



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – FAO

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.....	6
3. Planned next steps.....	7
4. Efficiency gains	7
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	11
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	13
2. Progress to date.....	13
3. Planned next steps.....	13
4. Efficiency gains	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned	13
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	14
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps.....	15
4. Efficiency gains	16

5. Good practices and lessons learned	16
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps.....	19
4. Efficiency gains	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned	20
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps.....	22
4. Efficiency gains	22
5. Good practice and lessons learned	22
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	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	26
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	27
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	27
2. Progress to date.....	27
3. Planned next steps.....	27
4. Efficiency gains	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	28
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	28
2. Progress to date.....	29
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	31
5. Good practices and lessons learned	32

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?

The eXtensible Markup Language (XML) data format in which IATI data is currently published does not lend itself to easy visualizations, and the IATI portal itself is not particularly user friendly. It would be an important step towards increasing the possible use of IATI data if such a portal/webpage with visualizations, search function and other user friendly tools were created for the full population of IATI data from all publishers.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

FAO became a signatory to and member of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) in April 2016. An FAO IATI task team was later created with the objective of reporting FAO aid expenditures to IATI by spring 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?

Following a process of identification of IATI standard requirements, review of possible data sources and design of technical solutions, FAO started publishing IATI data for all its projects in May 2017. Since then, reporting has been done on a quarterly basis

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)?

FAO is planning to further enhance the quality, frequency and scope of its reporting to IATI in the next two years. Specific steps planned include: the expansion of the reporting to include also non-project activities funded by the FAO Regular Programme, such as most of FAO's normative work and provision of global public goods; improvements to the level of automation of the reporting process in order to increase the frequency and addition of further fields in the reporting; periodic analytic reports and papers; and a webpage/portal to publish FAO IATI data and visualizations in more user-friendly formats.

The expansion of reporting to include non-project activities will also enable FAO to provide regular and consistent reports on FAO development expenditures to the OECD's Development Assistance Committee.

An FAO IATI portal will address the fact that the XML data format in which IATI data is currently published does not lend itself to easy visualizations, and the IATI portal itself is not particularly user friendly.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Three efficiency gains arose in our transparency initiatives from interdepartmental collaboration that has benefited GB commitments, though they were not driven by them.

First was the collaboration amongst relevant internal stakeholders, which helped FAO effectively identify IATI reporting requirements, as well as potential challenges and related solutions that facilitated the preparation of the first report. As a side effect, the reporting process has encouraged focus on data quality in FAO data bases, and initiated discussions on added features to our budget information systems that would help automate FAO IATI publication.

Second was the synergies between the FAO IATI publication and the reporting of FAO regular budget expenditures on development assistance to the OECD-DAC. A result of joining IATI and recognizing these synergies is an agreement by FAO management to also regularly report to the OECD.

Third, the importance of publishing to IATI, motivated the establishment of a senior management governance structure for oversight and clearance, which will in the future help implement changes to budget information systems to better automate report generation.

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?

FAO has benefitted from project funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; in-person technical advice and support from InterAction, which provided advice and guidance for new IATI reporters; and support from individuals/experts and other members of the IATI TAG team in various technical groups.

The reporting also identified agriculture and food security gaps in the OECD Development Assistance Committee's (OECD-DAC) classification system used to code the sectors in which activities occurred. This classification system is also used for the IATI publications. These gaps helped FAO, through consultation with experts, in presenting a proposal to the OECD-DAC's Working Party in Development Finance Statistics to address these gaps. This proposal was presented by FAO to the OECD-DAC working party in January 2018, reviewed in February 2018, and will be presented formally for decision in June 2018. If accepted, the proposal will help all IATI publishers and OECD-DAC reporters to more accurately code their interventions in agriculture and food security (including forestry and fishing).

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 **Please see the data collection form attached to the report as an annex.**

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?

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.

An important part of FAO's work on localization in humanitarian situations is undertaken through the FAO-WFP led global Food Security Cluster (gFSC). The concept of localisation has been included in the gFSC Strategic Plan 2017-19 under Result 4 - Fostered programmatic approach to coordination action; Focus Area 2 - Decentralization and localization of preparedness. In this regard, the gFSC has been promoting the participation of local NGOs and several countries have elected a national partner as the Cluster's co-facilitating agency.

The Global Food Security Cluster and the German- international NGO, Welthungerhilfe, have developed a joint video project with support from the German Federal Foreign Office. The three videos (in English, French and Arabic) highlight the importance of partnering in humanitarian crises, how local partners can get involved in Food Security Clusters in countries and how they collaborate in different humanitarian crises and responses. The videos also tell the story of the important role local actors play in humanitarian response. Since their release in early 2017, the videos have been used in different countries as a tool to raise awareness, create dialogue (especially to identify capacity building needs) and strengthen participation of local actors in country clusters.

