

Grand Bargain annual self- reporting exercise:

UNDP

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)	4
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	4
Work stream 2 - Localization	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	5
2. Progress to date	5
3. Planned next steps	6
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	7
Work stream 3 - Cash	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)	9
Work stream 4 – Management costs	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
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	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 6 – Participation Revolution	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
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	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 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)	12
5.	Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements		12
1.	Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2.	Progress to date	13
3.	Planned next steps	13
4.	Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	13
5.	Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	13
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement		13
1.	Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2.	Progress to date	13
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 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?

UNDP has been a strong proponent for transparency and has been publishing activity-level information to IATI since 2011. In 2016 UNDP scored 93.3% in the Publish What You Fund Aid Transparency Index, and was recognised for the second year running as the most transparent aid organisation among the 49 surveyed. At the policy level, UNDP also leads the Secretariat of the International Aid Transparency Initiative and in this way contributes to policy discussions on transparency, ensuring that it remains high on the international agenda through the inclusion of IATI in relevant processes and documents.

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 terms of UNDP's own implementation of the GB commitment on transparency, steps are already underway to increase reporting on the results of the organisation's activities in IATI from the initial 1,800 project results reported in 2016. Changes are currently being made to the corporate planning system to enable additional publication of results on selected corporate results in 2017. UNDP has also started including donor and implementing partner references in UNDP transactions enabling traceability of donor funding throughout the aid chain.

UNDP has been working closely with other UN agencies providing technical advice to publish data on UN Pooled Funds including humanitarian flows. This information was previously unavailable in IATI. UNDP also works with the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team to support the transparency work taking place in that forum around utilising IATI standards for FTS reporting.

At the policy level, through its IATI Secretariat coordination function, UNDP will support the ongoing conversation with humanitarian organisations to ensure that the IATI Standard – already upgraded in its version 2.01 to include a number of humanitarian fields – can be fully fit for the purpose of reporting humanitarian data. Recommendations for changes to the Standard will continue to be developed in close coordination with relevant organisations including OCHA, FTS and others.

UNDP will continue to offer peer support to other UN agencies that have not yet begun publishing to IATI - particularly those focused on humanitarian assistance - by sharing its own experience as a publisher and offering advice to new publishers.

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)?

UNDP will start using IATI humanitarian markers on its relevant activities and tag them in relation to specific crises and sectors. UNDP is developing internal tools that will support the use of IATI data by

its own staff and in turn improve the quality of its own data. In addition, it is looking into the development of a programme of training and materials jointly with other UN agencies which would be extended across UN agencies to support initial publication and ongoing use of IATI data.

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.

It has helped UNDP to improve data quality, especially results data, and increase the data available for crisis-related financing. The availability of data on pooled funds including from agencies in the humanitarian community contributes to increasing efficiency in decision-making processes around crises or emergency situations.

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

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

Work stream 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?

UNDP has been committed to localised approaches prior to the Grand Bargain commitments as it is part of the organisation's business model to work through local structures, support and build capacity of local actors and decision makers (local governments, community structures, civil society) and enable them to lead development efforts. Applying area based approaches and working with municipalities and local governments to design and deliver aid is imperative for UNDP. Subsequently UNDP also has guidelines for working with and supporting local governments in crisis. When working with local governments in crisis, the immediate objective for UNDP is to extend the legitimacy of the state through outreach and engagement of central government through sub-national administration; build confidence in the public administration by enabling resource distribution at the local level; signal efforts by the state to respond to pressing service delivery needs, in particular through engagement of communities in local recovery processes; and address drivers of insecurity or conflict by expanding engagement of the population in processes for decision making and the distribution of public goods.

Within the Global Cluster for Early Recovery, discussions have also been held on how to engage local actors in coordination of humanitarian response and how to transition from an 'externally' lead response through the humanitarian cluster system to a locally lead response through municipalities and local governments. In Nepal (Earthquake 2015) and Philippines (Typhoon 2013) efforts were made to transition clusters to local sector led responses. OCHA and UNDP worked together on this at country level.

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?

UNDP has participated in the two Grand Bargain workshops on localisation facilitated by the Swiss government and IFRC. The efforts of this work stream have so far evolved around discussions and clarifications on localisation, the terminology of 'funding as direct as possible' as well as local level capacities and coordination. A substantial amount of time has been spent on listing the challenges to localisation; the willingness and genuine commitment to devolve and localise funding; local level coordination and response; the trust, accountability and risks related to localisation; and the fact that most local actors are not 'at the table' where decisions are made (HCT, Cluster Coordination Groups, UNCT etc). The workshops have tried to reach clarity on what organisations are planning achieve through the commitments; what approach organisations are taking and who will take what parts of this agenda forward. However, more discussions are needed to achieve this.

