

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

Germany

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)	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	5
Work stream 3 - Cash	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)	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	7
Work stream 4 – Management costs	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 5 – Needs Assessment	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 6 – Participation Revolution	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 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	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)	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	13
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	14

1. Baseline (only in year 1)	14
2. Progress to date	14
3. Planned next steps	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	15
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	16
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	16
2. Progress to date	16
3. Planned next steps	16
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	17
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	17
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	18
2. Progress to date	18
3. Planned next steps	19
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	19
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	19

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?

All German humanitarian contributions are transparently reported to EDRIS which passes on information to FTS. All European Member States report to EDRIS and not directly to FTS. Germany has been in discussion with international and national partners of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) on how it could be adjusted to reflect humanitarian concerns.

In preparation of the Grand Bargain, Germany called upon the Financial Transparency work stream to ensure that IATI is appropriate to humanitarian contexts and links to OCHA's FTS. As part of the "Invest according to risk" shift at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), Germany committed itself to providing support to the affected state: work with governments of at-risk and crisis-affected states to play a leading role prioritizing and financing crisis-response by providing greater visibility of international financing investments through improved transparency and data analysis to enable better targeting of resources.

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 division for humanitarian assistance of the Federal Foreign Office (FFO) participated in an anti-corruption workshop organized by Transparency International in January 2017 to raise awareness for the necessity of a more transparent and open dialogue between the FFO and NGO partners on needs and challenges in preventing corruption in humanitarian projects. A follow-up workshop together with NGO Partners is planned.

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)?

The Netherlands and the World Bank have been in discussions with ICVA on how their work on transparency can complement the work of the Harmonized/Simplified Reporting Work Stream, which Germany co-leads, so it may be interesting to consider a transparency component in the joint reporting pilot project with GPPI (see Work Stream 9 on Reporting below).

The Federal Foreign Office is actively working on a software solution to be able to report according to IATI standards.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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?

Germany has actively been supporting local and national responders. Our German NGO partners regularly work with local partners and capacity building has been an integral part of these contributions. Moreover, the German Red Cross cooperates closely with National Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies and Germany's contributions to humanitarian funds aim to enable support to local and national responders. Germany's contribution to Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) has increased in the last few years, thereby also supporting different national NGOs identified by the respective CBPFs. In the work with German NGOs we encourage our partners to include a capacity development component benefiting national and local actors in their project proposals.

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?

In 2015, Germany provided 14.1 Mil. USD in funding to different CBPFs and was in tenth place in the donor ranking. In 2016, Germany's contribution to CBPFs increased significantly to more than 62 Mil. USD. Germany is currently fourth in the overall donor ranking for contribution to pooled funds. Germany's and ICVA's common efforts to develop a „Joint Reporting Framework“ under Work Stream 9, aim at harmonizing reporting requirements and would in consequence ease the burden for all actors, including local NGOs, and thus create free capacities. A project in the WASH-sector with the German Toilet Organization (GTO) and the German WASH-network aims at strengthening the WASH-capacities of national and local humanitarian actors. Germany is financing the second phase of 3 pilot projects with the German Red Cross and National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in Peru, Mozambique and Bangladesh on forecast-based financing. This is a new financing mechanism for improved preparedness of local actors for natural disasters based on extreme weather forecasts in line with commitment 2.1.

The German Coordination Committee on Humanitarian Assistance under the joint lead of the Federal Foreign Office and VENRO (umbrella organization of development and humanitarian NGOs in Germany) has established a working group on localization. The working group is closely following the work of the IASC HF TT on the definition of “local and national responders” and “as directly as possible” as this is going to have a direct impact on next steps to take within our system as well as for the development of a localization marker. Germany participated in the Grand Bargain Localization Work Stream Workshop in Geneva on 21 February, 2017.

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)?

