2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – Sweden

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. 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?

Transparency
- To provide timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding, Sida publishes its Humanitarian Crises Analyses of the 15 largest humanitarian crises on its webpage sida.se.
- A document detailing Sida's allocation model "Sida's allocation 2018 – Process, indicators and Outcome" is published on Sida's webpage.
- Information on all Sida humanitarian allocations, totalling 3,736,115 Swedish kronor (SEK) in 2017 is published on the webpage openaid.se.

Digital platform
- Sida has, as the first donor reported its humanitarian data on all IATI dashboard fields, effectively contributing to the improvement to the digital platform and engaging with the open data standard community.
- Sida has taken pre-emptive steps to submit full humanitarian reporting after the expected launch of IATI standard version 2.03.
- Sida has committed to participating in a pilot aiming to develop system synchronising data and reporting between OCHA Finical Tracking Service (FTS), and IATI.

- Sida is planning to use the IATI data within its organisation to e.g. monitoring and reporting vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments. However, IATI data from other signatories has not yet be accessible to Sida by IATI. At present Sida can therefore not use the IATI data for monitoring purpose, but plans to utilise data in monitoring of partners in the future.

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

Sida plans to continue working closely with partner organizations to improve timeliness and quality of data reported, especially related to work streams 3 and 8.

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

With the future possibility of submitting **high quality data via IATI directly to the FTS,** Sida foresees extensive efficiency gains related to time spent on reporting on data to FTS as well as gains related to transparency amongst donors and humanitarian agencies.

4. 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?

A lesson learnt from the Sida-IATI cooperation is the importance of ensuring technical solutions that can facilitate provision of relevant data without overburdening partners with reporting requirements.

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]

---

5. 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?

- Through the Swedish Contingency Agency (MSB), Sida supported the establishment and strengthening the capacity of national coordination mechanisms. For example, in 2017 MSB, with Sida funding, helped establish/strengthen the Coordination Centre (JCC), a national authority coordination disaster management in Iraqi Kurdistan.
- Sweden (through Sida) supported its UN and INGO partners in capacity strengthening and cooperation with national actors. Sweden provides funding to, for example, Unicef, which transfers 31 percent of its emergency funding to national or local implementing partners.

---

[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.

- Sida provided multiyear (usually 3 years) funding to 10 humanitarian projects aiming at strengthening the capacity of national/local actors, opting to support strategic partners specialised in capacity strengthening, community mobilisation and community based resilience. The funding is initially channelled through international organisations, but project will be handed over to national actors by end of the multiyear funding.

Funding provided to local and national responders:
- <u>Directly</u>: Sweden does not provide funding directly to local partners, but plans to identify one agreement modality, through which Sida could possibly directly finance and cooperate with local actors.

- <u>Through pooled funds</u>: Given the efficiency (speed, access and quality) of the UN Country-based Pooled Funds (CBPF) and Multi Partner Trust funds coupled with an opportunity for and promotion of national and local actors to receive support from the funds, Sida has increased its level of funding, (from 665 million SEK in 2016 to 857 million SEK in 2017) to CBPFs and Multi Partner Trust funds. 18 percent of CBPF funding is provided to local partners.

- <u>Through a single intermediary</u>: 12 percent of Sida's funding was provided to local and national responders through a single intermediary.

Sida has funded the Red Cross Movement's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) in 2017 and will in 2018 significantly increase funding (from 0,5 million SEK in 2017 to 10 million SEK in 2018), as the DREF provides funding and capacity to national actors, such as Red Cross/Red Crescent National Societies, to directly respond to humanitarian crisis.

Sweden is committed to further strengthen the links between flexible financing (work stream 8) and simplified reporting (work stream 9), which has implications of reporting requirements. Sweden therefore do not require partners to specify amount of funding allocated to capacity strengthening. Nevertheless, localisation, capacity strengthening, Principles of Partnership and handover to national actors is highlighted in Sweden's dialogues with strategic humanitarian partners. Moreover, Sweden (through Sida) provided support to research and policy development (International Council or Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) and Overseas Development Institute/Humanitarian Policy Group, ODI-HPG) on how the humanitarian system can invest in the capacity of local organisations aiming to increase learning as well as capacity of local organisations.

6. 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)?

Sida will:
- Continue high-level funding to CBPF.
- Significantly increase its funding to DREF.
- Continue funding multi-year project strengthening institutional capacities of local and national responders.
- Fund initiatives for strengthening national capacity to coordinate and implement humanitarian response, mainly through MSB.

