Grand Bargain in 2020:

Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: OCHA

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

Cathy Sabety, Special Advisor to the Director, Coordination Division and a member of the Grand Bargain Facilitation Group

Date of Submission:
February 2021

Grand Bargain in 2020: Self-Report OCHA, NARAS

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?

Needs assessment

Strengthened needs assessment and analysis, and confidence in the data and analysis put forward by humanitarian actors through the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), is one of the key outcomes towards which the GBNA has been working. **OCHA led the development of the enhanced HPC approach**, along with the associated guidance, tools and templates and, notably, the Joint Inter-Sectoral Group which developed the Joint Inter Sectoral Analysis Framework (J)AF).

While 2019 saw the introduction and application of some of its conceptual elements, in 2020 the **Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF) guidance was endorsed by the IASC and disseminated.** Drawing upon lessons learned from its preliminary application in 2020, the **first formal application of the JIAF took place this year, in the 2021 Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs).** Funding was secured for a lean Project Management Unit, tasked with taking forward the JIAF in collaboration with all partners through 2021 and beyond.

Further enhancements were made to the HPC based on findings from the 2020 HPC Multi-partner Review (MPR). The MPR collects and analyses information from field and headquarters entities through field-level After Action Reviews, a confidential online survey for partners, and other relevant documents (e.g. individual cluster or agency reviews, gender review, disability inclusion review). Enhancements focused on strengthened integration of diversity (age, gender, disability in particular), intersectoral analysis of needs and of response options, risk analysis and forecast, and transparency of response costing approaches.

The evidence base to inform our analysis requires an ability to compile and process data and information. The **Data Entry and Exploration Platform (DEEP)** is an open-source initiative offering a structured way to do so for use in humanitarian needs analysis, while encouraging collaboration and transparency.

More than a hundred active projects[1] on DEEP collect secondary data continuously with twelve hundred users collaboratively working on these projects, collecting secondary data from around 11,000 sources and producing 83,000 information snippets. The DEEP is now used in 35 countries and 25 crises. While its primary use is to support various types of humanitarian analysis, it is also used by OHCHR for human rights violation monitoring; by UNHCR for Protection analysis; by IFRC for Americas population movement analysis, and in Turkey for Syria Crisis focusing on project evaluations.

Notable projects on DEEP in 2020 included, USAID funded multi-partner Global Information Management and Analysis Cell (GIMAC), secondary data analysis project on COVID-19 pandemic. OCHA is co-leading the GIMAC together with WHO, UNHCR, IOM and the Global Health Cluster. GIMAC supported eight country teams in 2020, using DEEP as a tool to collect and structure secondary data using an analysis framework adapted from JIAF. In addition, iMMAP also supported five additional countries producing secondary data analysis to understand the broader impacts of COVID-19 on these humanitarian crises. These projects will continue till the second and third quarter of 2021.

---

[1] Projects that are constantly updated on daily/weekly basis.

Localisation / coordination:
OCHA continues to ensure application of IASC policy underscores that international coordination mechanisms should be established when the national mechanisms are overwhelmed or unable to meet needs in a manner that respects humanitarian principles.

In terms of leadership, according to 2019 data collected NNGO across the board filled 8% of co-lead and co-chair positions of clusters at national and sub-national level, as well as TWG focal point roles. In terms of participation, NNGOs constituted 43% of cluster members and 7% of HCTs in the operations surveyed. More than half of clusters indicated a national/local language was spoken at meetings, with the use of multilingual staff to translate as needed. NNGOs held the 4th highest number of HCT seats (7%), serving on 21 of 28 HCTs surveyed. *[Please note that annual coordination mapping was delayed due to COVID-19, hence data for 2020 will not be available before May 2021. The data included here is for 2019 and was collated and analysed in March 2020].*

Furthermore, OCHA through the localisation sub-group of IASC Results Group 1 started to lead the drafting of IASC guidance on Strengthening participation, representation and leadership of local and national actors in IASC humanitarian coordination mechanisms (in the footsteps of IASC Interim guidance on Localisation and the COVID-19 response endorsed in April 2020). It is expected that the guidance will include agreed global indicators for tracking progress at country level (but also globally) in the participation, representation and leadership of local and national actors. Its endorsement is expected in April/May 2021.

Cash
Within the CVA commitment, OCHA had achievements focused on CVA integration into planning processes and the increase of CVA and MPC within OCHA managed funds.

Planning integration
OCHA supported the improved integration of CVA into the newly revised Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) with increased integration of CVA references throughout the document, focusing on feasibility both at inter-cluster and cluster level, and the provision of an optional section for multipurpose cash following feedback from the field.

