

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

1. All signatories to the Grand Bargain are expected to complete the self-report annually.
2. Self-reports must be returned to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org] no later than **Thursday 15 March, 2018**. Any submissions after this date may not be considered by the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain Report.
3. Reporting should reflect activities and progress that has taken place between January 2017 and December 2017.
4. The self-report requests information by work stream, however, in order to best track progress, signatories are asked to provide as much specific and relevant detail on progress made against each of the 51 individual commitments as possible. A full list of commitments for each work stream is included in the self-report template for reference.
5. The questions contained in this self-report are the same as in 2017, however some work streams include additional question for signatories, at the request of the work stream co-conveners. If you are unable to provide this information, please note the reasons for this.
6. Signatories who have not previously completed a self-report are asked to answer question one for each work stream, to provide a baseline of where your organisation stood when it became a Grand Bargain signatory. Existing signatories can complete questions two to five for each work stream, as your 2017 self-report will have already provided the baseline information sought by question one.
7. Please type your answers immediately below each question asked.
8. Signatories are encouraged to report both on progress made, and where they may have experienced obstacles or challenges to realising their commitments.
9. Signatories are encouraged, where possible and relevant, to reflect on their contributions to the Grand Bargain both as recipients of humanitarian funds and donors of humanitarian funds. This will allow us to capture the transfer of benefits accrued at higher ends of the value chain down to the frontline.
10. Signatories are asked to limit their responses to a maximum of 500 words per work stream.
11. Self-reports are public documents, and will be published as submitted on the IASC-hosted Grand Bargain [website](#) from 3rd June, 2018.

12. Self-reports will be used to inform the 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report, which will provide a collective analysis of the progress for each work stream, and for the Grand Bargain as a whole. The Independent Annual Grand Bargain report will be published prior to the 2018 Annual Grand Bargain Meeting on 18 June 2018, in New York.
13. The 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report is being prepared by [ODI/HPG](#). Signatories may be contacted by ODI/HPG as part of their research and preparation of the Independent Report.
14. If you require support or advice to complete your self-report, you may direct enquiries to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org].

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each work stream, consideration should be given to the guidance provided by the [Aide-Memoire on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain](#) that addresses the gender dimensions of resources, capacity, evidence and data, participation, leadership, accountability and communication within the Grand Bargain. Signatories are also welcome to provide additional detail on how they consider they have, at a macro level, ensured their Grand Bargain follow-up is gender-responsive, and to include any examples of good practice that they wish to share. This data will assist in the preparation of the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain report, which will assess the extent to which gender has been considered by Grand Bargain work streams.



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – [Name of Signatory]

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps.....	6
4. Efficiency gains	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned	6
Work stream 2 - Localization.....	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	8
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.....	9
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	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps.....	16
4. Efficiency gains	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned	16
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	17
2. Progress to date.....	17
3. Planned next steps.....	18
4. Efficiency gains	18
5. Good practice and lessons learned	18
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2. Progress to date.....	20
3. Planned next steps.....	20
4. Efficiency gains	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned	20
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps.....	21
4. Efficiency gains	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	23
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	23
5. Good practices and lessons learned	23

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Estonia reports its humanitarian aid data to EDRIS, that transfers information on the humanitarian funding flows to FTS.

Timely humanitarian aid data is publicly available at the Estonian Development Co-operation Database (<https://rakendused.vm.ee/akta/index.php>). This database contains data in OECD DAC format and is the compilation basis of the report of Official Development Aid to DAC.

For transparency (mainly for Estonian Public) we also publish also humanitarian aid contribution and projects on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs web-page.

Estonia does not currently report according to the IATI standards.

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?

Estonia continues to publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding to EDRIS, the Estonian Development Cooperation Database and to DAC report.

