2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – GERMANY

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

1. All signatories to the Grand Bargain are expected to complete the self-report annually.

2. Self-reports must be returned to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org] no later than **Thursday 15 March, 2018**. Any submissions after this date may not be considered by the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain Report.

3. Reporting should reflect activities and progress that has taken place between January 2017 and December 2017.

4. The self-report requests information by work stream, however, in order to best track progress, signatories are asked to provide as much specific and relevant detail on progress made against each of the 51 individual commitments as possible. A full list of commitments for each work stream is included in the self-report template for reference.

5. The questions contained in this self-report are the same as in 2017, however some work streams include additional question for signatories, at the request of the work stream co-conveners. If you are unable to provide this information, please note the reasons for this.

6. Signatories who have not previously completed a self-report are asked to answer question one for each work stream, to provide a baseline of where your organisation stood when it became a Grand Bargain signatory. Existing signatories can complete questions two to five for each work stream, as your 2017 self-report will have already provided the baseline information sought by question one.

7. Please type your answers immediately below each question asked.

8. Signatories are encouraged to report both on progress made, and where they may have experienced obstacles or challenges to realising their commitments.

9. Signatories are encouraged, where possible and relevant, to reflect on their contributions to the Grand Bargain both as recipients of humanitarian funds and donors of humanitarian funds. This will allow us to capture the transfer of benefits accrued at higher ends of the value chain down to the frontline.

10. Signatories are asked to limit their responses to a maximum of 500 words per work stream.

11. Self-reports are public documents, and will be published as submitted on the IASC-hosted Grand Bargain website from 3rd June, 2018.

12. Self-reports will be used to inform the 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report, which will provide a collective analysis of the progress for each work stream, and for the Grand Bargain as a whole. The Independent Annual Grand Bargain report will be published prior to the 2018 Annual Grand Bargain Meeting on 18 June 2018, in New York.

13. The 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report is being prepared by [ODI/HPG](). Signatories may be contacted by ODI/HPG as part of their research and preparation of the Independent Report.

14. If you require support or advice to complete your self-report, you may direct enquiries to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org].

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each work stream, consideration should be given to the guidance provided by the *[Aide-Memoire]() on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain* that addresses the gender dimensions of resources, capacity, evidence and data, participation, leadership, accountability and communication within the Grand Bargain. Signatories are also welcome to provide additional detail on how they consider they have, at a macro level, ensured their Grand Bargain follow-up is gender-responsive, and to include any examples of good practice that they wish to share. This data will assist in the preparation of the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain report, which will assess the extent to which gender has been considered by Grand Bargain work streams.

2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – GERMANY

Contents

Work stream 1 – Transparency

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.*

2. *Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).*

3. *Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:*
   - *accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;*
   - *improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;*
   - *a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and*
   - *traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.*

4. *Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data.*

Transparency work stream co-conveners reporting request: How will you use the data from IATI within your organization including, for example, for monitoring, reporting and vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments?

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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?

   Transparent, timely and open high-quality data on German humanitarian funding was made available through a number of channels, including OECD DAC, EDRIS and FTS. In the course of 2017, the German Federal Foreign Office (FFO) upgraded its data management system's infrastructure, which has allowed Germany to publish data in accordance with the IATI standard as of January 2018.

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)?

   As of 2018, the FFO will report according to the IATI standard.

Germany intends to deepen its cooperation with the Co-Conveners of work stream 1 ("Greater Transparency"), specifically with the aim of improving the use of data analysis.

4. **Efficiency gains**

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

Adjusting the existing data management system's infrastructure to match IATI standards and training staff to report and publish to IATI (in addition to existing obligations to submit data to EDRIS/FTS and the OECD DAC) have to date increased the administrative burden and costs on the part of the FFO and thus hardly contributed to efficiency gains or other benefits. On top of that additional resources are required to support the capacity of humanitarian partners to access and publish data to IATI.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**

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?

Lessons learned: Despite relevant adjustments, the IATI standard does not fully reflect humanitarian actors' reporting needs, which has a negative impact on actors' willingness and capacity to report to IATI.

