

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

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

Emergency Support Financing Decision**Operational Priorities¹**

**The activities proposed hereafter are subject to the adoption of the financing decision
ECHO/-EU/BUD/2017/01000**

The purpose of these Emergency Support Operational Priorities (ESOP) is to serve as an information tool for Directorate-General 'European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations' (DG ECHO) partners and to assist them in the preparation of their proposals. The provisions of the Financing Decision ECHO/-EU/BUD/2017/01000 and of the General Conditions of the Agreements to be concluded with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

Title: Commission Decision on the financing of emergency support within the Union from the 2017 general budget

Description: Provision of emergency support within the Union

Location of action: European Union Member States

Amount of Decision: EUR 200 000 000²

Decision reference number: ECHO/-EU/BUD/2017/01000

1 Emergency Support context, needs and risks

1.1 Situation and context

Prolonged and unabated conflicts in Syria and Iraq, persistent insecurity in Afghanistan and conflicts and socio-economic instability in many Sub-Saharan countries continue triggering massive influx of refugees and migrants into the EU through the Central and Eastern mediterranean routes.

The migratory and refugee crisis in Europe in 2016 has been characterised by the closure of borders along the Western Balkans route, the EU-Turkey Statement and by an ever-increasing number of people using the Central Mediterranean route.

In **Greece**, the number of new arrivals has substantially decreased following the implementation of the EU-Turkey Statement. However, more than 60,000 refugees/migrants still remain in the country, according to Greek Government statistics. Out of these, more than 54,000 people have applied for asylum, according to the pre-registration exercise done by Greek authorities in August 2016 (UNHCR source). The majority are Syrians (48%), followed by Afghani (25%), Iraqi (15%) and Pakistani (5%). Of

¹ The ESOP will be published in APPEL, distributed widely to stakeholders.

² This includes 198,000,000 from the operational budget and 2,000,000 from the administrative budget.

particular concern is the high number of unaccompanied minors and separated children, estimated at 2,400, currently residing in Greece. In terms of relocations, a total of 7320 persons in need of international protection have been relocated as of early January. This number is much lower than the initially planned 17,000. As of January 2017, 6171 assisted voluntary returns have taken place from Greece to countries of origin.

Even if sharply reduced compared to the arrivals of the first months of 2016, a certain influx of refugees and migrants is still continuing.

Refugees/migrants arriving to the islands are first directed to one of the five hotspots for registration, identification, and launch the asylum requests process. People who do not apply for asylum in Greece or whose applications for asylum have been declared inadmissible will be returned to Turkey. People who apply for asylum in Greece will have their applications treated on a case-by-case basis, in line with EU and international law requirements (including the principle of non-refoulement).

On the islands, the inflow of refugees and migrants from Turkey has sharply decreased from thousands per day at the beginning of the year down to an average of a hundred per day. Nonetheless, the on-going - although strongly diminished - arrivals coupled with slow transfers to the mainland and return, pose serious challenges to the already overstretched reception facilities. The maximum shelter capacity on the five islands remains at 7,450 places (UNHCR source) while the total presence has reached twice that number in October. Overcrowding increases the exposure to fatal hazards such as fires, while the length of the asylum registration and processing increases the tensions among asylum-seekers, escalating to riots and material destructions by both refugees/migrants and groups of anti-immigrants extremists. Moreover, many women feel unsafe and fear sexual harassment in sites.

Those who arrived before 20 March 2016 have been located in sites on the mainland, in urban centres or are accommodated in hotels/apartments. People seeking asylum in the country, requesting family reunification or applying for relocation are issued a card that regularizes their stay and should provide access to basic services. Following the finalisation of the pre-registration exercise in July, people are now waiting for an appointment to start the formal asylum procedure.

In the mainland, refugees and migrants are currently either hosted in formal and informal sites, or live in urban environments, particularly in Athens and Thessaloniki. In the course of 2016 the Government of Greece has managed to close most of the informal sites, and has focussed on the improvements of conditions in around 40 official sites across the mainland. Upgrading and building works have started. Uncertainties remain as for the coverage of running costs related to water and electricity. The frequent turnover and limited decision-making capacity of site managers is negatively impacting the humanitarian agencies' capacity to properly plan and deliver on time. At the same time the urban case load is steadily increasing having reached in August 2016 some estimated 8,000 refugees.

As of January 2017 however, the works for upgrading the sites are still ongoing, and the finalisation of a general master plan has not been completed. Therefore, alternative accommodation solutions are being identified and implemented, mainly through urban rental schemes.

In **Bulgaria**, as of the beginning of October the number of refugees and migrants stranded is at its highest (over 6,000 people) since border controls by Serbia have been intensified. For the first time since the beginning of 2016 detention and reception centers are overcrowded – according to the Ministry of Interiors they are at 170% of their capacity.

