

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 – [UNDP]

Contents

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance	1
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	9
4. Efficiency gains	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	9
Work stream 3 – Cash	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	10
2. Progress to date	10
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	12
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	14
2. Progress to date	14
3. Planned next steps	14
4. Efficiency gains	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	15
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	16

1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	17
2. Progress to date	17
1. Planned next steps	17
2. Efficiency gains	18
3. Good practices and lessons learned.....	18
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....	19
4. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
5. Progress to date	19
6. Planned next steps	20
7. Efficiency gains	20
8. Good practice and lessons learned.....	21
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	22
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	24
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	25
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	25
2. Progress to date	26
3. Planned next steps	28
4. Efficiency gains	28
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	28

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?

As IATI provides the possibility for all humanitarian actors to publish their data in a systematic manner and using the same format and reporting definitions, UNDP intends to use the data for coordination with others in the humanitarian sector to better inform its own planning and implementation.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

UNDP has been a leader in transparency for more than ten years, as an initial signatory to IATI in 2008, and early publisher in 2011, and as Coordinator of the IATI Secretariat since 2013. The organisation seeks to be recognised as a trusted and transparent partner, offering peer support to other UN organisations on their IATI journey, whether as early publishers or advancing and seeking to improve the quality of their publication.

2. Progress to date

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

UNDP has actively contributed to policy discussions of the IATI Technical Advisory Group supporting the development of definitions for inclusion in the humanitarian upgrade to the IATI Standard (2.02 which introduced humanitarian markers and recently 2.03 which has further refined those markers). Currently, UNDP publishes its data on humanitarian activities to IATI. Internally however, UNDP has faced challenges drawing the required information from its existing financial systems which have not previously been configured to provide disaggregated information on humanitarian expenditure.

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)?

Although the information on humanitarian activities is available in IATI, to date UNDP has not included relevant humanitarian flags as it has had to be identified manually from existing financial systems. A cross-bureau effort involving policy, crisis recovery, finance and IT teams is currently working on the best way to ensure this can be done in a systematic manner so that disaggregated information on humanitarian expenditures can be included in IATI publishing and updated monthly along with relevant humanitarian elements. The timeline envisaged for this work is 6-8 months and will be reported in the 2019 Grand Bargain update.

4. Efficiency gains

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

It is envisaged that the benefits seen through other IATI publication of improved internal management and better more open and timely reporting to donors will also result from the publication of humanitarian data in IATI. With this initiative, UNDP has already started to work on strengthening the humanitarian reporting within UNDP and aims to increase UNDP's visibility in crisis-related financing.

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?

UNDP hopes to report in 2019 that it has met this commitment.

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

UNDP works directly and closely with national and local governments and communities with significant support going towards increasing local capacity in preparedness, planning, coordination and crisis response.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

¹ The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure ([available here](#)) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form ([available here](#)) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with yourself 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?

It is an integral part of UNDPs mandate and work to support national and local responders' ability to deal with disasters and crisis. UNDP provides extensive support to strengthen and increase local actor's capacity to assess and address disaster risks and increase response preparedness and preparedness for recovery. This is done through direct work with national and local governments, but also through global inter-agency (humanitarian and development) initiatives and platform.

In the last couple of years UNDPs country level Disaster Risk Reduction, preparedness and recovery efforts have reached expenditures of US\$2.1 billion – a significant increase from the USD\$ 1.7 billion in 2015.

UNDP attended the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Cancun in 2017 and could present substantial achievements on the commitments to the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction shows that UNDP, since 2005, has helped 148 countries develop national and local DRR strategies and action plans; supported 84 countries to understand and communicate risks through disaggregated risk assessments; worked with 90 countries to strengthen their legal and regulatory frameworks for Disaster Risk Management; and supported 110 countries to develop post-disaster recovery capacities.

At global inter-agency partnership level UNDP coordinates early warning and preparedness platforms through the IASC, the INFORM risk index, the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) and the Global Preparedness Partnership (GPP). Respectively, they assist humanitarian and development partners in supporting national and local actors in analysing risks and vulnerabilities and strengthening prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action while also coordinating better.

In 2017 UNDP worked on strengthening national and local governance systems in over 50 different countries within crisis settings. UNDP also supported 25 government Ministries, Departments and Agencies specifically in planning, coordination and leadership of conflict prevention and aid management.

UNDPs partnership agreement with UNHCR was renewed in 2017 with a joint action plan. Projects focusing on localised approaches, inclusion of refugees and displaced people, gender concerns, and area based planning were rolled out in countries such as Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan and Ethiopia.