FAO also issued a new manual to provide the Organization with the required framework for the engagement of FAO in partnership arrangements involving the transfer of FAO-managed funds to Operational Partners for implementation of 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)?

Under the Localization area, the gFSC will continue serving as a hub for partners, including local partners and mainstream localization into its core business and provide guidance in collaboration with the IASC and others, who are already involved for example in the development of a baseline or localization marker. The gFSC will also analyse how engagement of local actors could be optimized by reviewing different country coordination models.

FAO is an active member of the Grand Bargain localization workstream and plans to participate in the planned localization pilot mission. FAO will contribute through the sharing of best practices in humanitarian response partnerships. In addition FAO, will explore how to increase the country level financing solutions for local actors, support local actors to strengthen their capacity and engage local actors in coordination mechanisms.

4. Efficiency gains

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

In the three northeast States in Nigeria where FAO intervenes, our main local partners are the implementing partners (through Letters of Agreement) who benefit from an inception workshop on the programme, and from some technical training and capacity building

activities. FAO reaches its national counterparts, Government bodies and Service Providers through these Inception Workshops.

Besides, FAO has trained local NGOs from 16 States and Federal Capital Territory (FCT) in food security, vulnerability and Cadre Harmonisé process and implementation. Special sessions for these kinds of partners have also been organized in Abuja last year.

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 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?

As a follow up to FAO's signature of the Grand Bargain in 2016, an inter-departmental working group on cash-based transfers and a dedicated cash transfer programming team in the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division were strengthened. Two dedicated cash transfer experts were deployed to two sub-regional offices in sub-Saharan Africa.

At corporate level, FAO's programme database was upgraded to track projects involving cash-based transfers with markers.

During 2017, FAO delivered USD 53 million worth of cash and vouchers to 3 million beneficiaries in 26 countries, which represents a three-fold increase in value transferred and a double in number of beneficiaries, as compared to 2016.

A total of 36 countries benefitted from capacity development, cash preparedness, programming and operational support related to cash-based transfers. Specifically, 165 personnel (123 men and 42 women), 34% of whom from FAO partner organizations (Governments, UN agencies and local NGOs), participated to face-to-face training workshops

on cash transfer programming and operations. Updated training modules feature FAO's most recent field experiences in cash programming.

Several publications relevant to FAO's work on cash transfers were developed, including six infographics on FAO's approach to cash-based transfers, Unconditional and Conditional Cash Transfers, Cash-for-work, Voucher Schemes, Input Trade Fairs, and Cash+ (available at: <http://www.fao.org/emergencies/fao-in-action/cash-and-vouchers/en/>) and a brochure on FAO's approach to Cash+, for humanitarian response, resilience and shock-responsive social protection (available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7864e.pdf>).

FAO partnered with ECHO, DFID, UNICEF and others to organize an International Conference on Social Protection in Contexts of Fragility and Forced displacement (<http://sp-fragility-displacement.onetec.eu/>). The Conference represented a concrete contribution of FAO and partners to further commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit as well as in the framework of the Committee on World's Food Security. The importance of saving lives and livelihoods was presented throughout key sessions, as well as the need to have a comprehensive approach to social protection, ensuring effective linkages with social services and livelihood promotion.

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)?

- Finalization of FAO's manual on cash- and voucher-based transfers
- Development of a corporate Management Information System for cash- and voucher-based transfers
- Conduct studies to measure the impact of FAO cash and voucher programs
- Continued investment in new delivery models such as shock-responsive social protection systems, electronic voucher schemes for agricultural inputs and micro-project grants provided directly to beneficiaries
- Maintain regular engagement in the Cash and Market Working Group (CMWG) of the FAO-WFP led global Food Security Cluster (gFSC), CaLP Technical Advisory Group, and CashCap steering committee.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Increased use of technologies and automation allowed to reduce overheads and increase impact, with plans to standardise these approaches corporately.
- Improvements in project tracking allowed more adequate support to field offices at an earlier stage in the project cycle, facilitating more efficient and effective projects
- Ongoing corporate initiatives on cash hold a strong potential to reduce risks, system fragmentation and duplication and improve efficiency, transparency and security in the delivery of cash-based transfers.

- Plans in place to establish long-term agreements with an increased number of Financial Service Providers, and protocols for sharing contracts with other agencies, improving speed of procurement and reducing overheads.

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 2017, FAO invested in the scaling up of Cash+ programmes as a tool for emergency response settings (e.g. Somalia, north east Nigeria), resilience strengthening (e.g. Mauritania, Mali) as well as in support of national social protection programmes (e.g. Armenia, Kyrgyz Republic) through direct implementation, collaboration with partners, including other Grand Bargain signatories, and impact evaluation to build the evidence base.
- Cooperation with national government and utilization of Government systems (especially social assistance programmes) can massively increase efficiency and impact. In Zambia, FAO's agricultural electronic voucher management system, known as Farmer Input Voucher Management System (FIVMS), was adopted by the Government for its national country-wide agricultural input provision programme, reaching over 1 million beneficiaries (involving a total USD 200 million budget).
- Several FAO emergency responses at significant scale (e.g. north east Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan) demonstrated the need and the impact of using combinations of assistance modalities (cash, Cash+, vouchers, service delivery and in-kind assistance) in a flexible way in delivering the Organization's mandate and in leveraging and complementing its technical expertise.

