

The Grand Bargain 2.0

Endorsed framework and annexes

June 2021

Explanation of the process and framework

On 1 February 2021, the Eminent Person and the Facilitation Group Ministers and Principals endorsed a general direction on the future of the Grand Bargain (GB) in a 4-page Annex to the meeting.

As a follow up, the Facilitation Group invited the workstreams in mid-March 2021 to take stock of the results achieved through the Grand Bargain and assess any remaining key outputs with direct relevance to the two enabling priorities of the Grand Bargain 2.0 (localisation and quality financing). The Facilitation Group Sherpas met on 26 March 2021 to discuss the proposals that the workstreams submitted and the next steps, including the Grand Bargain Annual Meeting, planned for 15-17 June 2021. As a team with vast institutional expertise including writing four Annual Independent Reviews, ODI were invited to provide their views and suggestions as independent advisors to the Facilitation Group. In parallel over the last few months, further consultations took place at constituency level. The Friends of Gender Group were also consulted to ensure their inputs are reflected and strengthen gender components of the framework.

Based on the recommendations and suggestions from these meetings and documents (workstream strategies, constituency consultations, ODI suggestions), the Facilitation Group proposes the following draft framework to operationalise the strategic direction endorsed in February, as well as elements to be further elaborated:

- **Grand Bargain 2.0 Framework**

The original overarching objective of the Grand Bargain is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the humanitarian system. There is wide understanding that this can be achieved only by bringing the Grand Bargain closer and more centred around the people we are committed to serve. For this reason, the Grand Bargain 2.0 reframes the overall objective to achieving “Better humanitarian outcomes for affected populations through enhanced efficiency, effectiveness, and greater accountability, in the spirit of Quid pro Quo as relevant to all”.

In order to achieve this impact and measure the success of the future Grand Bargain, two enabling priorities have been agreed to, (i) A critical mass of quality funding is reached that allows an effective and efficient response, ensuring visibility and accountability (ii) Greater support is provided for the leadership, delivery and capacity of local responders and the participation of affected communities in addressing humanitarian needs.

While these enabling priorities are often summarised as “quality funding” and “localisation”, they have been carefully crafted to ensure that they integrate the other crucial elements of the

Grand Bargain without which localisation and quality funding are not possible to achieve, including: efficiency and effectiveness, visibility, risk sharing, transparency and accountability - including accountability to affected populations. The intention of the enabling priorities is not to be exhaustive and limit reform-oriented efforts, but to channel efforts towards priorities that are relevant for all Signatories and that have potential for system-wide transformative impact of the humanitarian ecosystem. Throughout the framework, a critical focus on gender has been applied in line with the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) on Gender Equality.

At the June 2021 Annual Meeting, Signatories will be asked to recognise progress achieved over the past five years as described in the Annual Independent Report(s), and re-commit to the Grand Bargain 2.0, its concrete design and outputs. The Grand Bargain 2.0 Framework lays out how the Signatories will aim to achieve the overall strategic objective and the enabling priorities through four main outcome pillars: 1) Flexibility, predictability, transparency, and tracking, 2) Equitable and principled partnerships, 3) Accountability and inclusion, 4) Prioritisation and coordination. The draft framework goes on to propose the priority outputs and more detailed activities that would contribute to achieving the four outcomes. The outcome pillars do not represent continuations of workstreams, and it is not anticipated that there will be dedicated structures attached to the outcome pillars – these will function at the output level. Rather, the outcome pillars seek to cluster the outputs together and present a rational grouping that gives a sense of how the structure supports the enabling priorities and overall objective.

The purpose of the framework is to demonstrate the interconnection of the different outputs and activities; it is not exhaustive or intended to limit discussions at this stage. Framework is based on extensive feedback received from all Signatories. It is anticipated that further refinement, particularly of outputs and activities, will come out of the Annual Meeting 2021 and in subsequent discussions around operationalisation of the Grand Bargain 2.0 framework.

