
TECHNICAL ANNEX

HORN OF AFRICA¹

FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL INFORMATION

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2016/01000 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).

Contents

1. Contacts.....	2
2. Financial info	3
3. Proposal Assessment.....	3
3.1. Administrative info.....	3
3.2. Operational requirements.....	5
3.2.1. Assessment criteria.....	5
3.2.2. Operational guidelines.....	5
3.2.2.1. General guidelines.....	6
3.2.2.2. Sector specific guidelines.....	12
3.2.2.3. Country specific priorities.....	20
a) DJIBOUTI programming priorities.....	20
b) ETHIOPIA programming priorities	21
c) KENYA programming priorities.....	23
d) SOMALIA programming priorities.....	25
e) UGANDA programming priorities	30

¹ Horn of Africa for this HIP and technical annex covers: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda.

1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge: ECHO.C3

Contact persons at HQ:

Horn of Africa:	Béatrice Miège - beatrice.miege@ec.europa.eu
Somalia:	Thorsten Muench - thorsten.muench@ec.europa.eu Riikka O'Sullivan . riikka.osullivan@ec.europa.eu
Ethiopia:	Manuela Palm . manuela.palm@ec.europa.eu Dorothee Riepma . dorothee.riepma@ec.europa.eu
Kenya	Thorsten Muench - thorsten.muench@ec.europa.eu
Uganda, Djibouti and Eritrea:	Juan Luis Barbolla Casas . juan-luis.barbolla-casas@ec.europa.eu

In the field:

Somalia:	Lars Oberhaus - lars.oberhaus@echofield.eu Heather Blackwell - heather.blackwell@echofield.eu Jean-Marc Jouineau - jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu
Kenya:	Quentin Le Gallo . quentin.le-gallo@echofield.eu Jean-Marc Jouineau (only for refugees in Kenya) jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu
Ethiopia:	Ségolène De Béco . segolene.de-beco@echofield.eu Jacob Asens - jacob.asens@echofield.eu Branko Golubovic - branko.golubovic@echofield.eu
Djibouti	Jean-Marc Jouineau - jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu
Eritrea:	Heather Blackwell - heather.blackwell@echofield.eu
Uganda:	Quentin Le Gallo . quentin.le-gallo@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 94 800 000

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 92 000 000

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO Dis. Prep.: EUR 2 800 000

Total: EUR 94 800 000

Country/Thematic	Total in EUR
Djibouti	500 000
Ethiopia	27 000 000
Kenya	18 000 000 (including 2 500 000 for DRR)
Somalia	29 000 000
Uganda	20 000 000
DRR Regional	300 000
TOTAL	94 800 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 77 000 000 (subject to the availability of payment appropriations, the amount awarded may be lower than the overall indicative amount or be spread over time. More information will be available upon adoption of the general budget of the European Union for the year 2016.
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the need described in section 3.4 and 3.2.2 (operational guidelines) for **Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda**.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016².
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 18 months for specific DRR and Resilience oriented projects.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form³.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 11/01/2016⁴**

² 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.

³ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

⁴ 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.

Assessment round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 800 000 (Ethiopia EUR 2 800 000, Kenya EUR 1 000 000, Uganda EUR 1 000 000).
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: All interventions as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁵. Actions will start from 01/01/2016
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: Preselected partners: International Rescue Committee (UK), Lutheran World Federation (CH), Save the Children Netherlands, Save the Children Sweden.

Assessment round 3

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 4 000 000 (Uganda)
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁶. Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months and up to 18 months for specific DRR and Resilience oriented projects.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO Partners who are already present in Uganda and dealing with refugees.
- f) Information to be provided: Modification request of on-going operation.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 15/09/2016**⁷

Assessment round 4

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 9 000 000 (Uganda)
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described in section 0 of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016⁸. Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months but in case of modification request could go up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO Partners who are already present in Uganda and dealing with refugees.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

- f) Information to be provided: Single Form or Modification request of on-going operation⁹.
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 16/11/2016**¹⁰

3.2. Operational requirements

3.2.1. Assessment criteria

The assessment of proposals will look at:

- The compliance with the proposed strategy (HIP) 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 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 its quality and the feasibility of the proposed action.

3.2.2. Operational guidelines

Sections 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.2.2 outline the principles and general and specific guidelines which need to be taken into account by ECHO partners in the design of humanitarian operations supported by ECHO. Complementary information can be retrieved on these principles and guidelines in the links which are indicated below. Partners are invited to duly reflect the guidance provided in these documents in the preparation of their project proposals to ECHO.

The EU Resilience Communication and Action Plan

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2012_586_resilience_en.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/resilience/com_2013_227_ap_crisis_prone_countries_en.pdf

Food Assistance

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

Nutrition

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/nutrition_en

Cash and vouchers

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/them_policy_doc_cashandvouchers_en.pdf
<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/en/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-and-vouchers>
[MPCT: Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash . Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs:](#)

⁹ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

¹⁰ 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.

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles_en.pdf

Protection

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

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/humanitarian_protection_funding_guidelines_en.pdf

Children in Emergency and Crisis Situations

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/children_2008_Emergency_Crisis_Situations_en.pdf

Health

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

Civil. military coordination

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/WASH_policy_doc_en.pdf

Gender

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/gender-sensitive-aid_en

Disaster Risk Reduction

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf

ECHO Visibility

<http://www.echo-visibility.eu/>

Remote Management

http://dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/actions_implementation/remote_management/start

3.2.2.1. General guidelines

A set of overall principles needs to guide every operation supported by ECHO.

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.

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.

Gender-Age Mainstreaming: Ensuring gender-age mainstreaming is of paramount importance to ECHO. Gender and age matter in humanitarian aid because women, men, girls, boys, and the elderly are affected by crises in different ways. Thus, the assistance needs to be adapted to their specific needs. All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age considerations. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit at:

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/gender_age_marker_toolkit.pdf

Protection: Mainstreaming of basic protection principles in traditional assistance programmes is of paramount importance to ECHO. This approach is closely linked to the principle of 'do no harm', and also extends the commitment of safe and equal access to assistance as well as the need for special measures to ensure access for particularly vulnerable groups. All proposals must demonstrate integration of these principles.

Integration of protection concerns 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. In such contexts, proposals must present a clear analysis of how threats against as well as vulnerabilities and capacities of the affected population impact their protection, and how this is incorporated in the response.

