

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

DFID

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	4
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	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	6
2. Progress to date	6
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 4 – Management costs	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)	9
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
2. Progress to date	10
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	10
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	
2. Progress to date	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. Planned next steps	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	14

1. Baseline (only in year 1)	
2. Progress to date	
3. Planned next steps	
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	15
3. Planned next steps	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	16
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	17
2. Progress to date	17
3. Planned next steps	18
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	19

General points:

- Promoted delivery of Grand Bargain commitments in the first rapid onset response after Grand Bargain (reviewed by Haiti RTE);

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 (GB) was signed?

- *UK GB Commitment: continue to publish data on UK humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit using IATI standards.*
- *Baseline: DFID has been an IATI compliant donor since 2011.*

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?

The UK is currently in the process of developing its new Transparency Agenda. This will be launched later in the year and is likely to include challenging commitments to make UKAid even more transparent. Across all funded partners, the UK will push for improved transparency, including new openness about management and administration budgets. We are working with several humanitarian multilateral agencies to facilitate their adoption of IATI, taking into account their particular responsibilities.

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 currently in discussions with Ministers on the new Transparency Agenda. We hope to have more details in April.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

- *UK GB Commitment: maintain UK commitments to START Fund, the Disaster Emergency Preparedness Programme and the Humanitarian Leadership Academy.*
- *Baseline: DFID is funding several major programmes that support local capacity. However we do not have the systems available to comprehensively track funding to build the capacity of local government, CSOs and community groups to respond to humanitarian crises*

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?

The UK continues to invest in a number of consortia that are working with local and national partners:

- I) The START network of national NGOs alongside international NGOs (*£30 million 3 year programme agreed until 2018*) provides rapid support to forgotten, or spikes in, humanitarian crises. 42% of START funding in 2015/16 went to local and national partners.
 - II) The Disasters Emergency Preparedness Programme (DEPP) (*£40 million 3 year programme agreed to 2018*) implemented by START Network NGOs and comprises 14 projects investing in the capacity development of national and local NGOs.
 - III) The Humanitarian Leadership Academy (HLA) (*£20million 5 year programme agreed to 2020*) investing in training and learning for local and national NGOs.
- The UK is the largest funder of Country Based Pooled Funds – providing US\$241.3m in 2015. Currently the UK is contributing to Pooled Funds in the following countries: Afghanistan; Ethiopia; Sudan; South Sudan; Syria region; Iraq; DRC; and CAR.
 - DFID is preparing a business case for core funding over 4 years to the Red Cross Movement, subject to approval from Ministers.

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 will work with GB partners and the IASC to develop a localisation marker in order to track our expenditure to local and national responders.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

- *UK GB Commitment: UK has committed to more than double its use of cash in crises by 2025.*
- *Baseline: in 2015/2016 humanitarian cash and voucher represented 14 % of DFID humanitarian spend, cash transfers alone represented 10 % of DFID humanitarian spend.*

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?

- Providing leadership to the humanitarian sector:
 - Co-convening Grand Bargain cash workstream with WFP: workplan established and event under preparation (to happen before June 2017);
 - Established GHD cash workstream, co-chaired with Norway, concept note and workplan endorsed; first meeting hosted (March 2017) and event under preparation (to happen before June 2017);
 - Coordinating with other cash platforms and actors (CaLP and others);
 - Engagement with other donors around common interests (e.g. outcome indicators).
- Creating incentives for the scale up of cash and operationalization of the Grand Bargain cash commitments:
 - Embedding cash as core pillar of UK core funding to UN and Red Cross Movement Agencies;
 - Funding of cash programming in country offices; including the promotion of streamlined models such as Lebanon.
- Institutionalising:
 - Cash is a key part of UK humanitarian reform agenda and new Humanitarian Policy;
 - Carried out a DFID baseline on use of cash within total humanitarian funding for FY 2015/2016;
 - Initiated development of internal markers to measure use of cash and included cash in new Humanitarian VfM guidance.
- Investment in Evidence:
 - Development Initiatives research on tracking cash published, establishing a sector wide baseline for 2015 and recommendations on how to track cash;
 - ODI case studies on models of cash scale up published.