OCHA engaged CashCap to support it with an internal review of Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) and Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) in 2020 (23 in total) in order to track progress and to target specific countries for support for future planning processes. All mentioned a Cash Working Group (CWG) if one existed in their context. Of these CWGs, all but two are now formally linked to the ICCG in line with global recommendations. A total of 16 HRPs in 2020 referenced cash feasibility ranging from a brief analysis (in ten out of these sixteen), to mentioning more detailed feasibility studies that were either undertaken or planned (in the remaining six). In terms of the reflection of multipurpose cash (MPC), 18 HRPs (78% of the total) utilised the optional multipurpose cash section (up from 33% the previous year).

In 2018, 2019 and 2020, OCHA developed complementary internal guidance for OCHA staff to signpost where CVA was included in the IASC approved HPC documents. This guidance was directed at OCHA staff leading the HPC process and was complemented by a series of webinars to support staff and share best practices across different contexts. OCHA updates this guidance each year in line with the enhanced HPC documents and language within. OCHA has presented the analysis and overview of CVA in the HPC within Grand Bargain meetings, the Global Cash Working Group and the CaLP Technical Advisory Group to further advocate for the correct reflection of CVA, including MPC, in planning documents.

OCHA also continued to provide targeted and direct support to individual country offices during the planning processes to ensure the transparent reflection of CVA in the HPC each year.

Increase of CVA within OCHA managed funds

OCHA's funding mechanisms Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and Country Based Pooled Fund (CBPF) adapted guidance and templates to accurately reflect the use of CVA and MPC. OCHA-managed funding instruments have actively promoted the use of CVA and MPC where feasible and appropriate and have year on year increased the percentage of funding provided through this modality.

In 2019, the OCHA Grant Management System (GMS) which captures information on both the CBPF and CERF allocations was updated and now reflects both CVA and MPC as part of its reporting. Both CBPFs and CERF have advocated for a greater use of CVA to flexibly meet the needs of people.

In 2019, CBPFs funded a total of $63million via CVA (6% of the total amount provided). Of this, INGOs made up the majority of recipients (67%), and the majority of CVA was classified as unrestricted (59%). In 2019, CERF funded a total of $48.7 million (9% of total funds). The proportion of unrestricted CVA in CERF also almost doubled from 45% in 2018 to 79% in 2019. In 2020, CERF released an $80-million funding call exclusively for CVA with a preference for MPC in 6 countries.

CBPFs

In 2020, the CBPFs surpassed the 25% benchmark by allocating 39% of total funding to local and national actors. Of $830 million allocated in 2020 (data as of 9 February 2021), $84 million (10%) went to cash programming. This represents an increase over 2019, when out of $1.03 billion allocated $65 million (6%) went to cash programming.

CERF

In 2020, CERF considerably expanded its use of cash and voucher assistance. Overall, there were 95 CERF-funded projects with cash-based components. The total value of cash and vouchers to transferred to affected people through 2020 CERF-funded projects was $134.4 million, according to available information in agencies' project proposals. Almost a tripling of the amount provided to cash programming in 2019. This included an innovative allocation of $80 million from CERF's Rapid Response Window to help stave off famine in high-risk countries. The allocation to supported cash and voucher programming in six countries, Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, South Sudan and Yemen.

With respect to localization, in June 2020, CERF made its first-ever NGO allocation, channelling $25 million in funding via IOM to 24 frontline NGOs for COVID-19 response. As the ERC has noted, "NGOs are at the heart of our global effort to contain the pandemic" and this unprecedented allocation was a way to pilot an approach to providing NGOs with more direct access to CERF funding. The allocation was successful in supporting localization, with one third of the recipient NGOs being national NGOs. Of the $500.5 million allocated by CERF in 2018[2], $137 million, or 27 per cent, was sub-granted to non-UN organizations through the partnership networks of UN agencies. Of this, $73.2 million, went to 567 national and local partners. This represents 53 per cent of sub-granted funding and 15 per cent of total CERF funding allocated in 2018. This represents the highest ever amount sub-granted to national/local

---

[2] Due to the nature of the CERF reporting cycle, this is the latest year for which comprehensive data on sub-grants is available.

partners in both absolute terms and as a proportion of overall funding, and it is also the highest ever number of local organisations in a single year benefiting from CERF funds as implementing partners.

CERF has made further efforts to improve the quality of its funding in line with GB commitments, for example through the **increased use of early disbursed anticipatory funding**. The year 2020 saw significant advances in ensuring more timely action for predictable humanitarian shocks. Anticipatory humanitarian actions undertaken in advance of forecasted climate shocks can help reduce human suffering and minimize costs of responding. During 2020, OCHA and partners operationalised Anticipatory Action frameworks in Somalia, Bangladesh, and Ethiopia and started development of frameworks in Chad and Malawi. In June 2020, the Somalia framework was activated when the established threshold for projected food-insecurity was reached and $15 million was allocated. In July, another $5.2 million was released from CERF for anticipatory action in Bangladesh in advance of severe flooding that had been forecasted with 10 days' notice and in December, $13.2 million was released in Ethiopia when the drought pilot was activated. CERF's support to these pilots has been critical to supporting innovation and the introduction and testing of new ways of working for the humanitarian system.

