

2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – United States of America¹

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	4
2. Progress to date.....	4
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains.....	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned	5
Work stream 2 – Localization	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	7
3. Planned next steps	8
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	11
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

¹ The report from the Government of the United States of America (USG) reflects inputs from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and Office of Food for Peace (FFP), as well as the State Department, Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM), Bureau of International Organization Affairs (IO), and Office of Foreign Assistance Resources (F).

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	16
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	17
2. Progress to date.....	17
3. Planned next steps	17
4. Efficiency gains.....	17
5. Good practices and lessons learned	17
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution.....	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	19
2. Progress to date.....	19
3. Planned next steps	20
4. Efficiency gains.....	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps	23
4. Efficiency gains.....	23
5. Good practice and lessons learned	23
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility.....	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	24
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps	25
4. Efficiency gains.....	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	26
2. Progress to date.....	26
3. Planned next steps	26
4. Efficiency gains.....	26
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement 28

- 1. Baseline (only in year 1) 28
- 2. Progress to date..... 28
- 3. Planned next steps 29
- 4. Efficiency gains..... 29
- 5. Good practices and lessons learned 30

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?

- We will use the information for funding and program decisions and communicating to our legislature how the U.S. Government's (USG) humanitarian assistance budget addresses targeted needs. The data will also enable the USG to encourage other donors to support humanitarian responses where there are gaps.

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?

- The USG has used multilateral fora, such as meetings of the UN executive boards, the OCHA Donor Support Group, and the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative, to press for implementation of commitments.
- The USG continues to report all humanitarian funding through the website www.foreignassistance.gov, the OECD Creditor Reporting System, the UN Office for the

Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Financial Tracking Service (FTS), and by publishing through the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).

- USAID/OFDA has added new language to its NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018), encouraging partners to report to the IATI and FTS.
- The USG funded FTS, thereby supporting efforts to pilot the IATI - FTS data triangulation and interoperability mechanism as a means for increasing humanitarian funding transparency and accountability. This initiative builds on the financial support the USG previously provided to OCHA to redesign the FTS website.
- Through its work with the USG, WFP increased transparency by making materials available to donors, initiating the development of a donor-accessible online portal containing data on WFP programs, and by posting all country strategic plans online.
- The USG supports our partners, such as UNHCR, who are working towards meeting IATI standards as part of this work stream.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG is working with IATI and FTS to potentially use funding information as part of the triangulation and interoperability pilot. The USG is looking at being one of the first donors to pilot the IATI interoperability for FTS.
- The USG is consulting with WFP as it builds an online portal enabling donors to access funding and program data. The USG and WFP expect to pilot the portal in June 2018. The USG will also continue to support UNHCR's Global Focus website, its main transparency and reporting platform.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Because the USG already reports to several different platforms in our continued efforts to maintain transparency, we anticipate the main efficiency gains to be achieved from the effective interoperability between IATI and FTS. The effective interoperability between IATI and FTS should eventually increase efficiency by reducing duplicative reporting efforts via the creation of one central resource for accessible, high quality humanitarian funding information.
- The WFP portal in development (per point 3) will increase WFP's accountability and transparency by enabling the USG and other donors to better trace the agency's use of funds. To reduce duplication and workload, the USG and other donors will use the portal's pilot implementation period to determine how to harmonize information uploaded to the portal with individual donor reporting requirements.

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?

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore, it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?² Additional funding details related to local and national responders are provided 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?

² 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.

