

TECHNICAL ANNEX

YEMEN

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 /C4
Contact persons at HQ:	Team Leader: Martina Ghelarducci (Martina.Ghelarducci@ec.europa.eu) Desk Officer: Anne DECAILLET (Anne.DECAILLET@ec.europa.eu) Desk Officer: Ani NEDKOVA (Ani.NEDKOVA@ec.europa.eu) Desk Officer: Fieke VAN DE VEN (Fieke.VAN-DE-VEN@ec.europa.eu)
Contact persons in the field:	Heather BLACKWELL (Heather.BLACKWELL@echofield.eu) Muriel CORNELIS (Muriel.CORNELIS@echofield.eu) Felix LEGER (Felix.LEGER@echofield.eu) Francesco RIGAMONTI (Francesco.RIGAMONTI@echofield.eu)

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
ECHO/YEM/BUD/2024/91000

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: **EUR 90 000 000** of which an indicative amount of **EUR 11 000 000** for Education in Emergencies.

Programmatic Partnerships:

Programmatic Partnerships have been launched since 2020 with a limited number of partners. A maximum amount of **EUR 1 000 000** will be dedicated to ongoing Programmatic Partnerships in 2024. No new Programmatic Partnerships could be funded under this HIP.

Indicative breakdown per Actions as per Worldwide Decision (in euros)³:

Country	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
Yemen	90 000 000,00				90 000 000,00

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)⁴.

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

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

⁴ Single form guidelines: <https://www.dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/ngo/action-proposal/fill-in-the-single-form>

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

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

Cost 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:

- 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

- 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 Partnerships⁵

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. There will be no PP opportunity under the HIP 2024 for Yemen.

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 HIPs⁶), 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. of this Annex, as well as

⁵ See the dedicated [guidance](#) on Programmatic Partnerships.

⁶ 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 most of the targeted countries.

the applicant organisation's capacities. The proposals should specify the breakdown between the different country allocations.

g) Multi-year funding actions⁷

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 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 90 000 000
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2024
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more⁸ provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner⁹. 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. 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 and f) of section 2 above).
- d) Potential partners: All DG ECHO Partners
- e) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modifications requests of on-going actions¹⁰

⁷ 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 \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org) and Grand Bargain definitions: [Multi-year and flexible funding - Definitions Guidance Summary - Narrative Section January 2020.pdf \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org)

⁸ Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

⁹ 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://dgeocho-website(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu)))

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

- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 21/12/2023.¹¹

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 employed, the activities to be undertaken and the objectives to be achieved?

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.

- 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?¹²

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.).

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 Measures¹³ 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 budget¹⁴ (“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 Hungary¹⁵**

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 2021¹⁶, including those entities listed in Annex I to Hungarian Act IX of 2021¹⁷ and other affiliated entities maintained by them (“Concerned Entities”). The Commission will further notify when the above-mentioned Conditionality Measures are lifted.

¹² In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092 of the European Parliament and 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

¹⁵ OJ L 325, 20.12.2022, p. 94–109

¹⁶ Act IX of 2021 on public interest trust foundations with a public service mission (entry into force 01/01/2023).

¹⁷ 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 when assessing proposals submitted in the frame of the 2024 HIP.

In line with the DG ECHO guidance on **localisation**¹⁸, and unless duly justified, DG ECHO expects proposals to be based on partnerships with local actors, with the aim of strengthening their participation and leadership in the humanitarian response. DG ECHO also expects partners to provide relevant support to local partners' response (technical training, institutional support, peer learning) as well as an adequate share of overhead costs. Proposed partnership with local actors must provide clarity on the selection criteria, roles, added value in the implementation of proposed action and capacity building plan. In case of similar quality and focus, DG ECHO will give priority to proposals where at least 25% of DG ECHO's contribution is set for activities implemented by local and national actors.

Regarding **logistics (meaning 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 effectiveness is demonstrated, in line with DG ECHO's Humanitarian Logistics Policy. DG ECHO encourages the application of this 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 impacts¹⁹.

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

For **Protection/Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) and Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH)**, specific implementation of the following elements in the proposal should be demonstrated as appropriate:

- Mainstreaming of protection, gender, age and disability inclusion based on a comprehensive needs and risk analysis;
- Strategies for effective prevention of and response to (S)GBV;
- Strategies for effective prevention of and response to SEAH, including adequate and victim/survivor-centred response approaches and reporting channels.

