

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### Latin America and the Caribbean

#### FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 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 which may be included in the related Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP).

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge	ECHO/C4
Contact persons at HQ:  <b>Colombia</b> Silvia Ermini <a href="mailto:Silvia.Ermini@ec.europa.eu">Silvia.Ermini@ec.europa.eu</a>  <b>Caribbean</b> Ulrika Conradsson <a href="mailto:Ulrika.Conradsson@ec.europa.eu">Ulrika.Conradsson@ec.europa.eu</a>  <b>Central and South America</b> Ulrika Conradsson <a href="mailto:Ulrika.Conradsson@ec.europa.eu">Ulrika.Conradsson@ec.europa.eu</a>	Contact persons in the field:  <b>Colombia</b> – Álvaro de Vicente <a href="mailto:Alvaro.De-Vicente@echofield.eu">Alvaro.De-Vicente@echofield.eu</a>  <b>Caribbean</b> – Virginie André <a href="mailto:Virginie.Andre@echofield.eu">Virginie.Andre@echofield.eu</a>  <b>Haiti</b> – Jordi Torres <a href="mailto:Jordi.Torres-Miralles@echofield.eu">Jordi.Torres-Miralles@echofield.eu</a>  <b>Central America</b> – Vicente Raimundo <a href="mailto:Vicente.Raimundo@echofield.eu">Vicente.Raimundo@echofield.eu</a>  <b>South America</b> – Jorge Torrealba <a href="mailto:Jorge.Torrealba@echofield.eu">Jorge.Torrealba@echofield.eu</a>

## 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 14 300 000

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises<sup>1</sup>: HA-FA: EUR 2 450 000

Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters: HA-FA: EUR 2 850 000

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO Dis. Prep.: EUR 9 000 000

Total: HA-FA: EUR 14 300 000

## 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

### 3.1. Administrative info

#### Assessment round 1 – Colombia

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 450 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/1/2017<sup>2</sup>. Actions may start from 1/1/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>3</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information<sup>4</sup>: 30/01/2017

#### Assessment round 2 – Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/3/2017<sup>5</sup>. Actions may start from 1/3/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.

<sup>1</sup> Possibly aggravated by natural disasters.

<sup>2,5</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>6</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 30/01/2017<sup>7</sup>.

### **Assessment round 3 – Central America**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 100 000
  - Support to Food Assistance interventions EUR 2 100 000
  - Support to DRR/Resilience interventions EUR 2 000 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/3/2017<sup>8</sup>. Actions may start from 1/3/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>9</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 30/01/2017<sup>10</sup>.

### **Assessment round 4 – Disaster Risk Reduction in South America (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela)**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 5 000 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 3.4 of the HIP and to the specific guidelines under section 3.2.2.2 of this Technical Annex
- c) Costs will be eligible from 1/3/2017<sup>11</sup>. Actions may start from 1/3/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>12</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 30/1/2017<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>6,9,12</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>7,10,13</sup> 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.

<sup>8,11</sup> 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.

## **Assessment round 5 – Peru floods response**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 750 000
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round. Please refer to section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 20/03/2017<sup>14</sup>. Actions may start as of 20/03/2017.
- d) The expected initial duration for Actions is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO partners. Priority will be given to partners already active in the most affected areas who have been providing integrated, multi-sectoral response to the affected population in coordination with local and national authorities.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>15</sup>.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: by 24/04/2017<sup>16</sup>.

### **3.2. Operational requirements:**

#### *3.2.1. Assessment criteria:*

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- Compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) and the operational requirements described in this section;
- Compliance with ECHO policies and humanitarian principles;
- 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 the country/region.
- In case of actions already being implemented on the ground, where 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
- Other elements that may be taken into account in the appraisal, based on context, relevance and feasibility, e.g.: coordination, security, monitoring and control management, access arrangements, lessons learned, exit strategy, comparative advantage, added value, sustainability.

#### *3.2.2. Operational guidelines:*

This section outlines the general and specific operational guidelines which need to be taken into account by ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL.

<sup>16</sup> 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.

by ECHO. Complementary information can be retrieved on these guidelines in the links provided below. Partners are invited to duly reflect the guidance provided in these documents in the preparation of their proposals to ECHO.

### 3.2.2.1. General Guidelines

**The humanitarian principles** of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, in line with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, and strict adherence to a "**do no harm**" approach remain paramount.

**Do no harm:** Partners should ensure that the context analysis takes into account threats in addition to vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations. The analysis should bring out both external threats to the target population as well as the coping strategies adopted to counteract the vulnerabilities. The risk equation model provides a useful tool to conduct this analysis. The model stipulates that *Risks equals Threats multiplied by Vulnerabilities divided by Capacities*, and the way to reduce risks is by reducing the threats and vulnerabilities and increasing the capacities. Depending on the type of threat faced by the population in question, reducing it can be anything from possible/straightforward to impossible/dangerous. In the latter case, one will resort to focusing on vulnerabilities and capacities, but the fact that the analysis has acknowledged the threat will contribute to ensuring that the response subsequently selected does not exacerbate the population's exposure to the risk.

**The safe and secure provision of aid:** the ability to safely deliver assistance to all areas must be preserved. ECHO requests its partners to include in the project proposal details on how safety and security of staff (including the staff of implementing partners) and assets is being considered as well as an analysis of threats and plans to mitigate and limit exposure to risks. ECHO or its partners can request the suspension of ongoing actions as a result of serious threats to the safety of staff.

