

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

**Name of Institution:** New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

**Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview):**

Richie Hannah  
Senior Policy Officer - Humanitarian and Disaster Management  
Richard.hannah@mfat.govt.nz

**Date of Submission: 2 March 2021**

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than **5 pages in total** – anything over this word limit will not be considered by ODI in their analysis. Please respond to all of the questions below.)

### **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?**

#### Support to localised humanitarian action in the Pacific

The Pacific was impacted by two Category 5 cyclones in 2020: Tropical Cyclone Harold (April) and Tropical Cyclone Yasa (December). New Zealand emphasized support for localised humanitarian action in its responses to these disasters, with the majority of funding going directly to national and local actors:

<b>Event</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>% of NZ funding awarded directly to national and local actors</b>
Tropical Cyclone Harold	Vanuatu	61
	Fiji	50
Tropical Cyclone Yasa	Fiji	58

In both cyclone responses the support that did not go direct to local and national actors went via one intermediary.

As part of this commitment to localised humanitarian action New Zealand increased the size of its Emergency High Commission or Embassy Fund (EHEF) mechanism relative to previous years. Under the EHEF mechanism, local and national actors (including both government agencies and NGOs/civil society groups) receive New Zealand funding directly in the local currency. In addition, MFAT Wellington (headquarters level) delegates responsibility for decisions about EHEF funding allocations to the relevant New Zealand High Commission (field level) to help ensure New Zealand’s humanitarian support is closely aligned to in-country priorities.

New Zealand’s range of multi-year investments to enhance the institutional capacity of Pacific humanitarian actors supports the direct provision of funds to local actors during disaster responses in the region and New Zealand’s commitment to supporting locally led preparedness and response efforts in the Pacific is captured in Priority 1 of its [Humanitarian Action Policy](#).

#### Enhanced financial support for pooled funding mechanisms

New Zealand is a long-standing contributor to the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). In 2020, New Zealand funding to the CERF reached NZ\$12.5m including a NZ\$7m contribution to support the Global Humanitarian Response Plan for COVID-19.

Recognising the operational benefits of pooled funding mechanisms, New Zealand has also continued to increase the amount of humanitarian funding going to

country-based pooled funds and the number of funds it supports. In 2020, New Zealand contributed a total of NZ\$5.5m to three UN Country-Based Pooled Funds (an increase from one pooled fund supported in 2018).

**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? 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.

New Zealand refreshed its [Humanitarian Action Policy](#) in 2019. The Policy affirms that gender equality and women’s empowerment are priorities for New Zealand humanitarian assistance and directs us to invest humanitarian aid funding (and advocacy efforts) accordingly. A number of recent investments demonstrate New Zealand’s commitment to strengthening gender equity in humanitarian settings:

Country/Context	Partner/s	Description
Core Funding	UNFPA	New Zealand currently provides a multi-year, un-earmarked core contribution to UNFPA (NZ\$6m in 2020).
Bangladesh	UNFPA	In 2020 New Zealand provided NZ\$2m to UNFPA to support its programming with Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh.
Cook Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati	IPPF	A three year activity to strengthen sexual and reproductive health in emergencies in three Pacific countries.
Fiji – TC Yasa	Empower Pacific, Live and Learn	Funding for dignity kits for women affected by the cyclone.
Fiji – TC Harold	Various	New Zealand supported DIVA (a women’s empowerment NGO), Women Defending the Commons Network (a grassroots NGO of women activists/leaders) and Loving Islands (for communal kitchens for women’s groups)
Vanuatu – TC Harold	Vanuatu Family Health Association	Provision of sexual and reproductive health services and dignity kits for women impacted by the cyclone.

In addition, New Zealand continues to mainstream gender considerations through the New Zealand Disaster Response Partnership (NZDRP), its primary NGO mechanism for humanitarian and early recovery assistance. The NZDRP proposal template explicitly asks NGO partners to explain how their planned intervention will support enhanced gender outcomes in affected areas and requests beneficiary numbers to be disaggregated by gender, age and disability status (where possible).

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

Whilst New Zealand's steps to enhance gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian settings reflect Grand Bargain commitments, they are also aligned to wider New Zealand Government priorities.

