

Final proposal for revised Grand Bargain 3.0 self-reporting

1. Introduction

In the [Grand Bargain 2023-2026 framework](#), signatories agreed to undertake a revision of the annual self-reporting process. The aim of [this revision exercise](#) is to propose a **simplified, more targeted self-reporting framework which will allow for greater comparability and accountability while minimising the administrative burden on signatories**. The proposal below sought to achieve this aim by:

- Removing indicators for commitments not within the focus of the current Grand Bargain framework from annual self-reporting;
- Improving the quality of indicators for continued objectives so signatories can more feasibly report against them and so that they yield more comparable data;
- Critically examining whether new indicators would be meaningful for newly added objectives given the stage of discussions on each of them.

Development Initiatives (DI) have led the revision process, with support from Victoria Metcalfe (lead author of the Grand Bargain Annual Independent Reports (AIR)). The following proposal is based on an initial review of the existing Grand Bargain indicators, previous self-reporting data and caucus outcome statements along with informal consultations with signatories around specific priority areas. In total, 32 signatories were consulted as part of this process as well as additional consultations with the Grand Bargain Ambassadors and Facilitation Group. All Grand Bargain signatories were given the opportunity to reach out directly to DI to input as part of this consultation phase. Feedback was requested from all Grand Bargain signatories in three virtual feedback sessions and in writing. Over 280 points of feedback received from 38 signatories were considered in the review of the initial proposal of the revised self-reporting indicators. **The content of the feedback was incorporated in the proposed indicators where feasible, except for specific points that require further consultation among signatories and that are highlighted throughout below.**

This document sets out the final version of the proposed revision to the self-reporting process, structured by:

1. The self-reporting process specific to the objectives within focus areas. There are two focus areas in the 3.0 framework with a number of corresponding objectives on different policy issues (focus area one: quality funding, localisation, participation; focus area two: anticipatory action, the nexus and innovative financing) and two cross-cutting priorities (gender and risk sharing).
2. The self-reporting process shared across commitment areas.

The [annex](#) includes a summary of the proposed indicators by Grand Bargain constituency. The Grand Bargain secretariat will adapt the self-reporting process for a small number of signatories – for example, the World Bank or OECD – to better reflect their distinct institutional structure and mandate. As explained in more detail below, there are no proposed indicators for the focus area two at this stage, given ongoing policy discussion among signatories to further clarify and agree on objectives within the Grand Bargain on anticipatory action, innovative financing and the nexus. **Indicators for focus area two will be added for future self-reporting cycles once those discussions have made sufficient progress.**

While the proposed indicators are reflective of the commitments in the focus of the Grand Bargain 3.0 framework, **the Independent Monitoring Report in 2026 will review progress among signatories across all Grand Bargain commitments**, including those that are not part of the streamlined annual self-reports (see [here](#) for a list for indicators no longer part of self-reports). There will also be separate and complementary accountability processes for Grand Bargain caucuses to ensure that their outcomes statements are put into action.

DI was additionally requested to highlight possible ways to publicly report on Grand Bargain objectives outside of the annual Grand Bargain self-reporting process. Grand Bargain signatories have committed to reporting funding data publicly and transparently to platforms such as OCHA's FTS and the IATI standard, which have the functionality to be able to monitor several Grand Bargain funding indicators in close to real-time. It is highlighted below for which objectives this reporting is already possible. If reported consistently and comprehensively, this would provide valuable, disaggregated data to independently verify self-reports or eliminate the need to annually self-report on certain indicators altogether.

2. Self-reporting specific to Grand Bargain objectives:

Objective 1.1: Quality funding

Previous indicators

The narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 1 (quality funding).

The spreadsheet self-reporting template included the following quantitative indicators:

- Total volume, and % of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organisations that are multi-year.
- Total volume, and % change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organisations that are multi-year.

- Total volume, and % of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organisations to implementing partners.
- Total volume, and % of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by aid organisations that are unearmarked/softly earmarked.
- Total volume, and % of unearmarked/softly earmarked humanitarian funding that is allocated by aid organisations, with flexibility, to implementing partners.

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

1.1. Reach a critical mass of quality funding that allows an effective and efficient response, whilst ensuring visibility, transparency, and accountability.

Proposed Outcomes:

- A **quantifiable increase in the provision of flexible and multi-year funding** (including 'core funds'), and promotion and expansion of the variety of 'flexibilities' provided by donors, based on an agreement of the 'critical mass' of flexible funding necessary from donors to enable a step-change in how aid organisations can maximise their efficiency and effectiveness.
- Comprehensive tracking and reporting** (using agreed common criteria/definitions and reported to FTS/IATI on how much/what proportion of flexible and multi-year funding is allocated onwards with what flexibilities), and provision of 'real-time' data/analysis from aid organisations to their institutional donors, resulting in increased transparency of funding flows and visibility of flexible and multi-year funding.

Proposed indicators

1. Multi-year funding

Reporting should be aligned with the endorsed [definition of multi-year funding within the Grand Bargain](#) as funding with a duration of 24 months or more based on the start and end dates of the original formal funding agreement, which reflects the [definition from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) (OECD).

| | Volumes of multi-year funding provided to partners, including local and national actors, and % of total funding provided to partners as multi-year funding. | Volumes of humanitarian multi-year funding received and % of total humanitarian funding received as multi-year funding. |
|---------------|---|---|
| Donors | <p><i>[Quantitative]</i></p> <p><i>The total funding refers to the total volume of humanitarian funding</i></p> | |

| | Volumes of multi-year funding provided to partners, including local and national actors, and % of total funding provided to partners as multi-year funding. | Volumes of humanitarian multi-year funding received and % of total humanitarian funding received as multi-year funding. |
|---|--|--|
| | <i>contracted to partners for the reporting period.</i> | |
| Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations (including UN OCHA) | <p><i>[Quantitative]</i></p> <p><i>This should all cover multi-year humanitarian funding provided to partners irrespective of whether the source of that humanitarian funding were public or private donors.</i></p> | <p><i>[Quantitative]</i></p> <p><i>This should refer to the contracted amounts of multi-year funding for the reporting period and its share out of the total contracted humanitarian funding received for that period.</i></p> |

Rationale: Greater predictability of humanitarian funding remains critical for a more efficient and effective humanitarian response in the context of a growing number of severe, protracted crises. The Grand Bargain signatories’ commitment to increasing multi-year humanitarian funding provided by institutional donors and passed on to partners by intermediaries was re-confirmed by the Grand Bargain caucus on quality funding in July 2022. The [caucus outcome statement](#) provides a quantitative target for caucus members of an increase of 30% by the end of 2023 compared to the baseline value of multi-year humanitarian funding provided by institutional donors in 2021. Efforts to monitor the caucus’ commitments are ongoing, but in the absence of comprehensive, publicly available data reported in close to real-time on quality humanitarian funding (see [below](#)), the consulted signatories agreed that these indicators remain relevant to tracking progress against this Grand Bargain objective. Based on signatories’ feedback, the volume of multi-year funding provided to local and/or national actors (LNAs) should be additionally reported on.

2. Flexible funding

Reporting should be aligned with the [endorsed definitions of different levels of earmarking](#) of humanitarian funding within the Grand Bargain and disaggregated by them.

| | % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding provided as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked | % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding received as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked | Which of the following flexibility provisions do you provide as standard practice to your partners, including local and national actors? |
|---|---|---|--|
| Donors | [Quantitative] | | [Qualitative – select from options] |
| Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations (including UN OCHA) | | [Quantitative] | Options to select from are: Simplified procedures to adapt programming to changes in the context; Budget flexibility of at least 10%; Pre-financing or simplified release of funds; Simplified procedures for no-cost extensions and carryover; Other [please elaborate in text field] |

Rationale: Both donors and aid implementing organisations remain committed to the provision of unearmarked or softly earmarked funding to enable an efficient and effective response where needs are greatest, especially under changing circumstances. Unlike the previous indicators, the proposed indicators disaggregate funding by all four earmarking categories as per the agreed definitions ([in the annex here](#)) to highlight donors' efforts to provide a greater share of unearmarked funding or to transition from funding tightly earmarked to projects to funding earmarked by country, but otherwise fully flexible. However, those earmarking definitions do not sufficiently capture the flexibility of funding that intermediaries can provide to their own partners. A qualitative indicator is therefore proposed instead to capture what flexibility provisions, building on [previous IASC guidance](#) issued in the context of Covid-19, is provided to partners. The same qualitative indicator is proposed for donors to report against to acknowledge that there are other ways in addition to low levels of earmarking for donors to provide flexibility to their partners, as reflected in the [outcome statement of the caucus on quality funding](#) as commitment around flexible arrangements complementary to multi-year funding.