CERF further improved the way it assesses Accountability to Affected People (AAP), ensuring that affected communities are meaningfully and continuously involved in decisions that directly impact their lives. For each proposal submitted to CERF, the quality of AAP measures was reviewed using a stricter and more detailed approach. Notwithstanding, in more than 70 per cent of CERF-funded projects, affected people were able to participate in decisions about project design and delivery.

Finally, in support of more flexible and efficient funding, CERF in 2020 allowed more flexibility in grant implementation times when deemed necessary for ensuring and effective humanitarian response, this included longer grant implementation times if required in a given context, and increased flexibility in grant reprogramming and extensions in the context of COVID-19 restrictions.

IASC *(prioritizing quality funding and localization as these crystallize themselves as the strategic enablers of the future version of the GB arguably)*
Quality funding: COVID-19 highlighted the importance of flexible funding. As per correspondence between the ERC and the Eminent Person, the *IASC guidance to support a harmonised approach to funding flexibility in the context of COVID-19* was instrumental in making the case for more flexible financing. **Getting resources at scale and speed to frontline responders** has been at the center of the IASC's efforts. A number of IASC organizations have taken concrete steps to facilitate administrative procedures to ensure that funds are channeled quickly to NGOs. As an example, so far in 2020, UNHCR has disbursed approximately $940 million to partners. Moreover, to address the current COVID situation, UNHCR has taken very concrete measures, including increasing funding flexibility within a project, early release of installments and simplified partnership selection, to minimize administrative hurdles and expedite the disbursement of funds. This is in addition to efforts by other UN agencies such as WFP, UNICEF, UNFPA, FAO, IOM, and OCHA, together with their NGO partners, thereby speeding up the response to the pandemic.

Localisation: COVID-19 heightened the need to catalyze progress and implementation of localization commitments particularly through meaningful engagement, capacity transfer and quality funding of local and national NGOs. The IASC promoted meaningful partnership with local and national responders in coordination structures based on the Principles of Partnership. The IASC Interim Guidance on Localization and the COVID-19 Response focuses on promoting responsible partnership practices, based on the principle of equality, risk-sharing, local leadership and meaningful participation. Initial lessons learned on the implementation of this Guidance suggest that the

humanitarian system should further invest not only in increasing participation of local actors in coordination systems, but also increase the quality of their participation and ensure a two-way capacity strengthening approach

AAP: The IASC RG 2 on Accountability and Inclusion created a remote service that provides AAP support at the national, regional or global level. This Helpdesk can be found on the Results Group 2 Accountability & Inclusion Portal, a one-stop shop providing tools, guidance, policies and standards. In addition, Results Group 2 is developing a Collective Accountability Framework that outlines core commitments and concrete steps for humanitarian leadership to develop joint preparedness and response efforts that put affected people at the centre of these activities.

Financial Tracking Service (FTS) continued to support transparency through its data curation and aggregation service, providing continuously-updated information on humanitarian funding flows for close to 130 countries including the tracking of 60 response plans. In 2020 FTS tracked funding to 295 organisations for a total amount of USD 26.8 billion (24.8 in 2019) including USD 18.9 billion toward plans (17.6 in 2019). Of this total over USD 295 million were tracked to local partners (excluding international NGOs). Continuous efforts in outreaching reporting partners have contributed to improvements of financial reporting from data providers. FTS has a critical role in measuring progress on other GB commitments. In this regard**, tracking of multi-year funding and cash- based programming** has continued in 2020. The work started in 2019 on the **tracking of funding to local and national** actors was put on hold due to staffing issues in 2020 but will continue again in 2021 as funding has been secured to further progress on the over 15,000 partners' database out of which over 8,000 were already reviewed and classified.

The **IATI pilot** has progressed over the year. The work with pilot participants has brought improvements in their IATI data and insights on the data compatibility with FTS reporting requirements; The testing on data ingestion has provided feedback for further improving the FTS ingestion module which has started later than planned due to funding issues. Further at the end of 2020 a review of the IATI pilot is in progress and OCHA's Coordination Division will review its priorities on IATI including a review of staffing and funding allocation to further progress.

Substantial improvements were made within the HPC Tools suite of applications supporting the programme cycle. Beyond the regular updating of the platforms in line with the review of the HPC for 2020, the tools were further improved including on further disaggregation of Protection and AoRs. Humanitarian InSight continued to progress in the field with additional countries providing inputs. In 2021 further integrations between the GHO and InSight will be discussed.

