

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

AUSTRALIA

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	4
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	4
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	4
Work stream 2 - Localization	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	6
2. Progress to date	6
3. Planned next steps	7
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 3 - Cash	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	10
Work stream 4 – Management costs	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2. Progress to date	13
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	14
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	16
3. Planned next steps	17
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	18
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	19
2. Progress to date	19
3. Planned next steps	19
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	20
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	21

1. Baseline (only in year 1)	21
2. Progress to date	21
3. Planned next steps	21
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	22
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	24
2. Progress to date	24
3. Planned next steps	24
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	25
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	26
2. Progress to date	27
3. Planned next steps	27
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	27

Work stream 1 - Transparency

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- DFAT uses a number of quality processes including
 - Detailed guidance on design standards
 - Peer review of significant investment concepts and designs, including by a senior management committee for high value/high risk investments
 - Clear identification of risks, including safeguards and fraud risk, and strategies to manage these risks.
- These processes are complemented by a range of other checks and balances to ensure the effectiveness of the aid program. These include
 - Strong systems for assessing the performance of key delivery partners (NGOs, contractors and Multilaterals), which closely link performance and funding
 - Operational evaluations of individual aid investments prioritised by value, risk or profile
 - Strategic evaluations of the aid program by the Office of Development Effectiveness (ODE) under the guidance of an Independent Evaluation Committee chaired by Mr. Jim Adams, a former World Bank Vice President
 - A detailed audit program.
- The aid program is also subject to periodic external scrutiny through the
 - Australian National Audit Office (ANAO);
 - Senate Estimates process
 - Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Peer Reviews.
- Annual reporting on aid effectiveness includes
 - The *Performance of Australian Aid* (PAA) report, which reports annually on progress against the 10 strategic targets; provides summaries of performance for country and regional programs, global programs, and key sectors; and aggregates performance information for all significant aid investments
 - The PAA report for 2015-16 will be published in March 2017
 - Aid Program Performance Reports (APPRs), which provide an annual assessment of country and regional aid programs
 - 2015-16 APPRs for country and regional programs were published on the DFAT website in September 2016.
- At the level of country and regional programs, performance is assessed against performance benchmarks and mutual obligations. Arrangements are also in place to assess the performance of the aid program's major delivery partners (commercial contractors, NGOs and multilateral organisations).
- In addition, a range of evaluations are undertaken each year by the Office of Development Effectiveness (ODE).

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- . DFAT provides detailed information on the Australian aid program in an open and accessible format on its website including:
 - the Australian Aid Budget Summary 2016-17 ("The Orange Book");
 - the Australian Engagement with Developing Countries. Part 1: Bilateral relationships at a glance and Part 2: Official Sector Statistical Summary 2014-15 ("The Green Book");
 - the Annual Performance of Australian Aid report;
 - the next comprehensive summary of the performance of the aid program (2015-16) will be released in February 2017.
- . Australia continues to participate in international efforts to improve the transparency and accountability of Official Development Assistance, such as the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).
 - We provide quarterly investment-level information to IATI's international database.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- . DFAT is already leading best practice, we will endeavour to:
 - support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data
 - improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure common standard data for some reporting purposes where possible.
- . In line with GHD principles, we seek to agree common strategic performance frameworks and universal, program-level reports prepared by multilateral partners in the humanitarian sector, reporting against agreed strategic priorities, and including both audited financial statements and annual/crisis-specific narrative results reporting. Common annual reporting including against budgets should meet common high standards for transparency and accountability in line with the commitments of aid organisations under the WHS and Grand Bargain.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- . Australia's reporting requirements are minimal, aligning to standard approaches of our multilateral partners. This further contributes to administrative efficiency by reducing donor burden.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- . We would like other major multilateral partners to replicate the WFP Model of Accountability for Multilateral Funding, increasing visibility they are able to communicate to donors on their core funding
 - However we recognize that not all multilateral organisations are necessarily able to, or would it be appropriate for them to given their mandate, replicate exactly the WFP model.