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 relevant guidance²⁰. The

¹⁸ 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.

²⁰ DG ECHO Guidance on the operationalisation of the Minimum Environmental Requirements and Recommendations for EU-funded humanitarian aid operations: https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/what/humanitarian-aid/climate-change-and-environment_en

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, for all sectors of intervention.

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, 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: 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. 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 oversee 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.

DG ECHO support will be articulated along 2 main pillars of integrated response:

1. **to populations directly exposed to conflict, disasters caused by natural hazards and displacement.**
2. **to food insecurity, malnutrition (CMAM and IYCF²¹) and health crisis, including WASH to prevent transmission of epidemics and malnutrition.**

DG ECHO will prioritise lifesaving needs resulting from ongoing conflict and climate-induced disasters while continuing to address acute needs of vulnerable hosting communities, displaced people, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and, marginalised populations, such as Muhamasheen.

4.1.2.1. General Priorities

Targeting

Under pillar 1, three priority groups are identified:

- i. Populations currently living in active conflict areas.
- ii. Populations in the acute phase of forced (conflict or climate-related) displacement (within 3 months).
- iii. Populations settled in IDP sites or displaced in locations hit by climate-induced disasters.

Actions designed *in support of populations in IDP sites* should ensure the provision of essential services during displacement, using an area-based approach and prioritizing access to adequate information and protection assistance. Depending on evolving displacement dynamics and scenarios, it is possible to envisage prioritised activities supporting *principled durable solutions*, including return.

Under pillar 2, DG ECHO will prioritise areas where acute malnutrition/food insecurity indicators surpass the emergency nutrition thresholds, with priority given to under-served locations within IPC 4+ and/or inter-cluster severity mapping 4 or worse. Proposals must align with system-wide joint assessments, including IPC reports, and with the inter-cluster severity mapping.

While each of these pillars is eligible separately to access DG ECHO funding, a priority will be made to:

- Geographical areas where partners can demonstrate a convergence of the 2 pillars.
- Integrated actions that contribute to reduce protection risks, including protection-related negative coping mechanisms, in line with the commitments on Centrality of Protection.
- Areas that are conducive for principled aid delivery.

Cross-cutting priorities

All proposals must address the following requirements:

²¹ Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition; Infant and Young Child Feeding.

- DG ECHO supports an integrated and area-based approach. Integration of services can be achieved through one organisation, with proven sector(s) expertise and/or through coordination with other organisations. Proposals shall demonstrate sectorial capacity within integrated sectors of intervention and engaged referral pathways for complementary assistance, when relevant.
- Partners shall explain their participation and engagement with the humanitarian coordination structure at national and local levels as relevant to each sector of intervention proposed.
- DG ECHO expects all partners to demonstrate how the proposed actions contribute to system-wide Centrality of Protection and its contextual priorities, regardless the sector of intervention.
- Affected populations, including marginalised groups, host communities and relevant stakeholders shall be consulted and participate in all phases of the humanitarian response, from the design to the implementation. This includes community participation and ownership at different levels (e.g., household level, site committees, local authorities). Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) is expected to be embedded in all programmes, with specific attention given to ensure safeguarding.²²
- Interventions should aim to reinforce existing local capacities (including targeted populations and local authorities), enhance contingency capabilities and promote self-reliance.
- Localised independent assessment(s) to supplement system wide assessments (e.g. IPC, SMART, MCLA, etc.) for all sectors shall be included in the proposal. Partners are strongly encouraged to demonstrate the utilisation of data from their own existing projects to strategise the proposed intervention.
- Partners are expected to include a transparent targeting strategy that shows how the most vulnerable are being prioritised. Additionally, proposals shall develop beneficiaries' inclusion and exclusion factors (e.g. triggers, beneficiary identification/verification, monitoring, etc.). The inclusion of extremely vulnerable and marginalised groups such as migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, People Living with Disabilities (PLWD), Muhamasheen, women and girls and elderly, etc. into all DG ECHO-funded humanitarian assistance is expected.
- Interventions shall be guided by clear access strategies maximising proximity to beneficiaries, adapting the delivery modalities to the security situation and seeking to increase access.
- The proposed intervention shall be informed by a localised comprehensive risk analysis, including a conflict sensitivity analysis of threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities (e.g. factor in recurrent natural disasters including flooding in preparedness and response plan). Strategies to mitigate identified risks shall be included in proposals and regularly monitored throughout implementation.
- The intervention shall include a monitoring strategy and support at field level for local implementing partners.
- Primacy will be given to direct monitoring of DG ECHO funded actions. Remotely managed actions remain a last resort measure and will be justified only to address critical humanitarian needs if formally agreed with DG ECHO. When security/access allows transition towards standard assistance modalities, the latter should be pursued.