Question 2: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment [3] 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.

The USG/ERC and ASG/DERC continue to demonstrate leadership and champion the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment both in their internal and external engagements, including through the International Gender Champions (IGC) initiative and within OCHA. OCHA remains dedicated to advancing gender equality in humanitarian action and promoting gender equality and

---

[3] Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available here.

women's empowerment, including making institutional commitments at the Deputies Committee inaugural Gender Retreat in February 2020. For the ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment, the USG delivered the opening remarks to the High-level panel on combatting and preventing sexual and gender-based violence in humanitarian crises.

OCHA's efforts to promote gender equality and women's empowerment also include ongoing advocacy through the Global Humanitarian Response Plan and the Global Humanitarian Overview where one of the thematic GHO Launches focused specifically of the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian settings. The ASG/DERC also was engaged as a key panelist in the ECOSOC Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Humanitarian Emergencies side event highlighting the importance of gender responsive programming in humanitarian action. The USG/ERC has also co-authored two OpEds with UNFPA Executive Director Natalia Kanem highlighting issues of women in humanitarian crisis, including "Women are on the Covid-19 frontline – we must give them the support they need" in the Guardian, and "The female face of Southern Africa's climate crisis" in the New Humanitarian.

Under the direction of the USG/ERC, CERF funding allocation has prioritized GBV in the recent 2020 Unfunded Window allocation for 10 countries with a special window of 15.5 million dollars which consist of 10 million to Yemen for women and girls and UNFPA and the remaining 5.5 million for GBV priorities. The allocation engaged with UNFPA GBV advisors, GBV AoR and HCTs to foster greater understanding of the GBV strategic focus. During 2020 16 Days of Activism, USG/ERC announced announcing CERF's $25 million allocation for GBV programming to strengthening GBV prevention, mitigation and response in humanitarian action to UN Women and UNFPA. The USG/ERC also co-hosted a side event at the UN General Assembly on ending GBV, together with member states and UN agencies, with Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, giving powerful remarks regarding the voice and agency of women and girls and survivors of GBV.

OCHA's Directors and Deputy Directors regularly speak, moderate, and chair dialogues on gender equality with donors, member states, and humanitarian stakeholders, as well as incorporate key messages on gender equality and women and girls in their speaking engagements. In addition, OCHA's USG/ERC co-hosted a roundtable with UNWOMEN in support of UNWOMEN COVID appeal for gender programming in COVID, giving high level visibility to gender equality and the need for funding to mitigate and prevent the impacts of COVID19 on women and girls.

OCHA's leadership is also evidenced by the partnerships with various entities, including a partnership with UNWOMEN and IFRC on a series of leadership dialogues focused on humanitarian women's leadership. Promoting women's leadership is a key priority – earlier in February 2020, the ASG Ursula Mueller convened a Women Humanitarian Leaders event with humanitarian women leaders from UN, civil society, member states, to promote, celebrate and encourage more leadership of women in humanitarian action.

The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls (GEEWG) assessed the progress on the operationalization of the IASC GEEWG agenda since 2017. The IAHE also captured the best practices and provided recommendations to further mainstream GEEWG into humanitarian action. The evaluation employed a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods and includes an analysis of humanitarian responses in ten countries (Bangladesh, Colombia, Iraq, Nigeria, Chad, Myanmar, Palestine, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen). Based on in-depth data collection and analysis for Bangladesh, Colombia, Iraq, Nigeria, the evaluation produced four case study briefs in addition to this report.

The independent evaluation team found that since 2017 the IASC made notable progress in integrating GEEWG into its humanitarian responses, especially in protracted crises. Success factors contributing to mainstreaming GEEWG into humanitarian responses included developing the IASC Gender Accountability Framework, cluster level and agency-specific guidance on gender mainstreaming, greater availability of gender advisors through the Gender Standby Capacity Project and cluster-lead agency surge mechanisms as well as increasing application of the Gender with Age Marker. Investments in the guidance, training, and availability of GEEWG expertise helped humanitarian actors to more systematically consult affected women and girls and increase collection and reporting of sex- and age-disaggregated data.

CBPFs have achieved considerable results in gender equality and GBV. In 2020, the CBPFs allocated $863 million in total, from which **$538 million (66.1%) contributed to gender equality (according to gender and age marker)**. An estimated **$34 million of this was allocated to GBV programming, continuing a steady increase since 2016 ($8 million was allocated**). Of the $860.7 million allocated by CERF in 2020, **$160.7 million (or 19 per cent) was allocated to projects with Gender with Age Marker (GAM) four.** These projects are likely to contribute to gender equality, including across age groups**. Another $341.3 million (or 40 per cent of 2020 CERF funding) was provided to projects with GAM three**. These projects are likely to contribute to gender equality, but without attention to age groups. Moreover, 9 per cent of CERF-funded projects in 2020 had GBV as their main objective and 62 per cent of CERF-funded projects included a GBV component.

