

## TECHNICAL ANNEX

### Southeast Asia and the Pacific

#### 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).

#### 1. CONTACTS

Operational Unit in charge	ECHO/B5
Contact persons at HQ	Myanmar, Thailand and DRR/resilience: Anne-Francoise Moffroid <a href="mailto:anne-francoise.moffroid@ec.europa.eu">anne-francoise.moffroid@ec.europa.eu</a> Philippines: Anne Marie Renner, <a href="mailto:anne-marie.renner@ec.europa.eu">anne-marie.renner@ec.europa.eu</a>
Contact persons at field level	Myanmar : Nicolas Louis, <a href="mailto:nicolas.louis@echofield.eu">nicolas.louis@echofield.eu</a> Thailand : Pedro Luis Rojo Garcia, <a href="mailto:pedro-luis.rojo@echofield.eu">pedro-luis.rojo@echofield.eu</a> Philippines: Roman Majcher, <a href="mailto:roman.majcher@echofield.eu">roman.majcher@echofield.eu</a> DRR/resilience : Edward Turvill, <a href="mailto:edward.turvill@echofield.eu">edward.turvill@echofield.eu</a>

#### 2. FINANCIAL INFO

Indicative Allocation: EUR 25 400 000	
Specific Objective 1 - Man-made crises:	HA-FA: EUR 13 300 000
Specific Objective 2 - Natural disasters:	HA-FA: EUR 6 500 000
Specific Objective 4 - DIPECHO	Dis. Prep.: EUR 5 600 000
Total:	HA-FA: EUR 25 400 000

### 3. PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1. Administrative info

##### **Assessment round 1: Myanmar and Thailand**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 12 700 000.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: assistance to actions in Myanmar and displaced population in temporary shelters in Thailand (as explained in section 3.4 of the HIP).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>1</sup>. Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>2</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 10/12/2015<sup>3</sup>.

##### **Assessment round 2: DRR/resilience**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 6 200 000 of which EUR 5 600 000 from the Dis. Prep. Budget-line and EUR 600 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: DRR/resilience interventions (as explained in section 3.4 of the HIP).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>4</sup>. Actions will start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 18 months.
- e) Potential partners: All ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>5</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 14/01/2016<sup>6</sup>.

##### **Assessment round 3: Philippines**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 500 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0. of the HIP (Philippines typhoons).

---

<sup>1</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>2</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>3</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

<sup>4</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>5</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>6</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/01/2016<sup>7</sup>. Actions may start from 01/01/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO partners present in the affected areas and actively involved in the emergency phase
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>8</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 17/02/2016<sup>9</sup>.

#### **Assessment round 4: Fiji**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 1 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0. of the HIP (Fiji - Cyclone Winston).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 20/02/2016. Actions may start from 20/02/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO partners present in the affected areas and actively involved in the emergency phase.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>10</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 24/03/2016<sup>11</sup>.

#### **Assessment round 5: Papua New Guinea**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0. of the HIP.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/04/2016. Actions may start from 01/04/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO partners present in the affected areas, already actively involved in the response to the drought and with the capacity to deliver food assistance at scale and fast.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 02/06/2016.

---

<sup>7</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>8</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>9</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

<sup>10</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>11</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

## **Assessment round 6: Vietnam**

- a) Indicative amount: up to EUR 2 000 000 from the HA-FA budget-line.
- b) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: as described in section 0. of the HIP (Vietnam - Drought).
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/05/2016. Actions may start from 01/05/2016.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: ECHO partners present in the affected areas and actively involved in the emergency phase.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form<sup>12</sup>
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 30/06/2016<sup>13</sup>.

### **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.

### **3.3. Operational guidelines:**

#### *3.3.1. General Guidelines*

In the design of your operation, ECHO policies and guidelines need to be taken into account:

*The EU resilience communication and Action Plan*

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

*Food Assistance*

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

*Nutrition*

---

<sup>12</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to ECHO using APPEL

<sup>13</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.

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

#### *Cash and vouchers*

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

#### *Protection*

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

#### *Children in Conflict*

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

#### *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](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](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](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/prevention_preparedness/DRR_thematic_policy_doc.pdf)

#### *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.

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/>.