Along the **Central Mediterranean Route** the situation continues to deteriorate. Although the monthly comparison from April to September 2015/2016 shows a decrease or an equal trend between the two years, in October 2016 a dramatic increase (10%) has been registered. Overall the total number of refugees and migrants disembarked in Italy in 2016 by December 2016 is over 172,000, which represent over 17 % increase compared to the same period in 2015.

This route is the deadliest route to reach Europe. As of 15 December 2016, 4,314 people have lost their lives at sea (IOM source), the majority in the Central Mediterranean Route. In the Eastern Mediterranean Route, 429 people have died trying to cross the Aegean Sea in 2016. Many shipwreck victims are never recovered; some 1,650 bodies have been disembarked in Italy since 2013. So far just over 200 have been identified.

In **Italy**, secondary reception facilities in major urban centres are under huge pressure with increasing problems to properly host the increasing influx of migrants/asylum seekers.

Given the exceptional magnitude of the crisis and the humanitarian needs of refugees and migrants the Council adopted the Emergency Support Instrument (ESI) on 15 March 2016. Actions financed under this instrument are in support of, and complementary to, the actions of the affected Member State. To this end, close cooperation and consultation with the affected Member State should be ensured. Furthermore, the ESI is only used when a Member State's resources combined with other funding instruments, in particular DG HOME Funds, respectively the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF) are not sufficient.

1.2 Identified emergency support needs

In line with the priorities established in 2016, the most important sectorial needs identified for 2017 are as follows:

➤ ***Shelter, site planning and site management:*** At the beginning of 2016 in Greece, dignified and safe accommodation capacity was not sufficient. As a result, asylum seekers and migrants were sheltered in different sites with varying quality standards. Later on during the course of 2016 the situation evolved by including both temporary, as well as longer-term accommodations and sites consisting of pre-fabricated housing, buildings and tents. Due to the forthcoming winter season, a decision was taken to work in parallel on the winterisation of temporary sites while upgrading/rehabilitating the long-term ones. Despite delays and coordination problems, work is progressing at existing sites where the vast majority of tents have been replaced by containers. Work is also progressing for the rehabilitation/upgrading of long-term sites, which will ensure better quality long-term accommodations. At the same time both for long term and temporary sites, small scale infrastructure activities related to improve safety in the sites facing public roads with intense traffic, or other safety measures are urgently needed.

➤ ***Food:*** With the support of the Greek Army and the financial support of the European Commission Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs (DG HOME), hot food rations have been provided daily in each site in 2016. While this allows for universal access to food, several actors have reported the cultural inappropriateness of the food distributed, as well as a fatigue with receiving catered food after several months, which has resulted in a general dissatisfaction by beneficiaries. Several humanitarian partners have complemented the food provided by the Greek Army with specific fresh-food distribution, or with the provision of a complementary cash component. There is need to ensure the continuity of provision of food aid, and find alternatives to replace the wet rations provided by the Greek Army by 1 March 2017, when the financial input of DG HOME Funds, respectively the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) Emergency Support ends. Humanitarian partners have developed a phased roll-out plan for the shift from in-kind to cash support in the mainland. The plan is still under discussion with the Greek authorities, and relies on the completion of works for the provision of cooking facilities in the sites.

➤ **Protection:** People should be well informed about their status and rights and the legal frameworks that protect them. Lack of information in their own language on future options risk creating misunderstandings, false hope and stress, and exposing people even more to the risk of smuggling and human trafficking. People with specific vulnerabilities such as women, children, elderly and people with disabilities need specific attention. Children and women account for two thirds of those crossing into Europe. A particular protection-related problem is the separation of families between borders. There is a need for safe places for children and their families and specific services, in particular, for unaccompanied or separated children.

A specific aspect of protection relates to unaccompanied minors (UAMs). Greek authorities have registered 2,400 unaccompanied minors and separated children currently residing in Greece, with 322 of these children living on reception centres on the islands. An average of 190 UAM arrive per month, many of whom have fled violence and armed conflict in their home countries, including Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq and are alone in Greece without parents or an adult responsible for their care. While the Greek state is responsible for the care and protection of these children, there is a chronic shortage of suitable community based accommodation for them.

Systematic implementation of a best interest assessment for all unaccompanied minors and separated children needs to be strengthened, allowing children to make informed decisions based on information about options available to them.