In order to fully address many protection issues, it may also be necessary to undertake advocacy interventions aimed at (a) stopping the violations by perpetrators and/or (b) convincing the duty-bearers to fulfil their responsibilities.

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.

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 partners' 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.

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.

DRR is not equal to Resilience, but it is an essential component of it as it enables people to prepare, mitigate and prevent risks, and react and respond to a disaster situation, protecting previous gains from future adverse shocks. Actions shall systematically analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters either through reducing exposure, lessening vulnerability of people and their livelihoods or strengthening their capacity to prepare, prevent and mitigate risks. DRR efforts should apply to all sectors according to hazard exposure and population vulnerability.

For targeted DRR interventions, proposals should clearly indicate that:

- all risks and vulnerabilities have been clearly identified;
- the intervention strengthens and promotes the role of the state and civil society 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. Linkage of operations to the existing DRR frameworks (such as the Sendai Framework for DRR, the Regional DRR frameworks (AU, IGAD, EAC etc) and the National ones) will be of value to ensure actions prioritisation is embedded and institutionalized in the existing frameworks;
- the action is designed taking into account the existing good practice in this field; this may include Supporting development/installation of appropriate early warning systems at regional, national and in particular at community level; also, supporting structural (e.g., hazard/disaster mitigation works, rehabilitation activities, protection works etc.) and non-structural (e.g., building codes and policies/procedures for risk analysis of infrastructure projects) measures to reduce or avoid the possible impacts of natural hazards.
- 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.

In the Horn of Africa context, ECHO also encourages partners to adopt approaches that integrate coordinated Emergency Preparedness & Response (EP&R) in their interventions. Support to EP&R can be formulated as a specific result in proposals or be mainstreamed. Priority will be given to actions aiming at detecting, assessing, preventing, reducing, and/or mitigating crises with specific reference to natural disasters (exogenous shocks), disease outbreaks and peaks of acute child malnutrition. Partners should also explore community mobilisation in order to ensure the largest coverage possible and ensure sustainability of the actions.

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.

Risk management is a core issue for all sectors and areas directly or indirectly affected by extremes of climate variability. 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, so as to reduce the immediate and future risks. This requires effective partnership and collaboration both horizontally and vertically, in particular with

the national government services as well as other humanitarian and development actors. Partners should indicate how they will increase ownership and capacity of local actors, whenever possible, to ensure sustainability, while retaining the ability to adapt to changes. ECHO partners are required to fill in the "Resilience Marker" in the e-Single Form.

Good coordination, convergence and strategic complementarity between humanitarian and development stakeholders (LRRD approach) are essential to the resilience approach, particularly in relation to i) increasing interest of humanitarian and development partners on joint efforts in dealing with protracted and recurrent crisis; ii) joint response analysis to prioritize targeting, vulnerabilities and risks; iii) seeking durable solutions for forcibly displaced people, ensuring access to essential services and innovative approaches toward strengthening self-reliance; iv) integrating disaster risk reduction into humanitarian interventions, including risks related to conflicts.

In the Horn of Africa, ECHO will advocate for the establishment and/or expansion of predictable safety nets and for the development of a scalable component ("crisis modifiers") to be activated when crisis strikes so as to ensure the continuous provision, and possibly expansion, of basic services. The potential linkages between safety nets, where they exist, and humanitarian activities should be illustrated in each relevant resilience building proposal. ECHO will also encourage actions that support learning, documenting of lessons learnt and actions that focus on ecosystems-based approaches in addressing resilience. Linkages, consolidation and complementarities with other existing and planned regional and national Resilience/DRR initiatives such as the IGAD IDDRSI¹¹ Process are crucial.

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. DG ECHO does not advocate for the preferential use of either cash, voucher-based or in-kind humanitarian assistance, but Partners should provide sufficient information on the reasons why one transfer modality is proposed and another is excluded. For any type of transfer modality proposed, the partner should demonstrate that it will be the most efficient and effective to reach the objective of the action.

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

Cash and Voucher and Multi-Purpose Cash-based Assistance (MPCT).

In complex humanitarian setting like those affecting some areas of the HOA, humanitarian needs are often complex, protracted/recurrent and multi-dimensional. A multipurpose transfer of resources may be considered in response to multi-sectorial needs.

While single-sector cash transfers are to be promoted where appropriate, cash is increasingly being used to address multiple humanitarian/ basic needs. Partners are referred to *Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash . Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs*⁺ for more details of ECHO's position.

¹¹ IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative

Coordination: Partners should provide specific information on their active engagement in cluster/sector and inter-cluster/sector coordination, including 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.

Whenever possible, integrated approaches with multi- or cross-sectoral programming of responses are encouraged to maximize impact, synergies and cost-effectiveness. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

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.

Remote Management: ECHO defines remote management as an operational approach used to provide relief in situations where humanitarian access to disaster-affected populations is limited.

ECHO will only fund actions whose activities can be supervised on a regular basis by the partner staff with appropriate qualification, and when ECHO staff can conduct regular monitoring visits.

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 arrangements¹². In addition, specific visibility requirements agreed-upon in the Single Form, form 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.

¹² See 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.

[FOI] 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.

[FOI] Section 9.2., above standard visibility; applicable if requested and if agreed with ECHO based on a dedicated communication plan prior to signature.

3.2.2.2. Sector specific guidelines

Protection: Protection activities which ECHO may support financially are: "non-structural activities aimed at reducing the risk for and mitigating the impact on individuals or groups of human-generated violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse in the context of humanitarian crises, resulting both from man-made or natural disasters.

The following protection interventions will be prioritised:

[FOI] *Prevention of GBV and assistance to victims of violence* including sexual and gender based violence. Ensuring timely access to professional medical assistance in accordance with internationally recognized protocols, as well as mental health/psycho-social support services is essential. Proposals should specify that the service providers to be engaged have appropriate medical qualifications; providers of psycho-social support should have, as a minimum, the educational level of social workers. When such levels of education are not available in-country, organizations must ensure a minimum level of specialized trainings for staff/service providers. The referral pathway from one level of care to the next must be foreseen within a proposal. Economic assistance as direct compensation for protection violations experienced will not be funded.

