

# Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

## Switzerland

### 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 .....	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 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) .....	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	10
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....	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) .....	11
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....	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 9 – Reporting requirements .....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	14
2. Progress to date .....	14
3. Planned next steps .....	14
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	14
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement .....	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	15
2. Progress to date .....	15
3. Planned next steps .....	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	16

## **Work stream 1 - Transparency**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Data on Swiss humanitarian funding is made available through a number of channels, for instance directly to OECD DAC or via the FTS, and indirectly through the lists of contributions made by partners. Switzerland regularly publishes its main statistics for international cooperation, which includes humanitarian aid (the most recent available at the time of writing is for [2015](#)).

### **2. Progress to date**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid has not made this work stream a priority but awaits some of the key proposals to be made, so as to take action.

Ongoing Swiss support to OCHA Geneva encompasses the FTS unit, which provides a key support to the community in this regards to transparency.

### **3. Planned next steps**

Next steps will depend on the results of the work stream.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

One remaining challenge for Swiss Humanitarian Aid is the difficulty to obtain good reporting from partners regarding the transaction chain from the initial recipient to the affected people (or final implementer). Standard reporting received continues to be on the model of “actor x and its implementing partners did y”. It would be of great use for the understanding of the way funding is used that partners specify what they (their staff) contributed directly and what their implementing partners contributed directly. There is usually an added value in an agency or INGO coordinating implementing partners, but there are also cases where a long “cascade” of implementing partnerships dilutes the effect of the funding for beneficiaries. While Switzerland has the ability through its cooperation offices / embassies in country to monitor these transactions to a great extent, time and energy invested in this monitoring could be used elsewhere with profit for all, and foremost the affected people themselves.

## **Work stream 2 - Localization**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid considers that humanitarian aid should be provided with as little intermediaries between donors and beneficiaries as possible. One third of its aid is provided to NGOs, including local NGOs, or given through direct actions, i.e. actions conducted the Swiss Humanitarian Aid staff without intermediaries.

### **2. Progress to date**

The first actions taken were linked to the co-convening of the work stream with the IFRC. This included the organization of a workshop in Geneva in August 2016. The workshop gathered over 50 participants, from a variety of backgrounds, including donors, UN and Red Cross / Red Crescent Movement, INGOs, academic institutions as well as most importantly representatives from five local NGOs from the global South (Colombia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Syria). Results include the need to work simultaneously on capacity investment, funding, coordination and measurement, but also to make progress on the definition of what is considered “local” or “national”. It also demonstrated that many different actors, not all signatories of the Grand Bargain, are involved in this theme.

In 2016, Swiss Humanitarian Aid launched a smaller number of projects in the domain of capacity-investment. One example is the support to the NGO CONCERN in Syria for investment in the capacities of ten local NGOs working on the Syria crisis. This pilot for around CHF 600,000 is planned to last for two years (2016-2017). The presence of Swiss cooperation offices in most countries affected by humanitarian emergencies also allows providing some funding directly to local NGOs, including civil society organizations at a very local level, such as a number of faith-based groups organizing soup kitchens in Syria.

Swiss Humanitarian Aid is also in the process of increasing its contribution to country-based pooled funds (CBPF); it currently takes part in ten of eighteen CBPFs and is part of the governing body of eight of these. Worldwide, CBPFs provide 60% of funding to NGOs and xxx% directly to local NGOs, thus reducing the need for intermediaries.

### **3. Planned next steps**

Switzerland has supported the setting up of a National Societies Investment Mechanism to be co-hosted by the IFRC and the ICRC. The aim is to launch it in the first quarter of 2017 and to have it operational in the fourth quarter, with a number of donors contributing. The Mechanism should be funded at a level of around 10 mio USD, which makes it a comparatively ‘cheap’ way to support localization of humanitarian aid: experience demonstrates that National Societies are always key responders, be it through their own operations or in cooperation with international players.

