

TECHNICAL ANNEX

HORN OF AFRICA¹

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

Contact persons at HQ:

Horn of Africa: Sandra Descroix – sandra.descroix@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: Johan Heffinck
Johan.heffinck@echofield.eu

Heather Blackwell
heather.blackwell@echofield.eu

Jean-Marc Jouineau
jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu

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

Kenya: Jean-Marc Jouineau (for refugee files in Kenya)
jean-marc.jouineau@echofield.eu
Quentin Le Gallo (for non-refugee files)
quentin.le-gallo@echofield.eu

Ethiopia: Ségolène De Béco
segolene.de-beco@echofield.eu
Branko Golubovic
branko.golubovic@echofield.eu
Lars Oberhaus lars.oberhaus@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
Isabelle D'haudt : Isabelle.dhaudt@echofield.eu

2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 132 250 000

Breakdown as per Worldwide decision:

Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises: HA-FA: EUR 131 250 000

Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO Dis. Prep.: EUR 1 000 000

Total: EUR 132 250 000

Country/Thematic	Indicative repartition in EUR ²
Djibouti	500 000
Ethiopia	42 500 000
Kenya	13 800 000 (including 1 000 000 for DRR)
Somalia	68 750 000
Uganda	6 700 000
TOTAL	132 250 000

3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

3.1. Administrative info

Assessment round 1

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 67 250 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 3.4 and 3.2.2 (operational guidelines) for **Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda**.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2017³
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months; up to 18 months if specifically required for ensuring more resilience or self-reliance oriented actions and up to 24 months for Education in emergencies actions.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single form⁴
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 23/01/2017**⁵

Assessment round 2

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 65 000 000
- b) This assessment round corresponds to the needs described in section 0 (**Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia- regional drought**).

² A tentative indicative amount of EUR 2 500 000 million for Education in Emergency components may be implemented in the current HIP. This amount may be reviewed in the context of the 2017 allocation of funds, based on the quality of proposals received.

³ 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.

⁴ Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

⁵ 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.

- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/02/2017⁶
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: ECHO funded partners already responding to the drought
For Somalia: Preselected partners COOPI, CONCERN WORLDWIDE -IR, DRC, FAO, ICRC, OCHA, NRC, Save the Children-UK, UNICEF, WFP.
For Ethiopia, Preselected partners ACF-FR, IRC-UK, WFP, UNICEF, OXFAM-UK.
For Kenya, Preselected partners: Red Cross -UK, OXFAM-UK, UNICEF, VSF-DE, WFP.
- f) Information to be provided: Modification requests or Single form⁷
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: **by 03/04/2017**⁸

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 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 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.

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

⁸ 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.

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.

Involvement of a wider variety of actors: Where it is in the interest of the action, and without prejudice to the applicable legal framework, ECHO supports involvement of a broad range of actors engaged in humanitarian response, including local and/or international private sector.

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

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 de-confliction 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

Education in Emergencies: ECHO will support education activities that enable children's safe access to quality education⁹ 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

⁹ 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

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/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.¹⁰

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

¹⁰ 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

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

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

Infant and Young Children Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF)

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/media/publications/2014/toolkit_nutrition_en.pdf

Health

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

Water sanitation and hygiene

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

Remote Management

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

For ECHO to consider funding an action on remote management, even partially, all seven 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.

3.2.2.2. Specific guidelines

General principles

- **Needs assessments:** All proposals should incorporate a well-articulated situation and response analysis that builds on recent needs assessment, and informs and prioritises response(s) as well as the targeting criteria (to be clearly defined). Various sources of information can inform the needs assessment, but should always be complemented by direct evaluation of the needs by the partner.
- **Humanitarian access:** Humanitarian access is regularly challenged and further restricted and needs constant efforts from all stakeholders in order to be preserved. Each partner should consider integrating approaches and activities to protect and preserve humanitarian access through its interventions, including adequate knowledge and promotion of humanitarian principles as well as emphasis on quality of humanitarian assistance. Such approach should support adequate response to needs as well as improving partners' acceptance. Only partners with a suitable and adequate direct access, presence and implementation capacity and knowledge of the country/region will be considered. Support to common services, dissemination of IHL and humanitarian principles, as well as coordination efforts, including civ-mil coordination, will be considered as they can enhance access to affected populations.
- **Response to protracted situations will be considered** based, on vulnerability, including needs-based targeted approach rather than status-based blanket assistance (e.g. food assistance) and on emergency gaps analysis (e.g. new displacements in existing camps, increased morbidity/mortality, outbreaks, etc.). **LRRD** opportunities should be analyzed and promoted for responses in protracted situations in order to establish a link with longer-term engagement of development support. Sustainability and cost effectiveness of basic services should be considered when designing the intervention, including fair community participation.
- **Capacity building:** Activities related to capacity building will only be considered if they are based on a strategy that has identified specific needs directly linked to the implementation of the action and its results, and is implemented through regular supervision and monitoring and that aims at transition towards an exit. Capacity development of local partners can be considered if it aims at ensuring adequate programme scale, quality and sustainability, including respect of humanitarian principles. Capacity building related costs should be clearly identified and justified in the proposed action.
- In order to facilitate capitalisation of good practices and harmonisation of interventions, effective **coordination** with other actors and other sectors is encouraged, including through the active participation in technical working groups (such as the cash working group). It is encouraged to systematically record and disseminate successful experiences in order to inform future programming as well as current reflections and planning on resilience, including from development actors.

