

DCA self-report

GRAND BARGAIN SELF-REPORTING

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?

1. Transparency and increased awareness of how funding is moving through internal channels and how much is transferred to local and national partners is a key result. Regular tracking of data results in informed decision making on issues such as direct vs local/national partner implementation. It sparks off debates and gives DCA an idea of how we perform in the wider humanitarian system.
2. DCA has also developed a new Project and Programme Documentation site in 2020. This will enable DCA to track meta data at project and programme level, which can be used for organisational analysis and results reporting.
3. DCA has continued taking a lead and instrumental role in bringing the localisation conversation from Copenhagen, Geneva to Goma and Kampala. This work has been done hand in hand with DCA country teams and local actors in Uganda, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Kenya, South Sudan, Myanmar, etc.

Question 2: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment^[1] 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). Please refer to the Guidelines for definitions of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, which are included in this self-report template package.

As a multi mandated and faith-based organisation, DCA works with a human rights-based approach to strengthen gender equality and women empowerment across the triple nexus. In dialogue with multiple stakeholders, including religious actors at all levels, DCA has during 2020 increased focus on women's economic empowerment, supported gender justice and challenged deeply rooted discriminatory practices, that reduce women's agency, empowerment and fulfilment of their rights.

Through the community-led crisis response (sclr) approach, women in the West Bank and Gaza, Palestine, have been empowered to co-lead needs assessments, planning and implementation of humanitarian and long-term development responses that address the specific needs of their communities. The intervention has ensured that women are more

actively involved, for example by having both female and male project coordinators at the local level. Inclusion of religious actors in community committees has further impacted women's inclusion and empowerment as they have contributed to promote changed gender norms to enable women's social and political participation. A key outcome has been to restore women and men's agency and sense of dignity, and women and youth have achieved a central voice in advocating for the fulfilment of these needs.

In South Sudan, DCA has developed a tool kit and training material on gender and cash in order to strengthen its approach to gender mainstreaming and GBV risk mitigation in Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) and humanitarian programmes. DCA has thereby provided guidance for DCA Country Offices and partners to work strategically with GBV prevention and response in CVA programmes. The tool provides specific guidance on how to integrate GBV mainstreaming, risk mitigation, prevention and response in the programmes, as an integral step of DCA's commitment to do no harm.

In Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh DCA and its partners combat gender-based violence, gender discrimination and providing critical services to women and girls in a refugee situation. The project applies a nexus approach as it is gradually moving from a humanitarian project focused on service provision to also include focus on transforming discriminatory gender norms in the long term by engaging and directly involving religious leaders, men and boys. Although GBV issues are difficult to talk about in public in the refugee and strongly male-dominated context, people are starting to change their mindset. Men are allowing their female household members to seek the service provisions while also starting to share responsibilities of household chores.

Question 3: 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.

DCA applies a nexus approach that recognizes the role and leadership of local actors and support them in an approach that spans the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, particularly the role of village elders, faith leaders, camp or community leaders (men and women) as well as youth, human rights organizations, local business partners, organizations of people representing other vulnerable groups such as the marginalized and displaced population at the community level.

DCA has strived to mainstream nexus across our Grand Bargain commitments particularly focusing on the workstreams related to localisation, cash and participation revolution. During the covid-19 crisis, our nexus focus has been to step up the role of local civil society organisations, in particular local faith actors, providing them with the organisational and programmatic support to carry out their work addressing both urgent needs of people and the long-term socio-economic impact from covid-19. Communities mobilized by DCA's and

partners' community-led approaches have during covid-19 been able to make use of their established skills and capacities and actively and with ownership applied their own adaptive responses in order to move themselves out of the crisis.

DCA continues to invest in local businesses and enhance local value chains across the nexus. For example, the Fruit Nexus project in West Nile, Uganda, which started in December 2018, with funding from the Danish ministry of foreign Affairs aims to economically empower refugees and host communities through the growing of Orange flesh sweet potatoes (OFSP) for both local and global markets. The project is implemented in partnership with private sector market actors in Uganda and Denmark and has enabled sustainable market development and entrepreneurship among marginalized groups. It links HDP-nexus closer together while contributing to the SDG targets 8 and "leaving no one behind" principle through local market development (the example can be further elaborated if relevant).

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? Please report on your institutional progress for the period 2016-2020, **even** if your institution did not become a signatory until after 2016.