UNDP was interviewed for research conducted by independent consultants for the Grand Bargain work stream 2. It concluded that there is momentum for localization, but questioned whether the efforts of the work stream are adding up to what was originally intended. It also concluded that unfortunately local and national actors are not aware of all the processes, thus it is difficult for them to influence the

agenda. There is still great concern with the lack of representation of local actors throughout the process and a sense that they are sidelined, which questions the credibility of the work on localization. The research also found that donors are engaged but as yet there is limited evidence of change in funding behavior. There is opportunity to mainstream localization in other GB processes but need for leadership from co-conveners to ensure coherence.

UNDP has launched a new Managing Agent Guideline for humanitarian Country-Based Pooled Funds late 2016, which it aims to make the NGO component of the fund more harmonized and efficient across the four countries that it manages these funds in (Sudan, South Sudan, DRC and CAR). While this is an internal piece of work, it has a potential positive impact on the accessibility and capacity building of local actors to take on these funds.

UNDP continues to advocate for localized approaches, through its policy work and programmatic work. UNDP trainings for country offices on crisis response include sessions on how to fulfill WHS and GB commitments including the elements of localization. UNDP advocates for localized approaches in protracted displacement contexts through its work in the Solutions Alliance (governing board member) and together with other UN agencies UNDP has developed tools and guidance on how to localize the SDGs.

Through its role as lead for the Global Cluster for Early Recovery, UNDP has taken part in cluster architecture review missions (Ukraine, DRC and soon Sudan) with the objective of analyzing the coordination structures in view of the New Way of Working and where possible promote and support a localized approach (as was done in Nepal and the Philippines). The Global Cluster for Early Recovery is also working with the Global Cluster Coordination Group in Geneva on conceptualizing what localization means for the cluster approach.

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 its engagement in the GB work stream.
- Continue to advocate for localised approaches in global policy forums
- Continue support to programmes that foster localised approaches, supporting to local government and communities to take the lead in their own recovery and development.
- Continue the deliberations within the Global Cluster Coordinators group on defining and conceptualising localisation within the cluster system. UNDP has committed to support this work in the Global Cluster Coordinators Group's work plan.
- Participate where relevant in cluster architecture review missions to assess the potentials for local level coordination.
- Roll-out of the CBPF Managing Agent guidelines.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 3 - Cash

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

UNDP has used cash based interventions for its livelihoods recovery projects in disaster and conflict settings, for instance in Haiti, Philippines, Syria, Jordan and Turkey. In the Ebola response, UNDP also implemented a large-scale project covering payments of Ebola health workers delivering essential services to the communities affected by the pandemic.

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?

UNDP is developing programme and operations tools to engage at scale in cash-based interventions targeting conflict and disaster affected communities and working with governments to support resumption of essential government services through the payment of public sector workers. The tools include guidance notes, cash based project management tools, long term agreements with service providers, communication messages, deployable experts from UNDP and stand-by partners' experts to be deployed. UNDP is also strengthening the collaboration with CashCap to receive support at cluster and interagency level.

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)?

UNDP intends to increase its use of cash based transfers for social protection, emergency response, core government functions and health systems response. It is also planning to finalize and roll out its programme and operations tools for cash based interventions in 2017.

UNDP is exploring options on digitizing cash transfers in partnership with private sector (Vodafone, Microsoft) and others, as well as exploring other innovative partnerships.

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.

Through cash-based intervention systems, UNDP aims to increase effectiveness, accountability and financing for the unbanked, and to link emergency response to longer term development with effective systems of data management and monitoring.

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?

Early results in cash programming point to the fact that the scope of digital cash programming will only continue to grow, necessitating increasing coordination between different cash programming actors.

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?

UNDP has been committed to coordinated needs assessments prior to the Grand Bargain Commitments.

UNDP takes the lead in coordinated recovery assessments and analysis such as the PDNAs and RPBA, and also takes part in humanitarian coordinated needs assessments (such as the MIRA or MSNAs).

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?

- Hosted and facilitated the first joint meeting between the IASC Task Team on Humanitarian-Development Nexus and the UNDG Working Group on Transition to discuss the New Way of Working, including the importance of joint needs analysis between humanitarian and development partners
- Participated in the follow up workshop in Brussels in February 2017, which led to the commitment on leading one of the activities under the work stream: “Identify linkages between humanitarian assessment (minimal life-saving interventions) and longer term recovery assessments (e.g. PDNA, PCNA/RPBA, DALA etc) - data exchange, joint analysis.”
- Advocated for the need for joint needs analysis at policy level in the IASC Task Team for Humanitarian Development Nexus as well as in-country on joint country support missions (E.g. DRC)

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)?

