



TECHNICAL ANNEX

PALESTINE

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2025/01000 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 /C2
Contact persons at HQ	Acting Team Leader: Mark Bennun Mark.Bennun@ec.europa.eu
	Desk Officers:
	Lucia Caccialupi Lucia.caccialupi@ec.europa.eu
	Massimo Gordini Massimo.GORDINI@ec.europa.eu
	Marlou Tolk Marlou.tolk@ec.europa.eu
	Luis Alcaraz Pardo Luis.ALCARAZ-PARDO@ext.ec.europa.eu
In the field	Head of Office: Anna Orlandini anna.orlandini@echofield.eu
	Technical Assistants:
	Georgios Frantzis (based in Jerusalem) Georgios.Frantzis@echofield.eu
	Audrey Crawford (based in Jerusalem) Audrey.crawford@echofield.eu
	Devrige Velly (based in Cairo) Devrige.Velly@echofield.eu

¹ Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO).
ECHO/PSE/BUD/2025/91000

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation²: 219 919 017³ of which an indicative amount of EUR 15 000 000 for Education in Emergencies.

The allocation is subject to the approval of the budgetary authority.

Programmatic Partnerships:

Programmatic Partnerships have been launched since 2020 with a limited number of partners. New Programmatic Partnerships or extensions of ongoing could be funded under this HIP⁴.

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

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
Palestine	219 219 017		700 000		219 919 017

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

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

a) Co-financing:

Under the EU Financial Regulation, grants must involve co-financing; as a result, the resources necessary to carry out the action must not be provided entirely by the grant. An action may only be financed in full by the grant where this is essential for

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 total amount of the HIP

⁴ 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>

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.

Where part of the action is delivered through implementing partners, submitted proposals must include a full list of these entities (section 10.6 or annex). If implementing partners are still being identified at the time of submission, the proposal must include a timetable for their selection and a deadline for transmitting relevant information to DG ECHO.

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 duly justified requests for alternative arrangements via the Single Form, 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

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

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.

- 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. of this Annex, as well as the applicant organisation's capacities. 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 where 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. Any proposals submitted should demonstrate these gains, which should be monitored during the implementation of the action and must be reported in the final report 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.

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.

⁸ For more information - See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho Website \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](#)) 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 \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)

4. ADMINISTRATIVE INFO

Allocation round 4

- a) Indicative amount: EUR 50 000 000⁹.
- b) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2025¹⁰.
- c) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more¹¹ provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner¹². 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. 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) Preselected partners¹³: the following partners have been pre-identified: IOM, UNICEF, UNRWA, WFP, WHO, UNDSS, UNDP, UNFPA as internationally recognised mandated agencies, NRC (in its capacity as the grant holder for the West Bank Protection Consortium), MERCY CORPS-NL, MDM-FR, WAR CHILD-NL, RI-FR, ACF-ES based on their comparative advantage for the identified needs and gaps, expertise and presence in Gaza and the West Bank. Other applications will not be considered under this round.
- e) Information to be provided: Modification of ongoing actions¹⁴.
- f) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 24/10/2025.

Allocation round 3

- g) Indicative amount: EUR 50 000 000⁹.
- h) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2025¹⁰.
- i) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more¹¹ provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner¹². 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. 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).
- j) Preselected partners¹³: Based on their respective mandates, comparative advantage for the identified needs and gaps, expertise and presence, the following partners have been pre-identified: NRC (in its capacity as the grant holder for the West Bank Protection Consortium), IOM, UNICEF, UNRWA,

- k) WFP, WHO, ICRC and UNDP. Other applications will not be considered under this round.
- l) Information to be provided: Single Form (new requests or Modification of on-going actions)¹⁴.

- m) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: n/a - proposals already received as part of allocation round 1.

Allocation round 2

- n) Indicative amount: up to EUR 528 000¹⁵.
- o) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2025¹⁶.
- p) 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. 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).
- q) Preselected partner ¹⁹: the external assigned revenue will be allocated to NRC, in its capacity as the grant holder for the West Bank Protection Consortium.
- r) Information to be provided: Single Form (new requests or Modification of on-going actions)²⁰.
- s) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: n/a – proposal already received as part of allocation round 1.

⁹ Reinforcement from the EAR.

¹⁰ *The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest. In case of amendments to existing agreements, the eligible date will however be the eligible date set in the initial agreement.*

¹¹ Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

¹² See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho WebSite \(dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgecho.europa.eu/dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu).)

¹³ Unless otherwise specified potential NGO partners refer to certified partner organisations.