Work stream 2 - Localization

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . DFAT is accountable to the Australian public for the expenditure of their tax dollars. We do this through due diligence checks, regular partner meetings, monitoring and reporting on our partnerships and contractual obligations.
- . Our commitment to localisation will challenge the way Australia provides humanitarian assistance, particularly given present discrepancies surrounding global and regional localisation definitions.
- . DFAT presently provides funding to Australian NGOs who are required to support and work with local NGOs to implement preparedness and response activities to natural hazards.
- . The Australian NGOs provide the technical skills to ensure the accountability of funds in support of local NGOs who may not have the governance structures and processes in place to meet DFAT requirements at this stage.
- . We have a long way to go if we are to meet the current target of 20% of humanitarian funding directly to national actors by 2020
 - o Safeguards such as our due diligence requirements can be onerous for local organisations
 - o Varying levels of national capacities will also make it difficult for a global localisation narrative to fit in the Pacific context.
- However we do provide direct support to NDMOs and local institutions for disaster preparedness and response
 - o And are looking at options for greater use of local suppliers, including in the private sector, for rapid response
- We need to work together to analyse this and develop an agreed framework for devolving funds to first responders.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

Australia's efforts to strengthen and localise responses in the Indo-Pacific include:

- . funding the Australian Red Cross (\$36.5 million 2015-19) and Australian Humanitarian Partnership (\$50 million 2016-21) NGOs to strengthen preparedness and response capacity of NGOs and government and build resilience of Indo-Pacific countries;
- . funding a Humanitarian Leadership Program managed by Save the Children and Deakin University that trains Pacific humanitarian officials, including the Foreign Ministers recent announcement on World Humanitarian Day of Humanitarian Leadership Scholarships for Pacific disaster managers;

- funding the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) to manage the SPRINT initiative, which builds the capacity of national governments to integrate sexual and reproductive health into disaster management policies, and builds the capacity of local NGOs (IPPF member associations) as first responders to provide vulnerable women, men and children with lifesaving sexual and reproductive health services;
- pre-positioning Australian Civilian Corps disaster risk management specialists in disaster management agencies in Vanuatu, Samoa, Fiji and Tonga, with a Pacific regional specialist in the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC);
- funding the World Food Programme to develop a map of prepositioned emergency supplies across the Pacific that provides information for regional countries to guide response and replenishment activities;
- funding UNOCHA to undertake a stocktake of regional capacity building efforts, which could lead to a regional competency framework;
- working with the Australian Energy Networks Association on a partnership to help the Pacific rapidly repair electricity networks to recover from disasters;
- our \$2 million Pacific Humanitarian Challenge, which will improve communication of needs following disasters; humanitarian logistics; and low-cost insurance;
- working with the banking and insurance industry to improve availability and uptake of disaster risk insurance in the Pacific;
- working with PIF members to develop an up-to-date list of regional disaster capabilities to be utilised by Pacific governments during responses.
- building capacity of local organisations and disaster management authorities and assisting countries to better manage risks. For example, Australia is supporting the Philippines build disaster preparedness, response capacity and resilience of systems and communities (\$16.6 million, 2012-2017);
- supporting UNISDR (\$5.7 million 2016-2018) in the work it is doing with national governments to: understand and predict likely disasters; put in place measures that will reduce the damage and loss from disasters; and improve the capacity of governments to respond to, and build back better following disasters to strengthen resilience to future disasters.
- ensuring future humanitarian framework agreements with INGOs and UN agencies have a focus on capacity building and working with national actors.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- We are taking a phased approach.
- Australia will improve its major partnerships to ensure future agreements and policy engagement has a focus on capacity building and working with national actors.

- . DFAT is committed to work with UN partners to improve coherence and coordination and ‘deliver as one’ particularly in the Pacific
 - o taking into account the region’s unique vulnerabilities and distinct operating environment
 - o DFAT conducts regular high-level consultations and monitoring trips with these partners.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 3 - Cash