UNDP has continued to work with UN Habitat and UCLG on tools for localization in different countries as well as developing and implementing a training module for local governments on how to localize development. UNDP has also partnered with the World Bank on strengthening these systems under the Inter-agency Working Group on Core Government Functions through the use of the joint tool developed by the UN and the World Bank on Core Government Functions that is being rolled out in CAR and Libya.

UNDP is the managing agent of Country Based Pooled Funds in South Sudan, CAR, DRC and Sudan. Nearly 50% of the funds are allocated to NGOs. The share for National NGOs in these countries has increased from 2016 to 2017, from 18% to nearly 20%.

3. Planned next steps

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

In response to WHS commitments , the Grand Bargain and the Secretary General’s call for a stronger humanitarian-development nexus, UNDP will continue to support the strengthening of national and local systems and institutions through our projects and programmes. .

4. Efficiency gains

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

The rationale of UNDP investing significant efforts in risk reduction measures, early warning, preparedness and prevention is to save lives, livelihoods, time and money when disaster strikes through focused, coherent, coordinated preparedness with national governments in the drivers’ seat. Integrated and collaborative partnership approaches assist in gaining efficiency on the operations’ side of programming. Setting up partnerships with national and local actors is a lengthy process. Efficiency should not be the main principle when strengthening these systems but ensuring a partnership approach.

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?

UNDP’s strength in supporting the work of the Grand Bargain lies in bringing development approaches to the humanitarian sphere. Specifically, this entails strengthening the national and local systems to work with humanitarian actors from the outset of a crisis. Good practices are mentioned above.

For UNDP the role as Managing Agent function under Country Based Pooled Funds has a focus on the capacity building element of NGO partners, including national NGOs and thereby create an increasing base of national NGO capacities that can support national priorities.

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?

UNDP has consistently identified cash transfer as an effective tool to meet diverse needs of vulnerable populations in both development and humanitarian responses. Committed to strengthening the humanitarian-development nexus, and mainstreaming it through the Grand Bargain, UNDP links immediate cash assistance to social protection, livelihoods recovery, governance, inclusive finance, health and development and other medium to longer term resilience building measures that enhance sustainable development.

This includes cash transfer programmes that are linked to government care systems or pro-poor policies and targeting strategies; establishment of social funds for development or Government social investment programmes such as school feeding linked to cash transfer in Nigeria.

2. Progress to date

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

UNDP has finalized its Guidance Note on Cash Based interventions for both Programme and Operations. This Guidance Note provides technical guidance to engage at scale in

cash based interventions targeting conflict and disaster affected communities and working with governments to support resumption of essential government services through the payment of public sector workers. The tools include guidance notes, cash based project management tools, long term agreements with service providers, communication messages, deployable experts from UNDP and stand-by partners' experts to be deployed.

UNDP is in dialogue with partners (incl. the UN Capital Development Fund - UNCDF and others) for joint trainings. UNDP has also reached out to partners for partnerships on Digital Platforms to ensure that cash programmes can be done through quicker and more efficient systems.

In its cash programming, UNDP advocates for:

- **A preparedness phase – where there are joint assessments for cash feasibility, financial systems and links to sustainability.**
- **Specific targeting mechanisms for the most vulnerable, particularly girls, women and youth – that are usually the most affected at the onset of crisis**
- **Systems and processes to ensure to make cash transfer systems are inclusive and sustainable.**

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)?

- **Capacity building: UNDP system wide training on elements of the Guidance Note for technical and operations staff.**
- **Increase joint trainings with partners to strengthen the links between humanitarian and development responses in cash based initiatives.**
- **Ensure a lead in UNDP's role in Digitizing cash payments from emergency response to resilience.**
- **As an advocate for a stronger humanitarian-development nexus, UNDP will share experiences and increase learning on how to link short term cash hand-outs with longer term social protection schemes.**

4. Efficiency gains

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

Through Cash based interventions, UNDPs aims at advancing the SDG agenda, particularly on reaching the furthest behind first, amongst the other SDG goals of Poverty, Jobs, Economic recovery and Livelihoods. Direct cash distribution empowers the affected population, it increases choices and freedom in accessing that which is most critical for development.

- **Through the planned work on digital platforms, UNDP wants to ensure response is fast, effective, measurable and increase its impact – which would in turn have a positive impact on Workstream 4 commitments to reduce management costs.**

- **Ensuring financial sustainability (and efficiency) by building long term interventions alongside the immediate response through social protection schemes – strengthening the humanitarian development nexus.**

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?

