

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 – [OECD]

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps.....	6
4. Efficiency gains	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned	6
Work stream 2 - Localization.....	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	8
3. Planned next steps.....	8
4. Efficiency gains	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned	8
Work stream 3 - Cash.....	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	9
2. Progress to date.....	9
3. Planned next steps.....	10
4. Efficiency gains	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned	10
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	12
2. Progress to date.....	12
3. Planned next steps.....	12
4. Efficiency gains	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned	13
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps.....	15
4. Efficiency gains	15

5. Good practices and lessons learned	15
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	16
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	16
2. Progress to date.....	16
3. Planned next steps.....	17
4. Efficiency gains	17
5. Good practices and lessons learned	17
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps.....	18
4. Efficiency gains	19
5. Good practice and lessons learned	19
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	20
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	20
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps.....	21
4. Efficiency gains	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps.....	22
4. Efficiency gains	22
5. Good practices and lessons learned	22
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	23
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	23
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	24
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25

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?

The OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) is the main systems allowing DAC members to report on their aid transparently. When the Grand Bargain was signed, the OECD started the process to modernise the humanitarian codes and include a Disaster Risk Reduction marker. The code modernisation is not directly linked to the Grand Bargain, because not all DAC members are part to the Grand Bargain, however it has been designed to be Grand-Bargain compatible.

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?

(Workstream 1.3)

End 2017, the DDR marker was elaborated, and finalised and was ultimately approved by the DAC working party on Statistics early 2018. The humanitarian codes were reviewed and discussed, and will be submitted for approval in the first quarter of 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)?

Once approved, the new CRS codes for humanitarian aid will be used for the year N+2 (in 2020 for reporting on 2019 data).

4. Efficiency gains

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

Once approved and used, the new humanitarian CRS codes will provide a better reflection of DAC donor's humanitarian assistance. For instance a way to measure the use of cash as a delivery modality in development and humanitarian programmes was introduced. New channel codes such as local branches of the Red Cross and Red Crescent will allow to better capture important element of the localisation of aid.

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 Grand Bargain framework incentivise DAC donors to reflect on the new way to approach crises and humanitarian aid. Through overall discussions around the Grand Bargain, DAC donors that are not part of the Grand Bargain are taking steps to implement some of aid effectiveness principles that are also reflected into the Grand Bargain, and the new coding will apply to all DAC members, increasing overall transparency.

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?

The OECD is supporting capacity building and partnership through engagement with partner countries government and CSOs in developing countries in all sectors of development co-operation. The World Humanitarian Summit provided the OECD with the opportunity to broaden the localisation and partnership agenda of aid localisation to the humanitarian domain.

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.

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?

(workstream 2.2)

After the World Humanitarian Summit and the Grand Bargain, the OECD has worked with DAC members and Grand Bargain co-conveners, participating in policy discussions to better define localisation. It ended up in 2017 with the publication of a guidelines for donors on localising the response :

<http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/Localisingtheresponse.pdf>

(workstream 2.2)

After the Grand Bargain, the OECD launched a series of field surveys undertaken by Ground Truth Solutions to assess people affected by crises' perception about the aid they get. Humanitarian field staff is also interviewed about the aid they provide and the partnership between international and local organisations is also surveyed. Surveys in six different crisis contexts (Lebanon, Haiti, Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia and Uganda were completed in 2017 and are available on the OECD website : <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/humanitarian-financing/> (what do people think about the aid they get?)

3. Planned next steps

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

The OECD is undertaking in 2018 a second round of surveys in the six countries already surveyed in 2017 plus Bangladesh.

4. Efficiency gains

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

The guideline on localisation provide DAC donors with incentives and advices on how to localise their aid as much as possible and necessary. The fields surveys provide a useful feedback on what are local partners' priorities and help DAC donors to programme their aid.

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 OECD/ Ground Truth Solutions Fields surveys are presented to DAC donors, which brings local NGOs' concerns about their partnerships with international organisations and NGOs directly to DAC donors.

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?

Through its publication about good development in fragile context, the OECD is supporting aid delivery channels that increase aid effectiveness, such as cash-based response. The World Humanitarian Summit and the Grand Bargain gave the opportunity to the OECD to broaden the aid effectiveness agenda to better include the humanitarian response in its work.

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?