- ECHO-funded actions need to be environmentally-friendly (e.g. sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy) and ensure linkages with the private sector (e.g. use of new technology such as mobile technology)
- Support to alternative **aid delivery modalities** will be emphasized. **Multi-Purpose Cash Transfer** (MPCT) assistance is encouraged, based on market analysis, Household Economic Approach (HEA) and innovative approaches (e.g. using new technology).
- Partners should demonstrate correct targeting and quality monitoring, including mainstreamed biometrics verification.
- ECHO has introduced standard **Indicators** for outcomes and results. The use of a specific KRI is mandatory for all actions covering the relevant sub-sector. Partners are strongly encouraged to use KOI whenever possible and in conjunction with "Custom" indicators.

Sector-specific priorities

Protection

Interventions designed to reduce and mitigate violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse can be supported through stand-alone programmes or in an integrated manner whereby protection outcomes are achieved through other programme activities or protection sensitive targeting. Specific protection interventions that will be prioritized are listed below along with technical requirements and recommendations:

Documentation, Status and Protection of Individuals: Registration for refugees and asylum seekers as well as separated and unaccompanied minors; birth registrations for refugee and other conflict-affected children; support to restoration of lost personal documentation; restoration of family links, family tracing and reunification and monitoring of detention conditions (only by specialized agencies).

Information Management: Population movement tracking and profiling (including vulnerability profiling), screening, registration and verification exercises for refugees, IDPs and returnees as well as protection monitoring.

Information Dissemination to the affected population on relevant legal frameworks, rights and entitlements in the country of displacement and asylum and concrete possibilities for assistance. Activities aiming at IHL dissemination in conflict affected area will also be considered.

Support to voluntary return in safety and in dignity and assistance for durable solutions: interventions that aim at providing support to returns of conflict-affected communities should focus on emergency life-saving activities, and should be based on an independent verification and monitoring of the voluntary character of the return. Humanitarian interventions should aim at covering needs of most vulnerable households and should not be considered as a tool for encouraging returns. Support to well-informed decision making by information campaigns on return conditions and area of return profiles; information provision on housing, land and property claims; transport; advocacy to ensure that the principles are respected.

Prevention of and response to Violence (including GBV): *Prevention* interventions should focus on a) physical infrastructure to improve protection/reduce opportunities for violence and exposure to risks and b) sensitization and awareness-raising strategies. The latter should include a baseline and an end-line survey to systematically assess impact. *Response* interventions should focus on ensuring timely access to professional medical assistance, as well as mental health/psycho-social support. Economic assistance as direct compensation for protection violations experienced will NOT be funded. Sensitization and awareness-raising strategies might be funded, and male targeting and involvement in these activities is crucial.

Child protection, including activities addressing separation of children and families, strengthening 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. 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.

Housing, Land and Property Rights (HLP) Legal protection against forced evictions, harassment and other threats to residents and users of property, whether or not they own it. Legal aid to property restitution or obtaining documents in connection with return/local integration will also be considered.

Community-based protection interventions – activities aiming to increase the self-protection mechanisms of communities affected by conflict/displacement, and promote cohesion with host communities.