One of the largest cash-based programs implemented by UNDP in 2017 has been in Yemen, with multi-donor funding, including through the partnership with the World Bank. Despite the continuous deterioration of the situation and the lack of a peace deal between parties in conflict in Yemen, UNDP has continued to deliver resilience related activities to Yemeni communities, helping to increase their coping mechanisms to withstand the negative impacts of the conflict. UNDP focused on the creation of emergency jobs, the clearance of solid waste and war debris, and launched nation-wide cash-for-work programmes to support targeted communities to boost up their household incomes and increase their capacity to afford food and health services, as well as clearance of mines/UXOs to allow access of UN specialized agencies to deliver humanitarian assistance. Cash for work interventions implemented to support the renovation of community infrastructure, field work, waste collection, livelihoods assets provision, solar water pumps and greenhouses. Over 8 million people, of which 50% women, benefited directly and indirectly from livelihoods and 3X6 initiatives for sustainable employment in the 22 Governorates covering 137 out of 333 districts.

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?

Please see response in the text below.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

UNDP has made considerable efforts to shape more standardized crisis response packages with strong operational components. This includes prepositioned good and services, expert rosters, Long Term Agreements (LTA) and relevant HR and Security guidelines as part of the crisis SOPs. UNDP has recently emphasized the expansion of its LTA library for crisis response related goods and services.

Significant progress has been made in various operational fields that can also be realized in a crisis context. Some more recent enhancements include a more automated travel system, optimized travel pricing, strengthened regional procurement advisory capacity, streamlined fast track procedures, delivery acceleration measures, access to satellite images for the evaluation of a crisis situation, and first responder roster with operations' experts.

As regards 'transparent and comparable cost structures' UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and UN Women have conducted work, that led to adoption of a harmonized cost classification framework by their respective Executive Boards.

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 SG's UNDS reform efforts UNDP is also seeking to realize further synergies with other UN agencies through mutual policy recognition, further rollout of common premises and where possible a more harmonized and consolidated approach to shared services provision. This will be also a priority area of work in 2018 going forward.

Increasing delivery through technology and digitization – such as cash delivery and monitoring (see Workstream 3 above) – will also have a positive impact on management costs.

4. Efficiency gains

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

See explanations and examples above.

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?

Piggybacking on LTAs which allows UN Agencies to access each other's Long-Term Agreements (LTAs) without reengaging in a procurement process is a good practice. This is of particular use in a crisis situation where fast turnaround is essential. UNDP has recently expanded its LTA library for crisis response related goods and services.

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?

Bottlenecks identified so far includes the lack of sharing of data, which has consistently been raised as a key impediment to genuinely strengthen joint assessments and analysis.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

UNDP is advancing the commitments under GB workstream 5 on Needs Assessments through its role in supporting (under the 2008 UN/WB/EU joint declaration) the coordination of joint needs assessments such as Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs) and Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs), as well as its role in supporting the operationalization of the New Way of Working (NWOW). UNDP has also drafted a discussion paper as part of Workstream 5's work plan on the differences and linkages between humanitarian and recovery/development needs assessment, to inform a more in-depth discussion thereon.

Recent country specific examples include Somalia, where UNDP played an instrumental role in the process that led to conduct of a joint UN/WB/EU Drought Impact and Needs Assessment (DINA) which was closely coordinated and complimentary to – and jointly launched with – the Humanitarian Response Plan. The joint assessment in CAR (RCPCA) was developed with strong engagement from humanitarian partners, which ensured complementarity between the Humanitarian Response Plan and the RCPCA. The RPBA being finalized in Cameroon has also been conducted with full engagement of humanitarian and development partners. Several countries have also been supported in better linking up their Humanitarian Needs Overview and the Common Country Assessments, leading to more complementary HRPs and UNDAFs (Sudan is exploring this). See also UNDP's report on Workstream 7 on Multi-year planning and Financing.

At the global level, UNDP is supporting the collection of evidence to identify good lessons to be shared and bottlenecks to be addressed, including on strengthened joint analysis. UNDP has furthermore co-organized several multi-stakeholder events and trainings that brings together the humanitarian, development and peacebuilding communities, which have led to peer-to-peer sharing and further identification of enablers and challenges, including on how to strengthen joint assessments and analysis.