For victims of GBV the following additional points must be observed:

- Proposals must specify the main type of GBV issues they seek to address as appropriate strategies for the different types are vastly different. Services must be available to men, boys, women and girls.
- Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies should prioritize information dissemination on the health, psychological and social consequences of GBV and availability of/access to confidential services (including location, opening hours, etc). Male targeting and involvement in these activities are crucial.
- Strategies to ensure the respect of survivors' confidentiality and informed consent must be included in the proposal;

[FOI] *Screening, registration and verification, protection monitoring:* Registration for refugees and asylum seekers as well as separated and unaccompanied minors will be prioritised, actions might include birth registration for refugees; population movement tracking and profiling for IDPs; protection and return and reintegration monitoring for refugees, IDPs and returnees. Emphasis will be placed on correct targeting and quality monitoring, including through biometrics.

[FOI] *Child protection,* particularly activities addressing separation of children and families, and activities addressing psycho-social needs of children affected by conflict/displacement. Actions focusing on the provision of individual case

management services to vulnerable children should foresee the use of sound Information Management Systems. Tracing activities might be supported only through partners with specialized experience thereof, and partners must document that they have the necessary capacity to link up with similar relevant agencies across the region to ensure that cross-border tracing is conducted if necessary. Special attention will be paid to prevention and protection of children from different forms of GBV. Specific activities to strengthen the protection of children affected by armed conflict including monitoring of grave violations of children's rights, prevention of recruitment and demobilization, reunification and first stage of reintegration of children affected by armed forces and armed groups, might be considered. All child protection related activities should be tailored to the specific development stage, needs and capacities of children of different age-groups.

E1 *Support to voluntary return in safety and in dignity and assistance for durable solutions:* support to well-informed decision making by information campaigns on return conditions and area of origin profiles; restoration of personal documentation; information provision on housing, land and property claims; transport; monitoring of durable solutions conditions, as well as advocacy to ensure that the principles are respected. Involvement of development actors in durable solutions initiatives is encouraged.

E1 *Community-based protection interventions* . activities aiming to increase the self-protection mechanisms of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promote cohesion with host communities. Activities aimed at measuring the impact of this kind of intervention should be included in proposals.

Education in emergencies

ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education¹³ 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, in particular actions targeting transition to formal education systems in preparation for a development intervention.

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 protected. Therefore, education in emergencies activities under this HIP could also include 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),

¹³ 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.

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 funded under this HIP 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 shall 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](#).

Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA).

Food assistance interventions will be supported to save lives and to protect productive assets as a response to severe, transitory food insecurity due to natural and/or man-made disasters.

- F0
E1 All proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on the needs assessment, and informs the choice of response(s) as well as the targeting criteria. The choice and value of transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) must be based on a sound analysis. Any conditionality should be duly justified according to the vulnerabilities of the targeted group. Market assessment and Household Economic Analysis (HEA) are recommended as part of the response analysis (partners encouraged to adopt the decision tree and the checklist in the Cash and Vouchers Guidelines).
- F0
E1 Emergency livestock activities can be supported where livestock are proven to be a vital asset for the most vulnerable people. Priority must be given to households with "minimal" livestock holdings and to those who have left the pastoralist livelihood due to asset depletion due to droughts, floods, animal disease outbreak, loss of animals, and market disruption. Proposals should demonstrate linkages of these interventions to longer term development. The feasibility and appropriateness of the interventions will have to be carefully considered and documented using the minimum standards developed by the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS: <http://www.livestock-emergency.net>) and considering existing early warning systems and documented gaps.
- F0
E1 Agricultural inputs, such as seeds and tools, can be considered where there is a clear link between the shock and the loss of such assets, and where they are important for livelihood recovery. A robust analysis of seed systems (such as a Sustainable Seed System Assessment: SSSA) should be conducted to make the appropriate choice of modality (in-kind, cash or vouchers) and to especially to ensure that seed systems (private and public) are not undermined by an in-kind provision of seeds.

-
- F0
E1 Reconstruction, rehabilitation of key productive assets such as river bank protective infrastructures and canals for irrigation should be considered in response/prevention of damages by flooding.
 - F0
E1 Food utilization is a pillar of food security that should be an inherent part of any food assistance project. Components such as hygiene, appropriate feeding practices, proper energy source and technology for adequately processing, cooking and conservation of food/ making and safe water should be considered alongside food access and availability.
 - F0
E1 The partner must ensure that all specific nutrition needs are taken into account in HFA. This is particularly important for distributions of food in-kind, which should include an appropriate complementary food for children aged 6 to 24 months. At the same time the partner must ensure the protection of breastfeeding from products and actions potentially harmful.
 - F0
E1 Partners should demonstrate linkages with other sectors either within their proposed actions or with other actions. Where possible, food assistance should be integrated within a multi-sectoral approach to the crisis (see also the above section on MPCT).
 - F0
E1 HFA, Protection and Gender: Partners are encouraged to refer to the "[Guidance for Integrated Food Assistance and Protection Programming](#)". DG ECHO is willing to support innovative approaches for integrated protection programming with the aim of building a body of best practices. Partners may propose an amount up to EUR 30,000 *within an existing* grant that aims to answer key outstanding questions and issues, including those listed in this guidance.
 - F0
E1 Where financial support is proposed, the purpose of the cash-based transfer, the amounts of cash transfer that will be paid per beneficiary and the criteria for determining the exact amount must be clearly explained. In addition, a clear description of the persons or categories of persons which may receive such financial support should be provided.

Nutrition

Needs assessment

- F0
E1 Nutrition programming will be implemented where nutrition needs are clearly identified, particularly where the prevalence of acute under-nutrition is above the emergency threshold, but also where justified by the analysis of the risks and vulnerabilities.
- F0
E1 Nutrition needs should be informed by quality and representative surveys or surveillance systems.
- F0
E1 Nutrition causal analysis is encouraged to help identify the main determinants of under-nutrition and guide the design of specific actions.
- F0
E1 Although weight-for-height (WHO 2006) is still the internationally agreed indicator to estimate the prevalence of under-nutrition, MUAC-based assessments can be used to trigger nutrition operations in specific circumstances after consultation with ECHO.

Implementation

- F0
E1 The nutrition programs implemented by ECHO's partners will strive to reach good coverage and good treatment performance, as defined by the SPHERE standards.