- **Structural Annexes: Political caucuses, Strengthened engagement of local and national actors and Examples of possible outputs and activities**

One of the recommendations for the Grand Bargain 2.0, coming from all constituencies and workstreams, is the need to elevate discussions and decision-making to a more political, strategic level. The Facilitation Group has therefore developed a proposal around “caucuses”, which involves relevant and concerned Signatories - “coalitions of the willing” - that agree to monitor, drive and encourage progress on specific commitments at the Political level. Self-appointed “champions” would take up specific actions from the Grand Bargain 2.0 framework and proactively and independently recruit other key stakeholders to work together in closed format to allow for an open and frank discussion, exchange of views, analysis of bottlenecks and decision making. The results of these discussions would then be presented for further debate or adoption with the other Signatories. This idea is further elaborated in Annex I.

The other key recommendation coming out of the surveys conducted in September 2020 and endorsed by the Facilitation Group Principals in February 2021, is agreement to put localisation and participation revolution at the centre of the Grand Bargain 2.0. To do so effectively, it is

clear that strengthening local actor engagement, as true strategic partners in the process, is required, recognising that local actors have a key role to play and that space, resources and other support is needed. Annex II lays out a few possible means of doing so. Other structural elements that have been agreed to at the Facilitation Group Principal Meeting in February include 1) the continuation of an "Eminent Person" role, to promote and foster the overall Grand Bargain 2.0 over a two-year term and 2) the continuation of a Facilitation Group, made up of representatives of all the constituency groups within the Grand Bargain.

The Facilitation Group would like to suggest that form follow function. Once there is general consensus around the Grand Bargain 2.0 Framework, it will be easier to discuss and elaborate other structural elements to support its operationalisation. It is envisaged that these discussions will take place during and after the Annual Meeting in June 2021.

Annex III is a matrix with examples of possible outputs and activities, building upon the work of the workstreams, as well as their recommendations. These outputs and activities will be further developed and operationalised also through the improvement of current targets or the definition of new ones.

GRAND BARGAIN 2.0

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE
Better humanitarian outcomes for affected populations through enhanced efficiency, effectiveness and greater accountability, in the spirit of quid pro quo as relevant to all constituencies.

ENABLING PRIORITIES

ENABLING PRIORITY 1
A critical mass of quality funding is reached that allows an effective and efficient response, ensuring visibility and accountability.

ENABLING PRIORITY 2
Greater support is provided for the leadership, delivery and capacity of local responders and the participation of affected communities in addressing humanitarian needs.

OUTCOME PILLARS

Flexibility, predictability, transparency, and tracking
 A greater amount of quality funding is transferred to humanitarian partners, including a greater proportion to local actors, to ensure a high quality response that is at scale, timely and relevant, with appropriate tracking and transparency around usage and impact of funding

Equitable and principled partnerships
 Quality funding and local partnerships must be based on a system-wide understanding of risk management (including risk sharing and transfer) and clear principles for partnerships which support local leadership delivery and capacity

Accountability and inclusion
 To achieve quality, responses must adapt to the capacities, priorities, and views of affected people, and support the agency and participation of people whose needs and vulnerability are heightened by gender inequality, disability, social exclusion and marginalisation, and humanitarians must be accountable to affected people

Prioritisation and coordination
 Quality funding targets the most vulnerable with what they need most based on inclusive consultative processes and gender analysis with affected populations, and effective coordination that promotes increased representation and where possible leadership of local responders including Women Led Organisations

LINKS WITH CORE COMMITMENTS AGREED IN 2016/2018

Core commitments on greater transparency (1.2), supporting local responders (2.1), multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding (7.1) and reduced earmarking (8.2), and harmonised narrative reporting (9.1).

Core commitments on supporting local responders (2.4), increasing cash assistance (3.1), reducing individual donor assessments (4.5).

Core commitments on joint needs assessments and analysis (5.1), engagement and accountability to affected populations (6.1) and humanitarian-development nexus (10.4).

