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 – [NEAR]

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?

NEAR's (Network for Empowered Aid Response) four institutional pillars is to develop evidence based research/communications, which will counteract the current lack of visibility in the international space of organizations working with local communities, by actively promoting their work through research and evidence-based publications. In principle, NEAR believes all institutions should transition to an open transparency platform allowing for their donors, partners and beneficiaries to have access to their funding data.

The availability of programmatic data will also help institutions working in conflict zones and locations where it is difficult to operate, to provide needed assistance in both a disaster and post-disaster environment. Donors and partners historically have outdated response information, this is an area where local and national organizations can help provide real-time support and information.

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?

NEAR is currently working with ODI/HPG on two traceability studies in Somalia and South Sudan. The results will be shared publicly with Grand Bargain members and others by the last quarter of 2018. The study involves donors, international organizations and local actors.

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)?

NEAR plans to work with its members and affiliated networks to expand their ability to conduct their own country traceability studies, It is anticipated that the Somalia NGO Consortium will continue the Somalia traceability study after 2018.

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

N/A

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

N/A

Work stream 2 – Localization

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?

---

[1] The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure (available here) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form (available

NEAR has been an active influencer of the Grand Bargain commitment, including being the one who suggested the establishment of a target initially at 20% of humanitarian funding to be accessed directly by local actors by 2020 which was later increased to 25%.

The network represents over 56 'committed members' from four regions chronically affected by the largest humanitarian crises of today. In upholding the spirit of diversity and inclusivity, NEAR has published open letters to IASC encouraging them to consider not just incorporating views of local actors, but to also include them into their discussions on how to better work together.

On the issue of promoting the implementation of the localization agenda, the network has taken to various international media platforms with a call to action to all players who committed to the Grand Bargain and Localization Agenda. An open letter was written to The Grand Bargain officially requesting a seat at all future Grand Bargain Sherpa group meetings with the same level of participation as other networks based in the US and Europe.

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?

NEAR has taken an active part in the Localization Marker Working Group, which has been working to finalize definitions of local actors and what "directly as possible" means in reference to the 25% Grand Bargain commitment and what is a "local actor". Through this engagement the work stream produced a consensus based definition of local actors "as directly as possible" that was supported by NEAR and by local actors in the global south dated 14th April 2017. However, the GB and the co-conveners for this work stream have unilaterally altered a transparent, inclusive and consensus based process with revised definitions that in the opinion of NEAR do not support local actors.

The revised definitions of the co-conveners will allow donors to fund one layer of intermediary (INGO or UN agency or private contractor) and if that intermediary funds a local actor then they can measure the 25% against that. Furthermore, an INGO with a registered national chapter that has affiliation to that INGO is now also considered a local actor and will allow donors to measure funding to that INGO national affiliate in meeting its 25% commitment. These revisions are in serious violation of the spirit and intent of the 25% commitment. NEAR will continue to advocate for the implementation of the agreed 14th April 2017 definitions that were approved by the work stream in an inclusive and transparent manner prior to the non transparent and unilateral change of these definitions.

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)?

NEAR is in the process of undertaking a transaction cost/traceability research study which will contribute significantly to the global humanitarian system's body of evidence regarding the most effective means of implementing relief work. This research will serve to provide baseline data utilizing the data from two case study countries.

NEAR will be launching a comprehensive financing strategy for local actors as part of a comprehensive research it has been undertaking in 2017/2018. This financing strategy will be laying

out how donors can enhance funding to local actors and innovative financing mechanisms that will allow donors to meet their 25% grand bargain commitment.

NEAR will be launching two pilot national funds that will put in practice some of the recommendations from the financing strategy. NEAR will also be producing a comprehensive organizational development strategy that will also provide policy recommendations and practical investments in developing the institutional capacity of local actors.

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

N/A

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

N/A

Work stream 3 – Cash

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?

NEAR members are already leaders in and a strong advocate for the use of cash as an effective tool to reach affected populations. Since 2002 one of our founding members, Adeso has been implementing cash based programming in the Horn of Africa and East Africa. It was the first agency to use cash programing at that time in that region. In 2017, approximately 90% of Adeso's humanitarian response used cash as a tool. Other NEAR members in Africa, Asia and Middle East are heavily involved in the use of cash programing in their humanitarian response.

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?

NEAR members continue to advocate for cash programing, speaking at forums like the Global Cash Forum hosted by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP). Our members are also active in CaLP and national cash based working groups. Members continue to refine their cash monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools to contribute to better gender inclusion and better evidence based learning of cash programming. Members also advocate for the use of mobile money payments to better assist affected populations, especially in hard to reach areas.

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 2 years

Members plan to continue advocating for the use of cash, particularly as a tool that can help push forward the localization agenda, capacity development of staff and peers on use of cash based programming, providing peer support on the use of cash based programming, advocate for more efficient delivery models such as the Lebanon example tried by DFID and ECHO to use one service provider to deliver cash payments in crisis and contribute to more evidence-based learning.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

Work stream 4 – Management costs

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?

As a network of local and national organizations, NEAR advocates for all humanitarian actors to work alongside the beneficiary community (including local/national organizations and local governments) at all phases of the response, inclusive of development and implementation of programming to ensure localized and context based responses. While technology can save management costs and provides a new layer of communication, implementation and evaluation of humanitarian programming, we find comprehensively working with local actors to ensure in-person and face-to-face interaction to be a great overall cost saving measure. The reduction of the existing multi layer transaction cost through 2-5 layers of intermediaries through direct partnership with local actors or the use of only one intermediary layer such as national funds will significantly reduce the overall cost of the humanitarian response and ensure more funding reaching affected people.

