**2017-2018 GB Self-Report – Extract for Workstream 4 – Management Cost**

**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?**

**Australia**

• Australia is committed to undertaking joint functional, monitoring and performance reviews, donor assessments, evaluations, risk management and oversight processes, wherever possible.

• Wherever possible DFAT bases its partnership agreements with humanitarian partner agencies on strategic objectives agreed between agencies and supporting donors.

• Australia requests specific reporting only when alternative sources for the information required are not available

**Belgium**

Belgium does not report on work streams 4 (management cost), 5 and 6, as the implementation of the commitments of those work streams are mainly the responsibility of international aid organisations, and not of donors.

However, Belgium has always put the Grand Bargain and the implementation of the 10 commitments on the agenda of its bilateral discussions with the international aid organisations in 2017, with the mutual understanding that each party should focus on what it can do best and can realistically achieve.

As mentioned above, Belgium is also funding a project from VOICE, aiming at contributing to strengthen further the quality of EU humanitarian aid through facilitating dialogue and providing operational expertise to the implementation of the Grand Bargain. The projects intends to foster NGOs and frontline responders engagement in the Grand Bargain, therefore contributing to a more inclusive and possibly a more contextualized implementation of the Grand Bargain. Besides, a specific paragraph has been added in its agreement on core funding (2018-2020) on the great value Belgium attaches to the implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments by its different stakeholders.

It is specifically mentioned that “the effective translation of these commitments into concrete action will be taken into account when Belgium will decide on its new financing cycle for core contributions (2021-2023).

**Canada**

Canada has shared information, lessons learned and best practices from its own humanitarian partner selection processes with other donors as part of an effort to harmonise donor assessments of partners.

**Chez Republic**

Increased transparency of administrative costs of grant programmes introduced

**Denmark**

Denmark supports and makes use of joint performance reviews, for example MOPAN for UN agencies, and requires reviews from CSO partners.

**Estonia**

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

**Germany**

Aligning and simplifying partner capacity assessments, e.g. in accordance with the FPA status, has led to efficiency gains for both partner agencies and FFO staff.

**ECHO**

ECHO has commissioned a study on criteria for assessing partner capacity by other donors. The final report is due for end march 2018.

**Ireland**

Ireland supports and makes use of joint performance reviews such as MOPAN rather than undertaking individual assessments, and encourages their use by other donors also, where feasible. Ireland provides over 30% of its humanitarian funding in the form of core support and accepts harmonised reporting from UN agencies, the ICRC and the IFRC. This reduces management costs and aids overall efficiency. We are also aligning any humanitarian and development funding provided to the same organisation in order to reduce the burden of managing numerous grants to the same organisation. We have also contributed heavily to the development of a Common Performance Framework for the OCHA-managed Humanitarian Pooled Funds and the annual results report of CERF.

**Italy**

The Italian Cooperation conducts assessments only on projects, while we do not have general assessments on humanitarian partners. 6. In case of CSOs, the Italian Cooperation can disburse the first instalment payment (50% of

**Japan**

Japan uses information published by international organizations, such as annual reports. We basically do not request extra information for our individual reviews.

**NL**

The Netherlands continues to conduct its own internal assessments of partners, based on existing information without additional burden on implementing partners.

**Norway**

The Ministry primarily supports and makes use of joint performance reviews, for example carried out by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN), rather than commissioning individual donor assessments.

**Sweden**

Sweden uses MOPAN assessments instead of conducting separate performance assessments of multilateral partners’ capacity. For NGO partners, before initiating reviews and evaluations, Sida always explores whether the partner has already conducted its own external or internal reviews or if other donors have conducted similar reviews/evaluations, to avoid duplications and ensure relevance of the assessments for partner organisations.

**Switzerland**

Swiss Humanitarian Aid regularly conducts audits of partners or big projects. These are however spread over the various partners, so as to avoid becoming burdensome, while providing enough quality and quantity data to ensure accountability to the Federal Finance Controlling

**UK**

DFID has rigorous due diligence requirements, and continues to be one of the most demanding donors in terms of individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes. Whilst at this point in time, DFID is unable to rely exclusively on multilateral systems of assessment, it does draw on this data to support DFID’s own assessments. DFID is working with a select group of donors to increase information sharing on due diligence to reduce duplication and burden on partner agencies.

**US report not available on the web**

**Action Aid**

ActionAid does not currently have specific actions planned against the Management Costs work stream.

**CAFOD**No reporting

**CARE International**

As part of our drive to become more fit-for-partnering, CARE is seeking to simplify and harmonize CARE-wide our partner capacity assessment template and partnership agreements and we have actively consulted partners and donors over 2017. As a principle, we agree that we will never ask more of our partners than donors ask of us.

**Catholic Relief Service**

No reporting

**Christian Aid**

No reporting

**ICRC**

In November 2017, as per previous years, the ICRC renewed its agreement to perform quality control free of charge for other organizations thereby reducing management costs.

**ICVA**

Once completed, the results from the UN partnership agreement survey will be analyzed by ICVA and shared between May and June 2018. These results can also feed in to a follow-up face-toface engagement between UN agencies and NGOs on the topic of UN harmonization.

**ILO**

Detailed report on procurement and internal business process improvement made.

**InterAction**

InterAction’s Risk Study Phase II – Local Actor Partnerships seeks to expand the evidence base of the state/strength of INGO-LNGO partnerships in relation to 14 multidimensional risk and identify areas for collective improvement within INGO-LNGO partnerships.

**IRC**

No reporting on partner assessment

**IOM**

No reporting on partner assessment

**OCHA**

OCHA CBPF engaged in broader PCA harmonization initiatives pursuing system-wide opportunities to further simplify or adjust the PCA principles, systems and process, as well as to contribute to collective efforts in this area that could reduce burden and duplication for donors, UN agencies, and NGO partners. In this regard, OCHA CBPF commissioned a study in collaboration with ICVA to explore efficiency gains related to PCAs focused on two country studies, Turkey (for the Syria response) and Somalia. The report is due to be published in Q1 of 2018.

**UNDP**
No reporting on partner assessment

**UNHCR**

UNHCR and UNICEF have harmonized the auditing approach for common partners, based on risk-based audit established by UNHCR.

**UNICEF**

UNICEF has adopted the UNDG’s harmonized approach to assessments (termed “microassessments” under the HACT framework) and accepts OCHA capacity assessment results in place of undertaking a new micro-assessment.

**WFP**

WFP is working with UNICEF and UNHCR on harmonising and simplifying partnership processes for NGOs. A new partner portal to manage due diligence and calls for Expression of Interest will be launched in 2018. See further details under workstream 2

**WHO**

The WHO due diligence system was systematised at corporate level as initial step to performing any partnership agreement in order to comply with the WHO Framework for Engagement of Non-state Actors (FENSA) obligations requested by WHO Member States. FENSA Handbook is now published online (http://www.who.int/about/collaborations/nonstate-actors/en/). The emergency provisions for FENSA are being further developed and will be completed in 2018.

**World Vision International**

No reporting

**ZOA**

No reporting