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?

With regard to the Commitment on cost structures, FAO is bound by its Corporate Cost Recovery Policy adopted by FAO Governing Bodies that provide for full proportional cost recovery in line with UN guidance. Insofar as any changes to cost structures are concerned, FAO will involve its membership as and when 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?

To contribute to FAO's commitment on cost structures, work has begun to develop the aforementioned policy during 2016-17 in consultation with other UN partners.

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 next steps include updating corporate systems; developing training modules and working with resource partners.

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?

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?

The global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) led by FAO and WFP has been advocating since 2015 for more systematic joint and cross-sectorial analysis of humanitarian needs that considers seasonal and livelihoods factors in defining the preconditions for outcome-based joint humanitarian planning. The World Humanitarian Summit and the Grand Bargain created both the momentum and the framework under which all 11 global clusters agreed to develop a joint project, led by the gFSC, on multi-sector joint analytical framework for protracted crises. The project was funded by ECHO in late 2017 and will be implemented during 2018 and 2019. The objective of the proposed Action is to directly contribute to the Grand Bargain's Workstream 5, while also contributing to setting the foundations for the achievement of Workstream 7.

FAO has been proactive in building and enhancing its relationships and partnerships with other UN agencies, academic institutions, NGOs and governments in relation to needs assessments, ensuring communication and coordination both internally and with other partners. More concretely, FAO worked jointly with partners on the majority of emergency needs assessments conducted during 2017, coordinating throughout all steps of the needs assessment process from questionnaire development to data collection and the reporting of results. This approach has assisted the affected population and has avoided putting a burden on them, as well as strengthened local capacities to respond to current and future emergencies in affected countries.

FAO needs assessment team was also an active participant in the Programme Quality Working Group of the gFSC during the 2017 year, participating in discussions on data collection in hard-to-reach areas and playing a leadership role in a mapping exercise of available needs assessment methodologies.

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 gFSC will continue to engage with the OCHA/ECHO led Joint Interagency Needs Analysis Group, and in the framework of the ECHO project, contribute to the development of an Intersectoral Analysis Framework and its piloting at field level.

In the spirit of the New Way of Working, FAO believes in "delivering as one" which is directly applicable to the objective of improving joint and impartial needs assessments. The main steps to undertake and implement the commitments of the Grand Bargain and guarantee the inclusion of the principles of the "delivering as one" initiative, will be to:

1. Strengthen and increase partnerships with governments and key UN agencies, as well as NGOs and other humanitarian actors, research institutions, academia and the private sector.
2. Deploy regional needs assessment specialists to expand technical support that can be provided quickly to countries during emergency situations.
3. Organize and conduct at least 70 percent of the work related to needs assessment "jointly" with the actors mentioned above.
4. Increase the use of standby partners when it comes to the preparation and implementation of needs assessments.
5. Advocate for and ensure government leadership when conducting needs assessments
6. Promote a more systematic use of the "Accountability to Affected Population" principles of Leadership; Participation and Partnership; Information; Feedback and Action: and Results when conducting needs assessments,
7. Ensure a more efficient integration of cross-cutting issues such as gender, DRR and DRM in needs assessment related work.
8. Continue building internal and external needs assessment capacities at global level through the conduct of trainings and webinars as well as the development of technical notes, case studies, reports and guidelines.
9. Continue supporting the work of the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) and other humanitarian Clusters.
10. Create additional platforms and modalities to share information material and data in relation to different types of needs assessment.
11. Advocate for and ensure the use of cash based programming, when and where appropriate, together with the use of specific market assessment.

4. Efficiency gains

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

In line with FAO's Grand Bargain commitments, the work conducted by FAO's needs assessment team to conduct joint needs assessments has led to better coordination and improved partnerships, in addition to minimizing the duplication of efforts and the unnecessary intrusion of these needs assessments into the lives of affected people.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

Within the needs assessment work stream, FAO has seen numerous successes over the past year. These successes can generally be broken down into three main areas:

1. **Leadership provided during emergency needs assessments:** FAO's needs assessment team conducted or supported 21 needs assessments during the 2017 year, the majority of which were conducted jointly with partners.
2. **Development of new needs assessment methodologies:** New methodologies include the development of a Fall Armyworm Risk Index and impact assessment tools. During the creation of these methodologies, FAO needs assessment team collaborated closely with FAO's country and regional offices, regional intergovernmental bodies (ex. IGAD, SADC), research institutions and technical agencies active in pest management issues and risk assessments more generally.
3. **Strengthening of capacities:** FAO built technical capacities relating to existing needs assessment methodologies through activities such as supporting several PDNA/DRF trainings, conducting trainings on rapid food security and market assessments to food security cluster members, and organizing a webinar on Seed Security Assessments.

