

# Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

## CHRISTIAN AID

### Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency .....	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	3
2. Progress to date .....	3
3. Planned next steps .....	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	3
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	3
Work stream 2 - Localization .....	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	4
2. Progress to date .....	4
3. Planned next steps .....	4
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	5
Work stream 3 - Cash .....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	6
2. Progress to date .....	6
3. Planned next steps .....	6
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	6
Work stream 4 – Management costs .....	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	7
2. Progress to date .....	7
3. Planned next steps .....	7
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	7
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment .....	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	8
2. Progress to date .....	8
3. Planned next steps .....	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	8
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution .....	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	9
2. Progress to date .....	9
3. Planned next steps .....	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	9
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding .....	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	10
2. Progress to date .....	10
3. Planned next steps .....	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	11
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....	10

1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	12
2. Progress to date .....	12
3. Planned next steps .....	12
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	12
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	13
2. Progress to date .....	13
3. Planned next steps .....	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	14
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement .....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	14
2. Progress to date .....	14
3. Planned next steps .....	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	15

## **Work stream 1 - Transparency**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Christian Aid has published IATI reports since 2012, covering only DFID funded work. An open information policy was published in December 2009 which set out a general commitment to transparency and provided links to several further documents and policies. Before the Grand Bargain was signed, we had recognised that our approach to transparency needed to be updated, especially in the light of technological advancements that made it possible to bring significant amounts of data in front of people in interesting ways. At the time of signature, we were in the process of rethinking our approach and the Grand Bargain provided an opportunity to take into account a tangible objective during that thinking.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

Christian Aid's new [open information policy](#) was published in November 2016. It makes openness the default position of Christian Aid, with data only being withheld if it meets criteria listed in the policy. Our new approach recognises that as well as making information available on request, we should also take active steps to bring information in front of people in engaging ways, prioritising the information that is of widest interest.

To that end, we have developed a tool to directly access data in Christian Aid systems and present it in interactive visualisations. We use this tool internally, and we realised that much of this information would be of interest to members of the public. We then developed a prototype public version. The tool is called Helicopter and can be accessed [here](#). Currently it only shows information from our DFID Programme Partnership Arrangement funded work.

We have also been engaging with IATI and preparing to publish much more information in IATI format. This has included work with other ACT agencies who were partners in a joint response to drought in Zimbabwe. The IATI reports that have been developed for this work are a first attempt by Christian Aid to use the results fields and the fields that allow joint work to be traced between different organisations' IATI reports.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

Christian Aid is planning to make much more data publicly available in the coming years. If learning from the Helicopter Public prototype suggests that people have found it a useful way to engage with data, progressively more information will be included. The initial focus will be on making data available from all funding streams, rather than just institutional donors.

To complement this, a major revision of its IATI reporting system in the first half of 2017. Where appropriate, this will include making use of the recent changes to the IATI schema to facilitate reporting on humanitarian activities. In connection to our commitments under Charter for Change, we also plan to use IATI reports to publish data on our progress towards localisation goals (for example the proportion of our humanitarian funding that is disbursed to local and national NGO partners).

## Work stream 2 - Localization

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Christian Aid works through national and local partner NGOs and does not do direct implementation. Christian Aid is a co-founder of the Charter for Change. Christian Aid in its submission to the WHS 'Making the World Humanitarian Summit worth the climb' was the first to propose a target for increasing funding to national and local actors from the derisory 0.2% reported by Development Initiatives Global Humanitarian Assistance report. Christian Aid worked with Action Aid, CAFOD, OXFAM and Tearfund to launch the series of Missed Opportunities reports evidencing the need for greater investment in local and national humanitarian actors. Christian Aid is a consortium member of four important initiatives funded by the DFID Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme which seek to build the humanitarian preparedness and response capacities of local and national NGOs in innovative ways: the Financial Enablers programme (Philippines), led by OXFAM; the Linking Preparedness Response and Resilience Programme which Christian Aid leads (Kenya and Pakistan); the Shifting the Power programme which Action Aid leads, and Christian Aid leads in Bangladesh (Bangladesh, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya and Pakistan) and the Transforming Surge Capacity programme, which Action Aid leads, and Christian Aid leads in Philippines.

