

TECHNICAL ANNEX

SYRIA REGIONAL AND LEBANON CRISES

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2024/01000 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: Joe GALBY (Syria) Joe.GALBY@ec.europa.eu Dina SINIGALLIA (Lebanon, Jordan) Dina.SINIGALLIA@ec.europa.eu Desk Officer for Regional, Thematic and Operational Issues: Roxane HENRY Roxane.HENRY@ec.europa.eu Syria: Manuela FISCHANGER Manuela.FISCHANGER1@ec.europa.eu Voja GLEICHGEWICHT Voja.GLEICHGEWICHT@ec.europa.eu Federica MIGLIACCIO Federica.migliaccio@ec.europa.eu Marius ENGELHORN Marius.ENGELHORN@ext.ec.europa.eu Simona SELISKAR Simona.SELISKAR@ec.europa.eu Thorsten MUENCH Thorsten.Muench@ec.europa.eu Lebanon: Magali LE-LIEVRE Magali.LE-LIEVRE@ec.europa.eu Leire ALONSO VICINAY Leire.ALONSO-VICINAY@ec.europa.eu Lucia CACCIALUPI Lucia.CACCIALUPI@ext.ec.europa.eu Jordan: Magali LE-LIEVRE

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO).

Magali.LE-LIEVRE@ec.europa.eu

in the field

Whole of Syria Head of Office:

Luigi PANDOLFI

Luigi.PANDOLFI@echofield.eu

Syria Damascus:

Giuseppe SCOLLO

Giuseppe.SCOLLO@echofield.eu

Jacob ASENS MOLAR

Jacob.ASENS@echofield.eu

Syria cross-border from Turkey:

Michael HOSSU

Michael.Hossu@echofield.eu

Laura HERNANDEZ

laura.hernandez-perez@echofield.eu

Syria cross-border from Iraq:

Loubna ABOU CHAKRA

Loubna.ABOU-CHAKRA@echofield.eu

Lebanon:

Beatriz NAVARRO RUBIO

Beatriz.Navarro-Rubio@echofield.eu

Branko GOLUBOVIC

Branko.Golubovic@echofield.eu

Jordan:

Jean-Marc JOUINEAU

Jean-Marc.Jouineau@echofield.eu

Regional Office:

Patricia Mirella HOORELBEKE

Patricia.Hoorelbeke@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: EUR 220 790 000 of which an indicative amount of EUR 30 000 000 for Education in Emergencies.

Programmatic Partnerships:

Programmatic Partnerships have been launched since 2020 with a limited number of partners. An indicative amount of **EUR 1 000 000** will be dedicated to ongoing Programmatic Partnerships in 2024. New Programmatic Partnerships could be funded under this HIP³.

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.

³ More information can be found in the 'Guidance to Partners – DG ECHO Programmatic partnerships 2023' <https://www.dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/programmatic-partnership/programmatic-partnership>

Indicative breakdown per Actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros)⁴:

Country(ies)	Action (a) Human-induced crises and natural hazards	Action (b) Initial emergency response/small-scale/epidemics	Action (c) Disaster Preparedness	Actions (d) to (f) Transport / Complementary activities	TOTAL
SYRIA	147 290 000				147 290 000
LEBANON	60 000 000				60 000 000
JORDAN	12 500 000				12 500 000
Programmatic Partnerships	1 000 000				1 000 000
TOTAL	220 790 000				220 790 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

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)⁵.

b) Financial support to third parties (implementing partners)

Pursuant to Art. 204 Financial Regulation, for the implementation of actions under direct management 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. In such cases, justification must be provided in the Single Form (section 10.6) based on the following grounds: a limited number of non-profit NGOs have the capacity, skills or expertise required; there are only a limited number of organisations in the country of operation, or in the region(s) where the action takes place; in a confederation, family or network context, the partner would rely on other members of the confederation, family or network to ensure geographical coverage, while minimising costs and avoiding duplication.

c) Alternative arrangements

⁴ For flexibility and fast responsiveness purposes, this breakdown can be adjusted within certain limits based on newly arising needs.

⁵ Single form guidelines: <https://www.dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/ngo/action-proposal/fill-in-the-single-form>

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 multi-annual Programmatic Partnerships⁶

Funding under this HIP may be used to finance actions implemented in the framework of multi-annual strategies (Programmatic Partnerships), as and when provided for in the HIP. Programmatic Partnerships can be at country, multi-country or regional level. If multi-country/regional, the proposals should specify the breakdown between the different country allocations. For Syria multi annual actions will be considered for the sectors listed in the HIP (Education in Emergency, Health, Food-Security and Livelihood and Wash) and if strategic, effectiveness and efficiency gains are demonstrable as and when provided for in the HIP. Given the volatility of the operational context in Syria DG ECHO will consider only a staged-funding modality in favor of partners that can maintain access across all hubs during the implementation of the multiyear action.

f) Regional and multi-country actions (non-Programmatic Partnerships)

Regional/multi-country actions can be supported under this HIP (and where relevant in conjunction with other HIPs⁷), 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 4.1.2.

⁶ See the dedicated [guidance](#) on Programmatic Partnerships.

⁷ 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.

of this Annex, as well as the applicant organisation's capacities. The proposals should specify the breakdown between the different country allocations.

g) Multi-year funding actions⁸

HIPs may be used for multi-year funding actions, which should have a duration of minimum 24 months and the full budget is committed upfront. Specific policy areas for multi-year funding may be mentioned in the respective HIP. Multi-year funding actions aim at generating additional efficiency gains and improve design and delivery of humanitarian assistance. The submitted proposals should demonstrate these gains, which should be monitored during the implementation of the action and will have to be reported in the final reports of the action.

It is possible to request multi-year funding in the context of a Programmatic Partnership to be concluded with DG ECHO. In this situation, see section 3.e.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE INFO

Allocation round 2 SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 790 000⁹
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions related to this assessment round: i) respond to exacerbated needs in earthquake-affected areas both in Northwest Syria and in Government-controlled areas and ii) to support the water crisis response in Northeast Syria.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2023.
- d) Pre-selected partners: Based on its comparative advantage, expertise and presence, the following partners have been pre-identified: ACTED, ZOA, Solidarités International. No other application will be received.
- e) Information to be provided: Modification request of ongoing action¹⁰.
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the requested information: by 18/01/2024¹¹.

Allocation round 1 SYRIA

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 142 500 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2024.