- The USG is committed to tracking the proportion of its humanitarian funding that is ultimately programmed through direct funding to local NGOs. To that end, USAID/OFDA, USAID/FFP, and State/PRM, have made the following contributions
 - In Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, USAID/OFDA direct funding to local and national responders increased from \$8,194,825 (0.62% of FY 2016 annual funding) to \$20,267,211 (1.12% of FY 2017 annual funding);
 - In FY 2017, USAID/OFDA increased its contribution to OCHA-led Country-Based Pooled Funds³ (for Ethiopia, Yemen, and Iraq);
 - For FY 2017, State/PRM funding totalled \$3,294,409,998, of which 84.6% was allocated to humanitarian appeals from International Organizations (UNHCR, ICRC, UNICEF, etc.) and, in turn, was disbursed largely to local partners implementing programs to assist forcibly displaced people and victims of conflict. For example, in 2017, 36.4% percent of the UNHCR's \$1.5 billion expenditure went to local and national partners;
 - In FY 2017, USAID/FFP provided \$116,214,159 for localization activities, including \$110,889 distributed to single intermediary organizations and the remainder to local/national actors.
- In FY 2017, the USG provided support to initiatives by CARE International, the International Rescue Committee, and Plan International to strengthen community-based protection mechanisms and assist local actors in engaging with and influencing the broader humanitarian coordination and response architecture.
- In FY 2017, State/PRM provided \$600,437 to support the first year of operating costs of a Secretariat to organize and lead the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement's National Society Investment Mechanism (NISM). The NISM will strengthen National Societies' long-term development and innovation through financial and technical support, especially with regard to governance, compliance, oversight, donor engagement, reporting, and communications. The NISM, expected to launch during in 2018, will focus on delivering multi-year (up to 5 years) institutional strengthening support enabling National Societies to address humanitarian risks at the local level.
- USAID/OFDA has added new language to its NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018), outlining our expectations for working with local actors.

3. Planned next steps

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

- In FY 2017 and FY 2018, USG staff will systematically track the proportion of funding that goes to local agencies, both directly and through sub-awards, in order to establish its baseline. The USG will make necessary adjustments to internal data systems, including working with other Grand Bargain partners to further define key tags or terms (e.g. "Single Intermediary") to allow for better tracking and analysis of the proportion of U.S. funding to local NGOs. It is important to note that to overcome limitations in this data,

³ According to OCHA, 24.6% of Country-based Pooled Fund resources go to national NGOs.

public international organizations (PIOs) that receive USG funds will need to provide details on sub-awards provided to local partners.

- State/PRM, pending availability of FY 2018 funding, aims to continue supporting the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement National Society Investment Mechanism (NISM).

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore, it is premature to assess efficiency gains. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*
- 2. Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*
- 3. Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*
- 4. Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*
- 5. Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*
- 6. Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- The USG continues to support cash-based programming, where appropriate⁴, and efforts to improve the coordination of cash-based programming.
- The USG amended NGO Proposal Guidelines for USAID and State (developed in 2017, published February 2018) to include additional, robust, new guidance on cash programming, particularly multipurpose cash.
- In 2017, the USG developed the Modality Decision Tool for Humanitarian Assistance, which offers harmonized, context-driven, and modality-neutral guidance to partners on the USG's approach to cash-based programming.
- The USG is both leading and actively participating in several efforts within the Good Humanitarian Donorship and Grand Bargain cash work streams, particularly on cash

⁴ The USG supports cash-based programming where it has been deemed appropriate for the market conditions, feasible, best-suited to meet programming and sector objectives, and cost-efficient.

coordination, cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness, and on outcome indicators for multipurpose cash.

- In 2017, the USG funded NGO partners to conduct research on cash and health-seeking behaviors, improved protection mainstreaming, and the effect of cash and other interventions on nutrition-promoting behaviors.
- The USG significantly scaled up its resources for cash-based programming in appropriate contexts, while removing barriers to and developing the necessary internal systems and trainings for implementation.
- The USG funded the establishment of the Cash Learning Partnership in North America that is advancing research, collecting best practices and supporting the capacity building of staff and partners.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The revised USAID and State NGO Proposal Guidelines, USG Modality Decision Tool, and USG guidance on for-work programming will all be released in 2018.
- Starting early 2018, the USG will require partner reports to disaggregate the actual transfer value for each type of intervention (e.g. cash, vouchers, and cash-for-work). This will enable the USG to meet sub-commitment number one on employing markers (currently the USG can only track the *number* of projects using cash or vouchers, not the value transferred). The USG will be making modifications to its internal tracking system so that it can more effectively and accurately capture data on cash programming.
- In 2018, the USG will participate in an event on cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness indicators for cash and other humanitarian interventions and lead an effort to compile outcome indicators for multipurpose cash.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess efficiency gains. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The USG recognizes the need for better donor coordination and to clearly communicate a shared vision and principles for reform in order for cash to be as effective a modality as possible. We recognize that cash cannot deliver all outcomes and should continue to be used where appropriate and in a complementary manner with other services and modalities.