-
- Nutrition interventions will be implemented following the CMAM protocols in effect in each country. When circumstances do not allow, the partner should consult and get an approval from ECHO.
 - The integration of nutrition programming into the existing health services is encouraged, as nutrition screening and therapeutic treatment should eventually be provided as a routine health service along with other preventive and curative activities. With this objective in mind, the partner is also encouraged to develop a relevant support and capacity building strategy.
 - The decision to intervene in substitution or in integration with the health system should be informed by the comparative advantages between the immediate impact of the program on the beneficiaries and affected communities, and the consideration of sustainability of nutrition programming in the long run.
 - Treatment of acute malnutrition and its complications should be provided free of any charge for the beneficiaries.
 - Project costs will be systematically checked to ensure cost-effectiveness (for example the cost of a CMAM program per SAM children treated).

Nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific actions

- Whenever possible, the integration of nutrition actions into others sectors is promoted to ensure holistic and multi sector approaches to prevent under-nutrition and reduce vulnerabilities.
- Actions relevant to other sectors should also be considered for integration into nutrition projects whenever possible and justified by the needs,

Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF)

- It is strongly recommended to assess and promote IYCF practices in all nutrition programs.
- The specific nutrition needs of infants, young children and women should be considered at all stages of the project cycle, across all sectors, and beyond Behaviour Change Communication and soft program components.
- Adequate and safe feeding of infants and young children should be provided through the most appropriate approach, including for non-breastfed children.

M & E

- Monitoring is crucial to ensure the effectiveness and impact of interventions. Evaluations are recommended in particular when innovative approaches are being piloted.
- Coverage assessments, following globally approved methodologies, should be conducted regularly to assess the coverage and its barriers/boosters.

Coordination, LRRD

- Active participation (including data sharing) to the Nutrition Cluster is strongly recommended.

F0 E1 The partner should clearly develop, since the design phase, the exit strategy criteria and involve as much as possible the national institutions and development actors to ensure the durability of the funded actions.

Health

Support to humanitarian health assistance is based on the identification of a crisis which has exerted, or which will imminently exert a negative impact on the health of a population and which is of a scale and severity that exceeds the capacity or willingness of local authorities to respond in a timely and effective manner.

F0 E1 Access to a package of basic health services needs to be ensured in any crisis situation. Their usage by the most vulnerable populations needs to be monitored. Free access to healthcare remains a key principle for ECHO.

F0 E1 Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives (during the period of assistance) should be prioritized. Community based health approaches are encouraged.

F0 E1 Actions should be based on a quantitative needs analysis (to be repeated at regular intervals). Data should be disaggregated according to sex and age. Continuations of previously funded projects should highlight the advances made and changing needs over the past period(s).

F0 E1 Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided and capacity building promoted. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.

F0 E1 The functionality of existing early warning, surveillance and response systems should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed. Surveillance should be strengthened, especially in view of a possible severe El Niño at the end of 2015.

F0 E1 Functional coordination mechanisms with existing health authorities and programs, especially, but not exclusively, those (co-) funded by the EU and member countries (e.g. EDF programs; Global Fund; GAVI) need to be established and opportunities for LRRD fully explored.

F0 E1 Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to medical waste management; safety (quality) of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (ambulances, drugs, etc.).

F0 E1 Advocacy towards the integration of nutritional activities in the healthcare package will be supported.

F0 E1 In refugee settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities.

Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Shelter

Support to preparedness and response through short term emergency water supply, sanitation, and hygiene promotion activities in order to minimize the risks of increased morbidity and mortality due to lack of water and/or water-related diseases with adequate stocks of pre-positioned supplies (natural or man-made disaster). In principle, a large quantity of reasonably safe water is preferred to small quantities of high quality water.

-
- F0 E1** Focus on rehabilitation and repair of existing WASH systems/facilities before constructing new ones; and re-establish institutional, social, and organisational structures to manage these WASH services. Community based water supply system management should be promoted as much as possible. The stability and drainage of the WASH facilities has to be ensured.
- F0 E1** Water trucking should only be considered for the shortest time, as a last resort lifesaving intervention requiring a clear and concrete exit strategy (developed as early as possible) such as the parallel rehabilitation of existing water sources
- F0 E1** WASH activities have a complementary value in order to control/prevent the spread of epidemics like Acute Watery Diarrhoea (AWD). Therefore, WASH activities might be linked to AWD response operations. A contingency plan related to the WASH response to AWD-related epidemics should be designed and tested. Whenever relevant, nutrition interventions should also be integrated to ensure a holistic and integrated approach.
- F0 E1** All partners involved in cholera, AWD or HEV (Hepatitis E virus) response should collect the most accurate epidemiological data on a daily and weekly basis during the outbreak. The level of dehydration of sick people when they arrived at the health structure, number of death and the most accurate available data in terms of provenance of the cases and water source used should be collected to assess impact of action.
- F0 E1** Hygiene promotion strategies have to be dynamic, adapted or tailored to the context. IEC materials must be tested with a representative sample of the population and subsequently adapted to the context. Notice boards should be installed at each water point and strategic location to enable awareness campaigns and information. Furthermore, the mode of communication in time of epidemic outbreak should be direct (focusing on warning people, identification of the disease, referral of sick people to the most appropriate health structure and the main rules of protection). The use of heavy and long participatory methods, aiming at unrealistic behaviour changes, should be avoided.
- F0 E1** In dry lands area where water availability is scarce, an appropriate geophysical survey should be performed prior to drilling. Water quality should be tested (bacteriological, physical and chemical) prior to opening access of the facility. The water table and recovery time of the borehole have to be monitored regularly, to avoid over exploitation of the aquifer. Data collected during the geophysical survey and drilling operations must be centralized and made available to any drilling actors. It is also recommended to analyse the dynamics for the use of water including for irrigation and livestock. Refer also to REGLAP¹⁴ good practice available at: <http://www.disasterriskreduction.net/east-centralafrica/documents/detail/en/c/1516/>
- F0 E1** All latrines must constitute a barrier to the transmission of contamination. Strict adherence and compliance with approved technical designs must be ensured.
- F0 E1** The design of household latrines should foster the use of local materials, and facilitate replication by the users when the pit is filled, to ensure sustainability.

¹⁴ Regional Learning and Advocacy Programme, OXFAM

**F0
E1** The public health risks coming from solid waste management and drainage issues should be assessed and monitored.

**F0
E1** Shelter design should be adapted to situation and protection needs, i.e. temporary, transitional, semi-permanent. Shelter and latrine designs must be based on a protection analysis and must duly reflect and address protection concerns, in terms of location, lighting, lockable doors, etc.