(workstream 3.4)

In order to help its member to make a better use of cash-based response in humanitarian contexts, the OECD has published a guideline for donors in using cash-based response in humanitarian context:

<http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/cashbasedresponse.pdf>

(workstream 3.4)

The OECD launched after the Grand Bargain a series of field surveys to assess people affected by crises' perception about the aid they get. Humanitarian field staff is also interviewed about the aid they provide and the partnership between international and local organisations is also surveyed. Perception about the use of cash in humanitarian programming was asked in all

context. See the OECD website : <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/humanitarian-financing/> (*what do people think about the aid they get?*)

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 part of the modernisation of the Creditor Reporting System codes for humanitarian aid, the OECD aims to introduce a measurement of cash-based intervention in development co-operation and humanitarian aid. The humanitarian codes were reviewed and discussed in 2017, and will be submitted for approval in the first quarter of 2018.

The 2018 field surveys will have a more refined questionnaire on cash-based response.

4. Efficiency gains

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

The guideline on cash-based programming provides DAC donors with incentives and advices on how to consider cash-based response when possible and relevant. The fields surveys provides a useful feedback on how cash-based responses are perceived on the field by people affected by crises and by humanitarian field 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?

The OECD guidelines series and the OECD/ Ground Truth Solutions Fields surveys are presented to DAC donors, which brings the opportunity to advocate and disseminate existing good practice about cash-based response.

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?

N/A

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?

(workstream 4.5)

In line with its mandate to help increase aid effectiveness, including on costs, the OECD has published a series of guidelines for donors. One of the guidelines focuses on increased effectiveness in humanitarian response, that addresses management costs and promotes joint work: <http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/> (*increased effectiveness*)

(workstream 4.5)

Through the peer review process, the OECD is analysing DAC members' aid policies and programming on a 5 year cycle. The peer review framework has been revised in 2017 and gives a greater space to review how donors co-ordinate and encourage their partners to contribute to better cost management.

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)?

Peer reviews are cyclical, and each DAC members is reviewed approximatively every five years. Six DAC members' policies are reviewed every year.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Peer reviews represent good opportunities to disseminate good donor practices amongst DAC members. For example if during a review the OECD is made aware of a good practice in joint work with other donors, such a practice will be highlighted at the DAC level, and disseminated amongst members.

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?

(Workstream 5.7)

Since 2014, the OECD is conducting The Resilience Systems Analysis (RSA), a tool designed to help DAC members and their partners effectively integrate risk and resilience into their strategies and programme planning. It places the shared understanding of risk, capacities and vulnerability at the centre of effective programming and emphasises the added value of programmatic approaches that are coherent, multidimensional, cross-sectoral and vertically integrated. The RSA helps to bring together a broad range of political, humanitarian and development actors to support common risk-informed programming on the ground. It facilitates a collective and contextualised understanding of the impacts of risks and stressors on a system's main assets. It also helps actors to focus on their comparative advantage – whether government, bilateral development co-operation partners, or other international, national and local agencies – to deliver better results

2. Progress to date

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

On top of continuing RSAs (see above) in 2017, Shared need analysis between development and humanitarian actors was promoted throughout the OECD work and publications. Notably, the “commitment into action” series is promoting joint analysis throughout its guidelines.

3. Planned next steps

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

The peer review framework has been revised in 2017 and gives a greater space to review how donors co-ordinate and encourage their partners to contribute to shared analysis. Peer review process is a rolling process. Approximately six DAC members' policies are reviewed every year

Efficiency gains

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

Peer reviews represent good opportunities to disseminate good donor practices amongst DAC members. For example if during a review the OECD is made aware of a good practice in joint work with other donors, such a practice will be highlighted at the DAC level, and disseminated amongst members.

4. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other rics) 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?

Community engagement is a key element of the OECD's work, and many publication and researches focus on how to partner with civil societies and support them in developing countries. The World Humanitarian Summit provided the OECD with the opportunity to broaden this partnership agenda to the humanitarian domain.

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?

(workstream 6.5)

The OECD launched after the Grand Bargain a series of field surveys to assess the perception of people affected by crises about the aid they get. Assessing aid beneficiaries' perception puts affected people and community at the centre. See OECD website : <http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/humanitarian-financing/> (what do people think about the aid they get?)

More specifically, people are asked about their participation into the programming process, the existence of a feedback or a complaint mechanism, and their trust in it.