WS Germany will finance the projects named under point 2 for the next 2-3 years to implement its respective commitments in this field. Germany continues to finance local and national responders as directly as possible. For the immediate future this includes one transaction layer, as discussed in the IASC Financing Task Team. Especially in the context of forecast-based financing, Germany will support the establishment of a special international funding mechanism to enable local actors to implement

preparedness for response measures (standard operating procedures for early action) based on specific early warning thresholds of extreme weather events in high risk pilot countries. To implement this forecast-based financing fund, Germany will also reach out to other donors to support this fund.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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?

In terms of good practices, our NGO partners work with local partners, enabling access, acceptance and shifts between short and medium term assistance. Establishment of a national working group on localization has highlighted the need to even further enable local actors. The challenge remains to define “as direct as possible” and the development of a localization marker.

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?

Germany has recognized the potential and value of cash-based assistance already before the Grand Bargain was signed. For example, in June 2015, the EU's working group on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid (COHAFA) had recommended common principles for multi-purpose cash-based assistance to respond to humanitarian needs, to be adopted by the Council of Europe. Germany has contributed to the development of these common principles, which call for a scale-up of multi-purpose cash-based assistance in appropriate contexts. In addition, it was recommended that cash should be systematically considered alongside or in combination with other delivery modalities from the outset and that we need to always ask the question "Why not cash?" As a direct consequence, the number and volume of German humanitarian assistance projects with a cash component have steadily increased over the past few years. Moreover, there has been a shift from conditional cash and/or vouchers to meet sector specific outcomes towards more unconditional, multipurpose cash assistance.

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 Federal Foreign Office (FFO) has further developed its own capacities. A number of FFO staff have attended learning events on various aspects of cash transfer programming. Also, an internal guidance note on Cash Transfer Programming has been drafted in order to increase in-house understanding and support of cash-based assistance at all levels. The guidance note can eventually be adapted to position the FFO in our strategic communication with partners and other stakeholders. Moreover, we have supported capacity building initiatives at national and global levels (e.g. via a programme to institutionalise cash transfer programming among German NGOs or via our financial support of the Cash Learning Partnership [CaLP] in the Middle East). Furthermore, the German Coordination Committee on Humanitarian Assistance in a recent session with CaLP discussed how German NGOs can use CASH as a modality more systematically in their projects following the WHS and Grand Bargain. Germany has also contributed to a number of research activities in the field of cash transfer programming (e.g. a scoping study on several donors' commitment to and perceptions of humanitarian cash transfers, which will enhance continued learning in this field). Germany is currently working on the ToRs of a sector evaluation with one of its strategic NGO partners in Lebanon (Caritas Germany and Caritas Lebanon). Germany is financing the evaluation of this NGO partner's Cash Programme in Lebanon. This evaluation is supposed to produce insights and results that will be of interest also for other NGO partners in Lebanon, who are engaged in cash programming.

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 remain committed to capacity building for cash programming at all levels in our future activities and also, where appropriate, support research and evidence building. We will also continue to engage

with our partners to further scale-up multi-purpose cash assistance in projects and programmes funded by the FFO. Over the next few months, Germany will more actively engage with the Grand Bargain Cash Work Stream, notably to develop a harmonised system (“Cash Marker”) to measure volume, efficiency and effectiveness of cash assistance over time, including the development of appropriate impact and outcome indicators. We may develop a Cash Policy for German humanitarian assistance or align with existing policies of other humanitarian donors. Germany is currently in discussions with other donors in order to develop a comprehensive tracking system for cash programs that would serve as a common ground for understanding how the use of cash has increased in each relevant area (e.g. unconditional/conditional, multi-purpose cash, vouchers and other). Moreover, Germany is actively encouraging some of its major UN partners to provide more exact data on the use of cash (i.e. disaggregated by vouchers, unconditional cash etc.) related to the overall programs, as well as Germany’s financial contributions. Germany has also put in place a monitoring and evaluation concept for its humanitarian assistance projects. This concept is also covering its cash transfer programs. Furthermore, Germany is engaged in strengthening the monitoring and evaluation capacities of its national German partners (i.e. NGOs and other organizations) through various measures. For example, Germany is currently funding an evaluation of the Cash Programme of a strategic NGO partner in Lebanon (see above).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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 discussions leading up to the Grand Bargain, Germany addressed the issue of management costs through participation in joint monitoring and field visits with other donors, organised by respective agencies.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to Progress to date in this work stream can be measured through increased coordination with other donors on reviews and monitoring, as well as expanding coordination with the private sector to assess new technologies. The Federal Foreign Office (FFO) recognizes the private sector's growing importance as donor and actor in the field of humanitarian assistance. The FFO has initiated and implemented an initiative to strengthen dialogue between private sector and humanitarian actors in Germany. The “#CSRhumanitaer campaign” has been launched in December 2015 and developed a mechanism to intensify exchange through multi-sector meetings on topics most relevant for business/humanitarian cooperation (e.g. healthcare, logistics). In addition, Germany values the introduction of the initiative Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance as an achievement to date.

