Grand Bargain in 2020:

Annual Self Report - Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Estonia

Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview): Ms Jaana Piilpärk, Desk Officer for Humanitarian Aid jaana.piilpark@mfa.ee

Date of Submission: 16.02.2021

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than <u>5 pages in total</u> – anything over this word limit will not be considered by ODI in their analysis. Please respond to all of the questions below.)

Grand Bargain in 2020

Question 1: Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2020?

Estonia is keeping its focus yearly on the same priorities, which are the following:

- Enhanced quality funding. Estonian Development-Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid Programme 2021-2024 sets goals for 4 years and it goes hand-in-hand with the results indicators for budget allocation. Multi-year planning and funding is also common for the bi-lateral humanitarian aid projects. We make our yearly non-earmarked contributions at the end of each year, in order to make the planning process more predictable.
- Enhanced capacity of local and national responders. Estonian NGOs implementing the humanitarian projects for example in Ukraine, Jordan or Lebanon are using flexible, needs based working methods, that involve local community and local partners. Part of a contribution have been small grants to individual needs. Also, we try to support CBPF-s more and more, where possible, in order to provide most adequate response to the local needs.
- Humanitarian-development nexus. Estonia keeps supporting sustainable livelihoods, vocational education and psychosocial support of Syrian refugees living in Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey.

Question 2: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment 1 in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard? (please outline specific initiatives or changes in practice and their outcomes/results). Please refer to the Guidelines for definitions of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, which are included in this self-report template package.

Estonia's humanitarian activities for refugees and IDPs take into account the needs of the most vulnerable groups among them women and girls, who are given special attention. Some concrete examples include activities for Syrian refugees in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan. In Turkey, women have been offered sewing and handicraft courses, which permit to earn a small income. In addition, entire families have received full psychosocial support to help them overcome the traumas of war. In Lebanon, vocational training courses have taken place in three sectors (carpentry, sewing and knitting), followed by the establishment of a sustainable social enterprise, which keeps providing sustainable employment also after the end of the project. As the

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available $\underline{\text{here}}.$

result of the project, 180 families have enhanced their livelihoods in a sustainable manner.

Question 3: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments? Please explain how your institution has linked commitments 10.1 - 10.5 with other commitments from other workstreams.

In the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid are under one branch. Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid programme is a strategic planning document for 4 years, which encompasses both fields. It is updated and adjusted once a year. The current one is for the period of 2021-2024. Also, the Director General as well as the Director of the Division are responsible for the budget planning of both, the Development Cooperation and the Humanitarian Aid, which supports synergies between the activities in both fields. As a result, many of the Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid activities are complementary, where possible, for example in the protracted crisis, preparedness activities, including also Covid-19 related support in 2020.

Grand Bargain 2016-2020: Overall achievements and remaining gaps

Question 4: What are the 2-3 key achievements/areas of most progress by your institution since 2016? Please report on your institutional progress for the period 2016-2020, even if your institution did not become a signatory until after 2016.

- Increase of enhanced quality funding (the percentage of flexible nonearmarked funding and softly earmarked funding is steadily growing)
- Harmonised reporting requirements (the simplification and reduction of reporting requirements for bi-lateral projects as well as co-financing for the ECHO projects)
- More attention to localisation (focus on capacity building and also providing more resources to local and national responders in order to reach better and in a more targeted way the most vulnerable and respond to their specific needs)

Question 5: What, in your institutional view, have been the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories, as a collective, since 2016? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think most progress has been made collectively by signatories.

In our view notable progress has been achieved in several workstreams such as quality funding, supporting local and national responders better, reporting in a harmonised and simplified manner and integrating meaningful participation in practice.

Question 6: What has the Grand Bargain not been able to achieve in its five year tenure? What outstanding obstacles, gaps, areas of weakness still remain after five years, in terms of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian action? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think there remain key gaps or obstacles.

Maybe more time is needed to really encourage and promote the use of 8+3 template, and, as a consequence, reduce the reporting burden across the humanitarian sector. Also, data can always be better, especially appropriately analysed data.

Risk and the Grand Bargain

Question 7a: How has risk (financial, operational, reputational, etc) affected your institution's implementation of the core commitments since you became a signatory to the Grand Bargain?

The risks have been rather low, except for last year, when COVID-19 brought along a global crisis and strongly and negatively affected the work of the humanitarians everywhere.

Question 7b: How has your institution sought to mitigate or address these risks to enable implementation of the core commitments?

We redirected funds from Development Cooperation to Humanitarian Aid, as the needs increased tremendously on the Humanitarian side, at the same time many Development Cooperation projects faced difficulties in implementation due to restrictions related to COVID-19. As a small donor, with Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid activities under the same branch in the MFA, it was not a difficult task.