- Strengthen dialogue with Sweden's humanitarian partners on localization based on the Principles of Partnership and promoting synergies with other work streams, in particular reduced earmarking, multi-year funding and harmonised/simplified reporting.
- Identify one agreement modality, through which Sida could directly finance and cooperate with local actors.

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

As implementation of the localisation commitment is very much work in progress, Sweden deems that more time is needed to illustrate more systematically how localisation is making humanitarian response more effective, efficient and relevant.

8. 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?

Sweden finds it too early to substantiate efficiency gains, good practices and lessons learnt (this will most probably become clearer in 2018) but overall support to CBPFs and DREF appear to be good practice for supporting local responders in a needs-based and coordinated way.

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.*

---

9. 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?

Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools
Internally:
- Sida has made a review to update internal procedures to reflect the use of cash and vouchers.

In cooperation with other signatories:
- Sida took initiative to set up a joint donor baseline on cash funding levels.
- Sida is conducting a study to gain further knowledge on partners' capacity to assess optimal aid modality, including cash, through response analysis.

Invest in new delivery models
- Sweden supports investments in new delivery models indirectly through flexible funding (core-support and programme support).

Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash
- Sweden has initiated dialogue with partners to systematically distinguish between cash and vouchers.
- Sida's funding to cash research such as Development Initiatives, Overseas Development Institute, UNICEF Innocenti Transfer Project.

Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming to better understand risks and benefits.
- Sweden has participated in donor coordination, methods and policy discussions on cash in various fora, including Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD).

- Sida's funding to CaLP and IRC has contributed to developing guidelines and standards.

Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.
- Sida's support to NRC Cash Cap has contributed to enhance coordination of cash.

Increase use of cash programming
- Sweden promotes increased use of cash programming, in dialogue with partners and through flexible funding. Sida has funded cash-based assistance through annual allocations and programme support. Swedish core support to UN agencies and ICRC enables partners to choose the optimal modality and to increase use of cash programming.

10. 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)?

Sweden will:
- Continue dialogue with partners to systematically distinguish between cash and vouchers.
- In dialogue with partners put emphasis on quality outcome, coordination, delivery, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms as well as reporting on cash transfers.

Sweden, through Sida, will:
- Continue to develop internal procedures to reflect the use of cash alongside other tools.
- Identify a number of contexts suitable for scale-up of cash, in particular multi-purpose cash.
- Link humanitarian cash to development approaches, such as in social protection programmes.
- Continue dialogue with partners on capacity for cash programming.

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

Sweden finds it too early to assess efficiency gains and will follow up with partners during 2018.

12. 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?

Sweden finds it too early to develop good practices and lessons learnt but believes that e.g. Sida's funding to cash research such as Development Initiatives, Overseas Development Institute, UNICEF Innocenti Transfer Project will enable systematic identification of good practice and lessons learned.

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?

---

13. 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?

- Sweden accepts agencies' annual reports (narrative and financial) as reporting on Swedish global core support to humanitarian UN agencies, ICRC, IFRC, ISDR (see work stream 8 on details).
- Sida continues to:
  1) base its allocation on the HRPs and ICRC's annual appeals. In 2017, around 90% of Sida's humanitarian funding went through coordinated HRPs;
  2) sign global agreements for its humanitarian allocation (and for the CBPFs), to reduce management costs at field level and increase efficiency. Partners can use their own format for proposals and reports.
- Sida has increased its programme-based support from one (2017) to three (2018) INGO partners. Programme-based support enables the organisation to use Sida's funding according to its own most urgent priorities, rather than funding being earmarked for specific projects.
- Sweden uses MOPAN assessments instead of conducting separate performance assessments of multilateral partners' capacity. For NGO partners, before initiating reviews and evaluations, Sida always explores whether the partner has already conducted its own external or internal reviews or if other donors have conducted similar reviews/evaluations, to avoid duplications and ensure relevance of the assessments for partner organisations.

14. 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)?

- Push for improved quality of aggregated annual reports on core support to multilateral agencies, with particular focus on improving aggregated results reporting.
- Share more widely Sida's practice for needs-based humanitarian allocation, as well as programme based approach (unearmarked funding to partners country programmes) to facilitate exchange of best practice o harmonisation.