### 2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

We have worked with Start Fund and Action Aid, CAFOD, OXFAM and Tearfund to propose and develop a National NGO Window of the Start Fund in DRC, Kenya, Pakistan and Philippines to establish a new channel whereby donor can direct money directly to NNGOs.

Christian Aid has undertaken an exercise with its 8 Regional Emergency Managers to manually classify the 175 current humanitarian partner organisations that Christian Aid funds into the 5 Development Initiatives Global Humanitarian Assistance report categories of NGOs, and designated them as such in our financial management information system, so as to be able to generate figures as to how much of our 2015/2016 spend was channelled through national and local NGOs. We have hence arrived at

Type	Number of partners	Percentage of spend
International NGOs	7	8%
Southern International NGOs	4	5%
Affiliated National NGOs	4	4%
National NGOs	61	62%
Local NGOs	21	22%

In order to be able to track our humanitarian capacity building spend which we do not currently have a way of measuring, we have established a new activity code for humanitarian capacity building in

our financial management information system, so that in future the system will generate data on capacity building spend.

We have undertaken to review our Partnership Agreement and Partner Principles to ensure alignment with Charter for Change commitments.

We have undertaken to develop internal guidelines for media, comms and PR staff to ensure that we give visibility to local actors in all our print and digital comms, publications, reports, press releases, channels, website and social media.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

By 2018, in collaboration with Start Network partners, we will significantly strengthen the humanitarian capacities of at least 100 local and national NGOs, through the “Shifting the Power”, “Financial Enablers” and “Transforming Surge Capacity” programmes.

We will continue to work with the Start Network to advocate for and set up a pioneering new Start Local Fund, for the exclusive access of national and local NGOs.

## **Work stream 3 - Cash**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

We have recruited 2 cash experts to drive forward cash within the organisation. We have held a global cash workshop for humanitarian staff to train staff in key cash precepts and brainstorm the best way to move forward the cash agenda within the organisation. We have achieved an increase from 9% to 21% of the proportion of our humanitarian funding going as cash.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

We have rolled out cash training for staff and partners. We have secured internal funding to pilot a private sector cash beneficiary data management system to improve the efficiency and digitalisation of cash transfer programming within the organisation. We have established a policy of looking at the scope for using cash at the start of every humanitarian intervention.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

Our main agenda is to roll out the beneficiary data management system to improve the security and reduce the risk around our cash transfer programming SOPs. Second we will continue to have our two cash specialists roll our best practices training with our country teams and partners in all key countries of humanitarian concern. Third we intend to identify the resources internally to join CALP.

## **Work stream 4 – Management costs**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

We have not yet allocated significant attention to this area. The organisation has looked at its cost charging processes/ standards (hence the new direct cost policy published last year) and conducts a financial review every year around indirect costs.

## **Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment**

### ***1. Baseline (only in year 1)***

*Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?*

Christian Aid has used in-house materials for assessments with partners over many years. Mostly assessments were paper based, sectoral and undertaken with partners and sister-agencies. Co-ordination has always been an important area of focus for Christian Aid and we have shared data as much as possible through the cluster co-ordination mechanisms.

### ***2. Progress to date***

*Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?*

We have developed a digital RNA and we are actively moving assessment templates onto a digital platform. We are members of the HDX and we are in the process of ensuring staff can access and upload datasets including assessment data to improve co-ordination. As the HDX is open source all our assessment data once uploaded will be available for all. We are working to ensure we are involved in joint assessments and cross-sectoral assessments where possible and actively seek to engage in co-ordination on the ground in relation to assessments.

### ***3. Planned next steps***

*What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?*

As a partnership based agency we intend to resource partners as much as possible to engage with the digital platforms being used for assessments. This creates a resource challenge in terms of capacity and finance but it is very much in line with our commitments on localisation. Local organisations can provide the timeliest information during a humanitarian crisis and can contribute greatly to the speed of a response and the effectiveness of any humanitarian response plan.

## **Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution**

### ***1. Baseline (only in year 1)***

*Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?*

Christian Aid has long standing commitments on accountability and participation. We were a HAP certified agency from 2010 onwards and have invested significant resources since then on accountability practices with partner organisations and in local communities where we work. We are a CHS certificated agency and accountability is central to all our programmes.

