

2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – [CHRISTIAN AID]

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	4
4. Efficiency gains	4
5. Good practices and lessons learned	4
Work stream 2 - Localization	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	6
2. Progress to date	7
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned	8
Work stream 3 - Cash	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned	10
Work stream 4 – Management costs	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	12
2. Progress to date	12
3. Planned next steps	12
4. Efficiency gains	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned	12
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	14
2. Progress to date	14
3. Planned next steps	14
4. Efficiency gains	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned	14
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	16

1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	16
2. Progress to date.....	16
3. Planned next steps.....	17
4. Efficiency gains	17
5. Good practices and lessons learned	17
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps.....	19
4. Efficiency gains	19
5. Good practice and lessons learned	19
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps.....	22
4. Efficiency gains	22
5. Good practices and lessons learned	22
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	24
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps.....	25
4. Efficiency gains	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	26
2. Progress to date.....	26
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	28
5. Good practices and lessons learned	28

Work stream 1 - Transparency

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.*
2. *Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).*
3. *Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:*
 - *accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;*
 - *improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;*
 - *a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and*
 - *traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.*
4. *Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data.*

Transparency work stream co-conveners reporting request: How will you use the data from IATI within your organization including, for example, for monitoring, reporting and vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments?

We have been publishing IATI reports for a number of years and the system that we use to generate the reports also generates internal data visualisations that we use in learning and decision-making. This tool includes data that is published to IATI alongside other data that does not fit within the IATI schema.

Our systems are currently not fully aligned to allow us to track some of the Grand Bargain commitments in anything approaching 'real-time'. We are working to remove that obstacle and, once we do, we can begin to use the data that will later be published in IATI reports to keep track of our performance on localisation and take corrective action without waiting for reporting periods.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 has gone beyond IATI reporting by publishing the first full version of Helicopter Public, allowing members of the public to interact and engage with data rather than rely on tools that link to the IATI Registry. Through Helicopter, users can filter projects related to emergency response and view information about the objectives of the work and the partners involved. This version will be updated and publicised in the first half of 2018, after we have ironed out bugs and increased the amount of data.

We have also engaged with conversations to agree final definitions for the categorisation of actors. For example, Christian Aid's lead on IATI spoke to Development Initiatives and contributed to topics on IATI Discuss relating to how the IATI standard can be changed to allow for reporting funding flows to local and national actors.

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)?

A further revision of our IATI reporting system is nearing completion, which will again increase the amount of data that we publish. We will then focus on how our internal systems can track financial flows under the confirmed definitions of local and national actors, which will then allow this information to be added to the IATI reports. Helicopter Public will also be updated so that people accessing the tool with a specific interest in localisation will quickly be able to find the data that they need.

We also plan to continue to share our experiences of transparency with our networks, including the Charter for Change signatories and British NGOs through the Bond Transparency Group. We hope that our learning from publishing data to IATI and through Helicopter Public will help other organisations to move forward.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Although it is too early to say that there have been efficiency gains from the publication of data under the Grand Bargain commitment to transparency, our work has influenced wider work within Christian Aid on how to integrate transparency within a wider approach to how data flows through the organisation. For example, the understanding that we have to publish data on the extent to which humanitarian funding is channelled through local and national actors has prompted a review of how work is designated as humanitarian within the various CA systems. When greater standardisation is achieved it will provide further opportunities for evidence-based learning and decision-making. This should in turn allow us to understand how better to support our local partners as they implement projects with us.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

In the experience of the transparency lead at Christian Aid, making IATI the dominant means by which information is made accessible can be counterproductive. Although IATI must be part of a comprehensive approach to transparency, it is difficult to generate enthusiasm for it

across different teams in a large global organisation – it is technical and seems quite far removed from operational realities for project delivery. We have had more success in talking about our Helicopter Public tool and the way that we are presenting information through that. The conversation is much more accessible, which means that more people are taking decisions in their work that support transparency. Because the data in Helicopter is largely the same data represented in IATI reports, this has meant that the quality of our IATI reports will actually benefit from the fact that IATI is not the main focus of our transparency approach, as counterintuitive as that sounds.

Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.*
2. *Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.*
3. *Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.*
4. *Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.*
5. *Develop, with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and apply a 'localisation' marker to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national responders.*
6. *Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CBPF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.*

Localisation work stream co-conveners reporting request: What percentage of your humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders

(a) directly (b) through pooled funds, or (c) through a single intermediary?¹

In the latest period for which figures are yet available (UK financial year 2016/7), an estimated 56% of our humanitarian spend was sent to partners in grants. Of this 56%, 85% was allocated to local and national organisations directly. (Unfortunately, our finance systems cannot track pooled or single intermediary funds once they leave Christian Aid accounts).

We will try to fill out the full data sheet footnoted as soon as we can. Our current data systems, which leave some room for improvement, do not generate all this kind of data at the touch of a button, so it is not an entirely straightforward endeavour to gather the data the Grand Bargain requires. And there are devils lurking in the detail. (Regardless of our

¹ The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure ([available here](#)) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form ([available here](#)) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with your self report is optional, but encouraged.

relative data unsophistication, we are confident that we meet the aspiration of channelling at least 25% of our funds via local actors.)

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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're working with consortia of like-minded INGOs on various flagship consortium localisation capacity-building programmes including the DFID DEPP-funded Christian Aid-led Linking Preparedness Response and Resilience programme in Kenya and Pakistan which is researching and piloting ways to put local communities and the small local organisations that represent them in the lead of their own response and recovery; Action Aid-led Shifting the Power project which is strengthening the ability of 55 LNGOs in Bangladesh, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya and Pakistan to take a powerful role in humanitarian leadership and coordination structures in their countries; Oxfam-led Financial Enablers project in Philippines which is experimenting with putting NNGO consortia in charge of choosing and running their own capacity building programmes without INGO interference; Action Aid-led Transforming Surge Capacity project in Philippines which is exploring ways of localising surge; and ECHO ERC HIP-funded Christian Aid-led Accelerating Localisation through Partnership project in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and S Sudan which is researching and piloting best practice in INGO-NNGO partnership. For example we lead the Shifting the Power consortium in Bangladesh which helped facilitate the establishment of the new and growing Bangladesh NNGO network NAHAB. We helped to organise the localisation session of the Humanitarian Forum-led WHAF Conference in London. NGO signatories to the Grand Bargain have appointed co-champions for each of the ten workstreams to galvanise energetic NGO engagement – we are a co-champion for this one. We are a founder member of and on the steering committee of Charter for Change, where working alongside 30 like-minded peer INGOs we are trying to identify and demonstrate best practice in INGO engagement with NNGOs/LNGOs and do energetic joint advocacy to the sector. We chair the ACT Alliance humanitarian group, and working with ACT colleagues have achieved that ACT's own Rapid Response Fund is now only eligible for Southern ACT members. We chair a small group of interested INGOs that has been established as a sub-group of the Conflict Humanitarian and Security Dept (CHASE)/DFID quarterly Humanitarian Directors meetings, and we have held three meetings with DFID to discuss how we can work together as a UK humanitarian community to further localisation. The group developed a paper which we presented to DFID with 13 ideas of steps that DFID could take to accelerate localisation. We developed proposals for a National NGO window of the Start Fund and we have held discussions with the Govt of Belgium about prospective funding for this.

Gender: We have looked to build on our contributions to the Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP) Age and Disability Capacity Building Programme (ADCAP) into our work on localisation, most prominently through Linking Preparedness Response and

Resilience (LPRR). In the latter, local staff and partners have been trained on inclusive programming approaches to support community led responses that incorporate and empower diverse groups and individuals. Numerous women's groups have come forward to pilot small grants in Northern Kenya as part of the East Africa Response for example. Inclusive methodologies are also being applied in the current ECHO programme "Accelerating Localisation through Local Partnerships" in order to facilitate diverse representation and engagement.