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)?

Planned next steps include to further strengthen relationships with other donors to share assessments and reviews about humanitarian response. In 2017, the “#CSRhumanitaer campaign” initiative will also develop, , a set of Guidelines for private sector actors willing to engage in humanitarian assistance through consultations with all relevant stakeholders.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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?

While not supporting joint planning/joint programming between humanitarian and development actors in order to preserve humanitarian principles, as the foundation of credible humanitarian action, we encourage our NGO partners to participate in common/joint and coordinated needs assessments and to participate in clusters and Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs), while highlighting the importance of sharing data.

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?

Germany participated in the Grand Bargain Needs Assessment Work Stream Workshop in Brussels on 28 February – 1 March, 2017.

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 plan to increasingly make funding to partners conditional to participation in coordinated and joint needs assessments, clusters, and HCTs. Germany expressed their interest in engaging and supporting ECHO to define a monitoring/evaluation mechanism to evaluate improvement on the quality of needs assessment and analysis.

The first phase in piloting the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in a range of countries (e.g. UGA) is a coordinated mapping of current responses, needs and gaps (humanitarian, development) at national and local levels to define partnership, coordination and resource mobilization needs, carried out by UNHCR. Germany actively supports UNHCR, as the mandated organization, in piloting the CRRF concept.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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?

It is important to continuously explain the different coordination mechanisms within the humanitarian system to national partners to continue awareness-raising about the importance to participate in these coordination mechanisms, and to emphasize the importance Germany attaches to a coordinated international humanitarian response, based on coordinated and joint needs assessments.

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?

Germany provides flexible funding, which allows partners to better adapt projects to feedback from communities and affected people.

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 Federal Foreign Office (FFO) is currently conducting an evaluation of its humanitarian cross-border programs as part of its Syria crisis response. One part of this evaluation examines ways to receive valuable feedback from beneficiaries on humanitarian projects in situations with restricted or no humanitarian access through remote monitoring. In addition, Germany funded the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) for 18 months and is now funding a follow-up project with the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance.

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)?

The FFO plans to further integrate an Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) component in its monitoring activities. The FFO is doing this by ensuring the inclusion of feedback mechanisms in the programming of humanitarian projects, which it is funding. Each NGO that receives funding from the FFO has to lay out the feedback mechanisms it applies in its projects in order to guarantee the accountability to affected people on the ground and the relevance of its work. The rigorously selected NGO partners of the FFO maintain a high standard/quality of work and are expected to use the feedback they receive from affected populations to inform their future strategy and programming. The FFO itself conducts external evaluations on a regular basis. High quality standards are applied to the methodology of these evaluations and to the contracted consultants. In order to safeguard the relevance of the evaluation results, feedback from beneficiaries and affected populations has to be included in the analysis, whenever possible. Moreover, we plan to raise awareness of AAP and have an exchange with our partner German NGOs on best practices and lessons learned through the working group of the German Coordination Committee on Humanitarian Assistance on accountability dealing with accountability to affected people in humanitarian assistance. Finally, we are exchanging information and experiences with other humanitarian actors on this issue and are looking at a potential future partnership with Ground Truth Solutions, who have developed a feedback mechanism for beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance.