### ***2. Progress to date***

*Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?*

In line with progress under other commitments, we have undertaken partner and community level surveys on accountability using digital technology. This has allowed us to collate and compare data from different contexts and to engage communities directly in shaping our programmes of work. Through working groups, we have shared the survey templates with other agencies working on the CHS commitments. The surveys include integrated indicators on inclusive programming to ensure the voices of the most vulnerable at community level are heard.

### ***3. Planned next steps***

*What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?*

We are working to ensure communities can access the technology to provide feedback and participate more meaningfully in accountability practices with our partners. We intend to strengthen the feedback loop from data collected and acted upon at local and national level to ensure learning can be transferred across programmes and with other actors. The use of digital technologies greatly enhances the potential to take this work forward within the next two years.

## **Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Christian Aid recently completed the management of a five-year £6.3 million UK Aid-funded Conflict, Humanitarian, Security and Justice Programme Partnership Arrangement (PPA) programme. The PPA provided strategic funding which was used to deliver work in nine fragile and disaster prone countries (in addition to a broader £29,979,640 PPA working in thirteen countries, focused on longer term development). This funding was used to make significant changes across our organisation.

We used PPA strategic funding to shift away from our business as usual models across the organisation, by promoting more adaptive and integrated programming based on our resilience work. The funding also allowed us to develop new and innovative approaches and technologies, for instance in developing digital data gathering systems to collect better data. We strengthened our organisational systems to better work with our partners and improve our efficiency and effectiveness.

PPA programmes across 22 countries focused on using the funding to leverage new resources and develop partnerships among actors to address humanitarian and development challenges, not only from Governments and NGOs but also from the private sector. Along with our partners, we successfully linked humanitarian and development actors in fragile contexts, particularly through network-building.

PPA funding was also used to strengthen our programme evidence to inform sector-wide debates and global policy. Tools such as participatory vulnerability and capacity assessments (PCVAs) were used to ensure the involvement of the community in planning and reviewing projects. During this time, we reaffirmed our commitments to inclusive programming and accountability, launching an inclusive programming framework and securing certification against the Core Humanitarian Standard.

We also updated our Resilience Framework, centring it on the key principles of power, gender and inclusion, Do No Harm, community-led processes and accountability. This brought together our thinking in a framework that is applicable across development and humanitarian contexts and consolidated efforts to develop an approach to programming that reflects on multiple risks and brings together different sectoral interventions such as health, DRR and governance.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

We are working with our partners to begin to implement a three year 'Health Legacy' programme, working in three fragile countries (Sierra Leone, South Sudan and Burundi) to promote health outcomes for vulnerable groups. This is bringing our health development work and humanitarian work closer together based on learning from our PPA programmes and resilience framework, bringing together a range of different interventions and actors to tackle health risks. The planning approach is adaptive, and coordinates with a wider Irish-Aid funded programme which will be running over a similar period of time. The approach will include 6-month planning and review sessions involving communities and project staff. The learning from this adaptive planning approach

will be documented during the project and used to develop stronger multi-country programmes in the future.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The Health Legacy programme will run from April 2017 until the end of March 2020.

## **Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

We have not made significant efforts thus far in this domain. We fund ACT partners through ACT appeals and in the past tended to earmark this to a specific partner in the Appeal whose programme we found most compelling.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

We have worked with ACT Secretariat, Norwegian Church Aid and other ACT peers to reform the ACT appeal system, including to bring it into line with the WHS reform agenda. This will enable us to aim to provide unearmarked rather than earmarked funding to future ACT appeals, with greater confidence in the robustness of the underlying system.

## **Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

All of our programming is done through implementing partners. The management of the relationships with these partners is the responsibility of country programme teams that are usually based within the country in question. Certain procedures are in place that are common for all of our partners, although there has been a significant amount of freedom to allow those managing the partnerships to agree project progress and financial reporting formats that they believe to be appropriate in that context. This balances the information requirements against the expected burden for partners. The differing reporting requirements of institutional donors has a knock-on effect on the reporting formats that we expect our partners to use in different contexts, meaning that a partner could fill out one reporting format for a project supported by our core funds, and a very different format for a project that uses funds originating with an institutional donor.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

We have begun examining some processes to look for ways to simplify information gathering from partners. For example, we have aligned a revised internal process for monitoring our partnerships with the requirement to gather feedback on particular questions from partners as part of our Common Humanitarian Standards commitments.