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- *Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - *Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - *Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - *Biometrics; and*
 - *Sustainable energy.*
2. *Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
4. *Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

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

Donors commit to:

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

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- The USG continues to find ways to do more with less through our funding to implementing partners, including UN organizations, as well as in our coordination efforts with other donors.
- The USG worked with other Executive Board members in support of WFP's efforts to undertake an extensive review with the objective to better align support costs with program needs; thus effectively reducing its indirect cost rate to 6.5%, while still ensuring adequate operational funds.
- The USG funded UNHCR's use/expansion of the Biometrics Identity Management System (BIMS) to improve population targeting and reduce duplication.
- In line with the Grand Bargain's provisions concerning management costs, the United States championed and, together with other Member States, secured the inclusion of significant language in key 2017 resolutions encouraging UN and humanitarian organizations to further advance efficiencies in delivering assistance through reduced management costs (Economic and Social Council Resolution 2017/14 on "Strengthening the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations," adopted June 23, 2017, and UN General Assembly Resolution 72/133, "Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations," adopted December 11, 2017).

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG will work closely with all Grand Bargain signatories to assist with addressing the commitments in this work stream and consider ways to best ensure that funding supports program outcomes.

- As part of these efforts, the USG will continue monitoring WFP's progress toward more efficient budgeting through participation in the WFP Executive Board meetings (three times a year).
- The USG will continue to participate in joint evaluation and monitoring with other donors, where possible.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess efficiency gains. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?

- Participation of staff that are entrusted with making decisions on behalf of their organizations.
- Work stream participants should commit to deadlines outlined by the work stream leaders.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- In line with the Grand Bargain's provisions on needs assessments, the USG championed and, together with other Member States, secured the inclusion of language in key 2017 resolutions on the importance of joint and impartial needs assessments and prioritized needs-based response plans (UN General Assembly Resolution 72/133, "Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations," adopted December 11, 2017). In a general statement issued in connection with the adoption of the UNGA Humanitarian Omnibus Resolution, the USG also stressed the importance of this language.
- USAID has amended its NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018) to further outline expectations regarding joint needs assessment and analysis. Partners are encouraged to participate in joint needs assessment and analysis processes as well as the comprehensive appeal or Humanitarian Needs Overview processes, where appropriate.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG is developing a training curriculum for staff to strengthen internal data analysis capacity and decision making.
- The USG will continue to press for joint needs assessments and analysis as a means of achieving comprehensive, prioritized appeals.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Joint assessments have not replaced programmatic assessments implemented by individual agencies, which continue to be an important complementary function in order to provide the more granular and detailed information necessary for programmatic interventions. We also believe that joint needs assessments and analysis should diminish the need for sector-specific assessments and analysis.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*
- 2. Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*
- 3. Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*
- 4. Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

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

Aid organisations commit to:

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- The USG is co-leading the work stream on Participation Revolution with the Steering Committee on Humanitarian Response (SCHR). Together, we have produced a set of documents to guide Grand Bargain signatories on implementation of these commitments, including a set of detailed recommendations aimed at incentivizing good practice in this area.
- The USG has amended its NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018) and other procedures to further strengthen its Accountability to Affected

Populations (AAP) requirements and ensure partners provide more detailed plans regarding their approach to obtaining and incorporating beneficiary feedback throughout program design, implementation, and monitoring. We will continue to support our partners' capacity to solicit beneficiary feedback through safe, accessible, and preferred mechanisms and ensure that affected people are systematically involved in decisions about the assistance they receive.