¹⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

¹⁵ This allocation is conditional upon the payment of a contribution by Finland of EUR 550 000 to the EU budget as externally assigned revenue, minus a 4% management fee.

¹⁶ *The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest. In case of*

Allocation round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 119 391 017.
- b) Emergency response aimed at the provision of life-saving aid and services in Gaza and in the West Bank, including support to key aid pipelines for the fast delivery of aid to the most in need.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/ 01/ 2025.
- d) The initial duration for the Action may be up to 24 months or more²¹ provided that the added value of a multi-annual duration is demonstrated by the partner²². 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. 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).
- e) Potential Partners: All DG ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form (new requests or Modification of ongoing actions)²³.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 16/01/2025.²⁴

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

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 \(dgeocho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgeocho-partners-helpdesk.eu).)

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

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

²¹ Maximum duration of an action is 48 months.

²² See the factsheet on EU Humanitarian Aid Multi-Year Funding available on the DG ECHO Website ([DGEcho WebSite \(dgeocho-partners-helpdesk.eu\)](https://dgeocho-partners-helpdesk.eu).)

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, including local partners)? 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, risk analysis, 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.

²³ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL.

²⁴ The Commission reserve the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs / priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

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?
- 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?²⁵

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 Measures²⁶ 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 budget²⁷ (“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 Hungary²⁸.**

This Conditionality Decision, in particular its Article 2.2, prohibits legal commitments under direct and indirect management with any public interest trust established by

²⁵ In accordance with the relevant section of the Single Form guidelines (section10)

²⁶ 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.

²⁷ 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

²⁸ OJ L 325, 20.12.2022, p. 94–109

Hungarian Act IX of 2021²⁹, including those entities listed in Annex I to Hungarian Act IX of 2021³⁰ and other affiliated entities maintained by them (“Concerned Entities”). The Commission will further notify when the above-mentioned Conditionality Measures are lifted.

4.1.2. Specific operational guidelines and operational assessment criteria:

The HIP Policy Annex should be consulted in parallel³¹.

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 **localisation**³², 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 including for risk management. 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 costs to their local implementing partners. In addition, DG ECHO will prioritise proposals where the locally led action constitutes a central element, which are designed bottom up, and where DG ECHO partners provide relevant support to local partners’ response (technical training, institutional support, peer learning etc.).

DG ECHO supports responsible **sharing of data** between humanitarian organisations to avoid fragmentation of efforts and improve the efficiency of humanitarian response. Interoperability of data and data management systems is a cornerstone of these efforts. While working on interoperability, partners should employ coordinated and streamlined approaches to data collection, including developing minimum common datasets and seek ways to share data with other actors at the response level to facilitate referrals and deduplication of beneficiaries. DG ECHO will prefer proposals that, in addition to their programmatic goals, also work to support/ facilitate the safe sharing of data between organisations.

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 benefit in increasing effectiveness and timeliness of the response is demonstrated, in line with DG ECHO’s Humanitarian Logistics Policy. DG ECHO also

²⁹ Act IX of 2021 on public interest trust foundations with a public service mission (entry into force 01/01/2023).

³⁰ Available (in Hungarian) at: <https://njt.hu/jogszabaly/2021-9-00-00>

³¹ [thematic_policies_annex_2025.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

³² <https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/dg%20echo%20guidance%20note%20-%20promoting%20equitable%20partnerships%20with%20local%20responders%20in%20humanitarian%20settings.pdf>

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 impacts. 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.

The crisis in and around Gaza has required the establishment of logistic hubs in the region (notably Egypt and Jordan) to coordinate and support all aid pipelines prior to entering Gaza. DG ECHO will ensure a complementary use of its instrument to strategically support the Gaza operation.

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 modifiers, and shock-responsive social protection) funded by DG ECHO. All cash interventions should comply with [DG ECHO's cash thematic policy](#),

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 Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and Transfer Values (TV) are defined under the coordination of the Cash Working Group (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.

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 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/depreciation. 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 ToR.

Preparedness

In line with the Disaster Preparedness Guidance Note³³, **preparedness** activities should be systematically mainstreamed into humanitarian operations to strengthen the capacity to respond to a crisis within a crisis (e.g. sudden floods during a conflict) or any recrudescence or aftershock, except in duly justified cases. To make humanitarian action more effective, response interventions should be designed to reduce immediate and imminent risks, and not add new risks (the ‘do no harm’ principle).

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 operations³⁴.

