

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

FAO

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	4
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	4
Work stream 2 - Localization	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	5
2. Progress to date	5
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	6
Work stream 3 - Cash	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date	7
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 4 – Management costs	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	9
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
2. Progress to date	10
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2. Progress to date	13
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	14
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	15
3. Planned next steps	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	16
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	17

1. Baseline (only in year 1)	17
2. Progress to date	17
3. Planned next steps	17
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	18
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	19
2. Progress to date	19
3. Planned next steps	19
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	19
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	19
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	20
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	20
2. Progress to date	20
3. Planned next steps	21
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	22
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	22

Work stream 1 - Transparency

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In December 2016, FAO secured project funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to support organizations in reporting their aid projects related to Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Security by creating tools, sharing reporting experiences, and updating international classification.

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 March 2017, members of this task team attended the IATI Technical Advisory Committee meetings in Tanzania, and presented their approach to applying international/OECD classifications used in reporting AID project to IATI, including some of the challenges and solutions that provided valuable insights to other reporters.

FAO plans to report its Aid project to IATI, for the first time ever, in April 2017. At that time the internal FAO IATI task team will submit a proposal to its management for enhancing the quality, frequency and regularity of ongoing quarterly reporting of FAO aid projects to IATI.

During 2017, FAO will submit a formal proposal to the OECD to expand and update its classifications to facilitate AID reporting to both the OECD and IATI. This proposal will be based on broad consultations with internal and external stakeholders through a community of interest, and will include other UN agencies, member countries, and civil society organizations, in partnership with InterAction, which has led IATI's Agriculture Working Group.

During the next two years, FAO will also build an Agriculture Investment Vocabulary/Multi-lingual thesauri, to include relevant classifications, in order to facilitate organizations in compiling and reporting their aid projects.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

Collaboration amongst relevant internal stakeholders has helped FAO effectively identify IATI reporting requirements, as well as to potential challenges and related solutions that will facilitate the April 2017 target date for the first IATI report.

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

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

FAO has benefitted from project funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; in-person advice and support from InterAction, which provides advice and guidance to new IATI reporters; and support from individuals/experts and other members of the IATI TAG team in various technical groups and fora, including at the International Open Data Conference held in Madrid, Spain in October 2016.

Work stream 2 - Localization

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

FAO has committed to reassessing its corporate mechanisms for partnership and financial engagement with NGOs, by introducing new administrative mechanisms and supporting the Charter for Change. On the former, FAO issued a completely 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. Regarding the Charter for Change, FAO is engaged at the level of the IASC Humanitarian Task Team on applying a localization marker.

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?

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 Global Food Security Cluster and the German-international NGO, Welthungerhilfe, developed a joint video project in 2016 with support from the German Federal Foreign Office. The video will show the importance of partnering in humanitarian crises, how local partners can get involved in Food Security Clusters at country level and how they collaborate in different humanitarian crises and responses. This video will also tell the story of the important role local actors play in humanitarian response. The gFSC/Welthungerhilfe videos will be available soon. They will be used as a tool to raise awareness, create dialogue (especially to identify capacity building needs) and strengthen participation of local actors in country clusters.

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 concept of localization 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. Under that focus 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. In this context, gFSC will focus on some concrete deliverables, such as (i) collection of good practices and sharing of lessons learned on local partnership; (ii) application of the gFSC/Welthungerhilfe video project as a tool and advocate the engagement of local actors more proactively; (iii) a mapping of who is doing what with the NGO partners to tap into their strengths, and (iv) piloting innovative approaches to engage local partners at country level.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 3 - Cash

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Since 2001, FAO has implemented cash-based transfers in over 40 countries, developed a policy (2012) and two technical guidelines (2013) on cash-based transfers and specific modalities, and put in place a capacity development programme on cash transfers since 2014.

The Organization has expertise on knowledge management and quantitative and qualitative impact evaluation of social cash transfers with a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa (Transfer Project, from Protection to Production).

The FAO Social protection team is currently working on policy, programming and evidence generation support to countries (including on national cash transfer policies and programmes).