15. Efficiency gains

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

Sida piloted a programme-based approach where a partner submits a programme document presenting its humanitarian programme per country, rather than separate project proposals. Sida earmarks funding per country but lets the partner make decisions on allocations within their country programme. The pilot, which included one strategic partner, proved successful and therefore two additional partners have been included in 2018. Efficiency gains includes reduced proposal and reporting requirements as well as alignment with partners' own monitoring and reporting systems, leading to efficiency gains for the partner as well as more comprehensive reporting for Sida as a donor.

Other donors have shown interest in the model and one more donor has aligned its funding to the programme-based approach. If more donors would commit to supporting the programme-based approach, efficiency gains would be made by reducing management cost related to proposal and report writing, and by giving flexibility to implementing organisations to adjust to changing humanitarian needs.

16. 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 concept of a programme-based approach is new for NGO partners, and therefore entail revised approaches (organisational appeal documents and systems for reporting on results). Lessons learnt by Sida and partners are documented and will be incorporated in further fine tuning of the model.

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. 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?

- Sweden is a long-standing strong proponent of a needs-based, coordinated response; substantial global core support to OCHA is one way of supporting such a response as well as funding to the CBPFs and CERF.
- In Sweden's 2017-2020 strategy for humanitarian aid, Sida activities should contribute to reduced risk for SGBV, ensure dignity for survivors of SGBV, reduce prevalence of SGBV and improve possibilities for support to survivors of SGBV.

- Sweden has continued to ensure that its funding enables and empowers inter-agency work on improving cross-sectoral needs analyses and subsequent joint response planning.
- Sweden has provided substantial amounts of flexible financing (see work stream 8), which provides UN agencies with unrestricted funds that may be used for strengthening, data collection and joint analysis
- Sida provides multi-year core funding to ACAPS for complementary needs analyses.
- Sida strives to allocate its humanitarian funding to responses that are based on inter-sectoral needs analyses. As a result of Swedish efforts in ensuring funding is within Humanitarian Response Plans, in 2017 more than 90% of Sida's funding to UN and INGO partners was reported within HRPs (where such existed). Simultaneously, Sweden is advocating for well-prioritized HRPs, based on strong intersectoral needs assessment.
- Sida's humanitarian allocation model is based on a number of objective indicators, complemented by a qualitative comparative analysis. In 2017, Sida further developed its needs-based model for the allocation of its humanitarian support (described in 2016 report). Sida's allocation, including criteria and outcome, is public.
- Sweden promotes an integrated gender approach, where the needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, girls, and boys are assessed in each context, including as part of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. Sida reviews partners' gender policies and individual projects to ensure that assessment and monitoring include gender disaggregated data and a gender sensitive needs analysis. Sida requires its partners to apply the IASC Gender Markers, and supports GenCap in further developing them.
- Sweden participated in the work stream 5 workshop in Geneva in June 2017 and continues to follow the implementation of the workplan.

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

- Sweden will continue to provide UN agencies and ICRC with global core support enabling flexible funding for needs analysis/assessments and response plans.
- Sida will continue to develop its approach along the lines of reported actions above, with focus on flexible, enabling financing and support to UN-led coordinated response plans.

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

Sweden finds it too early to point out concrete evidence related to efficiency gains (this will most probably become clearer in 2018).

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

Sweden finds that a key good practice for good humanitarian donorship is to give priority to programmes/projects within the HRP in order to ensure a relevant and effective and efficient response.

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.*

---

5. 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?

Sweden chaired the *Call to Action on Protection from Gender-based Violence in Emergencies* (Call to Action) during 2017. One of Sweden's priorities was to make sure women and girls are involved and have leadership roles in humanitarian response, and that women, girls, men and boys are engaged in prevention. Sweden recognises SGBV is an obstacle to i.a. participation. To realise these priorities, strengthened political support is key. To that end, Sweden has:

- Arranged several high-level panels on topics related to equal participation.
- Increased the Call to Action membership to 17 new members.
- Actively pushed for the Member States to live up to commitments SGBV and demanded integration and reporting of the work for gender equality and SGBV.

In Sweden's 2017-2020 strategy for humanitarian aid, one of the main priorities are to increase community engagement and participation, with an integrated gender approach and an emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable.

Common standards
- Sida provides core budget support to the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) Alliance to enhance effective application of the CHS.
- Sida provides funding to ALNAP, ACAPs, ELRHI/HIF, IRIN among others to improve the quality and accountability of humanitarian action.

