

CORE COMMITMENT	RESPONSIBILITIES: 'INDIVIDUAL' (All, Donor or Aid Organisation) or 'JOINT' (All, Donor or Aid organisation)	WHAT ACTION WAS TAKEN IN 2021 TO ACHIEVE THIS COMMITMENT?	WHAT WERE THE RESULTS/OUTCOMES OF THIS ACTION?	WHERE RELEVANT, WHAT RESULTS WERE REPORTED AT COUNTRY LEVEL AGAINST THIS COMMITMENT? (Please specify countries AND results)	HOW WERE CONSIDERATIONS OF GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT[1] INTEGRATED IN YOUR INSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THIS COMMITMENT?	INDICATOR DEVELOPED BY WORKSTREAM CO-CONVENERS	PLEASE REPORT THE REQUESTED DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR
<b>WORK STREAM 1 - TRANSPARENCY</b>							
1.2. Signatories make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances.	Individual - all	1° pilot the use of IATI files for the exchange of information on humanitarian aid funding between DG ECHO and the EU Member States with one or two EU Member States. 2. Official launch of the use of NL IATI files to upload NL financed activities in EDRIS and subsequently into FTS 3. Work continues with other EU Member States to replace manual encoding of activities into EDRIS	It highlighted the need for guidance and close collaboration with publishers to better understand their data before using it. In the longer term, facilitating exchange of information avoiding double encoding and risk of discrepancies. It contributes to the quality and completeness of data in EDRIS and subsequently OCHA FTS			Are you (or any of your affiliates) using IATI data and accessing IATI-compatible data platforms and tools (or different data standards/platforms/tools) in order to enable evidence-informed decision-making, greater accountability and learning? [2] (Yes/no question)  Can you expand on your above answer, giving an example(s) of how you use or are intending to use data published via IATI, or when applicable via other data standards/platforms/tools?	
<b>WORK STREAM 2 - LOCALISATION</b>							
2.1. Increase and support multi-year investments in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination.	Individual - all	In its 2021 Communication on the EU's humanitarian action, the EC committed to providing stronger support to local responders, in line with the GB. One of the key actions in the Communication is to develop guidance on the promotion of equal partnerships. Additionally, the multi-year pilot projects launched in 2020 have continued to provide funding a capacity support to local actors. Also multiple ECHO Guidances (Disaster Preparedness, Disability, etc) put local actors' capacity building as an important objective.	It is expected that the translation of the recommendations of the guidance will enable a scale up of localisation investments. In the meantime, the programmatic partnership on Education in Emergency (EUR 4.9m - 3years); the contributions to the South Sudan CBPF (EUR 3m) and Ukraine CBPF (EUR 1m), and the Local Initiative Fund in Turkey – LIFT (5 years programme with over EUR 16m EU contribution) continue to deliver.	Lessons from all pilots and feedback from partners confirm that these projects have created a level playing field for local actors. Beyond access to funding, programmatic partnerships are considered to be real game changers, allowing for more predictability, flexibility and quality funding to achieve more cost-effectiveness, better impact, as well as strengthening relationships with local responders.	Gender considerations are quite well mainstreamed in EU-funded interventions. Furthermore, the Communication on Humanitarian Aid emphasises the importance of diversity and inclusivity in DG ECHO's approach to localisation. Therefore, the guidance will take into account the needs of women-led organisations and marginalised groups.	% of partnership or funding agreements that incorporate multi-year institutional capacity strengthening support for local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % awarded to women-led and or women rights' organizations[3]	Institutional capacity strengthening is a common component in most ECHO-funded projects. However, the level of investment in such activities is not systematically tracked, but as DG ECHO is planning to step up its localisation efforts, this may be easier in the near future.
2.4. Achieve by 2020, a global aggregated target of at least 25% of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transaction costs.	Individual - all	The legal constraint stemming from the EU Regulation on humanitarian assistance have meant that DG ECHO had to adopt a progressive approach to localisation. In particular, it had to identify solutions that would enable the implementation of localisation without tampering with the provisions of the Regulation. As a result, progress towards the 25% target has been delayed.	Various pilot projects were rolled out. They include investment in the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (EUR 3m) and the Ukraine Humanitarian Fund (EUR 1m); programmatic partnerships and projects with an embedded funding mechanisms like the Local Initiative Fund Turkey (LIFT) or FLER in Myanmar. These carry many enabling features for meaningfully increasing support to local actors.	Lessons from the South Sudan and Ukraine pilot projects have resulted in the adoption of an approach for future contributions OCHA as of 2022. Programmatic partnerships and the LIFT model have been effective as funding tools with a multi-year, flexibility and capacity support dimension.	Gender considerations are quite well mainstreamed in EU-funded interventions	% of humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % of that funding awarded to women-led and/or women rights' organizations.	Nothing to report at this stage.
<b>WORK STREAM 3 - CASH-BASED PROGRAMMING</b>							
3.1+3.6. Increase the routine use of cash, where appropriate, alongside other tools. Some may wish to set targets.	Individual - all	DG ECHO set a target of 35% of aid delivery through cash transfers. This has meant routinely considering cash as a default modality while taking the context into consideration.	ECHO continued to fund large-scale cash programmes through multi-year programming. As previously reported, figures are relevant on a two-year basis. 2021's figure of 16,10% will have to be taken with 2022 (e.g. no cash data reported in Turkey in 2021 despite the ESSN's implementation). ECHO's accounting system reflects the split of WFP by modality in-country instead of the split agreed with ECHO.	ECHO continued to advocate with its partners as well as through Cash Working Groups for increased and coherent use of cash (e.g. co-hosting a workshop with the CWG in Burkina Faso; encouraging WFP in multiple contexts (Uganda, Sudan, Palestine etc)) to shift from vouchers or in-kind to cash; supporting greater use of MultiPurpose Cash in rapid response mechanisms (e.g. in Sudan, South Sudan, DRC))	Gender considerations were thoroughly integrated in ECHO's cash policy (to be published in 2022). A two pager on cash and protection was developed.	Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	USD 324 million transferred through cash (net amount) in 2021 (with the important caveats explained in column D)