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 work with ACT Alliance, Church of Sweden, DanChurchAid, Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe and Local2Global Protection initiative to mobilise resources for, replicate and scale up our emerging practice on Survivor Led Response. We plan to urge DFID and ECHO to make localisation a priority theme in future iterations of post-DEPP and post-ERC HIP funding, and to work with like-minded peer INGOs and local partners on follow-up funding proposals to build from the best of our joint DEPP work described under the previous question. As part of localising localisation, we intend to shift leadership of our global localisation policy and advocacy work to the Philippines.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

We believe that working with like-minded allies to strengthen the capacity of our local and national partners to take a bigger role in humanitarian response efforts in their own countries, over time reduces the cost of global humanitarian response, by over time reducing the need for expensive international operations.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Working in alliances, consortia and networks, such as the Charter for Change, the ACT Alliance, the Start Network and DEPP has proved effective as it enables us to have a louder voice, to achieve greater scale, and to learn from the achievements of peers. Charter for Change has been one of the successful developments in the localisation arena, and because we have 31 signatories, including meaningful agencies like CARE, CRS and OXFAM, we are quite influential. We pay tribute to CAFOD for being one of the visionary leaders of that initiative. Some of the localisation debates have not sufficiently included Southern voices which is counter-intuitive. If at least 25% of funds should go to national and local front-line responders, at least 25% of the seats at important global meetings about localisation should go to national and local front-line representatives. Since pooled funds are one of the mechanisms that have been able to channel significant resources to national actors, we should seek to set ambitious targets for the share of pooled funds that national actors receive. ACT Alliance is to be congratulated for leading the way on this with its 100% Southern RRF.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*
 2. *Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*
 3. *Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*
 4. *Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*
 5. *Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*
 6. *Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*
-

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 ensured adherence to our previously agreed policy to consider cash as the primary humanitarian response modality; this has been borne out by the deployment of a cash advisor at the beginning of each humanitarian response to assess feasibility of interventions delivered using cash.
- CA currently has 2 cash advisors, recruited as part of our commitment to scale up cash programming. One of the cash advisors has been deployed to Nigeria, where the lion's share of CA's cash programming is ongoing as part of the displacement crisis in the Northeast.
- We have continued to roll out training for staff and partners on cash and markets, with 3 sessions taking place in the UK, Nepal and Nigeria.
- We have successfully completed a pilot project using a private sector cash beneficiary platform and data management system (Segovia) to improve the efficiency and digitalisation of cash transfer programming.
- We have become a member of CaLP.

Gender: Partners undertaking cash programming in Kenya have been trained on inclusive programming approaches and incorporated approaches into design. For example, data has been disaggregated by age and sex and advisory committees formed to ensure that those who are not familiar with technology understand how to access their credit and cash funds – this has largely targeted older community members for example.

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 North East Nigeria where CA is delivering significant volumes of in-kind food with WFP. We have advocated to shift to cash instead of in-kind where this is feasible. CA will undertake an exercise to document this shift from in-kind to cash delivery, which will allow us to build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash relative to in-kind assistance.
- We will undertake a review of the Segovia pilot project to ascertain whether this system better enables CA to measure the volume of cash programming. If so, use of this system would be rolled out to all CA programmes delivering cash through mobile money. If this system is not feasible for all interventions, we plan to assess the limitations and devise an alternative system to ensure continued protection of beneficiary information and ability to measure increases in cash programming.
- We will finalize cash Standard Operating Procedures to reduce risks in cash programming and disseminate them across the organization and to partners.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- Use of the Segovia system involves automatic ingestion of registration and PDM data from Kobocollect, which has saved the Nigeria team time on manual input of information.
- The Segovia system allows our Nigeria team to run reports post distribution to determine which beneficiaries have not cashed out e-wallets. This enables the team to make contact with those individuals to ascertain the reason for not attending distribution and to address any issues/barriers.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- CA participated in the Cash Working Group (CWG) established at the onset of the Rohingya response. Although cash programming is not broadly allowed as a part of the response – it can be carried out with host communities but not Rohingya refugees directly – the CWG has been a good platform to scope feasibility of cash interventions, possible delivery modalities and collective advocacy for cash interventions. This push to share information early on in the response will undoubtedly result in better cash programming if and when it is fully accepted and may even contribute itself to acceptability of and appetite for cash programming.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- *Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - *Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - *Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - *Biometrics; and*
 - *Sustainable energy.*
2. *Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
4. *Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