➤ **Education:** Children make up 38% of the total refugee population residing in Greece. An estimated 1 in 5 of refugee and migrant children residing in Greece has never been in school, while the remaining children have missed on average 1.5 years of schooling, having fled conflict and insecurity in their country of origin and undertaken multiple displacements before arriving in Greece. Access to education for children is a right, which should be provided by each Member State. In September 2016, the Greek Ministry of Education (MoE) began rolling out in a phased approach its ambitious plan to provide education to all refugee and migrant children in Greece, through structured bridging classes in the public school system (7-15 years), preparing children with language and basic literacy skills for full integration into mainstream public school in 2017. Younger children (4-6 yrs) also have access to kindergartens. In parallel, non-formal education activities have been put in place by humanitarian actors, catering for children not yet incorporated into the MoE's action. But still needs in the form of continuation of non-formal education activities remain. Actions and curriculum developed in the area of non-formal education should be in alignment with the overall strategy designed by the government in order to facilitate the smooth transition from non-formal to the public education system.

Refugee and migrant adolescents and youth (age 15-24), are navigating a critical phase of their life and are at risk for engaging in negative coping behaviours. Access to quality and inclusive learning opportunities including non-formal education, as well as vocational trainings and language courses are crucial to build life-skills and support integration into Greek society.

Language classes for adults are required to reduce stigmatization and allow them to interact freely in the host community. Other non-formal education activities for adults such as for instance vocational training are also needed for better integration.

In addition, the following needs are recurrent:

➤ **WASH and NFIs:** Water and sanitation facilities are still insufficient in many locations, despite the efforts made. WASH facilities – toilets, showers, water taps, laundry facilities, cleaning items, hygiene items and promotion – are particularly needed, as well as solid waste management. The needs are different according to gender and age (e.g. toilets adapted for children, sufficient privacy when taking a shower, feeling of security when going to latrines at night). Needs for NFIs remain in terms of clothes, hygiene products, kitchen tools, recreational materials, etc.

➤ **Health:** The main pathologies are respiratory tract infections, gastro-enteritis and dermatology pathologies, all linked to the challenging hygienic and shelter conditions and the cold weather. Physical or mental disabilities and chronic illnesses have increased, with many requiring medical treatment. Psychological consequences of trauma are exacerbated by poor condition and situation of insecurity and uncertainty. In addition, many suffer from symptoms of anxiety, depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Cases of sexual and gender based violence (SGBV) need to be addressed. Vaccination campaigns took place but the number of vaccines was insufficient to cover the needs and need to be expanded. Cultural mediators/translators are an essential bridge between the patients and medical staff and their presence is lacking at hospital level. An epidemiological surveillance system to monitor trends of communicable diseases and respond to possible outbreaks has been put in place.

While access to healthcare is offered or facilitated by several actors, NGOs, Red Cross, UN, volunteers as well as Government and private actors for those living in sites and non-official settlement on the mainland, for the refugees and migrants living out of sites on the mainland access to healthcare services is less structured and so far poorly documented.

The procedure for pre-registered asylum seekers to have access to the Greek health system, including subsidized health costs still poses problems as it requires a tax registration number and social security registration number. Other challenges concern medicines for chronic diseases, transportation to and from outside health facilities, translation services at hospital level and provision of mental health care.

Preparedness and response to unforeseen events: Humanitarian partners have means and capacity that can usefully complement the Member States and the European Commission led response. The lessons learned from the EU response in 2015 and 2016 is that time is required to plan, procure and implement an adequate response. As the root causes of the refugee crisis continue to affect a high number of people, there is therefore a need to be prepared for unforeseen events.

1.3 Risk assessment and possible constraints

- Risks related to influx of new arrivals: sudden major increase of the influx of refugees and migrants into the EU, both through the Central and Eastern Mediterranean routes may overwhelm the response capacity of Member States and humanitarian organisations.
- Currently, Europol estimates that more than 90% of the migrants travelling to the EU use facilitation services. In most cases, these services were offered and provided by criminal groups. A large number of criminal networks as well as individual criminal entrepreneurs now generate substantial profits from migrant smuggling or crimes related to the “facilitation” of migrant smuggling. In the hope of continuing their journey, many refugees could seek for smugglers support, to help them with illegal crossing. They are potentially vulnerable to be targeted for labour or sexual abuse as they need to repay their debt to smugglers. Despite the sharp reduction of illegal border crossing since the borders closed on the Western Balkan route, there is still a certain number of refugees/migrant moving up along this route.
- Several years of economic crisis in Greece have put constraints on the response capacity of the authorities. The coordination of the response to the refugee crisis has been an additional burden on an

already overstretched administration. In this sense, it is important to underline that the ESI is a complementary instrument only to be used when no other national or EU instruments are available. DG ECHO's assumption is that Member States will use all other available EU tools and instruments at their disposal such as the AMIF National Plans.

- Increasing tensions inside refugee sites (and with host communities) out of frustration and despair (namely due to overcrowding and sub-standard condition in the hotspots) have already lead to riots and destructions. The violence reduces humanitarian access. Destruction of facilities and material has already happened and may continue.