⁸ For more information - See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DG Echo Website \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu)) Additional information can be found here: Grand Bargain Quality funding commitments: [Grand Bargain Caucus on Quality Funding - Outcome Document - final - 11Jul22.pdf \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#) and Grand Bargain definitions: [Multi-year and flexible funding - Definitions Guidance Summary - Narrative Section January 2020.pdf \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)

⁹ This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Belgium of EUR 6 000 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 3.5% management fee.

¹⁰ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹¹ 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.

- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more¹² provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner¹³. Education in Emergencies actions do not need further justification and should have an initial duration of at least 24 months unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration. For Disaster Preparedness, justification is needed only for particularly volatile contexts. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under a previous Humanitarian Implementation Plan, can be submitted as modification requests to extend the overall duration to a maximum of 48 months. Actions that are extended further through modification requests can be funded under a maximum of three successive Humanitarian Implementation Plans. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multi-annual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 2 above).
- d) Potential partners¹⁴: All DG ECHO Partners. Pre-selected Partner: UNOCHA (continuation of Programmatic Partnership).
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of on-going actions.¹⁵
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 18/01/2024.¹⁶

Allocation round 1 LEBANON

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 60 000 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2024.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more¹⁷ provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner¹⁸. Education in Emergencies actions do not need further justification and should have an initial duration of at least 24 months unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration. For Disaster Preparedness, justification is needed only for particularly volatile contexts. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under a previous Humanitarian Implementation Plan, can be submitted as modification requests to extend the overall duration to a maximum of 48 months. Actions that are extended further through modification requests can be funded under a

¹² Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

¹³ See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding (November 2022) available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho WebSite \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu)). Additional information can be found here: Grand Bargain Quality funding commitments: [Grand Bargain Caucus on Quality Funding - Outcome Document - final - 11Jul22.pdf \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#) and Grand Bargain definitions: [Multi-year and flexible funding - Definitions Guidance Summary - Narrative Section January 2020.pdf \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)

¹⁴ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

¹⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

¹⁸ See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho WebSite \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu))

maximum of three successive Humanitarian Implementation Plans. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multi-annual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 2 above).

- d) Potential partners¹⁹: All DG ECHO Partners. Pre-selected partners: UNOCHA (continuation of the Programmatic Partnership).
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of on-going actions.²⁰
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 22/01/2024.²¹

Allocation round 1 JORDAN

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 12 500 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2024.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more²² provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner²³. Education in Emergencies actions do not need further justification and should have an initial duration of at least 24 months unless there is a needs- or context-based justification for a shorter duration. For Disaster Preparedness, justification is needed only for particularly volatile contexts. Follow-up actions, which continue/extend ongoing operations financed under a previous Humanitarian Implementation Plan, can be submitted as modification requests to extend the overall duration to a maximum of 48 months. Actions that are extended further through modification requests can be funded under a maximum of three successive Humanitarian Implementation Plans. The same approach may also be used to the extent appropriate in furtherance of any multi-annual strategies provided for by the HIP (see point e) of section 2 above).
- d) Potential partners²⁴: All DG ECHO Partners.
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of on-going actions.²⁵
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 09/02/2024.²⁶

¹⁹ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

²⁰ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

²¹ 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.

²² Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

²³ See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho WebSite \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu.\)](https://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/))

²⁴ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

²⁵ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

²⁶ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

4.1. Operational requirements:**4.1.1. Assessment criteria:**

1) Relevance

- How relevant is the proposed intervention; is it compliant with the objectives of the HIP?
- Has a joint needs assessment been used for the proposed intervention (if existing)? How have the local partners been included in the needs assessment efforts? Have other recent and comprehensive needs assessments been used?
- Has the proposed intervention been coordinated with other humanitarian actors and local and national actors?

2) Capacity and expertise (including in support to the localisation approach)

- Does the partner, with its implementing partners, have sufficient expertise (country / region and / or technical)?
- How does the partner contribute to developing/strengthening 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.
- Quality of the proposed localisation approach, and measures taken to minimise the transfer of risks.

4) Coordination and relevant post-intervention elements

- Extent to which the proposed intervention is building on ongoing local response and 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 contributes to resilience and sustainability, including the sustainability of locally driven responses.

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, including the information on percentage of funding to be implemented by local actors and the share of overhead costs transferred to them?²⁷

²⁷ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section 10).

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.

In case of a Programmatic Partnership, the proposed action shall be assessed under the same criteria as listed above. However, a Programmatic Partnership proposal must also demonstrate a clear added value (e.g. efficiency gains; longer term outcomes, scaling up of innovative approaches; contribution to a specific policy; etc.). See dedicated guidance to partners for more details.

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).

All awards made using EU Funds must respect the Conditionality Measures²⁸ issued under any Council Implementing Decision adopted in accordance with Article 6 of EU Regulation 2020/2092 on a general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget²⁹ (“Conditionality Decision”).

The Commission hereby notifies applicants under this HIP/TA of the following Conditionality Decision (valid at the date of publication of this HIP/TA):

- **Council Implementing Decision (EU) 2022/2506 of 15 December 2022 on measures for the protection of the Union budget against breaches of the principles of the rule of law in Hungary³⁰.**

This Conditionality Decision, in particular its Article 2.2, prohibits legal commitments under direct and indirect management with any public interest trust established by Hungarian Act IX of 2021³¹, including those entities listed in Annex I to Hungarian Act IX of 2021³² and other affiliated entities maintained by them (“Concerned Entities”). The Commission will further notify when the above-mentioned Conditionality Measures are lifted.

²⁸ Conditionality Measures against a Concerned Entity, may, for example, include, amongst others, the requirement to: suspend payments or the implementation of the legal commitment to/with the Concerned Entity; and/or terminate the legal commitment with the Concerned Entity; and/or prohibit entering into new legal commitments with the Concerned Entity. Conditionality Decisions and Measures issued under Council Implementing Decisions may impact the implementation of grants, contributions and procurement contracts awarded, as the Commission is required to ensure the application of these Conditionality Decisions and Measures in the implementation of the EU budget via both direct and indirect management.

²⁹ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2020 on a general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget OJ L 433I, 22.12.2020, p. 1–10.

³⁰ OJ L 325, 20.12.2022, p. 94–109.

³¹ Act IX of 2021 on public interest trust foundations with a public service mission (entry into force 01/01/2023).

³² Available (in Hungarian) at: <https://njt.hu/jogszabaly/2021-9-00-00>

4.1.2. *Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:*

This section outlines the specific operational guidelines that DG ECHO partners need to consider in the design of humanitarian operations supported by DG ECHO. It also lists and explains the assessment criteria – based on those outlined in section 4.1.1 - 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.

