

Grand Bargain in 2021: Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: CAFOD

Point of Contact: Howard Mollett, Head of Humanitarian Policy, CAFOD
hmollett@cafod.org.uk

Date of Submission: 16/02/2022

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?

Three key outcomes for CAFOD over the past year of relevance to delivering on the Grand Bargain are as follows:

Firstly, an organisational restructure and new programme strategy in development which promote a more integrated approach to analysis, programming and MEAL efforts across humanitarian, development and wider kinds of programming.

Secondly, a process to shift towards a new norm of multi-year funding and planning with local partners. Most of CAFOD's partnerships have always been multi-year, and we have provided funding for many years to numerous partners, but the funding and decision-making was largely on an annual basis. Under our new strategy we are developing the finance, compliance and other prerequisites to make genuine multi-year funding and partnership in the fuller sense possible.

Thirdly, whilst CAFOD prides itself on its history as a partnership-based agency rooted in principles and lived history of solidarity, subsidiarity and attention to issues like dignity and agency, we are going on a journey to more systematically incentivise, track and evaluate progress on these priorities, generate learning on challenges and good practices in this, and set more ambitious and clear corporate and programmatic goals and metrics for these. A concern both with the localisation agenda, as well as wider priorities under the Grand Bargain, has been that systematising these things risks running contrary to a genuinely partner-led approach by CAFOD. Both our staff and local partners appreciate CAFOD being partner-led, and therefore less prone to the top-down and bureaucratic approach of many humanitarian agencies. Yet that partner-led approach then comes into tension with our efforts to become more systematic about things; including on MEAL in relation to localisation. Under our new programme and partnership strategy, we are setting clearer goals and will monitor progress in support to partner direct access to funding, strengthening our approach to two-way mutual accountability between CAFOD and its partners, and establishing an organisational Racial Justice Action Plan, which is key to addressing issues relating to structural racism that have implications for our efforts on localisation and decolonisation. As such, the past year has seen important progress in translating our localisation principles into clearer and more ambitious action, and changes in our policies and practices.

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](#).)

CAFOD is committed to ensuring quality funding reaches our local partners; enabling their effective and efficient work, and for them to sustain and grow as organisations. By securing funding through supporter donations, institutional funding and supporting partners to access direct funding, we have many opportunities to ensure quality funding reaches local partners. Our unearmarked contributions to Caritas Emergency Appeals allows local NGO partners to flexibly adapt their programmes within the project remit. As noted in our spreadsheet report, 34% of institutional funding in 2021 was for multi-year projects. Aside from this, whilst CAFOD does not hold many 'multi-year contracts' we commit to accompany partners and commit to working with them in the longer term. This is especially apparent in chronic protracted humanitarian crises like Syria and South Sudan. In Syria for example we have supported local partners through accompaniment, capacity-strengthening and advocacy, which has enabled them to lead on accessing new multi-year quality funding grants directly (€1,054,559 partner direct funding secured in 2021).

Under our current strategy commitment "to use funding and resources in diverse and innovative ways to deliver our mission in the most effective and appropriate ways", CAFOD is exploring new models of emergency funding to partners. For example, as part of our capacity-strengthening support, we have supported local partners to invest in their volunteer and domestic resource mobilisation efforts. CAFOD is in the process of revising our Humanitarian Strategy which also outlines our intention to dedicate a percentage of Emergency Appeal funding to humanitarian capacity strengthening. This will allow partners to identify and address capacity gaps. CAFOD is also participating in research led by IASC on overheads to partners to reflect on how we support partners with this.

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.

As highlighted in previous CAFOD reports to the Grand Bargain, we continue to play a lead role in the Charter4Change coalition and in support to our national and local partners in advocating for both local leadership of crisis response, and for increased and more effective action to support the dignity, agency and accountability to crisis-affected communities. Over the past year, CAFOD led on hosting an inter-agency roundtable on the role of faith-based organisations (FBOs) in humanitarian action; including speakers from national faith-based organisations from all regions engaging with representatives from UN agencies and donor governments. We have followed up on this through a UNHCR process to strengthen its engagement with FBOs; through input to the IASC localisation and humanitarian coordination guidance; and through support to local FBOs and other national NGOs to raise their priorities with the British government and other relevant donor and UN policy-makers in crisis contexts; as well as to directly access funding from institutional donors.

Over the past year, CAFOD has also started on a systematic review of its corporate strategy, organisational culture and human resources policies and practices, programme strategy and partnership framework to deliver on our commitments to local leadership and decolonising aid. Key performance indicators at a corporate level this year have included tracking our level of support to partner direct access to funding, and we are using the scores awarded by an independent auditor (as part of our CHS certification process) against localisation related indicators in the CHS standard to feed into an organisational KPI on support to local leadership. A summary of research of national and diocesan Church local NGO partners in the Caritas confederation was published, and a series of regional webinars have been convened around the world. Each of these webinars, and the process around them, have involved engagement with local faith leaders sharing theological as well as practical perspectives on localisation from a Catholic and local context-specific perspectives, as well

as dialogue with national and local Caritas NGO staff to identify their priorities for support to better partnership and localisation in their relations with CAFOD and other INGO partners.