Cooperation with the GHD work stream on localization will also be enhanced, so as to ensure a maximal donor engagement on this topic, as well as practical steps. Switzerland is in regular contact with Australia and Germany in this regards.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

A lesson learned is that there exists no quick fix to reach the Grand Bargain’s target of 25%. This will be a lengthier work, requiring the active participation of all the Grand Bargain’s signatories. Humanitarian organizations will

need to apply various measures to limit the levels of implementing partners to the maximum, while providing their local partners with intense capacity investment support (as was illustrated by the UNMAS intervention in the Afghan context). Donors will have to devise ways to identify reliable local partners more rapidly, especially in sudden onset disasters where the international response will not cover the crucial first few days – as was illustrated after hurricane Matthew in Haiti.

## **Work stream 3 - Cash**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid favours core funding and earmarking on operations' level to its partners which provides them major flexibility regarding the transfer method they use. In order to support bringing cash to scale, Switzerland shares key cash expertise through standby partner agreements with its main partners that allow secondments of Swiss cash experts (WFP, UNHCR, ICRC). Switzerland thus supports its partners' capacity-building in preparedness and use of cash-based transfers, and for their systematic consideration of cash as an option. In 2015, 10 experts were thus deployed.

In its direct actions, Switzerland has pioneered cash transfers since its operations in the Balkans from 1998, with projects in 16 different countries (until end of 2016). Swiss Humanitarian Aid continues to systematically consider and deliver cash transfers in the projects it implements directly.

### **2. Progress to date**

Since 2013, to allow the creation of a community of practice beyond turf battles, Switzerland supports the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) financially and by being a member of the board since 2016. This partnership regroups 50 members and aims at addressing the remaining barriers to bringing cash at scale.

Swiss Humanitarian Aid also works on further strengthening the support for cash with legislative authorities and the Swiss public – so as to generate support for the practice. In this regards, the briefing in late 2016 of the relevant commission of Parliament was a noteworthy progress. Another aspect of this work is the regular courses given to Swiss-based partners (NGOs), so as to build their interest and capacity on cash; in 2016, four courses were held for over forty participants; in 2017, the same level is planned.

Swiss Humanitarian Aid continues its policy of seconding experts with 15 persons deployed in 2016 and 17-20 foreseen in 2017. Such deployments can be part of rapid response to sudden onset disasters, such as when its HQ-based cash expert was seconded to WFP in the aftermath of hurricane Matthew in Haiti.

### **3. Planned next steps**

A common (humanitarian and development) internal position on Social Protection is being defined and will be accepted by Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency in the course of 2017 and form the basis of a joint approach (see work stream 10). Switzerland has also started to second cash experts to partners who are dedicated to work on these specific linkages.

Swiss Humanitarian Aid will work more closely with other donors, with legislative authorities and the public to communicate clearly on the benefits and risks of cash. It will continue to advocate for inclusive cash working groups subordinated to the humanitarian coordinator and not to any humanitarian organization, so as to favour collaborative approaches.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

There currently seem to be too many parallel initiatives, with too little common work, as illustrated by the many individual commitments at the WHS – where collective commitments would have shown unity. Swiss Humanitarian Aid will work with various partners (CaLP, individual agencies and donors, Grand Bargain co-signatories) so as to ensure that no competition arises between these initiatives. As a basis, it will, among other, use the conclusions of the IASC cash working group and the CaLP white paper on coordination of cash transfers. It will favour collaborative approaches where the partner with most technical expertise in a given context can play a leading role.

It seems important for each group of stakeholders to have dedicated space to discuss their different sets of joint responsibilities.

## **Work stream 4 – Management costs**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid regularly conducts audits of partners or big projects. These are however spread over the various partners, so as to avoid becoming burdensome, while providing enough quality and quantity data to ensure accountability to the Federal Finance Controlling (and in the end to the tax payers, to whom Swiss Humanitarian Aid is ultimately accountable).

A high proportion of core grant, both for Red Cross Movement, UN bodies and NGOs has the double effect of increasing flexibility (work stream 8) and decreasing management costs for partners. The necessary counterpart is however solid accounting that can demonstrate how the organizations spend their money.