Considerations for future self-reporting: There needs to be an agreement among Grand Bargain signatories on a meaningful quantitative indicator that captures the qualities of funding (including flexibility) provided by intermediaries and valued by their

partners, especially local and national actors¹. In addition, multiple signatories, including donors and aid implementing organisations, requested a revision of what falls under the currently agreed definitions of different levels of earmarking ([in the annex here](#)) to also recognise funding that is earmarked at the country-level, but otherwise fully flexible, as quality funding within the Grand Bargain. Opening up a discussion on these or other agreed definitions of key Grand Bargain concepts was beyond the scope of this revision of the self-reporting indicators but could be addressed by signatories for future self-reporting cycles.

Public reporting outside of annual self-reports

All Grand Bargain signatories committed in the GB 3.0 framework (see [above](#)) and in the quality funding caucus [outcome document](#) to publicly report to UN OCHA's Financial Tracking Service (FTS) or the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) on flexible and multi-year humanitarian funding. However, only a few donors and hardly any aid implementing agencies systematically and publicly report on these funding qualities to FTS or IATI.

1. Multi-year funding

UN OCHA's Financial Tracking Service can and already does record multi-year humanitarian funding flows. The [FTS reporting template](#) already provides the option to report on multi-year funding flows with annual breakdowns of that funding. FTS is currently working on a designated webpage to make the reported multi-year funding data more visible and easier to access.

Consultations with IATI on its possible role to evidence progress on Grand Bargain commitments are yet to be held. To DI's knowledge, it is currently not possible to publish the timeframe of funding agreements to the IATI standard. However, a methodology [was proposed](#) to approximate volumes of multi-year funding by combining IATI data on project start and end dates (if 24 months or more), project budgets and the volume of funding committed at the beginning of those projects.

2. Flexible funding

FTS has adopted the four levels of earmarking as per the agreed Grand Bargain definitions ([in the annex here](#)). The [FTS reporting template](#) already provides the option to report on the level of earmarking for each funding flow. FTS is currently working on a designated webpage to make the reported funding data by level of earmarking more visible and easier to access.

Consultations with IATI on its possible role to evidence progress on Grand Bargain commitments are yet to be held. To DI's knowledge, the IATI standard adopted a [codelist](#)

¹ While the [caucus outcome statement](#) on the role of intermediaries in supporting locally-led humanitarian action committed intermediaries to increase the quality and quantity of their funding, the indicator it proposed only focused on the quantity of funding.

that allows publishers to assign one of the four earmarking categories as per the Grand Bargain definitions to any transaction. However, [analysis](#) from 2023 showed that very few Grand Bargain signatories are using this codelist in their IATI reporting and therefore proposes to approximate degrees of earmarking by relying on the more much frequently used OECD DAC aid type codelist, which allows for the identification of tightly earmarked and unearmarked funding but can be ambiguous for other degrees of earmarking.

Objective 1.2: Localisation

Previous indicators

The narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 2 (localisation and participation).

The spreadsheet self-reporting template included the following quantitative indicators:

- Total volume, and % of humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % of that funding awarded to women-led and/or women rights' organisations.
- % of partnership or funding agreements that incorporate multi-year institutional capacity strengthening support for local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % awarded to women-led and or women rights' organisations.

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

1.2. Provide greater support for the leadership, delivery and capacity of local responders.

Proposed Outcomes:

- c) Quantifiable **increase in provision of funding**, including multi-year and flexible funding, to local and national actors (including women-led and women's rights organisations) as directly as possible to achieve the global aggregate target of at least 25% in line with the latest caucus outcome agreement using varying modalities (e.g. CBPFs, local actor led pooled funds, local actor consortia, bilateral funding and funding via institutional intermediary).
- d) Development/implementation of policies and procedures that enable **equitable partnerships**, as per intermediary caucus outcomes.
- e) Enable strong **contribution of local and national actors** (including women-led and women's' rights organisations) in existing NRGs or national and international coordination mechanisms, including by strengthening capacities to lead/co-lead responses.

Proposed indicators

1. Humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders

Reporting should be aligned with the Grand Bargain definitions of [local and national actors](#), and of what funding constitutes '[as directly as possible](#)' (up to one intermediary).

| | Volume of humanitarian funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors | Volume of humanitarian funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors | Number of CBPFs out of total number of active CBPFs that provided 25% or more of their allocations directly to LNAs |
|---|--|---|--|
| Donors | <i>[Quantitative]</i> | <i>[Quantitative]</i> <i>The self-reporting template will include methodological suggestions on how to estimate the share of unearmarked or softly earmarked funding (including to CBPFs) that may get passed on to local and national actors.</i> | |
| Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations | <i>[Quantitative]</i> <i>For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities) provided to local and national partners and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities).</i> | | |
| UN OCHA | <i>[Quantitative]</i> <i>Reporting on CBPFs.</i> | | <i>[Quantitative]</i> |

Rationale: The target of 25% of humanitarian funding reaching local and national actors as directly as possible remains one of the most recognisable commitments of the Grand Bargain. There has been much work done to [establish common definitions and a methodology for the tracking and reporting](#) of funding to local actors. These definitions including both local and national state and non-state actors (NGOs and CSOs, RCRC national societies, other private organisations). Due to the different roles of these organisation types in the response, signatories requested in feedback to the proposed indicators to disaggregate reporting of funding to local and national actors by those two groups of actors. While it is recognised that localisation goes far beyond just funding, it is important to continue monitoring this indicator, not least because it helps signatories hold themselves and partners to account. To ensure data comparability, signatories will be asked to confirm the definitions used in their reporting and there will be a free text space for any data availability caveats.

In addition, it is proposed that UN OCHA reports on the number of country-based pooled funds that provide 25% or more of their direct allocations to local and national partners. Based on received feedback it was not feasible to comprehensively track the proportion of Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs), which plan to allocate funding to local and national actors, as per a previous version of this proposal. More than half of HRPs in 2024 are unit-based, often without data on funding requirements by participating organisation.

2. Evidence of equitable partnerships

The [caucus on the role of intermediaries](#) identified several elements which contribute toward equitable partnerships, including joint planning and decision-making, with local and national actors playing a more visible and active role in programme steering. [IASC guidance](#) defines equitable partnerships in terms of the [Principles of Partnership](#). Regarding the provision of overheads to local and national partners, a corresponding [IASC Guidance](#) was issued in 2022.

| | Do you have an organisational policy or strategy in place that promotes equitable partnerships? | Do you cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners? |
|------------------------|---|---|
| All signatories | <i>[Qualitative and binary: yes or no] If yes, please provide links where possible to publicly available documents. E.g. allocation strategies, funding guidelines, and policies and guidance on areas such as partnerships and localisation. If not, please outline why and how else your organisation promotes equitable partnerships.</i> | <i>[Qualitative and binary: yes or no, with text box] If yes, please provide the average overheads rate provided to local and national partners. If not, please elaborate why not.</i> |

Rationale: The previous indicator tracking funding for multi-year institutional capacity strengthening support was poorly reported against and widely agreed to be inadequate in demonstrating the existence of equitable partnerships. Evidence of the existence of

policies and guidance around key areas such as localisation, partnerships or specific policy issues such as overhead funding are important indicators of institutional change. While the indicator relating to policies on equitable partnerships is limited in that the existence of policies does not automatically translate to good practice, it provides a starting point to hold signatories for the implementation of their policies to account and the existence of institutional policies signals an organisational commitment to equitable partnerships. The inclusion of the second indicator on overheads is based on received feedback and provides signatories space to share concrete evidence of whether and to what extent they are covering indirect costs and thereby contribute to institutional strengthening and full cost recovery of their local and national partners.