The minimum environmental requirements should be applied through a ‘mainstreaming’ approach with environmental impacts mitigated across sectors, projects and programmes

³³ [dg_echo_guidance_note_-_disaster_preparedness_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

³⁴ https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/what/humanitarian-aid/climate-change-and-environment_en

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.

Coordination and joint initiatives

During emergencies, coordination and joint initiatives are fundamental, DG ECHO may support the development of needs assessments, the development of SoPs, and other relevant tools. This is applicable to all sectors including WASH and shelter.

Risk Management and duty of care

Humanitarian actors operating in Gaza face significant risk management and duty of care challenges, including in the provision of medical care. The local healthcare system is overwhelmed, making it difficult for staff to receive adequate medical treatment. Moreover, the cost of insurances for humanitarian personnel has surged since the onset of conflict. Despite these challenges, humanitarian organisations need to continue supporting their staff i.a. with psychosocial support, hardship bonuses, food assistance, and/or shelter. Aid diversion and loss during the implementation of the actions are also a serious risk.

DG ECHO has implemented measures that aim to reduce vulnerabilities, including the risk of aid diversion, in its funded operations. DG ECHO supports increased operational costs related to risk mitigation, provided they are justified, necessary, and proportionate. Costs need to be clearly identifiable in the budget. DG ECHO also allows programmatic flexibility, encouraging partners to familiarise themselves with existing measures and apply them where relevant to ensure the continued delivery of aid in challenging circumstances. DG ECHO expects an open and transparent dialogue in the implementation of the actions.

Horizontal mandatory requirements

Proposed actions should clearly demonstrate the mainstreaming of protection, gender, age, and disability inclusion guided by a comprehensive needs and risk analysis. Specifically, for persons with disabilities (PwD), actions should ensure inclusive access, active participation, non-discrimination, and tailored assistance across all sectors. This includes integrating their needs into program design, implementation, and capacity building to address barriers effectively.

Proposed actions must include strategies for the effective prevention of and response to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), as well as abuse and neglect against children. Furthermore, actions should outline strategies for preventing and responding to Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH), ensuring that these strategies incorporate victim/survivor-centred response approaches and establish clear reporting channels.

Sector-Specific Priorities

Protection

The scale and severity of the hostilities, combined with the repeated forced displacement of over 1.9 million people and widespread IHL violations have generated massive protection needs in Gaza. The protection risks in Gaza are severe and multifaceted, affecting children, women, PwD and the general population. The West Bank has also been severely affected

with rising violence and a coercive environment disrupting basic services and humanitarian aid. This has significantly heightened protection risks for the population.

In **Gaza**, DG ECHO will support activities aiming to prevent and address the most urgent and acute protection risks faced by conflict-affected populations and other protection needs as they arise. Support for core emergency protection interventions will be prioritised which includes family separations, risks linked to UXOs, psychological distress, abuse and violence against women, men, children, and adolescents, as well as any other acute protection risks identified.

More specifically, DG ECHO will consider supporting the following interventions in **Gaza**:

- Activities providing information on functional basic services, emergency hotlines, and information linked to specific needs identified as well as on specific protection issues. Activities to preserve family unity and address family separation,
- Provision of life-saving specialised protection services for GBV survivors, children at heightened protection risks, and/or victims of other protection violations, including individual case management, legal aid, medical services, and MHPSS,
- Provision of MHPSS to children and their caregivers as well as communities through the most appropriate modalities across the IASC MHPSS pyramid.
- Awareness raising on explosive remnants of war (ERW) and mine risks education. The removal of ERW should be properly justified, at limited scale and in complementarity with other EU specialised services.
- Legal aid, support to address civil documentation and Housing, Land & Property (HLP) needs.
- Support to strengthen mechanisms for protection monitoring and documenting grave violations against children and IHL violations,
- Capacity building interventions including mentoring as per needs and in line with the protection cluster and its Areas of Responsibilities (AoRs).

In the **West Bank**, the protection response will continue to support prevention, mitigation, and response to settler-related violence, military incursions, demolitions, and forcible displacement through multi-sectoral interventions. Support to MHPSS will continue to be critical. DG ECHO will support projects designed to address exacerbated and emerging protection risks and violations identified through a comprehensive risk analysis, encompassing all aspects of protection to determine the most appropriate response package, including child protection, Sexual and Gender-Based Violence, documentation including housing, land and property, and MHPSS services.

