

OVERVIEW OF SIGNATORY ACTIONS IMPLEMENTING CAUCUS OUTCOMES

November 2022



IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAUCUS OUTCOMES

Context

The Grand Bargain Signatories gathered at a virtual meeting on 21 November to have an exchange about the outcomes that were agreed by the members of the caucuses on 1) quality funding and 2) role of intermediaries. The champions and members of the caucuses presented key agreed elements of the caucus, and how they are planning to implement them. Other Signatories also shared ideas and key changes they may be implementing to make progress on the caucus and other commitments. This document outlines some of those implementation plans and actions being carried out by the Signatories.

Country/Org.	Progress and best practices
CAUCUS ON QUALITY FUNDING – Outcome document here	
Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 31% of the humanitarian funding is unearmarked and softly earmarked. 58% of the current humanitarian funding is multi-year (MY), an increase of 30% from 2016. Already reporting on the multi-year funding (MYF) through the Financial Tracking Service (FTS). Adopted the 8+3 reporting template for all partners and welcome the standardisation for the local and national NGOs.
EU/DG ECHO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committed to increase by at least 30% the portfolio of MYF by the end of 2023, compared to 2021. Ensure flexible funding that allows partners to generate additional efficiency gains and improve design and delivery of humanitarian assistance in a quid pro quo spirit. <p>To reach those objectives, EU/DG ECHO has/is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepared an internal guidance note on MYF, shared with headquarters and field offices, to raise awareness of the political priority on MYF and clarify the operational implications. Prepared a factsheet on MYF, shared with partners, to encourage them to propose MYF projects when relevant and justified. Organising training and information sessions to increase the level of awareness on MYF within EU/DG ECHO staff and partners. Developing the monitoring and aiming to systematise the reporting of MYF. Piloting the 8+3 template.
Germany – GFFO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 78% of the German humanitarian funding was multi-year in 2021. Almost half of the current funding is unearmarked or softly earmarked with regional or sectional focus.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with partners to see how to increase levels of localisation, flexibility and visibility.
ICRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared the caucus outcome with key internal stakeholders to raise awareness and accelerate the implementation of ICRC's commitments. Strengthening the ICRC's ability to implement multi-year programs and projects including by building a new finance architecture. The first results will be improvements realised in summer 2023 for the 2024 budget cycle. Exploring ways to increase transparency and meet donors' visibility needs through reporting on multiyear funding and joint communication plans and activities in donors' capitals.
IRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to IRCs leadership of the quality funding caucus, they have engaged with caucus members and other key stakeholders to gather feedback about the successes, and challenges related to quality funding. Committed to continue to contribute to the evidence base of the added value of multi-year funding.
OCHA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country-based pooled funds (CBPFs) can now fund 24-month projects. Improved FTS reporting on MYF.
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MYF is already a core tool for the Swedish humanitarian partnerships that are channelled through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) or SIDA. 96% of the humanitarian funding channelled through the MFA is MY. This includes strategic partnership agreements with 7 UN agencies with humanitarian programmes, and ICRC, which runs from 2022 to 2025. Humanitarian funding through SIDA, so far this year, 9.7% is MY, which is an increase of 4.7% from 2021. Expected increase to around 19% in 2023, which would represent a four-fold increase as compared to 2021.
USAID/BHA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Fiscal Year 2022, which ran from October 2021 through September 2022, BHA increased multi-year humanitarian response funding by 86.5 percent compared to the previous fiscal year, reaching more than \$1.2 billion.
WFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committed to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterates its commitment to cascade 25 percent of its funding to cooperating partners. Will improve its internal tracking system to provide more data on the quality of funding cascaded to local actors. Remains committed to due accountability and visibility to demonstrate the value of flexible and predictable funding.