Particular efforts need to be made to ensure minimum quantity and quality of clean water and sanitation facilities and services in the overcrowded camp settings. Maintenance of existing facilities in areas with high density of displaced population and/or high level or risks of water-borne diseases will continue to be supported but partners must refer to possible exit strategies. As the conditions for another Cholera outbreak will most probably still exist in 2016, ECHO may consider supporting interventions addressing cholera preparedness.

3.2.2.3. Country specific priorities

a) DJIBOUTI programming priorities

Djibouti is affected by climate change, drought and structural problems which result in high food insecurity and malnutrition levels. Urbanisation adds additional burdens on the poor urban infrastructure and services and where limited employment opportunities exist. Though refugee numbers are relatively small they place a huge burden on the limited resources of Djibouti especially water. Refugee camps are located in high food insecurity area (Obock) and the urban centres where the limited infrastructure and services are stretched.

Due to the complex interaction of structural and acute factors, interventions should incorporate sound exit strategies in view of seeking durable solutions involving development stakeholders. For those in displacement (new and protracted) essential life-saving and protection assistance remain priorities. For protracted displaced focus on increased self-reliance and self-management should be incorporated in all actions.

In 2016 ECHO funding in Djibouti will mainly focus on refugees. However should the humanitarian situation deteriorate ECHO could consider possible funding to address unmet needs.

Any ECHO-funded intervention in Djibouti needs to be environmentally-friendly. Sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy will be favoured.

For the refugees programming ECHO will consider the following:

- In general, care and maintenance will only be prioritised as: a) critical stop-gap life-saving measures; b) if deemed necessary to avoid losing gains made in previous years or c) if added value in terms of efficiency and/or effectiveness can be demonstrated.
- Strengthened search for durable solutions, including local integration, voluntary return and resettlement, as well as innovative interim solutions such as advocacy for work visas;
- Action in line with regional approaches to promote increased refugee self-management and self-reliance;
- Specific protection-needs of vulnerable on and off-camp refugees, also linked to the continued security concerns and possible arrests and restrictions of movement;
- Monitoring mixed migration flows and the humanitarian protection and assistance needs of the people therein;
- Actions for protracted displaced people in the camps should be based on vulnerable-based criteria, while the status-based approach should be guaranteed for new flow of refugees only. Biometrics and e-card for beneficiaries, including vulnerabilities and multi-sectoral entitlements should be introduced in the camps.

b) ETHIOPIA programming priorities

Interventions in Ethiopia will be structured around two main priorities: Emergency Preparedness and Response and Refugees' assistance.

The EU resilience building programme in Ethiopia, known as RESET (REsilience in Ethiopia), should be as from 2016 funded under the newly established EU Trust Fund for Africa (Horn of Africa window) in which a specific objective targets specifically resilience building in line with the EU 2012 Communication on resilience. Within this programme, seven clusters had been identified in five regions (Afar, Amhara, SNNPR, two in Oromia and two in Somali region) where a multi-sector response within the humanitarian/development contiguum was favoured. Interaction with existing Government flagship programmes and other donors' interventions were key to maximise the impact. The exact framework of the new set-up as from 2016 including call for proposals will be known later in the year. The modalities of DG ECHO's involvement in this new RESET set-up is currently under discussion.

Emergency Preparedness and Response

In order to provide vulnerable population with appropriate assistance, ECHO has established a specific Emergency Response Mechanism (ERM) aimed at minimising the time between the occurrence of the crisis and the response, and is established in close cooperation with other rapid response funds in Ethiopia (HRF managed by OCHA and the OFDA funded WASH and nutrition rapid response capacity). The specificity of this Emergency Response Mechanism lies in:

- F0
E1 greater donor coordination,
- F0
E1 an improvement of information management and rapid assessment capacity including dissemination,
- F0
E1 reinforced logistical capacity, including pre-positioning of stocks
- F0
E1 the set-up of an NGO network able to provide emergency assistance in order to use and optimise as much as possible locally available resources and capacity.

This ERM allows a response to emergencies, as they occur, through any of the NGOs of the ERM consortium who are the best-placed to intervene in a given affected area. Based on the needs identified and in line with ECHO policies, the ERM can support any type of intervention be it in health, nutrition, WASH, NFI, shelter, or protection through technical, logistical or financial support.

Complementary to the ERM, IDP focussed interventions also address issues such as internal displacement mapping, food assistance, awareness raising & advocacy, and causal analysis of information on displacement potentially leading to prevention of displacement or conflict.

Under the Emergency Preparedness and Response priority, projects linked to humanitarian coordination and relief type operations as well as protection can also be funded. It could be through:

- FOET Coordination, assessment capacity and pro-active information sharing on the context of the crisis and the needs of affected populations as well as the joint programming of the response.
- FOET Immediate multi-sector response to most urgent needs.
- FOET In case of gaps identified, pre-positioning capacity for NFI, including warehousing and transport capacity.
- FOET Protection activities.

Vaccination campaigns in response to significant epidemic outbreaks (animal or human), covering critical vaccines stock reconstitution, minimum active surveillance, and short term training.

Refugees

Assistance to refugees remains a strong priority in ECHO's strategy in Ethiopia. Priority will continue to be given to life-saving interventions. Support will be provided to the establishment of new sites/camps in the case of new influx of refugees, where and when relevant.

All proposed actions must demonstrate the following:-

- FOET Clear up to date information of the main needs/gaps per sector per camp.
- FOET Technical strategies by sector are agreed by partners involved in the relevant sector (and attached to the proposal).
- FOET The target population is clearly known and identified through implementation of biometrics for continuous verification.

In general, care and maintenance services will not be a priority. ECHO may decide to support these services if deemed absolutely necessary so as not to lose the gains achieved in the past.

Partners should develop an Operation and Maintenance action plan to ensure the sustainability / functionality of the infrastructure or equipment prior to its completion or installation. Capacity of the users has to be taken into account as much as possible).

The country specificities and priorities are the following:

1. Strong protection monitoring mechanisms should be put in place as there is a crucial need to monitor the movements and protection needs of refugees.
2. Child protection, particularly protection of separated and unaccompanied minors, screening, registration and verification exercises, as well as family tracing will be supported. Assistance to victims of violence should be prioritised including prevention and response to sexual and gender based violence.
3. With regards to cash-based interventions, ECHO will prioritise the expansion of cash schemes to new camps where appropriate and in line with its humanitarian food assistance policy only if new advancements in efficiency are made.
4. Blanket supplementary feeding in the refugee camps will no longer be supported unless an under-nutrition causal study has been implemented, continuous verification is in place and its strict necessity and added value is proven. Exception may be made for new arrivals for a short period.
5. ECHO will only support protracted situations with the cash transfers. However, ECHO will continue to advocate for a more intensive involvement of

development partners in building more self-reliance and integration for protracted refugees.