OCHA continues to advocate for increased prioritization and funding for GBV initiatives in the COVID-19 response, as well as by ensuring their prioritization in CERF and CBPFs allocations. OCHA has prioritized women and girls and the prevention of GBV as one of the four strategic priorities of CERF allocation. Work continues at the country level to ensure planning for 2021 reflects GBV as a priority. One example of OCHA's prioritization of GBV is demonstrated by the CERF's Underfunded Emergencies Window allocation of $100mil for 10 countries with an earmarked amount of $5.5mil for GBV priorities; the allocation included $30mil allocated to Yemen, addressing exclusively specific issues of women and girls, including public health. Following country-level prioritization exercises, the total amount allocated by country operations to GBV-related programming increased from the $5.5mil earmarked to $22.5mil, including indirect GBV outcomes under the Health sector. The allocation engaged with UNFPA GBV advisors, GBV AoR and HCTs to foster greater understanding of the GBV strategic focus.

Another CERF innovation was the recent allocation of $25 million for GBV programming toward strengthening GBV prevention, mitigation and response in humanitarian action, as well as operational capacity development for WLOs/WROs. Another CERF first with this particular allocation is the fact that it focuses on outcome-based programming, rather than output. Implemented by UN Women and UNFPA, the GBV allocation contains both common outcomes as well as agency-specific ones, geared toward demonstrating the impact of the projects on the targeted people. The GBV allocation will be implemented during a two-year period, in 11 countries, and will conclude with a joint agency evaluation.

Its role as facilitator of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), OCHA has continued to advocate for gender mainstreaming within needs analysis, response planning, monitoring and evaluation. Over the past few years, we have seen significant advancement in these areas. Data is, where possible, collected and disaggregated by sex and age. In its role as the IASC capacity resource, the GenCap projects plays a critical role in support of humanitarian leadership in developing and implementing gender equality strategies, programming, and accountability systems, in close coordination with humanitarian partners, as well as development and peacebuilding actors, depending on context. In 2020, GenCap deployed to 16 different contexts (15 at country level and 1 at global level), up from 14 in 2019. This

amounted to over 90 deployment months in 2020, as against 55 months in 2019. Deployments served system-wide priorities, as evidenced by the GenCap project's engagement with 13 out of 25 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) country contexts.

CBPFs started to use the Gender and Age Marker in 2019 to assess/track gender elements in projects. In 2020, $538 million (66%) went to projects contributing to gender equality. An estimated $34 million was allocated to GBV - a steady increase since 2016 when the total allocated was an estimated $8 million.

Gender has been also been mainstreamed within the various activities co-implemented with partners, ensuring that data disaggregation and appropriate analysis is duly considered. This includes reference to these aspects in the Ethos principles, in the JIAF, and in training packages.

Emphasis on the analysis of how a crisis affects women and girls and both their shared and unique needs was a key focus in the development and rollout of the 2020 enhanced HPC and the elements of the JIAF that were applied to HNOs.

This past year has seen **increased focus on intersectionality, or the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage**. This has been central to ensuring that accountability and inclusion are effectively addressed, including but not limited to disability inclusion, age, and mental health. Gender viewed as binary and in isolation of these other identity characteristics is insufficient to allow us to effectively target the needs of traditionally underserved and disadvantaged populations.

To this end, OCHA has provided **training** to its staff on gender analysis and, in partnership with UNICEF, has developed and implemented a series of training modules on disability inclusion in the HPC.

The IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls (GEEWG) in Humanitarian Action and the accompanying Gender Accountability Framework, emphasise the centrality of gender equality programming in humanitarian action and holding duty bearers to account on the fulfilment of their commitments on gender. Under the policy framework, the IASC commits to the goals of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. This entails making provision to meet the specific needs of women, girls, men and boys in all their diversity, promote and protect their human rights, and redress gender inequalities. Gender Accountability framework, which was published in January 2020, emphasise the centrality of gender equality programming in humanitarian action and holding duty bearers to account on the fulfilment of their commitments on gender. This supports efforts by the IASC to monitor its own progress and hold itself accountable to the commitments contained within the IASC Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls (GEEWG) in Humanitarian Action