Save for an anti-corruption clause, generic Swiss contracts are kept as light as possible on secondary requirements, so as to ensure that the required reporting is not inflated through a number of issues that have little to do with the actual project. These issues are then followed up through regular dialogue with the relevant part of the receiving organization.

Swiss Humanitarian Aid uses the regular governance (and similar) bodies to ensure that other donors and itself have a dialogue on strategic and efficiency/effectiveness issues with their main partners. In 2015-2016, it chaired the ICRC Donors' Support Group; in 2016-2017, it chairs the UNRWA Advisory Committee, and the CERF's Advisory Board. It also acts as rapporteur to the UNHCR's Executive Committee through its Permanent Representative in Geneva.

### **2. Progress to date**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid has commissioned an evaluation of its biggest core support (to the ICRC). This was then discussed with the relevant parliamentary commission in the fall of 2016. Sadly, it was not possible to combine it with similar endeavours by other donors (notably due to the fact that this contribution is a parliamentary decision).

Swiss Humanitarian Aid considers that its reporting requirements are already more flexible than those of other donors, but is following the work stream very closely, because harmonization of agreements may provide a benefit to all involved.

### **3. Planned next steps**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid uses the regular governance (and similar) bodies to ensure that other donors and itself have a dialogue on strategic and efficiency/effectiveness issues with their main partners. From 2017 onwards, Switzerland will chair the OCHA Donors' Support Group, and be a vice-president of the UNHCR's Executive Committee. It will also be a member of WFP's Executive Board.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

n.a.



## **Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid has been a long-term partner of several mechanisms which have an assessment component, for instance UNDAC and INSARAG; it has a certified USAR team (heavy).

Generally speaking, needs assessments build the basis for any humanitarian action, including direct action, i.e. aid provided by Swiss Humanitarian Aid personnel; for partners, it is also a requirement for project funding. The network of Swiss cooperation offices and integrated embassies (see work stream 10) allows for a reality-check of projects and HRP.

### **2. Progress to date**

As a donor, Switzerland is significantly increasing its support to the NGO ACAPS ([www.acaps.org](http://www.acaps.org)), which provides assessment tools free of charge to the whole community (increase as of 2017). In recent crises, notably following hurricane Matthew in Haiti, many partners have confirmed that they did use these tools, which enhanced their knowledge of the situation and the needs, and therefore their speed in the response.

Through its direct actions, Swiss Humanitarian Aid regularly contributes to humanitarian action directly, using its own staff and material. To be qualified for these actions, personnel must have the required experience and follow relevant courses. In each Quick Deployment Team (SET), such as the one deployed in Haiti last autumn, one or several members have received training which specifically includes assessment methodology. Each member receives relevant documentation and, more importantly, tools at pre-deployment briefing. In addition, the Rapid Response team is considering a wider training for all prospective members of SET.

### **3. Planned next steps**

The USAR team (*Rettungskette*) will be reorganised to make it more nimble while still fitting the requirements. Specific coordination and assessment capacities will be better integrated so as to allow for higher quality 24/7 monitoring of the changing environment, and therefore needs.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

In the case of sudden onset disasters, surge teams should be composed with as many people with prior experience in the affected country as is possible; this was a huge asset in Haiti. In addition, a good liaison mechanism with actors already on the ground (e.g. development actors) helps to access a lot of data and knowledge of the context, if not the situation, in the disaster area; this was ensured through liaison between the SET and the development personnel of the Swiss embassy in port au Prince.

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

In Haiti, lessons learnt by Swiss Quick deployment Teams (SET) included the need for 'quick and dirty' assessments leading to quick action. The reinforcing and possibly correction of these assessments obviously needs to be conducted throughout the action, but the whole process should not be made heavier under the guise of being more complete.

## **Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid was funding the NGO Ground Truth and has been one of those players encouraging the inclusion of the theme “Accountability to Affected Populations” (AAP) in the World Humanitarian Summit deliberations. Swiss experts have regularly been deployed with UN partner organizations for missions including the setting up of accountability mechanisms, such as in 2016 for WFP in Sudan.

