectorial outcomes of cash programmes should be monitored against internationally accepted norms in a consistent way and should comply with the cross-cutting and sector-specific Grand Bargain MPC outcome indicators.

Markets (supply chains, access and availability, price trends) should consistently be monitored to inform and adapt assistance, irrespective of the modality. Given Lebanon's spiralling inflation and currency depreciation, partners have to put in place measures to track the evolution of purchasing power in comparison to the MEB, define triggers to adapt cash assistance based on market monitoring data, and design programmes from the outset to anticipate inflationary shocks.

In line with DG ECHO's Humanitarian Protection Policy, the use of cash to achieve protection outcomes will only be considered as part of a broader protection response (i.e. case management). The causal link between cash transfers and protection outcome should be detailed at proposal stage. Partners should demonstrate a strong referral/ coordination to/with basic assistance or livelihoods programmes. Protection outcomes for cash assistance need to be documented through a protection risk analysis (per case) and rigorous follow-up. Mitigation of risks due to cash provision also needs to be reflected in any protection cash assistance activity.

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Preparedness (DP) and Emergency

Response

The rapidly changing context in Lebanon requires that, in areas most at risk, partners mainstream DRR/DP in their humanitarian responses. Anticipatory and contingency measures should be embedded in partners' actions to anticipate and mitigate risks to the best possible extent. Priority threats to consider are related to increased insecurity and escalation of violence while small-scale natural disasters (epidemics, floods, fires) could be considered if their impact on local populations is sufficiently demonstrated. The use of Crisis Modifiers (CM) is strongly encouraged so that partners can initiate a rapid response when needed. Partners should define the response mechanism clearly (triggers, modality, timeliness, etc.) and are invited to dedicate a specific result to the CM, under the DRR/DP sector, with a budget attached. Referral pathways for emergency cases should be ensured through effective coordination mechanisms.

In 2022, DG ECHO will support, together with other EU instruments (FPI and DG NEAR), targeted Disaster Preparedness (DP) actions to enhance the emergency preparedness capacities of local and national responders via a systemic approach targeting the existing government and community Disaster Risk Management (DRM) structures. Key areas to consider for DP actions include reinforcing operational links between the community-based and national DRM systems, and with the humanitarian response systems; developing standardized data collection tools and information processes while ensuring adequate data protection; providing community first responders with the skills and tools to carry out community-based anticipatory actions/emergency responses.

Partners are encouraged to foster innovation-based and digital approaches where relevant while ensuring operational alignment at all administrative levels. Integration of conflict sensitivity and focus on urban areas are highly encouraged.

Protection

Protection is a key feature of DG ECHO's strategy of providing at-risk populations with improved access to quality protection and assistance.

Protection interventions will be supported through the following modalities:

- Protection monitoring: the systematic collection and analysis of information, whether by individual organizations or coordination mechanisms. Analysis should provide the basis for coordinated programmatic adjustments and advocacy efforts at different levels. Protection monitoring activities should always be complemented by the direct or indirect provision of assistance to beneficiaries through multisector response activities (including protection), most notably the provision of information on existing services and effective referrals for cases in need of specialized service.
- Risk and threats monitoring, including linkages with early warning mechanisms that could trigger multisector responses, including the use of crisis modifiers.
- Promotion of IHRL, the provision of legal counselling and assistance, including access to documentation. Legal counselling and assistance should be based on sound identification of needs, determination of the most appropriate response modality, with proved lessons learned integrated into the action and through demonstrated capacities in the country.
- Refugee registration, documentation and verification activities will be supported, as well as underlying evidence-based analysis linked to the performance of related

activities (effectiveness, accountability), considering the link between refugee status, vulnerability, and timely access to humanitarian assistance.