This is in addition, to the first thematic inter-agency humanitarian evaluation on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, issued in November 2020, assesses the progress on operationalization of the IASC GEEWG agenda since 2017. Findings indicate Gender Equality and Women and Girl's empowerment GEEWG mainstreaming has been increasingly integrated within humanitarian responses, although still not to the degree envisioned in the IASC Gender Policy. Gender expertise is increasingly found at the country level, albeit still not at sufficient levels and chiefly in longer term responses. With more gender expertise in the responses, humanitarian actors had more systematically consulted women and girls; improved in the collection and reporting of sex- and age-disaggregated data; made some progress in accounting for the needs of multiple populations and the specific needs of women and girls in needs assessment; and undertaken more nuanced analyses of

gender-related gaps, inequalities and contextual factors in Humanitarian Response Plans. Additionally, more women and girls had improved access to a greater number of feedback and complaint mechanisms across humanitarian responses. In addition, the IASC tracks mainstreaming efforts on gender in all projects, through the Gender and Age Marker. A stand-by capacity on gender, GenCap supports field deployments in humanitarian settings to strengthen priority on gender

In 2020, CERF allocated a record $65 million to support GBV prevention and response activities. This included two innovative allocations to address violence against women and girls: a dedicated GBV envelope in its second Underfunded Emergencies round of the year and a special allocation of $25 million focusing on women-led organizations and women rights' organizations working on GBV. CERF is focused on ensuring recording of lessons to be learned from these innovative allocations and has commissioned an independent review to assess to what extent these allocation and approaches have catalysed gender and GBV programming and their potential advantages and disadvantages. In addition, CERF continued to use the Gender with Age Marker on all project submissions.

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.

The **guidance for the 2021 HPC reaffirmed the importance of joint needs analysis and joined-up planning by encouraging systematic consideration in the HNO of needs assessments and other analyses conducted by development partners, and mapping and review of existing development plans to inform the strategic objective and response planning in the HRP**. The structure and content of the JIAF offer the foundation for strengthened humanitarian and development collaboration in needs analysis, and planning. OCHA provided dedicated technical support to field teams in support of this work in several countries. (e.g. Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, Niger, Nigeria and Somalia and Sudan Sudan).

Joint humanitarian needs assessment and analyses, including for the impact of COVID-19 have been shared with development partners and informed Common Country Analyses and UNSDCF planning processes in various countries that rolled out or revised their UNSDCF in 2020 (e.g. Chad, Ethiopia, Somalia). Humanitarian needs assessments and analysis will play a critical role to inform development investment and programming in countries rolling out the new UNSDCF cycle throughout 2021 (e.g. Afghanistan, Chad, Eritrea, Haiti, Libya, Niger, South Sudan etc.).

In 2020 the IASC adopted and started disseminating the 'IASC Light Guidance on Collective Outcomes' to provide RC/HCs and country teams with best practice and concrete steps to improve humanitarian development collaboration. The document strongly emphasises the importance of joint analysis and builds on accomplishments and experiences from this workstream.

Cash assistance, particularly when provided via an unrestricted format, offers an opportunity to link to longer term social protection systems in many contexts. OCHA continued to engage in opportunities to bridge this nexus via CVA. In 2020, OCHA together with CaLP undertook five 'Cash Reviews' which sought to unpack the opportunity to better link humanitarian cash systems and social protection mechanisms to rapid scale up cash assistance in response to COVID-19. OCHA also developed a tip sheet along with UNICEF and CaLP as part of the Grand Bargain Social Protection sub-workstream on linking humanitarian CVA and Social Protection. Moreover, in the 2020 planning documents, 17 out of 23 HRPs reviewed highlighted social protection systems as part of planning considerations.

In 2020, OCHA has continued to strengthen humanitarian development collaboration both at country and global level. In particular, OCHA supported the development of the IASC guidance on operationalising 'collective outcomes' across humanitarian development collaboration to reduce need, risk and vulnerability through strengthened field implementation. With IASC partners, OCHA has strengthened the HPC to foster joint-analysis and joined-up planning with the overall aim to ensure that development programming and investments are geared as well towards addressing underlying drivers of need. In addition, OCHA provides support to RC/HCs to rally humanitarian and development country teams around joint HDP priorities through the Joint Steering Committee to Advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration.

Throughout the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, OCHA continued to support and advocate for the complementary response to the humanitarian and socio-economic consequences of COVID-19. Joint analysis and priority setting have led to more comprehensive and complementarity responses in countries such as Chad, Ethiopia and Somalia.

IASC: Humanitarian-development-peace collaboration is one of the key strategic priorities of the IASC. The IASC guidance on collective outcomes provides a common understanding of analysis, funding and financial strategies and effective coordination initiatives in support of collective outcomes. The IASC has also published guidance around strengthening the articulation of peace in the nexus, specifically on the conditions under which the triple collaboration approach is of relevance: Issue paper: Exploring peace within the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus (HDPN). Upon request and in select contexts, the IASC through a system of pooled resources provides support to country operations in support of implementing the humanitarian development nexus.

