### **Grand Bargain in 2022:**

## **Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary**

Name of Institution: Global Affairs Canada

Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview):

Fatimah Elfeitori, Program Officer, Fatimah.elfeitori@international.gc.ca

Date of Submission: February 16, 2022.

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than <u>4 pages in total</u> – 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?

In 2021, Canada continued to move forward and achieve progress in implementing its Grand Bargain commitments. Of particular note are the key outcomes that Canada achieved against the enhanced quality funding and localization agendas.

Canada continues to be strongly committed to advancing **quality funding**. In 2021, Canada provided 58% of its funding through multi-year agreements, an increase of 107% from 2016 levels (28%). In 2021, Canada also provided 31% of its humanitarian funding as unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, an increase of 63% since 2016 (19.07%). Further details on this commitment are provided in the quality funding section below.

Canada also continued to demonstrate **support for localization** over the past year. In particular, Canada continued to increase its funding for Country-Based Pooled Funds, which represents the primary vehicle through which Canada most directly supports local responders. In 2021, Canada contributed CAD \$78 million to 19 CBPFs. This represents 11-fold increase from Canada's 2016 contributions (CAD \$6.5M). In addition, this year, Canada became the cochair of the Pooled Fund Working Group with OCHA. In this role, Canada supported the revision of the CBPFs Global Guidelines, emphasizing the role of the Funds in providing direct support to local actors (approximately 37% of CBPF funding was provided directly to local actors in 2021). Further, in 2021, Canada revised its International Humanitarian Assistance NGO Funding Guidelines to allow for a dedicated budget line for local partners' overhead costs (up to 7.5% of direct project costs for local overhead costs).

# 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.)

Over the last five years, Canada has significantly increased its provision of multi-year, as well as unearmarked and softly earmarked humanitarian funding. In 2021, Canada provided 58% of its funding through multi-year agreements, an increase of 107% from 2016 levels (28%). In 2021, Canada also provided 31% of its humanitarian funding as unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, an increase of 63% since 2016 (19.07%).

In addition, Workstream 7&8 – co-convened by Canada and the ICRC - held a closed-door senior-level meeting of key signatories to discuss the advancement of the quality funding agenda in May 2021. The outcome document stemming from the meeting provided a framework for the operationalization of quality funding as one of the two enabling priorities in Grand Bargain 2.0, by proposing a set of key recommendations for all Grand Bargain signatories moving forward.

## 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.

Canada made important strides to advance the localization agenda, including through increasing its contributions to CBPFs. In addition, the revisions to the overhead percentage for local organizations now facilitates greater flow-through of quality funding from our NGO partners to local actors, and further encourages Canada's NGO partners to set a minimum percentage of their budget to go directly to local responders. Canada is also increasing the predictability and flexibility of its humanitarian funding as indicated above, which allows partners to more effectively and meaningfully work with local organizations.

By leveraging its Co-chairmanship of the Pooled Fund Working Group, Canada has also contributed to mainstreaming localization in the revised Global Guidelines, including for example, on capacity strengthening, security and safety costs for local partners, and the meaningful inclusion of women-led organizations on advisory boards..

Canada believes that supporting localization through increased funding to local actors as well as support for their long-term institutional capacities requires coordinated action across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus. Global Affairs Canada's internal efforts to build bridges across the nexus will allow for greater advancement on the localization agenda and address longer-term issues including capacity building.

An example of working across the nexus to advance localization is the <u>Canada Fund for Local Initiatives (CFLI)</u> which was set up with the objective of addressing local needs through local partners working across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus (86% of projects directly fund local partners). With an annual operating budget of \$24.6 million, the CFLI is managed by Canada's diplomatic missions abroad and contributes to over 650 small-scale projects a year in 134 countries. The projects are run by local organizations active at the community and grassroots level, which help build capacity among civil society through a range of activities, including workshops, training and advocacy initiatives. The CFLI can also support modest first response to natural disasters and humanitarian emergencies through local organizations.

Canada also continued its engagement in multilateral and multi-stakeholder initiatives to advance the participation of affected communities in the international humanitarian response system. As chair of the Support Platform for the Comprehensive Regional Protection and Solutions Framework to address forced displacement in Central America and Mexico (MIRPS, as per its Spanish acronym), Canada is working to champion the protection, meaningful participation, and leadership of displaced women and girls. The theme of Canada's chairmanship – protection and empowerment of women and girls on the move – highlights Canada's feminist approach to international engagement and its commitment to placing affected populations at the centre of the response.