While it remains difficult to implement further adjustments to the IATI standard, significant efforts should be centred on improving data analysis capacities and tools, as well as synergies with existing data platforms. Enhanced data usability would create an important incentive for humanitarian actors to publish to IATI, thereby achieving greater accountability and efficiency gains in the long run.

Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.*

2. *Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.*

3. *Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.*

4. *Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.*

5. *Develop, with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and apply a 'localisation' marker to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national responders.*

6. *Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CBPF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO- led and other pooled funds.*

Localisation work stream co-conveners reporting request: What percentage of your humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders
   (a) directly (b) through pooled funds, or (c) through a single intermediary?[1]

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
    Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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?

---

[1] The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure (available here) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form (available here) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with your self-report is optional, but encouraged.

While the process of establishing a baseline has not yet been completed[2], it is estimated that approx. 19,6% of German humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders (0,04% directly, 2,6% through pooled funds, and approx. 17 %[3] through a single intermediary). Funding through a single-intermediary included, for example, two new pilot projects in Madagascar and the Philippines, which strengthen the institutional capacities and preparedness of local humanitarian actors for natural disasters, as part of Germany's innovative Forecast-based Financing (FbF) approach.
It is particularly worth noting that Germany more than tripled its contributions to CBPFs (179 mio. EUR in 2017; 62 mio. EUR in 2016), thereby becoming the second largest donor to CBPFs.

Moreover, Germany continued its support for the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI). The HQAI is an independent certification initiative, which validates evidence that a given NGO reflects the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) in its policy, procedures, and practices. Germany specifically supported the Subsidy Fund of the HQAI, which grants financial support to local organizations that wish to participate in the HQAI certification process. Consequently, the initiative allows local organizations to strengthen their capacities by setting an organizational learning process in motion. It also helps them demonstrate the quality of their work towards donors, thus improving their access to financial resources.

Germany also continued to support humanitarian partners in their capacity and resilience building activities for local actors. Drawing on the definitions and achievements of the Grand Bargain localization work stream, German humanitarian NGOs and the FFO formed a localization working group, which identified common priorities for the localization agenda. The key conclusions of the meetings were documented for publication and define clear goals for all German humanitarian stakeholders.

As co-conveners of WS 9 ("harmonized and simplified reporting", see below), Germany and ICVA included a localization component in the common donor reporting template, specifically encouraging partners to report on capacity-building of local partners. Additionally, one of the supplementary questions (that donors can choose to include) requires aid organizations to describe local implementing partners' role and contribution to the project.

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 further implement the priorities identified by the localization working group of German humanitarian stakeholders, e.g. an obligation for implementing

---

[2] Not all implementing partners were able to provide data within the given timeframe.
[3] Incl. estimates for WFP funding for 2017 based on WFP data from 2016.

organizations to pass on to their local partners an appropriate share of funding for indirect costs.

Furthermore, Germany will finalize its base line for humanitarian funding going directly or through one transaction layer to local actors; progress between 2017 and 2018 will be measured by early 2019.

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

   Increased financial support for CBPFs has improved local and national responders' access to funds while, at the same time, reducing the administrative burden, including on the part of the FFO.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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?

   Best practice: Drawing on the definitions and achievements of the Grand Bargain localization work stream, German humanitarian NGOs and the FFO formed a localization working group, which identified common priorities for the localization agenda and collected best practice examples. The key conclusions of the meetings were translated into English to share them with the members of the localization work stream.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*

2. *Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*

3. *Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*

4. *Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*

5. *Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*

6. *Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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 has further intensified its efforts to scale up humanitarian cash assistance in cooperation with its implementing partners. It has supported capacity building for cash assistance at international and national level as well as in the field.

   This notably includes Germany's ongoing support of the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), which has facilitated the publication of the "2018 State of World's Cash Report". Germany has also been supporting CaLP to set up its new regional office in Amman, which will strengthen cash capacity of international and local actors in the Middle East.

   With the establishment of a Cash Working Group in Germany, a national forum for exchange of views and good practices has been established. The working group is actively engaged in advancing Grand Bargain cash commitments in cooperation with German NGO partners.