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- Australia has experience supporting our delivery partners to use cash based responses in humanitarian settings.
- The independent Office of Development Effectiveness evaluation (2014) of Australia's response during the Horn of Africa humanitarian crisis in 2011, found cash transfers worked remarkably well. Even in the worst affected areas of Somalia, cash transfers attracted merchants and put decision-making at the family level. People were able to buy food, a critical difference in the famine epicentre where it was very difficult to get food in any other way. Another benefit was lower diversion rates than with food transfers.
- DFAT's Humanitarian Strategy (May 2016) included a recommendation to include cash transfers as a humanitarian programming option (for relief and early recovery) where appropriate, based on case-by-case analysis. DFAT sees cash-based transfers as important mechanisms to empower crisis-affected people and to catalyse economic activity in the aftermath of a disaster.
- DFAT aid management systems are currently limited in their capacity to capture cash programming, this will be improved in 2017.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- Australia has committed to increase cash-based transfers as a humanitarian option, as appropriate based on case-by-case analysis. Likewise the *Strategy for Australia's aid investments in social protection* (2015) prioritises bringing together social protection and humanitarian response, in particular in the Pacific. Humanitarian cash and its intersection with social protection systems is being considered within the Pacific Strategy process.
- Cash based transfers are likely to play a much larger role in certain DFAT humanitarian response packages (e.g. protracted crises such as assistance to people affected by the Syrian crisis). Recent DFAT-funded assessments¹ of the use of cash in the Pacific show cash transfers are feasible and likely to be effective in certain Pacific contexts, but that more work is required to better prepare for the use of humanitarian cash in future disaster settings.
- Both reports show that cash-based assistance is already featuring in responses. However, outside of Fiji, it is very much in its infancy, and there is little evidence of preparedness or planning incorporating the use of cash. In Fiji, the existing social protection system facilitated

¹ Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) report [Cash Transfer Programming in the Pacific: A feasibility Scoping Study](#) (October 2016), and World Bank (Forthcoming) Impact evaluation of the Government of Fiji's social protection top up transfers.

cash payments, and the Government of Fiji also implemented a large housing voucher scheme. Outside of this cash was little used.

- DFAT will work with its partners, including the private sector, to consider cash transfer programming as an appropriate humanitarian response option and when relevant, aim to provide cash transfers at scale.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- Australia will continue to draw on evidence, lessons learned and global good practice concerning the use of cash transfers in humanitarian situations to build the resilience of communities and markets in our region.
- In terms of priorities (and capacity) for 2017, DFAT will drive forward:
 - Finalisation of cash baseline figures and guidance notes for practioners
 - Training for staff
 - Collaborate with the Suva Regional Cash Working Group, and WFP around the in-country market and CTP assessments
 - Funding for World Bank second phase IE research and Pacific regional workshop