²² Safeguarding is defined as all actions taken by organisations to protect their personnel from harm and to prevent them from harming others.

- Partners shall systematically consider basic environmental impact of the proposed action and provide tailored risk mitigation plans. In addition, demonstrate that conflict sensitivities have been considered and addressed in relation to scarcity of natural resources and their planned use.
- Partners shall define appropriate exit strategies and handover, including options for graduation or transfer to development programmes, where applicable.

Visibility and Communication

Partners must ensure, through proactive communication on EU-funded actions, that the public is aware of how the EU is helping and how funding is used, with the objective of fostering continued strong support for humanitarian aid among key stakeholders and the general public. Detailed information on DG ECHO's visibility requirements can be found in the "Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union-funded Humanitarian Aid Actions".

Standard visibility is a contractual obligation for all DG ECHO-funded projects. Partners must ensure EU visibility through the prominent display of the EU emblem with accompanying text, as specified in Section 12.1.A of the Single Form, as well as communication actions throughout the project duration with broad dissemination, as specified in Section 12.1.B of the Single Form.

In addition to standard visibility, partners with strong and ambitious communication plans are encouraged to apply for above-standard visibility. DG ECHO may provide additional funding should a partner wish to carry out communication actions with wide outreach to the European public and media. For above standard visibility, a separate communications plan, costed, with an estimated audience reach and timeline, must be submitted as an annex to the Single Form.

Multi-year financing

DG ECHO is committed to increasing multi-year financing (i.e., 24 months or longer).

Sectors to be considered for multi-year financing in Yemen include the following priorities:

- Education in Emergencies.
- Initiatives addressing interoperability and deduplication of assistance.
- Protection, including capacity building of national actors in providing protection assistance.

Additionally, partners can propose multi-year actions for other sectors when a multi-year duration would increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the action compared to actions of shorter duration. These gains should be clearly demonstrated in the proposal.

Transfer modalities:

The choice of transfer modalities should be informed by a needs-based response and risk analysis, incorporating joint and timely market analysis as well as operational and environmental analyses. The use of cash should systematically be considered, across the variety of response mechanisms funded by DG ECHO (anticipatory action, rapid response mechanisms, emergency responses, crisis modifiers, and shock-responsive social protection).

DG ECHO promotes the adoption of a common system and/or coordinated programming approaches to reduce fragmentation and avoid duplication. This includes better operational coordination, coordinated approaches to vulnerability-based targeting, data interoperability

to facilitate deduplication and referrals (respecting data protection requirements), a common payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework. DG ECHO will systematically assess the cost-efficiency of different modalities, using the Total Cost to Transfer Ratio (TCTR), alongside the analysis of effectiveness.

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 Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and Transfer Values (TV) are defined under the coordination of the Cash and Market Working Group (CMWG) 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. 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, programme design, and implementation/delivery).

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.

At Specific Objective level:

- Livelihood Coping Strategy (LCS): “% of HH without crisis and emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies (LCS)” - Target 80% using the WFP methodology outlined in its Essential Needs Assessment guidance (see p20).
- Percentage of households who report being able to meet their basic needs as they define and prioritize them measured using the standardized scale (all/most/half/some)
- Given that large percentages of the MPC assistance is used to cover food needs, it is recommended to also use the Food Consumption Score (FCS) systematically.

At result level, DG ECHO recommends the use of:

- “Percentage of households with total monthly expenditure which exceeds the MEB”.
- Target 80%.