Annex I: Political caucuses

According to [Merriam-Webster](#), a caucus usually *refers to a gathering of politicians working towards a common goal*, and is thus a useful concept as we move towards a Grand Bargain 2.0 that focuses on the political elements of driving change in how we design and deliver humanitarian aid. One of the key weaknesses of the Grand Bargain workstream approach to date is that it has treated all problems equally, creating very large groups that struggle to reach agreement on specific points.

The “caucus” approach involves relevant and concerned Signatories - “coalitions of the willing” - that agree to monitor, drive and encourage progress on specific commitments.

The caucus approach should in no way be understood as a way to exclude certain Signatories. On the contrary, self-appointed “champions”, would take up specific actions from the Grand Bargain 2.0 framework and proactively and independently recruit other key stakeholders to work together in smaller format, allowing for open and frank initial discussions focusing on identifying needs and solutions, allowing for frank exchanges of views, analysis of bottlenecks and decision-making.

The caucuses would identify solutions, under the assumption that agreements can be more easily reached between 2, 3 or 4 partners with decision-making power. Once a blueprint is ready, the process would be further extended by involving and consulting other interested Signatories, in a widening concentric circle approach, ensuring that this process does not limit consultation and inclusiveness.

Caucuses should be collaborating with each other whenever possible, ensuring a more holistic approach to the Grand Bargain 2.0. “Champions” should inform the Secretariat of the topic they want to address in a “caucus” manner and with which other Signatories. This would allow for a **transparent repository** of ongoing discussions, opening the opportunity for other Signatories to join, or reinforce cooperation.

It must be underlined that the “caucus approach” does not replace the workstreams. It is just an additional opportunity for Principals to invite their counterparts to discuss on specific topics. For instance, a “co-convenor” of a workstream would continue organising technical and other discussions through the workstream (or other forums if so decided), but the Principal of the workstream could decide to address outstanding issues with selected Principals to facilitate the technical progress of the workstream.

Individual caucuses – made up of small groups of champions - would help to **drive political change** across the Grand Bargain, showing proof of concept among smaller groups and subsequently allowing other actors to emulate and/or join the particular initiative. This is not different from what is already ongoing when Sherpas or Principals discuss together. **The purpose is to encourage such high-level involvement by giving it visibility.**

Caucuses are not intended to be formal structures – they should be flexible, adaptive, informal and peer-to-peer, focused on shared interests and a common goal, which may be a specific shift or change, or something more far-reaching.

Caucuses should ensure a variety of representation, including local actors - from big to small - who will come together and who are truly interested in a particular change. Caucuses will enable frank, transparent, honest and challenging exchange of perspectives and ideas, utilising Chatham House rules to share open perceptions without linking them explicitly to specific actors or individuals.

When needed, the Facilitation Group and the Eminent Person would use their political leverage to ensure the key players on specific issues are part of the caucus.

Caucuses would keep the Grand Bargain Secretariat, and in this way the broader Grand Bargain Signatories, **informed of their activities and members**. The Secretariat would keep an informal **repository** of the caucuses and their topics and objectives for the transparency of all Signatories that would be shared on a **quarterly basis**. This is not to monitor or control them, but rather to allow a big picture overview and ensure coherence and avoid overlapping initiatives.

The Facilitation Group would be informed by the caucuses through the Grand Bargain Secretariat. The Facilitation Group would be **providing support to ensure coherence and balanced representation**, including of local actors in the caucuses, as well as ensuring complementarity with remaining workstreams, so that framework activities endorsed at the Annual meeting remain on track.

Progress of the caucuses can be reported at the Annual meeting against enabling priorities and endorsement of outputs/deliverables can be submitted for consensus-based endorsement by one or more Grand Bargain constituencies (or a vote based on the majority principle), respectively. It must also be underlined that, in many circumstances, caucuses will address issues that might not require endorsement. A typical example would be discussions around the adoption of the "8+3" reporting format, or enhanced flexibility or multi-year funding. In this case, the Champion would approach one or more specific partners and ask for instance for the adoption of the "8+3" model. If the model is adopted, then this will simply be shared as information. If a donor decides, following a "caucus" discussion, to enhance multi-year funding, this will also be subject to information allowing for other signatories to be aware of the opportunity offered (obviously such opportunity should not be offered on a strictly bilateral basis, should that happen then it might not be considered as part of the Grand Bargain).