CBPFs are humanitarian funding instruments addressing life saving and other top priority humanitarian needs. CBPFs seek complementarity with other funding, including humanitarian and development funding. Actual experiences vary due to the context and the financing landscape in each of the context where CBPFs operate.

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.

As Co Convener of Workstream 5, OCHA leads or is heavily involved the various projects associated with this workstream. The Needs Response and Analysis Section (NARAS) has invested heavily in this leadership and coordination role over the past five years.

Work to advance Workstream 5 initially struggled with lack of engagement and consensus on the wording and contents of the commitments. OCHA and ECHO led efforts to address this resulted in significant movement in 2019, including the development of a theory of change, and advancements were subsequently made at the working level on the technical elements of the workstream.

Several activities undertaken as part of the workstream matured in 2019, resulting in a **package of tools and guidance which were released in June 2019.** The *Workstream 5: Tools and Guidance for Advancing Coordinated Needs Assessment and Analysis Through the Grand Bargain: Progress on technical tools and normative guidance* package includes:

- Grand Bargain Principles for Collaborative Needs Assessment Ethos
- Quality Criteria for multisectoral needs assessments

- Draft conceptual Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework
- Data Entry and Exploration Platform (DEEP)
- Tools to ensure data is useful and usable

Most critical has been the development of the Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework, which fundamentally changes how we understand and reflect the needs of those we seek to assist. It was developed to deliver three key strategic objectives: (a) Improved decision making about how to respond to people in crisis through strengthened prioritization of needs and response (b) Improved decision making about how to fund people in crisis through better alignment of resources to have maximum impact (c) More streamlined, integrated and coherent humanitarian system.

While it continues to evolve, the JIAF provides an intersectoral framework for analysing the needs of people in crisis, including the causes of these needs, vulnerabilities and risks. The JIAF results are critical to inform a people-centred intersectoral response. The JIAF facilitates exchange between international and local actors, as well as across the development nexus inasmuch as root causes of needs are identified. The JIAF promises a more accurate and robust picture of the number of people in need, as well as the severity of multidimensional needs. Given the complexity of the transformational approach, the enhancements made in the HPC requires extensive coordination and collaboration with agencies with single sector mandates.

Localisation/coordination:
Increase institutional investments in the localisation of coordination, including annual coordination mapping which helps track global figures on the localisation of coordination.

Cash:
1) **Integration of CVA into enhanced HPC guidance inclusive of MPC (see above)**
2) **Increased use of CVA within OCHA-managed financing mechanisms (see above)**

In 2016, only 25% of CBPF funding went to local and national actors - 19% directly and the remaining through sub-grants. **In 2020, the CBPFs surpassed the 25% benchmark by allocating 39% of total funding to local and national actors** - 30 % directly and the remaining 9% through sub-grants. In 2019, the CBPFs introduced the simplified and harmonized 8+3 application and reporting templates for all partners.

Over the past five years, CERF has made significant progress in supporting local and national actors (LNAs) through its programming. For example, over 5 years sub-granting to LNAs has increased from $55 million to 421 partners, at the time representing 12% of CERF funding, to $73.2 million to 567 partners in the latest annual analysis, equivalent to 15% of CERF funding.

CERF's support to cash and voucher assistance has increased substantially over the course of the Grand Bargain's implementation. While there were no prohibitions on the use of cash and voucher assistance in 2016, CERF had no data on the of cash with the Fund's Grant Management System lacking the ability to record the use of this modality separately. The use of cash and CERF's ability to track it has increased considerably over the last five years, resulting in record use of cash in 2020 at $134.4 million, up from $49 million in 2019.

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 noted above, there has been significant progress on the JIAF, which benefitted significantly from the increased engagement between UN Agencies, donors, and NGOs that can be attributed to the Grand Bargain. Given the transformative nature of the JIAF and the evidence and analytical base it provides in support of inclusive and people-centred humanitarian response, we would characterize this as one of the 'main achievements' of the Grand Bargain.

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 Grand Bargain has not been able to achieve the systemic change it envisaged due to an inability to overcome the institutional and political bottlenecks.

Specific to Workstream 5, in 2017/2018 the GBNA articulated a Theory of Change to highlight the complexity and multiplicity of elements which would affect our ability to achieve the Grand Bargain Commitments and illustrate how the work is expected to contribute to long-term system-wide change.