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- Australia will continue to draw on evidence, lessons learned and global good practice concerning the use of cash transfers in humanitarian situations to build the resilience of communities and markets in our region.
- In the Pacific, the delivery of cash transfers to crisis and disaster-affected populations has mostly been small scale, although there are examples following Cyclones Pam and Evan.
- DFAT provided funding to CaLP to undertake a feasibility study of cash transfer programming in the Pacific. The report found:
 - Generalizing feasibility is fraught due to the uniqueness of each country and the nuances between islands and rural urban differences.
 - There is an immediate need to invest in baseline information on market supply chains and performance and to make this information available to decision makers.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . All DFAT development programs include a maximum of ten per cent administration fee
- . DFAT is committed to work with UN partners to improve coherence and coordination and ‘deliver as one’ particularly in the Asia-Pacific
 - taking into account the regions’ unique vulnerabilities and distinct operating environment
 - DFAT conducts regular high-level consultations and monitoring trips with these partners.
- DFAT is committed to making joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes where possible.
- Under DFAT’s Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP), NGOs are able to allocate up to 10 per cent of their annual ANCP grant to administrative costs in any financial year.
 1. *Project-related* administrative costs may be charged to project budgets. However, NGOs should remember that value for money is a significant aspect of the assessment of activities for funding and general overheads and pre-project costs (such as recurrent expenses at headquarters, membership costs or administration fees and maintenance costs of basic operations such as appraisal and design mechanisms) would not normally be charged to project operations, whether they occur in Australia or elsewhere.
 2. Fundraising costs are not eligible to be included in administration costs.
 3. NGOs are required to have auditable records of their actual expenditure against the approved list of items covered by the administration percentage, but will not be required to acquit them. The expenditure should be signed off by the NGO’s auditor as part of the NGOs annual financial audit forming part of their financial statement.
 4. If an NGO's actual expenditure is less than 10 per cent, they can use the balance of the funds for capacity building for staff assigned to development program implementation within the agency or with partner agencies in development projects, but they must be able to document use of the funds in an audit.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . The Australian Government’s Humanitarian Strategy (2016):
 - supports better coordinated regional approaches and operational mechanisms to prepare for and ensure rapid and effective disaster response in situations that exceed national coping capacities; and
 - puts affected people at the centre of humanitarian assistance, including when determining needs, in allocation and delivery of relief, and when assessing impact.
- . The government of the affected country holds primary responsibility for assisting and protecting all people within their borders during crises. When a government’s capacity is overwhelmed, it can request international humanitarian assistance. Australia works with affected governments and regional bodies to build local capacities. We support national leadership of a crisis response or, where a government cannot lead, we support its priorities. Where the government is weak, non-responsive to need, or is an active participant in conflict that is generating the humanitarian crisis, Australia may work with our other humanitarian partners to determine priorities that guide our assistance.
- . Wherever appropriate, international humanitarian assistance should supplement – not be substitutes for – national and local efforts.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- . Australia supports the Grand Bargain commitment to needs assessments that are impartial, unbiased, comprehensive, context-sensitive, timely and up-to-date
 - We have demonstrated this commitment through our support to key humanitarian agencies with responsibilities for coordinated humanitarian response and needs assessment including UNOCHA and UNDAC.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- . Australia will continue to advocate for and support needs assessments that are impartial, unbiased, comprehensive, context-sensitive, timely and up-to-date through our partnerships and our standard operating procedures for humanitarian response.
- . Australia will also seek to advance the localisation of humanitarian assistance by strengthening the leadership and decision-making of national leadership of crisis response where possible.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . The Australian Government is committed to strengthened inclusion of people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives.
 - This helps ensure that humanitarian response is relevant, timely, effective, and efficient.
- . Australia works to ensure that the voices of the most vulnerable groups considering gender, age, ethnicity, language and special needs are heard and acted upon.
- . The Australian Government’s Humanitarian Strategy (2016) puts affected people at the centre of humanitarian assistance, including when determining needs, in allocation and delivery of relief, and when assessing impact.
- . Australia is a strong advocate for the protection and inclusion of people with disabilities in all humanitarian action, in line with its obligations under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
- . Australia’s Humanitarian Strategy (2016) identifies Disability Inclusion as one of five priority areas for our humanitarian action.
- . Protection is a core component of Australia’s humanitarian action and Australia has a long standing commitment to protecting people affected by natural disasters and human-induced crises, reflecting our desire to prevent and reduce the violence, exploitation and deprivation that people in such situations face.
 - Australia released its first Protection in Humanitarian Action Framework (the Framework) in 2013
 - The Framework commits Australia to fund and advocate for dedicated protection programs and for protection to be mainstreamed in humanitarian action
 - It identifies three priority areas for Australia’s protection work: being accountable to affected populations; protecting people with disability; and preventing and responding to gender based violence (GBV).
- . Australia’s Humanitarian Strategy includes a number of guiding principles aimed at protecting people and reducing violence against women.
 - Guiding principle 5 ensures that gender equality and social inclusion is integrated into all aspects of Australia’s humanitarian action, promotes diverse participation in leadership, and ensures the specific needs of vulnerable groups are addressed.
 - The strategy also includes five thematic priorities, the first of which is Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment. This recognises that women, girls, boys and men experience crises differently – with different needs, responsibilities and capabilities.
- . This thematic priority commits Australia to
 - Undertake gender analysis at the design stage of humanitarian activities
 - Support the active participation of gender and age groups in disaster response and increase the disaggregation of data by sex and age

- Ensure women are well represented in leadership roles, decision making, planning and evaluation
 - Equal access to humanitarian assistance
 - Prioritise protection and empowerment of women and girls to prevent and respond to gender based violence
 - Promote international good practice and ensure partners implement and report against the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Gender Marker and use the Minimum Initial Services Package (MISP) for Sexual and Reproductive Health at the onset of a humanitarian emergency
- Australia’s policies were reflected and promoted strongly at the WHS. Australia made a joint commitment to work closely with local and national women’s groups to provide them with practical support to increase their capacity to deliver in humanitarian settings – and committed to ensuring that humanitarian programming both meets the needs of women and girls and meaningfully involves them in all aspects of programming
 - Australia committed for the first time to apply a Gender Marker to all humanitarian funding provided by the Australian Government – to ensure that gender issues are considered at all stages of the program cycle. Australia outlined its ongoing commitment to SRH in emergencies