In **Palestine**, DG ECHO will continue to support activities to strengthen coordination capacity across the protection cluster and relevant AoRs. This support aims to ensure coordination remains fit for purpose and that urgent protection needs are prioritised and addressed in a coordinated manner. Emergency referral pathways should be established within the protection clusters and with other sectors/services. In both the West Bank and Gaza, clear referral pathways to specialised protection services should be made available to address the range of protection needs such as child protection, GBV, PwD, detention.

Integrated protection programming shall be considered, and protection interventions can be provided through static and mobile modalities based on needs.

The use of Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) as an assistance modality to contribute to a protection outcome within specialised protection programming must be in line with the [Key considerations on Cash for Protection in Specialised/Standalone protection programming note](#), recently developed by the Cash for Protection Task Team under the Global Protection Cluster.

Humanitarian Advocacy

Advocacy, at all levels (both field and international level), can be supported when it is based on strong evidence and clear objectives: the causes of the ongoing dramatic deterioration of the humanitarian situation can only be addressed through effective advocacy, by calling all parties to respect International Humanitarian and Human Rights Laws (IHL and IHRL).

Advocacy should primarily focus on key protection issues, such as violations of IHL and IHRL, a constantly shrinking humanitarian space affecting humanitarian workers and front-line staff, a prolonged blockade encompassing a variety of barriers and access restrictions, increased settler violence and intimidation, and increased attacks on education and health. Partners willing to carry out advocacy initiatives must share a detailed advocacy plan providing information on the activities to be undertaken and under which timeframe, resources required for implementation, expected outcomes, as well as potential risks and mitigation measures to be put in place. Partners should develop realistic, achievable, and concrete advocacy plans and objectives, as well as specify the level at which advocacy activities would be undertaken.

Support to operations

Contributions can be provided towards the support to common services aiming at: i. safe access, ii. safety and security, iii. logistics, and iv. information management, including data collection and dissemination to humanitarian stakeholders. In addition, support to clusters and/or coordination of working groups can be considered when added value is demonstrated. All support services must operate inclusively and in respect of humanitarian principles.

Health and Nutrition

The ongoing escalation of hostilities has deeply disrupted the healthcare system in Palestine. All interventions should be implemented through a comprehensive methodology, ensuring close coordination, complementarity, and collaboration with relevant health and nutrition stakeholders and platforms. Thorough context analysis, strong situational awareness, and adaptability to evolving needs and gaps are essential.

For the health sector, DG ECHO will prioritise the following aspects:

For **Gaza**, the key focus will be on determining the most effective interventions, locations, and resources to provide emergency lifesaving response, ensure a flexible and adaptive health response to re-establish functional health services.

- [Primary Health Care](#) includes high priority health care services such as EPI, MCAH, rehabilitation/trauma care, MHPSS, etc. Supporting PHC facilities with minor structural

rehabilitation, eligible essential drugs, and equipment so they can function and deliver basic PHC services. DG ECHO expects support directly to PHC facilities with parallel systems considered exceptionally as short-term investment opportunities.

- Secondary Health Care should be directed towards emergency health and trauma care, including supply chain management to keep secondary care functioning and allow treatment for people in need.
- Both Integrated Primary and Secondary Health Care should emphasise access to health care services with links to protection.
- Outbreak preparedness and response will be supported, 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 plus IPC, vector control, environmental issues).
- Emergency Management System (EMS) with potential support for strengthening the Emergency Department of the MoH to respond to large-scale health emergencies. The establishment of referral pathways should be supported. Specific activities to mitigate long-term impacts and trauma response encompassing life and limb-saving measures, early reconstructive surgery, and post-op care can also be supported.
- Rehabilitation and Trauma Care interventions covering assistive devices and equipment, prostheses in combination with the training of multi-disciplinary teams and ensured follow-up procedures at hospitals and PHC.
- Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) should be integrated with other health activities and/or mainstreamed in the proposed action. A close link with protection is critical as well as a proper pathway between the different levels of care, specifically between psycho-social support (PSS) and mental health (MH) service providers. Mental health support activities covering level 3 and 4 of the IASC pyramid are encouraged. Furthermore, mental health support for healthcare workers (e.g. psychological de-briefing, PFA) deployed in this crisis needs to be strongly considered.
- Nutrition: DG ECHO will prioritise the nutrition sector in Gaza, with the detection of Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) and Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) and related preventative coverage (e.g. blanket feeding for MAM & SAM) for children under 5 years of age and pregnant and lactating mothers; as well as treatment of SAM with medical complications in TFCs.