- Life-saving protection response services (case management) will be considered when based on an individual protection assessment and where in line with international case management guidelines ensuring the prioritization of high-risk protection cases. Support to extremely vulnerable individuals without social support network to exercise their rights, including the right to access assistance. In case of remote service provision, partners are expected to demonstrate that lessons learnt are incorporated into the design and implementation of the action.
- In line with DG ECHO Humanitarian Protection policy, the use of cash to achieve protection outcomes will only be considered as part of a broader protection response (i.e. embedded within legal assistance, case management or accompaniment). The causal link between cash transfers and protection outcome should be detailed at proposal stage.
- Prevention: DG ECHO will prioritize protection integration (i.e. sector work that aims to prevent and respond to violence or threat of violence; coercion and exploitation; deliberate deprivation, neglect or discrimination, and supporting people to enjoy their rights in safety and with dignity, through sector specific work). Integrated protection programming should be based on solid evidence and ensure rigorous monitoring throughout the action. Partners must demonstrate in-country capacities in all sectors of intervention and a close inter-sector collaboration since the design of the action. Preventative actions aimed at changing harmful social norms will not be prioritized for funding.
- Psychosocial support activities will only be supported when conducted in-person, and when a solid monitoring mechanism is in place to monitor the improved psychosocial wellbeing of affected individuals/communities. Linkages with the provision of Mental Health should, as much as possible, be ensured.

Health and Nutrition

DG ECHO will continue to support the roll out of the national COVID-19 vaccination plan to extremely vulnerable individuals as well as the public services impacted by COVID-19, most notably secondary and tertiary healthcare services. Proposed actions will have to be in line with Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) existing frameworks and include clearly defined needs assessment and exit strategy. Emergency health interventions and preparedness will be considered if they clearly identify modalities of support to the public health system and demonstrate that appropriate coordination mechanisms are put in place for effective implementation and complementarity.

Emergency support to the purchasing of drug supply may be considered if gaps in pipelines continue to threaten the provision of life-saving treatment. Human resources for health is one of the main concerns for DG ECHO, especially linked with a HR for Health policy formulation and quality of care as entry point.

DG ECHO encourages linking protection and health programming, improving access to services for the most at-risk and vulnerable.

Nutrition interventions could be considered where emergency needs are clearly

demonstrated, as defined by the standard WHO thresholds for acute nutritional emergencies and whenever there is a clear gap in response that would require a DG ECHO contribution.

Applying cash in healthcare and nutrition programming will only be considered on a case-by-case basis and if justified by in-depth assessment and analysis of the availability of appropriate healthcare options (adequate provision of quality care, access to medical supply etc.) in the proposed areas of intervention. Potential cash application in healthcare and nutrition interventions will need to have clear healthcare and nutrition outcomes, with the application of associated indicators in the proposal.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO will prioritise non-formal education (NFE)/pathways for out-of-school refugee children/adolescents, in line with applicable sector frameworks, to support sustained entry/re-entry in formal education, while also focusing on educational performance. Targeted approaches – with corresponding indicators and reliable/valid measurement - to ensure retention and progression in NFE, transition to formal education and learning outcomes according to standards will need to be demonstrated.

Pilots/best practices to strengthen the above outcomes – with structured approaches that could be replicated within the education sector - will be considered. All NFE activities/pathways will need strictly to demonstrate complementarity with formal education, not risking undermining or replacing it in any way. Education planning and data/evidence, quality assurance and coordination may be supported, as relevant.

Psychosocial support/social and emotional learning will need to specify objectives, based on contextualised evidence of needs, with corresponding structure and outcome measurement.

Integrated programmes may be funded under EIE funding streams if the targeted outcomes and populations are the same for both sectors. In this regard, integrated EiE and child protection actions are strongly encouraged. Protection activities must be built upon a sound risk analysis and should address the most life-threatening protection risks. EiE interventions must ensure that child protection-related issues are timely and effectively responded to by professional actors (either directly when partners have demonstrated relevant capacities – or through referrals).

Proposals will need to specify how alignment with evolving national programmes or frameworks will be ensured (e.g., through reliable participation in relevant coordination fora, triangulation of information from multiple, strategically selected sources).

Additionally, comprehensive analysis of present and anticipated opportunities and risks affecting the sector, preparedness and response embedded in project design to ensure sustained relevance and effectiveness are highly encouraged.