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- Examples of Australia’s support for programs aimed at reducing and responding to violence against women in crises include:
 - Annual core funding for mandated protection agencies such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).
 - Earmarked funding for UNHCR’s and ICRC’s SGBV prevention and response work.
 - Ongoing funding for global gender and protection activities, including supporting the work of the Global Protection Cluster’s GBV Area of Responsibility and the Gender and Protection Standby Capacity Projects to deploy protection and gender specialists to humanitarian organisations operating globally.
- DFAT’s commitments to protection and gender equality are also reflected in our performance and partners assessment processes (eg. multilateral performance assessments, humanitarian aid quality checks).
- Australia also has a strong commitment to ensuring that sexual and reproductive health (SRH) needs are met during humanitarian crises and has been recognised by the UN and leading SRH NGOs as a leader in addressing this gap.
- Australia has been funding the SPRINT Initiative since 2007, which:
 - supports advocacy and training to governments and organisations to integrate sexual and reproductive health in their crisis responses; and

- saves lives by assisting vulnerable women, men and children in crisis to access a minimum standard of lifesaving reproductive and health services.
- Australia was proud to champion the Charter for Disability Inclusion in Humanitarian Action at the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016
- People with disabilities are often disproportionately affected by natural disasters. It is critical we do better at ensuring they participate in and are supported by humanitarian action
- We encourage states and humanitarian organisations to endorse and implement the Charter.
- Australia co-chairs the Global Action on Disability (GLAD), an international coordination mechanism working to enhance the inclusion of people with disabilities in international development and humanitarian action. Australia and Finland are the focal points for GLAD's Working Group on Humanitarian Action, one of three key GLAD themes.
- Australia supports initiatives to strengthen the international humanitarian community's response to people with disabilities in times of crisis, and has provided recent support for the activities of the Women's Refugee Commission; the International Committee of the Red Cross' Special Fund for the Disabled; the Protection Standby Capacity Project (ProCap); and research into protecting people with disabilities in camp situations through the University of Sydney.
-

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- In implementing the priority area of Disability Inclusion within Australia's Humanitarian Strategy (2016), Australia will continue to ensure that people with a range of abilities are active participants in the planning, design and implementation of humanitarian assistance.
- We will continue to work with partners to implement gender-sensitive humanitarian programming, recognising the additional risk of physical, sexual and other forms of violence facing women and girls with disabilities.
- Australia will also support work to strengthen data collection and analysis prior, during and after situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies to better track and improve the situation of people with disabilities.
- Disability inclusiveness is a thematic priority that underpins our \$220 million Syria package
- We know that disability inclusion is particularly poor in the response to the refugee crisis, and data is not available in many cases
- ongoing stigma around intellectual disability in particular, and access to education and livelihood opportunities is very limited – especially for women and girls with a disability.
- We will have mutually agreed performance expectations on sex, age and disability disaggregated data and targeting persons with disabilities for all our investments in humanitarian assistance and protection in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon [Components 1 & 2].