In the lead-up to the global compact of refugees, UNHCR will carry out a stocktaking of progress made and lessons learnt from Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) pilot countries, as well as from other contexts with large and protracted refugee situations. The lessons learnt will also reflect feedback from beneficiaries on humanitarian assistance and other types of support received so far. Germany actively supports UNHCR, as the mandated organization, in piloting the CRRF concept and preparing the refugee compact.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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?

When Germany signed on to the Grand Bargain last May, the Federal Foreign Office (FFO) was funding a total of 31 projects on a multi-annual basis. Out of the 31 projects, 25 funded humanitarian country- or regional programs in the context of protracted crises either in the country of crisis or in neighbouring countries affected by former. The main focus of the projects was on food security, assistance and protection measures for refugees and internally displaced persons in the Lake-Chad-Basin, Iraq, Syria and its neighbouring countries as well as South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia and Afghanistan. The remaining six projects were multi-annual preparedness measures. The main grant recipients were: UNHCR, WFP, ICRC, UNICEF and IOM.

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?

Germany is actively addressing this issue in our co-chairmanship of the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Initiative. In preparation of the WHS, we developed and coordinated operational best practices

The FFO currently chairs the ICRC Donor Support Group (DSG). Under the theme “Protracted as the new norm,” the ICRC and the FFO hosted two policy fora, one annual meeting, as well as two field trips to Mali/Niger and Lebanon. Multi-annual funding is a main theme of discussion during these events. At the second policy form, the very specific topic: “Unearmarked and multi-annual funding – Where do we stand with the Grand Bargain commitments?” was chosen for a plenary discussion. During these discussions the FFO stressed the importance to continue and increase multi-year funding and exchanged on current practices and experiences in which contexts multi-annual funding is most effective compared to more flexible funding approaches.

The selection of programmes eligible for multi-annual funding was also an integral part of bilateral consultations with International Organizations last year, such as UNHCR, ICRC, UNICEF and WFP. During these consultations all partners agreed on the importance of multi-annual funding and the intention to further increase this instrument in the coming years. Multi-annual funding is an important and integral part of the FFO’s internal planning processes. Especially the aspects of timeliness and predictability are taken into account as highly important elements of funding processes. Furthermore, to ensure the internal development of multi-year funding and as a follow-up to the Grand Bargain and WHS, the FFO established an internal working group focusing on the implementation of Germany’s WHS Commitments regarding multi-annual funding in the context of protracted crises.

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)?

Germany will co-chair the ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment (HAS) on 21 June, 2017 in Geneva and plans to address multi-year funding and protracted crises . in one of our three planned panels. The

FFO plans to further increase its multi-annual funding based on evaluations of current ongoing multi-annual funding projects.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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?

The value of discussing multi-year financing with partners is increased shared analysis of the potential future development of crises contexts and potential links with other sources of financing.

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?

In discussions leading up to the Grand Bargain, donors discussed how CBPF allocations could be considered “soft earmarking,” but our core contributions to international organizations have always been a core component of German humanitarian assistance, which falls under non-earmarked funding.

Baseline of the Federal Foreign Office’s earmarked and softly earmarked funding:

	2015 (EUR)
Non-Earmarked: Core Contributions	UNHCR: 8,000,000.00 OCHA: 1,500,000.00 UNRWA: 8,000,000.00 ICRC: 3,000,000.00 Total: 20,500,000.00 Percentage of overall funding (514 Mil.): 3.99%
Softly Earmarked Funding	CERF: 40,119,265.88 Pooled Funds: 14,800,000.00 OCHA-Branch-Level-funding 0 ICRC-Year End: 4,650,000.00 Total: 59,569,265.88 Percentage of overall funding (514 Mil.): 11.59%

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?