The critical outcomes identified as central to affecting positive, long-term change were:

- **Motivation and Leadership**: At each level - organization, county and individual - this translates into the resolve to move beyond competing mandates, with strength of leadership to make needs assessment and analysis a priority in crisis situations and ensuring staff are accountable for this work.
- **Availability of financial and human resources**, inclusive of donor contributions as well as making needs assessment and analysis a priority within organizations to which resources are dedicated.
- **Knowledge and capacity** throughout the humanitarian sector: among leaders and decision-makers, staff within Donor entities, UN Agencies, NGOs, and local entities (both Government and non-Government)
- **Norms/standards, guidance, tools and methods** which must be developed, agreed upon, widely available, and jointly utilized in crises situations. This includes a code of conduct for how we operate, quality standards and criteria against which needs assessment and analysis will be evaluated, data quality and usability, and an agreed-upon joint inter-sectoral analysis framework, among others.[4]

As noted in previous years' reports, efforts during 2019 (and prior) specifically targeted these pathways, namely through advocacy with donors and senior leadership, capacity development (see 2018 report which cites work of OCHA and ACAPS), and the development or revision of existing norms, standards, tools and methods. Most of these achievements essentially addressed the normative challenges. Much remains to be done to influence positive changes in the other critical outcomes identified.

Additionally, the **JIAF**, one of the most significant outcomes of the GBNA**, is complex technically and has political implications as it requires a different way of working particularly by organisations with**

---

4 Some of these normative tools and guidance already existing, including but not limited to the *IASC Operational Guidance on Coordinated Assessments in Crises*; and *Operational Guidance on Responsibilities of Cluster/Sector Leads & OCHA in Information Management.*

a sectoral mandate. It will take time before a conceptually robust framework is fully developed, and agency policies and staff evolve their sectoral approaches into a collective analysis of needs and more comprehensive responses to needs.

The **role and implication of donors also needs to be reinforced**. Efforts to develop the JIAF and enhance the relevance and credibility of the HPC should lead to donor support to both the needs assessment process and the HPC and resulting appeals. People centred needs assessments that encompass severity criteria allowing for reinforced prioritisation serve not only agencies in terms of programming and coordinating, but also donors in terms of allocations and, in a spirit of the **quid pro quo** at the foundation of the Grand Bargain, to allow for more flexible funding.

Localisation:
Localisation across different streams of humanitarian action still remains an elusive concept. While progress has been made on quantitative indicators related to funding allocation to local/national responders, local organisations still do not believe they are fully involved in or consulted on critical decision-making processes or assume a sufficient level of leadership in some coordination structures. Concerns still remain around the equitable sharing of administrative costs between international responders and their local/national implementing partners.

Cash:
While cash coordination was repeatedly raised and a 'political blockages' workstream was created, no progress on coordination or addressing the political hurdles to increased CVA was achieved. While the GB brought together a range of different stakeholders offering relevant input to the topics discussed, there were limits to how far issues requiring system-wide IASC agreement (such as cash coordination) could be addressed through the GB workstream.

Financial Tracking:
Financial tracking through the Financial Tracking Service remains difficult though significant progress has been noted over the years with more engagement from donors and partners alike apart from NGOs which remain more difficult to reach and get regular reports from. In addition, the use of Ngo consortia has at times made the work more difficult to properly disaggregated and track funding through comprehensive flows. The reporting remaining on voluntary basis continues to hamper the presentation of a clear picture of financial flows. The increasing use of activity-based planning and costing over the use of projectized plans has also further complicated the tracking as increasing amounts of funding can't be realistically allocated or tracked, this against the backdrop of increasing requests for more disaggregation.

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?
As noted above, the **JIAF is complex technically and has political implications as it requires a different way of working particularly by organisations with a sectoral mandate**. As such, it is at times perceived as a 'risk' which could reduce or divert focus on specific sectors, clusters or Agencies.

Since 2016 CBPFs have advanced Grand Bargain commitments as outlined above. Promoting localisation implies corresponding attention to risk management and ensuring good stewardship of resources.

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

Through the Joint Inter-Sectoral Analysis Group, the Grand Bargain on Needs Assessments, HPC Steering Group, Global Cluster Coordination Group, and others, OCHA has worked with partners on the development of the JIAF in a highly consultative manner. The aim is to ensure collective ownership of the JIAF.

CBPFs adopt a risk-based approach that analyses and mitigates risks both at the Fund level and at the partner level. Through a thorough assessment of the risks posed by the operating context and rolling assessment of the capacities and performance of partners, CBPFs are able to use different oversight modalities to mitigate and manage risks. The approach has been continuously strengthened since 2016 and continues to evolve.

Additionally, OCHA has developed and introduced Standard Operating Procedures to respond to risks associated with financial or sexual misconduct by CBPF implementing partners. These SOPs are designed and implemented in close collaboration with OIOS Investigations Division and allow for effective response that deters and prevents further occurrence.