

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

Estonia

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	3
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	3
Work stream 2 - Localization	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	4
2. Progress to date	4
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 3 - Cash	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	5
2. Progress to date	5
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	5
Work stream 4 – Management costs	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	6
2. Progress to date	6
3. Planned next steps	6
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	6
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date	7
3. Planned next steps	7
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	7
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	8
2. Progress to date	8
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	9

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
2. Progress to date	10
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	11
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	12
2. Progress to date	12
3. Planned next steps	12
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	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 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?

Estonia reports its humanitarian aid data to EDRIS, that transfers information on the humanitarian funding flows to FTS.

Timely humanitarian aid data is publicly available at the Estonian Development Co-operation Database (<https://rakendused.vm.ee/akta/index.php>). This database contains data in OECD DAC format and is the compilation basis of the report of Official Development Aid to DAC.

For transparency (mainly for Estonian Public) we also publish also humanitarian aid contribution and projects on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs web-page.

Estonia does not currently report according to the IATI standards.

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?

Estonia continues to publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding to EDRIS, the Estonian Development Cooperation Database and to DAC report.

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 developing Estonian Development Cooperation database for more simplified DAC reporting.

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 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?

Estonia supports the principle of empowering local responders. However, considering the Estonia's size and the size of the Estonian humanitarian aid programme, Estonia remains a strong supporter of the multilateral humanitarian system in order to maximize the effect of our aid.

Estonia increased contributions through local responders in 2015. We have been supporting local responders mainly via national NGOs partnerships and activities in the field in Ukraine and Jordan in 2015 with 117 933 EURs that is **6,9%** in proportion to the overall humanitarian funding portfolio. Many of the projects also include costs for the local responders. Estonia values and invests to capacity building of national and local 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?

To increase resources available to national and local responders' Estonian humanitarian aid projects include the needs of local NGO partners in their budget. In 2016 salaries and direct costs to local partners in Ukraine, Jordan and Lebanon reached to **7,7%** of the humanitarian funding portfolio.

Estonia does not currently contribute to specific pooled-funds.

Besides that (not included in the 7,7%) we supported Start Networks's work on innovative transfers to make the delivery of humanitarian aid more effective, transparent and accountable, so it could reach to the local responders quicker.

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)?

Estonian will continue to explore the possibilities to enhance the capacity of local and national responders.

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 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?

Estonia has supported common principles for multi-purpose cash-based assistance to respond to the humanitarian needs. Estonian NGO have used this opportunity on a small scale in Ukraine, while finding the most flexible and suitable solution to answer the humanitarian needs of the civilian population affected by the crisis.

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?

So far we haven't made any extra allocations for the organisations working on cash-based assistance. We do not finance bigger cash programmes as such, but modalities are used by some Estonian NGOs while delivering aid. Therefore, we do not also report more concretely on funding of cash.

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 will explore the possibilities to support the use of humanitarian cash transfers and emphasize the importance of private sector partners. With our NGO partners we will continue to find suitable ways to strengthen social protection systems to deliver humanitarian aid, including also cash where needed and appropriate.

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 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?

In our bi-lateral projects we follow the principle of less than 20 % allocation to management costs.

In contribution to the international humanitarian aid organisation we can add our voice on some of the advisory boards for budget planning (head quarter vs field offices/programmes).

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?

Shared information and joint field visits, where possible for Example in Ukraine.

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)?

Continue to coordinate with other donors and aid agencies on the monitoring and donor reviews.

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 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?

We appreciate coordinated, shared context based needs assessment. In humanitarian planning we depend mainly on the international aid organisations needs assessment and appeals. For bi-lateral humanitarian aid projects we use data available from open sources and also from feedback from our Embassies and also NGO partners on the field. Where possible, implementing partners later take part of OCHA cluster meetings.

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?

As for to date we have followed the same actions as described in baseline.

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)?

Coordinate more with other donors and aid organizations on the field.

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 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?

Estonian bi-lateral humanitarian activities have been community based, i.e. also using the knowledge of diaspora where possible. To answer to the community needs, there's also possibility for fields visits, need assessment. Our funding is also flexible to change the activities throw-out the project, if really needed.

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?

Estonian NGOs implementing the humanitarian projects for example in Ukraine are using flexible, needs based working methods, that involve local community and local partners. Part of a contribution has also been small grants to individual needs.

We do not fund separately activities related to feedback collection and programme adaption, but adapting to the local needs is done during feasibility studies and field visits by the Estonian NGOs capacity building projects.

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 continue monitoring and fields visits and joint discussions with local stake holders to better engage and answer to the most immediate humanitarian needs.