Partners will be expected to indicate the selection criteria in terms of areas of intervention based on severity of education needs and gaps, and beneficiary selection will need to be based on reliable/triangulated evidence of education needs. Partners are also expected to provide baselines, and targets correspondingly set, critically examining lessons learned, and show strategic and advocacy engagement. Complementarity, synergy with other projects, donors, stakeholders, not least to ensure sustained and successful education participation, are strongly encouraged.

Coordination and advocacy

DG ECHO will support coordination and advocacy mechanisms if operationalized within integrated and coordinated strategic partnership frameworks. Development of robust information management systems will be supported if they lead to informed programming decisions and evidence-based advocacy. In this regard, coordination should be essentially articulated as a structural means to improve the access, timeliness, inclusiveness, transparency, and connectedness of proposed actions within existing coordination set-ups. DG ECHO may support initiatives aimed at strengthening accountability to affected populations. Advocacy will be supported when it is based on evidence collected through DG ECHO-funded programming or wider humanitarian Action. Partners wishing to engage in advocacy should be prepared to submit an advocacy plan that is able to provide appropriate information on key issues, the suggested messaging, the target audience, tools, expected outcomes, potential risks, and mitigation measures.

JORDAN

Programming priorities

The effects of the COVID 19 pandemic on the socio-economic situation in Jordan continue to impact refugees and vulnerable Jordanians' resilience and capacity to access basic services. As a result, and despite the protracted nature of the crisis and the opening to transitional/Nexus paths, humanitarian aid remains vital in certain niche interventions and sectors.

DG ECHO's priorities in 2022 will continue to focus on the provision of timely, adequate, and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas, to refugees living in camps and/or in hosting communities and to vulnerable Jordanians based on vulnerability assessments. In 2022, DG ECHO will support the following thematic priorities:

Thematic priorities

Protection

Protection must be addressed systematically in all proposals, preferably as part of an integrated programming approach, including creating synergies between humanitarian (responsive and remedial actions) and development programmes.

Proposed target groups could include people living in camps and vulnerable host communities, as well as those stranded at the Berm.

DG ECHO will consider programs focusing on both physical and legal protection, in specific programs aiming at:

- Providing support to obtain civil and legal documentation with a view to enhance refugees' access to essential basic services. Proposed actions should address legal support and/or accompaniment of protection cases beyond basic legal advice.
- Providing specialized protection assistance for victims of violence or vulnerable groups at risk due to specific discrimination or risk factors. Some additional considerations:

DG ECHO will consider activities ensuring that a robust screening and referral system is in place to capture and track all types of protection cases; follow-up of referred cases

guaranteeing access to services will be needed.

While GBV issues should be addressed, related services must be integrated within Reproductive Health (RH) services where possible.

DG ECHO will consider Cash for Protection interventions only as part of case management. The link between cash transfers and protection outcomes should be clearly highlighted in the proposal. The use of cash as prevention and risk mitigation tool (i.e. protection-related negative coping mechanisms) will be supported only if evidence on the actual impact is provided at proposal stage.

DG ECHO will also consider funding advocacy with a focus on asylum space and access to basic services. Some examples (non-exhaustive) below:

- Advocacy for refugees' access to the Jordanian territory, prevention of refoulement as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to asylum seekers and refugees.
- Advocacy for durable solutions including for those stranded at the Berm.
- Advocacy towards camp management and relevant authorities to expedite refugees' screening in Azraq camp, thus guaranteeing freedom of movement and access to the necessary services including basic needs, health, and protection.

Health

Since 2019, Syrian refugees can access health services in hospitals and health centres run by the Ministry of Health for the same price as non-insured Jordanians, on the condition that they can demonstrate holding both UNHCR documentation and a registration card from the Ministry of Interior. Similarly, since August 2020, non-Syrian refugees have the same access to health care as Syrian refugees. Against that background, DG ECHO will consider funding specific health interventions among the following:

In host communities

Specific interventions could be proposed for immediate lifesaving needs in specific locations or where critical gaps in essential healthcare service provision for refugees and the most vulnerable Jordanians are identified.