In addition, through Charter4Change, ICVA, SCHR, BOND and other networks, we have lobbied for and supported local partners to bring their insights into influencing policy-making on relevant topics; including dialogue with donors, UN and others on the role of intermediaries in localisation, risk sharing, due diligence passporting, safety and security management, women, peace and security and other topics. CAFOD also played an active role in support to engaging national NGO partners in the Grand Bargain dialogues in South Sudan, Nigeria, Colombia, Philippines, which have also connected with our wider support to national NGO platforms and networking on humanitarian policy in those and other contexts. In the context of the IASC, CAFOD has provided support to national NGOs to influence discussions in IASC RG5 on funding, RG4 on humanitarian/development Nexus issues and the IASC process on localisation. Learning from this on localisation and capacity-strengthening published in ODI Humanitarian Exchange article.

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.

As highlighted in previous CAFOD reports to the Grand Bargain process, we continue to roll-out implementation of our Safe, Accessible, Dignified and Inclusive (SADI) package on programme quality across our humanitarian country teams and partner organisations. SADI profiles have been completed for all our partner organisations, which include indicators on accountability, accessibility for diverse groups and community participation. CAFOD is committed to support all long-term partners to adopt SADI practices which includes training and accompaniment on gender mainstreaming. During 2021, CAFOD has been undertaking an in-depth review of this package to build on lessons learnt and add further resources and monitoring tools, particularly to support aspects of gender and wider inclusion within. CAFOD has also committed additional funding to secure a full-time permanent advisory post on inclusion and gender to support the organisation and partners to deliver on its gender justice goals. We also support capacity strengthening projects on gender/GBV/ using gender methodologies of women networks, institutions and communities in all regions, including in DRC, Colombia, and Syria.

CAFOD continues to work closely with women-led and women’s rights organisations to strengthen their institutional capacity and provide opportunities for agency, voice and leadership at all levels of the humanitarian system. For example, recently secured EU funding in the Middle East will specifically target WLOs to equip local women leaders to influence camp management structures, local authorities and international policy makers. In 2021, CAFOD also demonstrated a commitment to challenge exclusion in the humanitarian system, by promoting the voice of indigenous women, including women’s rights defenders in various influential arenas – such as the Glasgow COP, at the UNSC in Colombia and with the UN Special Rapporteur on HR defenders. As a faith-based agency, CAFOD further has access to global ecclesiastical networks where it continues to advocate for gender justice.

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.

CAFOD prefers to emphasise the concept of Integral Ecology, which reflects Pope Francis' concept of Integral Ecology in *Laudato Si* and wider Catholic thinking about global issues understood in a holistic and inter-sectional fashion. Indeed we are revising our global programme strategy in line with this and developing what we have called an Integral Ecology Programme Model. Much of what CAFOD is seeking to take forward with this Integral Ecology lens resonates with the aid sector's concepts of HDP Nexus, however it is situated in and inspired by our Catholic mandate. One basic important shift over the past year has been that CAFOD used to have separate International Development Group and Emergency Response Group structures. There has been a structural change now to work towards integrated 'Core Programmes', and these former 'groups' have been disbanded and evolved to reflect that shift. In terms of links to other workstreams, efforts on gender equality in humanitarian action, localisation and on quality funding all involve work across not just our humanitarian funding and programmes, but wider CAFOD programmes engaged in development, resilience, peacebuilding, governance and other issues. Each of those priorities require longer-term support and investment; both in terms of CAFOD's own systems, staff expertise and technical knowledge and that of our local partners. CAFOD has also supported a wider collaboration across the Caritas confederation of INGO and national NGOs on HDP Nexus; through establishment of a CI Nexus working-group, which is catalysing joint research and analysis by Caritas affiliated members (eg research led by Caritas Bangladesh on experience of funding modalities across the Nexus in support of locally-led anticipatory action).

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](#).)*

CAFOD has played a proactive and lead role in the sector in support to policy dialogue as well as operational learning between humanitarian agencies and their national/local partners on risk management. Key examples of this over the past year include follow-up to the research, which CAFOD and its partners contributed to, by GISF on partnership and localisation approaches to safety and security management. A '[Joint Action Guide](#)' toolkit was developed, and CAFOD has trialled its roll-out in South Sudan. We are now following up with peer INGOs and national NGOs to build on that both in South Sudan and other contexts; and connecting this to collaboration with other agencies through Charter4Change.

Secondly, a key priority identified by our local partners in risk-sharing is provision of adequate overheads costs support to local NGOs. We have followed up in our advocacy on this topic both directly with the UK, EU and other donors, and through the IASC in supporting a new research initiative, implemented by Development Initiatives, to map and analyse the experience of UN agencies, INGOs and national NGOs on overheads costs. Findings should inform changes in policy and practice both by humanitarian agencies, as well as provide an evidence base for dialogue with donors on overheads costs and localisation.

Thirdly, CAFOD has contributed to wider efforts both with our own partners and through wider deliberations in the aid sector on partnership approaches to managing risk associated with safeguarding/PSEA. As part of this, CAFOD has supported BOND on dialogue with FCDO and the wider NGO sector about partnership approaches to safeguarding, and fed into deliberations through SCHR to input to IASC guidance and protocols on safeguarding. CAFOD has also been working with local partners in DRC to conduct research on safeguarding and the perspectives of national and local NGOs in terms of partnership and localisation approaches to effective safeguarding.