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 CMWG) should monitor markets and define inflation and currency-related triggers; design programmes 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 contexts of high

inflation/depreciation”²³. Whenever duly justified to mitigate 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 TCTR, alongside the analysis of effectiveness. DG ECHO will support the CMWG, 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 ToR.

4.1.2.2. Sector-Specific Priorities

Protection

Key elements of the Protection programme include:

- DG ECHO supports the promotion of International Law, including International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and Refugee Law, at various levels through direct engagement and evidence-based humanitarian advocacy. Additionally, DG ECHO supports partners’ contribution to joint advocacy efforts enhancing protection space in-country.
- Joint and integrated protection programming²⁴ is encouraged particularly when aimed at enhancing the access to protection cases and delivery of related assistance (e.g., integrated protection and health/nutrition programmes, integrated emergency livelihood and GBV programming) as well as reducing protection risks (e.g., MPCA, on top of covering basic needs, could potentially contribute to mitigate protection-related negative coping mechanisms).
- Protection monitoring: DG ECHO encourages the systematic collection and analysis of information to identify protection trends for populations of concern with the purpose of informing effective response as well as advocacy. Protection monitoring activities should always be complemented by the direct or indirect provision of assistance to beneficiaries through multisector response activities (including protection). Emphasis should be put on the provision of information about existing services and referrals for cases in need of specialised services.
- Addressing Psychosocial (PSS) needs remains a priority for DG ECHO. All partners must ensure that, as a minimum, Psychological First Aid is mainstreamed in their humanitarian actions. All proposals with a PSS component must: 1) specify the level of service provision (level 1 – 3 IASC MHPSS pyramid) as well as the profile and capacities of staff; 2) ensure availability of timely and effective referrals to specialised mental health services (level 4 IASC MHPSS pyramid) and; 3) monitor the improvement of beneficiaries’ psychosocial well-being.
- Case Management/Accompaniment and Referral: partners are expected to develop/update localised multi-sector service mapping (ensuring quality of assistance is taken into account) as well as referral mechanisms. Priority will be given to actions focusing on ‘high risk’ cases. For case management, technical supervision of case workers must be included.

²³ <https://www.calpnetwork.org/publication/good-practice-review-on-cash-assistance-in-contextsof-high-inflation-and-depreciation/>

²⁴ Integrated protection programming will employ responses from one or more traditional assistance sectors (shelter, WASH, health, food assistance, nutrition, etc.) to achieve a protection outcome.

- Legal protection, with a priority given to obtaining identity and HLP related documents, especially when linked to serious protection risks and eviction threats respectively, is encouraged.
- All partners are expected to assess the added value of direct service provision versus working through national actors, in view of enhancing both the sustainability of protection assistance as well as contributing to maintaining/expanding operational space of Yemeni civil society.
- Activities related to humanitarian mine action should be implemented in line with the humanitarian principles and can include humanitarian demining in populated areas affected by the conflict or around basic civil infrastructure (e.g., schools), mine risk education, awareness campaigns and mine action capacity-building support.
- Coordinated multi-sectoral victim assistance: As a minimum, proposals are expected to include health assistance, including rehabilitation and MHPSS as well as case management.

Food Security & Livelihoods (FSL)

Food Security: Improving availability of, and accessibility to, food shall be considered in the contexts of displaced populations and people affected by conflict, socioeconomic crisis and natural hazard induced disasters. Key elements of the FS programme include:

- An integrated approach aiming at reducing prevalence of food insecurity in locations classified as IPC4+. Support tackling severe levels of household food insecurity, based on the main outcome indicators (i.e., Food Consumption Score, Livelihood Coping Strategy Index), should be provided through the most suitable modalities (e.g., cash, voucher, in-kind). Partners shall base the design of their interventions on joint, impartial, and evidence-based needs assessments and response analysis.
- An appropriate description of the targeting (which should be at households' level and based on vulnerability).
- A close coordination with the Food Security & Agriculture Cluster (FSAC) and CMWG is required, including for the development of comprehensive standardised and institutionalised referral pathways especially to livelihood, protection, nutrition, and health services.
- An appropriate description of a preparedness and emergency response capacity for shocks (based on learning and experience), feeding into the work of the FSAC and CMWG on strengthening collective preparedness efforts.
- A description of how the action will improve interoperability between humanitarian actors to facilitate layering and referrals.
- A description of how the proposal will contribute to and use market monitoring data.