Annex II: Meaningful engagement of national and local actors

Although the humanitarian community has yet to negotiate and endorse a fully developed concept for the Grand Bargain 2.0, it is clear that localisation and community engagement will be at its heart. As such, local actor engagement in the Grand Bargain 2.0 deserves particular attention and consideration to ensure that identified solutions meet the needs of local actors, as peer, strategic partners in the humanitarian system. Local actors however are not a homogenous group and range from local governments to NGOs and community-based organisations (CBOs) to Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies that are auxiliaries to their governments. In addition to their diversity, local actors are also numerous, with 26,000 registered local NGOs in Bangladesh alone. Finding a feasible means to engage local actors across this spectrum in a meaningful way is therefore no easy task. Nevertheless, more could and should be done to strengthen local actor representation and inclusion in strategic decision-making in the Grand Bargain going forward.

A few possible means of strengthening local actor engagement in the Grand Bargain 2.0 are laid out below with the understanding that effective local actor engagement requires **dedicated resources**, and intentionality. A cost-sharing arrangement to support local actor engagement in the Grand Bargain 2.0 will realistically be required in order to make this happen. Furthermore, local actors cannot simply be expected to conform to existing structures and processes. Ideally, local actors themselves will engage according to their capacities, once a conducive, enabling platform for engagement is provided. The below suggestions attempt to offer a variety of engagement opportunities for local actors across several levels: global/political, global/technical, as Signatories and at country level.

At global/political level: 1 local actor representative to be a part of the Facilitation Group of the Grand Bargain 2.0.

This recognises that local actors have additional perspectives as compared to the wider NGO community that are usefully integrated at the earliest stages when the Facilitation Group, in partnership with the Eminent Person and the Grand Bargain Secretariat, is developing approaches and concepts for improvement and adoption by Signatories.

Similar to the other Facilitation Group members, this local actor representative would be an existing Grand Bargain Signatory and would rotate on an annual basis thus ensuring that no-one local actor dominates the discourse. Furthermore, it would be advisable that this seat be occupied by one of the local actor consortia¹ which represents many different local actors, thus ensuring adequate representation. Local actors should agree among themselves and nominate a representative, replicating the existing practice by other constituencies. An effort will be made to include a diverse group of national/local consortia as Signatories ensuring representation from different regions of the world.

¹ "Local actor consortia" refers to a group of humanitarian responders with a national or sub-national scope

In addition, the Friends of Gender (FoGg) group, will have a designated Facilitation Group focal point who will ensure regular engagement by and access to the Facilitation Group. Locally led womens' groups will thus have several means of engaging with the Grand Bargain.

At global/technical level: Local actors, including affected state government at the national and local level, are encouraged to engage with the Grand Bargain at the technical level, through the forthcoming structure of the Grand Bargain 2.0, the NGO and RCRC constituencies, as appropriate, and through the new enabling priorities. In this way, local actors that are not Signatories to the Grand Bargain would have an opportunity through the above forums to influence Signatories, specifically targeting those with the most financial and institutional power to effect change, sharing perspectives that Signatories have traditionally had less access to. In return, local actors would be expected to provide constructive critiques, make demands and provide examples of where they are not seeing the change they expected as a result of the Grand Bargain 2.0, as well as ideas and suggestions for how to make those changes happen. They should also engage in implementing Grand Bargain objectives, outcomes and outputs, contributing to the achievement of targets.