- Sida has funded a project on "strengthening accountability to affected populations and applying the Core Humanitarian Standards" in Chad. The project aims to ensure that the humanitarian response in Chad is informed by and adapts to the views, perceptions and priorities of the affected people. The project is implemented by the Core Humanitarian Standards Alliance with the Ground Truth Solutions.

Feedback and corrective action
- Sida co-funded UNICEF led inter-agency project for collective services for community engagement and accountability in the Central African Republic (CAR). The two-year project, 2018-2019, aims to implement a set of complementary collective service activities to make sure that the humanitarian response is informed by and adapts to the views, feedback and perceptions of the affected populations

Leadership and governance
- To improve leadership and governance mechanisms Sida has incorporated participation into ongoing partner dialogue, including its dialogue with, OCHA and UNHCR, at headquarters and country levels for the consideration of inputs from affected population.

Flexible funding
- To ensure flexible funding to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback, Sweden provides substantial global core supports. Sida allows all its larger humanitarian partners to prioritise how to use Sida funding.
- Sida continues flexible financing through: Program-based funding with nine (9) partners; Rapid Response Mechanisms (RRM) with 10 partners, and; Unallocated funds with six (6) partners.[2] Program based funding has been extended from only NRC 2016 to ACF and IRC for 2018. These flexible funding mechanisms afford partners the opportunity to adjust interventions and make them more responsive to the priorities and feedback of the affected people, including ongoing corrective actions.

6. 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)?

- Follow up on the commitment of Sida partners/GB signatories to ensure that HNOs and HRPs, and their strategic monitoring reports, demonstrate consideration of input from the affected population, as per existing humanitarian program cycle guidelines.

---

[22] a) Program based funding with ICRC, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNRWA, OCHA, WFP, NRC, ACF and IRC.
   b. Rapid Response Mechanisms (RRM) with Swedish Red Cross/IFRC, Save the Children, NRC, Plan International, IRC, ACF, OXFAM, Church of Sweden, Swedish Mission Council, Islamic Relief.
   c). Unallocated funds with UNHCR, UNICEF, FAO, OCHA, ICRC and MSB.

- Support prioritized partner-specific projects assessed to have system-wide benefits for learning and application/ adaptation. Continue the support to the Chad and CAR collective services projects for community engagement and accountability.
- Continue to support expert and operational organisations that facilitate participation of affected populations, in gender sensitive manner and continue to invest time and resources to fund these activities.
- Update application guidance and reporting tools to reflect better the participation and accountability commitments (linking with work stream 4 and work stream 9)
- Continue to provide flexible support facilitating programs based on consultations with and feedback of the affected people.
- Link Sida's participations commitments with its cash commitments given its potential empowering effect, particularly when given multipurpose cash.
- On policy level, Sweden will engage with other donors through GHD and GB processes for possible joint approaches for higher impact.

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

Sweden finds it too early to point out concrete evidence related to efficiency gains (this will most probably become clearer in 2018)

8. 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?

Sweden finds it too early to develop good practices and lessons learnt (this will most probably become clearer in 2018)

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[3] you have provided (as a donor) or received <u>and</u> provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.[4] When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

---

9. 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? '

Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments

- Sweden sees multi-year funding as key for a flexible and effective humanitarian response and has therefore entered into its first multi-year agreement for core funding with WFP 2018-2021.
- Sweden plans to conclude multi-year core funding agreements with three global humanitarian partners during 2018.

Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans

- Sida has supported multi-year programmes 2017–2019 in protracted crises with 330 MSEK in Afghanistan, Myanmar, Palestine, DRC, Sudan, Lebanon, Mali, Niger, Cameroon and Chad. Programmes are implemented through for example; Swedish Red Cross, Save the Children and Swedish Mission Council and all have a defined hand over strategy.

---

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

- Sida has developed methodology and criteria to assess multi-year funding: Humanitarian assistance in protracted crises, in line with multi-year Humanitarian Response Plan (only in contexts with multi-year humanitarian planning). Transition/phase out of humanitarian assistance (handing over to development and national/local actors according to a proposed plan within a specific time-frame). Humanitarian assistance in specifically hard-to-reach areas focusing on access to those with the greatest needs.

Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors.

- Sida coordinates humanitarian and development programmes by including analysis around humanitarian–development nexus opportunities and challenges in its yearly humanitarian crises analysis (in total 16 contexts). Also, humanitarian staff are increasingly involved in the preparation, operationalization and mid-term review of the multi-year development programme cycle.