1. Planned next steps

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

UNDP will amongst other actively engage in the newly established DSG-led 'Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration', where the UNDP Administrator and the Emergency Relief Coordinator and Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs will serve as vice chairs. The Steering Committee will work on addressing the bottlenecks identified through the processes highlighted above. Bottlenecks identified so far includes the lack of sharing of data, which has consistently been raised as a key impediment to genuinely strengthen joint assessments and analysis.

UNDP will also continue to engage in the Grand Bargain Needs Assessment Workstream and the IASC TT and use its coordinating role as an entry point to further advance the commitments both at country level and globally, including to further strengthen humanitarian actors' engagement in the RPBA and PDNAs.

2. Efficiency gains

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

Efficiency gains from better data sharing and stronger joint assessments and analysis are linked to the prioritization and programming based on comparative advantage that follows, which is not easily estimated.

3. 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?

The Somalia Drought Impact and Needs Assessment (DINA) seems to provide a strong example of a process that is successfully bridging humanitarian and development efforts. Early identification of success factors point to the adequate timing of the process and the strong leadership buy-in both in-country and at HQ. During 2018, the lessons from Somalia will be further unpacked and shared. The lessons from the RPBA in CAR and Cameroon will also be used as good practice to strengthen the involvement of humanitarian partners in joint assessments elsewhere.

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.

Funding to multiyear plans has been limited due to donor preferences. Please also see UNDPs report on Workstream 8 – earmarking/flexibility.

4. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

UNDP being primarily a development actor has always worked with a longer timeframe in mind to be able to build resilience and capacity, reinforce governance and sustain livelihoods over a number of years.

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?

UNDP's work in support of Work Stream 10, as well as the efforts in moving forward on the New Way of Working (NWOW) both complement the objectives of this workstream on multi-year planning and funding.

UNDP has been working closely with OCHA and UN agencies in supporting the operationalization of the NWOW through both normative work, advocacy, and through

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](#).

support to country teams. These for example include Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia and Somalia, who are all examining and testing how to address long term protracted crisis with a long-term/multiyear plan with collectively defined outcomes and eventually also long term funding in support of the collective outcomes. Concurrently UNDP also has been supporting inter-agency processes on refining the new UNDAF which also looks at integrating humanitarian needs where possible into the broader multi-year development framework at the country-level.

In 2017 UNDP also engaged with the OECD, the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) working group, on enhancing coherence across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, including discussions on how donor practices can enable multilateral reform efforts in support of greater coherence across the nexus and multiyear funding for collective outcomes.

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)?

UNDP will continue to work with UN agencies, NGOs and IFIs to advance the NWOW, in a context specific manner. This includes supporting country teams (especially in countries facing protracted crisis) wanting to align humanitarian and development processes (HRPs, UNDAFs and other instruments) over a multi-year time frame.

In addition, normative work will be ongoing to better define collective outcomes, their barriers and enablers, which can eventually be used for improving guidance to the field.

Meanwhile, UNDP is also working to ensure that development instruments, mechanisms and tools that are supporting the SDGs also take into account elements of humanitarian needs, over multiple years, and to be supported through multi-year financing.

7. Efficiency gains

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

As laid out in the High-Level Panel Report on Humanitarian Financing, every humanitarian dollar invested in reducing needs, vulnerabilities and risk will bring efficiency gains. Further gains will be achieved as funds are invested over multi-year timeframes, recognizing the reality of protracted crises, the need for addressing root causes and seek longer-term development gains, through the SDGs. The joined up (or where possible joint) planning and programming called for in the New Way of Working should greatly enhance the efficiency with which humanitarian and development actors can align their work to also reduce deeper lying risks and vulnerability.

Development tools supporting multiyear planning, such as the UN Development Assistance Frameworks; assessment tools, such as Recovery and Peace Building Assessments, the Post Disaster Needs Assessments and the Common Country Assessments; and analysis tools, such as the Conflict and Development Analysis - all provide significant opportunities to establish a collective in-depth understanding of

countries affected by protracted crisis and fragility. UNDPs comparative advantage as a development agency in using these can complement UNDP's and other agencies' work in protracted crisis, where joined up humanitarian and development planning is pursued.

8. 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?

UNDP is supporting the following countries, which are yielding novel and good practice around multiyear planning and financing.