The ongoing drought in Ethiopia may have adverse consequences for the refugee population in terms of security (more competition for resources and contrast between refugee population and host population in terms of available support and services). Support to host populations surrounding the camps may therefore be considered on a case by case basis.

In case a partner is intervening in more than one camp, a single agreement should be signed per partner. Proposals should be structured so that the intervention per camp and/or sector is reflected as one result in the log-frame. Consortia of different partners for different sectors in one or several regions are welcome. Response strategies are to be harmonised to the extent possible.

c) KENYA programming priorities

ECHO's support for Kenya will revolve around assistance to displaced populations, and DRR to contribute to resilience building, enhancing capacities of vulnerable populations to respond to future shocks while responding to their humanitarian needs. Specific attention will be given to areas of Kenya where access to basic services is limited due to all sorts of insecurity. In case of other emergencies, ECHO intends to continue supporting Kenya's emergency preparedness and response to ensure enhanced national capacity to react to crises.

For protracted refugee situations, ECHO will only in exceptional circumstances continue to support care and maintenance, while emphasis will be on enhanced cost effective programming and creation of opportunities for economic integration of host and refugee communities. Emphasis will also be put on protection and safeguarding asylum while looking at alternative self-reliance measures. New influx of refugees cannot be excluded and should be closely monitored in view of a potential response, including support to new settlement options.

Any ECHO-funded intervention in Kenya needs to be environmentally-friendly. Sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy will be favoured.

Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R)

EP&R is ECHO's core mandate and an essential element of disaster risk reduction. Therefore, ECHO will consider supporting an emergency intervention when necessary, as follows:

- Enhancing national and local capacity to respond to disasters, whether natural or man-made, through preparedness, i.e. enhanced assessment capacity, reinforced coordination especially at local level, prepositioning and response.
- WASH activities, e.g. water market survey, emergency response mechanisms.
- Health activities in response to displacement or epidemics, including a psychological component if needed. Links are to be made with WASH and nutrition activities. Surveillance activities should be integrated into the response.
- Protection activities with strong linkage to peace building networks.

-
- Funding to respond to small scale disasters should be embedded as emergency envelope in any DRR-oriented project in disaster prone areas.
 - Actions should consider integration with existing scalable HSNP¹⁵ mechanisms to avoid double targeting and ensure proper use of resources

Refugees

- Life-saving emergency assistance will be prioritised, especially for new arrivals.
- In general, care and maintenance will only be prioritised as: a) critical stop-gap life-saving measures; b) if deemed necessary to avoid losing gains made in previous years or c) if added value in terms of efficiency and/or effectiveness can be demonstrated. Dadaab and Kakuma will continue to be prioritised. The new settlement Kalobeyei could be considered as well.
- Support to the implementation of the Operations Continuity Plan, whereby refugee self-management and involvement of Government line departments are optimised.
- Enhancement of durable solutions for refugees in protracted situations, including alternative and/or innovative approaches contributing to building the self-reliance of the displaced population.
- ECHO will continue to advocate for further involvement of development actors in camps (Education, Nutrition).
- Strong protection monitoring is required.
- Response to SGBV is essential. Partners seeking funding to address violence must demonstrate sound strategies to address domestic violence and intra-family/intra-communal violence over and above sensitization campaigns.
- Child Protection, namely response to the situation of Unaccompanied and Separated Children (UASC) remains a particular concern among the South Sudanese refugees and innovative strategies to address the problem can be supported.
- Activities aiming to increase the self-protection mechanisms of refugee communities with a particular focus on making camps as safe as possible especially for women and children. In designing strategies for these types of interventions, care must be made to ensure that these remain protection mechanisms and do not become informal security structures.
- Support to alternative food assistance modalities including cash and/or vouchers, based on a market analysis; cash or vouchers are particularly important for increased access to fresh food. Alternative approaches including market-based interventions are preferable to BSFP. BSFP will only be supported for limited period of time, when justified by high GAM rates, and if proper implementation and monitoring capacities are in place.
- Emphasis will be placed on correct targeting and quality monitoring, including biometrics, and increasingly on introducing differentiated refugee assistance based on assessed needs (Household Economy Analysis (HEA)). Regular verification exercises are required to minimize exclusion and inclusion errors.
- Ensure adequate shelter design, respecting protection concerns. Local and/or transitional construction will be favoured.
- Adequate Operation & Maintenance (O&M) is crucial to avoid the deterioration of the existing WASH & Shelter services.

¹⁵ Hunger Safety Net Programme

Resilience / DRR

ECHO intends to continue supporting efforts aimed at aligning humanitarian and development assistance to enhance capacities of vulnerable populations and /or regions to effectively respond to repeated cycles of acute crises. Resilience building needs long-term vision and establishment of humanitarian/DRR and development strategies; actions shall aim at orienting the different initiatives toward the common goal of enhancing resilience of individuals, households, communities and county governments.

Actions will focus on:

- Focus on the Arid Lands and on all disasters with interventions targeting the most vulnerable individuals, households and communities.
- County governments will be supported in the decentralization process and in implementing their mandate to protect citizens from disasters (particularly the most exposed and vulnerable); advocating for resilience approaches to be incorporated in the counties` development plans is important. Improved quality of decentralized contingency and response plans (in particular regarding basic services at community level) and strengthened links between community contingency and action plans and district/county disaster management plans. Communities shall be assisted in increasing their capacity to incorporate their priorities into the county development plans and be vocal in influencing county governments.
- Continuous support to the on-going integration of diagnosis and treatment of acute malnutrition in the national health system with a focus on county level, aligning nutrition actions with the existing country's Food and Nutrition Security Policy, National Nutrition Action Plan and relevant national protocols and guidelines
- Focus on scalability of systems, i.e. enhancing nutrition response, that address peaks of acute malnutrition in arid and semi-arid counties.
- Support NDMA¹⁶ Early Warning Systems to trigger early action and improve the communication of early warning information to communities
- Fostering Institutional linkages and advocacy (adapting existing ASAL and DRR related policies into simple understandable formats for use by the community; follow up on animal health and the needed institutional recognition of community based animal health workers, strengthen the information sharing process on existing good practices, etc.)
- Capitalizing of lessons learnt to build an evidence-based advocacy, awareness strategy. This includes research and publications and identification of gaps to undertake operational research as relevant.

d) SOMALIA programming priorities

ECHO funding in Somalia will continue to focus on life-saving programmes for populations affected by crises, based on independent needs assessments, on the ability to access populations in need and in respect of humanitarian principles.