2 Proposed EU Emergency Support Response

2.1 Rationale

The exceptional magnitude of the crisis and the humanitarian needs of refugees and migrants have justified the establishment of a new instrument to complement what was already being provided by the Greek authorities and various other funding instruments, in particular DG HOME Funds, respectively the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF).

Through the Emergency Support Instrument, DG ECHO has funded the access to primary health care to refugees and migrants on the mainland, as well as ensuring referrals to public hospitals when needed. Psycho-social activities have been organized in sites for refugees and migrants of all ages. Non formal education in child-friendly spaces has been available for children. Living conditions have been improved through better accommodations and water and sanitation facilities, even if needs remain important in these areas. Through individual case management, partners address the most urgent needs, in particular in terms of protection of the refugee population, including those of unaccompanied minors. By end of 2016 a large majority of the refugee population will be receiving unconditional cash transfers to cover their basic needs, including a partial contribution to their food basket. By end of March 2017 the provision of basic needs assistance should be entirely covered through multi-purpose cash grants. Coordination and ensuring a fluid communication with all stakeholders, and foremost with the responsible authorities of the Member State is crucial for the success of the actions implemented.

The same modalities, including the Framework Partnership Agreements signed with the Commission for humanitarian aid outside the Union, will be used for this instrument. The interventions will be consistent with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid and related EU policies and approaches including those on protection, education in emergencies, health, water sanitation and hygiene, shelter, food, gender and age and with SPHERE standards for humanitarian assistance.

2.2 Objective(s)

Preserving life, preventing and alleviating human suffering and maintaining human dignity through the provision of needs-based emergency support within the Union, complementing the response of the affected Member States.

Specific Objectives:

- a) To meet the basic needs of people adversely affected by the disaster covered under this Financing Decision, i.e. the current influx of refugees and migrants into the Union, through the provision of multi-sectorial support. The multi-sectorial response may include the following sectors of intervention:
 - 1) Basic needs assistance;
 - 2) Food assistance
 - 3) Shelter;
 - 4) Protection, including unaccompanied minors;
 - 5) Educational services.
 - 6) Healthcare, including psychosocial support and mental health;
 - 7) Water, sanitation and hygiene;

- 8) Preparedness for and response to unforeseen events related to the migration crisis.
- b) To support the management of the response to be provided under this Decision through the provision of technical assistance to the extent required.

2.3 Components

□ **Basic Needs Assistance through cash-based transfers:** Access to basic services, basic food and non-food items will be pursued through the implementation of Multipurpose Cash Grants (MPG). MPGs are unrestricted cash transfers that place beneficiary choice and prioritisation of his/her needs at the forefront of the humanitarian response.

In Greece in 2017 DG ECHO will prioritize – along with shelter improvements, care for UAMs and education in emergencies - funding to establish a single delivery system of assistance, through electronic cards. The aim is to use MPG to ensure a full coverage of needs of the refugee population in Greece, both in the mainland and on the islands (limited to those refugees staying beyond the initial 25 days of permanence who are free to leave the reception centres). The MPG will cover a wide series of needs including non-food items, transportation, communication costs and food, provided that the beneficiaries do not receive other food assistance and are equipped with the sufficient facilities to store, preserve and cook food they procure.

DG ECHO aims at funding a single coordinated delivery mechanism for Multi-Purpose Cash Grants (MPGs) in 2017, through a single contribution agreement with one partner covering the whole territory. Consortia regrouping different partners will be accepted, and will have to adhere to the same efficiency considerations explained below. The system will have to include the following distinctive features:

- Coverage of the entire population of concern throughout the national territory. Vulnerability criteria may be added to specifically target and modify the assistance according to specific needs. Eligibility criteria for the cash assistance are to be clearly identified and verified on a regular basis.
- A single registry of eligible persons of concern, regularly verified and updated: this is essential to run an efficient operation, reducing the need for frequent validation of beneficiaries and keeping multiple registrations to a minimum.
- A single Financial Service Provider (FSP)/ cash delivery Platform: the registry database is the basis for uploading cash transfers onto beneficiary cards.
- A single card, delivering a standardised transfer value: through using a single FSP, a single card with distinctive features that looks the same throughout the territory. The card should display a logo according to the visibility requirements described below.
- A standard transfer value, which is essential to maintain impartiality and to avoid disturbances such as population movements, although it will be possible for a beneficiary to use the card in any location in Greece (but not outside). The transfer amount should be sufficient for the recipient to meet minimum basic needs. The value of transfer should be based upon the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) as defined by the Cash Working Group in agreement with the Greek Government. However, the actual transfer value may be a contribution to the MEB, and should not be more than the amount given to vulnerable Greek families by the social protection system.
- A single monitoring and evaluation framework with common result and outcome (KRI/KOI) indicators.
- Cost efficiency: Partners are expected to achieve a maximum efficiency, calculated on the ratio between the total costs for delivering of cash transfers, and the actual cash disbursed to beneficiaries.
- Anchored on best practice that is emerging from existing experience and partnerships.