#### *Remote Management*

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

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, 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. Thus, the assistance needs to be adapted to their specific needs - otherwise it risks being off-target, failing its objectives or even doing harm to beneficiaries. It is also a matter of compliance with the EU humanitarian

mandate and the humanitarian principles, in line with international conventions and commitments. All project proposals/reports must demonstrate integration of gender and age in a coherent manner throughout the Single Form, including in the needs assessment and risk analysis, the logical framework, description of activities and the gender-age marker section. The Gender-Age Marker is a tool that uses four criteria to assess how strongly ECHO funded humanitarian actions integrates gender and age consideration. For more information about the marker and how it is applied please consult the Gender-Age Marker Toolkit

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

**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, but also in its substantive sections, i.e. the logical framework, result and activity descriptions, etc.

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, where considerations on inter-communal relationships are of utmost importance for the protection of the affected population. 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.

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.

**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.

**Education:** ECHO will support education activities that enable children's access to quality education<sup>14</sup> in ongoing conflicts, complex emergencies and early recovery phases.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Commission adhere to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child that defines a 'child' as a person below the age of 18.

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), 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](#).

**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 all hazards, including natural, 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.

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

**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. Partners are requested to provide information on how their actions are integrated with other actors present in the same area.

**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 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, 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 – to address why people are vulnerable, to avoid re-occurrence and to better manage risks, 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, livelihood opportunities, innovative approaches to strengthening self-resilience, etc.); iii) integrating disaster risk reduction and preparedness into response, recovery and development interventions.

**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.

**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. 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.

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

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

The choice of modality for a resource transfer should be common across sectors and follow the same essential response analysis described in ECHO's Cash and Vouchers Guidelines. DG ECHO recommend to consider the use of cash based modalities whenever is appropriate and feasible. In any case, a proposal must always show that a clear situation and response analysis was performed for the appropriate selection of the transfer modality proposed. It is strongly recommend for this purpose to adhere to the principles provided in the DG ECHO Cash and Voucher Guidance. This includes the use of the decision tree and respect the minimum set of information to be provided in a proposal.

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 ([http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept\\_paper\\_common\\_top\\_line\\_principles\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/concept_paper_common_top_line_principles_en.pdf)) for more details of ECHO's position.

A number of essential steps would be expected in the design of a MPCT project:

1. Multi-sectoral assessment to determine priority needs of people in need of assistance;
2. Analysis of markets and services to understand which prioritised needs can be met through purchase, and to what extent can markets and services adapt to absorb higher demand;
3. Calculation of a minimum expenditure basket on the basis of the needs that can be met from the market/ services. This may include standard (SPHERE) quantities or qualities of the need that is intended to be purchased by a beneficiary, such as food (2100 Kcal); water (15l/p/d) etc.
4. Development of a targeting system and targeting criteria;
5. Understanding of the deficit that targeted families are experiencing or put another way, to what extent can targeted families meet their basic needs? This might involve an HEA-type analysis, or a simple estimate of income (usually derived through estimating average expenditures);
6. Estimate the value of transfer that will enable targeted households to meet their basic needs alongside their own resources (at the simplest, the MEB minus income);
7. MPCT require a high level of coordination across sectors and agencies. Cost efficiency gains should be optimised through excellent coordination and the establishment of a single programme approach that streamlines assessment,

- beneficiary registration, targeting, a common delivery mechanism (preferably electronic) and monitoring.
8. MPCT in emergencies should exploit social protection systems where possible and appropriate.
  9. In terms of accountability, partners should use standard outcome indicators for each of the sectors included in the MPCT at the specific objective level of the logframe. A more general well-being indicator such as CSI would also be helpful as a means to determine whether broader improvements to the lives of beneficiaries have been achieved.
  10. Protection and gender analysis should be integral to the design and implementation of MPCT.

### 3.3.2. *Specific guidelines*

#### **DRR/Resilience**

ECHO's DRR/resilience approach in Southeast Asia has, since 1996, aimed at providing most vulnerable populations and communities with sound technical solutions to improve their preparedness for natural hazards. With more and more solutions and practices being adopted by local and national authorities, in 2016 priority will be given to: a) consolidate achievements made during previous DIPECHO programmes, b) urban DRR and resilience actions, c) regional actions in Southeast Asia.