How local and national actors perceive current partnerships with international humanitarian actors is key to measuring the success of this commitment. It is challenging to meaningfully measure equitable partnerships at a global level. It is suggested that these two indicators on equitable partnerships reported on by signatories are therefore complemented by findings from annual surveys with local and national actors through networks such as NEAR.

Considerations for future self-reporting: Signatories emphasised the link between localisation and the cross-cutting area of risk-sharing and few suggested to add an indicator on this. However, there was no consensus on what this indicator should be nor sufficient time to consult meaningfully on this, so this could be an indicator to reach agreement on during or leading up to the next Grand Bargain annual meeting for future self-reporting.

Signatories also fed back that in addition to funding provided to cover indirect costs of local and national partners, there should also be consideration of investments in institutional capacity strengthening (as reflected in the [intermediary caucus outcomes](#)). This however requires agreement between Grand Bargain signatories and their local and national partners on what funding should count as such investments, and how to ensure that those investments and reporting on them are additional to overheads for LNAs.

3. Participation of and (co-)leadership by local and national actors in national coordination bodies

| | % of members in humanitarian coordination bodies (HCTs, ICCGs) and CBPF Advisory Boards that are LNAs | % of cluster leadership positions occupied by LNAs | How are you supporting and incentivising the participation and leadership of LNAs, including WROs/WLOs, in coordination mechanisms? |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| UN OCHA | <i>[Quantitative]</i> | <i>[Quantitative]</i> | <i>[Qualitative] Reporting might include organisational strategies, policies or systematically applied practice (including designated funding windows or budget lines).</i> |
| All signatories | | | |

Rationale: Ensuring the contribution of local and national actors, including women-led/women rights' organisations, in coordination mechanisms at a national and sub-national level is a key outcome of the 3.0 framework. These quantitative indicators are already part of the [IASC guidance](#) on strengthening participation, representation and leadership of local and national actors in coordination structures and tracked by OCHA. An additional qualitative indicator reinforces that it is the responsibility of all signatories to support local and national partners to participate meaningfully in these coordination mechanisms, for example through funding their participation. It is also the responsibility of cluster lead agencies, other than UN OCHA, to support LNAs to assume cluster leadership positions.

Considerations for future self-reporting: UN OCHA acknowledged in submitted feedback on a previous version of this proposal that comprehensively tracking WRO/WLO participation in coordination bodies for 2024 reporting may not be fully achievable. However, the organisation is currently exploring methods for collecting and tracking this data. OCHA will continue to refine data collection methods and the possibility of tracking WRO/WLO participation and leadership in coordination bodies will be evaluated for future reporting cycles.

Two signatories also fed back the need to track the extent to which Grand Bargain signatories are engaging with locally- or nationally-led coordination mechanisms other than the HCT or cluster system. This could be the starting point for further discussion among signatories to agree on a corresponding indicator if a consensus can be reached.

Public reporting outside of annual self-reports

Members of the Grand Bargain caucus on funding for localisation committed to publicly and transparently report on all their funding to local and national actors to FTS and/or IATI in the [caucus outcome document](#). Most institutional donors have established routine reporting processes to either or both platforms, however, very few intermediaries report on their funding provided to their partners to either platform.

FTS has adopted the [common definitions within the Grand Bargain](#) of local and national actors and went through the time-consuming process of applying them to the over 12,000 organisations in its database. All signatories, including institutional donors, UN agencies and funds, non-governmental organisations and members of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, can already report the funding they provide to their own partners to FTS. FTS offers several ways for all organisation types to report on funding to all their partners, including local and national actors:

- Automated reporting by working with the FTS team to set up a data pipeline that regularly extracts outgoing funding, disaggregated by funding agreement and with unique identifiers, from internal systems and shares that data with FTS
- Manual reporting by reporting outgoing funds, disaggregated by funding agreement and with unique identifiers, via the [FTS reporting template](#)

- FTS also offers to process the reports on the contributing organisation's behalf, as long as they put the FTS team in touch with the recipient organisation to verify aspects of the funding flows like country location, sector, etc.

The FTS team will then carry out their curation process to ensure no funding agreement is double-counted, to apply the definition of local and national actor where applicable in line with Grand Bargain definitions, and to link downstream funding with incoming funds where possible by matching unique identifiers.

Consultations with IATI on its possible role to evidence progress on Grand Bargain commitments are yet to be held. To DI's knowledge, the IATI standard has not yet adopted the [common definitions within the Grand Bargain](#) of local and national actors. A methodology has been [proposed](#) to track funding to local and national actors from IATI publishers in the absence of those definitions within the IATI standard. This methodology however relies on IATI publishers correctly using organisation identifiers and requires additional, manual verification to re-classify internationally affiliated organisations.

Objective 1.3: Participation

Previous indicators

The narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 2 (localisation and participation).

The spreadsheet self-reporting template included the following quantitative indicators (reported on by OCHA, all other questions optional for other signatories):

- % of HRPs that demonstrate that operational decision-making is informed by the views of affected people disaggregated by sex, age and vulnerabilities
- % of HRPs that integrate strategies/plans for the implementation of the IASC CAAC, PSEA commitments, centrality of protection in humanitarian action, gender policy and its accountability framework

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

1.3. Ensure greater support for the participation of affected communities in addressing humanitarian needs.

Proposed Outcomes:

- a) Expand investments in programmes and coordination platforms that allow **affected people to design and deliver responses to their own needs**, including in **strategic level-decision making**.
- b) Institute mechanisms to ensure an effective implementation of **accountability processes for affected populations** to hold humanitarian leaders to account.

Proposed indicators

1. Participation of -affected people in programme planning and design

| | Do you incentivise your partners to implement or promote the participation of crisis-affected people in their activities? | Do you systematically apply policies for engaging communities and people affected by crisis, paying attention to their diversity in terms of gender, age and disability, to reflect their priorities and risks in all stages of your work? |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Donors | <p><i>[Qualitative and binary: yes/no, with text box]</i></p> <p><i>If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how. If not, why not.</i></p> | |
| Aid implementing organisations | | <p><i>[Qualitative and binary: yes/no, with text box]</i></p> <p><i>If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how. If not, why not.</i></p> |

Rationale: Participation is complex to measure. However, there is a clear need to move beyond the previous optional self-reporting. Technical working groups in the Grand Bargain and IASC have done much work to establish the theoretical framework for participation. The Grand Bargain has already identified adoption of the CHS as part of the 2018 Participation Revolution [success indicators](#) and it is broadly accepted across the humanitarian system. The [revised CHS](#) (being launched in March 2024) puts participation at the heart of the first commitment: *“People and communities in situations of crisis and vulnerability can exercise their rights and participate in actions and decisions that affect them”*. The proposed indicator for aid implementing organisations to report against builds on aspects of the existing reporting framework of the CHS specific to the participation of affected populations and on commitments in the [outcome statement](#) to the quality funding caucus to provide qualitative evidence on how affected populations have influenced project/programme design.

2. Accountability to affected populations

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Do you systematically collect and act upon feedback from communities and people affected by crisis on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance, paying particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback?</p> |
| <p>Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations (including UN OCHA)</p> | <p><i>[Qualitative and binary: yes/no, with text box]</i></p> <p><i>If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how. If not, why not.</i></p> |

Rationale: Based on signatory feedback, the proposed indicator seeks to capture whether aid implementing organisations systematically capture and act on feedback from affected communities to be more accountable to them. This builds on aspects of the existing reporting framework of the CHS specific to accountability to affected populations.

Considerations for future self-reporting: The CHS covers a range of indicators to assess implementing organisations across a range of areas, including the participation of and accountability to affected populations, the timeliness and appropriateness of assistance, effective feedback mechanisms, coordination and more. Signatories fed back that it would require further consideration whether to lean on CHS verification within future Grand Bargain self-reports given the breadth of topics covered under the CHS and given key humanitarian actors, including for instance UN agencies or the RCRC Movement, have their own quality standards separate from the CHS.