Sudan

- **The Multi-Year Humanitarian Strategy (MYHS) 2017-2019 – the first of its kind in Sudan – recognises that Sudan has both new crises and long-term humanitarian needs which require different types of interventions. It represents a commitment by the humanitarian community to better address the long-term needs and to work towards a sustainable reduction in needs, vulnerabilities and risk.**
- **Though the intention of this multi-year approach is to address some of the humanitarian caseload with a more developmental approach, humanitarian needs in Sudan remain significant and a robust humanitarian response is essential.**
- **The MYHS will be linked to the UNDAF, enhancing alignment between humanitarian and development goals. Humanitarian partners have been implementing projects that address long-term displacement and build resilience and in 2016 started to shift to a vulnerability-based approach rather than targeting based on status. Building on this approach, this strategy will lay the foundations for durable solutions for displaced persons and refugees in line with international normative frameworks.**

Uganda

- **The Government of Uganda's progressive approach to refugees is a best practice in terms of the New Way of Working**
- **The National Settlement Transformative Agenda is supported by a Joint United Nations-World Bank Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (UN-WB ReHoPE) strategic framework that also is integrated into the UNDAF 2016-2020. It is also seen as a national strategy to pilot the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework.**
- **The Uganda model seeks to address the humanitarian-development divide by establishing a multi-year planning framework through the UNDAF that sequences humanitarian and development interventions ranging from protection, assistance and relief to resilience and development.**
- **Under this New Way of Working, a Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) is being developed and plans to fund both development and humanitarian needs**

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)

UNDP has provided the % requested. Please see the answers to the questions below.

This commitment is largely to be addressed by donor agencies that contribute with humanitarian funding.

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

It should be noted that UNDPs donor contributions are largely from development sources while humanitarian funding is limited in comparison.

The overview below explains the balance between earmarked and unearmarked funding for UNDP, covering the totality of donor contributions; humanitarian and development.

Contributions Category	2016	2017
Unearmarked contributions (given/received)	12.9%	12.7%
Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)	0.3%	0.3%
Country earmarked contributions (given/received)	0.4%	1.0%
Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)	86.3%	86.0%
	100%	100%

Despite the Grand Bargain commitments to increase the flexibility in funding and reduce earmarking donor contributions (development and humanitarian) to UNDP are still overwhelmingly tightly earmarked to trust funds and specific projects.

In calculating the above for UNDPs funds received in 2016 and 2017, the following categorization was used:

- **Unearmarked contributions = core contributions;**
- **Softly earmarked contributions = contributions to thematic funds/Funding Windows at the window level;**
- **Country earmarked contributions = contributions to thematic funds/Funding Windows earmarked to a country or programme;**
- **Tightly earmarked contributions = all other cost-sharing or trust fund contributions earmarked to specific projects.**

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.*
-

UNDP has significantly improved its internal Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) by simplifying corporate reporting and data analysis. There are also innovations at country level to streamline donor reporting, however for UNDP these tend to be specific to a country office and negotiated locally with donors.

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?"

UNDP is supporting the implementation of humanitarian-development nexus through the New Way of Working in policy and practice.

UNDP has supported a number of countries including Sudan, Lebanon, DRC, Somalia, Ethiopia, Uganda, Djibouti, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Mali and Yemen with advisory capacity and support to bridge the divide and strengthen joint analysis, planning, coordination, collective outcomes and programming.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

UNDP as a co-convenor of workstream 10

Together with Denmark, UNDP has co-chaired the Grand Bargain Workstream 10. From the beginning of the Grand Bargain, Work Stream 10 has been different to other work stream, because it is crosscutting and its achievements are captured by other work streams, while it at the same time being a policy component linking to various processes that all strengthen the nexus.

We see several workstreams capturing the nexus: Work stream 7 on Multi-year Planning and Funding captures the need to align humanitarian and development planning instruments. Work stream 5 on Needs assessments helps bring together humanitarian and development analysis of context, risks, needs and vulnerabilities. Work stream 2 on Localization focuses on strengthening support to local actors' ownership and involvement, and thereby sustainability in preparedness and response. Work stream 3 on Cash captures humanitarian cash based programmes, but also the linkages to social protection schemes.

The progress of our collective efforts to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus is increasing – also beyond the Grand Bargain:

The UN Secretary-General in his report on the repositioning of the UN Development System, has placed the nexus as a key component in leaving no one behind. UN reform efforts to further strengthen the coherence between humanitarian and development action include the recent establishment of a Steering Committee on Humanitarian-Development Collaboration under the Deputy Secretary General, with the UNDP Administrator and the Emergency Relief Coordinator and Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs as vice chairs. The humanitarian-development nexus is at the centre of discussions in the IASC Task Teams, across UN agencies and NGOs; and in the roll-out of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework.