- Mainstreaming disability inclusion will be a focus of all activities under our Education and Livelihoods in Jordan and Lebanon Component [Component 3], given the gaps identified on access to education and livelihood opportunities for people with disabilities. For example, our livelihood investment in Jordan will promote income-earning opportunities for women and people with a disability, and there will be a specific focus on disability inclusion as part of our funding to Education programs in Lebanon.
- Together with New Zealand, Australia has have developed a new Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for humanitarian responses to rapid onset disasters in the Pacific. The framework emphasises the importance of ensuring all data collected is disaggregated by sex, age and ability. It will support tracking of commitments made by Australia and New Zealand during the World Humanitarian Summit, with particular emphasis on stressing the inclusion of the voices of affected communities and vulnerable groups in information collection.
- The new Australian Humanitarian Partnership enables the Australian Government and six Australian NGOs to respond to humanitarian crises globally and to support local Pacific communities to take a leadership role in preparedness, risk reduction and resilience efforts. A key priority across the partnership is elevating the role of people with disability in decision-making.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . DFAT has multiyear agreements with all of its major multilateral partners
- . The multi-year approach is aligned to DFAT's Humanitarian Strategy and World Humanitarian Summit outcomes, both of which advocate adopting new, innovative approaches to situations of protracted displacement that build resilience by bridging the divide between humanitarian and development efforts, as well as providing significant unearmarked funding.
- . Australia's major multi-year partnerships with multilaterals all have an element of unearmarked funding and rely on standard reporting, making them highly efficient both for the agency we are supporting and in terms of internal management overheads. There are opportunities to make the funding chain from multilateral to implementer shorter, quicker and less administratively heavy; progress on the Grand Bargain commitments including on streamlining partner assessment processes could add real value to achieving further efficiency from unearmarked funding arrangements.
- . Australia is already a significant provider of core funding for humanitarian organisations. In 2016 Australia was the 4th largest unearmarked funding donor for UNOCHA; the 11th largest funder of ICRC overall and 5th largest funder for unearmarked; 12th largest funder for the CERF (unearmarked because CERF is a pooled financing mechanism); and 12th largest core funder for UNHCR. Of Australia's funding to OCHA, 82% is unearmarked.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- . Over the last year, Australia has signed new, multi-year strategic partnership agreements with five UN agencies which commit us to four years of voluntary core funding (with annual contributions of \$21m for UNICEF; \$12.7m for UNDP; \$9.2m for UN Population Fund; \$40m for World Food Programme; and \$7.8m for UN Women). Australia will sign new multi-year strategic partnerships with UNHCR and UN OCHA in 2017-18.
- . The Australian Government announced a three-year \$220 million aid package to respond to the Syria crisis as part of the 2016 Budget. This followed a commitment at the "Supporting Syria and the Region" conference that Australia would develop a multi-year package to help build the capacity of Jordan and Lebanon to continue to host large numbers of refugees.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- Multi-year strategies should set out a combination of multi-year funding commitments and planned funding allocations which balance increased leverage with partners with funding flexibility. We would engage in policy dialogue with partners and monitoring to realise the benefits of multi-year commitments in terms of increased efficiency and better results. Multi-year strategies should enable more proactive not reactive investments; and enable us to put in place a stronger framework to monitor and report on impact. Through multi-year strategies we would also seek to increase visibility of Australian funding to partners, host governments, affected communities and the Australian public.
- There needs to be a greater collective approach by donors on UN performance, to ensure we are funding and incentivising the most effective and efficient partners
- Australia will include performance expectations in all our upcoming multi-year agreements with UN agencies and the ICRC and we will use our first multi-year funding commitment to a protracted crisis (Syria) to incentivise multilateral partners to improve planning, use of cash, common needs assessments, coordination and efficiency
- As a medium-sized donor with at times limited on-the-ground presence outside the Indo-Pacific region, we see particular value in intermediaries (whether multilateral agencies or INGOs). We can draw on the contextual knowledge and operational capacity of these partners, combined with due diligence and risk management frameworks which can help ensure efficiency of humanitarian funds. This is supported by our dialogue with like-minded donor partners.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- Australia is already a significant provider of core funding for humanitarian organisations. In 2016 Australia was the 4th largest unearmarked funding donor for UNOCHA; the 11th largest funder of ICRC overall and 5th largest funder for unearmarked; 12th largest funder for the CERF (unearmarked because CERF is a pooled financing mechanism); and 12th largest core funder for UNHCR. Of Australia's funding to OCHA, 82% is unearmarked.
- Australia's funding to multilateral partners is based on Strategic Partnership Frameworks informed by Multilateral Performance Assessments. The Strategic Partnership Frameworks enable funding provided to support the organisation's strategic priorities with a multi-year perspective. Multilateral Performance Assessments provide a standard objective evaluation of an organisation's effectiveness, efficiency and management against set criteria. Under this structure Australia provides a range of core, soft-earmarked and earmarked funding.
- Soft-earmarked funding includes core funding with some requirements for regional presence and focus on strategic priorities on which we seek consensus with the organization and its funding donors.
- In addition to strategic partnership frameworks with multilateral organisations, and annual contributions to CERF at a global level, Australia has similar mechanisms to SIDA's for rapid response, such as support to country based pooled funds (CBBF).
- Australia also maintains the Humanitarian Partnership Agreement which enable rapid funding to specific crisis responses through five accredited Australian-based International NGOs who have demonstrated performance presence in affected countries through local CSOs.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- Australia is continuing to demonstrate its commitment to core funding of partner agencies, expanding to multi-year commitments.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- Australia is continuing to demonstrate its commitment to core funding of partner agencies, expanding to multi-year commitments.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- Australia's strong commitment to core, non-earmarked funding demonstrates confidence in our multilateral partners and our support to efficient and effective humanitarian assistance.
- Australia's major multi-year partnerships with multilaterals all have significant unearmarked funding and rely on standard reporting, making them highly efficient both for the agency we are supporting and in terms of internal management overheads. There are opportunities to make the funding chain from multilateral to implementer shorter, quicker and less administratively heavy; progress on the Grand Bargain commitments including on streamlining partner assessment processes could add real value to achieving further efficiency from unearmarked funding arrangements.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- Australia as a principled humanitarian donor has strong interest in advocating against greater earmarking. Recent donor earmarking trends have damaging effects on smaller donors like Australia are left paying for agencies' less attractive administrative costs. This could be an important disincentive for smaller but principled donors like Australia who also need to be accountable to political decision-makers for achieving value-for-money.
- We seek an equivalent level of visibility and impact to be demonstrated for core funding as for earmarked funding among our partners.
- The visibility of core funding support is a priority for Australia to support our case to political decision-makers, and so would be helpful for our government in order to be in a position to increase flexibility of humanitarian funding.
- It is difficult for core funders to substantiate core funding in the absence of a line of sight to its effectiveness and impact particularly in the immediate geographic region in which we have political and public expectations of achieving impact. This is a particular issue for Australia because of our Indo-Pacific focus, which differs from the Africa/ Middle-East focus of the majority of donor agencies.
- A move towards a transparent methodology for allocation of core resources would be helpful for the Australian Government to increase flexibility of humanitarian funding. In a contestable budget environment, it is important to provide a convincing and evidence-based narrative for political decision-makers and the Australian public to secure support for non-earmarked funding support.
- Amending management fees/ 'programme support cost' could be a constructive incentive to greater non-earmarked funding of multilateral partners. Waiving programme support costs for core funding while applying or increasing it for earmarked funding could assist in generating improved non-earmarked funding.
- As well as a transparent methodology for the allocation of core funding, we value and would appreciate more evidence from multilateral partners of tangible, on-the-ground benefits achieved from core funding, including the dollar-value benefit of core funding (eg \$1 of

