

**Grand Bargain in 2020:  
Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary**

**Name of Institution: CAFOD**

**Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview): Howard Mollett, Head of Humanitarian Policy, [hmollett@cafod.org.uk](mailto:hmollett@cafod.org.uk)**

**Date of Submission: 16/02/21**

## **Grand Bargain in 2020**

**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 2020?** Three key areas that CAFOD would like to highlight are as follows:

- Facilitating engagement of national and local NGOs in dialogue on ‘risk sharing’ linked to the Grand Bargain:  
<https://charter4change.org/2020/06/23/towards-risk-sharing-risk-management-and-localisation-in-the-covid19-response-and-beyond/>
- Generating learning on humanitarian capacity-strengthening of relevance to CAFOD global programming and the wider humanitarian sector  
<https://cafod.org.uk/About-us/How-we-work/Evaluations/HCS-programme>
- Supporting national and local partners of CAFOD and the Charter For Change coalition to bring their experience into informing IASC Key Messages on Funding Flexibility, IASC Proposals to Address the Inconsistency in Unlocking and Disbursing Funds to NGOs in COVID-19 Response, and Grand Bargain plans to facilitate country-level dialogues on localisation in South Sudan, Myanmar and Nigeria.

**Question 2: 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?** As highlighted in previous CAFOD reports to the Grand Bargain process, we continue to roll-out implementation of our Safe, Accessible, Dignified and Inclusive (SADI) package on programme quality across our humanitarian country teams and partner organisations. SADI is based on an intersectional approach, with gender, age and disability at the core of its analysis. SADI promotes the equal participation of women in its approaches, requires that accountability mechanisms are adapted appropriately and that projects are adapted to the needs and priorities of diverse groups. SADI profiles have been completed for all our partner organisations, which include indicators on accountability and community participation. CAFOD is committed to support all long-term partners to adopt SADI practices which includes training and accompaniment on gender mainstreaming. Learning from our SADI efforts was published by the ODI in an article entitled ‘SADI – CAFOD’s safe, accessible, dignified and inclusive approach’ (2020) (<https://odihpn.org/magazine/sadi-cafods-safe-accessible-dignified-and-inclusive-approach/> ) We also support capacity strengthening projects on gender/GBV/ using gender methodologies of women networks, institutions and communities in Afghanistan, Colombia, DRC, Guatemala, Bangladesh, Nicaragua and Bolivia.

CAFOD has also worked with women-led and women’s rights focused NGOs to lift up their experience and that of the women they work with in humanitarian policy and coordination spaces. Examples of this include:

---

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

- On-going support by women-led organisations and women's rights organisations in contexts affected by crises to engage with the UK government and multilateral processes (eg UN Security Council); including partners in Colombia, Syria, South Sudan and Lebanon. For World Humanitarian Day in 2020, CAFOD supported local women-led NGOs to raise awareness of their work under the Charter4Change coalition ( <https://charter4change.org/2020/08/19/world-humanitarian-day-2020-celebrating-local-heroes/> ).
- CAFOD facilitated an initiative of INGOs and local women-led NGOs to research and publish a joint agency report titled '*Humanitarian Funding, Partnerships and Coordination in the COVID-19 crisis: Perspectives from local women-led organisations and women's rights organisations*' in July 2020 ( <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/joint-agency-report-humanitarian-funding-partnerships-and-coordination-covid-19-crisis> ). The report involved collaboration with CARE International UK, ActionAid, DanChurch Aid and Oxfam as well as with local WLO and WRO partners in Lebanon, Jordan, Bangladesh, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Kenya, Nigeria, the Occupied Palestinian Territories and South Sudan and gathered a snap-shot of the Covid19 response to date in terms of access to funding, partnerships and decision-making for WLO/WROs. Findings from the report informed policy dialogue with UN heads of agency, donor governments and peer agencies.

**Question 3: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments?** As a faith-based agency that has a strong public support base and is less reliant on institutional funding than other humanitarian agencies, CAFOD has long been less constrained or driven by the institutional or funding siloes or the donor and UN-driven approaches to HDP Nexus than many other international agencies. Pope Francis' call in his 'Laudato Si' Encyclical for an 'Integral Ecology' approach to understanding the inter-connected nature of complex challenges facing the world (eg. the need to address both 'the cry of the earth' and 'the cry of the poor' in a holistic fashion) has been of central importance. Likewise, the experience of our programme staff and local partners has underpinned our shift towards integrated approaches across humanitarian, development and peace efforts.

During 2020 through to this year, CAFOD has worked on developing its new global strategy ('Our Common Home'), a new international programme strategy, a new 'integrated' programming model, and there is on-going work to revise our core programmes in collaboration with our local partners. At the heart of our new Integral Ecology Programming Model is a shift towards enabling holistic analysis and integrated approaches to design, monitoring, evaluation and learning across programmes and partnerships. In terms of links to other Workstreams, CAFOD highlights the following:

- CAFOD is currently working with partners in Bangladesh and Myanmar to plan and implement research on HDP Nexus issues to explore issues around multi-year, flexible funding and localisation in relation to the Nexus from the national and local NGO perspective.