The key lesson learned from these various activities has been the important value added of coordinating with other agencies during all needs assessment activities, in order to ensure higher quality information dissemination for decision making and to bring different skills and perspectives together in developing of needs assessment methodologies.

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?

When the Grand Bargain was signed, FAO was already working to implement the IASC Commitments to Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), to ensure that humanitarian responses are appropriate and are based on the needs of those most vulnerable. In addition, as one of the co-lead agencies of the global Food Security Cluster, FAO supports quality programming initiatives aimed at providing necessary guidance to cluster members at country level to ensure harmonization and complementarity in food security interventions for more relevant, efficient and transparent responses that ensure meaningful participation from those affected by 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?

FAO participates in the IASC AAP/PSEA task team, which aims to support humanitarian actors to improve capacities to plan and implement programmes and responses in respect of AAP principles. In Burundi, FAO led training on the mainstreaming of AAP, gender and humanitarian

principles targeting the national food security sector group to increase accountability in humanitarian programmes. In addition, the Global Food Security Cluster, of which FAO is co-lead with WFP, has provided national Food Security Clusters with training and technical support to include AAP in response and sector plans.

In addition to the work within the framework of the IASC and alignment with the new and revised AAP/PSEA commitments released in December 2017, FAO has partnered with Collaborative Learning Projects (CDA) to develop FAO-specific guidance, tools, training materials and technical resources to promote a common understanding and shared practice of AAP integration into FAO's work, particularly in humanitarian and resilience building contexts. FAO's endorsement of the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action is a further step towards ensuring maximum participation and inclusion in FAO's work.

To ensure the inclusion of AAP into large-scale humanitarian programmes, FAO has sought support from resource and technical partners. With funding allocated by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), FAO is implementing an umbrella project in Cameroon, Chad, Mali and Niger with the objective of mainstreaming gender and AAP into four country specific interventions. This has, amongst other things, allowed for the consultative development of indicators to ensure participation, and accountability throughout implementation of these programmes.

FAO has, with support from Standby Partner NORCAP, deployed an expert to support the integration of AAP into the ongoing Lake Chad crisis emergency response in northeast Nigeria. This has played an important role in developing a strategy for Communicating with Communities and including accountability measures in FAO's on-going humanitarian response.

Throughout FAO's programming, given the consistent interaction of FAO and partners with populations, FAO utilizes and promotes various participatory approaches for integrating local expertise and capturing the perspectives of affected populations into programme design, implementation and monitoring. One such example is the Caisse de Résilience approach, which has been used in nearly a dozen countries in various contexts. This approach builds on existing community groups – often farmers or women's groups – to develop resilience through three mutually reinforcing pillars covering social, technical and financial thematic. Throughout these interventions, the groups themselves establish their priorities for technical support and the rules that govern their access to the benefits accrued through participation. FAO and local partners actively seek and utilise feedback in their roles as technical resources and as facilitators for the groups to meet their objectives and priorities.

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)?

To increase FAO's accountability capacities at various levels, part of the collaboration with CDA includes the development of a training of trainers module to be rolled out in the application of AAP within FAO's programmes. This will promote peer-to-peer learning and practical application of tools and methodologies.

To further FAO's commitments to participation and inclusion in both the Grand Bargain and the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action, FAO has established a working group on inclusion, involving technical experts from across the Organization's mandate to identify key areas for inclusion across humanitarian and development programming.

4. Efficiency gains

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

FAO is exploring possibilities to streamline various grievance, feedback and complaints mechanisms that are required in its corporate guidelines, while including aspects of accountability to affected populations, to make these systems more efficient and sustainable in the long-term.

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 various field offices, FAO has piloted different feedback and accountability mechanisms to best suit the needs of the communities with whom it works along with partners. For example, in Somalia, FAO and partners have a widely publicised mixed method approach, where feedback can be received through a call centre hotline, randomised follow up surveys, email or on-site feedback boxes. This flexibility allows for affected populations to have varying levels of anonymity for their feedback, to receive specialist attention for technical issues and can also allow for interagency attention, if the feedback received so requires.

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.

The multi-year emergency agreements approved in 2017 amount to a total of \$178.5 million, equivalent to approx. 33% of the total funding received for emergency programmes.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

FAO has received substantial multi-year (min 2 years) funding over the past years. FAO is well placed to work with multi-year funding given its Strategic Programme 'Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises' aims to build the resilience of crisis affected population through investing in crisis preparedness, response and recovery, embracing short-, mid- and long term approaches. All of FAO's Country Programming Frameworks involve multi-year planning and programming with a view to linking the Organization's emergency work with longer term development work. Where relevant, FAO participates in multi-year Humanitarian Response Plans and develops multi-year resilience strategies.