- *Transportation/Travel;*
- *Vehicles and fleet management;*
- *Insurance;*
- *Shipment tracking systems;*
- *Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH, food);*
- *IT services and equipment;*
- *Commercial consultancies; and*
- *Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*
-

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

We have not yet made good progress on this workstream. We have lacked the capacity to pursue all workstreams energetically at the same time.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 not yet allocated significant attention to this area.

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 2018, we are assigning capacity to focus on this area specifically.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.*
2. *Coordinate and streamline data collection to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability and minimising intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process led by the Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator with full involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters/sectors and in the case of sudden onset disasters, where possible, by the government. Ensure sector-specific assessments for operational planning are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated plan of assessments at inter-cluster/sector level.*
3. *Share needs assessment data in a timely manner, with the appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks. Jointly decide on assumptions and analytical methods used for projections and estimates.*
4. *Dedicate resources and involve independent specialists within the clusters to strengthen data collection and analysis in a fully transparent, collaborative process, which includes a brief summary of the methodological and analytical limitations of the assessment.*
5. *Prioritise humanitarian response across sectors based on evidence established by the analysis. As part of the IASC Humanitarian Response Plan process on the ground, it is the responsibility of the empowered Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator to ensure the development of the prioritised, evidence-based response plans.*
6. *Commission independent reviews and evaluations of the quality of needs assessment findings and their use in prioritisation to strengthen the confidence of all stakeholders in the needs assessment.*
7. *Conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in adherence to humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.*

Needs assessment work stream co-conveners reporting request: What hurdles, if any, might be addressed to allow for more effective implementation of the GB commitment? There is significant overlap with some of the other workstreams, namely localization and participation. The competitive dynamics at field level alluded to in the workstream need to be tackled head-on, and the fast-tracking of a code of behavior to address this and other challenges should be prioritized. Donor behavior in relation to assessments should also be

reviewed and specific requirements on joint assessment activity should be linked to funding streams.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 been actively involved in the needs assessment workstream led by ECHO. We have engaged with the sub-working group on the development of a code of behaviour around assessment activities at field level. We continue to promote joint and cross-sectoral assessments where possible and actively seek to engage in co-ordination on the ground in relation to assessments.

Gender: We have developed an inclusive programming checklist, scoring tool and guidance related to needs assessments and data collection to encourage partners to take on board inclusive elements to their assessments. Our internal reporting mechanisms now also specify the need to collect SAD data and gender and power analysis. This has been opened up to intersectionality and wider gender identities in line with our refreshed gender justice strategy.

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)?

Digitalisation remains a critical tool in equipping local organisations with the means to lead assessment activities. We continue to promote locally led assessment activities and involvement of local organisations in the decisions taken in this area. 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.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other organisations) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Although it is proving a slow process it is important to codify behaviour around assessment activities. Given the diversity of actors involved in assessments the language used

in the code that is being developed will require universal acceptance as the code will be voluntary. Peer reviews of behaviour will be important in the future.