In addition, Germany's advocacy efforts have accelerated a transition to the use of cash wherever this is the most appropriate form of assistance (e.g. in Jordan and Lebanon).

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

   Germany (together with DFID and WFP, as co-conveners of the cash work stream, as well as Norway and UNHCR) will organise, a joint donor mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon in February 2018. The aim of the mission is to improve understanding of how donors can contribute to increase the routine use of cash, to invest in new delivery models which can be taken to scale, and to ensure that appropriate coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place. Next steps for global consideration will be proposed based on the findings of the mission.

   Moreover, Germany will work with Development Initiatives and other fora (e.g. CaLP) to establish a cash baseline and common methodology to measure cash within existing structures; this initiative will be joined by other donors.

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

   Innovative technology solutions (such as RedRose and Blockchain), developed and rolled out with German support, have already contributed to a quicker, more flexible and focused response in the field.

   Efficiency gains are also being achieved through increased donor coordination, which contributed to the harmonization of processes in the project cycle, a pooling of resources and avoidance of duplications in funding humanitarian projects with a cash component.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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?

   Best practice: Internal capacity building measures greatly increased awareness of FFO staff and hence enabled them to systematically consider cash as a response modality, in dialogue with humanitarian implementing partners.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- *Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
- *Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
- *Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback*
- *mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
- *Biometrics; and*
- *Sustainable energy.*

2. *Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*

4. *Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:
- *Transportation/Travel;*
- *Vehicles and fleet management;*
- *Insurance;*
- *Shipment tracking systems;*
- *Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH,*
- *food);*
- *IT services and equipment;*
- *Commercial consultancies; and*
- *Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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?

   2017 saw the continued exploration of frontier technologies (such as self-driving trucks, UAVs, blockchain and digital tech) and their operationalization in humanitarian contexts. Germany has been supporting partners to develop innovative approaches in order to help reduce management costs and increase operational efficiency and effectiveness. In this regard, German humanitarian assistance contributed e.g. 2 million EUR in 2017 to the WFP Innovation Accelerator located in Munich, Germany, which has developed a total of 26 innovative projects.

   Regarding the commitment to reduce individual donor assessments, it is worth noting that the FFO conducts assessments of humanitarian UN organisations primarily in the form of internal desk reviews using standard reports provided and evidence publicly made available.

   Moreover, in order to harmonize and reduce individual capacity assessments for humanitarian NGO partners, Germany has been funding the Core Humanitarian Standard Alliance, which is providing standardized assurances to donors to reduce capacity assessment efforts. Germany also continued its funding for the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI), in order to offer NGOs an external certification against CHS, which consequently reduces the need for individual donor verifications.

   Additionally, Germany also supports and relies on the ECHO Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) status. Depending on the FPA status, Germany conducts simplified capacity assessments for NGOs. This is reducing administrative efforts on the part of NGOs.

   Germany has also sought to reduce the management costs of humanitarian partners by pushing for progress within work stream 9 ("Simplified and harmonized reporting requirements"), as well as by reforming its budget rules with regards to indirect support costs.

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 continue its support to the WFP Innovation Accelerator and is committed to actively support more partners to identify innovative ideas and turn them into scalable opportunities which are put into practice in field operations.
   The FFO is planning to revise partner capacity assessments for NGOs, ideally jointly with other donors, to harmonize approaches and simplify the procedures for partners, working with different donors.

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

   Aligning and simplifying partner capacity assessments, e.g. in accordance with the FPA status, has led to efficiency gains for both partner agencies and FFO staff.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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 recognition of the private sector's great potential for innovation, Germany has increased its outreach efforts. With the #CSRhumanitär campaign, Germany successfully fostered dialogue between humanitarian NGOs and private sector actors. In 2017, the initiative developed guidelines on successful partnerships.