In line with the DG ECHO guidance on localisation³³, and unless duly justified, DG ECHO will expect that proposals are based on partnerships with local actors, including through the participation and leadership of local and national actors in the project cycle, giving them space in the governance process, allocating an appropriate share of funding to local partners. In case of proposals of similar quality and focus, DG ECHO will give priority to proposals where at least 25% of DG ECHO's contribution will be spent on activities implemented by local and national actors. DG ECHO also expects partners to provide an adequate share of overhead cost to their local implementing partners. In addition, DG ECHO will prioritise proposals where the locally led action constitutes a central element and which are designed bottom up, and where DG ECHO partners provide relevant support to local partners' response (technical training, institutional support, peer learning).

Regarding **logistics** (the entire supply chain), DG ECHO will support strategic solutions such as shared and / or common services, joint procurement, etc. if their cost-efficiency and benefit in increasing effectiveness and timeliness of the response is demonstrated, in line with DG ECHO's Humanitarian Logistics Policy. DG ECHO also encourages the application of the Humanitarian Logistics Policy more widely, in particular the key considerations set out in Annex 1: Framework for Operations.

The majority of organisations' environmental footprint comes from their logistics/supply chains, and as such these offer an opportunity to minimise environmental impacts³⁴. Preference should be given to procurement, distribution, and use of environmentally sustainable items, reducing and optimising secondary and tertiary packaging, avoiding procuring single-use items, and favouring products with greater durability and high recycled content.

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, particular attention should be paid to sustainability of the interventions and, when possible, linkages to longer-term livelihood solutions.

Transfer modalities

Modality choice should be informed by a needs-based response and risk analysis, incorporating joint and timely market analysis, operational and environmental analyses. The use of cash should systematically be considered, across the variety of response mechanisms (anticipatory action, rapid response mechanisms, emergency responses, crisis

³³ Preference should be given to procurement, distribution, and use of environmentally sustainable items, reducing and optimising secondary and tertiary packaging, avoiding procuring single-use items, and favouring products with greater durability and high recycled content.

modifiers, and shock-responsive social protection) funded by DG ECHO. All cash interventions should comply with DG ECHO's cash thematic policy³⁵, including the sector-specific considerations in Annexe 3 of that document. In addition, programmes above EUR 10 million should comply with the large-scale cash guidance note.

DG ECHO promotes a common system and/or coordinated programming approaches to reduce fragmentation and avoid duplication and parallel ways of working. This includes better operational coordination, coordinated approaches to vulnerability-based targeting, data interoperability (which respects data protection requirements) to facilitate deduplication and referrals, a common payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework.

DG ECHO promotes, wherever appropriate, a single multipurpose cash (MPC) payment to meet recurrent basic needs, through a common payment mechanism, and timely referral pathways to meet specific multi-sectoral outcomes based on a solid analysis.

DG-ECHO expects that the MEB and Transfer Values (TV) are defined under the coordination of the CWG for harmonised response. The value of cash assistance should be adequate to cover or contribute to emergency basic needs and should be complemented by other relevant sectoral interventions which cannot be met through cash, facilitated through multi-sectoral referral pathways. Cash assistance should be risk informed and targeted based on socio-economic vulnerability, and the protection concerns of individuals and groups.

Partners should invest in preparedness measures for cash assistance, as a key enabler of timely response e.g., through anticipatory action or rapid response mechanisms.

Partners will also be assessed on their ability to explore possible contributions to existing social safety nets and propose feasible entry points for linking humanitarian assistance and social protection at different levels (policy/governance, strategic/institutional level, program design, and implementation/delivery). In line with the nexus agenda, DG-ECHO encourages approaches that contribute to the delivery of a needs-based, coherent, and coordinated assistance package from both humanitarian and development funding sources, whilst respecting humanitarian and protection principles.

The sectoral and multisectoral outcomes of cash programmes should be monitored against defined objectives in a consistent way, using the relevant DG ECHO KOIs and KRIs, which are aligned with the Grand Bargain MPC outcome indicators.

Multi-sectoral market analysis and monitoring should be ensured, in real time, to inform and adapt assistance, irrespective of the modality. In contexts of high inflation and currency depreciation, partners (under the leadership of Cash Working Groups) should monitor markets and define inflation and currency-related triggers; design programmes

³⁵ [Cash Transfers \(europa.eu\)](https://europa.eu)

and budgets from the outset to anticipate inflation and depreciation; and adapt programmes and budgets based to maintain purchasing power and programme effectiveness.

DG ECHO maintains its commitment to providing cash, even in contexts of high inflation, provided that programming can be adequately adapted, in line with the Good Practice Review on cash in inflation/depreciation³⁶. Whenever duly justified, to cope with market price volatility, partners are encouraged to include contingencies to adapt the transfer value, increase coverage, and/or change to an alternative modality to preserve household purchasing power capacity. Irrespective of the modality, partners are expected to invest in robust due diligence processes and tracking capacity to minimise the risk of diversion.

DG ECHO systematically assess the cost-efficiency of different modalities, using the Total Cost to Transfer Ratio (TCTR), alongside the analysis of effectiveness.

DG ECHO may support Cash Working Groups, under the leadership of the inter-sector/inter-cluster, and in collaboration with relevant sectoral working groups, to provide leadership on the above, in line with the IASC coordination model and CWG ToR³⁷.

Environmental considerations

All partners are expected to include context-specific measures to reduce the environmental footprint of the proposed actions, while preserving their effectiveness, in compliance with the minimum environmental requirements set out in DG ECHO's Guidance on the operationalisation of the Minimum Environmental Requirements and Recommendations for EU-funded humanitarian aid operations³⁸.

The minimum environmental requirements should be applied through a 'mainstreaming' approach with environmental impacts mitigated across sectors, projects and programmes with the aim to consider the environment holistically when designing and implementing actions. The requirements will apply to all sectors with special attention on mitigating the negative environmental impacts in protracted, chronic situations.

The HIP Policy Annex should be consulted in parallel.

Sector-Specific Priorities

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 onset crises. For slow onset crises,

³⁶ [Good Practice Review on Cash Assistance in Contexts of High Inflation and Depreciation - The CALP Network](#)

³⁷ [CWG ToR](#)

³⁸ https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/what/humanitarian-aid/climate-change-and-environment_en

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 and/or act in advance of any new emerging shocks occurring and/or forecasted 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, as well as to act in advance of an imminent shock; the three 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; iii) to provide assistance in advance of an imminent shock to prevent or reduce its acute humanitarian impact, according to a pre-agreed plan with defined triggers and actions.

