



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)

Technical Guidance on the use of the revised DG ECHO Education in Emergencies KOI and KRI

Document purpose

This Guidance Note provides partners with key information when selecting and applying the revised Education in Emergencies (EiE) KOI and KRI.

Overview

The EiE KOI and KRI were revised in 2018-2019 to align with the new policy framework for EiE in DG ECHO, particularly the 2019 Staff Working Document on [Education in Emergencies in EU-funded Humanitarian Aid Operations](#). Throughout 2019 draft KOI and KRI were piloted by partners, providing feedback periodically and also through a formal consultation in Brussels in July 2019. The revised KOI and KRI reflect existing global indicators (particularly those used by the Global Education Cluster, Education Cannot Wait and the Child Protection AoR), and were developed in consultation with a wide range of relevant actors¹. The full list of EiE KOI and KRI can be found on the [DG ECHO Partners Website, under the chapter “Sectors, subsectors, KOI and KRI”](#).

Overall guidance

- When an indicator from the KOI/KRI list is relevant to the proposed action, partners should use the DG ECHO KOI or KRI, rather than inserting custom indicators.
- The ‘source/method of data collection’ column should be completed by the partner. The text in this section can be deleted and additional text can be added, specific to the proposed action. Partners should ensure that tools/surveys/reports listed in this section will be the ones actually used for the proposed action (deleting reference to any other tools). Partners should provide information on the scale of data collection (sample or population-based) and the planned timing and frequency.
- Levels of disaggregation are specified for each KOI and KRI. For gender and age disaggregation please refer to the DG ECHO [Gender and Age Marker Toolkit](#). For disaggregation by disability please refer to the DG ECHO [Operational Guidance The Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in EU-funded Humanitarian Aid Operations](#).
- The ‘comments’ field can be used by partners to describe any contextually-relevant information to be considered when reporting against and interpreting a specific indicator. For example, if conflict related issues, operational constraints or locally agreed terminology need further explanation this field can be used.

¹ Including but not limited to: DG ECHO partner organisations (NGOs and UN agencies), the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, Education Cannot Wait, the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack.

- DG ECHO has not included standard indicators for certain priority issues. This is not a reflection of DG ECHO priorities, but instead reflects a lack of available tools at the time of piloting. In the absence of globally available, validated and ready-to-use tools for humanitarian contexts, it was decided to rely on proxy indicators and provide room for partners to propose their own custom indicators if they have appropriate tools and capacities in place. Based on this, partners who have existing tools should include custom indicators for the following priority areas:
 - Improved learning outcomes
 - Improved well-being outcomes
- Partners should include custom indicators for any other significant activities/outcomes not covered by the DG ECHO KOI and KRI. Examples of activities that will require custom indicators include:
 - Projects that use cash for education as a modality
 - Projects with significant capacity building of the humanitarian response to EiE, including projects which aim to improve coordination of the education response
 - Projects relating to the protection of education from attack
 - Projects including EiE in rapid response mechanisms, disaster preparedness activities or similar preparedness/early responses.
- When EiE is part of integrated or multi-sectoral projects, where some results relate to other sectors, partners should identify KOI and KRI from the relevant sectors (e.g. WASH, health, DRR).
- Indicators on protective education services related to child protection activities are within the scope of an EiE response. For projects with integrated EiE and child protection responses, where **specialised child protection** responses are included in the action, partners should report against the DG ECHO Protection KOI and KRI.

KOI Guidance

- At least one KOI should be used when an action has one or more education results, and thus an expected education outcome.
- DG ECHO has two options of KOI for EiE:
 - *% targeted girls and boys who are retained in education at the end of the action.* This indicator is recommended for all DG ECHO funded EiE actions that include children as direct beneficiaries.
 - *Non Formal Education: % targeted girls and boys for non-formal education who transition into formal education or advance to the next level of non-formal education.* This indicator is recommended for NFE projects targeting out of school children. If a partner chooses **not** to include this indicator, it is recommended that they instead include the KRI: *Number of targeted girls and boys who complete the academic year or NFE course/level.*

KRI Guidance

- At least one KRI must be selected per EiE sub-sector in the single form. Additional KRI should also be selected where relevant to the action.
- The definition of each KRI provides clear guidance on how to interpret and report against each KRI. Partners should take care to align to the terminology, particularly for terms that relate to access, enrolment, retention, attendance, transition etc.
- For KRI: Protective education services: Number of girls and boys referred to specialised services (e.g. child protection, health, MHPSS): At proposal stage, in the indicator comments field, please provide

information on the below points. Where this information cannot be provided, partners should identify alternatives in consultation with protection experts:

- 1) Which sectors/services/assistance are functional referral pathways/agreements in place for (whether humanitarian organisations, government agencies, or others), and if there are gaps what efforts will be made to mitigate these;
- 2) A functional and effective referral pathway/system need to be described in terms of the expected times of feedback (minimum would be that the referral is acknowledged by the receiving NGO/best practice would be an actual feedback loop), and the specific way in which the referral is made (what is meant by a referral);
- 3) Existing capacities/expertise of partners involved in the pathway (in particular confidentiality and data protection);
- 4) System for following up on referrals made and existing/to be developed information sharing protocols;
- 5) Planned dissemination/capacity building for new partners/actors to be added in the pathways throughout the action.
- 6) At reporting stage:
- 7) Number of persons must be disaggregated by age, sex and disability;
- 8) Number of persons must be disaggregated by sector/ service type/assistance type;
- 9) Provide information on referrals per organisation or service provider referred to;
- 10) Please include lessons learned on successful or failed referrals.