**Accountability:** partners remain accountable for their operations, in particular:

- The identification of the beneficiaries and of their needs using, for example, baseline surveys, KAP-surveys, Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) or beneficiary profiling;
- Management and monitoring of operations, and having adequate systems in place to facilitate this;
- Reporting on activities and outcomes, and the associated capacities to collect and analyse information;
- Identification and analysis of logistic and access constraints and risks, and the steps taken to address them.

**Response Analysis to Support Modality Selection for all Resource Transfers** is mandatory. ECHO will support the most effective and efficient modality of providing assistance, whether it be cash, vouchers or in-kind assistance. However, in line with World Humanitarian Summit commitments, ECHO will endeavour to increase cash-based interventions in the interests of cost efficiency and effectiveness gains. The questions 'why not cash' and 'if not now, then when' should be asked before modalities are selected. Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons about why a

transfer modality is proposed and another one is excluded. The choice of the transfer modality must demonstrate that the response analysis took into account the market situation in the affected area. Multiple contextual factors must be taken into account, including technical feasibility criteria, security of beneficiaries, agency staff and communities, beneficiary preference, needs and risks of specific vulnerable groups (such as Pregnant and Lactating Women, elderly, child headed households etc.), mainstreaming of protection (safety and equality in access), gender (different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, boys and girls) concerns and cost-effectiveness. Therefore for any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should provide the minimum information as recommended in the '[Thematic Policy Document n° 3 - Cash and Vouchers: Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across all sectors](#)' and demonstrate that the modality proposed will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action proposed. Partners are encouraged to consider multipurpose cash transfers (MPCT) where assessments and response analysis demonstrates that multiple basic needs can be met through single cash transfers. In such approaches, the value of transfer would normally be based upon a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), while taking account the contribution made by households, and available resources.

For in-kind transfer local purchase are encouraged when possible.

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept\\_paper\\_common\\_top\\_line\\_principles\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles_en.pdf)

**Strengthening coordination:** Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector 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 local authorities and, when feasible and appropriate, stipulate co-ordination in Memoranda of Understanding. When appropriate, partners should endeavour to exchange views on issues of common interest with actors present in the field (e.g. EU, UN, AU missions, etc.). In certain circumstances, coordination and deconfliction with military actors might be necessary. This should be done in a way that does not endanger humanitarian actors or the humanitarian space, and without prejudice to the mandate and responsibilities of the actor concerned.

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/civil-military-relations>

**Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR):** As part of the commitment of ECHO to mainstream disaster risk reduction in its humanitarian operations, the needs assessment presented in the Single Form should reflect, whenever relevant, the exposure to natural hazards and the related vulnerability of the targeted population and their livelihoods and assets. This analysis should also assess the likely impact of the humanitarian intervention on both immediate and future risks as well as the partner's institutional commitment to and operational capability in managing risk (technical competence in the relevant sectors of intervention. The DRR approach and related measures are relevant in all humanitarian sectors (WASH, nutrition, food assistance and livelihoods, health, protection, etc.), and should be systematically considered in hazard-prone contexts. Risk-informed programming across sectors should protect operations and beneficiaries from hazard

occurrence, and include contingency arrangements for additional or expanded activities that might be required. Information from early warning systems should be incorporated into programme decision making and design, even where the humanitarian operation is not the result of a specific hazard.

**All ECHO beneficiaries and activities should be appropriately protected from hazards and shocks – according to their likelihood of occurrence, intensity and possible impact.** ECHO uses two complementary methods for DRR: 1) **Integrated DRR** is where ECHO humanitarian interventions are risk informed 2) **Targeted DRR** refers to specific DRR risk reduction actions – that cannot be "integrated" into ECHO response projects (see above) but that will strengthen a system to avoid future humanitarian needs by reducing risk to vulnerable populations.

For targeted DRR interventions, the information in the Single Form should clearly show that:

- all risks have been clearly identified, including their possible interactions;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes the role of the state and non-state actors in disaster reduction and climate change adaptation from national to local levels;
- the measures planned are effective in strengthening the capacity of communities and local authorities to plan and implement local level disaster risk reduction activities in a sustainable way, and have the potential to be replicated in other similar contexts;
- the intervention contributes to improving the mechanisms to coordinate disaster risk reduction programmes and stakeholders at national to local levels.
- demonstrate that the action is designed including the existing good practice in this field;
- the partner has an appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism to ensure evidence of the impact of the action and good practice are gathered, and effectively disseminated.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention\\_preparedness/DRR\\_thematic\\_policy\\_doc.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf)

**Education in Emergencies:** ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education<sup>17</sup> in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases. Furthermore, it may support longer-term educational activities in protracted crises and in refugee/IDP camps. Innovative solutions will be supported. Actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention may also be supported.

It is essential that education activities are carried out in close connection with protection programs. It is vital to ensure that children can access education where they feel safe and

---

<sup>17</sup> The Commission adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

protected. Therefore, education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include enabling activities like psychosocial support; mine risk education and provision of life-skills, such as vital health, nutrition and hygiene information, HIV prevention, sexual- and reproductive health information and DRR training and awareness.

Education activities could entail enabling access to education for children currently out of school, but also strengthening the quality aspects of education in emergencies, including the recruitment and capacity building of teachers. To reduce the vulnerability of children affected by conflict, actions in the field of education in emergencies and especially conflict situations, should reflect protection, relevant legal frameworks (International Humanitarian Law, International Human Rights Law and Refugee Law), education in mediation and conflict resolution, child protection (with special attention to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors and former child soldiers), community-based educational activities and the promotion of peaceful reconciliation. Hence, education projects could include components of child protection and peace education (i.e. mediation, conflict resolution, etc.).