In camp settings

- Proposals ensuring that refugees, including newly arrived ones, have direct access to health services according to their needs will be prioritized.
- Activities aimed at ensuring functioning, robust referral mechanisms, including follow-up, will be considered. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times, especially for chronic conditions or elective surgery, end result, etc.).

WASH

Specific activities could be proposed should immediate lifesaving needs be identified in specific locations.

Education in Emergencies (EIE)

DG ECHO will consider education activities (primary and secondary levels) that support vulnerable refugee and host community children/adolescents, especially in camps, to successfully enter, remain and progress in formal education. This may include non-formal education activities, as well as protective school environments, in alignment with the Sector Plan and its associated strategies, including back to school with COVID-19. Strengthening of coordination to optimize relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of provision may be considered, if relevant. EiE interventions must ensure that child protection-related issues are timely and effectively responded to by professional actors (either directly when partners have demonstrated relevant capacities – or through referrals). In this regard, integrated EiE and Child Protection actions are strongly encouraged: school-based protection activities must be built upon a sound risk analysis and should address the most life-threatening protection risks. All activities, including psychosocial support/social and emotional learning, will need to specify objectives, based on contextualised evidence of need, with corresponding structure and outcome measurement. All proposals will need to have a solid results framework, with baselines established and targets correspondingly set, with outcomes reliably and validly measured, and targeted approaches to improve these, based on clearly identified lessons and critical analysis for strengthening.

Partners will be expected to specify the selection criteria in terms of areas of intervention/schools based on severity of education needs and gaps, and beneficiary targeting will need to be based on reliable/triangulated evidence of education needs. All interventions will need to demonstrate alignment, complementarity and synergy with other projects/partners and development programmes, with clear identification of value added. Especially for the camps, actions situated within coordinated mapping of education needs and gaps, based on harmonised/standardised evidence and targets, are encouraged.

Coordination arrangements, with identified objectives and approaches, including with the Education Sector Working Group at both central and decentralized levels (as applicable) as well as with nexus/development programmes, will need to be detailed, not least showing engagement in the expected review of the Jordan Response Plan and other relevant response frameworks. The duration of projects should be set to allow for achievement of objectives. All proposals will need to consider an exit strategy, aiming for maximised impact and continuity/sustainability. To ensure appropriate sector alignment, all education interventions will need to be proposed under EIE.

STRENGTHENING EARLY RESPONSE CAPACITY**(1) Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERM/RRM) as standalone actions**

Emergency/Rapid Response Mechanisms (ERMs/RRMs) are stand-alone actions pooling capacities of different partners for improved and more coordinated preparedness and early response, guided by early warning and contingency plans. ERMs/RRMs are designed to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose assistance when other response mechanisms are not yet in place. ERMs/RRMs are mostly used for rapid-on-set crisis. For slow-on-set, objective indicators with thresholds for engagement / disengagement should be defined in coordination with other stakeholders including the State Authorities.

(2) Flexibility embedded into the actions

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce flexibility to mobilise resources from on-going actions and swiftly respond to any new emerging shocks occurring in the area of their operations (a crisis within a crisis). Flexibility measures can be triggered to provide initial lifesaving multipurpose response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis; the two main scenarios are: i) to fill the time gap while waiting for additional resources; ii) to respond to small scale humanitarian needs which would otherwise remain unattended.

The application of flexibility measures should be based on a multi-risk analysis and the development of worst and most likely scenarios. Partners should develop a detailed plan considering prepositioning of stocks, surge staff, triggers and sectors of intervention.

ERM/RRM and flexibility measures are complementary and do not exclude each-other; flexibility measures enable to bridge the time gap between the shock and the time needed to mobilize ad-hoc resources through the ERM/RRM or additional funding. Timeliness of response is a key element for effectiveness of both flexibility measures and ERM/RRM. Partners should adopt indicators to measure the timeframe required to deliver the first assistance (e.g. lifesaving response for xxx persons, and/or need assessment within xxx days from the displacement/disaster/alert/exceeded triggers).