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 2016, multi-year funding amounted to nearly USD150 million for emergency projects, i.e. nearly 40% of annual funding. Some of the funds, however, were released by the donor on an annual basis and became effective through an extension of already ongoing projects. Recent good practice examples to be highlighted are: (i) since 2014, Sida and FAO have been signing

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](#).

an umbrella agreement for a three-year period, covering a variety of emergency projects at global and country level. Some of the projects, particularly in the Sahel were funded over 3 years. To capitalize on this innovative funding framework, a lessons learnt exercise was agreed upon between Sida and FAO in 2016. (ii) In 2015, within the framework of the Rome-based Agencies (RBA) partnership on resilience, Canada agreed to support the implementation of an innovative, 5-year, RBA programme to strengthen resilience for food security and nutrition in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Niger and Somalia; (iii) the US, the UK, the EU and also the World Bank are increasingly funding multi-year agreements to support FAO's work in protracted crisis.

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 2017, and within the framework of the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team, FAO, together with OCHA and NRC produced a study: 'Living Up to the Promise of Multi-Year Humanitarian Financing'. The results of the study were presented during the Humanitarian Networks and Partnership Week in Geneva in February 2018. This year, FAO, OCHA, NRC and UNICEF will jointly embark on a follow up study to further develop the business case for multi-year funding (outlining added value of and/or arguments for multi-year funding).

4. Efficiency gains

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

Multi-year humanitarian funding has the potential to be flexible to address needs as they arise. Organisations can react quickly to changing conditions, thus reducing the levels of needs for assistance. Multi-year funding can be most effective if provided unearmarked. FAO will continue to advocate with its donors to reshape humanitarian funding to this effect.

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?

For FAO, Multi-year funding is clearly of advantage in the emergency context as it helps to strengthen livelihoods and build resilience. Furthermore the seasonality of agricultural support and local capacity building can be addressed more effectively. MYF requires more time for analysis, planning and budgeting at the beginning of the project cycle, before activities actually start. It also requires more time to negotiate with the donor. During the project, benchmarks/good monitoring/regular reviews are required, particularly in dynamic crises that may require adjustment of planning.

MYF can reduce transaction costs (project opening only once, staff contracts can be issued longer term...), however, more evidence of the positive impact of multi-year funding is to be gathered at the field level.

Joining multi-year humanitarian funding and programming can be seen as a good opportunity to support building resilience and embrace the New Way of Working and the formulation of collective outcomes.

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) **in 2016 were USD 5,874,000 and in 2017 were USD 4,880,997**
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received) **in 2016 were USD379,433,000 and in 2017 were USD 515,798,000**
- 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?

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?

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

FAO receives un-earmarked funding through its Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA), established in 2004 to enhance FAO's capacity to rapidly respond to emergency situations. SFERA provides FAO with the financial means and flexibility to react promptly to humanitarian crises reducing the time between funding decision and action on the ground.

Within SFERA, an Agricultural Input Response Capacity (AIRC) window was established through the support of a key donor (Belgium) to ensure the provision of time-critical agricultural support in emergency contexts, while fostering a more programmatic response to crises. The AIRC window has enabled FAO to kick start key interventions such as: i) prepositioning stocks of agricultural inputs in strategic locations; and ii) rapid distribution of farming inputs and livestock. In 2016, funding through the AIRC window enabled FAO to provide essential support in the Gaza Strip, Democratic Republic of Congo, Syria, Darfur, Malawi, Madagascar and Nepal to mention a few examples.

Under the SFERA, un-earmarked contributions can also be received and used in support of FAO's involvement in needs assessment; programme development; early establishment and reinforcement of emergency country team capacities; Level 3 emergency preparedness and response activities; as well as to anticipate early actions.

Dedicated efforts were deployed over 2017 with the aim of increasing the number of donors directly contributing to the AIRC (e.g. Sweden) and promoting the Early Action window as well as negotiating direct contributions to the Programme component of the SFERA for softly earmarked contributions.

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)?

At global level, the above advocacy efforts will be amplified with selected key donors. Specific credit will be attributed to donors making un-earmarked contribution in the SFERA reports submitted to FAO governing bodies on a yearly basis.

At country level, the development of multi-year resilience strategies will also be further promoted and dialogue with donors will be pursued to mobilise un-earmarked resources in support of resilience country programmes.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Most of the poor and hungry depend on renewable natural resources for their livelihoods. These natural resource-based livelihoods are most affected by natural hazards, transboundary pests and diseases, socio-economic shocks, conflict and protracted crises, making smallholder farmers, fishers and herders more vulnerable to shocks.

During a crisis, many productive assets such as seeds, livestock and fishing gear are lost. FAO's first priority is to help affected farming families produce their own food, rebuild their lives and livelihoods as quickly as possible while strengthening their resilience.

When effective agriculture-based response is delayed, communities suffer a domino effect of further losses that plunge them deeper into poverty and reliance on external aid.