In order to ensure holistic response, linking education to other life-saving humanitarian sectors, such as WASH and health could also be considered.

Activities must be tailored to take into account the different needs of children based on their age, gender and other specific circumstances.

Coordination is essential and all education in emergencies projects need to coordinate and support the priorities set by relevant humanitarian and if appropriate development governance mechanisms (e.g. Global Education Cluster, Refugee Working Groups, communities of practices, Local Education Groups), as well as national structures (e.g. Ministry of Education).

All actions funded on education in emergencies should in their design adhere to the [INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery](#), as well as the [IASC Minimum Standards for Child Protection](#).

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children\\_2008\\_Emergency\\_Crisis\\_Situations\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf)

**Gender-Age Mainstreaming:** Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to 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 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. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender\\_age\\_marker\\_toolkit.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid_en)

**Integrated approaches:** Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses in specific geographical areas are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. In contexts where it has been determined (see also response analysis below) that cash transfers are an appropriate modality, and that cash can meet multiple basic needs, partners are encouraged to transfer single payments using a common delivery platform. Multi-purpose cash transfers (MPCT) should be coordinated alongside other sector-specific responses within a basic needs approach, but fragmenting MPCT into sector clusters for coordination is not encouraged. MPCTs also offer the opportunity to conduct joined up assessments across sectors (including market analysis), common registration, targeting, and monitoring and evaluation frameworks. As far as possible, support functions should be separated out from actual transfers in order to reduce the potential for conflicts of interest. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

The application of an **integrated protection programming approach** is highly encouraged. In this particular attention should be paid to addressing protection threats and vulnerabilities emanating from issues such as freedom of movement restrictions and the use of dangerous/negative coping mechanisms. ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30 000 within a grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues on 1) development of indicators to measure impact of integrated protection programming with other sectors; 2) Approaches for monitoring and evaluating integrated protection programmes; 3) Training and human resources needs for integrated protection programming; and 4) Implementation of integrated protection programming in areas of difficult access. For more information please consult the Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming in the ECHO Humanitarian Protection Thematic Policy Document<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Annex 4 on p. 49 and forward in [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff\\_working\\_document\\_humanitarian\\_protection\\_052016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf)

**Protection:** Programme design should be based on a clear analysis of threats, vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population and the response must aim to prevent, reduce/mitigate and respond to the risks and consequences of violence, coercion, deliberate deprivation and abuse for persons, groups and communities in the context of humanitarian crises. Integration of protection concerns is important in all contexts, but should, in particular, be reflected in any actions implemented in a displacement-hosting context (be it refugees or IDPs), in situations of conflict or in contexts where social exclusion is a known factor, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population.

Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in all programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. It refers to the imperative for each and every humanitarian actor to prevent, mitigate and respond to protection threats that are caused or perpetuated by humanitarian action/inaction by ensuring the respect of fundamental protection principles in humanitarian programmes – no matter what sector or objective. While mainstreaming protection is closely linked to the 'do no harm' principle, it widens it to prioritising safety and dignity and avoiding causing harm, ensuring meaningful access, ensuring accountability, participation and empowerment. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

While humanitarian assistance often focuses on community-level interventions, it is important to remember that, in order to fully address many protection issues, it is also necessary to consider the relevance and feasibility of advocacy (structural level) interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities. The use of integrated protection programming approaches is also strongly encouraged.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff\\_working\\_document\\_humanitarian\\_protection\\_052016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/staff_working_document_humanitarian_protection_052016.pdf)

**Resilience:** ECHO's objective is to respond to the acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable and exposed people while taking opportunities to increase their **resilience** – to reduce on-going and future humanitarian needs and to assist a durable recovery. Where feasible, cost effective, and without compromising humanitarian principles, ECHO support will contribute to longer term strategies to build the capacities of the most vulnerable and address underlying reasons for their vulnerability – to all shocks and stresses.

All ECHO partners are expected to identify opportunities to reduce future risks to vulnerable people and to strengthen, self-reliance through livelihoods and capacities. ECHO encourages its partners to develop their contextual risk and vulnerability analysis and to adapt their approach to the type of needs and opportunities identified (see template). This requires partners to strengthen their engagement with government services (at all levels), development actors and with different sectors. In that regard, ECHO partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors whenever possible: community mobilisation, CSOs, technical dialogue, coordination and gradual transfer of responsibilities to countries' administration or relevant line ministries.

Good coordination and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development activities (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of development partners and governments on nutrition issues; ii) seeking for more sustainable solutions for refugees (access to education, innovative approach toward strengthening self-resilience, etc.) and IDPs; iii) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions.

Where applicable, partners should reflect on applying resilience thinking and programming to (protracted) **forced displacement** situations – so as to harness resilience and strengthen self-reliance of affected populations – refugees, IDPs and their host communities. Working towards the gradual socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced populations – focusing on access to employment opportunities and access to services – in protracted crises is a priority for ECHO, DEVCO, NEAR and the EEAS, working in a comprehensive manner, each under their mandate – and should be supported by ECHO-funded partners, in line with humanitarian principles.

Linking **social protection** and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide. Investment in social protection mechanisms is an opportunity tackling the challenges faced by humanitarian crises and contributes to a reduction in the chronic humanitarian caseload, especially in the context of extreme fragility. Access to predictable, adequate and regular aid can, in the short-term protect poor households from the impacts of shocks and help to build capacity over time. Moreover, emergency safety nets can be incorporated as a cornerstone of self-reliance strategy for empowering the forcibly displaced and giving them support to address vulnerabilities.