Local actors as Signatories to the Grand Bargain 2.0: Considering the sheer size and diversity of this constituency, priority membership in the Grand Bargain is given to consortia that can represent a critical mass of stakeholders, as well as NGOs and CBOs that have the effective capacity to implement the Grand Bargain commitments. An effort will be made to reach out, where appropriate, to recipient governments to engage in the Grand Bargain 2.0. This would be done through dedicated meetings with affected state governments.

Country level change: It is very much recognised that the Grand Bargain must move further from 'Geneva to the Front line' in order to achieve its objectives. Existing country and regional consultation initiatives driven by country level colleagues – either through government coordination, IASC forums such as the clusters, inter-cluster and Humanitarian Coordination Teams (HCT), or through less formal structures such as the proposed **National Reference Groups** (below) – will be proactively shared with local actors to engage with the Grand Bargain and challenge humanitarian and development actors that have traditionally held power in the sector. In addition, where there is energy, capacity and an identified need to do so, national-level stakeholders can form National Reference Groups, or Regional Reference Groups where this is more desirable, whose members will use the global Grand Bargain framework to hold the Country Directors of donors, INGOs and UN agencies, Humanitarian Country Teams and Humanitarian Coordinators accountable to delivering to it. Lessons should be drawn from the localisation workstreams' country level dialogues to guide the establishment/functioning of National Reference Groups and should build upon existing localisation working groups where these exist.

By exposing those with power in the humanitarian system to a 'safe space' critique of their progress against Grand bargain Objectives, they create greater political pressure to change.

The National Reference Group should ideally be small (<10 people) and may include representatives of affected people, local civil society, representatives of workers and employers

(social partners), engaged media, academics, national government, local government (including municipalities), non-humanitarian multilaterals and emerging donors.

The suggested process for establishing such a group would include a simple nomination process, either by existing Signatories or self-nomination by interested stakeholders, and appointment by the Humanitarian Coordinator. National Reference Groups would periodically report into the Facilitation Group and wider Signatories via the Grand Bargain Secretariat. Meetings with National Reference Groups would be organised, as required in order to share views, exchange information and enable National Reference Groups to feed into and influence global level discussions and decision making, including via caucuses. Furthermore, a representative of each National Reference Group would be invited to attend the Grand Bargain Annual Meeting.

In proposing this model, the Facilitation Group recognises that country level realities mean that many stakeholders who could add value to such a group, and to wider progress on the Grand Bargain at country level, are unlikely to have the time, energy or language to engage in what can be quite technical and jargon-filled discussions.

This should not prevent the model being tried where there is energy and capacity, and indicates two further points: Existing national level humanitarian structures – HCTs, Humanitarian Coordinators and others – will still need to largely drive change themselves which will require leadership and awareness. They will also need to actively create space and enable those contributions from local actors in whatever form, language, or structure they are provided.

Although creating such space may erroneously seem an additional burden on already overstretched humanitarian coordination bodies, it is likely that there will be a considerable payoff in terms of better access for local actors, improved complementarity of local and international actors, and ultimately, better humanitarian outcomes.

Appendix 1 – Suggested TOR for Reference Group.

Terms of Reference

The Grand Bargain Global/National Reference Group exists to provide a platform within the Grand Bargain and give voice to those with limited power in the humanitarian ecosystem. National Reference Groups provide an enabling environment for local actors to engage in open dialogue, and when necessary, challenge Signatories to change in a trusted environment and hold them accountable.

In a spirit of shared objectives and trust, Reference Group Members are expected to provide Grand Bargain Signatories with constructive critiques, demands and provide examples of where they are not seeing the change they expected as a result of the Grand Bargain, as well as ideas and suggestions for how to make those changes happen in the global/national context.

The Reference Group should be small (<10 people) and may include representatives of affected people, local civil society, representatives of workers and employers (social partners), engaged media, academics, affected State governments, non-humanitarian multilaterals and emerging donors. Particular attention should be paid to ensure a diversity of views in such Reference Groups, including participation and leadership of women rights' organisations and local women's organisations.

Members should be nominated by Grand Bargain Signatories or through self-nomination by interested stakeholders and will be appointed by the Eminent Person/Humanitarian Coordinator.