For the **West Bank**, the focus will be on scaling-up humanitarian efforts to meet growing needs. Health facilities should be equipped to handle emergencies, trauma, and critical cases. Priorities include decentralised services, supply continuity, and rapid adaptation to fragmentation, closures, violence, and movement restrictions. Flexible referral pathways are essential to maintaining access to lifesaving medical and MHPSS services.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

In **Gaza**, DG ECHO will support the response to acute WASH needs arising from the hostilities that began in October 2023. Emergency water supply, excreta and solid waste management and hygiene activities will be considered. If duly justified, flood mitigation/prevention measures and vector control measures could also be considered.

The focus should be on improving basic environmental health standards and conditions in formal and informal sites, critical institutions such as health facilities, field hospitals, and collective centres hosting IDPs. Critical infection prevention and control (IPC) measures at vulnerable shelters and sites, humanitarian service delivery points, and health centres will be considered. This may include activities to enable the functionality of WASH facilities and services, hygiene promotion along with provision of hygiene kits, disinfection materials, and cleaning kits.

DG ECHO may support the emergency repair, operational, and maintenance capacity of essential WASH facilities and infrastructures, potentially providing emergency fuel, spare parts, tools, and essential supplies to ensure the continued operation of critical WASH infrastructure. While DG ECHO typically does not address structural WASH needs, it may consider limited rehabilitation and/or extension of critical WASH facilities in support of early recovery efforts. Such projects should be supported by pre-feasibility studies before implementation, including basic technical and cost considerations (i.e. design, schematic, BoQ).

Despite the complexity of the situation in Gaza, DG ECHO advocates for the application of best practices to ensure the quality of humanitarian WASH assistance.

In the **West Bank**, Local authorities are increasingly unable to meet emerging needs due to increasing attacks and movement restrictions. Enhancing emergency preparedness and response capacity is an area where DG ECHO may provide WASH support, aiming at strengthening collective and multi-sectoral preparedness efforts. Water trucking is to be considered only as a last resort.

In **Palestine**, DG ECHO will also prioritise interventions designed to mitigate the impact of IHL violations, armed offensives, and sudden-onset disasters on critical WASH services.

The design of the WASH response and choice of modalities should be informed by evidence and needs-based assessments, comparative response options, risk analyses, and incorporating joint and timely market and environmental analyses.

Shelter and Settlements (S&S)

S&S interventions should aim to preserve life and alleviate the suffering of conflict-affected populations where conditions have significantly deteriorated and fallen below commonly accepted minimum humanitarian standards.

DG ECHO promotes the application of best practices to ensure the quality of humanitarian S&S assistance. The design of activities and choice of modalities should be guided by needs and risk analysis, incorporating joint and timely market and environmental assessments.

DG ECHO will also prioritise interventions aimed at mitigating the impact of IHL violations, armed offensives, and sudden-onset disasters on critical S&S services.

DG ECHO will consider supporting the following interventions in **Gaza**:

Emergency and Transitional Shelter: DG ECHO will continue funding emergency S&S actions in Gaza in support of IDPs living in individual and/or collective shelters (setup in UN buildings, schools, or public buildings) as well as those outside individuals and/or collective centres (sharing accommodation with host families, in informal settlements, in self-settled, or in makeshift shelters.). This may include the provision of climate-appropriate family tents, sealing-off kits, emergency shelter materials and toolkits and Household NFI such as blankets, mattresses, and kitchen sets. ECHO may also support the implementation of other critical works and services to improve the habitability of emergency and transitional shelters.

Shelter for recovery: While DG ECHO will not support reconstruction efforts, it may consider supporting light or medium repair and rehabilitation of damaged structures and unfinished buildings, including their repurposing or conversion for sheltering purposes where and when necessary and properly justified.

Emergency and transitional settlement: DG ECHO will continue funding actions targeting IDP temporarily settled in collective and informal sites. This may include site planning, coordination, management and maintenance can activities that are coordinated among all relevant actors, such as the Site Management Working Group, and Shelter, WASH and Protection clusters)

Localising the shelter and site response requires building the capacity of local actors (e.g., national NGOs) and community governance structures, which DG ECHO may consider funding.

In the **West Bank**, shelter solutions will be considered through multi-sectoral emergency interventions that will continue to support prevention, mitigation, and response to settler-related violence, military incursions, demolitions, and forcible displacement.

Food assistance and basic needs

Food assistance and emergency livelihood shall be part of a basic needs approach.

In **Gaza**, DG ECHO will support the response to the food insecurity generated by the hostilities that started in October 2023 and have impacted all four dimensions of food security (availability, access, consumption, and stability).