Germany’s overall humanitarian funding increased from 514 Million EUR in 2015 to 1.3 Billion EUR in 2016. We have increased the amount of non-earmarked funding from 20.5 Million EUR in 2015 to 27.117 Million EUR in 2016; our softly earmarked funding increased from 59.57 Million EUR in 2015 to 163.72 Million EUR in 2016. For 2017 we will only be able to provide reliable figures at a later stage.

Baseline of the Federal Foreign Office’s earmarked and softly earmarked funding:

	2016 (EUR)	2017 (EUR planned)
Non-Earmarked: Core Contributions	UNHCR: 12,000,000.00 OCHA: 2,117,000.00 UNRWA: 9,000,000.00 ICRC: 4,000,000.00 Total: 27,117,000.00 Percentage of overall funding (1.3 Bil.): 2.085%	UNHCR: 12,000,000.00 OCHA: 2.500,000.00 UNRWA: 9,000,000.00 ICRC: 4,000,000.00 Total: 27,500,000.00 Percentage of overall funding (1,229.5 Mil) : 2.23%
Softly Earmarked Funding	CERF: 50,000,000.00 Pooled Funds: 64,720,131.61	CERF: 50,000,000.00 +x Pooled Funds: 18,500,000.00

	OCHA-Branch-Level-funding 1,800,000.00 ICRC-Year End 47,200,000.00 Total: 163,720,131.61 Percentage of overall funding (1.3 Bil.): 12.59%	OCHA-Branch-Level-funding: 0 ICRC-Year End: 0 Total: Percentage of overall funding (1,229.5 Mil.):
--	---	---

The FFO currently chairs the ICRC Donor Support Group (DSG). At the second ICRC policy forum at the end of January 2017, the very specific topic: “Unearmarked and multi-annual funding – Where do we stand with the Grand Bargain commitments?” was chosen for a plenary discussion. During these discussions many donors advocated unearmarked funding and exchanged on current practices and experiences.

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)?

The Federal Foreign Office is currently looking at ways to increase its non-earmarked funding, which all signatories to the Grand Bargain have committed themselves to collectively. This may require changes in Germany’s legal framework. Germany is increasing softly-earmarked funding by increasing our CERF and Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPF) contributions and by supporting WHO’s Contingency Fund for Emergencies. Furthermore, we hold a dialogue with major international humanitarian partners on ways to even better design our funding modalities according to the operative needs of the respective organizations.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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?

As a general rule, the FFO has accepted annual reports plus a certified financial statement from UN agencies. For NGO partners we have requested interim (every 6 months) and final narrative reports. Financial reports are necessary for final reports and in the framework of multi-year projects we have been requesting 1 interim financial report per year.

Germany has been using logframes since 2016.

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?

On behalf of Germany, GPPI finalized a report with an analysis of reporting requirements and a proposed 10+3 reporting format. On 18 November 2016 in Geneva to learn about GPPI's research and proposal and develop a plan forward. The GHD Reporting Work Stream also met in Geneva at the beginning of February, 2017. Germany and ICVA have reached out to the GHD and IASC respectively, to solicit feedback on the GPPI proposal. We are planning to launch a 2- year pilot project in 3-4 countries in May 2017 to test a common reporting template/framework among selected donors and partners. As Co-leads of this work stream, ICVA and Germany convened a workshop for Grand Bargain signatories workshop on 24 March in Berlin. The workshop confirmed great interest in this pilot among donors, UN agencies and NGO partners. The pilot phase of this joint template was also discussed in the GHD Forum in January and February 2017. Germany participated in an IASC HFTT retreat end of January, 2017 at which donors were invited for the session on taking forward the Reporting 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)?