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)?

- Leadership: facilitate delivery of GB and Good Humanitarian Donorship cash workstream workplans;
- Institutionalisation within DFID:
 - Finalise establishment of a cash marker within DFID data management system;
 - Update internal guidance on cash programming;
- Further investment in evidence;
- Engage with other donors through our wider advocacy for reform.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

- *UK GB Commitment: support joint regular functional performance reviews of agencies and move away from individual donor assessments over time.*
- *Baseline: the UK has previously produced analyses of the performance of the multilateral system, as a proactive stakeholder in the system and advocate for reform. DFID has been keen to work with other donors to ensure that that all expenditure reaches its intended beneficiaries and delivers VFM. DFID is an active member of the MOPAN Network – co-chairing/facilitating the MOPAN Review of OCHA alongside Canada, as well as engaging actively with the OCHA Functional Review.*

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?

- The UK has initiated a conversation with multilateral partners on how greater collaboration can deliver improvements in value for money – this will be monitored through the core funding business cases.

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)?

- Strengthen results based financing and embed Key Relationship Management approaches to ensure the UK's relationship with key multilateral humanitarian agencies is managed in a coherent integrated way. We expect this to have a positive impact on the process for monitoring and evaluation of multilateral agencies. The rationale is that efficiencies are gained by working together. We want to see better agency collaboration in planning, strategy development and implementation of response, to achieve collective results. This will bring obvious benefits to beneficiaries – in terms of a more efficient and effective response - as well as to donors and tax payers in delivering better value for money.
- There is a potential saving of efforts and transaction costs through the monitoring of the Grand Bargain and the drive for donors to consolidate their requirements.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

- *UK GB Commitment: allocate UK funding on basis of single needs assessment and analysis, and prioritised plan.*
- *Baseline:* DFID has been advocating for and supporting joint and impartial needs assessments and analysis, to inform humanitarian funding prioritisation e.g. ACAPS in Nepal, Sierra Leone, and Syria.

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?

- Participation in Grand Bargain Needs Assessment workstream (participated to GB needs assessment workshop in Brussels Feb /March 2017); reviewed OCHA/ CASS review of needs assessments and engaged with OCHA;
- The UK has funded impartial needs assessments (e.g. ACAPS in Haiti – Hurricane Matthew);
- Engagement with DFID Country Offices to collect examples of best practice on joint impartial needs 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)?

- Participation in GB workstream (contributing to finalisation and delivery of workplan drafted during the workshop in Brussels);
- Planned development of a non-paper on ways to link humanitarian and development needs assessments in protracted crises;
- Ensuring specialist expertise is available in sudden onset emergencies to support impartial needs assessment by international responders;
- Engagement with DFID country offices and other donors to agree minimum standards for joint impartial needs assessment;
- Evaluation of quality and use of needs assessment and analysis.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

UK GB Commitment: Adopt new ways of working/standards to put affected people at the centre of the response.

Baseline: DFID has already begun to champion improved accountability and participation, however delivery and focus was patchy and inconsistent. The focus has been on rapid onset crises more often than long term protracted crises.

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?

Progress 2016

The UK is designing a means of ensuring that specialist expertise is available in sudden onset emergencies to support impartial needs assessment by international responders. In the only large rapid onset since the GB was signed (Haiti - Hurricane Matthew) DFID placed accountability in the centre of its response. Offered funding to OCHA for Stand By Partnership positions, funded *Internews* (£500,000 for 6 month programme) within the first week to focus on providing and channelling information to affected communities. Made accountability expectation known to all other agencies supported and willingness to fund this.

DFID is designing core funding arrangements with the UN and Red Cross agencies, subject to Ministerial approval, with a focus on indicators in support of Grand Bargain delivery. Within this DFID has championed accountability and participation. Results framework to be completed shortly and accountability will feature in this.

DFID is adjusting its NGO partner guidelines to require partners to have feedback mechanisms in place and demonstrate how these are being used to adjust and inform programming.