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 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?

We find it extremely important that international aid organisations constantly seek solutions to operate more efficiently. Estonian Development-Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid Strategy sets goals for 4 years and it goes hand-in-hand with the results indicators for budget allocation.

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?

Estonia makes its yearly non-earmarked transfers at the end of each year, in order to make the planning process more predictable. Aligned also with the Good Humanitarian Donorship standards.

Additional to the annual commitment to the international humanitarian organisations and programs (OCHA, UNCHR, UNICEF, CERF, WHO, WFO, ICRC, UNDAC), Estonia also supports longer-term project based activities. At the moment for example as a response to Syrian crisis in its neighbourhood countries.

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)?

Estonia continues to support the goals for multi-year planning and funding to make its contribution predictable. We continue to fulfil our strategic cooperation with priority aid organisations.

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.

Predictable budgeting and planning is more transparent and adds certainty to both the aid organization and the communities in need.

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 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?

2015 non-earmarked core contribution for 14,3 % of the total humanitarian aid.

2015 softly earmarked donation was 0,4% i.e. 160 000 EUR to OCHA activities in ROMENA region.

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?

Currently we do not have any joint agreement with other signatories on how to report on unearmarked or softly earmarked funding.

In 2016 Estonian non-earmarked core contributions reached to 14,8 % in proportion to the overall funding portfolio.

100 000 € OCHA

20 000 € UNDAC

80 000 € UNHCR

100 000 € ICRC

100 000 € CERF

50 000 € WHO

80 000 € UNRWA

Total: 530 000 €

In 2016 Estonian softly earmarked contribution was raised to 17% from 0,4% 2015. These were mainly contributions under the 2016 Syrian pledge via UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, OCHA to Jordan and Lebanon.

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)?

Estonia supports the flexible funding, if the trust and transparency is there also from the international aid organization side.

We appreciate also light reporting or overview of the core contribution, that could be useful also for the Estonian tax-payers and advocacy messages.

In 2017 we have increased the unearmarked contribution up to 17,8% in proportion to the overall funding portfolio.

OCHA 150 000 €

UNDAC 20 000 €

UNHCR 100 000 €

ICRC 100 000 €

CERF 100 000 €

WHO	50 000 €
UNRWA	80 000 €
Total	600 000 €

We will have more concrete numbers for the softly earmarked contribution in 2017 at the end of the year, but will plan to find more possibilities for more flexible earmarking (as for region, several countries).

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 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?

Estonia has taken steps to reduce the reporting requirements for bi-lateral projects and co-financing for the ECHO projects for Estonian NGO-s. Concrete changes are made to the rules of procedures for financing Estonian development cooperation and humanitarian aid projects.

Estonia supports the idea for the international organisation to jointly determine a way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding. But it shouldn't add extra workload. Just to see the main activity areas, priorities.

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.

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?

OCHA would distribute such a report.

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?

Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid is under one structure in the MFA. We have 4 years' strategic plan in the same document. Same director of the division and DG are responsible for the budget planning. That allows synergies between the activities in both fields.

We support the need to focus at concrete deliverables in protracted crises, including education, health services and livelihoods for displaced people. **In 2015 ca 36%** of the Estonian humanitarian aid contributions were directed to alleviate the refugees and IDPs situation in Ukraine and in the aftermath of Syrian crisis inside Syria and in its neighbourhood.

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?

Many of the Estonian Development Cooperation and humanitarian Aid activities are complementary, where possible (in the protracted crisis situation, preparedness activities). Revised EU development consensus takes account also humanitarian needs.

In Ukraine we have both development cooperation and humanitarian aid projects undergoing focused on IDPs. We have financed OCHAs Protection Capacity project in Ukraine to enhance social protection of the IDPs.

In Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey Estonia has projects carried out by the NGO Mondo and NGO Estonian Refugee Council with total budget of 377 650 EUR for the years 2016-2017.

In 2016 the Estonian humanitarian aid contributions were directed to alleviate the refugees and IDPs situation in Ukraine and in the aftermath of Syrian crisis inside Syria and in its neighbourhood was raised up to **68%** of the humanitarian aid budget.

From Development Cooperation side we have undergoing projects in Ukraine supporting the IDPs and victims of the conflict, including also direct micro financing to the local NGOs (314 707 EUR).

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)?

Continue to the joint assessment of the situation and complement the development, humanitarian and relief work in the same framework, where possible.

Activities in humanitarian aid should take account the Agenda 2030 and SDGs.

At COHAFA continue discussions and joint working modalities on development cooperation and humanitarian aid, where suitable, with respect to the humanitarian principles.

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