In the context of global high volatility of prices of food and basic commodities, needs and future risks should be identified through a combination of food security analysis and multi-disciplinary early warning systems (e.g., climate outlook, and global commercial, logistic and price trends) to allow preparedness to adapt the assistance and maintain cost-efficiency and effectiveness. From the outset of the Action, partners should design SOPs to adapt TV and frequency to the price of the food basket, including:

- i) Quality, breadth, frequency of multi-sectoral market analysis, and SOPs to share the analysis. Monitoring of official and parallel exchange rates and inflation and analysing the impact of inflation and depreciation on different modalities.

- ii) Develop triggers for adaptation of food assistance modality to inflation and exchange rate including changing the frequency and number of distributions.

DG ECHO considers cash as the default modality for food assistance when proven efficient and effective based on a comprehensive analysis, informing on choice and triggers to adapt the modality according to contextual changes. Voucher modality could be considered if higher cost-efficiency and effectiveness are demonstrated compared to other modalities. When in-kind assistance is deemed necessary due to contingent situations, partners are expected to develop since the start of the Action, triggers to switch to cash assistance. Food assistance should be part of a basic needs approach. DG ECHO is committed to continuing to support unconditional and unrestricted Multipurpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) using a single delivery mechanism to cover both food and basic needs. When operationally feasible and in accordance with the above considerations, DG ECHO and like-willing donors aim to consolidate a MPCA programme of sufficient scale to address basic needs (including food security and related multi-faceted needs) of the most vulnerable people.

Emergency Livelihoods: DG ECHO may consider supporting small-scale initiatives aiming at the protection and restoration of livelihoods and/or food systems if prompted by emergency needs and meeting humanitarian objectives within a defined timeframe. Specific considerations include:

- Focus on emergency livelihood support at the household level or communal level for a limited number of households. This may include agropastoral and off-farm livelihoods.
- Defined timeframe to achieve self-sufficiency of beneficiaries to cover their humanitarian needs in a timeframe of 12-18 months and consideration for seasonality to guide the calendar of activities for effective and timely assistance.
- A two-fold targeting framework balancing the present economic fragility and the potential 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.
- The choice of livelihoods 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 of the potential impact of markets' disruption; 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.
- A monitoring framework measuring the recovered economic capacity of the household (agropastoral production, livelihood assets, income) compared with a pre-disaster reference level. In addition to the use of the KRI, the following 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)”*.

DG ECHO prioritises a cash+ approach that combines cash transfers with productive assets, inputs, and/or technical training to enhance the livelihoods and productive capacities of targeted households. Soft conditionalities might be considered in case of subsequent instalments. 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 an aim of future upscaling of successful approaches and transfer cases towards development operations.

Integrated Health and Nutrition

Key elements of the health and nutrition sectors include:

- Health interventions should be approached in a comprehensive way and must be nutrition and protection-sensitive at all levels of care. All interventions require novel solutions in the context of Yemen.
- Primary and secondary care health facilities should provide comprehensive health services: sexual and reproductive (SRH), maternal, child and adolescent health (MCAH) and nutrition interventions in highly vulnerable locations affected by health service gaps. Health operations should support identification and treatment of acute malnutrition with or without medical complications. Community health volunteers should be considered for programming to reinforce the link between communities and health providers.
- Health interventions should also address stillbirths and maternal deaths. The first 1 000 days of life, from conception to 2 years, are critical in all interventions related to mother and child health and nutrition. Scale up of the Expanded Programme of Immunisation (EPI) is also critical in the current context of multiple outbreaks.
- Provision of conditional cash and/or in-kind assistance must be linked to a nutrition outcome combined with risk mitigation efforts and EPI. DG ECHO will support operations targeting the most-at-risk households, against identified and agreed selection criteria, including households with pregnant and lactating mothers, children under five years and acutely undernourished SAM/MAM cases. The use of cash for nutrition should not be a stand-alone intervention but in combination with other activities e.g., health.
- Acute malnutrition responses are required to routinely assess programme performance and define CMAM program quality improvement measures (including supportive supervision and/or on the job training) based on analysed bottlenecks for Nutrition program Information System and the recommendations of the Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) evaluation.
- Partners should adhere to the nutrition cluster CMAM caseload estimation methodology and provide evidence-based justification for specific deviations from the cluster recommendations.
- DG ECHO supports outbreak preparedness and response, including surveillance and EWARN for highly infectious and vaccine preventable diseases. Response mechanism should be coordinated and can include aspects of health determinants (i.e., WASH, vector control, environmental issues).
- Mental Health (MH) services must be provided through qualified and trained professional staff in Level 3-4 (IASC MHPSS guide). Capacity building for local health professionals, such as mhGAP is highly encouraged as well as clinical mental health scale up and further geographical roll out. Only clearly identified MH interventions will be considered following the MHPSS IASC guideline. A referral pathway needs to be clearly demonstrated in the proposal. This includes also referrals related to protection cases. Specialised MH interventions should be clearly mapped out in the areas of intervention. Integration of MHPSS in health and nutrition is preferred.

