**Grand Bargain Light Annual Presentation 2024**
***Signatory Self-Report – UN OCHA***

This streamlined self-report is designed to improve comparability and accountability. It will also serve as the basis for the light annual presentation of self-reports to be compiled by the Grand Bargain Secretariat. Furthermore, in line with the aim to simplify the self-reporting process, Signatories must submit their reports through an online form. To support in the internal gathering of data from various units or departments within your organisation, this document includes a list of all indicators applicable to your organisation type.

**Deadline submission of the self-report:** 19 July 2024, COB

**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*](https://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/multiyearfunding.pdf)  *from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).*

*The Grand Bargain caucus on quality funding* [*outcome statement*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2022-07/Grand%20Bargain%20Caucus%20on%20Quality%20Funding%20-%20Outcome%20Document%20-%20final%20-%2011Jul22.pdf) *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:*

*Local and national non state actors*: *Organizations 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*

*These definitions are included in the* [*collective monitoring and accountability framework*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2023-05/Grand%20Bargain%20Caucus%20on%20funding%20for%20localisation_Monitoring%20and%20accountability%20framework_VF.pdf) *for the caucus on funding for localisation.*

* + 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* | *[financial amount]* |
| *% of total funding received as multi-year funding* | *[%]* |

*Free text space (1024 characters max):*

* + 1. 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* | *[financial amount]* |
| *Volumes of multi-year funding provided to local and national actor, as included as part of the total multi-year funding to all partners s* | *[financial amount]* |
| *% of total humanitarian funding provided as multi-year funding provided 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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain/grand-bargain-shared-commitment-better-serve-people-need-2016)*) 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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2020-06/IASC%20Proposal%20for%20a%20Harmonized%20Approach%20to%20Funding%20Flexibility%20in%20the%20Context%20of%20COVID-19.pdf) *issued in the context of Covid-19. The* [*outcome statement*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2022-07/Grand%20Bargain%20Caucus%20on%20Quality%20Funding%20-%20Outcome%20Document%20-%20final%20-%2011Jul22.pdf) *of the caucus on quality funding also includes a commitment to provide**flexible arrangements complimentary to multi-year funding..*

* + 1. % of total humanitarian funding and volumes of humanitarian funding received as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked.
		*[Quantitative]*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *[%]* | *[financial amount]* |
| *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*](https://gblocalisation.ifrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/categories_for_tracking_direct_as_possible_funding_to_local_and_national_actors_003.pdf) *(LNAs) and of what funding constitutes ‘*[*as directly as possible’*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2018-01/hftt_localisation_marker_definitions_paper_24_january_2018.pdf) *(up to one intermediary).*

*Local and national non state actors*: *Organizations 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*

*These definitions are included in the* [*collective monitoring and accountability framework*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2023-05/Grand%20Bargain%20Caucus%20on%20funding%20for%20localisation_Monitoring%20and%20accountability%20framework_VF.pdf) *for the caucus on funding for localisation. The document also includes a methodology for tracking and reporting on funding to local actors.*

*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.*

* + 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) 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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2022-08/Outcome%20Paper%20Towards%20Co-ownership%20-%20Caucus%20on%20Intermediaries%20-%20August%202022.pdf) *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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2021-07/IASC%20Guidance%20on%20Strengthening%20Participation%2C%20Representation%20and%20Leadership%20of%20Local%20and%20National%20Actors%20in%20IASC%20Humanitarian%20Coordination%20Mechanisms_2.pdf) *defines equitable partnerships in terms of the* [*Principles of Partnership*](https://www.icvanetwork.org/transforming-our-network-for-impact/principles-of-partnership/#:~:text=The%20Principles%20of%20Partnership%20(Equality,and%20national%20humanitarian%20response%20capacity.)*.*

*Refer to annex A in the* [*IASC Guidance on the Provision of Overheads to Local and National Partners*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/humanitarian-financing/iasc-guidance-provision-overheads-local-and-national-partners) *for existing definitions of overheads/indirect costs.*

* + 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 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):*

* + 1. Do you cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners?
		*[Qualitative and binary: tick YES or NO as applicable, with 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.*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2023-06/Grand%20Bargain%20beyond%202023%20-%20Framework.pdf) *The updated* [*IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/IASC%20Policy%20on%20Gender%20Equality%20and%20the%20Empowerment%20of%20Women%20and%20Girls%20in%20Humanitarian%20Action.pdf) *(2024) includes definitions for women’s rights and women-led organisations (WROs/WLOs) in its annex. Local and national actors that meet those definitions are relevant to this indicator.*

*Women-Led Organizations (WLOs): An organization 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 Organizations (WROs): Women’s rights organization: 1) an organization that self-identifies as a woman’s rights organization with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organization 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 organization 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.*

* + 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. 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* | *[HCTs]**[ICCGs]**[CBPF Advisory Boards]* |
| *Total number of members in humanitarian coordination bodies and CBPF Advisory Boards* | *[HCTs]**[ICCGs]**[CBPF Advisory Boards]* |

*Free text space (1024 characters max):*

* + 1. Number 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 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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2022-07/Grand%20Bargain%20Caucus%20on%20Quality%20Funding%20-%20Outcome%20Document%20-%20final%20-%2011Jul22.pdf) *to the quality funding caucus to provide qualitative evidence on how affected populations have influenced project/programme design.*

**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]*

[ ]  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*](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/IASC%20Policy%20on%20Gender%20Equality%20and%20the%20Empowerment%20of%20Women%20and%20Girls%20in%20Humanitarian%20Action.pdf) *(2024).*

*Women-Led Organizations (WLOs): An organization 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 Organizations (WROs): Women’s rights organization: 1) an organization that self-identifies as a woman’s rights organization with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women’s empowerment and human rights; or 2) an organization 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 organization 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 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.*

* 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](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/model-cash-coordination-endorsed-grand-bargain-caucus-outcome-document)

[ ]  YES

[ ]  NO
*If no, please elaborate why not.*
*Free text space (1024 characters max):*

**6.1.2** [Quality funding](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/grand-bargain-quality-funding-caucus-concludes-new-funding-commitments)

[ ]  YES

[ ]  NO
*If no, please elaborate why not.*
*Free text space (1024 characters max):*

**6.1.3** [The role of intermediaries](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/caucus-role-intermediaries-final-outcome-document-august-2022)

[ ]  YES

[ ]  NO
*If no, please elaborate why not.*
*Free text space (1024 characters max):*

**6.1.4** [Funding for localisation](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/caucus-funding-localisation-endorsement-three-recommendations-march-2023)

[ ]  YES

[ ]  NO
*If no, please elaborate why not.*
*Free text space (1024 characters max):*