- The system should as far as possible take into consideration the design of the Greek social security program SSI, for longer-term sustainability and hand-over.
- Complementary with ongoing humanitarian and development action.
- Expandable: the system should easily include transfer “top-ups” (winterization, education, etc.) as needed and extend to other population groups (new arrivals) as appropriate, up to the ceiling given to vulnerable Greek families.

Due diligence and accountability in the selection, enrolment, cash transfer and appeals processes is required to provide humanitarian assurances and fiduciary oversight:

- Awareness raising and outreach to refugees and persons of concerns to take place country-wide.
- Applications coherent with procedures of the national social protection system and underpinned by Greek law.
- Opportunity to appeal offered to rejected applicants.

□ **Non-Food Items (NFIs):** In kind provision of NFIs can be considered for all sites and first reception centres (e.g. in the case of Greece, on the islands). Beneficiaries receiving the full amount of cash assistance should be able to cover their basic needs in NFIs and should not be targeted by additional in-kind distributions. In-depth co-ordination amongst partners providing NFIs will be a prerequisite.

□ **Food assistance:** When cash-based solutions are not feasible (either because of unavailability of food storage, cooking facility; or because of unexpected arrival of people), DG ECHO may fund the provision of food aid in the form of wet feeding³ only at established sites and in close coordination with national authorities of the country in question. Basic food package distribution can be envisaged at first reception of refugees and migrants (e.g. when they come off the boats on the islands).

□ **Shelter and site management:** The provision of adequate, dignified, short-term shelter solutions can be funded in case of emergencies. In Greece, particularly for the current caseload, longer-term accommodation solutions will be funded to contribute to the plan developed by the Government of Greece. Within these plans, measures reducing or mitigating the exposure to safety and protection risks must be integrated. Partners also can cater for the construction and equipment of cooking facilities, and the necessary heating/cooling solutions to make the living conditions acceptable.

Partners may support the site management authorities through the provision of seconded specialized staff. Inclusion of the refugee population in the provision of services is encouraged where appropriate.

Upon agreement by the national authorities, DG ECHO also supports rental schemes options (notably in apartments) particularly for vulnerable groups, which represent a more dignified accommodation.

□ **Protection:** Activities related to child protection in emergencies are prioritised, such as registration of unaccompanied minors (UAM) and separated children (SC), family tracing and reunification (FTR), referral and support to UAM/SC; psycho-social needs of children affected by conflict/displacement. Interpretation services to facilitate information sharing with refugees and migrants in their own language will also be supported. Response to the insecurity feeling in sites should be addressed. Inclusion of the refugee population in the provision of services is encouraged where appropriate.

³ Sphere standard: Exceptionally, a general food distribution can be a cooked meal or ready-to-eat food for an initial period during an acute emergency.

A comprehensive protection risk analysis is needed in order to determine the most appropriate response. This has to be precise enough to inform programming decisions. Aspects of gender and age particularly interwoven with protection as crises have differing impacts on women, girls, men and boys.

In terms of funding protection actions, DG ECHO will consider both targeted actions (sector) and mainstreaming (cross-cutting).

This list below contains examples and should not be regarded as exhaustive, or as a straightjacket. Nor is it organised in an order of priority.

PROTECTION ACTIONS – might be implemented as stand-alone OR as part of an integrated approach

Documentation, Status & Protection of Individuals	Legal aid to obtain social benefits; Refugee Status Determination; Family links; Family tracing; Victims identification.
Prevention of and response to violence (including GBV)	Prevention: Sensitisation/Awareness raising; Hardware/Infrastructure. Response: Medical; Mental Health and Psycho-social Support (MHPSS); Legal; Security
Child Protection	Prevention of and response to violence, including through strengthening existing child protection systems; Registration and identification of children; Case-management including BIA and BID processes; Family tracing; Prevention; Child Friendly Spaces/Adolescent Friendly Spaces.

OTHER SECTOR ACTIONS – as part of an integrated protection approach

Assistance to specific vulnerable groups	Typically some sort of material assistance (but could also be specialised medical, PSS or legal assistance).
Actively using other sectors to achieve protection outcomes	All “traditional” assistance sectors – food assistance, WASH, health, shelter & settlements, nutrition. Inter-linkages between these sector needs and protection needs to be identified through the risk analysis. Identification of coping mechanisms and freedom of movement restrictions are often key.