The UK promoted, managed and funded a joint donor (UK, US, Swiss, Canadian, ECHO) Real Time Evaluation (RTE) of the Haiti response – in particular looking at how Grand Bargain commitments were being advanced, and to use this as a baseline for rapid onset responses. The intention is to consider such joint donor RTEs as a standard feature in future rapid 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)?

- The above activities are HQ led. There is a need in coming years to develop country office capacity to ensure oversight and consistent coherent engagement and messaging to partners.
- To develop future and ongoing third party monitoring mechanisms to reflect participatory inputs

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

- *UK GB Commitment: Increase multi-year, multi-partner funding in protracted and recurrent crises from current 30% of bilateral humanitarian funding.*
- *Baseline: Multi-year planning and funding rapidly becoming the default approach for DFID humanitarian support in protracted crises. Two business cases proposing multi-year core support to seven UN humanitarian agencies are in advanced stages of consideration. We anticipate that, pending ministerial approval, funding for four years will be released summer 2017.*

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?

- A number of DFID country offices are developing new multi-year business cases aligning with the core funding business cases and using indicators tracking the same Grand Bargain commitments, eg Syria and Yemen.

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 focus for DFID's proposed core funding business cases will be to promote multi-year funding by UN agencies to implementing partners as part of fulfilling agency commitments under the Grand Bargain.
- Establish whether we can track multi-year humanitarian commitments through DFID systems.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report.

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?

- UK GB Commitment: *Maintain 30% of our humanitarian funding as unearmarked or softly earmarked, in return for system reform measured against GB commitments*
- Baseline: The UK's policy has been to provide un-earmarked flexible core funding to all multilateral humanitarian partners for some time. The UK also provides significant funding to the CERF and to country based pooled funds (CBPFs) where it is un-earmarked and fully flexible.

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?

- DFID is in the process of developing two funding arrangements to run over four years (2017 – 2021). Subject to Ministerial approval, these business cases will provide the UN humanitarian system as a whole (OCHA, CERF, IOM, WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF and WHO); and the Red Cross/Crescent Movement (ICRC, IFRC and British Red Cross) with flexible un-earmarked core funds and will be monitored through a single results framework for each business case
- We have participated in the development process of a Common Performance Framework for CBPFs, seeking to provide improved common indicators for performance measurement of pooled funds across all countries. We hope this will help to mobilise additional funds into CBPF.

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)?

- Reach agreement with OCHA and other donors on a robust reporting framework for CBPF – making link to Results Reporting workstream.
- Establish whether we can track multi-year humanitarian commitments through DFID systems.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report.

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?

- *UK GB commitments: (i) Streamline DFID humanitarian reporting arrangements and results reporting systems; and (ii) Align with other donors and agencies on a core set of results.*
 - *Ambition to report by results (with potential link to Sustainable Development Goals), and desire to explore a standard set of indicators, to be aligned with other donors where possible*
 - *Any streamlining to remain aligned with DFID regulations and requirements*
- *Baseline: DFID does not have a department-wide approach to results reporting which can result in inconsistent demands being made of partners.*

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?

Internally

- Working on refining our internal data structure to better articulate what results UK humanitarian aid achieves. In practical terms this has started by the revision of our internal spend categorisations (input sector codes). We are ensuring alignment with our new humanitarian VfM guidance (under development) so that better result reporting results supports VfM analysis.

With others

- Engaging with Results Reporting workstream leads, participating in meetings in Geneva and reviewing GPPi report on Harmonizing Donor Reporting
- Commented on recent set of standardised questions produced by GPPi
- Attending workshop in April to discuss a potential pilot.
- Consulted our Humanitarian Advisors to ask if they are interested in working on the pilot. Interest has been expressed, dependent on what this will entail in practice.
- Some liaison with other donors (ECHO and US)

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 considering a short piece of work to map current use of output and outcome indicators by major donors, to see where convergence and overlaps appear.
- Will continue to engage with workstream leads on pilot and follow up from that.
- Continue building internal engagement on this change process to ensure awareness and buy-in from DFID's humanitarian cadre

- Continue increasing technical capacity of DFID staff working on process
- Exploring whether the SDG indicators can be mapped across to existing humanitarian indicator sets.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report. Anticipate main efficiency gains to be with downstream delivery partners. Crucial that benefits are passed through the delivery chain.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report

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?