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 act in advance and 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 time 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).

(3) European Humanitarian Response Capacity (EHRC)

DG ECHO can decide on the activation of the EHRC should operational and logistical gaps emerge. The use of the EHRC support is described in the relevant EHRC Humanitarian Implementation Plan and its Technical Annex.

Under this HIP, DG ECHO can propose directly to one or more partners to receive and be in charge of the distribution of emergency relief items or hosting an EHRC humanitarian expertise. The choice of the partner will be taken by DG ECHO based on a set of criteria, such as presence in the affected area, and experience. The EHRC inputs will be part of the partner's response action and will, where relevant, be included in existing grant agreements.

(4) Disaster Preparedness actions

During the last years, an increasing number of countries and regions have been implementing targeted Disaster Preparedness actions, stretching the limited resources assigned to Disaster Preparedness to the maximum. In order to adapt to this increased demand in Disaster Preparedness, while ensuring an efficient use of the limited funds, and with the recommendation for actions to have an initial duration of 24 months, starting from 2024 the Disaster Preparedness budget line will be allocated on a biennial basis. This means that a given country/region will receive Disaster Preparedness funding every two years, unless exceptional circumstances would require otherwise. Two-year allocations will allow more predictability and sustainability of the DP strategy in the relevant countries/regions, with expected higher impact and effectiveness of its objectives.

In order to ensure a smooth transition from the previous annual allocation of funds to the current biennial frequency, a limited envelope has been established in 2024 to facilitate the shift between modalities and address specific gaps in some countries impacted by the transition. These “bridge funds” will be typically allocated for the extension of ongoing actions that, based on strategic and programmatic considerations, are considered eligible for a top up to ensure expected objectives are met, and to mitigate any identified gaps resulting from the shift to the new allocation frequency. This measure will be applied only in 2024 to avert discontinuity and it is not meant to be repeated in 2025.

Country-Specific Priorities

SYRIA

Programming Priorities

The 2024 strategy will aim to address acute humanitarian needs and promote the early recovery of conflict-affected people. Principled humanitarian assistance, protection, and advocacy (on IHL, IHRL and humanitarian principled action) are required, in the best interest of the affected population. DG ECHO will continue to highlight and advocate against recurrent violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

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.

DG ECHO will encourage partners to consolidate operational presence in the hub of intervention and the capacity to directly implement and monitor their actions.

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.

DG ECHO welcomes the creation of consortia where they contribute to improved coordination and a more integrated multi-sectorial humanitarian response as well as cost-efficiency. When possible, DG ECHO will prioritise actions that are coordinated with other interventions, promoting impactful and efficient responses.

The contextual specificities of each geographical area 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’s humanitarian response. For multi-hub actions, logical frameworks should present results per hub.

Partners applying for DG ECHO funding are requested to take into consideration all due diligence procedures to mitigate operational, and fiduciary risks including those associated with financial transfers, and to include and present mitigation measures at the proposal stage.

All sectors should include protection mainstreaming into their activities using the protection mainstreaming key outcome indicator (KOI) to ensure protection mainstreaming considerations are implemented and monitored at all stages of the action. 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 in all sectors.

Thematic priorities

Disaster Preparedness (DP) and Rapid/Emergency Response

To ensure flexible and rapid responses to sudden onset disasters in a volatile context, DG ECHO will continue to promote in-built multi-sectorial emergency response through the use of Crisis Modifiers as appropriate and duly justified.

In areas at risk, rapid assistance should cover lifesaving needs for one month, extendable to three months for the most vulnerable beneficiaries where no other assistance is available. Referral pathways to essential services such as health, protection and education should be ensured systematically. When possible, DG ECHO encourages the use of MPCA to cover basic needs under rapid/emergency response activities.

Partners with demonstrated emergency response capacity are strongly encouraged to include Crisis Modifiers in their project. Crisis Modifier mechanisms should be based on a multi-risk analysis and scenario planning. Partners are invited to dedicate a specific Crisis Modifier result under the DRR/DP sector, with a budget attached.

To be effective, emergency response assistance should be initiated within 72 hours after the shock. Partners should clearly define the triggers for activation, modality and package of assistance, timeliness, and monitoring process. Alignment with sector and cluster technical guidance is mandatory. Ensuring synergies with existing rapid response mechanisms in place is essential.

Health and Nutrition

DG ECHO will prioritise life-saving healthcare actions through the provision of sustainable quality health services. Continuity of care should aim to ensure positive outcomes for all patients reaching support health structures.

DG ECHO will prioritise the delivery of primary health care (PHC) in areas where essential services are not available and where partners can demonstrate a relevant gap that would lead to excess mortality or risk of disease outbreak.

Partners should demonstrate their added value and involvement in all aspects of the PHC-provided services, as per sectorial recommendations, and not only on marginal issues as financial or logistic support.

Partners providing PHC services should ensure that a quality functional referral service is in place to improve patients' outcomes.

The specific needs of Persons with Disabilities (PwDs) should be properly addressed in health interventions. Mental health and rehabilitation services for PwD should be considered.

DG ECHO may consider supporting secondary health care services (SHC) and structures as complementary access to continuity of care only where strongly justified by the criticality and life-saving nature of identified needs. Partners should consider internal and external referral mechanisms with a clear outcome.

Needs assessments of new proposals should be based on Health Information System data and coordinated mapping. Proposals should reflect lessons learned from previous projects in the sector of health.

Ensuring high quality of life saving healthcare services and medical supplies provided is a priority. All supported health facilities need to abide by international IPC standards. Recognising the health product supply is a challenge across all hubs, synergy or coordinated strategies could be supported.

All health proposals to DG ECHO should clearly detail:

- a) List of PHC and SHC centres to be supported, location of each centre, catchment population, total number of consultations foreseen (primary and/or secondary) per centre, number of health workers per PHC and/or SHC centre, and number of days opened per week.
- b) Estimated unit cost per primary health consultation.

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

To enforce the Do No Harm principle and protection mainstreaming, WASH and Protection component should be part of any health action.

DG ECHO will support integrated **nutrition** interventions that prioritise life-saving curative activities such as treatment of Severe and Moderate Acute Malnutrition (SAM/MAM). Interventions may include an integrated design to respond to various contributory causes underlying acute malnutrition, e.g. focusing on areas with significant prevalence of acute malnutrition and addressing the critical nutritional and food needs of specific groups such as caregivers and children. Acute malnutrition needs will be addressed in areas where the GAM emergency threshold has been exceeded, where local capacities are insufficient, and/or in high-risk or shock affected areas. Nutritional assistance should offer early diagnosis, treatment of acute malnutrition integrated in a minimum package of health care services and priority accompanying measures for children and mothers. In duly presented case, integrated interventions with other sectors could be considered for nutrition specific action.