10. 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)?

Sweden plans to:
- Elaborate additional multi-year core funding agreements in 2018.
- Continue dialogue with humanitarian partners on the need to analyse and communicate efficiency gains, good practices and lessons learnt and challenges of multi-year funding and programming.
- Continue dialogue with other donors on the efficiency gains, good practices, lessons learnt and challenges of multi-year funding and programming.
- Support enhanced synergies with workstream 8 on reduced ear-marking.

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

Sweden finds it too early to assess efficiency gains and will follow up with partners in 2018.

12. 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?

See above.

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[5].*

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

- Unearmarked contributions (given):   approx. 45 % 2016, approx. 38 % in 2017[6] See table below for concrete volumes o Sweden's core support
- Softly earmarked contributions (given): 24% in 2016, 27% in 2017
- Country earmarked contributions (given): 28% in 2016, 42% in 2017
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given): 32% in 2016, 29% in 2017

---

13. 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?

Sweden firmly believes in the efficiency of flexible humanitarian financing given that it allows for a need-based approach and caters for needs both in forgotten and protracted crises. Sweden's commitment to flexible financing and pooled funding, is illustrated by substantial support to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), increasing global core funding to UN humanitarian agencies as well increased funding to CBPFs. In 2017, Sweden completely un-earmarked core funding (from the MFA) is illustrated in table below:

---

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

[6] This illustrates the proportion of Swedish core support a from the total Swedish humanitarian allocation (both MFA and Sida administrated humanitarian aid).

Non-earmarked core funding 2017		
Organisation	**SEK**	**USD**
UNHCR	750 000 000 kr	$ 87 852 189,67
WFP	645 000 000 kr	$ 75 552 883,11
CERF	675 000 000 kr	$ 79 066 970,70
UNRWA	470 000 000 kr	$ 55 054 038,86
ICRC	105 000 000 kr	$ 12 299 306,55
IFRC	50 000 000 kr	$ 5 856 812,64
UNISDR	15 000 000 kr	$ 1 757 043,79
OCHA	125 000 000 kr	$ 14 642 031,61
Grand total	2 835 000 000 kr	$ 332 081 276,94

The share of Swedish humanitarian financing channelled through Sida (3,5 billion SEK in 2017) is allocated on the country or crisis level based on Sida's global allocation model. Within those premises, Sida has a adopted an approach of flexible financing modalities in line with the GHD principles.

Sida increased the level of flexibility of its funding in 2017:
- 23% (857,5 MSEK) of Sida's humanitarian funding was allocated to the Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs), up by 4 percentage points from 2016. The CBPFs are Sida's single largest channel of humanitarian financing, and a key vehicle for the implementation of Sida's humanitarian strategy.
- An additional 42% was allocated as flexible funding on the country level, meaning unearmarked funding to partner organisations' humanitarian country programmes or emergency appeals. Often the only restriction is that funding should be used within the HRP or equivalent. In 2018, Sida has further expanded the scope of programme funding to additional organisations. A total of 9 partner organisations will benefit from this type of funding in 2018.

Sida also allocates significant amounts, in 2017 some 13% of its total humanitarian funding, as prepositioned unearmarked funding to partner organisations for rapid use in sudden onset or rapidly deteriorating situations during the year.
- A total of 286 SEK was granted to 13 INGO partners for use within the Sida Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM).
- For ICRC and UN partners, Sida is expanding the use such unallocated funds, which in 2017 totalled 180 MSEK, and will expand in 2018 to include two additional UN partners.

14. 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)?

- Sweden together with ICRC as co-conveners of work stream 8 will continue to deepen understanding for what is hindering a move towards less ear-marking.

- Sweden, together with ICRC, will continue to push for reduced ear-marking
- Sida will continue to develop its modalities for flexible financing on the crisis level, including steps to strengthen monitoring of such funding and encourage further transparency on the recipient side.

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

The last external evaluation of Sida's humanitarian assistance (2016, Mowjee, Poole, et al.) found that flexibility of funding, along with being a neutral and principled donor, was a key value added as a humanitarian donor. Partners could use lightly earmarked funds to focus on the greatest needs instead of being locked into pre-set areas or activities. This had clear efficiency benefits.

16. 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?