**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.

Recognising the Pacific is one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world, New Zealand's aid and development cooperation in the region reflects nexus thinking by investing in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures alongside humanitarian action, and ensuring investments across these areas are aligned. For example, New Zealand's bilateral development programme recently invested in water security systems to reduce the risk of humanitarian needs arising due to water stress in Tokelau.

In its recovery-phase support following Pacific disasters, New Zealand looks for opportunities to support 'building back better' in order to help minimise the negative impact of future disasters. In 2020 New Zealand also launched a \$2m funding round for New Zealand NGOs and their local partners to undertake a range of COVID-19 preparedness and response activities in the Pacific.

At a global level, through both advocacy and investments, New Zealand continues to support anticipatory financing, recognising that timely mobilisation of funds before emergency needs reach a critical level can help to minimise the scale of humanitarian emergencies.

New Zealand will continue to periodically allocate humanitarian funding to large-scale global emergencies in response to spikes in need and new rapid-onset events and in some instances this funding will not be supported by complementary development or peace-building investments. This is because New Zealand is best placed to oversee nexus programming in contexts where it has a diplomatic presence or existing development cooperation programmes.

In 2020 New Zealand invested in global peacebuilding efforts with a NZ\$3m contribution to the UN Peacebuilding Fund.

### **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.

### Greater Transparency

New Zealand's score in the 2018 Aid Transparency Index was 31.0. Since that time the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade has taken steps to improve transparency around the New Zealand Aid Programme (including humanitarian aid funding), including by strengthening its reporting to IATI. As a result of these changes New Zealand's score in the Aid Transparency Index increased to 77.6 in 2020. In addition to IATI reporting, New Zealand also reports funding contributions on OCHA's Financial Tracking Service.

New Zealand's Humanitarian Action Policy was refreshed in 2019 and provides greater transparency around New Zealand's humanitarian priorities and the factors that New Zealand considers when making decisions around humanitarian funding allocations.

### Support to Country-based Pooled Funds

In 2016 New Zealand was not making any contributions to country based pooled funds. After signing on to the Grand Bargain in 2017, New Zealand examined opportunities to increase its support for pooled humanitarian funding mechanisms. In 2018 New Zealand made its first contribution to a country-based fund – the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund. This increased again in 2020, with contributions to three country-based funds: The Myanmar Humanitarian Fund, the Ethiopia Humanitarian Fund and the Syria Cross Border Humanitarian Fund.

### Multi-year and un-earmarked funding

New Zealand has increased its provision of multi-year and un-earmarked funding for humanitarian actors since 2016.

### **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.

The Grand Bargain appears to have strengthened momentum towards localised humanitarian action. The use of cash transfers as a modality has also continued to progress since 2016.

Across all work streams the Grand Bargain has provided a framework for greater clarity and accountability amongst and between the different groups of humanitarian actors;

**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, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think there remain key gaps or obstacles.

The humanitarian system would benefit from more multi-year, predictable core funding commitments from donors and broader commitment to key pooled funds like the CERF.

Nexus policy could be further strengthened by shifting more from theory/discussion into demonstrable practice, at scale and applying the learnings from practise over time.

Whilst signatories have made some progress towards localised humanitarian action work remains to be done to reduce transaction costs and ensure affected populations and their representatives have an active voice in decision-making processes.

### **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 has impacted New Zealand's implementation of some Grand Bargain commitments. For example, our limited diplomatic footprint in some geographic areas means we are not well placed to support local and national actors directly in those areas without unduly increasing financial, operational and reputational risks.

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

New Zealand has sought to mitigate or offset risks associated with implementing some of the Grand Bargain commitments. For example, recognising that it is not well placed to directly oversee humanitarian programming in some contexts, New Zealand has committed to providing multi-year and/or unearmarked contributions to humanitarian partners that we have a high degree of confidence in – both core contributions and in response to specific funding appeals. New Zealand engages closely in governance or donor support structures of our main multilateral humanitarian partners to contribute to their work and to inform ongoing due diligence around these relationships.

New Zealand has also put an increasing proportion of its humanitarian funding through country-based pooled funds, recognising that these funds benefit from decision-making occurring in close proximity to affected populations and the ability to undertake monitoring when funding local actors directly.

Provision of unearmarked funding allows New Zealand's implementing partners to decide on appropriate modalities of support, which may include cash-based programming.