Protection

Protection interventions will be considered along the following modalities:

- Interventions can be designed in the form of a) stand-alone protection actions, or b) integrated protection programming.
- To ensure the quality of specialised protection services and safety of service providers and beneficiaries, DG ECHO will consider supporting specialised capacity building activities for frontline workers based on training needs assessment and focusing on effective delivery of protection services. A solid capacity building and coaching plan should be included in the proposal. Support to inter-agency coordination to improve technical capacity could be considered.
- Partners are expected to contribute to a comprehensive service mapping and referral mechanism within their specific areas of intervention. Protection interventions need to provide a full package of protection services including protection monitoring, outreach activities to ensure targeting of people at high protection risk and survivors of violence. A strong protection risk analysis shall allow for identification of the most at

risks and marginalised individuals with an age gender and disability lens. These interventions should be built on a solid knowledge of the context and respect of ethical and safety considerations, including data protection.

Specific protection interventions which can be considered include, among others:

- Prevention and Response to violence: Partners are expected to prioritise the provision of quality, comprehensive and safe specialised protection services, accessible to all persons at protection risks, prioritising individuals at heightened protection risk and victims of protection violations, 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 gender-based violence (GBV), child protection violations and other protection violations, provision of specialised services including safety options, alternative care, legal aid and counselling, family tracing when feasible, Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS).
- All PSS activities must ensure that referrals to specialised Mental Health services are available.
- Partners including case management in their proposal should consider the availability of service providers and demonstrate the existence of referral pathways, including to internal and external providers.
- Prevention/mitigation of protection risks should be based on a pre-identified strategy.
- Awareness raising stand-alone activities will not be considered.
- Support to programmes focusing on children associated with armed forces and armed groups and children deprived of their liberty can also be considered, where partners can demonstrate adequate access and relevant technical expertise.
- For people deprived of liberty, activities may include monitoring of detention conditions through systemic approaches, provision of protection services for vulnerable detainees such as children or Persons with Disability (PwD), delivery of specific Mental Health/Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS) targeting victims of torture and abuse. DG ECHO will prioritise interventions with specialised agencies when operating in detention centres or internment camps.
- Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) activities will be considered only in conflict affected areas and when duly justified by the number of casualties figures or to promote access to essential humanitarian services. While DG ECHO recognises the importance of clearance activities to revitalise livelihood opportunities and the need to strengthen and promote a comprehensive approach to HMA, partners are encouraged to identify alternative and more sustainable sources of funding.
- Access to civil documentation could be supported.
- DG ECHO will not support House, Land and Property-related interventions (HLP) with protection funding. HLP considerations should however be considered and properly integrated in all shelter and CCCM programmes.

Cash within protection will be considered only if part of individual case management to address identified protection risks and only when the link between the use of cash and protection outcomes are clearly demonstrated.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

DG ECHO will prioritise interventions aiming at delivering basic domestic and potable water, sanitation and/or hygiene services and goods. Components can include safe water supply, through:

-
- a) Operation and Maintenance (O&M) of existing water systems and services
 - b) systems' repairs and small-scale rehabilitation
 - c) water trucking - only as last resort and with duly presented consideration of alternatives
 - d) rainwater harvesting

Partners are requested to include in their proposals:

- Foreseen water quantity (litres per person per day (L/P/D) to be provided and due justification). Duration of the water supply services, with detailed exit strategy, if any. Total cost per m3 (at distribution point).
- Water quality monitoring 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/where feasible.

In case of light rehabilitation or small-scale repair of water systems: basic feasibility study, schematic of design and broad description of required works and total costs are requested. Detailed documentation in terms of technical designs/specifications, and related Bill of Quantities (BoQ) must be provided before the implementation of works.

Partner's assessment on a) ownership and b) potential sustainability of all water supply systems proposed (incl. a clear description of cost recovery pilot schemes where relevant) should be provided.

All raw water extraction system (i.e. from surface and groundwater) must be equipped with sturdy water metering devices to monitor the volume extracted and with water variation devices to monitor critical drops of water levels. Monitoring of the data provided by these devices must be organised and consolidated (regularly reported by operators)

Sanitation interventions in IDP camps/sites will be prioritised. A maintenance plan and associated costs should be included in all proposals. Community incentives could be considered for the maintenance and cleaning of shared sanitation facilities, where duly justified. Basic feasibility study, schematic of design and broad description of required works and total costs should be provided. Wastewater treatment plants, faecal sludge management, and solid waste management may be supported, particularly when partners can demonstrate comprehensive and safe management beyond collection and disposal, including aspects of resource recovery and system and service durability. Detailed documentation in terms of technical designs/specifications, and related BoQs and environmental impact and mitigation measures must be provided before the implementation.

Stand-alone **Hygiene Promotion** (HP) activities will not be considered but may be considered within a water and sanitation project if supported by a detailed HP strategy, based on harmonised messages and communication channels in line with specific WASH Cluster and WHO guidelines.

Shelters and Settlements (S&S)

DG ECHO may consider the following components:

- Small-scale light repair of family dwellings (in line with sector/cluster recommendations), targeting extremely vulnerable families, preferably for people

-
- owning the house. In case of landlord housing, partners should ensure a free rental or at least frozen rent prices for at least 12 months for the direct beneficiaries.
 - Temporary shelter units (TSU) may be considered on a case-by-case basis. This may include models promoted under the so-called “dignified shelter initiative”.

Partners including this type of shelter should specify in their proposals:

- Site plan, including drainage
- Technical specifications of the TSU and timeframe needed for its set up.
- Unit cost per TSU (in Euros)
- Expected lifespan
- Cost of connections to sewage, drainage, and water supply (if available/feasible)
- Small scale rehabilitation of collective centres, while taking public health preventive and mitigation measures into consideration.

Winterization actions must seek to achieve relative thermal comfort at domestic and personal levels. Monitoring will need to objectively demonstrate achievement of improved thermal comfort at these levels (and not just beneficiary satisfaction). DG ECHO will prioritise cash assistance as the main modality, but other additional modalities may be proposed if relevant (i.e. sealing off kits, and heaters); transfer value to beneficiaries should be in line with the SNFI Cluster/Cash Working Groups recommendations. Emergency site improvement interventions to ensure life-saving access to essential services may be considered.

Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM)

DG ECHO may consider support to fixed or mobile CCCM teams in IDP camps/sites (formal or informal) with the highest/most acute needs in terms of camp coordination and management. Partners are requested to refer to the CCCM Cluster or Working Group regarding the prioritisation and identification of those IDP camps/sites.

Food Assistance, Food Security and Livelihoods (FSL)

Food assistance should be part of a basic needs approach. Needs and future risks should be identified through a combination of food security analysis and multi-disciplinary early warning systems (e.g. climate outlook, price trends) to allow for preparedness and early response.

Key elements of the FSL sector include:

- Actions should use an integrated approach aiming at reducing the prevalence of food insecurity. Targeted support to tackle severe levels of household food insecurity based on the main outcome indicators (Food Consumption Score, Livelihood, and food consumption Coping Strategies) should be provided under the most suitable intervention modalities (e.g. cash, voucher, in-kind) through joint, impartial, evidence-based needs assessments and response analysis.
- Targeting should be based on the needs and vulnerabilities of households in close coordination with the Food Security Cluster (FSC) and Cash Working Group (CWG).
- Close coordination with FSC & CWG to contribute to the development of comprehensive standardised and institutionalised referral pathways (including feedback loops and monitoring) especially to livelihood, protection, nutrition, and health services.
- Improved inter-operability between humanitarian actors within hubs to facilitate layering and referrals.

- Contribution to and use of market monitoring data.

DG ECHO is committed to continuing to support unconditional cash transfers when proven efficient and effective based on a comprehensive analysis, informing the transfer modality and especially the strategy to adapt the modality according to contextual changes.

From the outset of the action, partners should design SOPs to adapt the Transfer Value (TV) and frequency to the price of the food basket, including:

- a. Quality, breadth, and frequency of multi-sectorial market analysis.
- b. Monitoring of the official and parallel exchange rates, inflation and analysis of the impact of inflation on different modalities.
- c. Triggers for adaptation of food assistance modality to inflation and exchange rate including changing the frequency and adequacy vs coverage, to maintain cost-efficiency and food security outcomes.

When operationally feasible and in accordance with the above considerations, DG ECHO and like-minded donors aim to consolidate a Multipurpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) programme of sufficient scale to address basic needs (including food security and related multi-faceted needs) of the most vulnerable people. In order to increase coordination and impact, and increase coherence, DG ECHO encourages partners to:

- a. consider regular MPCA in proposals (transfer value in line with CWG). Beneficiaries of regular MCPA should not overlap with other large scale food assistance programmes.
- b. explore opportunities of improving complementarity of partners, including options for setting up consortia per hub.
- c. set up a common inter-operable platform per hub (if not already set up) for data management and deduplication of beneficiaries (with potential for upscale in the future).

DG ECHO may consider the protection and/or restoration of livelihoods and/or food systems so long as it is prompted by emergency needs and meets humanitarian objectives within an appropriate and defined timeframe. Specific considerations include:

- a. Purpose: achieve self-sufficiency of beneficiaries covering humanitarian needs in the action's timeframe.
- b. Range of activities considered: Emergency livelihood support at household level or communal level. This may include agri-based livelihood and/or non-agri-based livelihoods in non-rural areas (for instance in IDP camps, or urban areas)
- c. A monitoring framework measuring the recovered economic capacity of the household (livelihood assets, income, etc.) compared with a pre-disaster reference level. In addition to KRI indicators, the following ad-hoc indicator shall be used: *"Number/percentage of the target population that restore their livelihood and regain sustainable economic self-reliance <to....., from..... pre-disaster level> (monthly income)"*.
- d. A two-fold targeting framework balancing the present economic fragility and the potential
- e. Self-reliance capacity of households who lost their productive assets including the revolving capital but have knowledge of the production process, familiarity with markets, and regulations, financial and operational resilience. It is encouraged to undertake household livelihood profiling to inform the modalities of support.

- f. Informed approach: The choice of livelihoods and the modality shall be informed by:
- i) A comprehensive market analysis including the availability of technically sound equipment on the local market and access to post-sale assistance; ii) A risk analysis iii) A basic business plan with a timeframe to reach the self-reliance of the beneficiary; iv) A protection risk analysis including sociocultural acceptance and risk linked to the access to productive assets.

DG ECHO may consider supporting communal pilot and small-scale projects to restore access to productive resources and assets (e.g. water for irrigation, electric power for business) at communal level in targeted areas in which such activities will result in immediate increased access to basic services and contribute to a more conducive environment for livelihood opportunities. To the extent possible, humanitarian partners should be thinking collectively of energy solutions for targeted areas, in order to pool resources and increase efficiencies, this is particularly important in rural areas with lower population density.

Partners are strongly encouraged to include a detailed learning and documentation component, test different approaches (e.g. volume of assistance, beneficiaries' livelihood profiles, productive contexts, etc.), and document the impact of the intervention with the aim of future scaling-up of successful approaches and transfer of cases to development operations.

Education In Emergencies (EiE)

With the aim to support safe and sustained access to quality education, DG ECHO will target out-of-school children/adolescents and those already enrolled in formal education but at risk of dropping out to promote their successful (re)integration.

DG ECHO will prioritise Non-Formal Education (NFE)³⁹, in line with applicable sector frameworks, to provide relevant and effective pathways to enter, re-enter or stay in formal education (direct referral of out-of-school children who do not need NFE to school is to be ensured). 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 may establish referrals to vocational and livelihood streams, where appropriate.

Specific EiE interventions which can be considered include:

- Non-formal education, such as literacy/numeracy, accelerated, remedial, and exam support.
- Training and structured guidance of teachers involved in NFE activities. Teacher professional development should be based on identified teacher needs compared to objectives. Its effectiveness, in terms of knowledge/skills gained and applied in the classroom, is to be measured.
- Light repairs of school facilities to ensure minimum standard of safety and protection for children in NFE/out-of-school to enter and remain in school; rehabilitation of basic WASH services, to ensure safety against identified health risks. Quality assurance for these activities includes needs and damages assessment, cost estimates, description of works and BoQs.

³⁹ Partners implementing NFE activities should make use of the definitions, tools and guidance developed by the INEE/AEWG : <https://inee.org/network-spaces/aeWG>

- Teaching, learning material and supplies support for children/adolescents and teachers involved in NFE activities.
- EiE interventions are to be linked to child protection activities, including psycho-social support/recreation/MHPSS.