Education in emergencies

Formal, non-formal and informal education opportunities, Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD), primary and secondary education as well as technical and vocational education and training (TVET) will be considered for funding. Specific activities can include rehabilitation of classrooms and/or establishment of temporary structures, as well as provision of emergency supplies, but not construction of new permanent infrastructures. . Capacity building opportunities for education personnel should be based on in depth assessment of the needs of both education personnel and learners, should take into consideration the current capacities of education personnel, should follow well designed and contextualized training curricula and their ultimate impact on learners should be thoroughly assessed.

Integrated education actions aimed at responding to the multifaceted humanitarian needs (e.g. protection, health, nutrition, WASH) of learners will also be considered for funding. As a minimum requirement, linkages with Child Protection interventions as well as measures to ensure learners' physical safety and psychosocial wellbeing in schools must be foreseen starting from the program design phase.

The duration of the action should aim at covering the total duration of a school year and allowing the evaluation of the impact, especially in terms of retention of children in the next school cycle.

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.

- Food assistance interventions will target the most severe food insecure as a priority (IPC 3 or more areas).
- Age and group specific nutrition needs must be taken into account in HFA. For example, food in-kind distributions should always include appropriate complementary food for children aged 6 to 24 months. At the same time, breastfeeding practices must be protected from potentially harmful products and actions
- Actions for protracted displaced people should be based on vulnerability criteria (profiling) and livelihoods capacities to cover food needs (for example using HEA), while the status-based approach should be guaranteed for new influxes of displaced populations.
- Emergency livelihoods activities should be included in the response whenever possible in order to support strategies for self-reliance and livelihoods protection, and they should be based on market livelihoods and risk analysis. Interventions should be environmentally-friendly. Sustainable technical solutions including renewable energy will be favoured
- The choice and value of transfer modalities (cash, vouchers, in-kind) must be based on a sound analysis. 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. Partners should ensure coordination and complementarities with national safety nets where possible.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Nutrition

- Nutrition needs must be clearly identified by quality and representative surveys or surveillance systems. In particular ECHO will fund under-nutrition treatment projects where the prevalence is above the critical threshold, but also where justified by the analysis of the risks and vulnerabilities.
- 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.
- Nutrition causal analysis is encouraged to help identify the main determinants of under-nutrition and guide the design of specific actions.
- Coverage assessments, using globally approved methodologies, should be conducted regularly to identify barriers/boosters.
- Nutrition interventions will be implemented following the CMAM protocols in effect in each country. When circumstances do not allow, for operation research or any other situation where derogation from MoH guidelines is needed, the partner should receive 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; the partner is therefore also encouraged to develop a relevant support and capacity building strategy. The decision to intervene in substitution to the health system should be justified by needs and circumstances.
- Treatment of acute malnutrition and its complications should be provided free of charge for the beneficiaries. This can include systematic and non-systematic drugs and analysis, transport and board for caretakers, etc.
- Innovative approaches to target MAM children can be considered but should be negotiated with ECHO beforehand. MAM treatment services should always be 'linked' to a health facility where SAM services are available. Standalone MAM services will not be considered for funding.
- Partners should specify in the proposal the source of therapeutic food (whether procured with ECHO funds or granted by UN agencies) and include an indicator for stock-out
- All nutrition projects should promote IYCF practices.

Health

- Access to a package of basic health services needs to be ensured in any crisis situation. Interventions that contribute to the reduction of key morbidities and mortality, targeting vulnerable populations, will be prioritized. These should include improved free and equal access to quality primary and secondary health care, war surgery and basic and comprehensive Emergency Obstetric and Neonatal Care.
- Those health activities that have the highest potential to save the most lives during the period of assistance should be prioritized. Evidence-based community health approaches are encouraged. High impact public health mass interventions (i.e. measles vaccination + VIT A + de-worming + MUAC assessment + LLINs distribution) are encouraged for areas of high vulnerability and precarious access.

- Capacity gaps at the level of the local health system should be identified, substitution avoided as much as possible and capacity building promoted. Trainings need to be as much as possible in line with existing curricula and HR management frameworks.
- Regular supportive supervision should be ensured to guarantee the quality of the services and on the job training.
- The functionality of existing early warning, surveillance and response systems (EWARS) should be assessed systematically and, in case of need, actions to reinforce them proposed. All health projects should contribute to strengthening EWARS and to support basic control programs (i.e. EPI, TB, Malaria, HIV/AIDS).
- 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, duplication avoided and opportunities for LRRD fully explored. Partners are expected to participate actively in the health cluster meetings and activities.
- Do no harm principles should be respected especially related to universal precautions, safe transfusions, medical waste management; safety (quality assurance) and efficacy of drugs; unnecessary duplication of existing health systems and protection of human resources, premises and means (ambulances, drugs, etc.).
- Advocacy towards the integration of nutritional activities in the healthcare package will be supported.
- In refugee settings, health services should be equally accessible to surrounding host-communities

Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

- Support to emergency WASH activities 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.
- Focus on rehabilitation and repair of existing WASH systems/facilities before constructing new ones; re-establish institutional, social, and organisational structures to manage these WASH services.
- Water trucking should only be considered for the shortest time as a last resort lifesaving intervention requiring a clear and concrete exit strategy.
- Community based water supply management should be promoted. Cost recovery systems with progressive decreasing of dependency on relief should be planned as early as feasible.
- Whenever possible, WASH services for displaced populations should be connected to / integrated with those of host communities. Equity in the level of service between host and displaced communities should be pursued.
- WASH activities have a complementary value in the control and prevention of epidemics, and should be linked to epidemics response where relevant. Contingency plans should be designed and tested accordingly. Partners should record accurate epidemiological data during outbreaks, as well as provenance of the cases and water source used so as to efficiently target and assess impact of action.
- Whenever relevant, nutrition interventions should be integrated to ensure a holistic and an integrated approach to reduce vulnerabilities.
- The minimum package for WASH in Nutrition interventions should include:

- Safe water access and storage as well as appropriate sanitation in health facilities (ceramic filter, incinerator, autoclave, hygienic latrine, hand washing...)
- Hygiene kit distribution, containing water treatment product, jerry-can, and soap. Pre-distribution awareness should be provided on the use of water treatment products, followed by rigorous and regular monitoring.
- When relevant, feasible and economically realistic, provision of safe water access for the whole community could be considered, especially in the context of high incidence of malnutrition.
- Implementation of awareness campaign related to diarrheal disease and its impact on malnutrition status of children.
- Hygiene promotion strategies have to be dynamic, adapted or tailored to the context. Notice boards should be implemented at each water point and other strategic locations to enable awareness campaigns. In times of epidemics outbreak, simple direct communication should be prioritised; the use of heavy and long participatory methods, aiming at unrealistic behaviour changes, should be avoided.
- In dry lands areas, local dynamics of water use should be thoroughly considered. Appropriate sectorial practices must be applied including geophysical surveys, appropriate pumping tests (step-down), water quality tests (bacteriological, physical and chemical) and monitoring of the ground water resources. Data collected during the geophysical survey and drilling operations must be centralized.
- Latrine designs must address protection concerns, in terms of location, lighting, lockable doors, etc.
- All latrines must constitute a barrier to contamination (lid on drop hole and net on vent pipe...).
- Sanitation projects should, where possible, have a clear community-based approach with beneficiary contribution. The design of household latrines should privilege and be based on the capacity of the people to replicate it (once the pit is filled) to ensure sustainability.

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)

DRR should be integrated into all sectors that the partner will be intervening in.

Community engagement in risk analysis is encouraged to ensure communities build capacities to deal with future risks.

Aspects of conflicts, resulting from recurrent natural disasters in particular among the pastoralists, and hastened by resource sharing mainly of pasture and water, should be taken into perspective and appropriate DRR measures considered.

It is strongly recommended that partners:

- Actively participate in the DRR local/National platforms for coordination and coherence in implementation of activities. Interventions being implemented in the ASALs, should whenever possible be coordinated with those of the country specific EDE(Ending Drought Emergencies)/IDDRSI strategy, by supporting the Country Programming Papers that define key country priorities on drought Resilience.

- Support communities/local authorities to develop contingency plans that are guided by local/National Early Warning Systems that are able to inform of the foreseen climatic/hazard situations, such as the forecasted La Niña in the Region¹¹. Sector specific contingency plans should be linked to other sectors for a unified CP, as community risks are interlinked and thus have to be addressed as a whole. Advocate for DRR policies at National level and for knowledge management platforms, which have triggers for early actions such as scale up of social safety nets systems in case of emergencies. Coordinate on use of crisis modifiers/ Contingency fund with the state wherever relevant.