Accordingly, un-earmarked contributions to SFERA ensure:

- Rapid and effective agricultural assistance thanks to the quick release of funding within a few days after a disaster, even before official resource partner agreements are finalized.
- Strategic programme support to formulate resilience building response.
- Quick capacity recovery of crisis-affected populations through rapid agricultural input delivery to restore food production and stabilize livelihoods.
- Increased cost-effectiveness by reducing time and transaction costs for all stakeholders.

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 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?

FAO has joined the pilot exercise to harmonize narrative reporting which is co-led by the German Federal Foreign Office and ICVA. FAO Country Offices in the three pilot countries – Iraq, Myanmar, Somalia – have been asked to prepare final narrative reports using the agreed 8+3 template. FAO obtained from several participating donors confirmation on the optional questions in this common 8+3 template.

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)?

FAO will continue to participate in the pilot exercise on harmonized narrative reporting and the work stream as a whole. As we move towards the target date of end 2018, a renewed effort will be required among all stakeholders if the commitment made under this workstream in the area of harmonized and simplified financial reporting is to be achieved.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Since the pilot exercise on narrative reporting started only in mid-2017, and will continue until 2019, efficiency gains cannot yet be observed.

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

FAO's Country Programming Framework comprises a five-year plan across all strategic objectives – including humanitarian and resilience programming – and which is agreed upon with the host government and informs FAO's contributions to national development frameworks and to the UNDAF. FAO has developed multi-year resilience strategies in many major crisis countries. The FAO/WFP-co-led food security cluster are responsible for developing the food security component in the Humanitarian Response Plans which, at times, are planned with a multi-year horizon, and is also participating at the formulation of collective outcomes under the New Way of Working.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

FAO is uniquely positioned to bridge humanitarian relief with sustainable development: since 2009, FAO introduced a Strategic Framework with five main objectives, one of which is

articulated around increasing the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crisis, helping countries govern, prevent and mitigate risks and crises and support them in preparing and responding to disasters.

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?

FAO's Early Warning – Early Action (EWEA) System translates warnings into anticipatory actions to reduce the impact of specific disaster events. It focuses on consolidating available forecasting information and putting plans in place to make sure FAO acts when a warning is at hand. FAO issues quarterly Global EWEA reports⁵ which complements early warning analysis with tangible early action recommendations that could be taken to mitigate or prevent the impact. Risks are divided into high and on watch, depending on the level of likelihood and potential impact.

At global level, FAO closely collaborates with, among others, the International Federation of the Red Cross, the Red Cross Climate Centre, World Food Programme and the German Red Cross. FAO is an active proponent of EWEA at Inter Agency level.

FAO worked closely with its partner the Red Cross Climate Centre and the German Red Cross in advancing the Forecast Based Financing (FbF) concept globally. Through participation in the FbF Global Dialogue Platforms (Germany, Mexico and Vietnam), experiences and ideas were shared and the basis was set for future close collaboration both at global and also at field level through joint or collaborative pilots.

Together with OCHA, FAO co-led an initiative to develop an Inter-Agency EWEA Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for El Niño/La Niña events which have been submitted to the IASC Principals endorsement in early 2018.

FAO has created a funding window under the Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA) to implement early actions at field level as a result of an early warning alert, to lessen the impact of the disaster. As of 2018, this funding window is being supported by the governments of Belgium and Sweden.

FAO is part of the Global Compact on Refugees and advocating to enhance the resilience of both host and displaced communities and to address the root causes of fragility and displacement within the context of food security and nutrition. Migration is an growing area of work for FAO, which is active both in development and humanitarian settings, FAO and IOM recently signed an MOU to further strengthen their relationship in view of their current role as co-chairs of the of Global Migration Group (GMG) during 2018. This MoU represents a unique opportunity to mainstream FAO's approach throughout migration initiatives at the regional and country level.

Supporting coherence between agriculture and social protection is a priority area of work of FAO to eradicate hunger, malnutrition, rural poverty and strengthen resilience. Accordingly, social protection was recognized as a corporate priority, and FAO has been able to position itself as a strategic contributor to the global social protection agenda, and as an important player in national social protection processes across regions, in partnership with UN agencies,

⁵ <http://www.fao.org/emergencies/results/en/?keywords=GLOBAL%20EWEA%20REPORT>

research organizations and national governments. Key FAO initiatives have included the From Protection to Production Project and The Transfer Project (both joint with UNICEF) which have strengthened the evidence base on social protection, developing a strong economic case for social protection as an investment not just a cost, while helping to address policy concerns and misperceptions linked with dependency and labour disincentives. Moreover, the initiatives support governments in enhancing programme design and implementation to maximize social and productive impacts.