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Communication\\_Forced\\_Displacement\\_Development\\_2016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Communication_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff\\_working\\_document\\_Forced\\_Displacement\\_Development\\_2016.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/refugees-idp/Staff_working_document_Forced_Displacement_Development_2016.pdf)

**Community-based approach:** In all sectors, interventions should adopt, wherever possible, a community-based approach in terms of defining viable options to effectively help increasing resilience and meeting basic needs among the most vulnerable. Community inclusion should be considered at all stages – design and implementation. Community ownership of the process is more effective and is encouraged. This includes the identification of critical needs as prioritised by the communities, and the transfer of appropriate knowledge and resources.

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/resilience>

**ECHO Visibility:** Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with **visibility** requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of and partnership with the EU/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 EU funded relief items and equipment; 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 ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

For standard visibility activities, partners may, in principle, allocate a budget of up to 0.5% of the direct eligible costs of the action with a ceiling of EUR 8 000. However, for individual agreements equal or above EUR 5 million no absolute ceiling applies. Hence, in such cases, the standard visibility budget may go up to 0.5%, even when this amount exceeds EUR 8 000. In the latter case, partners must provide an overview of planned visibility activities and a budget breakdown.

Further explanation of visibility requirements and reporting as well as best practices and examples can be consulted on the dedicated ECHO visibility site: <http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

### **Other Useful links to guidelines and policies:**

#### *Food Assistance*

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/food-assistance>

#### *Nutrition*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04\\_nutrition\\_addressing\\_undernutrition\\_in\\_emergencies\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/tpd04_nutrition_addressing_undernutrition_in_emergencies_en.pdf)

#### *Infant and Young Children Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF)*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/2014/toolkit\\_nutrition\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/2014/toolkit_nutrition_en.pdf)

#### *Health*

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/health>

#### *Remote Management*

[http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions\\_implementation/remote\\_management/start](http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start)

#### *Water sanitation and hygiene*

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH\\_policy\\_doc\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_policy_doc_en.pdf)

### 3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

#### **Assessment round 1 – Colombian Conflict – EUR 2 450 000**

ECHO actions will primarily focus on covering gaps left by official assistance:

- Integral humanitarian assistance and protection to IDPs in situations of extreme vulnerability.
- Rapid response to communities directly affected by conflict violence.
- Information management (including risk monitoring) and coordination.

Given the amount of funds available, and in order to provide a more efficient response, complementarity and articulation between partners and alliances or consortia are encouraged.

Given the uncertainty of the current situation in terms of conflict and armed violence, partners are encouraged to maintain flexibility in terms of the geographical location for the proposed actions.

With this in mind, the main sectors of intervention will be:

Protection: Considering the high risks for people's safety, integrity and dignity in conflict-affected areas, protection is the overarching sector of intervention. All actions supported by ECHO should aim at improving the protection of the beneficiaries either through specific activities or by integrating protection in other sectors of intervention. The presence of humanitarian actors in a territory will not be considered as protection by itself but as a part of an integral protection strategy defined after a proper risk analysis. ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practice.

Actions will aim to reduce the risks and support the victims of threats, violence (including sexual and gender based violence), restriction of mobility, forced recruitment, explosive artefacts, etc. Examples of specific protection activities that could be supported are: legal assistance for identification & documentation of displaced and refugees, psychosocial support, mine risk education, promotion of IHL, etc.

Food assistance: affected populations can frequently no longer ensure access to sufficient food. Assistance to recent IDPs could include emergency cash, vouchers or in-kind food distributions when public entities cannot provide it. The rationale for the choice of the transfer modalities must comply with a clear and transparent response analysis in line with ECHO guidelines. Nutrition-sensitive activities should be integrated when relevant, particularly among vulnerable groups, including under-nutrition detection and adequate referral, promotion of good feeding and care practices, response to special needs in WASH in nutrition or the integration of nutrition in health services.

Shelter, non-food items, water, sanitation and hygiene: During the first months after forced displacement, people lack essential household items (hygiene or kitchen sets, mosquito nets...), basic temporary shelter with proper sanitation conditions and access to sufficient water of adequate quality for domestic use. Covering these needs is a priority when local entities are not able or ready to do it.

Early recovery and resilience: partners are encouraged to boost the resilience of targeted communities and the humanitarian response capacities of local institutions (mainly municipalities and UARIV) through articulation, advocacy, short-term capacity building, and a proper rights-based approach in the interventions. It is expected that ECHO partners will continue to open humanitarian space and establish links between communities and institutions.

Coordination and information management: Coordination, information management and monitoring of the humanitarian situation as well as the risks is essential and particularly important in the current context of a "forgotten crisis" with humanitarian needs evolving and becoming less visible. ECHO supports the humanitarian country and local teams, encouraging partners to contribute actively to these instances as well as coordinating with national and local institutions. Partners are encouraged to actively participate in the various coordination mechanisms, and incorporate coordination activities to be implemented in the proposals. ECHO encourages partners to continue providing complete information regarding the projects to OCHA and the Humanitarian Country Team, and to clusters and humanitarian organizations implementing activities in the same geographical area. Partners should also contribute to coordination among humanitarian actors including national and local public entities. For this purpose, information regarding the projects should be shared with the Presidency Cooperation Agency (APC), the Victim's Unit (UARIV) and the National Unit for Risk Management (UNGRD).

All proposals should include advocacy, visibility and communication activities aimed at highlighting this forgotten crisis.