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 developing Estonian Development Cooperation database for more simplified DAC reporting.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Estonia supports the principle of empowering local responders. However, considering the Estonia's size and the size of the Estonian humanitarian aid programme, Estonia remains a strong supporter of the multilateral humanitarian system in order to maximize the effect of our aid.

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.

Estonia increased contributions through local responders in 2015. We have been supporting local responders mainly via national NGOs partnerships and activities in the field in Ukraine and Jordan in 2015 with 117 933 EURs that is 6,9% in proportion to the overall humanitarian funding portfolio. Many of the projects also include costs for the local responders. Estonia values and invests to capacity building of national and local responders.

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?

To increase resources available to national and local responders' Estonian humanitarian aid projects include the needs of local NGO partners in their budget. In 2017 salaries and direct costs to local partners in Ukraine, Jordan and Lebanon was 5% of the humanitarian funding portfolio. Estonia does not currently contribute to specific pooled-funds.

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)?

Estonian will continue to explore the possibilities to enhance the capacity of local and national responders and to work more closer together in the field.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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?

Estonia has supported common principles for multi-purpose cash-based assistance to respond to the humanitarian needs. Estonian NGO are using this opportunity on a small scale in Ukraine, while finding the most flexible and suitable solution to answer the humanitarian needs of the civilian population affected by the crisis.

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 do not finance bigger cash programmes as such, but modalities are used by some Estonian NGOs while delivering aid. So far we haven't made any extra allocations for the organisations working on cash-based assistance. Therefore, we do not also report more concretely on funding of cash.

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 explore the possibilities to support the use of humanitarian cash transfers and emphasize the importance of private sector partners. With our NGO partners we will continue to find suitable ways

to strengthen social protection systems to deliver humanitarian aid, including also cash where needed and appropriate.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In our bi-lateral projects we follow the principle of less than 20 % allocation to management costs. In contribution to the international humanitarian aid organisation we can add our voice on some of the advisory boards for budget planning (head quarter vs field offices/programmes).

2. Progress to date

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

Joint field visits, where possible and information sharing.

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)?

Continue to coordinate with other donors and aid agencies on the monitoring and donor reviews.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In humanitarian planning, we depend mainly on the international aid organisations needs assessment and appeals. For bi-lateral humanitarian aid projects we use data available from open sources and also from feedback from our Embassies and also NGO partners on the field. Where possible, implementing partners later take part of OCHA cluster meetings. Therefor we appreciate coordinated, shared context based needs assessment.

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 for to date we have followed the same actions as described in baseline.

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)?

Coordinate more with other donors and aid organizations on the field.

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 rief) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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?

To answer to the community needs, Estonian bi-lateral humanitarian activities have been community based, i.e. also using the knowledge of diaspora where possible. There's also possibility for fields visits, need assessment. Our funding is also flexible to change the activities throw-out the project, if really needed.

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?

Estonian NGOs implementing the humanitarian projects for example in Ukraine are using flexible, needs based working methods, that involve local community and local partners. Part of a contribution has also been small grants to individual needs.

We do not fund separately activities related to feedback collection and programme adaption, but adapting to the local needs is done during feasibility studies and field visits by the Estonian NGOs capacity building projects.

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 continue monitoring and fields visits and joint discussions with local stake holders to better engage and answer to the most immediate humanitarian needs.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

We find it extremely important that international aid organisations constantly seek solutions to operate more efficiently. Estonian Development-Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid Strategy sets goals for 4 years and it goes hand-in-hand with the results indicators for budget allocation. Multi-year planning and funding is also common for the bi-lateral humanitarian aid projects.

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?

Estonia makes its yearly non-earmarked transfers at the end of each year, in order to make the planning process more predictable. Aligned also with the Good Humanitarian Donorship standards.

Additional to the annual commitment to the international humanitarian organisations and programs (OCHA, UNCHR, UNICEF, CERF, WHO, WFO, ICRC, UNDAC), Estonia also supports longer-term project based activities (for example in humanitarian innovation and prevention). At the moment for example

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](#).

as a response to Syrian crisis in its neighbourhood countries and the humanitarian crisis in Eastern-Ukraine.