	Joint - all	DG ECHO has been the co-lead of the Donor Cash Forum (DCF) since January 2021, alongside Switzerland. This co-leadership has reinvigorated the group and driven common donor approaches at country-level (Nigeria, Ethiopia, Somalia) and on policy priorities (cash coordination, inflation/depreciation and interoperability)	Key successes of the DCF in 2021: 1) Good Practice Review on Cash assistance in contexts of inflation/depreciation; 2) Establishment of dedicated resourcing for donor cash coordination in 3 countries (Nigeria, Ethiopia and Somalia); 3) Launch of work to develop joint donor principles on interoperability; 4) Cash coordination: joint positioning and representation in the GB cash coordination caucus	DG ECHO continued to use the Joint Donor Statement as a basis for common donor positioning on the use of cash at response level, in the DCF focus countries and beyond (e.g. creation and co-leadership of a Yemen Donor Cash Working Group, development of donor principles on MPC in Lebanon, collaboration with FCDO & US on a joint transfer value for drought response in Somalia)	ECHO reviewed the protection mainstreaming indicator, which informed the definition of the Grand Bargain multi-purpose cross-cutting indicator on protection. It flags issues related to women.	Total volume (USD value) transferred through vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	USD 54 million transferred through vouchers (net amount) in 2021. Note: The Grand Bargain commitment focuses on cash, not on vouchers -- with the reasoning behind it linked to the unrestricted nature of cash. DG ECHO doesn't have a commitment linked to vouchers.
<b>WORK STREAM 4 - REDUCING MANAGEMENT COSTS</b>							
4.5. Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.	Joint - donors	Oversight mechanism by and large remain fit for purpose.	It must be noted that the EU and UN have agreed in 2021 on a further simplification of the evaluation mechanism of UN agencies. It does expect a "reduction of management costs" as a result of the use of cash and a.o. simplification of assessment mechanisms.	It would be interesting to re-center the debate on reducing management costs, the strategic topic to reduce the funding gap.		N/A[4]	N/A
	UN agencies					# of UN agencies adopting the UN Partner Portal to harmonize UN processes for engaging civil society organizations/non-governmental organizations, and reduce duplicate information reviews/requests of partners.	
	Civil society					% of civil society organizations/non-governmental organizations partners of the UN agencies adopting the common UN Partner Portal process.	The reporting responsibility for this specific target is with UN agencies that are using the Portal
<b>WORK STREAM 5 - NEEDS ASSESSMENTS</b>							
5.1. Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound, and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund, thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.	Joint - all					Which challenges have you identified and which actions have you been taking over the past year to strengthen humanitarian needs assessments and needs analysis in field locations and at headquarters? To which extent are these actions contributing to better joint (multi-stakeholders) inter-sectoral needs analysis in the field?	
	Joint - all	Work continued in 2021 around the development of a coordinated, sound, people-centred methodology to assess needs. An independent review of the process allowed to gather lessons learned and propose ways to improve the framework. Work continued on the use at field level.	It seems that a people-centred, coordinated needs assessment methodology is an accepted tool. This remains a very complex task, where errors can have far reaching consequences for the affected populations. Nevertheless, a joint work is going forward to gather experience from all actors towards a "good enough" methodology.	JIAF is used in a variety of countries to prepare HNOs, HRPs and consolidated in GHO. It is important that the methodology is used in a comparable manner. It is most important though that needs assessments are performed in a participative and transparent manner. This depends on the HCT, and as donors we support such approach with the different tools and ways at our disposal.	Gender considerations are integrated in the JIAF.	On a scale of 1 – 10, with 10 being the highest, please identify at what level of priority within your organization you consider the work to support coordinated needs assessments and analysis? What steps has your organization taken over the past year, if any, to ensure the requisite capacity is available to undertake this work.	
<b>WORK STREAM 6 - PARTICIPATION REVOLUTION</b>							