- Through funding to UNICEF, the USG has continued to support a project aimed at enhancing communication and engagement with affected populations at all stages of the humanitarian program cycle across global and country-level coordination mechanisms; emphasis is on ensuring their views and intentions inform preparedness and humanitarian response approaches.
- The USG is supporting the Women's Refugee Commission to develop and pilot a real-time monitoring tool to track adolescent girls' access to services in Mali.
- The USG has funded WFP's humanitarian policy office to support the integration of AAP activities in WFP planning and operations.
- The USG supported International Rescue Committee research aimed at identifying ways to assist humanitarian actors in the systematic application of beneficiary feedback for program decision-making; findings presented at a December 21, 2017 InterAction meeting with international and non-governmental organizations are available at <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/278568.pdf>.
- To improve service delivery to affected populations, the USG is piloting a Refine and Implement programming model in order to ensure adoption of people-centered approaches derived from deeper community engagement that results in greater understanding of needs and strategies that build upon existing capacities.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG will seek ways to broaden its gender standards into the Grand Bargain work streams.
- The USG will continue to require its partners to ensure that people receiving assistance participate in the design, monitoring, and evaluation of programs that affect them. We will continue to support building our partners' capacity to involve affected people in decisions about the assistance they receive.
- The USG will continue to support the integration of AAP activities in country strategic planning, including Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms (CFMs).
- The USG will continue to implement Call to Action and "Safe from the Start" commitments.
- USAID's Refine and Implement pilot launched in 2017 in the DRC and Liberia; monitoring and evaluation analysis will run through 2022.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Although individual agencies have taken steps to more systematically integrate AAP into their programming, additional efficiencies could be gained through the standardization of approaches, monitoring, and evaluation.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The Participation Revolution work stream has served as a platform to discuss existing and implement new AAP initiatives, events, and evidenced-based practices, such as the examples listed above. From this baseline, planned work on existing and new platforms will generate evidence for sharing and improving best practices. Therefore it is premature to assess lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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 agreements⁵ you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.⁶ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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?

- USAID/OFDA has amended its NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018) to note that multi-year awards may be appropriate for a protracted emergency or a longer-term disaster risk reduction project. NGO partners are encouraged to discuss with USG field representatives if multi-year awards are appropriate and if funding is available. Funding determinations will be based on the local context, incremental multi-year planning, and available funding.
- The USG actively reviewed WFP's Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) to date, which provide a three to five year plan for each country where WFP is operational. The USG has established a clear review process for future CSPs allowing us to provide feedback on draft plans and consult with WFP on programming decisions.

⁵ Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

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

- The USG supports our partners, such as UNHCR, who has launched multi-year, multi-partner planning pilots with the aim of developing more innovative, long-term programs with its partners and rolling this out globally.
- In FY 2017, USAID/FFP allocated 45.02% of its overall spending to multi-year funding, with 89% of its multi-year funding allocated to the PRRO (Protracted Relief Recovery Operations) project.
- Of the 223 awards State/PRM provided in FY 2017, 82 were multi-year awards totalling \$146,001,466; representing 37% and 29% of State/PRM's cooperative agreement and grant spending respectively.
- USAID/OFDA's multi-year agreement funding in FY 2017 was \$373,967,314, which represents 20.65% of total funding and a gross increase of \$92,732,873 or nearly 33%, over FY 2016.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG will draft internal guidance documents for USG staff on considerations for programming multi-year awards. From 2018 onward, and where appropriate, the USG has further decided to release Notice of Funding Opportunities (NOFOs) for multi-year projects in two to three year increments for specific populations or regions, instead of on an annual basis.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- The USG's action to increase opportunities for multi-year planning and funding and standardized reporting requirements present opportunities to further streamline management and workload processes.

5. Good practice and lessons learned

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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 2020⁷.*