Two potential indicators for future consideration on the participation of and accountability to affected populations that were suggested as part of the feedback on this proposal were:

- Evidence of targeting or programming decisions that were changed or significantly changed based on community feedback. This would require signatories to systematically capturing this information across their programmes and to agree on what counts as significant change.
- The percentage of people served by aid implementing organisations who have reported feeling consulted and listened to, as reported by an independent verification method or entity independent to the operational agency.

Objective 2.1: Anticipatory action

Previous indicators

Anticipatory action is a new priority area for the 3.0 framework and was not part of previous self-reporting.

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

2.1. Scale up anticipatory action, better integration of technology, and more flexibility in programming to foresee and respond to future shocks.

Proposed Outcomes:

- a) A **shared conceptual understanding** of anticipatory action and how it contributes to shrinking the needs is established and formally endorsed.
- b) **Scale up of anticipatory action**, incl. programming and funding.

Proposed indicators

Following the consultation process with anticipatory action stakeholders, no indicators on anticipatory action are proposed at this stage, awaiting the conclusion of the caucus to settle on meaningful indicators, methodology and definitions related to anticipatory action.

Rationale:

The Grand Bargain caucus on to scale up anticipatory action [launched](#) in February 2024. Two of its three objectives are to secure funding commitments for the scale up of coordinated anticipatory action and to develop a joint methodology that allows tracking of funds for anticipatory action. The caucus aims to conclude its work by the Grand Bargain annual meeting in October 2024. The caucus outcomes should inform a quantitative indicator on the scale up of anticipatory action, underpinned by a shared methodology, for Grand Bargain self-reporting in 2025 and 2026.

Public reporting outside of annual self-reports

The anticipatory action caucus seeks to reach a consensus around how to track and report progress on the potential targets for the scale-up of anticipatory action that are yet to be agreed. This should include considerations on how to publicly report on funding to anticipatory action, ideally through existing platforms to build on routine reporting processes. Past experience on the localisation commitment has however clearly shown that an interagency consultation process resulting in a shared definition is not sufficient for comparable data on policy progress. This shared definition needs to first be adopted by the relevant humanitarian stakeholders before it can effectively be reported on to public platforms.

In the meantime, the Anticipation Hub maintains a [global map](#) of anticipatory action projects by country and OCHA's Centre for Humanitarian Data tracks current [OCHA-coordinated frameworks](#) for anticipatory action.

Objective 3.1: Nexus and innovative financing

Summary of previous indicators

Innovative financing is a new priority area for the 3.0 framework and was not part of previous self-reporting.

For the nexus, the narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments?

The spreadsheet self-reporting template included the following quantitative indicator (reported by OCHA and UNDP, all other questions optional for other signatories):

- # of joint multi-hazard, risk and vulnerability analyses and multi-year plans developed with national actors, to elaborate a shared vision for outcomes (% of HRP including collective outcomes)

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

2.2 Use the convening power of the Grand Bargain as a platform to bring together all relevant stakeholders of the nexus.

Proposed Outcomes:

- a) Address existing institutional barriers and adapting internal systems to **enable multi-stakeholder collaboration** in humanitarian settings.
- b) Increased **dialogue and partnerships between humanitarian / development donors and international financial institutions (IFIs)** to identify opportunities to launch new initiatives and scale-up investments in protracted crises.

2.3 Map, support and scale-up existing financing mechanisms that enable cross-sector collaboration and innovative approaches, that are fit for purpose in protracted crises.

Proposed Outcomes:

- a) **Document/disseminate existing funding mechanisms and innovative financing approaches** that enable partnerships across sectors and the deployment of more public and private capital.
- b) Foster the **knowledge on innovative approaches and policies** to further increase the efficiency of humanitarian action.

Proposed indicators

Following the consultation process with signatories and based on their feedback on a previous version of this proposal, no indicators on the nexus and innovative financing are proposed at this stage.

Rationale: The nexus and innovative financing were introduced as new priority areas in the 3.0 framework (following the nexus being mainstreamed as a cross-cutting commitment in the original Grand Bargain). As of yet, no caucuses or communities of practice have been established. There is expected to be greater clarity following the high-level retreats and closed-door meetings being convened by Ambassador Köhler in the throughout 2024. It is therefore proposed that any new indicators for these areas are revisited for the 2025 round of self-reporting once specific objectives have been identified during these high-level discussions. Feedback provided by signatories on this indicator area suggested that possible indicators could focus on the role of development donors, in particular international financial institutions, in fragile and conflict-affected countries, or on the number of formal partnerships between those development actors and other Grand Bargain signatories.

Public reporting outside of annual self-reports

The possibility of publicly reporting on progress by Grand Bargain signatories to FTS or IATI entirely depends on what types of funding by which actors should be catalysed through this Grand Bargain objective. For now, IATI offers the opportunity to report on both development and humanitarian financing to crisis countries and on a variety of [transaction types](#) by any organisation that opts to publish data to the IATI standard, including international financial institutions.

Cross-cutting: Gender

Summary of previous indicators

The narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard? (Please outline specific initiatives or changes in practice and their outcomes/results).

The spreadsheet self-reporting template included the following indicators:

- For each of the eleven core commitments across all previous Grand Bargain workstreams: How were considerations of gender equality and women's empowerment integrated in your institutional efforts to implement this commitment?

- Optional reporting on the % of funding awarded to local or national women-led and/or women rights' organisations

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

Cross-cutting issue 1: Gender

The current efforts to improve the integration of gender across the Grand Bargain will continue, thereby ensuring that gender aspects are adequately addressed in humanitarian action.

Proposed outcomes:

Recommit to and invest in Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls (GEEWG), by:

- **Engaging and partnering with diverse women-led and women rights' organisations and organisations that prioritise GEEWG targeted interventions** (SRH, GBV, girls' education in emergencies, women economic empowerment and livelihood, etc.) at global and country levels;
- Enhancing accountability as Signatories by reporting against GEEWG commitments, including on **funding to women-led organisations and funding for GEEWG targeted interventions.**

Proposed indicators

The updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024) includes definitions of women's rights organisation (WROs) and women-led organisations (WLOs) in its annex. The adoption of these definitions is a necessary condition for comparable and meaningful reporting on the proposed indicator, as it provides a shared reference point for the Grand Bargain signatories' self-reports. Partner organisations are now also able to self-identify as women-led organisations on the UN Partner Portal.

| | Volume and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | Volume and % of total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Donors</i> | <i>[Quantitative]</i> | <i>[Quantitative]</i> |
| <i>Aid implementing and/or intermediary</i> | <i>[Quantitative]</i> | |

| | Volume and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | Volume and % of total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations |
|--|--|---|
| organisations (including UN OCHA) | <i>For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities) provided to local and national WLOs/WROs and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities).</i> | |

Rationale: The proposed indicator will apply to all Grand Bargain signatories and no longer be optional, given signatories recommitted to advancing Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls and to increase funding to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations. Signatories are encouraged to provide in the corresponding text boxes for this quantitative indicator their public targets, if existing, for funding to local or national women-led and/or women rights organisations.

Considerations for future self-reporting: Feedback to the proposed revision of the self-reporting exercise also requested an indicator for funding/activities targeting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (GEEWG) interventions. There however did not seem to be a consensus among signatories what funding would count towards such an indicator, complicating meaningful and comparable tracking of progress within the Grand Bargain. Reaching an agreement on this could pave the way for the potential introduction of an indicator on GEEWG funding for future self-reporting exercises.

Public reporting outside of annual self-reports

The consistent adoption by Grand Bargain signatories of the common definition of local or national women-led/women rights' organisations is a necessary prerequisite before considering the possibility of how funding to this organisation type can best be captured on IATI or FTS. In the meantime, it could be an option for the Grand Bargain Gender Community of Practice to maintain a reference list of local or national women-led/women rights organisations, which can be cross-referenced with improved reporting by institutional donors and intermediaries to FTS or IATI on all their funding disaggregated by partner. The UN Partner Portal already allows registered partners to self-identify as women-led organisations and has through that a list of self-identified WLO partners, which can serve as starting point for comparable reporting on the proposed indicator.