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*
- 2. Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*
- 3. Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*
- 4. Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.*
- 6. Invest time and resources to fund these activities.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 7. Ensure that, by the end of 2017, all humanitarian response plans – and strategic monitoring of them - demonstrate analysis and consideration of inputs from affected communities.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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?

- Mid-term progress audit against CHS conducted by HQAI
- Active participation in CWC Working Group and AAP sub-group in Rohingya Response
- Completed research and pilot on [Rohingya Preference for feedback and complaints mechanism](#)
- Surge deployment of accountability specialist to Nigeria response and Rohingya Response to explore and establish culturally acceptable complaints mechanisms
- In consortium, developed the [humanitarian inclusion standards for older people and people with disabilities](#)
- Conducted internal survey on use of feedback and complaints mechanisms to improve effectiveness and explore opportunities for building systematic links

between feedback and complaints received and programmatic learning at all levels of the organisation

- Training on CHS, feedback and complaints mechanisms conducted in Nigeria (Abuja and Maiduguri) Nepal, Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, Burundi, South Sudan,
- Training on inclusive programming conducted in Kenya,
- Accountability committees established in East Africa response
- Developed inclusive programming resources e.g. how to guide, practice paper, checklist
- Developed resources on feedback and complaints mechanisms e.g. tracking tools, checklists
- All country programmes annually reporting on implementation of CHS, inclusive programming and gender justice strategy

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)?

- Update and re-sensitization of corporate global complaints policy and procedure to ensure fit for purpose
- Adaptation of prioritised country programme complaint mechanism, where needed
- Strengthening of prevention and reporting of PSEA and safeguarding including Code of Conduct
- Development of resources to support partners to develop feedback and complaints mechanism
- Continued strengthening of CHS Commitments and establishment of CHS steering group

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- Reports through F&CM have alerted us to 2 incidences of misuse of funds and allowed us to take early remedial action
- Increased representation of vulnerable and marginalised groups in programme decision making and implementation

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- Inclusive programming work has increased representation and participation of traditionally excluded groups such as PLWD and elderly people in Christian Aid and partner activities. Further information on what lead to these successes can be found in the ADCAP's Good Practice Guide on inclusion that Christian Aid contributed to.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.
2. Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.
3. Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements² you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.³ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

Multiyear funding received from donors	Of which amount transferred to national and local front line responder partners	Partner %	Of which amount used by Christian Aid and not via partners	Christian Aid %
April 1 2016- March 31 2017				
£11,086,262	£9,754,180	88%	£1,332,082	12%
January 1 2017- December 31 2017				
£15,010,712	£9,407,588	63%	£5,603,124	37%

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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?

Actively exploring opportunities to use the same tools at community level to identify community vulnerability and risks where we are implementing a multi-year humanitarian programme and a multi-year development programme. We have

² Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

³ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

successfully done this for the first time in South Sudan where we receive humanitarian funding from the Irish Government and development funding from a 3-year Health Legacy programme.

- We have built in a 'crisis modifier' to the Health Legacy programme as an innovative flexible funding mechanism. This is a section of the legacy grant that has been set aside given the fact that we are implementing this programme across 3 fragile contexts (South Sudan, Burundi, Sierra Leone) with increased risks related to conflict and displacements, natural disasters or disease outbreak. This will enable country programmes to proactively respond to risks that threaten the success of their projects, by supporting individuals, communities and organizations to continually monitor changes in context, analyse and record any signals of a crisis, and prepare and respond in a timely manner. This is the first time Christian Aid has used such a mechanism within our programming and the flexible nature of the legacy funding is enabling us to trial and test approaches that, if successful, can be used in all our work in fragile contexts moving forward.

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 continue to run for the next 2 years. We will also be implementing a 3-year DFID funded programme (UK Aid Match) in South Sudan which will start in July 2018 and will be integrated into the Health Legacy programme, thus linking and better aligning our humanitarian and development programming.

We will explore using joint Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (PVCAs) in other programmes where we have both humanitarian and development work ongoing to seek better alignment between our work.