Country-specific priorities

a) Djibouti

Djibouti is affected by climate change, drought and structural problems which result in high food insecurity and malnutrition levels. The consequences of El Nino in 2016 contributed to further weaken already extremely fragile conditions. A predicted La Nina event may worsen the situation. Urbanization adds additional burdens on the already poor urban infrastructure and services and further constrains the limited employment opportunities existing. Though refugee numbers are relatively small, they have increased recently due to a new wave of displacement from Ethiopia (4 000 in October 2016) which is still on-going. Moreover forced repatriation especially of Ethiopian nationals is taking place from Yemen, adding more stress to the existing caseload in Obock district. Refugees place a huge burden on the limited resources of Djibouti, especially water. They are located in highly food insecure areas (Obock, Ali Sabieh) and in urban centres where limited infrastructure and services are stretched.

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

In 2017 ECHO funding in Djibouti will mainly focus on refugees. However should the humanitarian situation deteriorate such as in 2016, ECHO could consider possible funding to address other unmet needs.

For the refugees programming, ECHO will consider the following:

- taking into account newly displaced people from Ethiopia and the ones forcibly repatriated from Yemen
- In general, care and maintenance will 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;

¹¹ GHOA Climate Outlook Forum (Ghacof44) For October To December 2016 Rainfall Season; http://www.icpac.net/wp-content/uploads/GHACOF44_Statement.pdf

- 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;
- Actions for protracted displaced people in the camps should be based on vulnerability criteria, while the status-based approach should be guaranteed for new flows of refugees only. Biometrics and e-card for beneficiaries, including vulnerabilities and multi-sectoral entitlements, should be introduced in the camps.

b) Ethiopia

Emergency Preparedness and Response

In order to provide vulnerable disaster affected 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 working in close cooperation with other rapid response funds in Ethiopia. The ERM allows a response to emergencies, as they occur, and ECHO will prioritise partners 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 interventions be it in health, nutrition, WASH, NFI, shelter, or protection through technical, logistical or financial support. Vulnerable populations affected by the 2015-2016 severe drought exacerbated by the El Niño phenomenon and still in need of humanitarian assistance in 2017 may also be considered eligible for provision of assistance. However, in this case, the operational focus should be kept on multi-sectoral type of responses.

Forced displacement

Assistance to refugees and IDPs remains imperative in ECHO's strategy in Ethiopia. Priority will continue to be given to life-saving interventions.

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

With regards to refugees, support will prioritize the new influx of refugees, where and when relevant.

All proposed actions must demonstrate that the target population is clearly aligned with the latest biometrics-verified figures.

In general, camps 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.

Education in Emergencies will be prioritised in areas of continuous influx of refugees and not supported by the Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP).

However, ECHO may also deem opportune to support education in these areas should it target the children left out of the system.

Support to host populations surrounding the refugee camps may be considered on a case by case basis, taking into consideration other planned long term actions supported or to be supported by the World Bank, EU and/or others.

If 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.

Additional priorities

Response to epidemic outbreaks will be considered on a case-by-case basis (including vaccination), in strict accordance with existing international guidelines for the particular disease and focus on the life-saving / humanitarian part of the response.

Coordination and protection initiatives will remain key elements of ECHO strategy in Ethiopia and should follow a principled approach. Coordination, assessment capacity and pro-active information sharing on the context of the crisis and the needs of affected populations; joint programming of the response as well as advocacy based on basic humanitarian principles will be supported. Protection should be mainstreamed in all interventions and targeted initiatives will also be encouraged whenever relevant.

In view of the current situation (State of emergency), access to the beneficiary populations for projects' implementation and monitoring, as well as respect of the humanitarian principles, will be preconditions for funding.

c) Kenya

ECHO's support for Kenya in 2017 will mainly focus on assistance to displaced populations. In support to ECHO's exit strategy from the Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL), ECHO intends to continue supporting Kenya's emergency preparedness and response to ensure enhanced national capacity to react to other emergencies through the Disaster Risk Reduction allocation within this HIP.

Refugees: ECHO engagement in the Kenya refugee operation will focus on emergency/ life-saving programming. This is especially the case for new arrivals in the camps. Where a care and maintenance approach is adopted, this will only be considered for critical life-saving interventions, where partners can demonstrate that it is necessary to avoid losing gains made and the added value in terms of efficiency and/or effectiveness.

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.

Geographically, the encamped refugee population in Dadaab and Kakuma continues to be prioritised.