### **Assessment round 2 - Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean – EUR 2 000 000**

a. Priorities for proposals under this assessment round are as follows:

The overall aim will be to support regional strategies, translating them into action on the ground. ECHO support will assist regional and national authorities to deliver practical implementation by building local preparedness and response capacities, with the aim of creating better prepared communities and local, national and regional institutions to face disasters, thus reducing mortality and protecting to the extent possible the assets and livelihoods of the most vulnerable. Focus will be on 1/regional cooperation through exchange of information and capacity building and 2/implementation of advocacy measures at national and regional level on past DRR investments to be capitalized and scaled-up.

While the region has seen improvements in Disaster Risk Reduction, in particular concerning certain hazards, there is a need to further support a **multi-hazard approach** and **improve collaboration at institutional level between key stakeholders**, systematically involving all sectoral institutions in the DRR agenda.

Priority will be given to **multi-hazard approaches**, as well as reinforcing **Early Warning Systems**, fostering exchanges between countries and between regional institutions. A regional approach to tackle hazards, ensuring shared monitoring and support response mechanisms must be reinforced.

Further support is also needed to contribute to the **Comprehensive Disaster Management strategy for the Caribbean** and align it to the Sendai priorities (through application of a specific harmonized set of indicators to be used in proposals). All DRR actions should foster partnership and integration in regional and national strategies and expected results should be identified as a contribution to national and regional priorities. Project tools and products should be appropriately institutionalized. In this sense it is recommended that proposed operations are discussed and validated by the National and Regional Systems in place and to consider developing joint monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

Actions should allow compilation of DRR tools and processes endorsed at national and regional level, led by national systems in coordination with the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), EU Delegations and other development actors. The aim is to enhance capacity to respond when a disaster strikes **through standardized products and tools** easily transmitted to beneficiaries. **Raising awareness and advocacy** on the need to adopt risk reduction approaches to disaster management will be promoted.

Specific vulnerabilities to hazards of **marginal populations in urban settlements** will also be considered. Interventions aiming to reinforce preparedness enhancing local market based and/or multi-purpose cash transfer responses are also encouraged.

Multi-country or regional actions are favoured. Specific areas (e.g.: Early Warning Systems, urban risk management, safe hospitals, or safe school initiatives, etc) when addressed should be according to priorities established by regional institutions. Regional actions should consider consolidation of experiences developed in the region, coupled with a scaling up and communication strategy. Actions should support existing regional strategies, translating them into action to enhance monitoring and response capacity on the ground.

Country-specific actions could be possible where there is a strong and demonstrated added value with a clear exit strategy. In this sense, priority will be for unaddressed risks and following discussion with national and local authorities. Actions at this level should ensure links with longer-term interventions, clearly showing consolidation of local

capacities and strengthening at institutional level. Priority should be to areas with high levels of risk and vulnerability and recurrent humanitarian needs, where there are insufficient local capacities to reduce risk or respond effectively and opportunities for sustainability and scaling up.

b. Elements to be taken into account when formulating proposals:

- **Scaling-up opportunities** should be at the centre of the project implementation plan. Evidence should be provided that political commitment and institutional engagement allow the continuity or scaling up of the operations. Links should be made with existing mechanisms to access public funds for DRR beyond the duration of the proposed project.
- Supporting activities that facilitate or **strengthen cooperation mechanisms** between key stakeholders are recommended
- Coordination between applicants is key, promoting joint efforts to reach a common result. Combined actions are recommended in the communication sector. **Collaborative strategic formulation** and planning between partners is encouraged, and can take the form of consortia or alliances.
- Collaboration between countries on **Early Warning Systems to exchange on good practices** should be fostered.
- Support to **handover of previous products** supported by the DIPECHO programme to development/longer-term programmes by effective implementation of advocacy measures and joint planning on DRR should be included.
- All DRR/DP ECHO actions should contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (SFDRR). Proposed actions should look at supporting the on-going implementation measures of the SFDRR in the region. In their proposals, applicants are encouraged to refer to the SFDRR priorities and when possible to their main relevant indicators as well as to the Caribbean Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) strategy.
- Partners are encouraged to improve and apply comprehensive approaches towards improving **resilience and linking relief with rehabilitation and development (LRRD)**, linking with other EU and Member States' financing mechanisms and opportunities, and those of other development actors. Close collaboration with all the EU Delegations in the region, and especially with the one in Barbados – in the case of regional actions – is key in order to create synergies.
- Urban risk management, seismic risk, DRR and protection, cash preparedness, further use of safety net systems to anchor emergency response and assisting local disaster management systems to embrace new technologies, etc. are some of the critical thematic areas of targeted DRR investments across regions. The potential for fully phasing out of



the region in this cycle should be the aim and actions should integrate a **clear exit strategy**.

- **Links with Civil Protection** should be explored to foster exchange of practices and tools between the countries of the region and jointly better prepare for future emergencies affecting the area, as well as enhancing collaboration during emergency response. In this sense, in March 2017, an exercise will be organized by France in Martinique (Richter exercise) using an earthquake scenario followed by a tsunami. Partners are encouraged to link an activity to this, so as to use the opportunity to test previous investments or identify gaps in the region.

- Support to the standardization at regional and sub-regional levels of hazard analysis, disaster risk indicators, and risk assessment methodologies (INFORM) could be considered.

- New DRR key results and outcomes indicators have been introduced by ECHO. Actions should systematically include them.