FAO is an active member of the Social Protection Inter-Agency Coordination Board and Cash Group of Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).

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 corporate commitments on cash-based transfers were made within the framework of the World Humanitarian Summit and the Grand Bargain. An internal inter-departmental working group on cash-based transfers (bringing together operations, finance, procurement, information systems and programming capacities) was set up, as was a dedicated cash transfer programming team in the Organization's Emergency and Rehabilitation Division. In conjunction with the former, a market analysis expert was recruited. Markers to track cash-based portfolio were defined.

Additional resources have been mobilized to scale up the cash capacity development programme and to assess the impact of integrated cash and productive interventions.

A CashCap expert was seconded to the Organization to support the FAO-WFP led global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) to produce a Cluster Coordinators Briefing Package/Checklist in line with the cluster functions and in close collaboration with the field Cluster Coordinators. The Briefing Package was developed and shared with a wide range of relevant stakeholders.

A position paper on the role of social protection in fragile, humanitarian and protracted contexts was produced as was a guidance note on social protection in protracted crises.

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)?

- *Development of FAO's manual on cash and vouchers*
- *Implementation of markers to track cash-based portfolio and progress*
- *Scaling up of the cash capacity development programme*
- *Deployment of dedicated staff on cash and social protection at regional/sub-regional levels*
- *Investments (operational research, technical assistance, programme development and impact evaluation) in new delivery models such as shock-responsive social protection systems and electronic voucher schemes for agricultural inputs*
- *Joint work on cash coordination with the FAO-WFP led global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) Cash and Market Working Group (CMWG)*
- *Joint Partnership with ECHO, DFID, UNICEF and other IGOs to organize Global Conference on Social Protection and Fragility, focusing on the use of social protection instruments, including cash in extreme fragile and forced displacement contexts.*

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 4 – Management costs

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

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 implement 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 the development of cost categorization; addressing budgeting, accounting and financial reporting implications; formulating functional requirements; updating corporate systems; developing training modules; working with resource partners; and starting phased implementation.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Accurate and timely situational analyses and need assessments provide the foundation and justification for efficient interventions to support recovery and enhance resilience of the population. FAO in partnership with national governments, UN partners as well as international and local NGOs has continued to support and implement a wide range of assessments in different crises and post-crisis situations at global level. In addition, to strengthen knowledge and capacities FAO supports staff and partners in the design and implementation of interventions. In this regard, FAO has focused on the development and dissemination of assessment tools and trainings tailored to different contexts and objectives. Since 2012, FAO has developed needs assessment capacities in more than 30 countries, and has led and jointly participated in a large number of needs assessments including: (1) Crop Food Security Assessment Missions (CFSAM), (2) Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessments (MIRA), (3) Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA), (4) Seed Security Assessments (SSA) and (5) Emergency Fishery and Aquaculture Needs Assessments.

Simultaneously, since 2015, the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) led by FAO and WFP has been advocating 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 gFSC, on multi-sector joint analytical framework for protracted crises. The project has been submitted to donors. The objective of the proposed action is to directly contribute to Grand Bargain's work stream 5 (needs assessment), while also contributing to setting the foundations for the achievement of work stream 7 (multi-year planning and funding).

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 been proactive in building and enhancing its relationships and partnerships with other UN agencies, academic institutions, NGOs and governments' beneficiaries even before the Grand Bargain was signed. For example, regular meetings are organized by FAO's technical and managerial staff with relevant humanitarian actors such as WFP, OCHA and IFAD, with the intention of strengthening coordination, sharing resources, and building internal and external capacities, thus ensuring alignment of humanitarian and development programming. FAO believes that this approach will not only be adopted at HQ level but also mainstreamed at regional, sub-regional and national levels. Hence the importance of communicating and coordinating both internally and with other partners remains imperative and is genuinely stressed throughout the work stream. Concretely, when FAO receives a request to organize and/or participate in various types of needs assessments, the first step is to liaise with the concerned line ministries and other humanitarian actors in order to understand how best to

share roles and responsibilities, what type of experts and resources are required, and which methodology can be used. This approach aims at providing a single, comprehensive and cross-sectoral assessment which is conducted in a coordinated manner to assist the affected population and avoid putting a burden on them. Last but not least, FAO believes in the importance of sharing timely data and information. In this regard, the results of every assessment in which FAO participated are shared in a dedicated section of the FAO emergency webpage and other public FAO outreach channels (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) in order to ensure a transparent and useful dissemination of the information.