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)?

Estonia continues to support the goals for multi-year planning and funding to make its contribution predictable. We continue to fulfil our strategic cooperation with priority aid organisations. With our bi-lateral humanitarian project partners we ease and harmonize the reporting requirements as much as possible.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Predictable and flexible budgeting and planning is more transparent and adds certainty to both the aid organization and the communities in need.

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?

N/A

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)

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

2015 non-earmarked core contribution for 14,3 % of the total humanitarian aid. In 2016 Estonian non-earmarked core contributions reached to 14,8 % in proportion to the overall funding portfolio.

2015 Estonian softly earmarked donation was 0,4% i.e. 160 000 EUR to OCHA activities in ROMENA region. Whereas in 2016 Estonian softly earmarked contribution was raised to 17% from 0,4% 2015.

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

These were mainly contributions under the 2016 Syrian pledge via UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, OCHA to the neighbouring countries hosting Syrian refugees.

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 Estonian non-earmarked core contributions were 13,32 % in proportion to the overall funding portfolio.

20 000 € UNDAC

80 000 € UNHCR

100 000 € ICRC

100 000 € CERF

50 000 € WHO

80 000 € UNRWA

Total: 450 000€

In 2017 Estonian softly earmarked contribution remained at 17 %.

Country earmarked contributions given was ca 60% (including different country donor pledges).

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)?

Estonia supports the flexible funding, if the trust and transparency is there also from the international aid organization side.

We appreciate also light reporting or overview of the core contribution, that could be useful also for the Estonian tax-payers and advocacy messages.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

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?

Estonia has taken steps to reduce the reporting requirements for bi-lateral projects and co-financing for the ECHO projects for Estonian NGO-s.

Estonia supports the idea for the international organisation to jointly determine a way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding. But it shouldn't add extra workload. Just to see the main activity areas, priorities.

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?

Concrete changes have been made to the rules of procedures for financing Estonian development cooperation and humanitarian aid projects.

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)?

Learn from others experience and the work Germany is doing under this work-stream to simplify the reporting requirements.

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 signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?
N/A

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 organisation done to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid is under one structure in the MFA. We have 4 years' strategic plan in the same document. Same director of the division and DG are responsible for the budget planning. That allows synergies between the activities in both fields.

We support the need to focus at concrete deliverables in protracted crises, including education, health services and livelihoods for displaced people. **In 2015 ca 36%** of the Estonian humanitarian aid contributions were directed to alleviate the refugees and IDPs situation in Ukraine and in the aftermath of Syrian crisis inside Syria and in its neighbourhood. **In 2016** the Estonian humanitarian aid contributions were directed to alleviate the refugees and IDPs situation in Ukraine and in the

aftermath of Syrian crisis inside Syria and in its neighbourhood was raised up to **68%** of the humanitarian aid budget.

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?

Many of the Estonian Development Cooperation and humanitarian Aid activities are complementary, where possible (in the protracted crisis situation, preparedness activities). Revised EU development consensus takes account also humanitarian needs.

In Ukraine we have both development cooperation and humanitarian aid projects undergoing focused on IDPs. We have financed OCHAs Protection Capacity project in Ukraine to enhance social protection of the IDPs.

Estonia continues to implement resilience related projects carried out by the NGO Mondo and NGO Estonian Refugee Council in In Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. **In 2017** the Estonian humanitarian aid contributions directed to alleviate the situation of the refugees and IDPs situation in the crisis regions remained at **68%** of the humanitarian aid budget.

From Development Cooperation side we have undergoing projects in Ukraine supporting the IDPs and victims of the conflict, including also direct micro financing to the local NGOs.

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)?

Protracted forced displacement was one of the Estonian humanitarian aid policy priorities and we will continue to contribute to support the refugees and IDPs situation in the humanitarian crises and migratory routes.

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?