UK Commitment: We will spend at least 50% of DFID's budget in fragile states and regions in every year of this Parliament.

Baseline: DFID had begun internal work to better align our development and humanitarian efforts, particularly in fragile states and regions. Through the UK National Security Strategy (NSS) and the Strategic Security and Defence Review (SSDR), we had also committed to spend at least 50% of DFID's budget in fragile states and regions throughout this Parliament (ie up to 2020).

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?

- The 2016 Bilateral Development Review calls for a new approach to protracted conflict and refugee crises through increased focus on service delivery and economic development and better integration of development, humanitarian and stabilisation expertise. DFID's new Humanitarian Reform Policy proposes to deliver this approach through longer-term funding in support of systems strengthening for essential services and private sector and livelihoods interventions to stimulate jobs creation. DFID's Building Stability Framework (BSF) also calls for inclusive economic growth and effective and legitimate institutions to support stability in fragile and conflict states. DFID also produced a new Economic Development strategy that offers solutions to enable inclusive growth in refugee crises and conflict situations.
- In 2016, several high profile international events (including the London Syria Conference, Wilton Park Forum, World Humanitarian Summit and high-level refugee events at UNGA) secured global consensus that a new approach is needed to respond to protracted conflict and refugee crises. In response, in 2016 DFID established a dedicated Protracted Crises Hub, to work across DFID, with other UK government departments and with international partners to strengthen our responses to protracted conflict and refugee crises. The Hub has carried out a review to assess DFID's approach in protracted conflict and refugee settings, and is beginning to share the findings and examples of best practice internally and with other donors, IFIs and NGOs. The review found that DFID is using development and humanitarian instruments to respond to crises in 16 out of 19 country operations surveyed. In 11 countries, development programmes are run in at least two sectors alongside humanitarian interventions. A significant number of operations are also in the process of transitioning towards portfolios that fully bridge the development-humanitarian divide.
- The UK pioneered the model for a new approach to protracted crises at the London Syria Conference in February, through the Jordan and Lebanon Compacts, which go beyond people's basic needs and invest in education, jobs and livelihoods. This model was extended to the "jobs

compact” in Ethiopia. At the US Leaders’ Refugee Summit in September in New York, the Prime Minister announced £80 million UK support for the Ethiopia jobs compact, an agreement with the Government of Ethiopia, the World Bank, European Investment Bank and the EU to create 100,000 new jobs for Ethiopians and refugees.

- We are also building on ten years of experience and evidence on fragility and conflict and improving our understanding of how to operate effectively in fragile states, many of which are extremely challenging environments for development work. By improving our knowledge of local contexts – and the underlying causes of instability in countries and regions – we can ensure that aid money achieves maximum impact. In so doing, our development programmes may reduce humanitarian needs in future by improving the resilience of fragile states.

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)?

DFID’s Protracted Crises Hub will support the development of policy and programme shifts to bring together humanitarian, development and stabilisation expertise from the outset of a crisis.

The UK will be working to influence the global agenda on refugees and protracted crises through the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework pilots and Global Refugee Compact. The UK is supporting UNHCR to successfully implement the CRRF in ways that lead to the transformation of the international community’s support to refugees and the countries that host them. The Protracted Crises Hub is working with the OECD to help shape their guidance on protracted displacement for donors.

Furthermore, the UK is committed to:

- Providing sufficient and predictable multi-year humanitarian financing.
- Bringing in a wider range of partners to deliver in situation of protracted crisis and displacement, including development agencies and the private sector.
- Identifying non-aid instruments, for example trade, that help to incentivise policy shifts towards inclusion of refugees and displaced populations in economic opportunities and access to services in host countries and to drive economic development, where appropriate.
- Investing in improving the data and evidence base to better understand the profile of displaced populations, supporting increased sharing of data, and to support better analysis on what interventions work and at what cost.
- Transforming the way we work with and for young people, empowering them as agents and advocates for better outcomes throughout our protracted crises response.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

- Too early to report

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

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?

- Too early to report