At the level of the Emergency Directors Group, FAO is working closely with WFP and OCHA on adopting, adapting and replicating the IPC in various countries to support the joint assessment work undertaken for the Humanitarian Needs Overview.

At the request of the IASC Principals, an interagency Task Team composed of FAO, WFP, UNHCR and OCHA was convened to revisit costing methodologies for appeals, and to strengthen the transparency of needs assessments. This is one of the issues that was discussed by the IASC Principals and FAO Emergency Director presented at this session.

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 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 partnership with governments and key UN agencies, particularly WFP, as well as NGOs and other humanitarian actors, research institutions, academia and the private sector.*
- 2. Organize and conduct at least 70 percent of the work related to needs assessment “jointly” with the actors mentioned above in point (1).*
- 3. Increase the use of standby partners when it comes to the preparation and implementation of needs assessments.*
- 4. Advocate for and ensure government leadership when conducting needs assessments.*
- 5. Promote a more systematic use of the “Accountability to Affected Population” principle and its five dimensions (1) leadership/governance, (2) transparency, (3) feedback and complaints, (4) participation, (5) design, monitoring and evaluation, when conducting needs assessments. Special attention should be paid to the inclusion of the affected population in the needs assessment process.*
- 6. Ensure a more efficient integration of cross-cutting issues such as gender, DRR and DRM in needs assessment related work.*
- 7. Work closely with other UN agencies in the implementation of the Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPBA) process, in addition to the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment project roll-out phase II.*

8. *Expand the FAO roster of needs assessment specialists in order to ensure the availability and mobility of high quality experts.*
9. *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.*
10. *Continue supporting the work of the Global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) and other humanitarian Clusters.*
11. *Create additional platforms and modalities to share information material and data in relation to different types of needs assessment.*
12. *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 (optional for year 1)

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 (optional for year 1)

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

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution 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?

- *In this first year of the Grand Bargain, FAO continued to ensure that its response plans specifically include AAP principles, to address how the most vulnerable will be reached, how communities will be able to participate during planning and implementation of programmes, how they will have access to feedback channels and how information will be available in a timely and appropriate manner.*
- *FAO continued to develop capacity of staff to ensure that AAP is effectively mainstreamed in all phases of the project cycle for all responses and projects.*
- *FAO is supporting its country offices to build and improve feedback and complaints mechanisms that offer secure ways for affected communities to have a voice. A concrete example is the system in place in FAO Somalia, which integrates a call centre and a hotline, offering communities the opportunity to provide feedback through different channels. The call centre gathers data on satisfaction and quality of interventions through its regular monitoring exercises, while the hotline provides a number that community members can call at any time to give feedback and make complaints. Information received through both channels is analysed in a timely manner, leading to appropriate action (e.g. programme reorientation, targeting corrections) and the provision of a response to the complainant.*
- *FAO participated in an IASC Emergency Directors Group joint mission to Nigeria in November 2016 to scale up the response in the region and ensure it remained responsive to the needs of those affected. The mission included specific time for consulting with communities and had a special focus on issues of gender, AAP and protection for sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA). FAO sees this as an important example of how IASC organizations are coming together to improve collaboration, efficiency and accountability in humanitarian contexts.*

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 strengthen the capacity development programme for field staff, systematically disseminate guidance and best practices on participatory and inclusive community engagement methods, mainstream AAP in the humanitarian project cycle.*
- *Work closely with Monitoring and Evaluation teams in decentralized offices to integrate context-specific, qualitative indicators into surveys and other monitoring tools as a way to monitor/measure community participation/engagement, perception and satisfaction.*
- *Reach out to partners to strengthen efforts for more collaborative and complementary work, e.g. development of common platforms for information gathering/sharing and community-based feedback and complaints mechanisms.*

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

All of FAO's Country Programming Frameworks involve multi-year planning and programming (MYP) with a view to linking the Organization's emergency work with longer term development work.