unearmarked funding = \$1.XX of core funding in terms of benefits achieved). Such evidence helps us make the case to political decision-makers to continue prioritizing non-earmarked funding.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- In line with GHD principles, we seek to agree common strategic performance frameworks and universal, program-level reports prepared by multilateral partners in the humanitarian sector, reporting against agreed strategic priorities, and including both audited financial statements and annual/crisis-specific narrative results. Common annual reporting including against budgets should meet common high standards for transparency and accountability in line with the commitments of aid organisations under the WHS and Grand Bargain.
- Our reporting requirements for humanitarian implementing partners are driven by the Australian Aid Policy & Performance framework, and specifically the requirements of the Multilateral Performance Assessment.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- DFAT has concluded a Humanitarian M&E framework jointly with New Zealand specifically for sudden onset natural disasters in the Pacific.
- DFAT advocates for effective mandating, resourcing and authority of the information role for UNOCHA authority within the UN/ broader humanitarian system would support this function

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- In line with GHD principles, we seek to agree common strategic performance frameworks and universal, program-level reports prepared by multilateral partners in the humanitarian sector, reporting against agreed strategic priorities, and including both audited financial statements and annual/crisis-specific narrative results reporting (wording as per concept note). Common annual reporting including against budgets should meet common high standards for transparency and accountability in line with the commitments of aid organisations under the WHS and Grand Bargain.
- DFAT will further review the strengths and challenges of humanitarian partner reporting in its humanitarian partnership management.
 - The GPPi report “Harmonizing Donor Reporting” identified Australia has one of the countries requiring ‘bespoke reports’ of UNHCR/ WHO/ WFP. This may have arisen because as a core-funding donor, common reporting was not adequately reporting on core administrative expenditure for our information purposes. The message here is that in order for donors to meet commitments to unearmarked funding, we need to have adequate information and visibility to make a case to our decision-makers for unearmarked funding to be supported.