This HIP aims to support specific DRR/Resilience actions as follows:

- A. Regional actions covering ASEAN countries;
- B. In-country or multi-country actions in: **Cambodia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar, Philippines and Vietnam.**

Detailed guidance for partners' proposals (regional and in-country/multi-country) is compiled here below.

#### **A. Regional actions covering ASEAN countries.**

##### **Background**

The partnership between the European Union and ASEAN has been long-standing. In 2015, it was formalised in a Joint Communication<sup>15</sup>, 'The EU and ASEAN: a partnership with a strategic purpose', which states: "the EU has a strategic interest in strengthening its relationship with the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). The EU is one of the leading financial supporters of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA) Centre, while also enhancing its links with national crisis response structures, e.g. in Myanmar/Burma and the Philippines. Supporting the post-2015 development of the "ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response" (AADMER) and in line with the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, the EU and ASEAN will focus on increasing the resilience of

---

<sup>15</sup> Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council (May 2015)

populations to meet disaster challenges as well as on the reduction of risk, notably in urban settings.” One specific initiative flagged by the Communication is “developing EU-ASEAN collaboration on disaster management, notably through stronger operational links, expanded training activities and participation in the ARF disaster relief exercises and by focusing on the implementation of the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction.”

ECHO has been instrumental in recent years in supporting the involvement of Civil Society Organisations in the AADMER process through the AADMER Partnership Group. More recently, funding was allocated to initiate activities under the priority project ‘ASEAN School Safety Initiative (ASSI)’.

Given the new global framework for DRR defined in Sendai (March 2015) and the need to capitalise on DIPECHO programmes implemented since 1996, these two matters will also be considered.

#### Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Support to the roll out of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) work programme 2016-2020 (e.g. Urban DRR/Resilience, comprehensive School Safety focusing on natural hazards...).
2. Support to the translation and dissemination of the Sendai DRR Framework.
3. Capitalization and dissemination of the outcomes of the DIPECHO programmes in Southeast Asia since 1996.

#### **B. In-country or multi-country actions in: Cambodia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar, Philippines and Vietnam.**

#### Background

Despite a number of DIPECHO initiatives implemented in urban settings over previous funding cycles, very limited attention has so far been given to developing models and tools specific to the challenges posed by urban disaster risk. ECHO intends to further invest in this area, giving the fast urbanization trends and growing disaster risks in Southeast Asia, through pilot projects and the capitalization and dissemination of their good practices.

#### Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Actions that provide critical learning and solutions for the most vulnerable and at-risk city dwellers (piloting actions in urban DRR/resilience).
2. Actions aimed at consolidating achievements made during previous DIPECHO programmes (limited to certain countries, see below).

Although in-country specific proposals can be considered, sharing lessons and good practices between countries of the region (multi-country proposals) would be considered an added value.

For detailed guidance on ECHO priorities per country, further details are provided below.

### **Cambodia: DIPECHO consolidation and piloting urban community-based DRR**

ECHO has been funding DRR actions in Cambodia for many years and partners have a long-standing presence in the country, with a solid understanding of the operational context. The recent adoption of Cambodia's National Disaster Management Law provides increased momentum for ECHO partners to consolidate and replicate proven CBDRM methodologies to support the Government's effective operationalization of the law, in line with key priorities outlined in the Sendai framework for Action 2015-2030. Rapid urbanization and unregulated construction are increasing the frequency and nature of hazards to which vulnerable populations in urban and peri-urban areas are exposed. Significant knowledge and capacity gaps exist in this regard and there is a need for partners to engage in small-scale piloting of proven CBDRR techniques within urban contexts, in order to map key vulnerabilities and hazards and provide Government, development donors and the private sector with a menu of potential long-term investment options.

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals:**

1. Consolidation and replication of effective CBDRR actions initiated during the previous DIPECHO cycles (for example, consolidating evidence-based knowledge on drought-resilient agriculture techniques and savings groups, scale up of mobile Early Warning Systems, etc.)
2. Small-scale piloting of relevant CBDRR techniques in urban contexts.
3. Advocating for increased Government leadership and budgetary support for DRR at relevant levels.

