Purpose

Ensuring a systematic inclusion of resilience considerations in ECHO funded projects

Monitor DG ECHO’s performance in supporting resilience

*The Marker ensures coherence with the EU policy on Resilience*
# Resilience Marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience Marker Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not sufficiently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses, vulnerabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Is the project risk informed? Does the project include adequate measures to ensure it does not aggravate risks or undermine capacities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Does the project include measures to build local capacities (beneficiaries + local institutions)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Does the project take opportunities to support long-term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerability and risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECHO – 45 staff, 450 Single forms

"Useful, a good idea, a positive addition and a beneficial tool for partners to reflect on their performance."

Q: Summary question: What is your overall opinion of the marker?

- Positive 18
- Neutral 10
- Negative 8

Q: Do the marker questions capture the concept of resilience?

- Yes 24
- No 10
- Don’t know 11
Voice

Resilience marker generating constructive interaction with ECHO representative

- Not applicable: 27%
- Not at all: 27%
- Yes, a little: 41%
- Yes, very much: 5%

Interest in ECHO training or workshop on the resilience marker

- Yes, very much: 11%
- Yes, a little: 18%
- Not necessary: 71%
- Not applicable: 2%

Overall view on the introduction of the resilience marker

- Not applicable: 2%
- Strongly disagrees: 5%
- Somewhat disagrees: 9%
- Neither agrees or disagrees: 9%
- Somewhat agrees: 43%
- Strongly agrees: 32%
Limitations....

- Relevance to conflict response
- Time
- No difference when there was already a good dialogue with partners
- Projects were of a high enough standard already
- Can the marker assess quality?

VOICE partners

- ECHO expectations – adequate?
- How the marker will be used?

.................................dialogue/50%
Recommendation - Continue

- Guidance altered
- Expectations are context specific – HIPs, technical annexes, ECHO TAs
- Questions – capacities
- Difference = follow up dialogue

Training options

- ECHO FPSA – e-single form
- Joint with Gender age marker