The best way to ensure a consistent adoption of the existing definitions of WLOs/WROs and a comparable application in Grand Bargain self-reports is for signatories to publicly

report alongside their self-reports on their funding to local WLOs/WROs disaggregated by organisation and country. Signatories also highlighted in their feedback to the proposed indicator the need to preserve a degree of flexibility in the application of the definition of local WLOs for contexts where there are legal restrictions for women to assume leadership positions.

Cross-cutting: Risk sharing

Summary of previous indicators

The narrative self-reporting template included the following qualitative question:

- Has your institution taken any steps to share risks with its partners? If so, please describe how (*optional question*).

Grand Bargain 3.0 objectives and outcomes

Cross-cutting issue 1: Risk sharing

Building on the evidence generated and the good practices identified, Signatories use the Risk Sharing Framework to integrate new approaches to share risks with their partners, paying attention to the risks identified by local and national actors.

Proposed outcomes:

- Initiatives**, including pilots, **are launched**, which take into account **risk perspectives of local actors**, and progress shared at the Grand Bargain Annual Meetings.
- Signatories come together to **take stock and assess the outcomes** of various initiatives.

Proposed indicators

The [Risk Sharing Framework](#) defines key concepts related to risk sharing in the context of this commitment and provides an effective tool to collaboratively identify, manage and share a range of risks between partners. It also provides examples of risk sharing solutions for different risk categories.

Following the consultation process with stakeholders involved with developing the Risk Sharing Framework and based on signatories' feedback, the proposed qualitative indicator on risk sharing seeks to capture any progress made relating to the application of the Risk Sharing Framework when operationalising partnerships and to potential updates of funding or partnership guidelines.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Have you taken any steps to progress risk sharing in your partnerships, e.g., by adopting internal policies or guidance on this, or by piloting the Risk Sharing | Have you experienced progress in how the partners that you receive funding from collaboratively promoted risk |
|--|--|---|

| | Framework in operationalising partnerships in specific contexts? | sharing in their partnerships with your organisation? |
|---|---|--|
| <i>All signatories</i> | [Qualitative and binary question: yes/no. If yes, please briefly outline the steps taken with links to public documents, where possible. If not, please briefly elaborate on why not, including any obstacles.] | |
| <i>Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations</i> | | [Qualitative: Tick as applicable on this Likert scale with four levels (regression, no progress, some progress, significant progress), with free text box to optionally elaborate on examples of challenges or good practices] |

Rationale: Risk sharing is a newly added area within the Grand Bargain as it previously was a voluntary initiative by a number of signatories. Pilot initiatives on risk sharing are in progress and lessons from those that can inform the next possible focus of this policy area are yet to be identified. For at least the first reporting round, the proposed indicators therefore seek to map out what steps signatories were able to take to progress risk-sharing and if not, what the obstacles were. Based on signatory feedback, another indicator was added to capture from the perspective of aid implementing organisations whether their funding partners have made progress in collaboratively assessing and sharing the risks they face as implementers.

Considerations for future self-reporting: Multiple consulted signatories suggested that risk sharing experts should hold workshops with technical counterparts working on localisation and quality funding to jointly explore potentially meaningful indicators on risk sharing for each of those two objectives for self-reporting in 2025 and 2026.

Previous indicator areas not included in annual, streamlined self-reporting

The revised Grand Bargain self-reporting process will be reduced to the focus and cross-cutting areas listed above, which were endorsed by signatories during the 2023 Grand Bargain annual meeting, for a simplified annual reporting process. This means that the following commitments and corresponding indicators will not be included in the 3.0 Grand Bargain annual self-reports, though signatories will be expected to report on progress across these areas as part of the independent monitoring report for 2026 in comparison with the available baseline from 2023 self-reports:

| Previous Grand Bargain commitment workstream | Self-reporting indicators |
|--|---|
| <i>Transparency</i> | % of signatories publishing humanitarian data to IATI and % publishing more useable humanitarian data. |
| <i>Cash</i> | Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash and vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs |

| Previous Grand Bargain commitment workstream | Self-reporting indicators |
|--|--|
| Reducing management costs | # of UN agencies adopting the UN Partner Portal. % of civil society organisations/nongovernmental organisations partners of the UN agencies adopting the common UN Partner Portal process |
| Needs assessments | % of HNOs meeting at least 80% of the agreed quality-scoring criteria % of multi-sectoral needs assessments meeting at least 7% of the agreed quality-scoring criteria |
| Harmonised reporting | % of signatories that have a grant-giving role using the '8+3' template as the reporting standard for agreements with partners |

3. Self-reporting shared across Grand Bargain focus areas

Previous shared reporting

The [previous self-reports](#) were made up of a spreadsheet and a narrative document. The spreadsheet included a set of common free-text questions against each core commitment as well as a small number of (mainly quantitative) indicators specific to each commitment. The common questions across all commitment areas were:

- What action was taken in [year] to achieve this commitment?
- What were the results/outcomes of this action?
- Where relevant, what results were reported at country level against this commitment?
- How were considerations of gender equality and women's empowerment integrated in your institutional efforts to implement this commitment?

As well as the spreadsheet, signatories submitted a narrative summary. This was limited to a total of four pages and, in 2022, was structured around seven set questions, of which the following two cut across all multiple Grand Bargain commitments:

1. Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2022?
2. Has your institution endorsed the caucus outcome document on quality funding, on the role of intermediaries, on cash coordination, Yes/No?

Proposed shared reporting

Signatories consulted reinforced that the previous self-reporting process had evolved within the Grand Bargain to be overly burdensome, especially in terms of accessing the required data for some of the quantitative indicators. As noted in previous AIRs, self-

reported data completeness and quality was often poor, which reduced comparability and usefulness of the data – and therefore how meaningful the self-reporting was as an accountability mechanism. For this reason, the emphasis in this proposal is also on improving the quality of indicators that seek to capture what signatories agree is still critical to monitor.

The revised self-reporting process needs to balance a need to reduce the reporting burden as agreed during the 2023 Grand Bargain Annual Meeting, while also ensuring the exercise is not so minimised as to be reductive. Based on signatory feedback, repeated and common narrative questions for each commitment area were removed to keep the self-reporting exercise as light as possible. These broader, qualitative narrative questions on each indicator area will be explored as part of the data collection to inform the independent monitoring report in 2026.

In response to signatories' feedback and to support the accountability process for Grand Bargain caucuses, the following question will be added to the self-reporting template:

Did you endorse and take steps to implement any of the outcome statements of the following Grand Bargain caucuses? (Yes/No; If no, please respond in the text box to elaborate why not?):

- [Cash coordination](#)
- [Quality funding](#)
- [The role of intermediaries](#)
- [Funding for localisation](#)

4. Format of reporting

There are two aspects of the self-reporting that were raised in terms of format during consultations: firstly, the format of the self-reports signatories are required to complete and submit on an annual basis, and secondly how this reporting is then analysed and presented back to signatories.

Self-reporting format: Stakeholders agreed that the templates for this need to be made less heavy and unwieldy. Most were agnostic about what format this takes (e.g. excel, word, online form) as long as it meets certain criteria:

- The self-report is easily shareable internally before submission to account for the fact that there are often many individuals inputting across an organisation
- The self-report should only contain questions or indicators relevant to each signatory without duplication between them
- The format needs to be suited to the type of data – e.g. having rules in cells which only allow a quantitative answer for quantitative indicators.
- All quantitative responses need to have an accompanying text field where signatories can provide qualifying detail, caveats or explanations.

Based on the above suggestions, the Grand Bargain Secretariat has progressed the development of an online reporting form that meets those criteria. This form will be presented to signatories alongside the final self-reporting indicators.

Format of how self-reporting data is presented: In the past, this has been limited to the annual self-reports being [uploaded on the Grand Bargain website](#), which was agreed to not be an accessible or comparable way of presenting the data, as well as the analysis of the self-reports in the AIR. Stakeholders consulted emphasised that self-reporting data could be made more useful by allowing for user-friendly comparison and aggregation of data so that indicators can be more clearly tracked. This could take the form of an online dashboard. Exactly what this looks like will be taken forward by the Secretariat.