### **DPRK : Promoting rural resilience through small-scale Community-Based Disaster Risk Management**

According to OCHA, floods and flash floods are the biggest natural threats in DPRK. Given the extreme underdevelopment of rural areas, floods have potential devastating results on people's food security and livelihoods. The provinces of Jagang, Ryanggang are said to be among the most vulnerable, with the provinces of North Hamgyong, South Hamgyong, Kangwon and North Hwanghae also at high risk of natural disasters. The same provinces are also exposed to the damaging effects of droughts.

Although being a relatively new concept in the country, DRR is a growing concern and authorities have expressed their interest to engage with institutions such as UNISDR and others.

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals:**

Proposals that pilot community-based DRR (addressing floods and drought risks in particular) in one or more of the high-risk provinces mentioned above, aiming at protecting rural populations and their livelihoods.

Given local particularities, for proposals to be accepted it is essential that access to the beneficiaries is possible on a regular basis, both by partners' international staff and ECHO staff.

### **Lao PDR: Replication, consolidation and institutionalization of DIPECHO achievements**

Since the first DIPECHO action plan in 1996, ECHO has observed slow but significant progress in piloting CBDRR models and building local and national capacity at institutional level. However, significant acceleration of progress must be made if the country is to keep up with its neighbours and its regional and global commitments under ASEAN, ADDMER and the post Sendai Framework for Action. DRR/Resilience programming in Lao PDR is currently at an important juncture, where effective piloting of CBDRR models and technical briefs on risk and damage assessments, gender mainstreaming and comprehensive school safety training packages have been produced and shared with relevant authorities and must now be consolidated and institutionalized. An effective conduit for ensuring that this happens is the national DRR platform, which is expected to be operational by the end of 2015. This is a crucial step towards ensuring that local level initiatives are integrated and replicated at scale and that the necessary legislative and policy frameworks are in place. It is expected that through the platform, other line ministries will be encouraged to incorporate DRR mainstreaming into their plans and that the platform will provide a unified voice to articulate longer term funding requirements and gaps to the Government, development donors and private sector.

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals:**

1. To ensure a fully functioning and accountable National DRR platform to validate and institutionalize technical guidelines in areas such as:
  - a. school safety,
  - b. post-disaster needs assessments,
  - c. early warning mechanisms,
  - d. improved preparedness and response planning.
2. Consolidation and replication of community-based DRR interventions, targeting high-risk areas and focusing on the most vulnerable populations (conducted in parallel to capacity-building of newly hired DDMCC staff, to address institutional knowledge gaps and foster stronger cross-sector collaboration).

### **Mongolia: Urban disaster preparedness in Ulaanbaatar.**

The country is very prone to earthquakes, industrial disasters, or calamities relating to climate change. If confronted with a major earthquake or an industrial catastrophe in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia may be faced with an unprecedented crisis, given that over 50% of the country's population now lives in the capital city.

The level of vulnerability varies for various types of emergencies: Ulaanbaatar's middle class would be likely to suffer particularly from the outcomes of an earthquake; whereas the poorer recently arrived in the big city and living in its outskirts, would be more likely to suffer from devastation brought by industrial catastrophes or flash floods. The dispersed rural populations although poor, are relatively well prepared to withstand hazards relating to harsh winters (dzud) and to some extent droughts - given the DRR investments that have been undertaken in rural Mongolia so far.

There is a growing understanding from the authorities, civil protection agencies and civil society organisations, of the overwhelming challenges and capacity shortcomings in case

of a major earthquake, and thus there is willingness to upgrade overall capacity. The lack of funding instruments focusing on DRR (both from the government and international donors) is an obstacle in addressing preparedness gaps.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

Proposals limited to Ulaanbaatar, aiming at:

- building urban disaster response capacity to earthquakes, industrial catastrophes and floods (e.g. NEMA, Mongolian Red Cross);
- basic pre-positioning of life-saving items to be used during an emergency.