- The GPPi report further notes that a handful of donors, and UN agencies in general, impose greater reporting burdens on humanitarian implementers
- Australia is committed to unearmarked funding, a focus on common strategic performance frameworks agreed

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- N/A

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- . Australia recognises Early Recovery is vital to arrest and begin to reverse the decline in an affected country's/region's development trajectory (caused by a natural disaster, or humanitarian crisis) and to lay the foundations (or sustain minimum services) for Recovery / Reconstruction and Development activities.
- . The new DFAT Humanitarian Strategy commits to further support the transition from humanitarian relief to longer-term recovery and development.
 - It prioritises Early Recovery efforts to resuscitate basic services (health, education and infrastructure), markets and livelihoods, and protecting the vulnerable, immediately after a disaster or crisis; and
 - Will provide technical assistance to partner organisations and governments to assist Early Recovery efforts; including exploring the option of seconding specialist DFAT staff and/or members for the Australian Civilian Corps to the Early Recovery Cluster (and others) to enhance the timely recovery of the affected country.
- . Early Recovery programming is subject to consultation with the host government and will seek to leverage existing Australian Aid Investment Plan programming. Early Recovery investments help to localise a post-crisis response by empowering local actors, including women and children, people with disabilities and other marginalised and vulnerable groups and supporting the local private sector, particularly small to medium enterprises, to get back on its feet.
- . A key vehicle for these activities will be DFAT's partnerships with the host government, UN agencies, the Red Cross movement and non-government organisations, international and national, including the Humanitarian Partnership Agreement and the Australian Defence Force.
- . The Australian Government announced a three-year \$220 million aid package to respond to the Syria crisis as part of the 2016 Budget. This followed a commitment at the "Supporting Syria and the Region" conference that Australia would develop a multi-year package to help build the capacity of Jordan and Lebanon to continue to host large numbers of refugees. The indicative structure of the package:
 - Component 1 – humanitarian funding inside Syria (30 per cent);
 - Component 2 – humanitarian funding to Syria's neighbouring countries (30 per cent); and
 - Component 3 – education, small-scale livelihoods and innovative pilot projects in Jordan and Lebanon to support Syrian refugees and host communities (40 per cent).
- . This breakdown off the Syria package will allow Australia to preserve our current commitment to addressing immediate humanitarian needs in Syria and the region, which are increasing as the conflict draws on. The package aims to respond to the immediate needs of people in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon to prevent the humanitarian situation from further deteriorating; stemming further displacement, and to support the efforts of Jordan and Lebanon so that Syrians see a future for themselves and their children in the region, rather than risking their

lives by fleeing even further from their homes. This will be achieved by funding trusted humanitarian partners to provide emergency assistance, protection services, education and livelihood activities in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. The substantial contribution for education and livelihoods will enable Australia to support the Jordanian and Lebanese Governments' own priorities in response to the crisis. The package will also be complemented by Australia's contribution to the global 'Education Cannot Wait' fund – designed to ensure that no child or young person will have her or his education interrupted because of an emergency or crisis. It will place Australia as a leading advocate and funder of this sector globally.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- The DFAT Humanitarian Strategy provided guidance to partners on the Australian Aid Program's priorities for Early Recovery, mindful of existing aid activities in country, to generate early, visible results.
- Guidance notes to assist DFAT Country Programs and Partners to implement key components of the Humanitarian Strategy will be released with the Strategy.
- The Performance Assessment Framework in the 2016 Humanitarian Strategy outlines how DFAT will assess its effectiveness, including the three key result areas described for early recovery. This includes actively learning so as to produce a more effective future humanitarian response.
 - Early Recovery is a key component of the work being undertaken in the joint Australia / New Zealand Humanitarian Monitoring and Evaluation Framework project, to harmonise how we can work better in the Pacific.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- . DFAT's multi-year Syria response is aligned to DFAT's Humanitarian Strategy and WHS outcomes, which advocate adopting new, innovative approaches to situations of protracted displacement that build resilience by bridging the divide between humanitarian and development efforts, as well as providing significant unearmarked funding.