   One lesson learned was that there are many companies that do not only want to contribute funding, but that are keen to jointly work on innovative solutions, that make humanitarian assistance more efficient and effective and even more tailored to the needs of those requiring assistance.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.*

2. *Coordinate and streamline data collection to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability and minimising intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process led by the Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator with full involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters/sectors and in the case of sudden onset disasters, where possible, by the government. Ensure sector-specific assessments for operational planning are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated plan of assessments at inter-cluster/sector level.*

3. *Share needs assessment data in a timely manner, with the appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks. Jointly decide on assumptions and analytical methods used for projections and estimates.*

4. *Dedicate resources and involve independent specialists within the clusters to strengthen data collection and analysis in a fully transparent, collaborative process, which includes a brief summary of the methodological and analytical limitations of the assessment.*

5. *Prioritise humanitarian response across sectors based on evidence established by the analysis. As part of the IASC Humanitarian Response Plan process on the ground, it is the responsibility of the empowered Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator to ensure the development of the prioritised, evidence-based response plans.*

6. *Commission independent reviews and evaluations of the quality of needs assessment findings and their use in prioritisation to strengthen the confidence of all stakeholders in the needs assessment.*

7. *Conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in adherence to humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.*

Needs assessment work stream co-conveners reporting request: What hurdles, if any, might be addressed to allow for more effective implementation of the GB commitment?

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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 2017, Germany funded a Coordinated Assessment and Information Management (CAIM) Training, which was organised by OCHA and took place in Berlin. This training course improved the skills of 28 humanitarian aid workers from different humanitarian organisations, focusing on translating guidance, tools, field practices, innovative concepts and practical solutions to implement the needs assessment life cycle. This practical training helped field practitioners to take leadership and supports their role in coordinating, managing, planning and implementing needs assessments in the field. The development of a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral needs assessment should be actively pursued. The data collection should include data on gender, age and disability, while at the same time ensuring compliance with data protection standards.

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 continue to fund Coordinated Assessment and Information Management (CAIM) Trainings in Berlin. In 2018, two courses are planned.

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

   Due to unresolved disagreements on the role that specialised entities should play in improving joint and impartial needs assessments, it remains difficult to assess efficiency gains.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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 makes sense to complement work stream participants' efforts by training and awareness building of humanitarian practitioners in the field. Cross-organisational trainings contribute to better understanding of the extra-added value of a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral needs assessment.

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*

2. *Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*

3. *Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*

4. *Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.*
6. *Invest time and resources to fund these activities.*

Aid organisations commit to:

7. *Ensure that, by the end of 2017, all humanitarian response plans – and strategic monitoring of them - demonstrate analysis and consideration of inputs from affected communities.*

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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 encourages its humanitarian partner organizations to include participatory approaches in all stages of the project cycle. In project proposals, partner organisations are e.g. asked to provide information on how participation of those in need, including the most vulnerable, is ensured in different phases of the project. Partners are specifically encouraged to conduct participatory needs assessments, including i.a. focus group discussions, as well as monitoring and feedback mechanisms that empower affected populations to express their views. Germany increasingly funds baseline studies as well as mid-term evaluations to allow its partners to carry out project specific studies and adapt their programming according to the needs of affected populations.

In 2016-7, Germany funded an OECD-DAC project that sub-contracted Ground Truth Solutions (GTS) to conduct surveys among affected populations, field staff and local partner organisations in six countries (Afghanistan, Somalia, Haiti, Lebanon, Iraq and northern Uganda). GTS offers to humanitarian teams practical tools to include the perspectives of affected people in their programming, thereby helping them to check/explore whether the services they provide are appropriate and relevant.

Germany also contributed to the budget of the Core Humanitarian Standard Alliance, which promotes accountability to communities and people affected by crisis as the key pillar of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS). Besides advocacy activities, the CHS Alliance offers policy support, technical assistance, training and other capacity development initiatives.

As co-conveners of work stream 9 ("Simplify and harmonize reporting requirements"), Germany and ICVA have supported the inclusion of a mandatory question on participation of and accountability to affected populations in the common donor narrative reporting template piloted within the framework of work stream 9.

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)?