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

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

⁷ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

- The USG has increased its softly earmarked funding through increased contributions to OCHA's Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs), as well as to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF).
- USAID/OFDA contributed \$11.7 million to CBPFs in Iraq and Ethiopia in FY 2016. In FY 2017, USAID/OFDA contributed \$29.5 million to the Ethiopia Humanitarian Fund, and \$5 million to the Yemen Humanitarian Fund.
- In FY 2016, 99.78% of USAID/FFP's overall earmarked funds were tightly earmarked, while in 2017, this trend remained the same with nearly all funds remaining tightly earmarked (99.84%).
- State/PRM continued to provide flexibly earmarked funds when possible in 2017, while balancing calls for greater accountability and scrutiny on use of funds. In FY 2016, 71.35% of State/PRM funds provided to PIOs were earmarked or tightly earmarked, while 28.65% of funds were softly earmarked or not earmarked. In FY 2017, 68.48% of State/PRM funds provided to PIOs were earmarked or tightly earmarked, while 31.52% of funds were softly earmarked or not earmarked, representing an improvement in the provision of flexible funding.
- The USG met with WFP in February 2018 to discuss the effects of funding at activity and outcome levels.
- The USG intends to discuss funding strategies with other donors to consider ways to reconcile donor preference for activity-level funding and a desire for outcome-driven projects.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG remains committed to reducing earmarking and providing flexible resources. USG efforts on this issue are dependent, however, on the fulfilment of Grand Bargain commitments by implementing partners. The USG will target those agencies that demonstrate increased transparency and accountability.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess efficiency gains. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*
- 2. Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*
- 3. Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- The USG reduced NGO narrative reporting requirements to twice annually, effective October 1, 2016.
- The USAID/OFDA revised NGO Proposal Guidelines (developed in 2017, published February 2018) to require partners adopt IASC indicators to the extent practicable.
- The USG is working with partners and NGOs to simplify reporting requirements. For example, State/PRM produced a new updated reporting template for NGO partners that derived from the template being piloted in the Harmonized Reporting Work Stream. Further, reporting for NGOs has been reduced by 25%, and WFP reporting is now required twice a year. These efforts allow partners to provide more robust and less duplicative reports to the USG.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The USG will continue to explore the applicability of IASC indicators in reporting and monitoring frameworks. Should these indicators allow the capture of necessary data, the USG will consider adopting these indicators.
- Following launch of the new WFP online reporting portal in June 2018, the USG will begin tracking areas of duplication between CSPs and the portal and consider ways to further reduce duplication between CSPs and the portal.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess efficiency gains. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

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?

- Many of the actions took place during 2017 but results will not be known until 2018 or later. Therefore it is premature to assess good practices and lessons learned. Additional work in this area will be forthcoming.

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
- 2. Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
- 3. Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
- 4. Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
- 5. Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

What has your organisation done to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2. Progress to date

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

- The USG continues to encourage partners to participate in joint humanitarian and development planning in appropriate contexts, such as those impacted by recurring or protracted crises.

- The USG has worked with interagency partners to promote financial and/or diplomatic support to international financial institution (including the World Bank) efforts aimed at facilitating sustainable solutions for conflict-affected populations and their host communities. This includes leveraging interest from the private sector for support to programs that benefit refugees and evidence based approaches that address the linkages between fragility, displacement, and development goals.
- In July 2017, USAID/OFDA finalized a guidance paper on Early Recovery and Transition Programming. This paper includes significant details about aligning USG-funded programs with other development-oriented initiatives.

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)?

- USAID is finalizing a Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategy paper to highlight synergies with development-oriented efforts; this paper will accompany the Early Recovery and Transition guidance document noted above.
- The USG is actively working with development and peacebuilding actors, including the World Bank and OECD-led International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), to develop a coherent approach for collective action in humanitarian settings. Through this engagement, the USG aims to ensure lifesaving needs continue to be met while further embracing opportunities for prevention, recovery, and long-term stability.
- The USG is supporting the New Way of Working by participating in discussions on implementation at both headquarters and field levels. The USG supports development of collective outcomes among humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding actors in appropriate contexts, emphasizing the opportunity for a strengthened response through joint analysis and planning.
- The USG will continue to promote the role of international financial institutions in facilitating sustainable solutions for conflict-affected populations and their host communities. This includes continuing to leverage private sector interest in supporting programs that benefit refugees and evidence-based approaches that address fragility, displacement, and development goals.
- The USG will continue to coordinate with other donors to bolster support and resources for improved humanitarian-development engagement.
- The USG will work on internal planning systems so that humanitarian and development program strategies are in sync. This will include establishing a baseline for current efforts.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- The USG is supporting the New Way of Working and a strengthened humanitarian-development nexus, recognizing the needs of affected populations may be better served through improved continuity of resources in different phases of the response. This approach ensures both a response to immediate life-saving needs and livelihood

development. The USG has seen efficiency gains in different contexts, particularly through resilience building strategies, DRR, and preparedness activities that have contributed to reducing need and reliance on life-saving humanitarian assistance.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The USG has increasingly contributed to CBPFs, including to Ethiopia and Yemen in 2017 and Ethiopia and Iraq in 2016. These contributions have helped in strengthening early recovery as an essential bridge from assistance to development.