- Reinforcement of inter-sectoral coordination (e.g. protection, nutrition and food security clusters and/or cash working group) should be ensured to maximise entry points and coverage.
- Project related data collection, analysis and interpretation should be demonstrated (including from ongoing or previous responses) to inform local drivers of acute malnutrition/food insecurity and associated epidemic outbreaks. The use of epidemiological data shall guide community-based programming.
- Integration of clinical management for GBV services into health is expected by all health partners enabling GBV survivors' access to safe and timely medical and psychological assistance. Child protection considerations are particularly important in relation to prevention and treatment of malnutrition and children treated during epidemic outbreaks. Health and nutrition partners should be aware of child protection concerns in their respective areas of operation when programming. Partners should ensure children are cared for by parents/caregivers to the extent possible, prevent or mitigate family separation due to treatment and ensure holistic care for caregivers.
- Partners should clearly articulate the complementarity of their proposed action with other large-scale programmes funded by other donors.
- Proper waste management of healthcare and nutrition product waste (including single-use packaging) should be ensured. Low-quality incinerators should be avoided.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Shelter and Settlement (S&S)

General considerations for WASH/S&S are the following:

- In IDP sites, particular consideration should be given to up-grading existing emergency WASH/S&S services/facilities (e.g. from emergency shelter/latrines to transitional solutions).
- WASH actions should address needs comprehensively, as a part of a broad multi-sector public health approach (i.e. access to clean water in sufficient quantity, safe management of excreta/solid waste, adapted hygiene promotion and NFI provision), and promote responsible water extraction, conservation and (re)use.
- WASH/S&S actions should deliver sectoral inputs/services/facilities in line with applicable humanitarian standards, whether a stand-alone result or in support of other sectors.
- Non-acute emergency WASH/S&S actions require a basic environmental assessment/screening and the implementation of corresponding mitigation analysis/measures.
- WASH/S&S actions are expected to support local resources/capacity and promote community-mobilisation in their design and implementation, enhancing quality control and accountability.

WASH:

General considerations:

DG ECHO's strategy will contribute to specific elements of the 2022-2024 Yemen WASH Cluster (YWC) strategy, particularly to the Survival and Integrated WASH pillars but also some elements of the Resilient WASH pillar, as detailed below. Contribution to these specific elements will have to be weighed against the DG ECHO's WASH and Shelter policies and relevant technical guidelines. Partners are invited to use DG ECHO WASH

KOIs and KRIs but, when deemed relevant and better suited, DG ECHO may accept outcome and output indicators included in the YWC Strategy.