In line with the indicative framework for the SDGs and the recommendations of “The One Humanity: Shared Responsibility Report”, the EU, WFP and FAO have joined forces to coordinate needs assessment to increase the impact of humanitarian and resilience responses through the preparation of the Global Report on Food Crises 2017. This Global Report aims to enhance coordination and decision making through a neutral analysis that informs programming and implementation. The key objective and strength of the report is to establish a consultative and consensus-based process to compile food insecurity analyses from around the world into a global public product. The Report compares and clarifies results of food security analyses conducted during the period January-December 2016 by various partners and across geographical areas to provide a clear picture of acute food insecurity situation. This report will be updated in 2018 with the participation of many more stakeholders.

In 2017, FAO and the World Bank have expanded their partnership to address food insecurity in conflict-affected countries: the World Bank contributed a total of USD73 million to FAO’s work in Somalia, Yemen, South Sudan and Regional Eastern Africa. FAO is supporting the World Bank to explore potential financing instruments and innovations that can be activated before, during, and after famine conditions emerge, and that help to promote famine mitigation efforts.

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)?

FAO is a member of the High Level Joint Steering Committee to advance Humanitarian and Development Collaboration which was recently established by the UNSG to strengthen humanitarian-development collaboration, contributing also to preventing the outbreak of conflict as well as peace building. At the IASC level, FAO is an active partner in various subsidiary bodies such as the IASC Task Team on the humanitarian-development nexus, the Task Team on Humanitarian Financing, and the Reference Group on Risk, Early Warning and Preparedness.

At the regional and country levels, two initiatives embracing the humanitarian-development divide are important to mention: i) provide energy access in both rapid humanitarian response planning as well as in longer-term resilience-building interventions using innovative technology for woodfuel supply and demand assessments (linked to the Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All) initiative and to SDG 7; and ii) address short-term response and to strengthen resilience capacity of pastoral communities and prepare for future drought events and respond to prevailing crisis, given that the 2016-17 El-Nino related drought has further exacerbated the pastoral livelihoods crisis in East and West Africa.

4. Efficiency gains

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

In Madagascar, to address this chronic hazard, FAO strengthened the existing key source of information – SISAV (Integrated Monitoring System for Vulnerability and Food Security – by providing forward looking indicators in order to alert about potential new droughts and increasing vulnerabilities. The monitoring conducted by SISAV is operationalized into a specific FAO EWEA Plan for Drought, which encompasses a set of early actions interventions to safeguard agriculture livelihoods of affected communities.

As of late 2017, the above systems begun to indicate worrying signs of food insecurity depleting further. In response to this situation, FAO Madagascar, through the Early Action Fund, formulated a project to support 8 400 vulnerable and food insecure households to respond quickly to the cumulative effects of the long drought periods. With the provision of short-cycle seeds, small irrigation systems and technical support including training on crop diversification and improved farming techniques, the supported households will be able to have two harvests in 2018, thus improving food availability and income.

Sudan is one of the driest countries in Africa and rainfall, which the overwhelming majority of the country's subsistence agriculture depends on, is very erratic. With these conditions, the EWEA system in Sudan was tailored towards the risk of drought. In March 2017, the EWEA team supported the Sudan FAO Country Office to establish an early warning system to monitor drought and dry spells in both Kassala and North Darfur states. The system drew upon 13 different indicators which incorporated climate, seasonality and vulnerability data. This early warning system is tailored to trigger early actions which target vulnerable agro-pastoralists in both Kassala and North Darfur states.

Since March 2017, the FAO Sudan team have closely monitoring the situation in both states. As of July, signs of stress started to emerge in Kassala and after a few months of monitoring prompted the FAO Sudan Office to conduct a rapid assessment to further understand these signs. The assessment confirmed the early warning signs, with fodder and water reserves reported as poor and below-average harvests for the main crop, sorghum. The results from the early warning system combined with the assessment prompted the Sudan FAO Office to apply for the Early Action Fund to support vulnerable pastoralist in light of these concerning conditions.

As of December 2017, the FAO Sudan office has been implementing activities to mitigate the impact of drought for 5000 households and an estimated 30 000 livestock. The project will focus on livestock interventions including provisioning supplementary animal feed, animal health treatments and trainings, destocking campaign and water tanks and trucking.

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 2017, FAO continued to refine and publish the FAO Global EWEA Report – a tool which informs decision makers to better prepare and response to food security and agriculture crises. Four public reports were produced in 2017, with improvements to the design and methodology, including a seasonality map, funding gaps and an increased focus on the IPC analysis.

Throughout 2017, FAO continued to develop and pilot (Pacific Region, Sudan, Mongolia) its Early Warning-Early Action System (EWEA) which translates forecasts and early warnings into anticipatory action.

Furthermore, in response to the major drought affecting large parts of the Horn of Africa, FAO released USD 1.2 million to support Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia with early action interventions. Activities included the provision of feed, water rehabilitation and veterinary drugs in a bid to protect core livestock breeding herds and safeguard people's livelihoods and food security.