- CAFOD has worked with UNICEF and Development Initiatives to facilitate input from national NGOs into research and policy dialogue on cascading of quality funding and Nexus in Lebanon, Jordan and Bangladesh.
- CAFOD supported a national NGO partner from Colombia to input to the Cash Workstream discussions on engaging local actors in cash programming. Their input included reflections on the implications of bridging humanitarian and development approaches to cash.

### **Grand Bargain 2016-2020: Overall achievements and remaining gaps**

#### **Question 4: What are the 2-3 key achievements/areas of most progress by your institution since 2016?**

- Documenting learning from the experience of CAFOD and its national/local partners to inform policy and practice on localisation both within the Grand Bargain, IASC and in dialogue with bilateral donors (eg see above link to CAFOD Humanitarian Capacity Strengthening Learning research).
- Strengthening and systematising our approach to safeguarding, accountability to affected populations, dignity and inclusion through the CAFOD 'SADI' framework aligned with, informed by and informing wider efforts in the sector on safeguarding, gender and AAP.

#### **Question 5: What, in your institutional view, have been the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories, as a collective, since 2016?**

From CAFOD's perspective, the most progress has been made on cash, joint needs assessments and the 8+3 reporting template. One implication of this is that it helps to identify very specific, technical initiatives and approaches, which can be systematised and scaled-up.

#### **Question 6: What has the Grand Bargain not been able to achieve in its five year tenure?**

CAFOD believes that the Participation Revolution and the Localisation Workstreams are hugely important, but progress on these has been constrained by the complexity of the issues at stake. Some of the commitments under these have focused on collective action or inter-agency action. A consequence of this is that when everybody is responsible, then in practice nobody is responsible or held accountable. For this reason, CAFOD strongly welcomes the initiatives in the Localisation Workstream to scope the potential for agency-specific localisation self-assessments of international 'intermediary' agencies. This kind of process has helped to inspire change and cross-agency learning amongst Charter4Change signatory INGOs, who self-assess their progress against the eight commitments of the Charter4Change charter. Likewise we also strongly welcome the initiative to pilot Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream country-level dialogues on localisation in a number of context. Experience from this can hopefully inform the next phase of the Grand Bargain beyond June 2021 to build on and deepen engagement with country-level missions and programmes of signatories on how they translate the global commitments into practice on the ground.

## Risk and the Grand Bargain

**Question 7a: How has risk (financial, operational, reputational, etc) affected your institution's implementation of the core commitments since you became a signatory to the Grand Bargain?** At present, it appears that the trend amongst donors and international agencies is towards a highly risk averse approach. Quality and accountability is experienced in too many cases as a very top-down exercise. There is a risk that the sector – including most of the GB signatories – are unwittingly creating a sort of 'humanitarian bubble' – a bubble in which a small number of bigger international agencies receive funding because they meet the ever increasing compliance and due diligence standards, and yet they are ever more challenged to gain access in the major crisis contexts like Yemen, Syria, Somalia – or indeed arguably during Covid19 across much of the world. Separate from this, there are national and local NGOs which have access to hard-to-reach areas, who “stay and deliver” and do not withdraw in the face of health pandemics or other crises. Those local actors are expected to somehow meet all those same international standards and find their funding abruptly cut when they do not. Yet almost no institutional donors are willing to invest in the multi-year capacity-strengthening and learning by doing which can enable local actors to understand, contextualise and act in alignment with the standards effectively. If localisation is understood as a cross-cutting priority of relevance to all GB commitments, then the current approach to risk obstructs progress across all of those commitments. CAFOD has sought to support partners as described in response to the following question. We have also drawn on our own funding to support partners in ways that most institutional donors will not. But accelerating progress across all aspects of the GB will require a wider shift by all signatories towards a 'risk sharing' approach.

**Question 7b: How has your institution sought to mitigate or address these risks to enable implementation of the core commitments?** CAFOD has played a leadership role in supporting national/local NGOs to engage with the risk discussions in the GB process; building on our support to research on partnership in security/risk management through the Global INGO Forum on Security in Myanmar and Colombia (<https://gisf.ngo/resource/partnerships-and-security-risk-management-from-the-local-partners-perspective/> ) and policy dialogue on risk-sharing through the Charter4Change. As part of this, we facilitated a virtual roundtable between major donors (UK, Netherlands, ECHO) and national NGOs in June 2020, which identified priority recommendations on a localisation and partnership approach to risk management: <https://charter4change.org/2020/06/23/towards-risk-sharing-risk-management-and-localisation-in-the-covid19-response-and-beyond/> In terms of our programmatic work, one central element has been a framework and process to work on risk and other programme quality issues in our partnerships with national and local NGO partners, which we have called 'SADI' ('Safe, Accountable, Dignified and Inclusive' programming). This has been embedded into multi-year, partner-led approaches to capacity-strengthening. Importantly, this has also included support for local partners to undertake south-south capacity-sharing, partner-led piloting and learning work; alongside accompaniment and technical support from CAFOD staff.