- Water supply:
 - Priority is given to the ‘optimisation’ of existing water supply systems and sources, based on technically sound rehabilitation, local capacity building and risk mitigation. Where appropriate, renewable/hybrid power sources should be considered for water pumping to promote durability, autonomy, cost-efficiency and limited environmental impact. Particular attention should be paid to the quality and local availability of equipment/spare parts, system dimensioning, water loss/leakage reduction, water extraction monitoring and usage and tariffs. Detailed technical diagnostic of current level of functionality of the water system is required. An O&M management model is required, and how the proposed action would tackle it is meant to improve this model. Formal involvement of the local authorities, water utilities and operators should be promoted throughout the project cycle. Exit and strategy/hand over strategy should be based on realistic assumptions including capacities and constraints for O&M and operation, maintenance and management. The expected improvements in the management model should be fully justified.
 - Development of new water sources should only be considered as a measure of last resort. It should be based on a sound feasibility study including all relevant information (i.e. water consumption demand, water quality results, aquifer recharge capacity, risk mitigation measures and based on a master plan with design criterion, technical orientation, eco-technical comparative analysis of options and detailed calendar).
 - When implementing water trucking, partners should be aware that, as per DG ECHO’s policies, this modality should be considered as last resort and can only be used as a temporary/surge solution. DG ECHO will only fund for a short period of time (maximum 6 months), for any given site.
- Excreta disposal:
 - Actions should include a cost comparative analysis of the potential toilet/latrine solutions and design options, promote household/facility self-reliant solutions in terms of operation and maintenance.
 - Desludging should be only considered as a last resort. The environmental impact of the final disposal of the faeces must be assessed and, if needed, risk mitigation measures should be incorporated. Only quick impact action on sewage collection or treatment system should be considered, case by case based on the public health risks, and with partners demonstrating capacity for this type of action.
- Hygiene promotion (HP):
 - Actions may consider the provision of household level WASH NFI, either in-kind or, where applicable, using a cash-based modality complemented with public health messaging. HP strategy should be contextualised and based on evidence of success and lesson learnt from alternative approaches, and with the support of experienced CHW/HP staff.
- Shelter & Settlements:

- S&S/WASH actions should be informed by existing shelter and settlement risks and vulnerabilities regarding location, planning, design and construction, including those made worse by the disaster or due to the impact of climate change. The S&S actions should contribute settlement informed to protection outcomes and, including Housing Land and Property (HLP) considerations, risk-informed where relevant.
- Technical assistance for shelter construction/repair/upgrading should be part of most S&S response and make use of local know-how, materials and design considerations, including dissemination of lessons learned and capacity building, where relevant.
- Proposals shall include details on quality control measures on construction materials and cost-benefit analysis factoring in the lifespan of shelter items. Findings should be used to define potential actions to improve the supply chain at various level including the composition of shelter kits or shelter design. Partners should ensure that shelter solutions are adapted to the different climatic conditions in Yemen. When applicable, cash may be considered to support the delivery of tangible S&S outcome.

CCCM (Camp Coordination and Camp Management)

- CCCM actions (fixed or mobile) will provide basic site level coordination and community/humanitarian actors' mobilisation. CCCM actors should liaise effectively with local representatives as well as sector specific agencies. Timely monitoring and reporting of critical needs in IDP sites should be provided to sector lead organisations per site (regular mapping of services available, service providers and gaps). Proposals shall include referral systems and follow up of service provision.
- Integration of Protection and Housing, Land and Property (HLP) services within deployed CCCM capacities is to be pursued, as well as co-location and joint delivery by CCCM actors of required sectorial services, within the organisation area of expertise or in coordination with other service providers (e.g., infrastructure).
- CCCM partners are expected to ensure provision of basic psychological first aid, identification of multi-sectorial needs. CCCM actors shall also support the transfer from RRM to other services.
- CCCM partners should include a solid risk analysis for sites and mainstream emergency preparedness and prevention measures especially in relation to flooding and fire prevention.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

- The priority target for EiE are displaced children in IDP sites with inclusion of host communities, as per localized context.
- EiE actions will target out-of-school children and those at risk of dropping out, with the aim to provide safe and sustained access to quality education. Priority will be on modalities in line with applicable education sector frameworks, including non-formal education, to provide relevant and effective pathways to (re)enter formal education. Targeted approaches to ensure retention and progression, safe transition to formal education and learning outcomes according to defined standards will need to be demonstrated.
- Non-academic barriers to education (financial, physical, protection and infrastructural) may be addressed, in line with DG ECHO EiE policy, with a solid theory of change, demonstrating contribution to education outcomes. Localised assessments in areas of

operation are required to identify the barriers and appropriate contextualised responses, considering applicable education sector standards.

- Integrated EiE and child protection actions are encouraged, ensuring child protection risks are timely and effectively addressed by qualified actors (either directly, when partners have demonstrated relevant capacities, or through referrals). Protection activities must be built upon a sound risk analysis and should address the most life-threatening protection risks (e.g., psycho-social support, safe schools).
- Partners should clearly articulate their proposed action (complementarity and synergies) with other humanitarian and development programmes (ECW, GPW, EU, etc) and ensure conflict sensitivity as well as do no harm.