We will document learning from the use of the crisis modifier fund which has been built into the Health Legacy programme to see if this is something we should consider in all multi-year development funding initiatives.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

We have been able to use similar tools to generate information on community risks and vulnerabilities which have then been picked up by humanitarian and development multi-year funding instruments. As such, we've reduced duplication and maximised efficiencies by using one process to generate the same information which can be used in different programmes. This also means it is less resource intensive for the communities in which we work as they are engaged in one process, rather than two.

5. Good practice and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- Linking up the humanitarian and development work where we operate in the same space and using the same tools to generate information on community risks and vulnerabilities.
- Building in a crisis modifier fund to the development programme, recognising the fragile nature of the contexts in which are working.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and to initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.*
- 2. Reduce the degree of earmarking of funds contributed by governments and regional groups who currently provide low levels of flexible finance. Aid organisations in turn commit to do the same with their funding when channelling it through partners.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 3. Be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated (for example, urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management)*
- 4. Increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognising the contribution made by donors.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020⁴.*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

Unfortunately we cannot track this, especially at this level of detail. Our systems just don't allow us to capture this data.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

⁴ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

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?

This year Christian Aid used appeal funds, core funds and donor funds to provide soft or unearmarked funds to several local and national organisations. Generally, our appeal, DEC and core funds are received unearmarked. We are committed to passing it onto partners in the same state. Our financial systems do not currently allow us to track the flexibility and earmarking of funds.

Christian Aid appeal funds helped local agencies in Greece build their capacity and improve management in receiving and assisting refugees, core funds were allocated to two local organisations responding to a forgotten context in the Philippines who decided independently the best way to help displaced communities, and Start DEPP funds were distributed in Myanmar, Kenya and the Philippines for community-led, -designed, -driven responses.

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)?

It's likely that Christian Aid will commit to an increase in soft or unearmarked funds to partners, especially through our unrestricted appeal funding.

...Allow us to take a moment to congratulate ODI if you have made it this far into our self-report. If 50+ signatories report on 50+ questions each, you have 2,500+ answers to digest – quite an ordeal – we commend your stamina, and are thankful that we work for Christian Aid and not ODI...

Christian Aid supporters donate funds to assist those in need and often local and national responders are best place to decide and deliver how to do so.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Christian Aid's Humanitarian Division is committed to localisation and last year undertook the START Network Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP) Linking Preparedness Response and Resilience in emergency contexts (LPRR) research and pilot strand. The research and case studies of this pilot highlighted the need to put power in the hands of local and national people who best know the contexts in which we are responding. This shift in programming will lead further soft and unearmarked funds to partners in the future.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*
- 2. Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*
- 3. Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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?

- As an organisation, we are in the midst of an organisational change programme, one aspect of which is to digitally transform. On a practical level, this has meant greater investment in digital technologies and staff to streamline our systems and processes.
- As part of this, we have increased our investment in staff capacity – recruiting a humanitarian digital officer to support our increased use of digital tools within our humanitarian reporting systems.
- We have developed an app for outcome harvesting on an ongoing basis, in collaboration with a software developer in South Africa. The app gathers information from partners and provides them with access to this data in real-time. The app is currently being used for a large Irish Aid funded programme and is due to be rolled out to other programmes.
- We have continued our work as part of the IATI working group to promote realistic and proportionate expectations of the extent to which our partners can be required to report to IATI.
- Where we have implemented new core funding programmes, we have studied hard the requirements for reporting and attempted to align these as far as possible with existing reporting commitments to reduce duplication
- We have been working with our ACT counterparts as part of the Getting Our ACT Together (GOAT) initiative to explore options for harmonised reporting between agencies.

Gender: Our internal reporting mechanisms have, for the first time, opened up our gender commitments to wider inclusion – requesting all country programmes to report SAD data, analysis, inclusive accountability and accessibility.