6.1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.	Joint -aid organisations	Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) is a key priority for the EU. This is not only reflected in its policies and programmes which emphasise participatory approaches, active participation of beneficiaries in the entire project cycle, but also in the EU's advocacy efforts to strengthen the accountability of the sector as a whole.	Having dedicated a lot of attention to meaningful participation of affected populations, particularly on feedback mechanisms and two ways communication, as well as the inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups in all aspects of programming, we are now looking into ways of fostering accountability practices at the humanitarian leadership level, including through collective actions with other donors.	Dialogue and two-way communication are strongly promoted in EU-funded feedback mechanisms. Our project management frameworks also allow for course correction measures to ensure that beneficiaries opinions are well taken into account. Regarding collective actions, we will consider participating in relevant initiatives from the participation revolution workstream where we can make a difference.	Gender remains a top priority in particular within the AAP debate and efforts.	N/A[5]	N/A
	Joint -aid organisations					N/A[5]	N/A

**WORK STREAM 7+8 - ENHANCED QUALITY FUNDING**

7.1.a. Signatories increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding. Aid organisations ensure that the same terms of multi-year funding agreements are applied with their implementing partners[6].	Individual - all	HIPs allow for actions that last up to 24 months. This might nevertheless not be achieved as systematically as possible if proposals do not demonstrate the gains from a multi-year approach (beyond theoretical gains demonstrated in studies, it is important to have concrete gains at the level of individual	Work is ongoing to see how to reinforce and enhance a multi-year funding, that goes beyond the annual provision of funds with possibility of extension. This will depend on availability of funding (need time to deploy) and confirmation of the gains of a MY approach.	Concretely, <b>statistics to be added.</b>		% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	
	Individual - all					% change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	
	Individual - all						% of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organizations to implementing partners
8.2. and 8.5. Donors progressively reduce earmarking, aiming to achieve a global target of 30% of humanitarian contributions that is unearmarked or softly earmarked by 2020. Aid organisations reduce earmarking when channelling donor funds with reduced earmarking to their partners.	Individual - Donors	DG ECHO has introduced programmatic partnership, and contribution to Country based Pooled Funds, as means to earmark less. These delivery mechanisms are now embedded in the toolbox and will gradually increase in terms of proportion of funding.	Increase proportion of less earmarked funds, introduce new working mechanisms that can gradually move towards less earmarking, depending on the gains in terms of efficiency and improved delivery for affected populations.	Extension of programmatic partnership to new partners. Continuation of use of CBPF. In terms of percentage, <b>statistics to be added.</b>		% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by aid organizations that are unearmarked/softly earmarked	
	Individual - Aid organisations					% of unearmarked/softly earmarked humanitarian funding that is allocated by aid organizations, with flexibility, to implementing partners	

**WORK STREAM 9 - HARMONISED REPORTING**

9.1. Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2019 by reducing the volume of reporting, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.	Individual - all	- introduction in DG ECHO IT proposal management and reporting tool of a 8+3 tab enabling partners to download their reports in a 8+3 format: deployed in 2021. - decision to pilot the 8+3 reporting format for Programmatic Partnerships with International Organisations	The 2021 programmatic partnerships foresee the opportunity to use the "8+3" format.	To be monitored with the 2021 PP, which imply that first 8+3 reports are expected in 2022.		Are you using the common reporting template as the standard for reporting by your downstream partners?  if yes, on which level (global, limited scope (e.g. regional))  If your scope is limited, please specify how and why?[7]	
--	------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--

**HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS**

<p>10.4. Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.</p>	<p>Joint - all</p>	<p>2021 was the year of programming of the new development instrument (NDICI-GE). In case of fragile and conflict affected countries, the Commission undertook a thorough coordination process between humanitarian, development and peace actors, making sure to increase complementarities and coherent response between the different instruments. The NDICI programming process also included development of conflict analyses for all relevant settings. The EU also moved beyond the original six pilot countries for in-country nexus implementation and explored new coordination and financing models. Joint planning, including through development or update of joint humanitarian-development frameworks, also took place in a number of countries and across sectors.</p>	<p>Most of the Multiannual indicative programmes (MIPs) under NDICI-GE include reference to the HDP nexus. Nexus references also feature prominently in humanitarian implementation plans (HIPs) thus ensuring a coherent approach between the two instruments. Joint/shared analytical frameworks constitute a basis for more concrete nexus implementation at the field level.</p>	<p>(non-exhaustive list)</p> <p>Common HDP nexus coordination bodies established (Chad, Mozambique, Iraq)</p> <p>Contribution to collective outcomes (Uganda - CRRF; Chad – global network to fight against food crises)</p> <p>Joint analytical and planning frameworks established or developed (Jordan, Ukraine, Palestine)</p> <p>Joined up financing mechanisms explored (Myanmar, Central African Republic)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A[8]</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	--------------------	--	--	---	------------	---------------	------------