- “Crisis modifiers” could be considered in DRR activities to allow a shift to more “emergency-type” interventions in case of need and when possible, where it can be effective and bring an added value.

- Co-financing. Preference for at least 15% co-financed proposals.

c. Background information:

Existing Country Profiles should be considered, as well as recommendations of the November 2016 **regional DRR workshop**. Additional information at the following links:

- Tools and good practices: [www.dipecholac.net](http://www.dipecholac.net)

- Country profiles available at: <http://dipecholac.net/contenido/120-documentos-pais.html>

Country profiles for Haiti and Antigua & Barbuda are being drafted and will soon be available.

**Assessment round 3 – Central America – EUR 4 100 000**

- Food Assistance – EUR 2 100 000 million

1. In view of the severity and recurrence of recent adverse impacts, interventions related to **food assistance** will be considered especially for Guatemala and Honduras and to a lesser extent El Salvador and Nicaragua. These interventions should consider cash or voucher delivery mechanisms and target the most vulnerable households.

2. Response to acute needs in terms of severe food insecurity should be based on information and analysis done at national and local level. Targeting of areas and beneficiaries based on food security indicators should be ensured. Areas most affected by acute food insecurity will be prioritized, based on IPC analysis (areas and households considered in IPC Phase 3 –Crisis - will be the priority). Food security and livelihoods information and analysis should be used for project design and monitoring and evaluation (*inter alia* livelihood profiles, IPC information, food security assessments).

3. It is encouraged that interventions aim at covering needs in two lean periods (2017 and 2018) and include nutrition sensitive components (e.g. support nutrition monitoring systems at community level (screenings) and referral in intervention areas in order to contribute to information systems, nutrition promotion, IYCF-E, among others).

4. Assistance delivery should be differentiated based on specific family needs to ensure minimum nutritional requirements for all household members and should ensure the availability of appropriate delivery channels (financial service providers and food distributors) and security measures.

5. To complement food assistance interventions, short to medium term **livelihood recovery and protection** will be considered on the basis of replicating and/or adapting past successful initiatives that have been proven to reduce vulnerability to food insecurity after a shock and helped to build resilience. Livelihood initiatives integrating Climate Change mitigation and adaptation are encouraged.

6. Generation and dissemination of reliable **food security and nutritional information** will be considered due to the lack of such data and importance of timely and accurate information for context analysis and needs assessments, and for development of preparedness measures and appropriate humanitarian response. Support for the improvement and reach of information methods, systems and platforms will be considered, as well as events, forums and other mechanisms to disseminate information.

7. A multisector approach that incorporates DRR and/or protection elements into these initiatives as appropriate is encouraged.

8. Synergies with on-going humanitarian and development initiatives for Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods will also be considered.

- DRR in Central America – EUR 2 000 000.

a. Priorities for proposals under this assessment round are as follows:

The overall aim will be to support regional strategies, translating them into action on the ground. ECHO support will assist regional and national authorities to deliver practical implementation by building local preparedness and response capacities, with the aim of creating better prepared communities and local, national and regional institutions to face disasters, thus reducing mortality and protecting to the extent possible the assets and livelihoods of the most vulnerable. Priority will be given to regional and national

institutions responsible for DRM in need of technical support and to those communities with the highest risk indicators and the lowest coping capacities, most exposed to natural catastrophes, pervasive violence and food insecurity.

Based on previous successful initiatives and on consultations with EU Delegations, Regional and National DRR bodies and key implementing partners, ECHO will aim at:

- Developing proven, successful and innovative DRR partnerships, building on the actions of the previous HIP (2014-16) and seeking to consolidate private sector/public institution partnerships in DRR, notably in Honduras and Guatemala. Adaptation and roll-out of well-known risk assessment tools such as, but not limited to, the INFORM to the national and sub-national level and context or Hospital Safety Index will also be prioritized.
- Assisting Regional and National DRR Systems in incorporating into their legal frameworks and planning and response systems key issues which have so far been absent, such as introducing protection within classical humanitarian response, and responding to slow-onset shocks affecting livelihoods, such as drought and plagues.
- Emphasizing response preparedness for natural catastrophes with potentially devastating effects such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.
- Further focusing on contributing to on-going relevant regional, national and international DRR platforms and initiatives, such as alignment of the SENDAI framework to the Central America Regional and National DRR policies, the inclusion by the Regional Body (CEPREDENAC) of food security-related issues, the inclusion of protection considerations during disaster response operations at municipal and national levels.

b. Elements to be taken into account when formulating proposals:

1. All DRR/DP ECHO actions should contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (SFA). Actions should look at supporting the on-going implementation measures of the SFA in the region. Proposals should refer to the SFA four priorities and when possible to their main relevant indicators.

2. All DRR actions have to be aligned to the respective national and regional (Central America Integral Risk Management Policy - PCGIR) DRR frameworks. This includes policies, strategies, legislation and planning at various levels. Synergies with mandated international organisations are encouraged in particular in the case of regional projects and for proposals including activities contributing to the international campaigns (e.g.: Resilient Cities, Safe Hospitals and Schools).

3. In line with the Resilience Action Plan of June 2013, ECHO and other services of the EU institutions will share joint analysis, common priorities, coordinated planning, and a multi-sector approach that will eventually lead to phase-out and handover of projects either to the target community/institution, the relevant authorities, or to an appropriate

longer-term funding instrument. In this sense, the partner must **demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy** at the time of proposal submission that will ultimately **conclude with phase-out and handover**.

4. Actions should ensure comprehensive **participatory approaches and methodologies that address vulnerabilities and inclusiveness** as far as different gender groups, children, the elder, marginalized groups, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities, are concerned.