Later, in July 2017 FAO set out to gather quantitative and qualitative evidence on the cost effectiveness of these early actions in Kenya. Preliminary results from this study demonstrate that for every 1 USD dollar spent on livestock interventions, beneficiary households had a return of almost 3.5 dollars in terms of livestock saved, livestock body conditions improved and increase in milk production.

With reference to commitment number 2 of the workstream: *"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"*.

Good or promising practices with refugees have been documented in Uganda, Turkey and Sudan.

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/good-practices/good-practices-details/en/c/1099990/>

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/good-practices/good-practices-details/en/c/1046058/>

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/good-practices/good-practices-details/en/c/461735/>

Optional data collection form related to the the Grand Bargain localization commitment on financing local responders

Purpose: this form is intended to assist signatories in capturing and analyzing their implementation of GB commitments under workstream 2 and to facilitate self-reporting. If you are willing to share this document with the workstream co-convenors, we would like to use this data to develop a baseline for where we currently are regarding implementation. For questions or clarification, please feel free to contact the co-convenors (contacts below).

Government / organization name: **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

Applicable to all signatories

Q1. **What currency would you like to report your data in?** **US Dollar**

Government donors can skip this question

Q2. **What was your humanitarian income by source in 2017?** **Notes**

Bilateral government donors and the EU	\$456.5 million	
UN agencies	\$7.7 million	
CERF	\$33.4 million	
OCHA-managed country-based pooled funds	\$11.4 million	
Private donors		
National affiliates / national fundraising offices		
Other sources (pls specify)		
Other sources (pls specify)		
Other sources (pls specify)		
Total	\$509 million	

Additional points to note on how you calculate your humanitarian income:
FAO has an internal data base system where we can track all the humanitarian funding by source/donor

Applicable to all signatories

Q3. **What was your total humanitarian expenditure in 2017?**

Additional points to note on how you calculate / define your humanitarian expenditure:

Approx. \$416.4 million

For Governments as well as Humanitarian actors who fundraise directly from the public

Q 4. **Direct funding: How much of your privately raised funding was channeled to partners in 2016?**

Partner type	Total contract value	Value of cash/ vouchers/ elements	Value of in-kind goods	Notes
Multilateral organisations				
OCHA managed CBPFs				
Other pooled funds				
International NGOs				
International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement				
International private sector				
Local and national non-state actors (total)	-	-	-	
- Red Cross/Red Crescent National Societies				
- Local and national NGOs				
- Local and national private sector				
National and sub-national state actors				
Internationally affiliated organisations				
Other (please specify/suggest category name)				
Other (please specify/suggest category name)				
Other (please specify/suggest category name)				
Total funds disbursed to implementing partners	-	-	-	

If your systems do not allow you to disaggregate this data, please provide a brief description of your reporting challenges:

Government donors not need to fill this out: focussed on funds received from government donors only

Q5. **One transaction layer: How much of your total humanitarian expenditure was channeled to partners in 2017?**

Partner type	Total contract value	Value of cash/financial elements	Value of in-kind goods
Multilateral organisations			
International NGOs	\$21.1 million		
International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement			
International private sector			
Local and national non-state actors (total)	\$61.2 million	-	-
- Red Cross/Red Crescent National Societies			
- Local and national NGOs			
- Local and national private sector			
National and sub-national state actors			
Internationally affiliated organisations			
Other (please specify/suggest category name)			
Other (please specify/suggest category name)			
Other (please specify/suggest category name)			
Total funds disbursed to implementing partners	\$82.3 million	-	-

If your systems do not allow you to disaggregate this data, please provide a brief description of your reporting challenges:

The system doesn't allow us to precisely disaggregate the data by "type" of actor. It has to be done manually. Kindly consider all the data as approximate

Applicable to all signatories

Q 6. **Capacity strengthening: Can you quantify your investments in capacity strengthening of local and national partners?**

Transfer of funding for capacity strengthening
In-kind contributions to capacity strengthening
(workshops, etc.)

\$37.30

Other (please specify/suggest category name)

Distribution of Inputs and Community
Micro Infrastructure \$18.6 million
Scientific Research Services and
Surveys \$8.7 million
Cash for Work and Voucher Schemes
\$4.2 million
Policy Development \$736,000
Capital Transfers to Revolving Funds
\$650,000

Other (please specify/suggest category name)

Other (please specify/suggest category name)

If your systems do not allow you to disaggregate this data, or you would like to add further details, please provide a description of your capacity-strengthening work:

We are working on our internal data base system and on the quality of the information that is manually reported by FAO country offices, in order to allow us to better track the funding that is transferred to local partners. As of now we are able to track how many Letters of Agreement are signed with local partners and the amount that is transferred. Being FAO also a development agency we will also be working to find a systematic way to separate the two different types of funding: hum. vs dev.

Applicable to all signatories

Q 7. **Reporting: What changes would your organisation need to make in order to capture funding flows to partners in accordance with the proposed definitions and categories of direct as possible funding to local and national actors?**