Responding to ‘specific needs’ of children, different age groups, elderly, chronically ill, persons with disabilities, lactating or pregnant women means enabling their access to basic needs (shelter, food, water, health, nutrition and education) and this sometimes requires the humanitarian actors to have a stronger focus on certain groups or individuals.

While communities may know about their protection needs and possible responses, this is not tantamount to being capable of taking action on them. Therefore, supporting and empowering communities to better analyse the risks they face, and to develop their own strategies to reduce exposure to and mitigate the effects of these risks, need to be maintained as a core strategy in protection work. Protection that is achieved by people, rather than delivered to them, is likely to be more durable.

Humanitarian agencies cannot and should not be seen as a substitute for the protection role and responsibility bestowed on national authorities.

□ **Unaccompanied Minors:** The provision of appropriate community based care support for UAMs that ensures physical security; well-being and access to appropriate services will be encouraged. A package of appropriate services should include security, counselling, information, legal aid, psychosocial support, translation services, access to education and language courses, medical services and recreational activities, in alignment with Greek standards and procedures.

Humanitarian actors incorporate Best Interest Assessments for all unaccompanied minors and separated children, recognising that it is foundational to guarantee the best approach to child protection.

□ **Educational services:** ECHO will support the provision of and access to non-formal and/or informal educational activities, that will ensure access to safe, structured, high quality, child-friendly and flexible learning opportunities that will fill the gap as children transition into formal education provided through the MoE. The actions and curriculum proposed by the partners should be in alignment with the overall strategy designed by the government in order to facilitate the smooth transition from non-formal to the public education system. Non-formal education activities provided during the transition phase should be adequate to empower the child to engage in the local school environment with dignity.

The provision of non-formal education, vocational training and mother-tongue language classes for youth and adults are also encouraged, while all actions should be designed in close consultation and collaboration with the Ministry of Education. Cultural mediators will also be supported.

Skills within the community should be identified and promoted, as they offer a large potential for refugees and migrants to re-establish a sense of normalcy and empowerment. This can include teachers, interpreters, implementation of community based services, maintenance of WASH facilities, etc.

□ **Water, sanitation and hygiene:** Provision of WASH facilities (including latrines, showers, water tabs, laundry facilities, cleaning items and promotion) at established shelter facilities/ sites will be considered, as will be the distribution of hygiene items and garbage collection at established sites and/or at first reception locations. WASH facilities must take specific women's and children needs into consideration. Inclusion of the refugee population in the provision of services is encouraged where appropriate.

□ **Healthcare:** First Aid capacity and emergency healthcare (including emergency and comprehensive obstetrics) with appropriate referral mechanisms need to be ensured at the entry points, which receive substantial numbers of refugees and migrants and at sites on the mainland. The existing health care infrastructure of the country affected needs to be respected when it comes to referrals and be taken into account in the design of the operation.

Access to a basic package of health services should be ensured for all refugee and migrant population. This should include medical and psychological support to victims of violence (including gender based violence). Translation services are also essential for the patient and medical staff to understand each other and for the appropriate care to be provided and follow up.

Improvement in the sites settings, for instance in water, hygiene and other basic provisions can lead to improve both physical – preventing disease outbreaks - and mental conditions of the refugee and migrant population.

Stranded refugee/migrant population may require responses such as ensuring sufficient capacity to address chronic diseases, including sufficient medical supplies. While they should be supported to register into the national health system (AMKA number), DG ECHO will consider for partners to purchase or reimburse the necessary drugs. The increase of mental health problems due to previous traumatic experiences in their country of origin or during their journey and stress provided by uncertainties in their current host country should be addressed, beyond basic psycho-social support.

Transportation to and from health facilities remains an issue as the vast majority of the sites are isolated. Costs for transportation will be included in the multi-purpose cash transfer but this would require public transportation to be available, which is not always the case.

Health promotion and preventive services could also be supported as well as the set-up of a proper information management system and harmonised procedures.

Health promotion and preventive services could also be supported as well as the set-up of a proper information management system and harmonised procedures.

Additional measures to increase response capacity include the possibility of engaging refugee and migrant healthcare workers, with their particular added-value to solve linguistic and cultural problems.

Health actions have to take into consideration the MoH support received from DG HOME.

Preparedness and response to unforeseen events related to the migration crisis

Preparedness and stock-piling can be considered for funding, and to be used for response to unforeseen events related to the migration crisis. As an example, this might be the case, where secondary reception facilities are overcrowded and basic humanitarian services are not fully covered or where centres in urban areas are under significant pressure due to difficulties to properly host the increasing influx of migrants/asylum seekers.