In the **West Bank**, DG ECHO will support cash interventions that play a critical role in responding to shocks, providing support to those affected by violence and IHL violations.

The proposed response should include the following key elements:

- In coordination with the Food Security Sector and the Cash Working Group, ensure that all four dimensions are collectively addressed by maximizing synergies and complementarities among partners, optimizing resources, modalities, and types of assistance, and developing comprehensive and institutionalized referral pathways, especially to livelihoods, nutrition, protection and health services.
- Efficient and integrated approaches should aim to maximise the effectiveness in reducing the prevalence of food insecurity as measured by indicators such as FCS, LCS, and rCSI. Where humanitarian access is limited by active conflict or blockade, partners should make the best use of temporary access to assist the beneficiaries in the most effective way possible.
- Contribution to and use of market monitoring data. Markets should be monitored consistently to inform and adapt assistance, irrespective of the modality.

The choice of modality for food assistance should be informed by a comprehensive risk analysis, incorporating joint and timely market, operational, protection, and environmental assessments. DG ECHO expects to see 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, coordinated and streamlined approaches to data collection, including the use of minimum common data sets, interoperability of data and data management systems across the response to facilitate deduplication and referrals, a common payment mechanism, a common feedback mechanism and a common results framework.

When in-kind assistance is the only possible modality for food assistance, partners are expected to describe its comparative advantage and relevance vs cash and vouchers and to consider:

- Detail the specific risks associated with the in-kind modality in Gaza, such as access challenges, looting, chaotic distributions, reselling, and backlogs at the border crossing, and describe the corresponding mitigation measures in the eSF.
- Minimum environmental arrangements should be made to address energy needs, and the limited availability of existing cooking spaces and options adapted to the context (crowded displacement sites). For example: i) consider providing ready-to-eat rations; ii) supply fuel and cooking stoves designed to reduce indoor air pollution and fire hazards; iii) include food varieties that require shorter cooking times; iv) Use reduced plastic packaging to limit garbage accumulation and associated health hazards.

In **Gaza**, while significant efforts have been made to utilise all available options and corridors to increase the availability of food and NFIs, the use of cash and vouchers was not discontinued and eventually scaled up, demonstrating its feasibility, relevance and complementarity. DG ECHO remains committed to supporting cash for food and basic needs and expects partners to scale up this modality based on protection considerations, market conditions, and functionality of financial service providers.

DG-ECHO is committed to supporting the scale-up of Multipurpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) programmes in **Gaza** when feasible and relevant. Under the coordination of the CWG, key elements of the MPCA programme in Gaza include:

- Contributing to the collective capacity to analyse the ecosystem and to monitor markets, especially on: i) informal market dynamics; ii) safety and protection risks; iii) impact of humanitarian aid on markets; iv) challenges faced by the traders; v) stocks and supplies of commercial imports; vi) availability, origin and value chain of foods with a particular nutritional importance (fresh foods, animal protein); vii) availability of financial services; viii) cash availability.
- Adapting the sMEB, TV, and number of payments based on price monitoring.
- Analysing the specific risks of MPCA in Gaza (e.g., cash liquidity, connectivity, availability of financial services, and safety), and describing the corresponding mitigation measures in the eSF.
- Improved emergency and preparedness response (EPR) capacity for quick onset shocks' responses aligned to the CWG's efforts on strengthening collective preparedness efforts.
- A Crisis Modifier (CM) with clearly defined shocks and triggers and in line with OCHA contingency plan.

DG-ECHO may support the rehabilitation of bakeries upon demonstrated accessibility and availability of bread, and when the coordination, supply, security, and handover processes are adequate to ensure sustainability.

In the **West Bank**, MPCA is crucial for individuals whose livelihoods have been disrupted by violence and violations of IHL, including demolitions and other forms of displacement. As soon as conditions allow, emergency livelihoods are to be introduced to help affected populations recover by offering temporary income and resources to stabilise their situation.

Attention to greater interoperability, information sharing, and commonly agreed-upon vulnerability framework and targeting shall be prioritized across Palestine.

The role of the Social Registry of the MoSD in enhancing interoperability for deduplication, complementarities, and referrals must be acknowledged from the design phase of any Action. DG-ECHO will prioritize interventions that mainstream the strengthening of the pivotal role of the MoSD National Cash Transfer Program supported by EU- PEGASE while avoiding parallel and un-coordinated registries. From a NEXUS perspective, and under the coordination of the CWG, DG-ECHO may support initiatives that promote better interoperability and coordination among partners and with the MoSD.