Many humanitarian partners of Swiss Humanitarian Aid have developed AAP mechanisms, although it is difficult to measure which type of role the Swiss dialogue with them on the issue has played.

### **2. Progress to date**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid considers that its efforts to provide funding as flexible as possible (core or earmarked at country level) provide humanitarian organizations with enough resources to set up feedback mechanisms, even when these are difficult to fund as such. This is in line with commitment 5 and will be continued.

### **3. Planned next steps**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid will look into the issue much more closely in its strategic dialogue with its main partners, especially on the link between feedback and adjusted programming (commitment 4). It will also continue to provide funding as flexible as possible.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

A good feedback mechanism improves not only the program’s quality, but also the justification of support towards legislative authorities.

## **Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Core funding was mostly decided from year to year. Core and predictable geographic funding have been relatively steady over the years, but rarely with formal notification to partners.

### **2. Progress to date**

As a pilot, the core funding to UNRWA, one of Swiss Humanitarian Aid's main partners, was transformed to cover the whole length of the Dispatch to Parliament on international cooperation 2017-2020 (the legal basis for humanitarian aid). This provides predictability to the partner, but also allows the staff of Swiss Humanitarian Aid to concentrate on strategic dialogue with the partner and not on revising funding proposals.

A similar approach is being developed with NGO partners. As illustration, the 7 partners of the multilateral affairs division active on the theme "principled and effective humanitarian action" have undergone a review process in 2016: those who will receive continued support will receive it over a period of two, three or four years.

The core grant to the ICRC (80 mio CHF) results from a parliamentary decision. Although there is no formal contract, the partner knows that this level of support is assured in the mid-term.

Most geographically-bound funding is planned as part of whole-of-government country cooperation strategies. While this does not provide specific partners with indications of how much funding they will receive, it ensures that Swiss humanitarian funding is planned over several years and that humanitarian priorities are clearly set at the outset. It also allows for a better work on the nexus between humanitarian action – development – mediation and political action to address root causes and peace-building.

### **3. Planned next steps**

In 2017, the plan is to develop another core funding agreement with a priority UN partner – with a lifespan for the rest of the Dispatch's validity. A similar step is also foreseen for 2018.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

Humanitarian organizations need to demonstrate that investment in their activities (or core) is good use of tax payers' money. Without this assurance, it is very difficult to convince oversight authorities to fund activities over the long-term. Their performance in the field is more important in this regards than the template of reports.

Multi-year funding seems to be best put into practice with core funding, and not geographically bound funding; the latter is too easily influenced by the need to respond to big emergencies (and more rarely by crises winding down), including through decisions of the legislative authorities.

## **Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid has long ensured that a significant portion of its humanitarian funding is core funding. For 2015, core funding represented 150.6 mio CHF (ICRC 80; UN 58.4, including CERF and IOM; NGOs 12.2) and contributions to country-based pooled funds another 15.1 mio CHF; this represents a total of 165.7 mio CHF out of a funding budget of 516.6 mio CHF<sup>1</sup>, i.e. 32% of unearmarked or softly earmarked funding.

In addition, Swiss Humanitarian Aid strives to earmark its geographic funding as little as possible, mostly at country level. A specific funding methodology for the ICRC and UN priority partners is the “predictable geographic funding”, contributions paid early in the year but destined for operations at country level (usually paid in February or early March). In 2016, the total amount of this type of funding was 117.4 mio CHF. While earmarked, it provides cash flow in the first quarter of the year, a key factor of initiation or continuation of operations at this period.

### **2. Progress to date**

For 2016, the total amount of core humanitarian funding paid early in the year was 58.4 mio CHF (UN organizations including IOM and CERF), 81 mio CHF (Red Cross / Red Crescent Movement) and 12.9 mio CHF (NGOs), i.e. a total of 152.3 mio CHF. Almost all this funding was provided in the first quarter, so as to ensure maximum flexibility. With the addition of funding to country-based pooled funds (12.8 mio) and a late-year contribution to ICRC operations (2.3 mio CHF, the first time Swiss Humanitarian Aid uses a non-contextually binded contribution for operations, i.e. a level D of earmarking), the proportion of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding reached 37.7% (167.4 of 443.1 mio CHF)<sup>2</sup>, compared to the GB 30% aspiration for 2020.