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)?

- Recruitment of another staff member focused on digital innovation to explore how we can test and pilot some digital approaches to programming and reporting moving forward
- Pilot of an internally developed reporting system to assist country offices and partners to manage and learn from project data, to feed directly into our programme management information system to cut down on the manual re-entry of data from one system to another.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- The outcome harvesting app cuts down the amount of time it takes to gather and process data. For example, it is possible to look at data from across the different countries without the need for a manual process of consolidating the information from different partners. It also streamlines the process of providing feedback to partners on the data that they have submitted, eliminating the need to email various versions of documents back and forth.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

What has your organization done to operationalize the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

Christian Aid has rolled out our new Resilience Framework in 30 countries where it works.

The Framework represents our theoretical and programmatic platform to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus and plug in different components such as community-led response, inclusion and conflict sensitivity.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 2017 the new Resilience Framework has been rolled out to 5 additional countries (Brazil, Colombia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Ghana) reaching a total of 30 country programmes. The Christian Aid-led DFID-funded Linking Preparedness Response and Resilience (LPRR) consortium project (2015-18) with Action Aid, Concern, Muslim Aid, Kings College London (KCL), World Vision and Saferworld has completed a research with KCL to understand how humanitarian response can build and not undermine resilience and has developed together with Church of Sweden, Local to Global Protection and Saferworld an approach based on the research finding. The approach has been field tested in Myanmar and Kenya. The field testing of the new methodology developed by Saferworld (community security organisation), Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience (ICPR) in Kenya, Pakistan, Myanmar and Honduras to build resilience in fragile settings was completed with very positive results in terms of conflict prevention.

The Christian Aid-led DFID-funded Preparedness and Early Response to Public Health Emergencies project in the Gambella Region of Ethiopia (2015-18) with AMREF, the Federal Ministry of Health and National Meteorology Agency is integrating traditional humanitarian preparedness approaches within the health system to strengthen the health system of Gambella.

The Christian Aid IrishAid programme (2017-19) is based on the new Resilience Framework in Angola, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, IOPT, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe (Programme grant) and on the Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience (ICPR) methodology in DRC, Burundi, Lebanon, South Sudan and Myanmar (Humanitarian Programme Plan (HPP) linking governance, humanitarian response, protection, conflict prevention and resilience.

A new legacy programme in South Sudan, Burundi and Sierra Leone (2017-2020) started integrating Christian Aid work based on the Resilience framework, Integrated Conflict Prevention and Resilience (ICPR) and Health framework linking health services, conflict prevention and resilience.

Christian Aid is 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.

A new USAID programme in Kenya (2017-2020) based on the Resilience Framework will integrate risk-based approaches with service delivery.

All the above are framed by the updated Resilience Framework which aims to approach 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 (2018-20), Christian Aid will look to secure funding to mainstream the Resilience Framework and the LPRR approach. We'll explore opportunities to collaborate with the insurance sector for risk reduction measures.

The IrishAid (Programme grant and HPP) implementation will offer opportunities to capture and share learning to influence the sector offering best practices for linking the governance, conflict prevention and humanitarian sectors

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries. The Grand Bargain offered Christian Aid an opportunity to focus more on integrated approaches based on the new Resilience Framework in new funding opportunities.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why? Our updated Resilience Framework based on 5 years of field experience allowed us to create a coherent and practical framework that integrates different organisation workstreams. As a result, other projects based on it such as the LPRR, Health Legacy and IrishAid HPP, gained traction as the different pieces of work were building on each other, using the same language and vision. This allowed us to maximise learning and cross-fertilisation across the organisation and credibility in the wider sector. Being part of the DFID-funded DEPP portfolio managed by the Start Network created a receptive audience for new approaches to be showcased and explained, amplifying our reach. For example, the LPRR approach to response influenced the thinking of several organisations when developing funding proposals for possible post-DEPP funding initiatives.