ECHO encourages initiatives that seek to engage with the UN System, EU Member States and other Commission services, towards the promotion of sustainable resilience strategies that prepare the capital to deal with earthquakes and other hazards.

**Myanmar**

ECHO has been among the first donors to support targeted DRR projects in Myanmar, a dynamic that is now firmly being established. Previous DIPECHO programmes have built a very solid and multi-sector consortium of qualified agencies. The Consortium is delivering quality integrated and inclusive CBDRR, but acute needs are far from being covered in the country. The strong institutionalization component allows, among other things, to initiate the early phase of what may eventually become a national earthquake and tsunami strategy.

Additionally, DRR has proven to be a natural and uncontroversial entry point for community dialogue in Rakhine State in a context of community tension and segregation.

Priorities for ECHO proposals:

1. Coastal Communities: Consolidation and exit strategy in communities targeted since DIPECHO VIII. Follow-up support to communities that initiated the process under DIPECHO IX.
2. Rakhine State: Follow-up support to community-based disaster risk management in urban and rural communities. Further engage and capitalise on DRR and Protection. Nutrition sensitive programming is to be considered.
3. Urban Risk Reduction in Yangon City: expand on Earthquake Risk Assessment; Assessment of Hospitals; Mass Casualty Management; work on Township/Local Earthquake Emergency Response/Preparedness Plans and School Safety. Synergies may be possible under a regional or multi-country action.
4. Scale-up DRR Awareness Raising: support initiatives under the DRR Working Group on Information, Education and Communication, including impact measurement; explore mass awareness campaigns through various media.
5. Capacity development of technical staff of RRD and other relevant institutions to increase the number of key staff able to champion DRR/Resilience Agenda at different levels.
6. Support the DRR Working Group to support the facilitation of a Post-Sendai Visioning Exercise.



### **Philippines: Pilot Urban Risk Reduction**

During past DIPECHO programmes, ECHO engaged in a number of DRR initiatives focusing on community based disaster preparedness as well as advocacy, aiming to improve overall DRR governance. These projects are now being replicated by other organisations/institutions and are part of an integral disaster preparedness system. However, the poor urban population remains especially vulnerable, and further attention is required to address the needs of those exposed to disasters in urban areas.

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals:**

Beyond the 'hardware' element, ECHO expects proposals to contribute to practical solutions to the needs of urban populations in the immediate aftermath of natural disasters in urban zones. Pilot proposals should also aim to provide learning and examples for replication and promotion of good practices for development programmes (such as the Asian Development Bank, UN Habitat, DEVCO and agencies of the Government of the Philippines).

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals** (limited to the National Capital Region) are:

1. Initiatives to pilot alternative temporary shelters for the most vulnerable urban poor people. Dissemination of successful practices at the end of the project.
2. Capacity building of urban poor communities on disaster preparedness and localised response (including homogeneous early warning systems).
3. Support to local structures, mechanisms, and policies on institutionalising urban resilience.

### **Vietnam: Piloting urban risk reduction**

ECHO's engagement in Vietnam has yielded significant results at both community and national level, in addition to enhancing partner's capacity in country. Vietnam has made remarkable progress in developing DRR frameworks and policies. A number of important laws and strategies to address DRR and Climate Change Adaptation have been passed and several Ministries and sectors represented in the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control have developed action plans for the mainstreaming of DRR in their sectors. In the light of the progress made, an exit strategy from previous country-specific actions focusing on supporting the national CBDRM program was initiated and will be completed in 2015. However, significant gaps remain as regards to urban disaster risk preparedness and Vietnam represents a unique opportunity to pilot proven techniques, particularly in the areas of CBDRR and safe housing, focusing on the needs of extremely vulnerable people living in urban and peri-urban areas.

#### **Priorities for ECHO proposals:**

Interventions should focus on providing policy makers, urban planners and long term development partners with a range of tested methodologies and intervention tools to improve vulnerability risk mapping and response capacity for at-risk urban communities.

Priorities are as follows:

1. Identifying key hazards and capacity gaps at both community and institutional level within urban and/or peri-urban areas.

2. Implementing small-scale proven CBDRR and safe housing techniques in urban areas and/or peri-urban areas, addressing the needs of the most vulnerable, at risk urban communities.