5. Applicants should provide details of the **existing coordination mechanisms both at local, sub-national and national levels taking into account links with other on-going initiatives funded by other actors** (including Government) and the proposed coordination modalities.

6. A key interface in the development of DP/DRR strategies is the National Disaster Management institutions, which are responsible for the articulation of a national risk reduction policy. However, **this does not preclude a multi-ministerial planning/programming dialogue**.

7. Applicants must systematically consider **the capitalization of experiences** (key lessons learned, as well as documentation processes following accepted methodologies in the region) and most of all, their **dissemination** in an appropriate manner. These activities should be explicitly envisaged under the activities and in the work plan of each proposal, developing or using a common capitalization and dissemination.

8. For the risk analysis, the entry point of a DRR targeted action is the natural hazard itself and this doesn't change. But the evolution of the humanitarian context in Central America shows that humanitarian stakeholders have to take into consideration the **impact of organized violence, as a key element of increased vulnerability** of the population and **reduced capacity** of basic social services in different areas of the region. Proposed operations should thus take into account the **integration of this variable** in their analysis of vulnerabilities and capacities, allowing a more comprehensive approach when strengthening capacities.

9. Proposed operations should, when appropriate, take into account the integration of **preparedness to the risk of epidemics** in their planning as part of a comprehensive risk approach. In this sense, where appropriate, local and municipal multi-hazard approach plans should include epidemiologic outbreak protocols and the respective coordination with institutions leading the national response in this type of threats.

10. **Climate change adaptation (CCA)** cannot be the sole focus of a specific and ad hoc DRR targeted action. However, ECHO considers CCA concepts an integral component of DRR. In this context, although Climate Change cannot be the entry point of a DRR targeted action, risk analysis, tools and methodologies should integrate CCA concepts when relevant and feasible.

11. Where relevant and feasible, with the aim of strengthening on-going coordination mechanisms and increasing capacities of national DRR systems, **cooperation and**

**exchanges between European and Central American Civil Protection systems** may be pursued.

12. Actions covering the **Dry corridor** of Central America should complement ongoing food-security related actions.

13. Taking into account that the consultative process and the updating of DRR country profiles (*Documento País*) have evolved with increased country ownership, these processes will not be carried out necessarily in the same way in the region, as they will depend on national decisions. In this sense, **the consultative process and updating of country profiles will be based on requirements established by the National Systems.**

14. Systematic integration of **technical, specific and scientific institutions (national and regional) and of the academic sector should be sought; as well as, particularly, collaborations with the private sector.** Proposed actions should also seek synergies with institutions in charge of **Municipal Development**, in order to contribute to institutionalization processes.

15. Regarding **human resources**, it is suggested to start the recruitment process of the staff as soon as possible. We recall in this regard that the start date for the eligibility of costs can be set before the start date of the project. Staff should be selected in order to ensure sound management of the project and expected level of quality. Gender and age balanced teams should be sought as far as possible in order to ensure appropriate access to beneficiaries. It is recommended to ensure sufficient and well qualified staff to carry out the planned activities of the project; and to recur to external services only if needed.

16. Co-financing. Preference will be given to at least 15% co-financed proposals.

17. Regional priorities include support to the standardization at regional and sub-regional levels of hazard analysis, disaster risk indicators, and risk assessment methodologies (INFORM).

#### **Assessment round 4 – Disaster Risk Reduction in South America (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela)**

In South America ECHO funds will consolidate previous achievements at regional and national level. While previous DIPECHO programmes supported community based DRM projects, scaling up and replication of these initiatives and tools is lacking due to low technical capacities at national and local levels and limited resources. Further ECHO support is needed to support and strengthen the DRR system and advocate for DRR/DP, as institutions and communities are becoming more aware of risks. Support will also be provided to UNASUR to facilitate coordination, and dissemination of good practices at national and local levels, while enhancing response and coordination capacity to face large scale natural hazards at regional level. Coordination between the EU Civil Protection Mechanism and UNASUR's Civil Protection will also be facilitated. ECHO actions will support national, regional, multi-country or cross-border initiatives.

As DRR/Resilience funding is now available on a yearly basis, actions implemented during the present HIP will:

- Avoid work in the same areas already supported by a 2016-2017 action, unless the action will consolidate a previous initiative;
- When appropriate and feasible, actions should pursue coordination and synergies with on-going projects on any topic that might be of mutual interest;
- Target highly vulnerable populations that are not beneficiaries of an on-going project financed by ECHO and aim to increase their resilience;
- Take advantage of possible momentum for DRR and Resilience generated by recent events in the countries.

All DRR/DP ECHO actions should contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (SFA). All proposed actions should look at supporting the on-going implementation measures of the SFA in the region. In their proposals, applicants are encouraged to refer to the SFA four priorities and when possible to their main relevant indicators.

In line with the Resilience Action Plan of June 2013, ECHO and other services of the EU institutions will share joint analysis, common priorities, coordinated planning, and a multi-sector approach that will eventually lead to phase-out and handover of EU funded projects either to the target community/institution, the relevant authorities, or to an appropriate longer-term funding instrument. In this sense, the partner must demonstrate a clearly defined overall intervention strategy at the time of proposal submission including, when feasible, links with development and environment/climate change initiatives supported by the EU or other actors as a priority to extend the possibilities of dissemination, adoption of good practices, handover and phase out.

