

Grand Bargain in 2021:

Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: Alliance for Empowering Partnership

**Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview): Smruti Patel – Focal Point
spatel@gmentor.org**

Date of Submission: 16/02/22

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than **4 pages in total** – anything over this word limit will not be considered. Please respond to all of the questions below.)

Grand Bargain in 2021

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 2021?

A4EP has taken part in taken part in Grand Bargain Annual meeting and increased the voice of local and national organisations by involving 9 of the members in the meeting. A4EP has taken part in the two-key caucus – Cash coordination and intermediary caucus to ensure that local voices are represented. A4EP active advocacy ensured that local actors are not represented in the facilitation group.

<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/a4ep-position-paper-whs-five-years-national-and-local-actors-voices-humanitarian-wilderness>

A4EP has a regular meeting with NEAR and is preparing to take over the role in the facilitation group to represent local actions in 2022. We have also been reviewing and contributing to the National Reference Group concept and encouraging our members to take leadership in the country level discussions. A4EP jointly worked with C4C to produce a paper of the future of the Grand Bargain to contribute to GB 2.0.

Question 2: Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 1 (quality funding).

Enabling priority 1: A critical mass of quality funding is reached that allows an effective and efficient response, ensuring visibility and accountability.

(For ease of reference, see Senior Officials Meeting recommendations [here](#).)

Quality funding continues to be the biggest challenge for local and national organisations. Ensuring adequate funding and sharing of overhead costs has been a critical issue for most local and national organisations. A4EP has been advocating for quality funding through discussions with donors and through its position papers. Members of A4EP have also be advocating with C4C signatories to more actively engage with these discussions. A4EP members are now actively negotiating ICR and appropriate administrative costs. They are also advocating for joint decision making on budging for project and programmes

so appropriate funding is allocated for appropriate quality response to the affected population.

A4EP is advocating for intermediaries to cascade down multi-year funding. A4EP member have also representing local actors in CBPF working group to push forward more access to pool fund for local actors and assisting in reviewing the guidelines that are being reviewed.

Question 3: Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 2 (localisation and participation).

Enabling priority 2: Greater support is provided for the leadership, delivery and capacity of local responders and the participation of affected communities in addressing humanitarian needs.

A4EP has been taking part in localisation work steam discussion and actively advocating for localisation and participation revolution. A4EP has hosted webinars to discuss barriers to localisation. A4EP has produced an animation video to raise awareness of localisation commitments at country level so local actors are better informed and are able to hold their international partners to account.

A4EP with its member agency ECOWEB with two GB signatories, Oxfam Philippines and OCHA carried out a country level dialogue on localisation in the Philippines. The executive report of the dialogue was published in November 2021. Seven dimension of localisation framework was used to assess the state of localisation in the Philippines and in Jordan and there is now a monitoring framework that has been developed and endorsed by the HTC. Both reports have been published.

Two A4EP have developed a consortium project to work with a donor administration in facilitating conversations on relations with local and national organisations. Member of A4EP have been sharing lived experiences of working with international partners and how to address issues of inequity and distrust. A4EP member in Bangladesh is working with many local CSO to raise awareness about localisation through annual conference.

A4EP members have written several papers to raise awareness of the barriers facing local actors and the issues of power imbalance in the humanitarian system.

<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/moving-forward-localisation-humanitarian-action-philippines-summary>

<https://odihpn.org/blog/localisation-racism-and-decolonisation-hollow-talk-or-real-look-in-the-mirror/?s=03>

<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/a4ep-statement-typhoon-rai-and-localisation>

Grand Bargain and cross-cutting issues

Question 4: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women’s empowerment¹ 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.

A4EP is holding regular meeting with women leaders in the alliance to identify the continuing challenges. A4EP has put forward women leaders to represent in the coordination mechanisms. Special consultation was held to get their views and a position paper was produced and shared with views. We continue to support women leaders and provide space for them to engage directly with international actors and donors.

A4EP has 50% women and 50% male leaders as members. It has 50% women and 50% male leaders in the international convening committee. A4EP has deliberately chosen to nominate 2 Sherpas - one male one female both getting equal chance to participate.

<https://ardd-jo.org/Publications/localizing-gender-agendas-position-paper-calling-for-local-actors-to>

¹ Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available [here](#).

Question 5: 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.

A4EP has been advocating for triple nexus in all our communication. For local actors this is a crucial issue. A4EP members have been taking part in advocating in various forums. They have also been taking part in climate talks in the UK and in other locations.

Question 6: Has your institution taken any steps towards improving risk sharing with its partners? If so, please describe how. *(For ease of reference, please see a set of actions to enhance risk sharing as suggested in the Netherlands and the ICRC [Statement on risk sharing](#).)*²

Members of A4EP have taken active part in the discussion on Risk sharing, contributing to the statement on risk sharing. A4EP will continue to work to raise awareness of the donors and intermediaries on this issue. A4EP members took part in the meeting to share their perspectives from the ground level country experiences.

² During the 2021 Annual meeting and in consultation leading up to this Signatories have expressed a strong interest in advancing the risk-sharing agenda. As communicated, the Netherlands, ICRC and InterAction are in the process of setting up a Risk Sharing Platform. This work will benefit greatly from an inventory of Signatories' risk-sharing practices.