Partners will need to indicate the selection criteria in terms of areas of intervention/schools and level of education based on the severity of education needs and gaps identified. Beneficiary selection will need to be based on reliable/triangulated evidence of education needs, with gender and conflict sensitivity considered.

Support Services, including coordination

Contributions can be provided towards the support to common services aiming at: a) safe access, b) safety and security advice, c) humanitarian flight services, d) logistics, and e) information, data collection and dissemination to humanitarian stakeholders. In addition, support to clusters and/or coordination WGs (coordination tasks) can be considered when added value is demonstrated at hub level. All support services must operate inclusively and in respect of humanitarian principles.

LEBANON

Programming priorities

Building on the objectives set out in previous DG ECHO strategies, programming priorities in 2024 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 populations residing in Lebanon. 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-Sectorial Needs Assessment (MSNA), and the Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees (VaSyr).

Protection is a core priority of DG ECHO's strategy. DG ECHO expects that protection of all persons affected and at risk informs humanitarian decision-making and response.

The 2024 strategy will focus on the following key programmatic pillars:

- Access to basic needs including health, and education to address the impact of 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 (IHL).
- Specialised protection services including legal assistance to populations of concern.
- Disaster preparedness and emergency response.

DG ECHO promotes integrated programming with solid referral pathways, with whenever possible, an exit strategy or transitional strategy (NEXUS).

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 PSEAH, 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. As per policy frameworks and guidelines, DG ECHO supports, and encourages the localisation agenda.

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

Thematic priorities

Multipurpose Cash transfer in Basic Needs Approach

DG ECHO emphasizes on the Basic Needs Approach (BNA), which aims to effectively meet people's essential requirements through coordinated efforts driven by demand, ultimately ensuring their survival and maintaining a minimum standard of living within BNA. 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 sectorial outcomes. For the Lebanese component of cash programming, interventions must be aligned with the National Poverty Targeting Programme (NPTP). 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, organised under the Louise Platform, with the aim of reducing fragmentation and working 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.

For the MPC interventions targeting vulnerable Lebanese, partners should address the exclusion errors of the national programmes and ensure de-duplication. Transfer Value (TV), duration, and frequency of the cash assistance must be aligned with the National Poverty Targeting Programme (NPTP). The assistance shall be based on coordinated and rigorous targeting criteria to identify the households in emergency food insecurity and extreme deprivation.

Partners should focus on geographic areas with the highest incidence of crisis and emergency levels of food insecurity as identified by the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) and demonstrate the capacity to maximise geographic outreach and beneficiary caseload while maintaining cost efficiency.

DG-ECHO encourages the integration of MPC assistance with referrals to services to address specific needs. Seasonal flexibility of the TV might be considered.

Partners must develop sound implementation strategies and monitoring frameworks to demonstrate the capacity to refer beneficiaries to national programs and other interventions.

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

DG ECHO strongly urges programming that is emphasizing on Transfer Value (TV) to be in relation to the Minimum Expenditure Basket (S/MEB). The Transfer Value (TV) should be defined and monitored based on an estimation of the gap between the Minimum

Expenditure Basket (S/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. As outlined in ANNEX IV of the cash transfers policy, DG ECHO expects that the partners maintain or improve the TCTR set at the proposal stage throughout the action, unless duly justified. For programs funded through multiple successive actions (e.g., protracted assistance of refugees), DG ECHO expects that the TCTR will improve over time. Irrespective of the value of cash assistance, partners should be able to demonstrate that the amount transferred to beneficiaries is maximized.

The sectorial 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.

To increase coordination/impact/effectiveness, and boost coherence, DG ECHO encourages partners to ensure the deduplication of beneficiaries in their action.

Disaster Preparedness (DP) and Rapid/Emergency Response

To ensure flexible and rapid responses to sudden onset disasters, DG ECHO will continue to promote in-built multi-sectorial rapid response using Crisis Modifiers (CM). Crisis Modifier mechanisms should be based on a multi-risk analysis and scenario planning. Partners should define the response mechanism clearly (triggers, monitoring, modality, timeliness, thresholds, etc.).

In areas at risk, rapid assistance should cover life-saving needs for one month, extendable to three months for the most vulnerable beneficiaries where no other assistance is available. Referral pathways to essential services such as health, protection and education should be ensured systematically. When relevant, DG ECHO encourages the use of MPCA to cover basic needs under rapid/emergency response activities.

To be effective, emergency response assistance should be initiated within 72 hours after the shock. Partners should clearly define the triggers for activation, modality and package of assistance, timeliness, and monitoring process. Alignment with sector and cluster technical guidance is mandatory. Ensuring synergies with existing rapid response mechanisms in place is essential.

Partners with demonstrated emergency response capacity are strongly encouraged to include Crisis Modifiers (CM) in their project. While opting for CM, partners should dedicate a specific result under the DRR/DP sector, with a budget attached.

Protection

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

Protection interventions will be supported through the following modalities:

-
- Refugee registration, documentation, and verification (IHL) 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.
 - Interventions supporting access to civil documentation for groups at risk, in accordance with IHRL, building on lessons learned from previous actions. Provision of legal counselling and assistance would be considered.
 - Provision of prevention and response interventions to attend persons at heightened protection risk including but not limited to: SGBV, child protection violations, and other acute protection risks. Interventions can include individual protection case management inclusive of focused MHPSS components, legal aid, and physical safety, based on an individual case plan.
 - Integrated programming with a protection entry point and envisioned protection outcomes aiming to prevent/mitigate protection-related negative coping mechanisms (e.g. worst forms of child labour, early marriages, survival sex, etc.). Risk analysis should demonstrate the root of negative coping mechanisms, could be considered. 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.
 - In line with DG ECHO's Humanitarian Protection Policy, the use of cash to achieve protection outcomes will only be considered as part of case management) and should be based on a solid protection risks analysis. The causal link between cash transfers and protection outcomes should be detailed at the proposal stage. Partners should demonstrate a strong referral/ coordination to/with basic assistance or livelihoods programmes.
 - Preventative components will only be considered when focused/targeted on an identified protection risk.
 - Protection monitoring: the systematic collection and analysis of trends, risks, and gaps in evidence, to inform programmatic adjustments and advocacy efforts. Protection monitoring activities should always include effective referrals to appropriate services.

Health

DG ECHO will prioritise life-saving health interventions and continuum of care. Proposed actions will have to be in line with the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) existing frameworks and include clearly defined needs assessment and exit strategy or endpoint.