CAUCUS ON THE ROLE OF INTERMEDIARIES – <i>Outcome document here</i>	
Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked for a localisation plan for partners in Bangladesh. • Largely unearmarked funding to their large multilateral partners underpinned by Strategic Partnership Frameworks where driving localisation and inclusion are agreed priorities.
Catholic Relief Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed key performance indicators related to the percentage of funding that is going directly to local actors, either through CRS as through sub-granting or from their private funding and the total value (USD) directly secured from donors/government by local partners as a result of significant contributions by CRS. • Has two other local leadership KPIs that have been developed which are the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of documented examples where local partner capacity was strengthened as a result of significant contributions by CRS - Number of documented examples where CRS contributed significantly to government decisions to adopt or revise public policies, methodologies and tools that positively impact the poor and marginalised • Looking to shift their role from service providers to more technical support – specific projects are ongoing on this regard including CRS' EMPOWER Projects in Latin America, Asia and Central and West Africa. • In the process of developing a policy on ICR sharing with local partners.
Germany - GFFO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection process and contract: GFFO is verifying through their due diligence and project proposal template: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quality and scope of partnerships - The division of responsibilities between international organisations as intermediaries and local partners - The amounts of funding that are passed on for capacity strengthening and overhead cost • Working on introducing new financial guidelines, allowing to include a separate budget line for capacity strengthening for local partners and to increase overhead costs from 7% to 9% if shared with local partners. • Providing guidance to their missions abroad on how to implement the caucus outcomes concretely.
IRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertaking ambitious reforms to reach their own Grand Bargain commitments including through increasing their resources to local actors and by continuing to build principled partnerships particularly with women-led organisations. IRC wants to support efforts related to providing more granular data on cascading by improving their financial system to capture these efforts.



<p>OCHA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBPFs are recognised for their leading role in advancing localisation. While their main aim is to address lifesaving needs, promoting localisation is an important secondary objective. CERF also continues to promote localisation through sub-grants and to encourage prioritisation of local and national actors in its grants. • Localisation is a broader commitment that goes beyond funding. OCHA pooled funds promote a more comprehensive approach to localisation. For instance, CBPFs promote strengthening representation and participation of local and national actors in the Funds’ governance and operations, increased flexibility in the use of funding, as well as capacity development. • CBPFs have piloted innovative approaches to support localisation. To cite just a few: country specific localisation strategies (Yemen), dedicated funding envelopes for local and national actors (Afghanistan, Sudan, RhPF), and promotion of consortia that expand involvement of local and national actors and access to funding and mentoring (Nigeria, Venezuela).
<p>SCHR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCHR approach to implement the commitments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peer sharing - Support within two main inter-agencies – Charter 4 Change and Pledge for Change. - Individual action by SCHR members taking their own internal steps within their own organisations to deliver on the commitments
<p>Switzerland</p>	<p>Actions since August 2022 when Switzerland committed to implement the outcome document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcome document was shared with SDC staff, in headquarters and with the teams in the field with a strong message to implement the commitments on role of intermediaries. • As the co-chair of the Pooled Funds Working Group, Switzerland defined localisation as its first priority. Based on the caucus outcome document and the CBPF Global Guidelines, clear targets were defined to be reached within one year to make sure localisation is understood and used consistently in all Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs). Organised a retreat amongst the CBPF managers to discuss these issues and made clear that Switzerland is going to monitor progress. • Started developing a position paper on localisation based on the results of the commitments taken by Switzerland within the caucus, with the aim to orient the new Swiss Cooperation Strategy 2025-2028. Trying to include some of the results of the caucus into the localisation process led by the development community, the 2022 Effective Development Cooperation Summit. • Looking into the policies, guidelines and funding agreements and having discussion on how to better reflect the localisation commitments. • Started a dialogue based the caucus outcome document with Swiss NGOs that are also intermediaries. Next spring there will be a High-Level discussion on this topic.



	<p>Also, started conversation with main humanitarian multilateral partners and just finalising the long-term planning for some of them and included many of the outcome document indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pushing with the MOPAN Secretariat for the inclusion of the indicators of the outcome document in the draft adapted framework for organisations working in crises, which will now be tested on IOM.
UNHCR	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Launched a new specific grant for refugee-led organisations that takes into account specific barriers that they face as local actors including the requirement to be legally registered.• Simplified the grant agreements for all actors, which reduces the overall length of the documents that need to be signed with over 30% and also allows for greater funding flexibility between different budget lines.• Created an Advisory board consisting of organisations led by refugees, IDP and stateless people that will be able to influence UNHCR policy. The selection of the agencies were done by in consultation with the beneficiaries themselves. The first meeting will be held in December 2022.