Sweden, together with ICRC, will continue to push for reduced ear-marking in line with conclusions from the work stream in 2017:

- In order to gather political will for less earmarking key with clear evidence and stronger advocacy from implementing agencies of how un-earmarked funding is both more principled, not least needs-based, and cost-effective.
- Clearer link between un-earmarked contributions and humanitarian results help build confidence.
- A clear and transparent allocation process contributes to trust between donors and agencies.
- Increasing data collection on un-earmarked contributions – using Financial Tracking System (FTS) and/or the annual GHA report facilitate a more evidence-based approach.
- Reduced ear-marking should be unpacked along the "transaction chain".
- Key to measure progress on reducing tightly earmarked.

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.*

---

17. 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?

Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements (see also work stream 4)

- Sweden is a major donor of flexible funding (core support and programme support) and accepts the organisations global annual report as reporting requirement.
- Sweden is engaging in strengthening the links between workstream 9 and 8 as reducing ear-marking depends on qualitative aggregated results reports.
- Sida has increased its programme-based support from one (NRC in2017) to three (2018) INGO partners (IRC, ACF). This has "transferred" the level of reporting required from project level to program level. This approach also entails only one report aligned with the organisations' own format.
- For project support, Sida only requires annual reports and partners are encouraged to simplify reporting by focusing on achievement of results , lessons learnt and relevant financial reports.
- Sweden encourages partners to include gender disaggregated data in reporting.
- Regarding UN agencies, Sweden accepts UNBOA audit reports.
- Sida has contributed to the development of a standard format for reporting for humanitarian country-based pooled funds (CBPF).

Enhance the quality of reporting

- During 2017 Sweden (through Sida) engaged in the pilot on harmonising reporting in all three identified pilot countries. Sida developed templates for project reporting and a simplified version for reporting on RRM projects based on the "Common 8+3 template". Templates are shared with participating partners with project support.

18. 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)?

Sweden will:

- Contribute to strengthening the links between workstream 9 and workstream 8 to discuss harmonising donor reporting requirements for flexible financing.
- Continue to actively contribute to the pilot on harmonising reporting.

- Continue to enhance the quality of reporting in dialogue with partners with the focus on achievement of results and lessons learnt and relevant financial reports.
- Provide good practices and lessons learned on efficiency gains on reporting from a programme based approach support to NGOs (compared to project based approach).

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

The programme based approach support to NRC started in 2017 as a pilot for Sida's humanitarian funding. The most tangible efficiency gain is that of enhanced flexibility for the implementing partner to allocate funds where they are most needed. It has also provided administrative efficiency gains for Sida in terms of administrating one application per country, rather than multiple project applications for one country.

20. 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 programme based approach support is a good practice, however it requires time and commitment initially to develop and adjust the format for reporting to fully harmonise with the partners own system and at the same time fulfil the donor requirements.
By participating in the pilot on harmonising reporting Sida has shared good practices based on a simplified version for reporting on RRM.

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?"

---

21. 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?

Sida identified a three pillar-approach to systematize the work on risk, resilience and strengthened synergies between humanitarian and development assistance, examples of progress within the pillars are provided below:

Pillar 1: Common analysis, planning and programming based on risk, vulnerability and resilience

- In all 16[7] contexts where Sweden, through Sida, has both development cooperation and humanitarian support, Sida has included analysis on opportunities and challenges on the humanitarian-development nexus in the yearly Humanitarian Crises Analyses.[8]

---

[7]*Afghanistan, Somalia, Palestine, Syria Crisis, DRC, Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Iraq, Mali, Myanmar, Bangladesh, South Sudan, Sudan, Ukraina, Zimbabwe*
[8] *Humanitarian Crises Analysis for 2018 are available on www.sida.se*

- Humanitarian staff are increasingly involved in the preparation, operationalisation and mid-term review of the multi-year development programme cycle.
- Sweden's development strategies are increasingly geared towards strengthening resilience of vulnerable people and communities addressing root causes of crises, and seeking synergies with humanitarian assistance, e.g. the regional Syria-crisis strategy[9], the strategies for Iraq[10] and Sudan[11]. To further strengthen the integration of resilience and humanitarian-development nexus throughout the development portfolios, resilience strategies have been developed [12] which have resulted in a more multi-sectoral approach focusing on risk, vulnerability and resilience[13].
- Sida has strengthened its risk-informed development planning and programming through piloting, with the OECD/DAC, the method of resilience systems analysis (RSA) in six contexts at various points of the programme cycle. The RSA[14] has identified synergies and the need to include the most vulnerable groups in development assistance.
- The Swedish government adopted in 2017 a new strategy, Sustainable Peace, which includes addressing root causes of humanitarian crises. The strategy will contribute to increased collaboration between actors in the humanitarian system and long-term development cooperation with a focus on joined-up analysis, planning and goal formulation.