The nexus is also being embraced by donors, e.g. through new joined-up humanitarian-development strategies by the EU and its Member States operationalising the nexus in pilot countries; policy shifts by bilateral donors; the OECD DAC International Network on Conflict and Fragility, as well as the Good Humanitarian Donor Group.

Most importantly we are seeing good and innovative practice of joint context, risk and vulnerability analysis and joined up planning and programming in a number of countries with protracted crisis.

Based on lessons learned and with the plethora of efforts and significant progress made since 2016, UNDP and Denmark no longer see a need for Workstream 10 to continue as a separate structure. Rather the humanitarian-development nexus should be more evidently cross-cutting, and integrated in the other work streams of the Grand Bargain.

UNDPs contribution to humanitarian-development nexus in the IASC

- UNDP and WHO co-chair the IASC Humanitarian-Development Task Team. The main objectives of the Task Team are to shape a common understanding of humanitarian-development nexus; and review and assess current policy, guidance and operational tools.
- UNDP is also engaged in the IASC Task Team for Humanitarian Financing. Together with FAO and WB, UNDP is – when endorsed - planning to undertake a study on how collective outcomes could be financed.

UNDPs support to humanitarian-development nexus and UN system change

- The UNDP Administrator and the Emergency Relief Coordinator and Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs are vice chairs of the recently established Steering Committee on Humanitarian-Development Collaboration under the Deputy Secretary General.

UNDPs support to global exchanges and level lessons learned on humanitarian-development nexus

- In 2017 a high-level NWOW workshop was co-organised together with Denmark, in Copenhagen bringing together high-level representatives from Member States, multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, UN entities, ICRC, and NGOs. It showcased efforts of humanitarian-development nexus in Ethiopia, Uganda, Somalia, Yemen, Sudan, CAR and Burkina Faso.
- UNDP co-organised a conference in Istanbul on NWOW – as a follow up to WHS one year on, giving another opportunity to share field experiences and address practical challenges.
- Together with OCHA, UNDP also organised a multi-stakeholder regional workshop Eastern and Southern Africa workshop in Entebbe. The aim again was to increase the understanding of the NWOW and foster peer-to-peer exchange.

UNDPs contribution to humanitarian-development nexus strengthening at country level

- In 2017 UNDP supported Sudan, Lebanon, DRC, Somalia, Ethiopia, Uganda, Djibouti, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Mali and Yemen with advisory capacity and support to bridge the divide and strengthen joint analysis, planning, coordination, collective outcomes and programming.
- UNDP supported the IASC-UNDG Steering Committee on Famine Response and Prevention to coordinate the four famine response and prevention efforts in in North-East Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen. This included reinforcement of country-level leaderships on implementing the NWOW.

3. Planned next steps

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

- **UNDP will undertake a study and collection of best practice and lessons learned on humanitarian-development nexus.**
- **UNDP is also completing an analysis (under an initiative called 'people pipeline') of the human resources and capacities, skills and competencies needed for the UN to strengthen coherence and collaboration across the humanitarian, development and peace pillars. The results will inform further trainings and capacity strengthening of staff.**
- **Two multi-stakeholder NWOW workshops will be organised by UNDP, OCHA and partners in the Middle East and West/Central Africa regions in 2018.**

In light of the multiple developments within and outside the Grand Bargain, going forward workstream 10 will stop to exist as a separate structure, as explained above. Humanitarian-development nexus should be strengthened across the remaining 9 Grand Bargain workstreams. As signatories to the Grand Bargain, UNDP and Denmark will remain strongly engaged and continue to influence and guide the operationalization of the nexus.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Bringing humanitarian and development actors together in preparedness, assessment, analysis to planning, programming and coordination and not least financing and funding is a massive endeavour. Building on the mutual strengths of the humanitarian and development communities (as well as the peacebuilding community) to work jointly to shrink needs, by reducing fragility and building resilience to shocks, particularly in protracted crises takes time, effort and willingness. It is not the achievement of one agency alone. Despite the good will and efforts of many partners, there is a long way to go – particularly in terms of more flexible, unearmarked, long term financing from donors, which is imperative for the nexus to take effect. If a genuine humanitarian-development nexus is accomplished – as laid out in the report from the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing – the efficiency gains will be significant.

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?

There is already a plethora of promising practices and lessons learned to be found at country level. Several have been shared at regional workshops and in the IASC Task Team. UNDP is collecting these good practices and lessons learned in 2018.