Disaster Preparedness (DP) and Rapid Emergency Response

No targeted DP funding will be allocated to Yemen in 2024.

Mainstreamed DP:

- Regardless of the nature of the action and sectors of interventions prioritised, partners should complement their needs analysis with a risk analysis identifying the main threats for the targeted populations and the action itself.
- DG ECHO will continue to support anticipatory, flexible and rapid response mechanisms to effectively mitigate the effects of sudden onset hazards. Both rapid and flexible mechanisms should be based on a multi-risk analysis, with the development of worst and most likely scenarios, and allow for an initial response to be activated within 72 hours.
- In areas frequently and severely affected by conflict and insecurity, shocks of natural origin and forced displacements, a RRM should provide the timely initial lifesaving assistance to the affected populations. The minimum response package should focus on the most pressing needs and cover at least one month of assistance. Effective referral mechanisms for the continuation of assistance should be in place and regularly monitored. Regular post-monitoring should inform the use, adequacy and efficacy of the assistance provided. Issues of scale, triggers and modality of assistance will be carefully considered to maximise cost-effectiveness.
- In other areas potentially at risk of extreme climate events, epidemics and displacements, partners are encouraged to introduce Crisis Modifiers (CM) to be able to quickly mobilise resources from on-going actions and respond to any new emerging shocks (a crisis within a crisis) occurring in their area of operations. CM should be triggered based on pre-agreed thresholds to provide initial lifesaving multisector response in the aftermath of a rapid onset crisis. Alert and response tools and assistance should align with technical sectors recommendations in country. Partners are invited to dedicate a specific result to the CM, under the DRR/DP sector.
- When working with local and national actors (L/NAs), partners should consider specific and tailored capacity building initiatives to strengthen the capacity of local actors to design and implement anticipatory, flexible and rapid responses.
- DG ECHO might consider funding actions with anticipatory action components, provided that they are in line with DG ECHO guidance note on Disaster Preparedness²⁵.

Coordination

²⁵ DG ECHO Disaster Preparedness Guidance Note available at https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/what/humanitarian-aid/disaster-preparedness_en

- Support for coordination can be considered, at various levels (e.g., national, sub-national, hub etc), based on demonstrated priority gaps and tangible outputs/outcomes. Priority should be given to gaps that are in line with DG ECHO strategy in support to collective responses.
- In line with DG ECHO's localisation guidance note, support to local actors' effective participation and leadership in the framework of international coordination systems (i.e. cluster system) will be considered.

Nexus

Partners shall explain in their proposals how the DG ECHO supported action will contribute to the following priority areas for Nexus, including detailing graduation and/or exit strategies, as well as the existence of other sources of funding complementing the action proposed to DG ECHO:

- **Food security and nutrition:** Show how food and nutrition assistance through in-kind, cash and voucher assistance, including MPCA, would contribute to improved self-reliance and strengthen synergies for livelihoods restoration and diversification for crisis affected communities.
- **Multi-purpose cash assistance:** Show the complementarities and synergies with existing social safety nets/social protection programmes, including the steps to be taken to put in place the interoperability requirements such as shared registries, transfer values, targeting, and transfer mechanisms/systems.
- **WASH/Disaster Risk Reduction and public health:** Explain the linkage of emergency WASH support with long-term initiatives, addressing damaged infrastructure, severe water scarcity and climate change impacts.
- **Education:** Explain the linkage of education in emergency actions (targeting most at risk, out of school children) with continued education, especially formal (at individual, school and other levels).
- **Protection:** Explain the cooperation and coordination on Children in Armed Conflict (CAAC), including linking the humanitarian agenda of children in armed conflict with the policy agenda supporting frameworks and roadmaps for implementation. Joint efforts to contribute to the implementation of EU Gender Action Plan III are encouraged.
- **Capacity building:** Explain the steps done in strengthening local actors' capacity to provide humanitarian assistance in the immediate term – i.e., through building the individual skills of humanitarian workers and volunteers, and, at the same time, to continue civil society work in the long-term, through shaping the structural capabilities and transforming organisational processes.