The 2017 levels of core funding and predictable geographic funding are foreseen at similar levels than in previous years; core for UN and Red Cross / Red Crescent partners paid early in the year is slightly lower (149.7 mio CHF). This represents 33.8% unearmarked funding compared to a total funding budget of 443.3 mio CHF<sup>3</sup>, but does not provide a full picture as some core funding and the support to country-based pooled funds will also be provided for UN, Red Cross / Crescent or NGO partners later in the year. Switzerland will therefore continue to exceed the target set in commitment 5.

Predictable geographic funding at the start of the year was slightly lower than in 2016 (119.10 mio CHF), representing a priority given to core funding in early year disbursements. As of 2017, WFP will receive no more in kind contribution (milk products, or money earmarked for milk products), but this type of funding, earmarked for operations, which should provide more flexibility.

### **3. Planned next steps**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid is exploring various avenues to provide less earmarked funding. While there seems to be little flexibility on the legislative side regarding a significant increase in core funding, other are under consideration, notably decreasing the (limited) tightly earmarked funding, such as described in the Grand Bargain Annex under I-L in favour of earmarked (only G), or Country-Based Pooled Funds (F).

An area where Swiss Humanitarian Aid is not going to provide more flexible resources is the secondment of Swiss Humanitarian Aid experts; this type of in-kind contributions provides specialized human resources that can fill a gap for partners at very short notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> Including deployment of Swiss experts, but excluding staff costs both at capital and field levels.

<sup>2</sup> Including deployment of Swiss experts, but excluding staff costs both at capital and field levels.

<sup>3</sup> Excluding deployment of Swiss experts and staff costs both at capital and field levels

In 2017, Swiss Humanitarian Aid plans to shift some of its contribution to the IFRC from earmarked to unearmarked.

#### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid is currently providing an above-the-average level of flexible finance (commitment 2), yet recognises that project funding comes with administrative transaction costs are difficult to bear for the donor; it has consequently drastically reduced the number of project funding (Annex, I) in several regions.

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

While humanitarian partners at the highest level request more flexible and long-term funding from their donors, during the year the same donors sometimes receive multiple requests for project funding from the same organization but at lower levels. The co-conveners could look into a mechanism that limits this double track of requests under work on commitment 3, so as to ensure “packages” of funding discussed one time between both partners, without prejudice to funding for emergencies.

## **Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid is quite flexible and does not require donor-specific reporting for core funding, nor for funding for operations. There are therefore no standard guidelines or benchmarks for partners' reporting. Swiss Humanitarian Aid accepts reports based on the UN reporting format and others formats. In this, it contributes to commitments 1 and 3.

The reason of this flexibility is double: on the one hand, Swiss Humanitarian Aid is recognized within the administration as working in fragile or conflict environments, where administrative tools used elsewhere in international cooperation may prove too rigid to accurately reflect the reasons of evolutions in projects or operations. Thus, it is recognised within its parent directorate (the Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency) that its use of the standard tools such as Results-Based Management and budgeting need to be less formally used.

On the other hand, several systems are in place to ensure proper oversight, and therefore accountability to the tax payer. One of the main tools for oversight is the Swiss Cooperation Offices in the field and the multilateral affairs division in capital for follow-up of and dialogue with multilateral and NGO partners in their operations. This allows for early detection of potential problems (such as a poor performance) and rapid corrective action. The multilateral division is responsible for the Core Contribution Management reporting, that actually covers the Swiss contribution to priority organizations, receive the bulk (two thirds) of Swiss humanitarian funding. This tool is based on a strategic study (CCM sheet) and an annual appraisal of the performance of the partners (CCM report). The onus of this process rests on the Swiss Humanitarian Aid, and not on the partners. The basis of each report is the vast amount of generic or specific reporting a partner provides during the year. For instance, for the UNHCR's operations in 2015, 8 core reports were used.

