

**Grand Bargain in 2021:
Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary**

**Name of Institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Republic of Slovenia**

**Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to
enable the consultants to contact you for an interview): Mojca
Grandovec, humanitarian officer, mojca.grandovec@gov.si**

Date of Submission: 18. 2. 2022

(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?

We almost doubled our cash-based assistance: from 30.000 EUR (in 2020) to 50.000 EUR (in both cases, contribution to CERF's cash programmes).

Based on a public tender, we established a strategic partnership for urgent humanitarian response with NGO which has a strong network of local partners in the affected zones.

Harmonised reporting is ensured for all implementing partners – NGOs and other implementing partners.

In 2021, we increased multi-year contributions significantly (compared to 2020). During the Slovenian Presidency in COHAFA Working Party in the Council of the European Union (July-December 2021), we were advocating for a coordination among Members States in terms of planning and implementing national humanitarian budgets and also reporting (monitoring and sharing data on national humanitarian budgets, including soft reporting from Member States).

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](#).)

In 2021, we made several multi-year pledges, for example, at the International Donors' Conference in Solidarity with Venezuelan Refugees and Migrants (2-year contribution through ICRC), we announced 3-year contribution for Yemen through ICRC and 3-year contribution for Syria through the UNCHR.

We also established a strategic humanitarian partnership with NGO Slovenska karitas for the period of three years (2021-2023) in order to respond quickly and efficiently to sudden humanitarian crises.

We responded very quickly to sudden crises, such as an earthquake in Haiti (via IFRC, via strategic partnership with NGO Slovenska karitas and Slovenia also provided in-kind aid), humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan (through ICRC, UNHCR,

WFP, UNFPA), food crisis in Madagascar (via WFP and strategic partnership) and to other humanitarian crises.

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.

All on-going humanitarian projects implemented by Slovenian NGOs have a local partner on the ground, responsible for implementing project activities on the ground.

In case of urgent humanitarian response, our financial contributions were channelled through international organizations that have strong and efficient local partners on ground, such as IFRC, ICRC, UNHCR, WFP and Caritas Internationalis.

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).

Gender equality and women's empowerment is one of the mainstreaming priorities of humanitarian activities. Gender aspect is included into all our actions (planning, implementation, evaluation). All bilateral projects have to take into account gender equality and women's empowerment. In 2020-2022, seven bilateral projects in the total value of 1.158.00 EUR were fully or partially addressing gender equality and women's empowerment. More specifically, GBV represented the main area of action in two humanitarian projects in Lebanon (total value of 400.000; 200.000 each in three years), and one of the priority action of a humanitarian project in Uganda (total value of 200.000 EUR). We also contributed 40.000 EUR to ICRC programmes against sexual violence. We reaffirmed our commitments in the international initiative *The Call to Action on Protection on Gender Based Violence in Emergencies* for the period 2021-

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

2025 and we were advocating for gender equality in international discussions during the Presidency of the Council of European Union in COHAFA Working party.

Slovenia also continued providing financial assistance for the health clinic for women in Kabul (a project implemented by ITF Enhancing Human Security).

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.

In line with the Strategy on International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid, by 2022, Slovenia will earmark at least 50 % of humanitarian response to humanitarian crises where its development and other activities are already in place. We have no final data available for 2021 yet, but we can assure that a great part of our humanitarian response was earmarked for crises where Slovenia implements humanitarian and development activities (e.g. the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Syria ...)

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

As an example of the activities, related to risk sharing, we enclose lesson-learnt by our partner ITF Enhancing Human Security, when implementing its activities in Afghanistan.

Since 2014 when ITF started with its activities in Afghanistan, it was exposed to difficult security and political situation. In 2014 – 2021, many institutional meetings of different stakeholders took place and operational risks were discussed and mitigated. The meetings involved national mine action structure and disaster management, UNMAS, national and international NGOs. Namely, ITF staff was conducting activities in all parts of Afghanistan and it was confronted with Talibans every day. Consequently, several measures and procedures were developed in order that Mine Action activities could be conducted even in relatively hostile environment.

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.

Safety measures for offices in Kabul and in 6 regional centres as well as for local and international staff were developed jointly, where national mine action structure, UNMAS and ITF worked together on procedures for different risks mitigation. After 15 August 2021, ITF had regular contacts with UNMAS and Donor representative where security situation was assessed on regular basis. Due to big uncertainty and fear, all personnel was advised to stay at home and work from there. Based on donors' decision, ITF suspended nearly all operations in Afghanistan on September, 8th 2021. Only small office with 3 employees remained. Namely, national mine action structure was taken over by Taliban and ITF stopped all official contacts with them (as all international stakeholders, except UNMAS who had few unsuccessful meetings with national mine action representative), but remained in a regular contact with UNMAS, two International NGOs and some national NGOs. Fear and uncertainty are still present among ITF staff due to a fact, that they were working with US contributions and funds.

One of substantial risks for continuation of humanitarian work in Afghanistan are international sanctions preventing any formal bank transfers to Afghanistan. Problems with bank transfers starts in countries of origin already (ITF domicile bank forwarded a list of 30 countries, where they do not transfer funds – ITF is present with programs in 9 countries out of mentioned 30). If funds are somehow transferred, then they are usually stopped by intermediary bank and humanitarian organization are left to seek for certain different/alternative solutions.