- UNDP will continue to advance this as part of its core work on assessments including through new partnerships and contributions to enhancing tools and methodologies.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

UNDP has been an active participant in discussions to move towards MY humanitarian planning and funding and, as a development actor, already uses multi-year planning and funding models in its resilience-building efforts. UNDP has been a proponent of aligning, wherever possible, joint and/or joined up analysis, as well as aligning humanitarian and resilience response plans to ensure coherent planning and funding.

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?

UNDP has co-hosted, with OCHA, WB and Denmark, a high-level workshop to identify concrete bottlenecks related to MY financing on the ground as a key element of advancing the NWOW. An action plan will be published shortly, outlining next steps for humanitarian and development entities, to seize opportunities and overcome challenges related to MY financing and planning on the ground.

Furthermore, UNDP co-chairs the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team activities on the humanitarian-development nexus with the World Bank and FAO and in this context, has also been technically engaged in the multi-year humanitarian financing study currently taking place through that team.

Another element closely linked to this work is multi-year planning that looks at how to better harmonise humanitarian and development plans to reduce humanitarian need in the long-term. UNDP works on this with other partners from the UN Development System's side and continues to drive country-level solutions jointly with teams on the ground.

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)?

- UNDP will continue engagement on this at both country and HQ levels

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 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?

UNDP has been at the forefront of progressing better solutions to humanitarian-development coherence even prior to the Grand Bargain as UNDP's crisis response fundamentally works in a space that is shared with humanitarians. This is done through work around Early Recovery, as well as, more recently new sustainable solutions to protracted crisis situations such as displacement.

UNDP is the co-convenor of the work stream on humanitarian-development engagement in the Grand Bargain and since the signing of the Bargain, has led advocacy efforts and technical solutions to issues within the work stream's agenda with humanitarian partners.

Furthermore, UNDP is a member of the Solutions Alliance, which has convened humanitarian and development actors to jointly find sustainable solutions to protracted displacement.

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

Since the launch of the Grand Bargain at the WHS, UNDP has been co-leading the operationalisation of commitments of work stream 10.

Internally, UNDP has started a process of reorienting policy and programming approaches to respond to the commitments of the GB outcomes, reflecting these in new policies coming out on recovery and resilience. Work has also been done with various country offices to support better linked-up analysis and planning, contribute to mainstreaming these considerations to the agency's core SDG support to countries and elaborating programming solutions targeting protracted displacement.

UNDP is also engaged with humanitarian partners to support country-level work with RC/HC's in countries such as Sudan, Burkina Faso, Lebanon, DRC, Somalia, Ethiopia, Uganda and Yemen.

At the interagency level, UNDP co-convened, with the Government of Denmark, the WB and OCHA, a high-level meeting on advancing the implementation of the New Way of Working, which took place 13-14 March. This is the first in a series of such meetings, including a planned high-level side event during the World Bank Spring Meetings in April and one hosted by the Government of Turkey in May, with the aim of keeping up political momentum on the commitments made at the Grand Bargain and beyond. The Copenhagen meeting utilised country cases from Yemen, Somalia, Uganda and Ethiopia to identify the challenges, bottlenecks and opportunities related to implementing NWoW in the field. An action plan document, outlining key next steps for development, humanitarian and peacebuilding actors will be published shortly

UNDP has also worked with key UN partners and the World Bank to operationalise the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Initiative, which rolls out joint work amongst humanitarian-development-peace

partners. Implementation of the initiative is about to start in Cameroon, Yemen, Sudan and Somalia. The expectation is that this will be scaled-up during the next phase of the UN/WB partnership.

As co-chair of both the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian-Development Nexus and the co-chair of the UN Working Group on Transitions, UNDP has been in the lead in integrating this work into system structures and processes. The two entities had a first ever joint retreat at the end of 2016 that articulated a joint action plan to advance this work and is currently under implementation by both the IASC and UNWGT. A core element of this also support is to countries through joint missions, the first of which will take place in Sudan at the request of the RC/HC during Q2 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)?

In addition to the continued work at the interagency level for which the different processes will define the exact steps, UNDP will be elaborating its new Strategic Plan and aims to integrate relevant parts of Grand Bargain commitments within that. UNDP will also be concentrating on collecting an evidence-base for this work with country-level partners that aims to inform best practice and lessons learned for this work stream moving forward.

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.

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?