2.4 Complementarity and coordination with other EU services, donors and institutions

A wide range of Commission services are contributing to the response to the refugee crisis. DG HOME with the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF), DG SANTE with the health programme budget line to support Member States facing migratory pressure and DG JUST with the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme have already provided significant financial resources for assistance inside Europe. In addition, the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM) has been used for mobilising more than 185,000 items such as tents, beds, shelter, hygiene material and medical supplies. A significant proportion of these items were made available soon after Greece activated the UCPM in December 2015 for the refugee and migrant crisis. Since the situation in Greece has stabilised more recently, offers of assistance have not been received with the same frequency. Though a renewed request by the Greek Civil Protection authorities or a worsening of the situation could lead to further offers being received, the volume of any assistance is unlikely to be to a level that means ESI support needs to be adapted to accommodate this.

In 2015 / 2016 the Commission was by far the largest humanitarian donor in Greece, accounting for 77% of the total (Source: UN OCHA, September 2016). The vast majority of this funding was from DG HOME and DG ECHO, with HOME granting EUR 352M of Emergency Assistance (EMAS) funding under AMIF and ISF and DG ECHO contracting EUR 161M under the Emergency Support Instrument (as of 11 November 2016). Though focused on asylum and border security measures a considerable amount of DG HOME EMAS funding was granted for actions relating to the humanitarian response to the situation in Greece, notably accommodation, food and medical care which were provided by the army for refugees and migrants. Throughout 2016 there has been thorough coordination between DG ECHO and DG HOME to ensure most effective use of funds, avoid duplication and anticipate gaps. This will continue into 2017, though the role of DG HOME EMAS funding is expected to be greatly reduced. The DG HOME national programme funding, intended as a longer term support measure, should be gradually phased in to tackle the refugee crisis.

In Italy, EUR 38.2 million was awarded so far under the AMIF Emergency funds: EUR 13.2 million to the Ministry of Interiors (MoI) for borders and migration management and 22.2 million to the Navy and

Coastguard for Search and Rescue and surveillance. Further 2.5 million will be allocated to the MoI to support UAMs.

In Bulgaria, EUR 149 million was awarded so far under the AMIF Emergency funds.

Several EU Member States have contributed to the response to the migration and refugees crisis in Europe. France, Germany and Luxembourg have funded specific actions implemented by various international organisations.

3 Monitoring

In accordance with Article 7 of Council Regulation (EU) 2016/369 of 15 March 2016 on the provision of emergency support within the Union, actions receiving financial support must be monitored regularly.

4 Proposal Assessment

Administrative info

- a) Indicative amount: An amount of EUR 198 000 000 is available under this ESOP. Up to EUR 99 000 000 will be allocated in a first round at the beginning of the year. A second allocation round for the remaining available amount will indicatively take place at the end of the first semester of the year.
- b) Description of the emergency support interventions relating to this assessment round:

In Greece, the indicative amount for project proposals to be considered for this assessment round is of a minimum value of EUR 5 000 000, in complementarity to other financial assistance provided by DG HOME, UCPM and other EU funding sources (Member States and European Commission). DG ECHO can take into account proposals of a lower amount for partners with a financial threshold.

Geographical coverage: in accordance with Commission Decision on the financing of emergency support in favour of the affected Member States in response to the current influx of refugees and migrants into the Union to be financed from the 2017 general budget of the European Union (ECHO/-EU/BUD/2017/01000), funding available under this assessment round may be used to address humanitarian needs where necessary, including in an affected Member State other than Greece.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.⁴
- e) Potential partners: all DG ECHO partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Standard⁵ Single Form

⁴ If the implementation of the actions envisaged in this Decision is suspended due to force majeure or any comparable circumstance, the period of suspension will not be taken into account for the calculation of the duration of the emergency support actions. Depending on the evolution of the situation in the field, the Commission reserves the right to terminate the Agreements signed with the partner organisations where the suspension of activities is for a period of more than one third of the total planned duration of the action. In this respect, the procedure established in the general conditions of the specific agreement will be applied.

g) Indicative receipt date of the above requested information: 16 February 2017.⁶

Operational requirements

Assessment criteria:

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (ESOP) and the operational requirements described in this section.
- Commonly used principles such as: quality of the needs assessment and of the logical framework, relevance of the intervention and coverage, feasibility, applicant's implementation capacity and knowledge of/presence in the affected State.
- Partners have to demonstrate in their project proposals that their proposed activities do not overlap with activities funded by other donors, in particular from the EU.
- In principle, only one partner per sector per site will be funded. A large geographical coverage will be given priority, in order to promote efficiency and economy of scale.
- In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where DG ECHO is requested to fund a continuation, a visit of the ongoing action may be conducted to determine the feasibility and quality of the Action proposed.

