

Grand Bargain in 2018:

DENMARK's Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: DENMARK, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

**Point of Contact (name, title, email): Jette Michelsen, Chief
Advisor, jetmic@um.dk & hmc@um.dk**

Date of Submission: 22 March 2019

Question 1: Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2018?

1) Denmark was a major provider of unearmarked/softly earmarked and multi-year funding in 2018 – exceeding Grand Bargain target

In 2018, Denmark reached DKK 1,16 billion in non-earmarked or softly earmarked humanitarian funding out of a total humanitarian budget of DKK 2,58 billion. Thus, **44,9 % of Denmark's total humanitarian funding in 2018 was non-earmarked or softly earmarked.** Hence, Denmark by far exceeded the GB target of 30% for unearmarked/softly earmarked funding.

Denmark's flexible funding allows humanitarian organisations to act swiftly in sudden onset or rapidly deteriorating crises during the year. Our funding represents quality funding, that imposes less transaction costs on aid organisations and therefore allows them to work more efficiently and effectively and adapt to changing crisis contexts.

In 2018, Denmark provided core funding to UN agencies with a humanitarian mandate and ICRC. Moreover, Denmark provided substantial core funding to the Central Emergency Response Fund, as well as to the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. Denmark had strategic partnership agreements with UNHCR, UNICEF and UNFPA for which funding was softly earmarked for priority protracted crises. We were among the top donors of softly earmarked funding to the Country-Based Pooled Funds. Furthermore, Denmark's crisis specific funding generally supported Humanitarian Response Plans and joint appeals based on joint assessments, thus funding directed to specific countries and otherwise fully flexible. In funding agreements with strategic CSO partners, 30% of funding could be allocated by the organisations themselves to sudden on-set or rapidly deteriorating crises.

Denmark was also a **major provider of humanitarian multi-year funding.** In 2018, Denmark entered into 4-year agreements with its strategic CSO partners, and had multi-year agreements with WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNRWA. As an innovative approach, Denmark provided **substantial non-humanitarian multi-year funding targeted reducing fragility and vulnerability.**

2) Denmark supported cash-based assistance and innovation

Denmark supported responsible technological innovation through our long-term partnerships. We provided dedicated innovation funding to a number of UN agencies and our strategic civil society partner organizations. The major outcomes have been a focus on food security including cash and innovations to ensure better delivery or efficiency in humanitarian settings. Innovation funding offers our partners a significant new opportunity to innovate, experiment and catalyse efforts such as cash-based programming to seek improved outcomes.

3) Denmark supported localisation, participation and accountability

Denmark supported the localisation agenda, requiring its strategic CSO partners working in areas affected by conflict or natural disaster to build capacities of communities, national and local actors. On the financing side, Denmark was

among the top donors to the Country-Based Pooled Funds that allocate substantial funding to NNGOs and LNGOs. Denmark made the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) obligatory not only for humanitarian interventions, but also for civil society activities in fragile situations. The CHS was also used as an instrument for ensuring accountability to affected populations and feedback mechanisms, as well as involvement of local actors in decision-making and coordination.

Question 2: Please explain how the outcomes/results will lead to long-term institutional changes in policy and/or practice.

With Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action *The World 2030* our focus is in on how to address fragility and vulnerability in a coherent manner. The Danish approach to the humanitarian-development-peace nexus (cf. question 4 below) acknowledges the interlinked nature of the SDGs and the need for coherent efforts, not least in protracted crises. We believe that we have the strategic and policy framework in place, and that we need to focus on operational roll out.

We expect that progress on multi-year and flexible funding enables our multilateral and CSO partners to work strategically and more long-term and in flexible and innovative ways in protracted crises. With respect to Danish bilateral programmes in crisis and conflict-affected contexts, the Danish MFA aims at working with more adaptable programming taking account of sudden on-set or rapidly escalating crises. We support the localisation agenda and require our partners to strengthen local actors' key role in preparedness, response and recovery. Innovative approaches and operational work across the nexus at country level will strengthen the effectiveness and the efficiency to the benefit of crises-affected populations.

Question 3: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard? (please outline specific initiatives or changes in practice and their outcomes/results).

Gender equality and women's empowerment is a priority for Denmark, and is being pursued in Denmark's work to fulfil the commitments of the majority of GB work streams. In 2018, Denmark worked to ensure that humanitarian partners in all sectors include gender in needs assessment and programming.

One example is the Danish contribution of 9.2 mil USD to WFP to advance operational partnerships in the field with a focus on women and girls' protection, SRHR, equality, and empowerment. This has led to joint programs with UNFPA, national ministries and organisations working for women's equality and empowerment in 8 humanitarian contexts, and where food security has been integrated with access to SRH and GBV services. Other examples include a seminar held in September 2018 by Danida for Danish CSO partners on strengthening inclusion of gender and SRHR considerations in their work in humanitarian and fragile contexts.

Denmark has worked to enhance inclusion of gender considerations in the global coordination mechanisms and humanitarian country teams by secondment of

personnel to OCHA's gender unit in New York as well as preparing a grant to UNFPA to develop a model for embedding dedicated GBV specialist within the humanitarian country teams. Denmark has in dialogue with INGO, UN and Pooled fund mechanisms worked to ensure that localization efforts also include gender perspectives and support to women's groups. Another focus has been on ensuring that cash-based assistance programs fulfill the potential of improved equality and empowerment of women. With the Danish support to WFP in 2018, WFP has started mainstreaming SRHR in WFP cash programmes in different contexts. Also, in 2018 Danida made the preparations for a new grant to UNFPA for developing and piloting new cash-based programming and guidelines for increasing women's access to services, protection and empowerment through cash-based assistance.

Denmark has been actively engaged in international fora and with civil society in order to agree on common international PSEAH standards and third party verification in alignment with the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS). In 2018, Denmark e.g. financed a mapping study of the Danish CSO partners PSEAH safeguarding mechanisms, which resulted in development by the Danish CSOs of a common set of PSEAH commitments which align themselves with the CHS.

Question 4: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments?

Please explain how your institution has linked commitments 10.1 - 10.5 with other commitments from other workstreams.

Denmark has been supportive of the humanitarian-development nexus as a cross-cutting issue. A policy discussion in the Danish Development Council in 2018 confirmed the nexus approach. We collaborate with international partners, e.g. the UN, the World Bank and the EU, to enhance the nexus approach, and we see the GB as a catalytic instrument for driving change towards more coherent financing and work across the nexus, relevant to all GB work streams.

With multi-year humanitarian financing (WS7&8) Denmark enables humanitarian actors to have long-term perspectives in protracted crisis and thereby facilitates alignment with development actors. When using a mix of humanitarian and non-humanitarian multi-year ODA to finance vulnerability-related interventions in protracted crises Denmark aims to ensure more coherent financing in crisis and thus facilitate work across the nexus.

When Denmark supports both humanitarian cash assistance and national social protection systems (WS3), e.g. in Ethiopia, Denmark helps work across the nexus.

When Denmark requires its CSO partners to strengthen their local partnerships building capacities (WG2), this strengthens local actors' role in planning, programming and coordination and improves sustainability.

Denmark is supportive of joint needs assessments (WS5), involving humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors. In the Danish MFA joint context analysis is increasingly used for Danish country programmes, and this leads to better aligned humanitarian and development work.