

CORE COMMITMENT	RESPONSIBILITIES	WHAT ACTION WAS TAKEN DURING PAST	WHAT WERE THE RESULTS/OUTCOMES OF THIS	WHERE RELEVANT, WHAT RESULTS WERE	HOW WERE CONSIDERATIONS OF GENDER	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	Continued to train staff in Mercy Corps Europe and Netherlands on publishing data to IATI. Participated in meetings with the IATI Community of Practice and BOND Transparency group. Developed an IATI SoP for uploading data. Upgraded Aidstream membership to PRO to facilitate easier uploading of project data to IATI	More robust training plan and SoP in place for MCE/MCNL Programmes staff. Easier uploading of data to IATI. Published financial data on flows of funds, as well as narrative data in the case of Dutch funding, on 26 projects throughout the Middle East, South East Asia, and Africa.	Countries reporting via IATI: Myanmar, Uganda, Jordan, Nepal, Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Lebanon, Palestine, Indonesia, Iraq, Nigeria, Tanzania, Mozambique, Congo	While no explicit gender equality considerations have been implemented, the IATI training was conducted for all necessary staff, regardless of gender.	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?	Yes. The FCDO DevTracker website, which pulls its data from IATI, is used extensively to track FCDO programming and commitments across countries and sectors, informing programme development decision-making at the country level. Data is now published to IATI on FCDO and Dutch Government funding. An IATI training presentation has been developed and refined and is delivered to all new Programmes team staff at Mercy Corps Europe.
<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					% 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]	<b>35% of subaward expenditure was to local organizations, representing \$32,283,613.</b>  <b>14% of multi-year humanitarian programming prime awards included subawards to local organizations</b>
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		7.5% of all direct program and subaward expenditure for humanitarian programming went to local organizations. 17% of subaward expenditures under humanitarian programming went to local organizations, totaling \$7,625,241.			% 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.	7.5% of all direct program and subaward expenditure for humanitarian programming went to local organizations. 17% of subaward expenditures under humanitarian programming went to local organizations, totaling \$7,625,241.
<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	Mercy Corps has transferred \$47 million directly to participants via cash transfers.	Outcomes for Mercy Corps cash transfers include: meet basic needs, shelter, food security, livelihoods, small business development	Mercy Corps' largest CVA portfolios include Nigeria, Colombia, DRC, Kenya, Palestine, Yemen, Iraq, CAR, Syria, Lebanon, Nepal, Myanmar, Sudan, Somalia, Haiti, Mali, Uganda, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Niger.	All of Mercy Corps' programs are required to complete a gender and social inclusion analysis to determine how to best implement CVA.	Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	Mercy Corps has transferred \$47 million directly to participants via cash transfers.
	Individual - all	Mercy Corps has transferred \$16.2 million directly to participants via vouchers.	Outcomes for Mercy Corps vouchers include meet basic needs, food security.	Mercy Corps' largest CVA portfolios include Nigeria, Colombia, DRC, Kenya, Palestine, Yemen, Iraq, CAR, Syria, Lebanon, Nepal, Myanmar, Sudan, Somalia, Haiti, Mali, Uganda, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Niger.	All of Mercy Corps' programs are required to complete a gender and social inclusion analysis to determine how to best implement CVA.	Total volume (USD value) transferred through vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	Mercy Corps has transferred \$16.2 million directly to participants via 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	N/A				N/A[4]	N/A
	UN agencies	N/A				# 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.	N/A
	Civil society	N/A				% 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?	Mercy Corps continues to prioritise the strengthening of our agency wide capabilities in detailed contextual analysis to inform programmes. In many contexts, this analysis is shared and serves the wider humanitarian community. In 2021, Mercy Corps continued to build our in-house crisis analysis capabilities across multiple regions with additional countries adding analysis expertise.
	Joint - all					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.	Mercy Corps continues to prioritise the strengthening of our agency wide capabilities in detailed contextual analysis to inform programmes. In many contexts, this analysis is shared and serves the wider humanitarian community. In 2021, Mercy Corps continued to build our in-house crisis analysis capabilities across multiple regions with additional countries adding analysis expertise.
<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	N/A				N/A[5]	N/A
	Joint -aid organisations	N/A				N/A[5]	N/A
<b>WORK STREAM 7-8 - ENHANCED QUALITY FUNDING</b>							
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					% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	<b>23% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.</b>
	Individual - all					% change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	<b>2% change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year</b>
	Individual - all					% of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organizations to implementing partners	<b>25% of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organizations to implementing partners</b>
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	N/A				% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by aid organizations that are unearmarked/softly earmarked	NTR
	Individual - Aid organisations			Financial Reporting Only		% of unearmarked/softly earmarked humanitarian funding that is allocated by aid organizations, with flexibility, to implementing partners	NTR
<b>WORK STREAM 9 - HARMONISED REPORTING</b>							
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					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]	We are currently exploring how to operationalise the reporting templates with partners  For those donors where the template is required, we flow down to partners
<b>WORK STREAM 10 - HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS</b>							

<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>Facilitated shared outcomes joint analysis across stakeholders via MC-led USAID-funded SCC mechanism (Niger/BF), including close consultation with national/regional HDP coordination bodies. Internally, MC continued institutionalizing HDP coherence in 2 strategic country missions and launched 1 new mission. Released study on use of crisis analysis to aid joint analysis across HDP practitioners.</p>				<p>N/A[8]</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	--------------------	---	--	--	--	---------------	------------