5. Other considerations on self-reporting

Once finalised, the revised self-reporting process needs to be properly socialised among the signatories, along with the 3.0 framework to encourage quality reporting and, more importantly, buy-in at all levels to the commitments. This self-reporting process is an important mechanism to improve the monitoring of progress, however it cannot be meaningful without sufficient buy-in to individually and collaboratively implement the commitments and without leadership from the Grand Bargain structure. This is especially important given the inevitable staff turnover in signatory organisations, and the need to ensure that gains made in the Grand Bargain through the different workstreams and caucuses (e.g. around definitions and existing commitments) are not lost, but built upon. Signatories requested in their feedback to multiple indicators in this proposal that methodological guidance or reporting examples would be provided in the self-reporting template. Some of that guidance was already added above and will be reiterated in the self-reporting template.

While these global commitments are important to track, they need to be realised at the country level to translate into better outcomes for crisis-affected populations. It is not possible for this streamlined self-reporting process to include meaningful country-level reporting. However, it is critical that National Reference Groups and other country-level coordination mechanisms advancing the Grand Bargain commitments, are properly supported and resourced to develop their own monitoring and accountability systems.

Annex. Self-reporting indicators by constituency

Donors

1. Quality funding

1.1. Multi-year funding

In the Grand Bargain, multi-year funding is defined as funding with a duration of 24 months or more based on the start and end dates of the original formal funding agreement, which reflects the [definition from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) (OECD).

The Grand Bargain caucus on quality funding [outcome statement](#) provides a quantitative target for caucus members of an increase of 30% by the end of 2023 compared to the baseline value of multi-year humanitarian funding provided by institutional donors in 2021.

Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

1.1.1 Not relevant to your constituency.

1.1.2 Volumes of multi-year funding provided to partners and % of total funding provided to partners as multi-year funding. **[Quantitative]**

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to all partners | [financial amount] |
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to local and national actors, as included as part of the total multi-year funding to all partners | [financial amount] |
| % of total humanitarian funding provided as multi-year funding to all partners | [%] |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.2 Flexible funding

Reporting should be aligned with the endorsed definitions of different levels of earmarking of humanitarian funding within the Grand Bargain (available in the annex of the [original Grand Bargain commitments](#)) and disaggregated by them.

To capture the flexibility provided to partners particularly local and national actors, a qualitative indicator has been introduced building on the [IASC guidance](#) issued in the context of Covid-19. The [outcome statement](#) of the caucus on quality funding also includes a commitment to provide flexible arrangements complimentary to multi-year funding.

1.2.1 Not relevant to your constituency.

1.2.2 % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding provided to partners as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked. *[Quantitative]*

| | <i>[%]</i> | <i>[Financial amount]</i> |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Unearmarked | | |
| Softly earmarked | | |
| Earmarked | | |
| Tightly earmarked | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.2.3 Which of the following flexibility provisions do you provide as standard practice to your partners, including local and national actors?

[Qualitative – select all answers that apply from options] Options to select from are:

- Simplified procedures to adapt programming to changes in the context;
- Budget flexibility of at least 10%;
- Pre-financing or simplified release of funds;
- Simplified procedures for no-cost extensions and carryover;
- Other *[please elaborate in text field]*.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2. Localisation

2.1 Humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders

Reporting should be aligned with the Grand Bargain definitions of [local and national actors](#), and of what funding constitutes ‘[as directly as possible](#)’ (up to one intermediary). Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

Please note that direct operational assistance by international organisations to target beneficiaries (without the involvement of local partners) in the form of cash delivery, in-kind assistance or support costs spent by intermediaries for work in partnership/on localisation does not constitute funding for localisation and should not be measured towards reaching the 25% goal.

2.1.1 Volume of humanitarian funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors. *[Quantitative]*

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Local or national non-state actors | | |
| Local or national state actors | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.1.2 Total volume of funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors. *[Quantitative] Comments in the free text box may helpfully include an assessment from each donor on the share of funding provided to intermediary organisations for which there is information on whether or how much of this funding was passed on to LNAs. For unearmarked or softly earmarked funding, it is the responsibility of the recipient organisation to share information with their donors or publicly of how much of flexible funding was passed on to LNAs. This is in line with the [quality funding caucus outcome statement](#), in which intermediaries committed to provide greater transparency on their cascading of quality funding. In combination with the share of flexible funding provided by each donor, this would allow those donors to estimate how much of their flexible funding to that intermediaries ends up with LNAs. For country-based pooled funds (CBPFs) this is already possible to calculate, given data on donor contributions and the share of allocations to LNAs is [publicly available](#) for each CBPF.*

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Local or national non-state actors | | |
| Local or national state actors | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2 Evidence of equitable partnerships

The [caucus on the role of intermediaries](#) identified several elements which contribute toward equitable partnerships, including joint planning and decision-making, with local and national actors playing a more visible and active role in programme steering. [IASC guidance](#) defines equitable partnerships in terms of the [Principles of Partnership](#).

Refer to annex A in the [IASC Guidance on the Provision of Overheads to Local and National Partners](#) for existing definitions of overheads/indirect costs.

2.2.1 Do you have an organisational policy or strategy in place that promotes equitable partnerships?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide links where possible to publicly available documents. E.g. allocation strategies, funding guidelines, and policies and guidance on areas such as partnerships and localisation.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please outline why and how else your organisation promotes equitable partnerships.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2.2 Do you cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide the average overheads rate provided to local and national partners.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.3 Participation of and (co-)leadership by local and national actors in national coordination bodies

Ensuring the contribution of local and national actors, including women-led/women rights' organisations, in coordination mechanisms at a national and sub-national level is a key outcome of the [3.0 framework](#).

The updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024) includes the following definitions for women's rights and women-led organisations (WROs/WLOs) in its annex:

- **Women-Led Organisations (WLOs):** An organisation with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.

- Women’s Rights Organisations (WROs): Women’s rights organisation: 1) an organisation that self-identifies as a woman’s rights organisation with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women’s/girls’ interests and rights (or where ‘women,’ ‘girls,’ ‘gender’ or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.

Local and national actors that meet those definitions are the focus of this indicator.

- 2.3.1** How are you supporting and incentivising the participation and leadership of LNAs, including local WROs/WLOs, in coordination mechanisms?
[Qualitative] Reporting might include organisational strategies, policies or systematically applied practice (including designated funding windows or budget lines for staff that participates in coordination fora, travel of that staff, and for IT costs to enable connectivity).

Free text space (65,000 characters max):

3. Participation

3.1 Participation of affected people in programme planning and design

- 3.1.1** Do you incentivise your partners to implement or promote the participation of crisis-affected people in their activities?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

4. Cross-cutting: Gender

To ensure comparable and meaningful reporting, Signatories are requested to adopt the definition for local or national women-led and/or women’s rights organisations, which are local and national actors that meet the definitions for WLOs and/or WROs as per the updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024):

- Women-Led Organisations (WLOs): An organisation with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.
- Women’s Rights Organisations (WROs): Women’s rights organisation: 1) an organisation that self-identifies as a woman’s rights organisation with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement

- of women's/girls' interests and rights (or where 'women,' 'girls,' 'gender' or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.

Signatories are encouraged to provide in the corresponding text boxes for this quantitative indicator their public targets, if existing, for funding to local or national women-led and/or women rights organisations.

- 4.1** Volume of funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations.
[Quantitative]

| | <i>[Financial amount]</i> | <i>[%]</i> |
|--|---------------------------|------------|
| Total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

- 4.2** Volume of funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations.
[Quantitative] See the text under indicator 2.1 for additional guidance.

| | <i>[Financial amount]</i> | <i>[%]</i> |
|--|---------------------------|------------|
| Total humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

5. Cross-cutting: Risk sharing

The qualitative indicator on risk sharing seeks to capture any progress made relating to the application of the [Risk Sharing Framework](#) when operationalising partnerships and to potential updates of funding or partnership guidelines.

- 5.1** Have you taken any steps to progress risk sharing in your partnerships, e.g., by adopting internal policies or guidance on this, or by piloting the Risk Sharing Framework in operationalising partnerships in specific contexts?
[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please briefly outline the steps taken with links to public documents, where possible.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not, including any obstacles.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6. Grand Bargain Caucuses

To support the accountability process for Grand Bargain caucuses, please answer the following questions.