In the eSF, the partners must describe the strategy, and the activities to identify potential duplications including data-sharing agreements with peer partners and plans for joining existing platforms. In the log frame, the partner must use process indicators to report on the deduplication and operational coordination with peer partners.

DG ECHO expects partners to develop operational and inclusive systems and technologies that facilitate the expansion of the cash modality, as long as it remains feasible and relevant.

Emergency Livelihood recovery

Across **Palestine**, DG ECHO may consider supporting the protection and recovery of livelihoods prioritising emergency interventions with a direct impact on the food chain from production to local markets, particularly for fresh and animal protein foods which are rare on the market. The choice of livelihoods and the modality shall be informed by:

- A comprehensive market and risk analysis including the availability of technically sound equipment and spare parts on the local market.
- A protection risk analysis including risks linked to the access to productive assets, and destruction/confiscation by the military.
- Sustainability elements including an assessment of the potential self-reliance capacity of the household after the support. DG ECHO prioritises a “cash+” approach that combines cash transfers with productive assets, and inputs, to restore and/or protect the livelihoods and productive capacities of targeted households. Soft conditionalities might be considered for the payment of 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, return of investment of different types of livelihood support, etc.), and document the impact of the intervention with an aim of future upscaling of successful approaches and transfer cases towards development operations.

Education in Emergencies (EiE)

DG ECHO will support EiE interventions with a focus on access to protective learning environments, including safe and violence-free schools, ensuring learning restoration and continuity in emergencies, and addressing the psycho-social support needs of children in highly vulnerable communities.

Partners are strongly encouraged to integrate child protection services within their proposed EiE intervention, including psychosocial support (PSS) and referral to specialised child protection services. Beneficiaries should be the same children, activities should be school-based to the extent possible (where access is granted) and the purpose of the protection intervention should be to support the return or the retention of the affected children into education activities.

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

In **Gaza**, the initial phase of the EiE response should focus on establishing Child-Friendly Spaces (CFS), with the primary goal of restoring a semblance of normalcy and catering to the PSS needs of children deeply affected by conflict. Creating safe, nurturing environments within these spaces is crucial, fostering activities promoting emotional healing, recreation, and education in a supportive atmosphere, ensuring the inclusion of children with disabilities. Implementing trauma-informed practices and engaging in play-based learning activities are essential components to restore the provision of classical classroom education activities. As a second phase, transitioning into the setup of Catch-Up Programs (within Temporary Learning Spaces – TLS - where needed) will be pivotal. These TLS should offer a structured curriculum aimed at bridging educational gaps caused by disruptions, employing adaptive teaching methodologies to accommodate diverse learning paces and needs. Partners are encouraged to ensure that their non-formal education activities are compliant and coordinated with the recommendation of the education cluster. Mobilizing qualified educators and resources and maintaining a flexible curriculum adaptable to changing circumstances would be crucial for successful catch-up programs in the area.

In the **West Bank**, special focus should be on students and/or schools affected by demolitions, settler violence, and military incursions. In this context, partners are encouraged to include a crisis modifier in their proposed actions, which will allow a flexible and quick response capacity to protect, preserve or restore access to schools (escorts, quick protective repairs, etc). Preventative and responsive advocacy efforts for safe access to education must be considered. Advocacy and legal support to schools under attack are key elements of the protection of education in Palestine. Alternative learning modalities could also be supported in areas where safe access to schools is no longer possible. Remedial and catch-up programmes can also be needed to mitigate the cumulative learning gap faced by affected children.

EiE interventions should demonstrate coordination with stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, UNRWA, Education Cannot Wait, donors, and the Education Cluster to optimize synergies, and complementarities and avoid overlap.

Disaster Preparedness (DP)

In line with the *Disaster Preparedness Guidance Note*³⁵, DP activities should be systematically mainstreamed into humanitarian operations to strengthen the capacity to respond to a crisis within a crisis (e.g. sudden floods during a conflict) or any recrudescence or aftershock, except in duly justified cases. To make humanitarian action more effective, response interventions should be designed to reduce immediate and imminent risks, and not add new risks (the ‘do no harm’ principle).

Strengthening health-system emergency preparedness and trauma management will remain a priority area of support in 2025. Particular attention will be given to the reinforcement of health capacities to prevent and mitigate the impact of recurrent escalation of conflict, including a strong focus on IHL.