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?

At the interagency level, FAO is part of the Advisory Panel to OCHA's evaluation on multi-year planning (with the OECD, the RC/HC for OpT, the World Bank, UNDP, ICVA) and is part of the steering committee for OCHA's interagency missions to various countries who have adopted a MYP framework (recent trip to DRC, planned trip to Sudan in April 2017).

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)?

Together with OCHA and the Norwegian Refugee Council, FAO is launching a study on the implications of multi-year financing for the humanitarian system. The objectives are to:

- 1) Determine to what extent multi-year funding is actually being provided to meet the needs as stated in a select number of multi-year or annual Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) through a desk review and baseline data gathering exercise.*
- 2) Undertake an analysis of multi-year funding and its implications for humanitarian organisations in particular how it affects budgeting, resource mobilisation, relationships with donors, agreements between first-level funding recipients and implementing organisations, possibilities for innovative financing solutions, and operations in the field. This analysis will include MYF that is exclusively for **humanitarian response**, as well as MYF for humanitarian organisations working across the **humanitarian – development – peacebuilding nexus**.*

The results will be presented at the ECOSOC Humanitarian Segment and in various fora in June 2017.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

Efficiency is one of the elements that the study on MYF will specifically look at.

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

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

FAO has been using multi-year agreements with some humanitarian donors, specifically Sweden and Canada, to strengthen resilience building of vulnerable livelihoods in protracted crisis. FAO is actively promoting this approach as a good practice with other humanitarian donors.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Less than 2 percent of FAO's annual received contributions were un-earmarked over the period 2012-2015.

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 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 2016 with the aim of increasing the number of donors directly contributing to the AIRC (well advanced conversation with Sweden) and promoting the newly established Early Action window which were presented to the FAO Governing Bodies as well as negotiating direct contributions to the Programme component of the SFERA for softly earmarked contributions in support of the response to El Nino (Netherlands and Ireland) and in two protracted crises contexts (Syria with support from Norway and South Sudan with support from Canada). Finally, a dedicated publication was produced to demonstrate the added value of un-earmarked contributions from Belgium under the AIRC window.

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 (optional for year 1)

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 (optional for year 1)

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

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

FAO fully identifies with the issues highlighted under the goal of “Harmonise and Simplify Reporting Requirements” and the commitments made under this heading. Clearly, the goals of “harmonization” and “simplification” will require significant coordination across donors and the recipient (of funds) organizations.

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 on-going discussions around this Grand Bargain work stream; Simplified and harmonised reporting requirements by their nature will require discussion and agreement across UN agencies, resource partners and NGOs. FAO will pursue these discussions in the context of the established structures within the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB).

At the same FAO continues to encourage the adoption of standard financial reporting formats when discussing individual funding agreements with donors.

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 participated in the Berlin workshop on 24 March 2017 where the piloting of the template 10+3 for narrative reporting will be tabled. This does not yet touch upon harmonizing financial reporting.

The issue of donor reporting will be discussed at the 29th Session of the Finance and Budget Network in June 2017.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

A main focus of the Organization's Strategic Framework on building resilience is bridging the humanitarian-development and now peace nexus. The Organization is working towards strengthening the narrative and evidence base behind a common theory of change across humanitarian, development and peace nexus.

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?

At the interagency level, FAO is an active partner both in the IASC Task Team on humanitarian-development nexus and the UNDG Transitions Working Group, both of which are working on system-wide guidance on joined up analysis, planning, programming and financing.

At the Organizational level, FAO has been working on a resilience framework since 2008 that aims to bridge humanitarian and development work through its technical work in agriculture, food security and nutrition.