**Grand Bargain and cross-cutting issues** 

Question 4: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment<sup>1</sup> 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).

Through the implementation of its Grand Bargain commitments, Canada has contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian settings. The majority of our funding in any given year is provided to multilateral partners either as fully unearmarked, softly earmarked, or earmarked at the country level but with full flexibility given to partners to allocate according to needs. With this flexibility, we expect that our partners use these funds to address gender equality along with the other priority areas. Canada has made the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment a cornerstone of our engagement in the governance bodies of, and policy dialogue with, our humanitarian partners. We have supported the development of gender equality strategies of key humanitarian partners.

In addition to flexible funding, Canada supports specific multi-year initiatives to strengthen gender capacity and bring about lasting, systemic change on gender and Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), and Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights (SRHR). For example, since 2019, Canada has supported UNFPA's efforts to strengthen SGBV coordination and response in the Middle East. This model of consistent, predictable support provides a number of benefits, including: sustained coordination; strengthened information management; greater support for local engagement and innovation. Additionally, Canada supports IOM Syria in a response-wide Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse initiative.

Further, Canada supports international and local NGOs with integrated programming that is focused on women and girls in conflict settings, for example through health initiatives integrating protection case management, SRHR and SGBV targeted interventions.

Canada also continued to be an active member of Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies. In 2021, Canada re-affirmed its commitments to prevent, mitigate and response to SGBV through advocacy and support to field level implementation. Through Canada's efforts, the current 2021-2025 Roadmap has an increased focus on local organizations, particularly women-led organizations, the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, and gender equality in humanitarian action.

In 2021, Canada also sat on the steering committee for the IAHE on Gender Equality and the Empowerment or Women and Girls. This evaluation was the first of its kind and set out clear recommendations for improving the humanitarian system. Canada then hosted a follow up donor briefing to share the findings of the evaluation and advance the shared recommendations'.

Question 5: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available <u>here</u>.

**Grand Bargain commitments?** Please explain how your institution has linked commitments 10.1 - 10.5 with other commitments from other workstreams.

To achieve better alignment between humanitarian, development, and peace interventions, Global Affairs Canada is improving its internal triple nexus operating structures and processes, guided by a multi-year, multi-phase departmental workplan, in line with a 2019 Recommendation by the Organization for Economic Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). In particular, Canada is working on developing internal nexus guidelines to enable more complementary planning processes between humanitarian, development and peace-building programming, including in responding to refugee situations.

At the same time, Canada has also been continuing to program across the nexus. As an example, with Canada's support, the Canadian Foodgrains Bank (CFGB) is helping to address the impact of COVID-related food insecurity among vulnerable populations in eight countries: Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Sudan and Zimbabwe. Project activities include: (1) providing cash, vouchers or in-kind food rations to address immediate food needs; (2) identifying and supporting agricultural and non-agricultural livelihoods and market opportunities to improve household food security and resilience; (3) facilitating the development and strengthening of community groups to build community ownership and resilience; (4) rehabilitating or constructing community and environmental assets to support community development; and, (5) providing training on local gender equality issues and gender-based violence risks and prevention to women and men from households experiencing acute food insecurity.

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 <u>Statement on risk sharing</u>.)<sup>2</sup>

Canada recognizes the risk is inherent to humanitarian action. As such, Canada has developed a robust due diligence process in order to mitigate and manage financial, operational and reputational risks, while being conscious of any undue burden this process would create on humanitarian partners. Canada carefully balances the need to be accountable – towards both those affected by crises and to its domestic democratic institutions –as well as maintain trust in its humanitarian partners.

Canada works through experienced humanitarian partners who have demonstrated that they have the requisite control, accountability and risk mitigation mechanisms in place to work in complex and challenging operating environments. GAC's humanitarian team maintains engagement with multilateral and NGO partners at an institutional level through institutional focal points and at a country level through geographic leads. Institutional focal points monitor partners' performance at an organizational level, and maintain open communication with partners, which facilitates sharing risk information

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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.

and building transparency and trust. In addition, and as a complement our due diligence processes, Canada is also an active member on the governing bodies of our key partners, keeps open lines of communications with our partners and other stakeholders (including through bilateral consultations), and engages in site visits - as well as joint donor monitoring missions -when it is possible to do so. Canada also draws on MOPAN findings, other donor assessments' of multilateral partners, as well as organizational evaluations and functional reviews.