DG ECHO will consider supporting access mainly to primary and secondary healthcare services for extremely vulnerable individuals. The scope of intervention will also include sexual and reproductive health. In the case of tertiary healthcare, DG ECHO might consider support on a case-by-case basis, focused on life and limb-saving interventions. Moreover, a clear mapping of service coverage will be used to foster synergy, and complementarity and avoid duplication.

Emergency and preparedness health interventions might be supported through the public health system, with appropriate coordination mechanisms in place, ensuring effective implementation and complementarity. This component is the core of DG ECHO ongoing Programmatic Partnership.

Human resources for health is one of the main concerns for DG ECHO. In supporting the provision of health services, DG ECHO might consider HR support, in line with MoPH support, to avoid tensions and dissatisfaction of health workers. Moreover, an endpoint should be embedded in the design.

DG ECHO encourages integrated programming linking protection, cash for health, and health programmes; improving access to services for people in need with special attention to Persons with Disability (PWD).

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

Activities, when needed and applicable, should integrate robust referral mechanisms, including follow-up. The methodology to capture, track and follow-up referred cases until their completion must be described in proposals whenever feasible (e.g. type of cases disaggregated by age/sex, waiting times, end result, etc.). If not feasible, a justification should be provided at single form level.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO will prioritise non-formal education (NFE)/pathways for vulnerable out-of-school Syrian refugee children/adolescents to support sustained transition in formal education while also focusing on educational performance.

The actions should align with applicable sector frameworks (including MEHE curriculum) and ensure retention and progression in NFE, including measuring clear learning outcomes/attainment.

All NFE activities/pathways must demonstrate complementarity with formal education. Information systems, planning and data/evidence, quality assurance, and coordination may be supported as relevant.

Light repairs/rehabilitation of school facilities/learning should be duly justified, provided they are needed to ensure revitalisation of services and minimum standard of safety and protection for children returning to school or transiting from NFE.

DG ECHO expects partners to actively participate in relevant coordination fora, providing evidence and lessons learned through a comprehensive analysis of present and anticipated opportunities and risks affecting the sector.

Integrated EiE and child protection actions are strongly encouraged but ensuring that child protection services are provided by specialised child protection actors.

Partners will be expected to indicate the selection criteria in terms of areas of intervention based on the severity of education needs and gaps, access to the community and capacity of response/scale up.

Partners are also expected to provide baselines, target correspondingly set, critically examine lessons learned, and show strategic and advocacy engagement. Complementarity, and synergy with other projects, donors, and stakeholders (including development actors in a NEXUS approach) are strongly encouraged. Necessary capacity, monitoring, and quality assurance of implementing partners is to be evidenced.

Coordination and advocacy

DG ECHO may fund support services, such as coordination, access, and advocacy.

The development of robust information management systems and analytical products will be supported if they lead to informed programming decisions and evidence-based advocacy (operational and humanitarian space). 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.

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.

Shelter

Repairs of buildings/shelters and infrastructure damaged as a result of conflict, could be considered where the necessity of an ECHO intervention is demonstrated, and in line with relevant ECHO policies and guidelines.

The use of cash-based and/or in-kind (NFIs) distribution modalities, where it is supported by a comparative analysis and takes into account cost-effectiveness and efficiency considerations, could be considered by DG ECHO.

JORDAN

Programming priorities

The effects of the conflict in Ukraine on the socio-economic situation in Jordan strongly impact refugees and vulnerable Jordanians' resilience and capacity to access basic services as well as their physical safety and psychosocial wellbeing. 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.

Building on the objectives set out in previous DG ECHO strategies, programming priorities in 2024 will aim at strengthening the protection space and dignity of refugees seeking safety in Jordan as well as access to basic services. Within this context, the strategy will be an integral part of the broader EU response in Jordan, designed in synergy with interventions funded under other EU/development instruments.

DG ECHO's priorities in 2024 will continue to focus on strengthening the asylum space as well as on the provision of timely, adequate, and appropriate humanitarian assistance to persons stranded in border areas, to refugees living in camps and/or in host communities, and to vulnerable Jordanians, based on vulnerability assessments.

As per policy frameworks and guidelines, DG ECHO supports, and encourages the localisation agenda.

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

In 2024, DG ECHO will support the following thematic priorities:

Thematic priorities

Protection

Protection must be addressed systematically in all proposals, ensuring that the four elements of protection mainstreaming are systematically monitored and corrective measures are implemented within the course of the action.

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

Protection integrated programming, including creating synergies between humanitarian and development programmes (e.g. MPCA/protection) will be considered for funding. Integrated programming must ensure outcomes in all sectors of intervention and partners must demonstrate in-country capacities and a close inter-sector collaboration from the design of the action.

As for stand-alone protection interventions, DG ECHO will consider programmes focusing on both physical and legal protection, in specific programmes aiming at:

- Providing support to obtain civil and legal documentation with a view to enhancing refugees’ protection as well as access to essential basic services. Proposed actions should address legal support and/or accompaniment of protection cases beyond basic legal counselling.
- Systematic monitoring of the asylum space in Jordan, including push factors that might lead to premature returns and/or perilous onward movements.
- Providing specialised protection assistance for victims of violence or vulnerable groups at risk due to specific discrimination or risk factors.

Some additional considerations:

DG ECHO expects partners to develop robust referral mechanisms, based on in-depth service mapping, and ensure systematic monitoring of the effectiveness of referrals.

All proposals must demonstrate linkages with existing longer-term approaches supported by development actors when they exist.

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 and legal stay in the Jordanian territory, upholding the principle of non-refoulement as well as principled humanitarian assistance delivery to individuals seeking international protection in Jordan.
- Advocacy to grant unhindered humanitarian access wherever needed.
- Advocacy for voluntary, safe, and dignified durable solutions including advocacy for self-reliance 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, including cash for health, 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. Clear transitional / exit strategy should be demonstrated by partners from the onset.

In camp settings

- Proposals ensuring that refugees, including newly arrived ones, have direct access to health services according to their needs will be prioritised.
- Activities aimed at ensuring functioning, and 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.).

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

Specific activities could be proposed should immediate life-saving needs be identified in specific locations.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO will only consider education activities (at compulsory basic education level) that support vulnerable refugee children/adolescents in refugee camps to successfully enter, remain and progress in formal education. This may include non-formal education activities, in line with sector regulations, as well as protective school environments. Strengthening of coordination to optimise relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of education response, starting from camp level, may be proposed if justified. 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).

Interventions need to demonstrate alignment, complementarity, and synergy with other projects/partners and development programmes, with clear identification of value added. 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. All proposals

will need to consider an exit strategy, aiming for maximised impact and continuity/sustainability.