By 2020, DCA has streamlined and professionalised its reporting and data systems to measure our efforts, track data and report on results (financial tracking of direct funds, global result framework and localisation indicators, etc.). We have been successful in increasing our humanitarian funding portfolio including multi-year contracts by 278% since 2016. We have successfully raised awareness within our organisation (HQ and country offices) on the localisation agenda and through advocacy continuously pushed donors to meet their localisation commitments.

On the cash workstream we are seeing very good progress in terms of cash transfer programmes multiplying and cash grants increasing as well.

We are seeing more traction for community-led interventions and more donors engaging on the initiatives and learning from sclr.

Question 5: What, in your institutional view, have been the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories, as a collective, since 2016? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think most progress has been made collectively by signatories.

As a collective the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories are in our view:

1. Enhanced commitment to progress on localisation and engage local actors more proactively as well as commit country level mechanisms and actors to lead the way –

e.g. country-based pooled funds, the GB country-level dialogues on localisation, IASC groups' engagement in leveraging localisation during covid-19, etc.

2. Increase multi-year humanitarian funding hence making it possible to plan for long term solutions in the midst of crisis and enabling a nexus approach in protracted crisis (in particular, refugee settlements, less so for conflict zones like Syria).

Question 6: What has the Grand Bargain not been able to achieve in its five year tenure? What outstanding obstacles, gaps, areas of weakness still remain after five years, in terms of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian action?

Please indicate specific commitments, *For reflection: any thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think key gaps or obstacles remain.*

In DCA's operation humanitarian transfers to L/N partners were estimated at 30% in 2016, 24% in 2017, 20% in 2018 - and 19% in 2019. The variation and downwards trend reflect both a refined tracking and calculation methodology AND that most available humanitarian donor funding favours self-implementation. In practice, collective solutions to the problems we encounter at field level are far from realised despite rhetoric and commitment to do so. The system as a whole is still not geared for change. There are too many layers in the system where traditional thinking and power dynamics persist, and as long change in these layers are not changing the system will not change. Most donors (and some INGOs/UN agencies) don't have real appetite for shifting more power and resources to local actors. Hence, it becomes cosmetic changes to the system (e.g. how to measure the 25% funding target is not consistent across signatories and reflects very different interpretation of what direct funding means).

Another key gap is the inability to address increased level of compliance. Due diligence and compliance requirements are increasingly posing a significant burden on INGOs and making it impossible for smaller INGOs and local actors to meet the requirements. This is driving focus away from deliver on needs and ensure good quality programming. It reflects a trend of upward accountability at the expense of accountability to the people and communities we serve. Following this trend, unearmarked funds become more and more earmarked with compliance targets.

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?

Risk aversion by donors (upward accountability and transparency to taxpayers) is affecting our work. We spend a lot of resources finetuning and streamlining our due diligence

mechanisms and making them fit for purpose in order to meet funding requirements and maintain funding over time. Risk aversion adds constraints to our outreach and ability to work with local actors and communities in a timely and effective manner. We become less agile when burdened with a heavy machine of due diligence and compliance. Compared to five years ago we are ourselves now more risk averse and less willing to take on risks which has a negative down spiralling effect on our partnership with local actors (e.g. channelling flexibility and multi-year funds to our local partners). This is partly due to donor compliance requirements but also governments in countries where we work have added similar or parallel demands on our work. For example, we are seeing more court cases and more legal frameworks imposed on us as a result of national legislation that hinder our work. Counter-terrorism legislation is one example.

In sum, this poses a dilemma for DCA and its GB commitments as it is impossible to both push for enabling a more locally led response while also continuously increasing the demands of compliance and due diligence.

Question 7b: How has your institution sought to mitigate or address these risks to enable implementation of the core commitments?

DCA has sought to mitigate or address these risks by through multiple strategies: meeting the requirements and setting up extra layer of compliance in our own operation – for example by developing CTL compliance (screening and documentation of staff/partners/contractors across HQ and country offices, training of all staff/partners).

In response to increased compliance and national level requirements (that affect and hamper civic/humanitarian space), DCA proactively strengthen our rights-based approach through dissemination and operationalisation e.g., our human rights defenders' fund, and in our advocacy and dialogue with donors and duty bearers.

We develop learning (compliance) tools and make them accessible to partners and we engage with partners regularly on how to meet the risks collectively, proactively, and adaptively.

Finally, our partnership approach is driven by joint learning and exchange with partners engaging them in strategic dialogue and plans for capacity development, joint advocacy and communication to monitor changes and risks in the partnership.-At an overall governance level, DCA board consults a Partner Group on the development of DCA strategies, management and overall programming where risks issues are discussed, and mitigation strategies developed.