Durable solutions for refugees in protracted situations will be emphasized including support to assisted returns provided that this meets the principles of voluntariness, safety,

dignity and to areas of choice. In the current context of returns assistance, protection monitoring should also include cross border assessment of the effectiveness of the process including durability of the returns. Alternative and/or innovative approaches contributing to building the self-reliance of the displaced population can be supported. In view of the new settlement at Kalobeyei, humanitarian services may be considered as well though this has to be well elaborated in line with the development orientation of the settlement. Partners must provide a clear exit strategy at the onset. Synergies with actions funded by other donors and other EU funded instruments should be demonstrated and overlap must be avoided.

DRR and Resilience

Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) is an essential element of DRR, enhancing capacity to respond to emergency events which may include flooding, disease outbreaks or an increased influx of new arrivals. However, as mentioned already, and notably in the HIP, ECHO is engaging into an exit strategy from ASALs and will therefore limit its support to ensuring a smooth transition to development stakeholders of previously funded activities aiming at (i) enhancing national and local capacity to respond to disasters (natural or man-made) through preparedness, reinforced coordination especially at local level, prepositioning and response and (ii) provision of basic services (e.g. WASH, health, protection with strong linkage to peace building networks) in response to small scale disasters including drought, displacement or epidemics.

d) Somalia

ECHO funding in Somalia will continue to focus on **life-saving programmes** for populations affected by crises, based on independent needs assessments, access and respect of humanitarian principles. Conflict-affected populations in south and central Somalia and other areas also exposed to natural hazards will continue to be prioritised.

Geographical prioritisation and design of the response will be based not just on the IPC classification but equally on nutrition data (FSNAU/other studies) and also the sub-national INFORM risk index, the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) and other natural-hazard-specific maps and information (floods, drought). The needs-access matrix will also help to prioritise. Barriers to access include not just insecurity, but also bureaucratic impediments.

Targeting those most in need of humanitarian assistance is essential and actions able to identify the vulnerabilities through profiling of different groups will be prioritised (pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, urban poor, protracted IDPs, recent conflict-displaced, evictees, victims of violence, etc). 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 with resilience programmes and longer-term actions will be essential.

ECHO will prioritise *integrated multi-sector* actions (either within one agency or integrated, well-coordinated actions across partners). In Somalia, the protection crisis requires particular attention; protection-specific actions and protection mainstreaming in all sectors will be encouraged.

Addressing the high levels of malnutrition remains a priority, including actions to prevent as well as treat under-nutrition.

ECHO remains fully aware of the skeleton health infrastructure in Somalia and that respective actions by humanitarian organisations remain critical and life-saving. ECHO remains therefore committed to provide a contribution to the humanitarian gap-filling in the health sector, while the sector is high on the advocacy agenda for a greater involvement of development actors.

Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R). Humanitarian organisations must be able to respond quickly and in a flexible way at the onset of new crises, 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. Indicators on timely response should be included together with triggers or thresholds for response.

In Somalia, 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 (please see general section).

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. Solid and sophisticated risk management systems are essential in Somalia.

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 prerequisite.

Recovery and resilience building activities may be funded, provided access and monitoring are feasible; priority would be given to drought-related recovery initiatives, also in the context of El Niño and La Niña. Moreover, durable solutions for displaced populations will be considered, including local integration and voluntary returns to places of origin or choice.

e) Uganda

ECHO's support for Uganda will focus on lifesaving and protection activities for displaced population. Specific attention will be given to the South Sudan refugee crisis with lifesaving activities. ECHO will continue supporting other refugee caseloads in Uganda with more self-reliance actions while maintaining emergency response capacity in case of unforeseen crisis (e.g. 2017 DRC Election).

ECHO will focus on:

- Life-saving care and maintenance with a strong preparedness component for continuous influx of refugees.
- Integrated programming (e.g. Shelter, WASH, Health, Food Security, Nutrition and Protection) in full respect of the Government self-reliance strategy, allowing early engagement in livelihoods support.
- Education in Emergencies (EiE) with a strong emphasis on child protection
- Youth programming, aiming at supporting self-reliance of the refugee families, through youth participation to the economic integration with the host communities, should be well articulated with other development funded interventions (e.g. under the EUTF) in terms of livelihood and vocational skills training activities. Youth programming to
- Supporting surveillance and early warning systems (e.g. nutrition, epidemic, drought)
- Vulnerability analysis of the refugee population to better understand the needs and opportunities and inform a more targeted and tailored response.
- Integrating transfer of resources with initiatives supporting capacity building, business planning, and creation of grass-root savings and safety net mechanisms.
- Integration of activities aiming at improving coordination and Accountability to Affected Population (AAP).