6.1 Did you endorse and take steps to implement any of the outcome statements of the following Grand Bargain caucuses?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

6.1.1 Cash coordination

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.2 Quality funding

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.3 The role of intermediaries

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.4 Funding for localisation

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

Aid implementing and/or intermediary organisations

1. Quality Funding

1.1 Multi-year funding

In the Grand Bargain, multi-year funding is defined as funding with a duration of 24 months or more based on the start and end dates of the original formal funding agreement, which reflects the [definition from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) (OECD).

The Grand Bargain caucus on quality funding [outcome statement](#) provides a quantitative target for caucus members of an increase of 30% by the end of 2023 compared to the baseline value of multi-year humanitarian funding provided by institutional donors in 2021.

Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

1.1.1 Volumes of humanitarian multi-year funding received and % of total humanitarian funding received as multi-year funding.

[Quantitative]

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Volumes of multi-year funding received | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| % of total funding received as multi-year funding | <i>[%]</i> |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.1.2 Volumes of multi-year funding provided to partners, including local and national actors, and % of total funding provided to partners as multi-year funding.

[Quantitative]

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to all partners | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to local and national actors, as included as part of the total multi-year funding to all partners | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| % of total funding provided to all partners as multi-year funding | <i>[%]</i> |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.2 Flexible funding

Reporting should be aligned with the endorsed definitions of different levels of earmarking of humanitarian funding within the Grand Bargain (available in the annex of the [original Grand Bargain commitments](#)) and disaggregated by them.

To capture the flexibility provided to partners particularly local and national actors, a qualitative indicator has been introduced building on the [IASC guidance](#) issued in the context of Covid-19. The [outcome statement](#) of the caucus on quality funding also includes a commitment to provide flexible arrangements complimentary to multi-year funding.

- 1.2.1 % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding received as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked.
[Quantitative]

| | <i>[%]</i> | <i>[Financial amount]</i> |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Unearmarked | | |
| Softly earmarked | | |
| Earmarked | | |
| Tightly earmarked | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

- 1.2.2 Not relevant to your constituency.

- 1.2.3 Which of the following flexibility provisions do you provide as standard practice to your partners, including local and national actors?
[Qualitative – select all answers that apply from options] Options to select from are:

- Simplified procedures to adapt programming to changes in the context;
- Budget flexibility of at least 10%;
- Pre-financing or simplified release of funds;
- Simplified procedures for no-cost extensions and carryover;
- Other *[please elaborate in text field]*.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2. Localisation

2.1 Humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders

Reporting should be aligned with the Grand Bargain definitions of [local and national actors](#), and of what funding constitutes ‘[as directly as possible](#)’ (up to one intermediary). Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

Please note that direct operational assistance by international organisations to target beneficiaries (without the involvement of local partners) in the form of cash delivery, in-kind assistance or support costs spent by intermediaries for work in partnership/on localisation does not constitute funding for localisation and should not be measured towards reaching the 25% goal.

- 2.1.1** Volume of humanitarian funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors.
[Quantitative] For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities or other forms of in-kind support) provided to local and national partners and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities). If your methodology to calculate the percentage of your humanitarian funding transferred to local and national actors differs from this suggested approach, please outline in the free text box any differences alongside reasons behind them.

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Local or national non-state actors | | |
| Local or national state actors | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2 Evidence of equitable partnerships

The [caucus on the role of intermediaries](#) identified several elements which contribute toward equitable partnerships, including joint planning and decision-making, with local and national actors playing a more visible and active role in programme steering. [IASC guidance](#) defines equitable partnerships in terms of the [Principles of Partnership](#).

Refer to annex A in the [IASC Guidance on the Provision of Overheads to Local and National Partners](#) for existing definitions of overheads/indirect costs.

- 2.2.1** Do you have an organisational policy or strategy in place that promotes equitable partnerships?
[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide links where possible to publicly available documents. E.g. allocation strategies, funding guidelines, and policies and guidance on areas such as partnerships and localisation.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please outline why and how else your organisation promotes equitable partnerships.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2.2 Do you cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide the average overheads rate provided to local and national partners.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

3. Participation

3.1 Participation of affected people in programme planning and design

This indicator builds on aspects of the existing reporting framework of the CHS specific to the participation of affected populations and on commitments in the [outcome statement](#) to the quality funding caucus to provide qualitative evidence on how affected populations have influenced project/programme design.

3.1.1 Not relevant to your constituency.

3.1.2 Do you systematically apply policies for engaging communities and people affected by crisis, paying attention to their diversity in terms of gender, age and disability, to reflect their priorities and risks in all stages of your work?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

3.2 Accountability to affected populations

This indicator seeks to capture whether aid implementing organisations systematically capture and act on feedback from affected communities to be more accountable to them. This builds on aspects of the existing reporting framework of the CHS specific to accountability to affected populations.

3.2.1 Do you systematically collect and act upon feedback from communities and people affected by crisis on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance, paying particular attention to the gender, age and

diversity of those giving feedback?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with text box]

YES

If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how.

Free text space (1024 characters max)

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

4. Cross-cutting: Gender

To ensure comparable and meaningful reporting, Signatories are requested to adopt the definition for local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations, which are local and national actors that meet the definitions for WLOs and/or WROs as per the updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024):

- **Women-Led Organisations (WLOs):** An organisation with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.
- **Women's Rights Organisations (WROs):** Women's rights organisation: 1) an organisation that self-identifies as a woman's rights organisation with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women's/girls' interests and rights (or where 'women,' 'girls', 'gender' or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.

Signatories are encouraged to provide in the corresponding text boxes for this quantitative indicator their public targets, if existing, for funding to local or national women-led and/or women rights organisations.

4.1 Volume of funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations.

[Quantitative] For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities) provided to local and national WLOs/WROs and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities). If your methodology to calculate the percentage of your humanitarian funding transferred to local and national actors differs from this suggested approach, please outline in the free text box any differences alongside reasons behind them.

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|--|---------------------------|------------|
| Total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

5. Cross-cutting: Risk sharing

The qualitative indicator on risk sharing seeks to capture any progress made relating to the application of the [Risk Sharing Framework](#) when operationalising partnerships and to potential updates of funding or partnership guidelines.

- 5.1 Have you taken any steps to progress risk sharing in your partnerships, e.g., by adopting internal policies or guidance on this, or by piloting the Risk Sharing Framework in operationalising partnerships in specific contexts?
[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please briefly outline the steps taken with links to public documents, where possible.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not, including any obstacles.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

- 5.2 Have you experienced progress in how the partners that you receive funding from collaboratively promoted risk sharing in their partnerships with your organisation?
[Qualitative: Tick as applicable on this Likert scale with four levels, with free text box to optionally elaborate on examples of challenges or good practices]

Regression (i.e., funding partners promoted risk sharing less during than before the reporting period)

No progress

Some progress

Significant progress

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6. Grand Bargain Caucuses

To support the accountability process for Grand Bargain caucuses, please answer the following questions.

- 6.1 Did you endorse and take steps to implement any of the outcome statements of the following Grand Bargain caucuses?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

6.1.1 [Cash coordination](#)

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.2 Quality funding

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.3 The role of intermediaries

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.4 Funding for localisation

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

UN OCHA

1. Quality Funding

1.1 Multi-year funding

In the Grand Bargain, multi-year funding is defined as funding with a duration of 24 months or more based on the start and end dates of the original formal funding agreement, which reflects the [definition from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](#) (OECD).

The Grand Bargain caucus on quality funding [outcome statement](#) provides a quantitative target for caucus members of an increase of 30% by the end of 2023 compared to the baseline value of multi-year humanitarian funding provided by institutional donors in 2021.

Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

1.1.1 Volumes of humanitarian multi-year funding received and % of total humanitarian funding received as multi-year funding.

[Quantitative]

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Volumes of multi-year funding received | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| % of total funding received as multi-year funding | <i>[%]</i> |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.1.2 Volumes of multi-year funding provided to partners, including local and national actors, and % of total funding provided to partners as multi-year funding.