<Ends>

Annex III: EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES (Continuously evolving)

Outcome pillars	Flexibility, predictability, transparency, and tracking		Equitable and principled partnerships		Accountability and inclusion		Prioritisation and coordination	
	Proposed outputs	Proposed activities	Proposed outputs	Proposed activities	Proposed outputs	Proposed activities	Proposed outputs	Proposed activities
<p>Outputs and activities</p> <p>(Specific areas of focus and proposed activities to ensure the outcomes are delivered)</p>	<p>Flexible, multiyear funding (MYF)</p> <p>Greater amounts of quality funding (flexible and multiyear) channelled and use of mechanisms and instruments allowing for more effective passthrough of quality funding to downstream</p>	<p>e.g., Building on increases in flexible and MYF already achieved, increase in the volume and percentage of flexible (unearmarked or softly earmarked, untargeted) and multi-year funding, as well as timely, predictable, and other built-in flexibilities;</p> <p>e.g., faster disbursements of funding to downstream partners, including local</p>	<p>Reporting and risk</p> <p>Simplified and harmonised due diligence, assurance, reporting and risk management approaches in delivery chain, increased efficiency in delivery</p>	<p>e.g. Continued roll-out of 8+3 template by all Signatories e.g. More coherent & proportionate assessment practice e.g. Continued open discussion on risk-sharing, building on existing work done by NL and ICRC, to ensure more balance across the delivery chain</p>	<p>Collective accountability</p> <p>Improved collective accountability in responses between donors, responders and affected communities in terms of their responsiveness to the needs and priorities of affected communities, with focus on the needs and priorities of women and</p>	<p>e.g. Support cross-cutting bodies such as Community engagement and accountability (CEA) working groups more systematically e.g. Support country leadership efforts e.g., agreed donor position on collective CEA/AAP approaches and more coordinated funding approach</p>	<p>Prioritisation and needs assessment</p> <p>Coordinated, impartial, collaborative, multi- and inter-sectoral needs assessment process is in place to support analysis of data, and the subsequent prioritisation and decision-making informing funding</p>	<p>e.g., Review, approval, testing, and roll-out of Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF)</p> <p>e.g. ensure participation/leadership of local actors in needs assessments e.g. Ensure gender and inter-sectoral analysis is integrated in the JIAF</p>

	partners/ local actors ² .	actors and women-led organisations e.g., greater pass through of overhead funding to downstream partners, e.g., building on UNHCR 4% commitment where possible e.g., More funding to local actors including local women-led organisations, organisations of persons with disabilities, and those representing other marginalised people			girls as well as other vulnerable groups	e.g. support local actors' empowerment to contribute to improved accountability e.g. Accountability to crisis affected and at-risk women and girls is strengthened e.g. Strategic actions addressing the needs and mitigating the risks of violence against women and girls and advance key objectives linked to empowerment of crisis affected	allocations as far as possible ³	
--	--	---	--	--	---	---	---	--

² Balanced against need for visibility, including women-led organisations, women's rights organisations, and organisations representing groups at risk, including People with Disabilities

³ Including a connection to collective outcomes across peace and development actors as well as their respective frameworks

		<p>e.g. Progress towards reduced duplication and management costs by UN agencies</p> <p>e.g. explore more alternative best practices to provide more flexible quality funding, including strategic programme-based approaches, or earmarking in consultation with partners</p> <p>e.g. Explore linkages to the other two pillars of the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing</p> <p>e.g. Promote the strategic use of financing instruments to</p>				women and girls		
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------	--	--