   Drawing on the work stream's recommendations, Germany will continue to encourage partner organisations to use participatory approaches in all stages of the project cycle. Specifically, Germany will develop an inclusion (gender-age-disability) marker which promotes participatory approaches to adapt programming to the different needs and capacities of women, girls, men and boys with and without disabilities. Germany will continue its funding for the CHS Alliance in 2018.

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

   While increased participation can also make a contribution to efficiency gains, the commitments related to the "participation revolution" do not primarily aim at increasing the efficiency of humanitarian assistance but rather its effectiveness.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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 Ground Truth Solution studies, funded by Germany, demonstrate very clearly that the best way to design humanitarian programmes and gauge their impact is to include the perspective of affected people at all stages of the project cycle.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.*

2. *Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.*

3. *Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.*

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements[4] you have provided (as a donor) or received <u>and</u> provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.[5] When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

---

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 2015, Germany provided a total of 88 million EUR for 31 multi-year projects. Consequently, funding for multi-year projects accounted for 17,1 % of Germany's overall humanitarian budget of 513,9 million EUR in 2015.

   In 2016, Germany was able to significantly increase its multi-year funding, providing a total of 337.2 million EUR for 124 multi-year projects. Accordingly, 25,6 % of Germany's overall humanitarian budget of 1.318 billion EUR in 2016 was used to fund multi-year projects.

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?

---

[4] Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset
[5] For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available here.

In 2017, Germany has further increased its multi-year humanitarian funding. Overall 166 multi-year projects were funded, including projects with a duration of up to 3.5 years. Multi-year funding amounted to 607.6 million EUR in 2017. Consequently, 34.6 % of Germany's total humanitarian budget of 1,757 billion EUR was used to fund multi-year agreements in 2017.

By the end of 2017, a total of 480 million EUR of German humanitarian funding was already contracted for 2018, giving Germany's humanitarian partner organizations a solid basis for multi-year programming.

Germany has also actively participated in the work stream's activities and discussions, highlighting the need for recipients of multi-year funding to 'hand down' the benefits of multi-year funding to their implementing partners and to document the efficiency and effectiveness gains of multi-year funding.

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

   In the next two years, Germany will continue to promote multi-year humanitarian funding, both among other donors and relevant stakeholders within Germany.

   Germany is also planning to engage in a dialogue with its humanitarian partners to highlight the need to pass on the benefits of multi-year funding to their respective implementing partners.

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

   Multi-year funding commitments reduce administrative costs on the part of donors and allow for improved advance planning.

   However, efficiency gains will need to be primarily measured and demonstrated at the level of the organizations receiving multi-year funds. Concrete documentation on how multi-year funding has resulted in better humanitarian programming and better results for affected populations could also be used for advocacy purposes.

5. **Good practice and lessons learned**
   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?

   Lessons learned: humanitarian partner organizations need to have the capacities to develop strategic planning documents with a multi-year perspective in order to develop adequate multi-year project proposals.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and to initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.*

2. *Reduce the degree of earmarking of funds contributed by governments and regional groups who currently provide low levels of flexible finance. Aid organisations in turn commit to do the same with their funding when channelling it through partners.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated (for example, urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management)*

4. *Increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognising the contribution made by donors.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020[6].*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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?

---

[6] For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available here.

Germany's <u>overall humanitarian funding</u> increased from 1.318 billion EUR in 2016 to 1.757 billion EUR in 2017.

<u>The amount of non-earmarked</u> funding[7] was increased from 77.12 million EUR in 2016 to 105.50 million EUR in 2017. By further increasing its CERF contributions to a total of 75 million EUR, Germany became the second largest CERF donor in 2017.

Germany's <u>softly earmarked funding</u>[8] increased from 70.5 million EUR to 195.6 million EUR. It is particularly worth noting that Germany more than tripled its contributions to CBPFs (179 million EUR in 2017), thereby becoming the second largest donor to CBPFs.

