



Joint Agency feedback on the updated proposal (6 May) from the Grand Bargain Facilitation Group

Oxfam, CARE, Christian Aid, Nexus-Somalia, Action Aid, NEAR, DanChurchAid (DCA) and Save the Children commend the Grand Bargain Facilitation Group for the updated proposal received on 6 May for the future of the Grand Bargain.

We appreciate the continued prioritisation of quality funding and localisation and we welcome considerations to engage more and more diverse local and national actors in GB 2.0 structures.

However, we remain concerned over significant gaps as outlined below and recommend reading alongside our initial [joint position on the future of the Grand Bargain](#):

On the proposed new Framework

- We reiterate our request to integrate objectives *beyond* the current Grand Bargain scope – shrinking need and deepening and widening the resource base for humanitarian action – as part of next steps. We must begin moving beyond that “first stage” of our ongoing process to transform humanitarian financing, as recommended by the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing.
- Gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls (GEEWG) is currently not reflected at the political or enabling priority levels, nor is it significantly and systematically reflected across each of the outcome pillars. This revised framework proposal does not go far enough to centre gender transformative action, without which we will not reach improved humanitarian outcomes for all. We recommend inclusion of GEEWG in the GB 2.0 as a third enabling priority and by ensuring each level of the framework has measurable GEEWG commitments, as recommended at the 2016 WHS and by the Friends of Gender Group.
- While there are some references or links to the nexus, we believe these can be strengthened, including by recognising the clear connection between nexus and improved, predictable funding to local and national actors.
- Given localisation outcomes are an enabling priority for the GB 2.0, we recommend strengthening language in each of the pillars to reflect the spirit of local humanitarian leadership and ensure the perspective of new local and national signatories as proposed, including crisis-affected governments.
 - In particular, for Outcome pillar 1: Participation and Coordination, we suggest: *“Quality funding targets the most vulnerable with what they need most **based on the leadership of local responders**, including women-led organisations, and affected populations, supported by inclusive consultative processes with international actors”*
 - It is our understanding the proposed framework will not replace the original 51 commitments in the GB, including the existing 25% as directly as possible funding target to local actors. We ask that the next version of the Framework clarify how the original commitments are explicitly integrated into the GB 2.0, including to reference the existing target, as well as measurable commitments for increasing funding to local WLOs, WROs, and RLOs. While we are still, collectively, unable to reach the 25% target, we cannot lose sight of these key drivers of change.
- The activities, as currently proposed, do not reflect our ambition of transformative change and remain largely technical with some overlap with work already in progress by other humanitarian spaces (for example in the IASC Results Groups or the CHS). Further, 2.0 activities should include existing Workstream proposals, recognising that work already underway can and should be considered, if we are to build further. Prioritisation of activities must be based on fully informed options. We suggest much more time – beyond the 19 May deadlines – be spent *with all willing signatories* to map Workstream proposals, those outlined in the new framework, as well as other work in progress in order to further develop activities in the final 2.0 framework.

On governance of the GB 2.0

- We miss entirely links to other ongoing processes, like the Sustainable Development Goals, and an expression of long term commitment. The proposed framework will not be met in two years; given the scale of ambition, a two year timeline is more realistically a milestone. We must make our intention clear at the outset and align the GB 2.0 to the 2030 agenda.
- It is our understanding that the Workstreams, as they exist or in a lighter version, would remain as working spaces for the GB 2.0. This does not seem to be in line with the proposed framework and we are not clear of the added value of multiplying working spaces.
- Further, despite being a key Outcome Pillar for the GB 2.0, the proposed framework reflects few accountability measures in its governance. We recommend, echoing IRC, that accountability between GB 2.0 structures are developed to ensure political buy-in and progress. More specific to the current proposal, concepts of “caucuses” or “self-appointed champions”, while suggesting a potential for greater flexibility in structure, also reflect a contradiction in principle to accountability, transparency, and inclusion. We are particularly concerned about informal, closed format discussions that have the potential to set up private member clubs growing disconnected with other parts of the GB 2.0 structures.
 - We ask again for commitment to move from voluntary reporting on selective commitments (as is current practice) to mandatory reporting against enabling priorities and collective outcomes, including on gender specific indicators to be agreed collectively. Reporting should reflect stakeholder efforts on political goals.
 - We reiterate the need for greater investment in sharing progress and learning at the regional and country levels, in order to enhance collaboration and trust between actors and provide opportunities to replicate and scale.
- We are encouraged by the general support to strengthen local and national signatories’ representation and inclusion, including crisis-affected governments, in the GB 2.0 and it’s governance structure. However, we need much clearer language to demonstrate this commitment in the next version of the framework; “efforts will be made” does not reflect form following function. Further, the inclusion of one local actor in the Facilitation Group is not sufficient to represent the diverse views of this wide community. We recommend GB Facilitation Group composition is revisited to reflect enabling priorities and include a greater number of seats for different national and local responders, such as women-led and women’s rights organisation, as well as from civil society and from crisis affected countries’ governments.
- We appreciate the proposed National Reference Groups concept, which offers an opportunity to ground change at the country and emergency level, but believe the proposal needs to be strengthened:
 - On composition: without including some GB signatories at the county level, commitments and activities by National Reference Groups risk being unconnected or unaccountable to shifts needed at the global level, even with the support of the Facilitation Group. We recommend setting broad based criteria to include GB signatories including donors, as well as interest-based appointments, and believe National Reference Groups should design, themselves, the most relevant composition for their context which strengthens existing structures already in place.
 - Our experience in the GB tell us that National Reference Groups will require financial support to convene and drive progress, as was the case for co-conveners over the past five years. We recommend financial commitments be made explicitly to support the reference group structures.
 - Given the experience and existing groups set up as part of GB Workstream 2 country level dialogues, we suggest the GB Facilitation Group build on learning from W2 members to further develop this proposal.
- We recommend, again, that the Friends of Gender Group (FoGG) be included, formally, into the coordination structures of the GB 2.0 at the global level and that National Reference Groups ensure gender expertise is included, in particular through women-rights and women-led organisations.