At the World Humanitarian Summit, eight UN agencies committed to a new way of working together. The new way of working is urgently needed because humanitarian needs have risen to levels not seen since the end of World War II. These people will be left far behind in achieving the SDGs unless urgent action is taken. These crises have become more protracted, lasting seven years on average with 89 percent of humanitarian resources spent on crises lasting more than 3 years. Conflict has become a very significant driver (over 80 percent) as well as another significant constraint to reaching the SDGs.

For FAO, resilience is a unifying concept that could help the international system to translate a very high/strategic outcome into a concrete deliverable that actually will change the needs of specific populations in protracted situations. The concept brings together the short, medium and long term perspectives of the different communities of actors and promotes the use of these differing approaches in a layered manner, not excluding any actor. In this regard, FAO together with Rome based partners, WFP and IFAD, have been working on various framing documents to coordinate action in the field of agriculture, food security and nutrition to bridge humanitarian, development and investment actions in areas of protracted crises. The below are examples of this work, with in some cases is being undertaken within the framework of the Committee on World Food Security.

- The endorsement of the CFS-FFA - <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bc852e.pdf> which is the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises (CFS-FFA, the Framework). The objective of this framework is to improve the food security and nutrition of populations affected by, or at risk of, protracted crises by addressing critical manifestations and building resilience; adapting to specific challenges; and contributing to addressing underlying causes.

- The development of Guidance Notes supporting operationalization of the CFS-FFA on a number of

thematic areas including on Gender; Information and analysis; Fuel and energy; and Social protection in protracted crises. Others include on Land; Livestock; Distress migration and youth; and Nutrition.

- Funded by CIDA, the joint Rome-based Agencies' Resilience Initiative (2017-2021) in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Niger and Somalia will allow to address the root causes of vulnerability related to food insecurity and malnutrition in three different contexts of protracted fragility and crisis. The specific resilience tools and approaches of FAO, IFAD and WFP will be aligned and integrated to maximize the synergies and eventually the impacts of the programme on nutrition, responsible governance of natural resources, food supply and sustainable agricultural production.

- FAO is using a modified version of the PDNA in Syria and intend to use the same approach in Iraq. The overall PDNA approach can be found at:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/jkupa570iwbah05/AADbloxxifh9akRKRQwvQvt2a?dl=0>.

The innovations the Organization has made in Syria are: Estimation of damage and loss from a protracted six-year crisis at sub-national (Governorate) level. Normally, PDNA is used for estimating damage and loss from a sudden onset natural disaster and results are presented at national level only. Modifying to a longer time period and a sub-national level is important for understanding the impact of protracted crisis which is long in duration and normally geographically diverse. Inclusion of household and community level results to capture the impact of the crisis on livelihoods. The household level survey is designed to generate estimates with 95 percent confidence at Governorate level. The household level is not normally included systematically in PDNA and certainly not through a statistically representative sample. By combining the household level with the macro (Governorate) level, we can generate a deeper picture of the impact of crisis, which will inform targeting and programming in general.

In addition, FAO has been developing a Resilience Index Measurement Analysis (RIMA) <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5298e.pdf>. FAO has been at the forefront of efforts to measure the resilience capacity of people to food insecurity and the effectiveness of resilience strengthening interventions. In this framework, FAO has pioneered the development and the use of Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA). RIMA is an innovative quantitative approach that allows to explain why and how some households cope with shocks and stressors better than others do. The first version of RIMA has been technically improved based on its application in 10 countries.

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 has embedded its commitments in the Organization's Medium Term Planning Results Framework (2018-2021). In the MTP, three major areas of work have been identified, with four mutually reinforcing outcomes. All Grand Bargain commitments have been mapped against these four outcomes as have the WHS commitments made by the Organization. These commitments are in fact in support of FAO's Resilience framework, using as an entry point, the resilience concept to link shorter term emergency work with longer term development work, also illustrating the necessary shift from emergency crisis response to preventive and proactive anticipatory measures.

As described above, the framework with its different components is being translated into action in different regional and country settings.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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