Stakeholders will be reconvened periodically in the lead up to the end of 2018 to ensure tangible progress on the commitments is made. Moreover, Germany and ICVA have reached out to Development Initiatives, which is working with the Dutch Government on the Transparency Work Stream, and DFID on the Cash work stream, to ensure linkages to these work streams and get feedback on the GPPI proposed template when considering IATI. Furthermore, Germany is exploring options for harmonised, streamlined reporting, consistent with donor requirements, as part of its co-lead with the U.S. of the Reporting Requirements Work Stream in the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Initiative. As outcome of the workshop in Berlin on 24 March, 2017 the joint reporting pilot project is to be officially launched in May, for a duration of two years with regular evaluations. A number of donors, UN agencies, and INGOs have expressed an interest in taking part in this pilot. Three pilot countries (i.e. Iraq, Myanmar, and Somalia) were selected at the work shop to test the pilot.

The German Coordination Committee on Humanitarian Assistance under the joint lead of the Federal Foreign Office and VENRO (umbrella organization of development and humanitarian NGOs in Germany) has established a working group on simplifying administrative procedures.

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).

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?

gap

In Germany's view, one of the greatest achievements of the World Humanitarian Summit has been to put the spotlight on the fact that all humanitarian assistance can do is to address humanitarian needs, and that other actors are called upon to take their responsibilities when it comes to preventing humanitarian crises from arising in the first place, containing the scope of humanitarian crises, and ensuring that all opportunities are taken to bring humanitarian crises to an end as soon as possible, through sustainable, development-oriented approaches.

At the same time, Germany remains aware that for humanitarian assistance to be able to live up to its goal to address humanitarian needs wherever they arise and as long as it takes, an environment must be in place that makes assistance in accordance with the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence possible, and that the linking of the different instruments must be designed in a way that preserves the space for humanitarian organisations to act in accordance with these principles and, thereby, to ensure acceptance of humanitarian assistance worldwide.

At the national level, Germany is privileged to have separate budget lines in the areas of humanitarian assistance, stabilization, development-oriented transition aid and development cooperation, which enable us to effectively address needs across the whole spectrum of needs, while entailing the evident additional challenge of ensuring optimal coordination and complementarity in the application of the different instruments.

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?

Germany is actively participating in discussions at all levels and in multiple fora on how to operationalize efforts to reduce humanitarian needs, how to design humanitarian assistance in a way that promotes the transition towards durable, development-oriented solutions, and how to encourage development actors to engage as early as possible to seize the opportunity for promoting sustainable, development-oriented solutions. In the context of disaster and climate induced migration, Germany is the chair of the Platform on Disaster Displacement and this platform is already working towards enhanced cooperation, coordination and action to improve the protection of disaster displaced persons among stakeholders dealing with a broad range of policy and action areas including humanitarian assistance, disaster risk reduction, climate change mitigation and adaptation and development cooperation.

At the national level, the entities in charge of the relevant budget lines have intensified efforts, and improved mechanisms, to ensure that the instruments available in the German "tool box" are being used to ensure a truly comprehensive response to the different aspects of the specific crisis situations. Furthermore, the Federal Government, in the context of its budgetary process, has taken the initiative to analyse the use of the different instruments in the field of humanitarian assistance and development-oriented transition aid, and related budget lines, in practice in order to help optimize their application to specific crisis situations.

In addition, an outreach has taken place with the World Bank to encourage greater complementary in engagement and we engaged in a joint COHAF-CODEV meeting in Bratislava. We also participated in the Grand Bargain Humanitarian-Development Engagement Work Stream Workshop in Copenhagen on 13-14 March, 2017.

2. 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)?

Germany will continue to actively participate in discussions about the further conceptual development of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, as well as its application in the field.

In this regard, Germany believes that the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), adopted by consensus as part of the New York Declaration dated 19 September 2016, is an important example for the operationalization of a comprehensive approach to protracted, large-scale crises and an important test case for the operationalization of the nexus debate. Germany therefore actively supports UNHCR, as the mandated organization, to pilot the CRRF concept in a range of countries, by providing direct support to UNHCR, as well as addressing different needs arising in the pilot country situations through its different budget lines and other instruments of its “tool box.”

3. 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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the impact the implementation of our commitments has had on our beneficiaries and partner organisations).

4. 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 (Please Note: it is too early to assess the success of concrete actions in this work stream).