[Quantitative]

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to all partners | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| Volumes of multi-year funding provided to local and national actors, as included as part of the total multi-year funding to all partners | <i>[financial amount]</i> |
| % of total funding provided to all partners as multi-year funding | <i>[%]</i> |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

1.2 Flexible funding

Reporting should be aligned with the endorsed definitions of different levels of earmarking of humanitarian funding within the Grand Bargain (available in the annex of the [original Grand Bargain commitments](#)) and disaggregated by them.

To capture the flexibility provided to partners particularly local and national actors, a qualitative indicator has been introduced building on the [IASC guidance](#) issued in the context of Covid-19. The [outcome statement](#) of the caucus on quality funding also includes a commitment to provide flexible arrangements complimentary to multi-year funding.

- 1.2.1** % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding received as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked.
[Quantitative]

| | <i>[%]</i> | <i>[Financial amount]</i> |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Unearmarked | | |
| Softly earmarked | | |
| Earmarked | | |
| Tightly earmarked | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

- 1.2.2** Not relevant to your constituency.

- 1.2.3** Which of the following flexibility provisions do you provide as standard practice to your partners, including local and national actors?
[Qualitative – select all answers that apply from options] Options to select from are:

- Simplified procedures to adapt programming to changes in the context;
- Budget flexibility of at least 10%;
- Pre-financing or simplified release of funds;
- Simplified procedures for no-cost extensions and carryover;
- Other [please elaborate in text field].

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2. Localisation

2.1 Humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders

Reporting should be aligned with the Grand Bargain definitions of [local and national actors](#), and of what funding constitutes '[as directly as possible](#)' (up to one intermediary).

Within the Grand Bargain, local and national actors (LNAs) are defined as follows, as included in the [collective monitoring and accountability framework](#) for the caucus on funding for localisation:

- Local and national non state actors: Organisations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO.
- National and sub-national state actors: State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level

Please note that direct operational assistance by international organisations to target beneficiaries (without the involvement of local partners) in the form of cash delivery, in-kind assistance or support costs spent by intermediaries for work in partnership/on localisation does not constitute funding for localisation and should not be measured towards reaching the 25% goal.

- 2.1.1** Volume of humanitarian funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to LNAs, disaggregated by non-state and state actors.
[Quantitative] For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities or other forms of in-kind support) provided to local and national partners and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities). If your methodology to calculate the percentage of your humanitarian funding transferred to local and national actors differs from this suggested approach, please outline in the free text box any differences alongside reasons behind them.

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Local or national non-state actors | | |
| Local or national state actors | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

- 2.1.2** Not relevant to your constituency.
- 2.1.3** Number of CBPFs out of total number of active CBPFs that provided 25% or more of their allocations directly to local and national actors.
[Quantitative]

| | [Number] |
|---|-----------------|
| Total number of CBPFs active during the reporting period | |
| Number of active CBPFs that provided 25% or more of their allocations directly to LNAs | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2 Evidence of equitable partnerships

The [caucus on the role of intermediaries](#) identified several elements which contribute toward equitable partnerships, including joint planning and decision-making, with local and national actors playing a more visible and active role in programme steering. [IASC guidance](#) defines equitable partnerships in terms of the [Principles of Partnership](#).

Refer to annex A in the [IASC Guidance on the Provision of Overheads to Local and National Partners](#) for existing definitions of overheads/indirect costs.

2.2.1 Do you have an organisational policy or strategy in place that promotes equitable partnerships?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide links where possible to publicly available documents. E.g. allocation strategies, funding guidelines, and policies and guidance on areas such as partnerships and localisation.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please outline why and how else your organisation promotes equitable partnerships.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.2.2 Do you cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please provide the average overheads rate provided to local and national partners.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.3 Participation of and (co-)leadership by local and national actors in national coordination bodies

Ensuring the contribution of local and national actors, including women-led/women rights' organisations, in coordination mechanisms at a national and sub-national level is a key outcome of the [3.0 framework](#). The updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024) includes definitions for women's rights and women-led organisations (WROs/WLOs) in its annex. Local and national actors that meet the following definitions are relevant to this indicator:

- *Women-Led Organisations (WLOs): An organisation with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.*
- *Women's Rights Organisations (WROs): Women's rights organisation: 1) an organisation that self-identifies as a woman's rights organisation with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women's/girls' interests and rights (or where 'women,' 'girls', 'gender' or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.*

2.3.1 How are you supporting and incentivising the participation and leadership of LNAs, including WROs/WLOs, in coordination mechanisms?
[Qualitative] Reporting might include organisational strategies, policies or systematically applied practice (including designated funding windows or budget lines for staff that participates in coordination fora, travel of that staff, and for IT costs to enable connectivity).

Free text space (65,000 characters max):

2.3.2 Share of members in humanitarian coordination bodies (HCTs, ICCGs) and CBPF Advisory Boards that are LNAs. *[Quantitative]*

| | Number |
|--|--|
| Number of members in humanitarian coordination bodies and CBPF Advisory Boards that are local and national actors | <i>[HCTs] [ICCGs] [CBPF Advisory Boards]</i> |
| Total number of members in humanitarian coordination bodies and CBPF Advisory Boards | <i>[HCTs] [ICCGs] [CBPF Advisory Boards]</i> |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

2.3.3 Share of cluster leadership positions occupied by LNAs
[Quantitative]

| | Number |
|---|---------------|
| Number of cluster leadership positions occupied by local and national actors | |
| Total cluster leadership positions | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

3. Participation

3.1 Not relevant to your constituency.

3.2 Accountability to affected populations

This indicator seeks to capture whether aid implementing organisations systematically capture and act on feedback from affected communities to be more accountable to them. This builds on aspects of the existing reporting framework of the CHS specific to accountability to affected populations.

3.2.1 Do you systematically collect and act upon feedback from communities and people affected by crisis on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance, paying particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with text box]

YES

If yes, please provide a link to publicly accessible policy documents where possible or briefly outline how.

Free text space (1024 characters max)

NO

If not, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

4. Cross-cutting: Gender

To ensure comparable and meaningful reporting, Signatories are requested to adopt the definition for local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations, which are local and national actors that meet the definitions for WLOs and/or WROs as per the updated [IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action](#) (2024):

- Women-Led Organisations (WLOs): An organisation with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.
- Women's Rights Organisations (WROs): Women's rights organisation: 1) an organisation that self-identifies as a woman's rights organisation with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women's/girls' interests and rights (or where 'women,' 'girls', 'gender' or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or 3) an organisation that has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.

Signatories are encouraged to provide in the corresponding text boxes for this quantitative indicator their public targets, if existing, for funding to local or national women-led and/or women rights organisations.

- 4.1** Volume of funding and % of total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations.
[Quantitative] For better comparability of the percentage share, the suggested numerator is the volume of humanitarian funding (excluding commodities) provided to local and national WLOs/WROs and the suggested denominator is total global organisational humanitarian expenditure (minus fundraising and domestic activities). If your methodology to calculate the percentage of your humanitarian funding transferred to local and national actors differs from this suggested approach, please outline in the free text box any differences alongside reasons behind them.

| | [Financial amount] | [%] |
|--|--------------------|-----|
| Total humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or women's rights organisations | | |

Free text space (1024 characters max):

5. Cross-cutting: Risk sharing

The qualitative indicator on risk sharing seeks to capture any progress made relating to the application of the [Risk Sharing Framework](#) when operationalising partnerships and to potential updates of funding or partnership guidelines.

- 5.1 Have you taken any steps to progress risk sharing in your partnerships, e.g., by adopting internal policies or guidance on this, or by piloting the Risk Sharing Framework in operationalising partnerships in specific contexts?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

YES

If yes, please briefly outline the steps taken with links to public documents, where possible.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

NO

If not, please elaborate why not, including any obstacles.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6. Grand Bargain Caucuses

To support the accountability process for Grand Bargain caucuses, please answer the following questions.

- 6.1 Did you endorse and take steps to implement any of the outcome statements of the following Grand Bargain caucuses?

[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with free text box]

6.1.1 [Cash coordination](#)

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.2 [Quality funding](#)

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.3 [The role of intermediaries](#)

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):

6.1.4 [Funding for localisation](#)

YES

NO

If no, please elaborate why not.

Free text space (1024 characters max):