		incentivise nexus approaches and reduce compartmentation of aid”						
	Transparency and tracking Improved transparency, visibility of how quality funding is used per results delivered/ impact, greater visibility of various humanitarian actors	e.g. Track use of funds, on specific issues (i.e. the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)) through publication of data in IATI and other complementary platforms e.g. strengthen accessibility and understanding of data by local actors	Role of intermediaries Clear system-wide expectations about the role of intermediaries (upstream and downstream partners) in supporting local leadership and delivery.	e.g., define and agree principles/ guidance for intermediary role, as well as for donor-first recipient relations e.g., clarity on instruments to provide targeted resources/ support to strengthen local leadership.	Vulnerability analysis Strong analysis of vulnerability, different needs and capacities in response, including their root causes as well as regular and systematic integration of affected	e.g. Perception surveys of affected populations are regularly carried out to ensure their feedback is systematically integrated into responses, with a system-wide documentation in place on how such feedback is	Cash coordination Predictable and accountable strategic coordination of Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA), particularly multipurpose cash	e.g., Agreement on predictable, accountable framework for strategic cash coordination in responses e.g. participation/leadership of local actors in cash coordination

	<p>along the supply chain from donors to local actors in a timely manner⁴</p>	<p>e.g. Establish a 2020 or 2021 baseline or mapping among donor Signatories to increase in the volume and percentage of flexible (unearmarked, untargeted) and multi-year funding</p> <p>e.g., visibility of donor contributions and local actors</p> <p>e.g. improved tracking of unearmarked and multi-year funding flows to downstream partners</p> <p>e.g. Adoption of Money Where it Counts cost</p>		<p>e.g., strong, and agreed framework for long-term technical and organisational capacity building and institutional strengthening of local actors, including increased financial support to existing pooled funds and with attention to gender.</p> <p>e.g. better alignment of humanitarian and development funding to enable more investment in</p>	<p>communities' views⁵</p>	<p>integrated and course correction adopted.</p> <p>e.g., Increased integration of specific objectives identified by communities following the principle of equality and non-discrimination (such as towards promoting gender equality and disability inclusion in humanitarian crises)</p> <p>e.g. Ensure integration and representation of all</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

⁴ including on use of overheads and unearmarked funding

⁵ including through support for community protection and accountability mechanisms led by women's organisations, networks, and groups.

		<p>classifications and definitions</p> <p>e.g. Develop an indicator to monitor the distribution of funding across the three pillars of the HDP nexus”.</p>		<p>local capacity, resilience and better address protracted crises.</p> <p>e.g. donors to establish clearer and more coherent expectations of intermediaries</p>		<p>community members, including the marginalised and disempowered , in response planning</p> <p>e.g. agencies to introduce measures to recruit, retain and promote women in leadership positions</p> <p>e.g. Improvement of Accountability to Affected People' (AAP) Results Tracker developed under IASC RG2</p> <p>e.g., Strong engagement with women-</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						led groups, Organisations of Persons with Disabilities, Indigenous People, etc. to prevent, mitigate, and respond to gender-based violence		
	Predictability Improved predictability of funding, including to local actors	e.g., higher proportion of multi-year funding down the transaction chain e.g., Published criteria for allocation and long-term partnership e.g. more nexus funding and stronger synergies with development					Inclusive coordination Coordination mechanisms more transparent and inclusive of local actors ⁶	e.g. Strengthening linkages and support the implementation of work being done through IASC RG 1 on IASC Guidance on localisation in coordination. e.g. support linkages with Nexus actors to achieve humanitarian outcomes. e.g.

⁶ including women, women's-rights and women-led organisations and persons with disability led organisations, and improve links within the humanitarian-development peace nexus (including in the fields of Social Protection , development, climate change, peacebuilding, DRR and socio-economic recovery)

		<p>funding cycles, particularly DRR and anticipatory action to allow greater alignment with SDGs.</p> <p>e.g. Improved quantity and quality of funding for local and national actors, including women-led organisations (WLO) and women's rights organisations (WRO) as well as organisations representing groups at risk, including PWDs</p> <p>e.g. commitments are met in a timely manner</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>Women's participation</p> <p>Women's participation in decision-making and leadership is enhanced and accountability to crisis affected and at-risk women and girls is strengthened in the humanitarian system</p>	<p>e.g. Women's meaningful participation in decision-making and leadership is enhanced</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--