Overall, the <u>amount of non-earmarked and softly earmarked funding has more than doubled</u> from 147.62 million EUR in 2016 to 301.10 million EUR in 2017. Consequently, <u>the percentage of non-earmarked and softly earmarked funding compared to the overall humanitarian funding has increased from 11 % to 17 %.</u>[9]

As an active member of the <u>"Pooled Fund Working Group"</u>, Germany helped shape the strategic direction of the CBPF mechanism, greatly enhancing its overall operational effectiveness and accountability. Moreover, Germany helped develop and introduce the new Common Performance Framework – a set of performance indicators to standardize reporting and performance measurement across all CBPFs. Germany has also actively lobbied together with other stakeholders to broaden the donor base and to increase the overall funding for the CBPFs and CERF.

Germany has been supporting the initiative of the UN Secretary-General to increase the fund ceiling of the Central Emergency Respond Fund (CERF) to US$ 1 billion and has actively contributed to the CERF Advisory Group discussing innovative ways to reach this target.

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

   In order to help OCHA and the CERF Secretariat achieve the 1 billion USD funding goal, Germany will support OCHA's efforts to mobilize funding from philanthropic sources. Germany will also continue to promote increased funding for CBPF; at the end of 2018, Germany will become co-chair of the Pooled Fund Working Group.

---

[7] Non-earmarked funding includes UNHCR, UNRWA, UNOCHA, ICRC core contributions and CERF.
[8] Soflty earmarked funding includes: CBPFs, ICRC Special Appeal "Addressing Sexual Violence 2017", WHO Contingency Fund for Emergencies, UNMAS Voluntary Trust Fund, IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund, WFP Immediate Response Account.
[9] Exact data on the earmarking funding for 2016 and 2017 (incl. non-earmarked, softly earmarked, country earmarked and tightly earmarked contributions in total value and percentages) can be found in the annex.

4. **Efficiency gains**

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

   Efficiency gains will need to be primarily measured and demonstrated at the level of the organizations receiving flexible funds. However, it is clear that less earmarking also reduces the administrative burden on the part of donors.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**

   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?

   Lessons learned: From a donor perspective enabling factors for increasing flexible funding include clear and transparent allocation processes on the part of partner organizations, robust needs assessments, transparency and risk management as well as reporting on results of these flexible contributions.

   Donors should individually and collectively support these processes with active engagement in the respective governing bodies and groups (such as the Pooled Fund Working Group and the CERF Advisory Group) in order to help shape the strategic direction and enhancing overall operational effectiveness and accountability.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*

2. *Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*

3. *Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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

   As co-conveners of the "Harmonizing and Simplifying Reporting Requirements" work stream, Germany and ICVA have launched a two-year pilot project in June 2017. It introduces the so-called "8+3 template": a Common Donor Narrative Reporting Framework, which is piloted in three countries (Myanmar, Iraq and Somalia).

   The template has been developed with the support of GPPi in a consultative/participatory process with donors and humanitarian agencies alike to ensure that the reporting burden for partners is reduced while reflecting at the same time donors' reporting needs.

   The template is in English language and consists of 8 core questions and 3 supplementary questions, which donors can individually choose to add. The pilot does not duplicate reporting; it replaces existing reporting templates of participating organizations.

   GPPi provides technical support on the reporting template, and collects the interim and final reports and other qualitative data to evaluate the pilot. To ensure buy in and understanding, the pilot includes outreach at the country level (e.g. country orientation process and community of practice). Together with GPPi and ICVA, Germany has been providing continuous support and advice to all participants.

   Germany has introduced the common reporting template with respect to its humanitarian funding in all three pilot countries and has actively promoted participation of other donors and humanitarian organizations in the pilot.

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 continue its political and financial support to the pilot project, focusing specifically on advocacy efforts to encourage broader usage of the common reporting template.

   The first interim report on the pilot project will be finalized by July 2018; the final report is expected by mid-2019.

   Germany and ICVA have identified synergies with various other work streams (e.g. Greater Transparency, Reduced Duplication & Management Costs, Multi Year Planning & Funding and Reducing Earmarking), which will inform the further development of the reporting pilot going forward. Specifically, based on the lessons learned of the narrative reporting pilot, the possibility of developing a common financial reporting template will be considered in close cooperation between relevant work streams.