Pillar 2: Flexible, innovative and effective funding for the most vulnerable people

According to context specific opportunities, Sida strives to ensure that strategy implementation increasingly contributes to strengthening resilience, creating durable solutions and avoiding dependency of humanitarian assistance, e.g:

- In the allocation process for 2018, Sida opened a specific window for multi-year humanitarian support aiming at avoiding humanitarian dependency allocating approx 330 MSEK for 2018-2020; a majority aims to reach displaced populations.
- Sida supports durable solutions for displaced populations, e.g. in Somalia, Uganda and DRC.
- Sida is focusing on strengthening resilience and reducing humanitarian needs in the Horn of Africa through an additional allocation of 800 MSEK (2018-2021) with focus on addressing root causes of crises.
- In drought-affected food insecurity contexts, Sida supports social protection for vulnerable people and communities designed to lift people out of chronic poverty using cash transfers and access to social services.
- 2018-2020 Sida is supporting MSB with humanitarian and development funding meet people's immediate humanitarian needs, but to also over time to reduce risk, vulnerability, and dependence on humanitarian assistance.

---

[9] *Sweden's Regional Strategy for the Syria Crisis 2016-2020*
[10] *Sweden's strategy for development cooperation with Iraq in 2017-2021*
[11] *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Sudan 2018–2022*
[12] *Among others, they include establishing resilience criteria for contribution selection and modalities for flexible re-programming, continuous conflict and risk analyses, and closer linkages between programs at national and local levels and between results areas for a more holistic approach.*
[13] *This is the case in for example the Mali programme where development assistance complements and builds on emergency response programming and the DRC which has taken a multi-sectoral and integrated approach to targeting chronic needs and root causes of vulnerability*
[14] *Resilience Systems Analysis Learning and Recommendations report, Sida/OECD/DAC http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/risk-resilience.htm*

- Sida is supporting UNHAS in Sudan with humanitarian as well as development funding to ensure effective passenger and light cargo transport in extremely vulnerable hard-to-reach areas.

Pillar 3: Promote increased dialogue and coordination on risk, resilience and synergies between humanitarian and development

- Issues related to risk, resilience and humanitarian-development nexus, are priorities in Sweden's dialogue with governments, the UN, donors and partners. Common planning and prioritization between humanitarian and development assistance should be promoted and issues around risks, vulnerabilities and resilience included in the national and UN Plans.
- Sweden supports the New Way of Working as well as implementation of the pilots of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF).

22. 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)?

- Sweden (MFA) has in 2018 established an informal working group for developing knowledge and policy within the nexus between humanitarian-development- and peacebuilding efforts. This working group will collect experiences from the field as well as link up to processes at the UN, World Bank and EU.
- In line with Sweden's feminist foreign policy, including investments in women's and girls' empowerment and capacity in all stages of conflict and crisis, is key to build equal, sustainable and resilient societies.
- In Sida's 2015-2018 vision, resilience and the humanitarian/development nexus constitute one of five priority areas. A mid-term internal evaluation on humanitarian and development collaboration (2017) concluded that the priority was fairly well understood, but uncertainties remained regarding how to take words to action.

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

In contexts with large humanitarian needs as well as ongoing development cooperation, where Sida has increased focus on resilience, risk and humanitarian development nexus, as well as strengthened field capacity, it is clear that complementarity between humanitarian and development assistance is increased and "silo approaches" avoided - benefiting the most vulnerable.

24. 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?

Sweden's work is guided by an increased focus on: (i) resilience and risk by investing in risk-informed analyses and programming; (ii) tackling the underlying drivers of risks, crises and vulnerability as well as prevention, early action and durable solutions to recurrent and protracted crises; (iii) ensuring that development reaches the poorest and most vulnerable in line with "*leave no one behind*" and "*address the needs of those furthest behind first; (iv)* a strengthened complementarity between humanitarian and development programming ("humanitarian/development nexus") aiming at avoiding humanitarian dependency.

This approach is based on lessons learned and we believe that this approach constitute best practice.