Conflict-affected populations in South-Central Somalia and other areas exposed to natural hazards will continue to be prioritised based on their critical humanitarian needs. Geographical prioritization and design of the response will be based not just on the IPC phases but also on the subnational INFORM risk index, the Normalized Difference

¹⁶ National Disaster Management Agency

Vegetation Index (NDVI) and other natural-hazard-specific maps and information (floods, drought). Targeting those most in need is essential, and actions aiming to better understand vulnerability through profiling of beneficiaries will be encouraged. Specifically it will be paramount to understand the vulnerability of the different population groups (pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, urban poor, protracted IDPs, recent conflict-displaced, urban evictions).

Life-saving will be the main objective, but recovery and resilience building activities may be funded provided access and monitoring are feasible. Partners must maintain efforts to increase acceptance by communities and parties to conflict through their conduct, demonstrated neutrality and quality service provision.

Due to the protracted and overlapping nature of crises in Somalia, partners will need to clearly explain their intervention strategy based on identified needs (acute or protracted), and the level of coverage of these needs by the proposed action. An explanation of linkages with other actors and between their humanitarian aid and longer-term actions will be essential. Partners will have to justify their action, and especially the way in which they target those most in need, with reference to their own recent needs assessments, in addition to publicly available data such as FSNAU or FEWSNET reports.

Partners must pay particular attention to the provisions of the *ECHO Instruction Note for ECHO staff on Remote Management* in terms of its requirements of independent assessment, staff qualifications and experience, monitoring capacity, respect of humanitarian principles, security management and the life-saving imperative. For ECHO to consider funding an action on remote management, even partially, all 7 criteria mentioned in the guidance note will need to be reflected in the Single Form, under the sections mentioned in the document. It remains paramount to ensure that all activities involving transfer of resources are properly monitored and supported by strong accountability mechanisms, with clear procedures for grievance, whistle-blowers protection, confidential handling of the information, decision-making on actions to be taken and feed-back to the donor. In the Single Form, partners need to outline explicit resources and staff involved in the accountability mechanisms and monitoring approaches.

Since 2014, ECHO has requested from its partners a quarterly update of the monitoring missions conducted in the country. Consequently, this constitutes an additional clause in the agreement.

In geographical areas in which stabilization programmes are ongoing and/or planned, ECHO will prioritise partners with a principled humanitarian agenda. A clear explanation on what stabilization activities are to be implemented, where, and how safeguards are put in place to ensure respect for these principles and separation of mandates is a prerequisite in order to avoid misperceptions.

Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP & R)

Partners should be prepared to respond quickly and flexibly to new emergency needs, in a well-coordinated and multi-sector approach.

EP & R is a priority for ECHO and must be integrated in all actions. Proposals must consider risks of disasters relevant for the location(s) and type of intervention, and integrate flexibility ("crisis modifier") and emergency response actions to be activated

rapidly in case of a new or deteriorating situation. Partners should include additional or expanded activities that may be required to respond to new crises, including a planned financial allocation, and ensure that project staff has the skills required to implement a response. Indicators on timely response should be included together with triggers or thresholds for response.

Displacement

- ECHO expects its partners to react as soon as possible to acute needs related to new displacement being IDPs, refugee or returnees.
- Protracted displacement situations need to be addressed with a view to durable solutions, through needs-based targeting taking into account gender and age requirements and host populations. To improve targeting, actions for protracted displaced people should be based on vulnerability-based criteria, while the status-based approach should be guaranteed for newly displaced. Especially for Puntland and Somaliland, strengthened search for local integration, as well as involvement of development partners and local authorities should be demonstrated.
- Support to IDP relocation, or IDP/refugee returns and reintegration must be delivered in a coordinated manner, strictly voluntary, informed and in safety and dignity. Humanitarian aid must not be used to direct population movement. Relocation of IDPs to new sites must be based on managing risk, better service provision, protection/security and linkages to urban planning. Due attention should be given to livelihoods opportunities and land rights.
- The ability to work with other actors to address protection issues, and to influence and engage with development actors will be considered favourably. Studies, profiling and other initiatives that aim to improve the understanding of the needs of IDPs and to search for solutions to protracted IDP situations can be supported.

Protection

- The issue of IDP relocation and evictions must be followed closely and adjustments to intervention strategies made accordingly after consultation with ECHO.
- The voluntary and forced returns and reintegration of Somali nationals, particularly from Kenya and Yemen but also from other crisis affected countries, should be monitored.
- Protection of children, particularly from the effects of armed conflict, as well as prevention and response to GBV is considered as crucial.
- Community-based protection interventions must have a particular focus on making IDP settlements as safe as possible especially for women and children, and protecting the rights of the displaced through advocacy and measures to address gatekeeping.

Nutrition

- Proposals should clearly indicate the other actors involved in delivering the basic nutrition services package (BSNP), the referral mechanisms and must be aligned to the nutrition cluster recommendations with demonstrated integration of BSNP. Partners experiencing problems with referral (especially to/from Stabilisation Centre, between OTP and TSFP, or with immunisation and health programmes) must put in place immediate measures to address these as well as engaging in advocacy to solve these issues.

-
- Interventions such as wet feeding or blanket supplementary feeding, will only be considered in exceptional circumstances provided a clear exit strategy is included.
 - The source of specialized nutrition supplies should be specified in the application. Buffer stocks of essential supplies may be considered, provided partners have addressed issues with pipelines (RUSF/RUTF, drugs, vaccines etc).