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

   It is still too early to qualify efficiency gains of the common donor reporting framework. However, the introduction of the English reporting template as part of the pilot project has already alleviated the burden of translating reports into German for participating German humanitarian NGO partners.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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?

   Lessons learned: As GHD-Co Chair, Germany conducted an online survey in mid-2017 to understand better the reporting requirements of GHD donors. The survey found that a considerable part of humanitarian organization's reporting burden is not strictly caused by donor requirements. Consequently, other motives for reporting (e.g.: resource mobilization, advocacy, internal management or coordination) should also be considered in addition to harmonizing and simplifying donor reporting requirements.

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*

2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*

3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*

4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*

5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:
What has your organisation done to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

---

1. **Baseline (only in year 1)**
   Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

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 2017, Germany expanded both its political and financial support for anticipatory humanitarian assistance. The further development of the innovative risk financing approach Forecast-based Financing (FbF) is at the centre of these efforts. Based on scientific extreme weather thresholds and forecast information, FbF releases

humanitarian funding for pre-defined preparedness measures in high risk countries. In 2017, approximately 3 million EUR were invested in FbF pilot projects and in the facilitation of an FbF anticipation window within the IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF).

Moreover, in June 2017, the German government published national guidelines on "Preventing Crises, Resolving Conflicts, Building Peace", which strengthen inter-ministerial approaches in crisis contexts, i.e. from early warning to context analysis, to formulating shared goals, to the planning and implementation of specific measures, and all the way to evaluating the results of this engagement. The guidelines seek to improve coordination, coherence and complementarity between the different instruments.

Germany also continued its active participation in discussions at all levels and in multiple fora on how to operationalize the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, e.g. as part of the International Network of Conflict and Violence (INCAF). Furthermore, Germany supported relevant research like the World Bank-UN joint Flagship study "Pathways to Prevention", which has delivered best practices and policy recommendations on prevention and peace-building.

With its 2017 chairmanship of the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD), Germany enabled various stakeholders (e.g. UNHCR, IOM, NRC) to work across sectors of humanitarian assistance, disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and development, focusing in particular on the protection needs of people displaced across borders in the context of disasters.

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)?

   Besides its participation in the nexus pilot of the European Union, Germany will take action to operationalize the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus with its own pilot initiative in Somalia, which seeks to deepen cooperation and coordination between the relevant instruments at the German national and - in consequence - at field level.

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

   Germany's innovative risk financing mechanisms Forecast-based Financing (FbF) enables humanitarian stakeholders to make better use of forecasts and to react promptly and targeted and therefore also more efficiently to rising risks in disaster prone countries.

5. **Good practices and lessons learned**
   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?

   Good practices: The WFP Innovation Accelerator, jointly funded by the FFO, the Ministry for Development Cooperation and the Free State of Bavaria, demonstrates how

humanitarian assistance and development cooperation can successfully cooperate in supporting innovative approaches. Successful innovations included e.g. the use of blockchain technology for cashed-based transfers.

Lessons learned: Two years into the nexus discussion it has become clear that it is not headquarter discussions at a rather abstract level that will harness the full potential of the concept but operationalization in the field that fosters strengthened complementarity, cooperation and coherence while giving due attention to humanitarian principles and allowing all instruments and actors involved to act in accordance with their respective mandates.

Annex:

WS 8: Data on non-, softly-, country- and tightly earmarked funding for 2016 and 2017

	2016	2017
Total humanitarian budget	**1.318 billion EUR**	**1,757 billion EUR**
	% of total budget & million EUR	**% of total budget & million EUR**
Non-Earmarked	6 % (77.12)	6 % (105.50)
Softly Earmarked	5 % (70.50)	11 % (195.60)
Non-earmarked + softly earmarked funding	**11 % (147.62)**	**17 % (301.10)**
Country earmarked[10]	Estimate: 9 % (113.9)	12 % (202.65)
Tightly earmarked[11]	Estimate: 80 % (1.053)	71 % (1.279,8)

---

[10] Estimates: We currently do not have the statistic tools to provide data at such a level of detail in the given time frame.
[11] Estimates.