We have also looked at the use of digital tools to make reporting processes more efficient. For example, we are beginning to replace Excel and Word-based reporting formats with forms built in KoBo, which are easier to understand and tend to gather cleaner data the first time round without requiring a time-consuming back and forth with those providing the information.

We are engaging with DFID on the question of whether IATI is an appropriate format to gather information from partners. Our Data and Transparency Advisor is coordinating a group of UK NGOs to examine the implications of a suggested requirement that our partners receiving DFID funding should publish information to IATI. This engages with the possibility of whether IATI reporting could be the way that reporting is harmonised across different institutional donors and the NGOs like Christian Aid that then sub-grant to implementing partners.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

We plan to continue examining the potential of IATI to publish results and harmonise reporting through revising our own reporting formats and engaging with DFID on the use of IATI in their own reporting processes. We also plan to continue producing simple to use and efficient digital tools to make it easier to gather key information from our partners and reducing the amount of time that they require to provide it.

## **Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Christian Aid has been working on different workstreams in the past five years (2010-15) across the organisation and country teams. The humanitarian division have explored and rolled out HAP (now CHS), protection and inclusion across several countries and led the resilience agenda through the DFID CHASE PPA. At the same time the development side of the organisation have pushed forward our thinking and work on gender, health, governance, pro-poor markets and climate services through IrishAid, DFID General PPA, ECRP and several DFID service contracts.

In March 2016, Christian Aid has developed an updated Resilience Framework building on several years of field practice and understanding on these themes for an holistic programmatic approach linking humanitarian and development best practices. The framework has the aim of leading our programmatic work.

### **2. Progress to date**

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In 2016 the new framework has been rolled out in 25 countries programmes (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, DRC, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi, Mali, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, OPT, Philippines, South Sudan, Zimbabwe, Pakistan, Nepal). 5 countries (Philippines, Kenya, Burundi, Bolivia, Malawi) have updated their programme plans based on the framework.

An ACT consortium (DCA, CA, FCA, ICCO and Diakonia) has implemented an EUAV capacity building project (2016-17) to strengthen capacity of 48 local organisations in Cambodia, Myanmar, Nepal, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, South Sudan and DRC to mainstream DRR/resilience into development. The Christian Aid led DFID funded Linking Preparedness Response and Resilience consortium project (2015-17) with Action Aid, Concern, Muslim Aid, KCL, World Vision and Saferworld has conducted a research with KCL to understand how humanitarian response can build or not undermine resilience and field tested a new methodology developed by Saferworld (community security organisation), Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience in Kenya, Pakistan, Myanmar and Honduras to build resilience in fragile settings.

The Christian Aid led DFID funded Preparedness and Early Response to Public Health Emergencies” project in Gambella Region of Ethiopia (2015-17) with Amref, the Federal Ministry of Health and National Meteorology Agency is integrating traditional humanitarian preparedness approaches within the health system to strengthening the health system of Gambella

In 2016 Christian Aid has successfully secured funding from IrishAid for a programme based on the new Resilience Framework in Angola, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, IOPT, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe (Programme grant) and DRC, Burundi, Lebanon, South Sudan and Myanmar (HPP) linking governance, humanitarian response, protection and resilience.

Christian Aid leading the DFID funded Shifting the Power project (2015-17) in Bangladesh aimed at building local capacities which are useful for both humanitarian and development work

All the above are framed by the updated resilience framework which has the aim at approaching holistically the humanitarian -development nexus

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

In the next two years (2017-18), Christian Aid will look at securing funding to mainstream the Resilience Framework. The planned new funding opportunities are: ECRP II, DEPP II (DFID) and DFID Aid Connect. We'll explore opportunities to collaborate with the insurance sector for risk reduction measures.

The LPRR is planning to roll out the new approach in 2 countries (Kenya and Myanmar) capturing and sharing learning to influence the wider sector offering practical approaches to link humanitarian response to long term development.

The IrishAid (Programme grant and HPP) implementation will offer opportunities to capturing and sharing learning to influence the sector offering best practices to link governance and humanitarian sectors