(workstream 6.5)

In order to help donor funds addressing people's needs in crisis, the OECD has published a series of guidelines for donors. Starting the programming process through an analysis of people's need is reflected in all guidelines, most notably on the improved coordination between development and humanitarian programming

<http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/COHERENCE-OECD-Guideline.pdf>

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)?

Dissemination of the surveys' will continue with a second round of beneficiaries' perception surveys in the six same countries than in 2017, plus an additional one. This will keep people feedback at the centre of the DAC reflexion on crisis response.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Surveys' finding are disseminated to DAC members' administration, both in humanitarian and development units. It has promoted the integration of people's feedback into donors' thinking and is also promoting new way to approach crisis response.

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 OECD/Ground Truth Solutions field surveys are steering a significant interest amongst DAC members. Workshops were organised in several capitals to discuss the surveys' findings and good practice to share.

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 agreements² 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?

Through its work on fragility and resilience, the OECD is promoting a better coherence between emergency needs and medium to long-term programming. The World Humanitarian Summit provided the OECD with the opportunity to broaden the coherence agenda to the humanitarian domain.

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?

(workstream 7.1 and 7.3)

In order to help donor funds increase multiyear funding in humanitarian contexts, and clarify the stakes for donors, the OECD has published a guideline for donors on this particular topic: <http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/multiyearfunding.pdf>

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)?

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](#).

Peer reviews represent good opportunities to disseminate good donor practices amongst DAC members. Good practice such as multiannual programming and multiannual funding will be underlined during the review and highlighted at the DAC level, and disseminated amongst members as appropriate.

4. Efficiency gains

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

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?

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 2020⁴.*

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?

The OECD is promoting practices that increase aid effectiveness, including when relevant reduced earmarking of funds. The World Humanitarian Summit provided the OECD with the opportunity to broaden its work on partnership to the humanitarian domain.

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

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?

(workstream 8.5)

The DAC members peer review framework was adapted after the World Humanitarian Summit, and programming flexibility and earmarking is one of the elements that are reviewed to assess DAC member's partnerships in their engagement in fragile and crises contexts.

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)?

Going forward, all DAC members peer reviews assess donor's flexibility in fragile and crisis contexts.

4. Efficiency gains

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

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

Work stream 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?

[N/A to the OECD](#)

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 to the OECD](#)

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 to the OECD](#)

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 to the OECD](#)

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 to the OECD](#)

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?

Since 2014, the OECD is conducting The Resilience Systems Analysis (RSA), a tool designed to help DAC members and their partners effectively integrate risk and resilience into their strategies and programme planning. It places the shared understanding of risk, capacities and vulnerability at the centre of effective programming and emphasises the added value of programmatic approaches that are coherent, multidimensional, cross-sectoral and vertically integrated. The RSA helps to bring together a broad range of political, humanitarian and development actors to support common risk-informed programming on the ground. It facilitates a collective and contextualised understanding of the impacts of risks and stressors on a system's main assets. It also helps actors to focus on their comparative advantage –

whether government, bilateral development co-operation partners, or other international, national and local agencies – to deliver better results

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?

(workstream 10.1)

In order to help donor funds addressing people's needs in crisis, the OECD has published a series of guidelines for donors. All guidelines in the series promote a new way at looking at crises and needs, in a way that transcend existing siloes and allow more durable solutions for refugees and affected people. A particular guidelines was published in the coherence between development and humanitarian aid:

<http://www.oecd.org/development/humanitarian-donors/docs/COHERENCE-OECD-Guideline.pdf>

(workstream 10.1)

The DAC members peer review framework was adapted after the World Humanitarian Summit, and programming link between aid instrument, notably development and humanitarian is one of the key elements that are reviewed to assess DAC member's engagement in fragile and crises contexts.

3. Planned next steps

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

The OECD ensures the secretariat function for the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF). The INCAF workplan for 2018 will address the nexus between humanitarian, development and peace, to increase knowledge and good practice dissemination amongst members.

Peer review will continue to assess how donors combine humanitarian, development and other instruments in fragile and crisis contexts.

4. Efficiency gains

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

The guideline on coherence humanitarian-Development provides DAC donors with incentives and advices on how to coherently articulate their aid as much as possible and necessary. The fields surveys provide a useful feedback on what are affected people's priorities, notably on durable solutions that requires both immediate and long-term response.

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?