### **2. Progress to date**

As part of SDC, Swiss Humanitarian Aid is taking an active part in the change of the SAP accounting system, so as to make it more compatible with OECD requirements.

It is investing in the Global Humanitarian Lab to ensure that proper structures for system-wide innovation exist that can take up some of the reporting challenges and suggest organisational or technological solutions to the challenges (commitment 2).

### **3. Planned next steps**

SDC is planning a number of significant steps in 2017, including the monitoring of the 2017-2020 Dispatch to Parliament, with agency-wide impact indicators, an evaluation of the RBM framework and the setting up of the national SDGs/Agenda 2030 monitoring.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

It is possible to have a quality monitoring using generic reports (as opposed to reports tailor-made for each donor), but this requires a significant amount of work on the donor's side to ensure that questions receive answers.

## **Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Switzerland has tackled the issue through an angle wider than the humanitarian / development angle; it has long been recognised that other instruments of foreign policy can have / should have an effect on the humanitarian needs. As the report of the UN Secretary General ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit and the Sustainable Development Goals both have highlighted, peace is a key component of both development and reducing humanitarian needs in a sustainable way. In the same vein, job creation can have a deep impact on the needs of a given population. Switzerland has long engaged in mediation, in supporting peace-building and the restoration of social cohesion, in protection of migrants and refugees where they are and in sustained bilateral economic cooperation. It has also created several *migration partnerships* with other countries and engaged in international dialogue on migration. The main tools for the integration of all these dimensions are country cooperation strategies, integrating all the dimensions relevant to a given context, in a multi-year framework – to date of writing, 27 out of 44 of these strategies are fully integrated (commitment 4).

### **2. Progress to date**

Building on the experience of country strategies, the new Dispatch to Parliament on international Cooperation (2017-2020) has integrated humanitarian, development, human security and economic cooperation in one single whole-of-government framework. Parliament has approved this document, and the attached budget. Actions under commitments 1 and 2 are detailed in the dispatch.

Integration of staff with different expertise in ‘integrated embassies’ or in permanent missions has proved a good way to ensuring that various branches of the administration can speak in a single and coherent voice to partners, while “respecting the principles of both” humanitarian and development action (see commitment 3, work stream 7). The regular gathering of heads of cooperation offices brings together coordinators from both areas of expertise.

At headquarters, a number of initiatives also allow for better consultation between development and humanitarian staff. For instance, the strategic dialogue with UNICEF is coordinated by development staff but due to the Fund’s double mandate, humanitarian staff leads the relations with their emergency branch; regular consultations between both parts of SDC allow for a coherent approach in boards. The support to Multilateral Development Banks (commitment 5) is led by the development multilateral affairs, but internal cooperation is being developed; for instance, the support to the World Bank’s project on forced displacement is led as a joint venture between both divisions.

In 2016, Switzerland started supporting with 2 mio CHF per year a flexible UNDP Trust Fund for Emergency Development Response to crisis and recovery. This allows UNDP - as the lead of the Early Recovery Cluster - to react rapidly to changing circumstances on the ground and deploy financial and human resources. In addition, Switzerland has supported the development of a joint UN-World Bank recovery and peacebuilding assessment (RPBA) tool, which was already used in the CAR and is being progressively rolled out."

### **3. Planned next steps**

Switzerland is developing its approach to social protection in international cooperation; this is led by humanitarian and development areas, with substantial input from the Federal Office for Social Insurances. Dedicated programs should be deployed in the field in 2018, with pilots and adapted programs already under way (commitment 3; see work stream 3 for more details).

In the multilateral field, Switzerland will continue to promote joint analysis and strategic planning between actors using humanitarian, development and peacebuilding instruments as well as the harmonization of SRPs and UNDAFs.

**4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

n.a.

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

The drafting of country cooperation strategies demonstrate the need for staff involved in planning them to understand the good reasons why development and humanitarian instruments are distinct. It also requires staff able to go beyond institutional territories.