As stated above, NEAR is a large proponent of open transparent data inclusive of programmatic and assessment data. We believe more accurate, real-time information equates to better programming for all humanitarian actors and coordination of such information will help improve not only humanitarian response but also will help local government and local actors prepare for cyclical disasters. Coordination is also necessary to ensure there is limited to no duplication of programming.

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?

While NEAR is not an active member of this work stream, and as a network does not directly implement humanitarian programming, we will still continue to work with our members to advocate for open transparent data inclusive of programmatic and assessment data to ensure management costs are minimized.

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)?

NEAR will continue to advocate for its members to ensure real-time information is provided to all humanitarian actors. NEAR will also continue to provide evidence-based research/publications concerning localization and the availability of real-time programmatic and assessment data. Further, NEAR will continue to advocate for the equitable partnership between donors, international actors and local actors to ensure management costs are minimized.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

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?

Many of NEAR members are active in their respective country cluster system/national NGO consortia. While we believe these to be great coordination mechanisms, at times they are dominated by large organizations, with limited local and national organizations involvement. A commitment such as conducting analysis with local actors including local authorities is a great start in engaging local actors.

As an institutional pillar, increasing evidence-based research is also a key component in developing needs assessments and responding to a humanitarian crisis.

We also advocate for donors and international actors to provide funding to local institutions to conduct research, as they are sometimes better positioned to gather information at a lesser cost.

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?

Advocating on behalf of NEAR members on various work stream topics is one NEAR's top priorities. Since its inception, NEAR staff and members have engaged in local, regional and international fora to advocate for increased involvement of local actors in conducting assessments and evidence-based research as they are not only the first responders in many occasions but are also almost always personally affected by a humanitarian crisis.

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)?

NEAR staff and members plan to continue to advocate for local actor involvement in the development and verification of assessments and localized evidence based research.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

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?

The existing coordination mechanisms in many countries where humanitarian crisis exist are dominated by UN and international NGOs, with very little engagement of national and local governments as well as local actors. The existing IASC and cluster systems require significant restructuring to ensure that a real participant revolution takes place as the existing structures do not lend themselves to diversity, voice of affected people and transparency. NEAR supports that an external review of the IASC and cluster system be undertaken with the full engagement of southern governments and local actors as equal stakeholders in the review process.

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

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

NEAR will continue to request membership to the IASC similar to ICVA and Interaction. With no southern representation of voice of the IASC, NEAR believes that the current structure is not inclusive or transparent in decision making of all stakeholders, in particular those who are closest to the affected populations that the aid system claims to serve. If NEAR is accepted as a IASC member, it will advocate for an external and inclusive review of the IASC and cluster system structures with equal and transparent engagement of national governments and local actors.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

Work stream 7 – Multi-year planning and funding

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[2] you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.[3] 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?

NEAR members are typically the first responders to quick onset disasters and remain in their respective communities after the initial humanitarian response. The transition between humanitarian programming and development programming is a spectrum for local actors and has no clear cut-off point. Local actors have traditionally worked along this spectrum, and would benefit greatly from multi-year funding to allow for a more sustainable programming for their communities.

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?

N/A

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)?

N/A

---

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

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

N/A

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?

N/A

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[4].

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?

NEAR supports the enhanced flexibility of financing including increasing the un-earmarking of funds. It should be noted that while donors do not earmark funds of their international UN or INGO partners, these same agencies earmark their funding to local actors and severely restrict these funds. In addition, most INGO and UN agency donors either provide no unrestricted funding or extremely limited amount (far less than what they receive from donors) to local actors. The lack of unrestricted funding is a significant contributor to the lack of capacity of a local actor. If local actors are not receiving un-earmarked or fully flexible funding for core operations, which UN and many INGOs receive as well as not receiving the small 7% or 10% overhead provided for a specific project,

---

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

they will have no funding to invest in developing their core systems inclusive of finance, HR, operations, etc. They will always remain having limited capacity and not able to grow to strong institutional partners of donors.

NEAR believes that this issue needs to be critically addressed from the perspective of local actors who are seen as being at the bottom of the pyramid or the last actor in a long supply chain. Either way, they are critical to the delivery of humanitarian assistance but they benefit the least in unrestricted funding contributing directly to their inability to grow their capacity.

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?

NEAR has produced a global position paper highlighting this issue of how the lack of overheads and unrestricted funding undermines the capacity of local actors. This document will be launched globally in 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)?

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

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?

NEAR believes this is a great opportunity to provide capacity development to local actors while harmonizing reporting requirements. Harmonized reporting should also include community accountability measures, to ensure beneficiary involvement in humanitarian programming. Furthermore, NEAR believes that the harmonization of reporting is limiting and that this commitment should expand to the harmonization of all due diligence including capacity assessments.

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?

N/A

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)?

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Work stream 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?

Many NEAR members are actively engaged in bridging the humanitarian to development nexus and in developing innovative programming that support affected people from continuing to be aid dependent. Local actors are actively engaged in durable solutions for refugees and IDPs, transitioning from humanitarian cash transfers to longer term social protection, disaster risk reduction and mitigation strategies at local and national levels and more. It is important for NEAR members to not perpetuate the long term humanitarian aid dependency that occurs in protracted crisis and to find programming that truly empower affected people to find solutions to self-sufficiency and dignity.

24

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?

N/A

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)?

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A