In **Gaza**, considering that under the prevailing context, standalone DP intervention might not be feasible, partners are recommended to integrate priority preparedness actions to address current threats and gaps into humanitarian programs. Proposed actions should aim at addressing foreseeable sudden and acute shocks. Partners are also encouraged to strengthen preparedness for health emergency responses and mass casualty management still in place from previous actions, by adapting them to the current environment.

In the **West Bank**, including East Jerusalem, DG ECHO will continue to support mass casualty management and trauma preparedness in most at-risk locations.

Priority should be on emergency health and trauma preparedness with standard protocols and coordination among actors but can also address preparedness gaps related to other sectors. Partners should emphasize a system-wide, decentralized approach, combined with community preparedness. Strengthening contingency planning mechanisms and services ensuring effective emergency health services during escalations of violence remain a priority.

Overall, across Palestine, the complexity and volatility of the situation requires strengthening multi-risk emergency preparedness (including through but not limited to contingency planning) for multi-sectoral response addressing prevailing hazards and risks of demonstrated relevance and added value, including at community level. Actions can include prepositioning of essential items (shelter, energy, WASH), medical supplies, advanced medical posts, and improved coordination.

Alignment with other response mechanisms and sectoral recommendations is essential to foster the use of standard and harmonised practices. Service mapping and referral pathways should be put in place to ensure acute needs are covered and continuity of services via other mechanisms encouraged. Coordination with other sector leads, local actors and authorities is key to effective responses.

³⁵ [DG echo guidance note - disaster preparedness en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#)

Humanitarian – Development – Peace nexus

DG ECHO partners are encouraged to support the operationalisation of the Humanitarian - Development - Peace Nexus whenever possible considering the very fluid and rapidly evolving context.

In **Gaza**, given the scale and severity of humanitarian needs generated by the current hostilities and foreseeable prospects, DG ECHO's response will prioritise lifesaving and first line response to meet the most pressing needs of some 2 million people almost totally dependent on humanitarian aid until a sustainable ceasefire is reached.

During the post-emergency phase DG ECHO's response will complement the emergency response with a focus on emergency restoration of the functionality of essential services massively destroyed by the conflict. Restoring the functionality of essential services, as well as resumption of livelihoods will require strategic and programmatic partnerships with longer-term EU instruments, EU Member States and UN agencies to maximise complementarities and synergies in line with the Council Conclusions on the implementation of the humanitarian–development nexus³⁶.

In the **West Bank**, DG ECHO will continue its strategic engagement with longer-term EU instruments, EU Member States and UN agencies to maximise complementarities and synergies to enhance access to basic service and protection.

When circumstances allow, DG ECHO partners are encouraged to further explore opportunities to align short-term/shock responsive humanitarian cash transfer projects to the Palestine-wide social protection programme supported through the European Union's PEGASE programme. In this respect DG ECHO will continue to advocate for the continuation of the national Cash Transfer Programme and its full re-deployment in Gaza.

DG ECHO partners will continue to be encouraged to work through local partners and, where needed, to strengthen their operational and administrative capacity.

³⁶ EU Council Conclusions on operationalising the humanitarian – development nexus – May 19, 2017.

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 including through crisis modifiers.

Whenever relevant, partners should introduce flexibility such as crisis modifiers 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 location of their operations (a crisis within a crisis). In addition to the embedded flexibility into all DG ECHO funded actions (that can in some cases be subject to an adaption of the Action through an amendment), it can take the form of a “crisis modifier” (i.e. a specific result in the action).

Flexibility measures/crisis modifiers 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/crisis modifiers are complementary and do not exclude each other; flexibility measures enable stakeholders 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) ReliefEU Capabilities (former European Humanitarian Response Capacity - EHRC)

DG ECHO may decide on the activation of the ReliefEU Funding and Capabilities should operational and/or logistical gaps emerge. The use of ReliefEU Funding and Capabilities support is described in the relevant ReliefEU Humanitarian Implementation Plan and its Technical Annex.

Under this HIP, DG ECHO includes the provision of common logistics services to humanitarian partners in the form of international and in-country transport operations (across various modes of transport), warehousing capacities, prepositioning and delivery of emergency stockpiles, and other supply chain/logistical support and coordination, as well as deployment of expertise and capabilities. ReliefEU capabilities are developed via different modalities. Some actions may be operated directly by DG ECHO through DG ECHO partners or through contracting arrangements with private service providers with the required expertise, whilst others may be indirectly managed through DG ECHO partners or collaborators. When receiving support through the ReliefEU Capabilities, inputs will be part of the partner's response action and will, where relevant, be included in existing grant agreements.