When DRR/Resilience proposals include activities at local level, and when a clear added value either in terms of reduction of extreme vulnerability or a catalyzing demonstrative effect exists, the following components need to be taken into account:

- a) Local disaster management components: targeting local actors in disaster prone areas: early warning systems, mapping and data computerization, local capacity-building, training, response protocols and planning, etc.
- b) Institutional links: targeting institutions involved in disaster management/disaster risk reduction at regional, national and sub-national levels with special emphasis on Municipalities: advocacy, facilitation of coordination, institutional strengthening. To strengthen links with civil society, actions should also look at institutionalizing tools and practices among non-state organized local or national groups.
- c) Information, Education, Communication, targeting direct and indirect beneficiaries: awareness-raising among the general public, education and dissemination of tools and proven good practices.
- d) Small-scale infrastructure and services, at community level (particularly when a demonstrative effect to authorities is foreseen): infrastructure support and mitigation works, reinforcing critical infrastructure, operation and maintenance systems; non-structural mitigation activities.

- e) Livelihoods and economic assets protection: supporting direct and indirect beneficiaries to adapt, prepare or protect their livelihoods from natural events.
- f) Where relevant and appropriate, and with the goal of contributing to provide a required comprehensive response to the communities' vulnerabilities, partners may consider mainstreaming within their regular DRR intervention context-specific issues such as epidemics preparedness and/or organized violence affecting their communities.
- g) The initial assessment should take into account all predictable events such as rainy season and elections.

### **Priorities**

**a) Regional actions in South America.** UNASUR is a strategic partner at regional level in South America, and has requested support to consolidate its High Level Technical Committee on DRR. This should allow facilitating coordination, and dissemination of good practices at national and local levels, while enhancing response and coordination capacity to face large scale natural hazards at regional level. UNASUR can play the role of repository and experience exchange for successful previous initiatives, allowing South-South information sharing between all its Member States. As a parallel process, ECHO will also look at supporting UNASUR to develop its own Civil Protection regional Mechanisms, requesting support from the EU Civil Protection Mechanism.

Other regional actions looking at: enhancing civil-military preparedness and coordination mechanisms; or enhancing civil society involvement and participation in DRR/Resilience decision making to improve hand-over and phase-out will also be of potential interest for funding.

**b) In-country or multi-country actions in: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela.**

**Bolivia:** After the first “Resilience to floods” initiatives in the Beni and Mamoré river basins, ECHO will look at strengthening the different successful processes of the initiatives, with a more active and sustained ambition to showcase and disseminate the lessons learned as well as provide support to local organized groups, local, regional and national authorities to allow for institutionalization of good practices. Linkages with development and environmental initiatives supported by the EU or other actors will also be a priority to extend the possibilities of dissemination and adoption of good practices. ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, or other recurrent hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisaged in multi-country actions that include Bolivia.

**Colombia:** A first definition of priorities for DRM has been led by the UNGR (national system for risk management) with inputs from different actors, including ECHO and its partners. These priorities are described in the “Document of prioritization of strategic lines and intervention areas for Disaster Risk Management in Colombia, 2014-2018<sup>19</sup>”. This document should be considered in orienting actions in terms of results, objectives and geographic targeting, as well as in coordinating with authorities from the formulation stage onwards.

More concretely, actions prioritized by ECHO would be:

- Vulnerable population exposed to both natural hazards and man-made crises.
- Communities recently affected by recent disasters where a humanitarian intervention opened opportunities for effective DRR.
- Compilation and homologation of tools developed by DIPECHO programmes in Colombia.

ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, or other recurrent hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisioned in multi-country actions that include Colombia.

**Ecuador:** At present, ECHO supports DRR actions centred on strengthening the Ecuadorian DRM system, both at institutional and local levels. Recent experience in emergencies in Ecuador has revealed that there are still important gaps mostly related to an adequate and on-time response to the humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable populations. The promotion of proven DRR strategies and good practices, focused mostly on the support and strengthening of capacities at local levels will be considered a priority in this phase. ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, volcanic risk, earthquakes or other recurrent hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisioned in multi-country actions that include Ecuador.

**Paraguay:** ECHO supported flood response actions in Paraguay during 2016. Taking advantage of lessons learned exercises that were done with local communities, local and national authorities, ECHO will support DRR and Resilience actions targeting the most vulnerable populations still potentially affected by future floods. Additionally, ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, or other recurrent

---

<sup>19</sup> <http://dipecholac.net/docs/files/783-priorizacion-de-lineas-estrategicas-y-zonas-de-intervencion-en-grd.pdf>



hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisioned in multi-country actions that include Paraguay.

**Peru:** After developing tools and methodologies to allow local governments and civil society to implement DRR and DRM activities in previous actions plans and facilitating National Plans to be further refined, ECHO will support strengthening the institutionalization of such tools, while working on providing methodologies and practices that allow national authorities to support local governments to implement DRR and resilience plans and activities. Actions should support authorities to develop methodologies to multiply successful practices at national level. ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, or other recurrent hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisioned in multi-country actions that include Peru.

**Venezuela:** ECHO has been supporting local efforts to enhance disaster preparedness and response in Venezuela. Focus on urban settlements has been important, and past efforts should be strengthened in order to allow for more institutional and civil society involvement in DRR and resilience. ECHO will carefully analyze proposals that intend to reduce the vulnerability of indigenous people and most vulnerable urban inhabitants to floods, landslides, or other recurrent hazards affecting these specific populations. Supporting information sharing and exchanges with other initiatives focusing on strengthening the resilience of indigenous people and/or urban vulnerable population could also be envisaged in multi-country actions that include Venezuela.