Food assistance and Livelihoods

- Populations and areas with high exposure to natural hazard (drought and flood) or new displacement and/or in acute food insecurity (IPC 3 and 4) will be prioritised.
- The analysis of vulnerabilities and needs shall take into account the urban/rural setting as important differences exist in terms of access to services, markets, protection needs, Minimum Expenditure Basket.
- The choice of modality (in-kind versus cash or voucher) must be explained and any conditionality duly justified with regards to the acuteness of the crisis, timing and situation. In the case of conditional cash transfers, a provision for unconditional transfers or light conditionality must be included for the most vulnerable. Market monitoring should be carried out and a change in modality must be considered in case of market fluctuations. Cash utilisation monitoring or post-distribution monitoring in the case of commodity transfer must be included and analysed in reporting.
- Transfer of resource may be multi-purpose, hence considering all needs of the household (MEB) vs incomes. Innovative approaches aiming at better understanding the economic profile of the households (including remittances) are strongly encouraged.
- While the primary objective of conditional cash transfer shall be responding to food need of the populations, infrastructures created through CFW may reduce the exposure to natural hazards (repairs of embankments, river banks canals etc) and ultimately contribute to the resilience agenda. However, to be effective, the infrastructures shall respect technical norms and may require additional resources for design, construction materials and semiskilled labourers. Specific works with clear evidence in reducing risks may be considered, however linking and creating synergies with existing resilience programs should be the preferred strategy.
- Platforms for exchange of information and coordination on amounts and mode of transfer of resources, targeting lists and enrolment criteria in the different programs (conditional vs unconditional) are strongly encouraged. Consortia for economy of scale of services like monitoring, accountability, targeting etc are also welcomed.
- Support to livelihoods strengthening or income generation must be based on proven strategies. Life-saving support will be prioritised.
- Emergency animal health treatment activities should be justified with reference to existing surveillance/early warning information and documented gaps.

Health

- Surgical capacity for weapon-related injuries should be maintained.
- Particular attention to Maternal and Child Health (MCH), including Basic Emergency obstetric Care (BEoC) and extended programme on immunisation (EPI).
- Integration of health and nutrition services.
- Coherent linkage with protection: in particular, 72 hours indicator for treatment of victims of rape, and referral systems must be included in all health proposals;

-
- Surveillance and Emergency Preparedness should be integrated and ensured with adequate stocks of pre-positioned supplies. This includes continued efforts for management of epidemic outbreaks (measles, cholera/AWD, etc).

WASH and Shelter

- Priority should be to ensure appropriate quantity and quality of water. Proposals should clarify the different sources and uses of water, for instance through infrastructure mapping in the case of IDP camps with multiple actors. Water quality testing must be ensured at household level in the case of drinking water. Water treatment at household level should privilege tried and tested solutions such as ceramic filters. Aquatab or PUR to be distributed as emergency response, not as routine activity. PUR should not be distributed prior to demonstration if not largely known in the area and Aquatab should not be used to chlorinate turbid water over 5 NTU, with a tolerance to 8-12 NTU in temporally emergency.
- Once water access is secured, focus on hygiene and proper sanitation including hand-washing facilities in densely populated areas (IDP camps), while in sparsely populated situations with high epidemic potential hygiene components would take priority. Link with other partners and the cluster for epidemic surveillance, preparedness and response, including link to medical responders.
- Focus on functionality of existing water points, instead of new constructions, and adequately consider operation and maintenance. Solar powered water points should be clearly justified with regards to technical aspects (yield) and demonstrated success of the approach in the same area (theft or destruction of panels).
- Latrine design must be provided to address protection issues in camps. Latrines should lock from the inside, and adequate lighting needs to be considered as well as segregated marks for men and women used. Alternative cash-based modality (cash or vouchers) should always be examined before resorting to temporary water supply, such as water trucking or seasonal fuel subsidy. Water stress and/or targeting should be demonstrated to justify temporary water supply, and exit strategies must be developed in advanced to ensure appropriate communication and soft hand over or phase out of the activity.
- Shelter design must be adapted to situation (new/protracted) and protection needs and security of access to land, i.e. temporary, transitional, semi-permanent. In the case of temporary shelter, shelter kits to be prioritised. In the case of transitional shelter, improved buuls or CGI to be justified with regards to context. Where feasible shelter response should seek to include appropriate settlement planning/re-organisation to facilitate space for sanitation, drainage, and general improved living conditions. Due attention must be given to livelihoods options when supporting IDP relocation.
- Emergency preparedness ensured with adequate stocks of pre-positioned supplies. Attention must be given to pre-positioning through cash-based (cash or vouchers) approaches for items of appropriate quality readily available in local markets (such as soap for example). For items such as water treatment materials, consideration should be given to supporting or developing local markets. The type of water purifier product to be supported should be very limited (one for clear water and one for turbid water). In any way whether there is different brand or type, the chlorine dosing should be the same among the product to avoid confusion among the users in case of different type of product implying different way to use it.

e) UGANDA programming priorities

ECHO's support for Uganda will focus on life saving activities and protection of the refugee population.

Any ECHO-funded intervention in Uganda needs to be environmentally-friendly. Sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy will be favoured.

For the refugees programming ECHO will consider the following:

- Life-saving care and maintenance to refugees with a strong preparedness component for continuous influx and epidemics.
- Core sectors of ECHO support to refugees will be Protection, and livelihood support if aligned with the Government self-reliance strategy.
- Other complementary interventions in Shelter, WASH, Health and Nutrition may also be considered if proved to be life-saving and based on a rigorous gaps assessment.
- Further understanding of the nutrition situation in the South Sudanese refugee population, to better inform response.
- Vulnerability analysis of the refugee population is encouraged to better understand the different needs and opportunities and inform a more targeted and tailored response.
- While the most vulnerable sub-groups remain the priority, youth may also be targeted. The youth represents an opportunity for the self-reliance of the refugee families, through their participation to the economic integration with the host communities.
- Introduce Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer (MPCT) assistance to refugees based on market analysis, HEA and innovative approaches.
- Integrating transfer of resources with initiatives supporting capacity building, business plans, and creation of grass-root savings and safety net mechanisms are encouraged.
- Integration of activities aiming to improve Information, Education and Communication, (IEC) as well as Accountability to affected population is encouraged.

f) DRR Regional

At regional level, DG ECHO will encourage the consolidation and dissemination of experience gained under previous disaster risk reduction funding decisions especially in evidence based advocacy for provision of appropriate disaster risk management; developing capacities for stronger governance; development of climate proofed infrastructures; provision of basic services for vulnerable and at risk individuals, households and communities; addressing the conflict risk; etc.

Bearing in mind that ECHO has been funded DRR projects for years in the Horn of Africa, new projects will, therefore only, be considered if the proposal includes an **added value** and an **exit strategy** with a clear timeline.

It will be important to demonstrate adequate level of synergies and complementarities with development interventions in the same area of expertise.