Operational guidelines:

In the design of their operation, DG ECHO partners need to take into account DG ECHO policies and guidelines. **The humanitarian principles** of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, and strict adherence to the "**do no harm**" approach remain paramount. Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in **coordination**: participation in coordination mechanisms at different levels, not only in terms of meetings but also in terms of joint field assessments and engagement in technical groups and joint planning activities. The partners should actively engage with the relevant national and local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding.

Ensuring **gender-age mainstreaming** is of paramount importance to DG ECHO, since it is an issue of quality programming. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men are affected by crises in different ways. Emergencies also tend to change gender dynamics. The needs and capacities of different gender and age groups among targeted populations must be adequately assessed and - consequently - assistance must be adapted to ensure equal access and that specific needs are addressed. Context-specific gender-sensitive needs assessments and gender analysis must be conducted to avoid vulnerability-related assumptions (e.g. women should not be considered the most vulnerable groups by default) and to ensure a more effective targeting. On the basis of the identified needs, practical examples of assistance adapted to the needs of different gender and age groups must also be provided in the Single Form. Actions targeting one specific gender and/or age group - particularly when one group is clearly more vulnerable than others —may in some instances be deemed necessary (e.g. unaccompanied minors or adolescents): such actions should respond to a clear need that has been

⁵ Standard Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL. Sections 7.4 and 8.3 are not applicable. Section 2.2 is mandatory.

⁶ 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.

identified through a gender and age analysis and cannot be adequately addressed through mainstreaming. While assistance may specifically target one group, the participation of other groups may prove crucial for reaching the expected impact. All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section.

Involvement of a wider variety of actors: Where it is in the interest of the action, and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework, DG ECHO supports involvement of a broad range of actors engaged in humanitarian response, including local and/or international private sector. Involvement of local organisations is promoted as a mean to improve efficiency of the action and to develop response capacities, and should be framed in a cooperative and coordinated environment.

Innovative tools and approaches: Given the growing humanitarian needs and the limited response capacity of humanitarian actors, innovative tools and approaches are key to ensuring an efficient and effective response. Partners are encouraged to look at and – when relevant and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework – procure and implement innovative solutions, processes and products to perform their actions. Partners are also encouraged to better communicate with researchers and innovators, grant them access to their activities, and – outside the scope of DG ECHO funded activities - participate in research and innovation projects to help them better meet the needs and tackle the challenges of emergency support and humanitarian action.

Visibility and Communication requirements

Funding provided under the EU Emergency Support Instrument is an expression of European Solidarity towards vulnerable displaced people. Partners are expected and encouraged to acknowledge this as a key message in their project-related communication. Partners are also encouraged to particularly highlight in their communication products the actions in line with EU priorities, namely Shelter, Cash, Health and education in emergencies.

Partners will need to agree on their communication plans with DG ECHO and will be invited to provide regular updates on the nature of activities, mention of EU visibility, impact and results of the different communication actions taken.

Partners are expected to inform DG ECHO in advance about media and communication activities planned in the framework of the joint projects in order for DG ECHO to advise on its participation in these events.

Partners will be expected to acknowledge the EU as a donor through visibility and communication.

This includes the prominent display of the EU emblem with accompanying text on all project sites, relief items and equipment as well as the systematic written and verbal recognition of the EU's support when referring to EU-funded projects in press releases, social media, webpages, blogs, media interviews, articles and other communication products. The EU emblem should be included in all items where the partner organization's emblem is planned and should be foreseen at the production phase. All partners are required to respect the guidelines laid out in the DG ECHO visibility manual <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>.

Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with visibility requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of and partnership with the EU/DG ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements, namely the following:

- The communication and visibility articles of the General Conditions annexed to the Framework Partnership Agreements (FPAs) concluded with non-governmental organizations or international organizations or in the General Conditions for Delegation Agreements concluded in the

framework of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) with the UN.

- Specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, forming an integral part of individual agreements:
 - Section 9.1.A, Standard visibility in the field, including prominent display of the EU humanitarian aid visual identity on all projects sites and on EU funded relief items and equipment (see below) ; derogations are only possible where visibility activities may harm the implementation of the Action or the safety of the staff of the partner, staff of the Implementing partners, the safety of beneficiaries or the local community and provided that they have been explicitly agreed-upon in the individual agreements.
 - Section 9.1.B, Standard visibility recognizing the EU funding through activities such as media outreach, social media engagement and provision of photos stories and blogs; every partner is expected to choose at least 4 out of 7 requirements. If no requirements are selected, a project-specific derogation based on security concerns is needed.
 - Section 9.2. Above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with DG ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

This is the EU humanitarian aid visual identity to be used in a project related visibility and communication actions (applicable in English and in the language of the Member State concerned, e.g. Greek):

