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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?

Transparency and information sharing are key principles for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA), in line with the Act on the Openness of Government Activities. According to the Act, all official documents shall be in the public domain, unless specifically provided otherwise.

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?

MFA Finland continued to share information of its humanitarian assistance in an open and prompt manner. The MFA Humanitarian Policy and Funding Guidelines can be found in the internet, providing information on the principles and objectives of Finnish Humanitarian Assistance. The funding guidelines establish the methodology, criteria and procedures to be observed in the allocation of Finnish humanitarian funding, with the aim of giving a clear picture of the way in which Finland implements the Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles (GHD) of 2003, adopted by the OECD-DAC and the EU and the Grand Bargain (2016).

After a funding allocation is made, a press release is published by the MFA to inform the general public on the context of the crises, countries and regions receiving humanitarian funding, key sectors and partners for each crisis.

The funding agreements in the Ministry include a clause that makes a reference to zero-tolerance against corruption, anti-fraud policy and transparency concerning contracts and procurement.

The Ministry also regularly informs ECHO's Edris and OCHA's Financial Tracking systems about its funding decisions.

Finland promotes the compliance with IATI standards through dialogue at the Executive Boards of UN agencies.

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)?

Finland will revise its humanitarian policy and funding guidelines next year. This process provides an opportunity to discuss how to best integrate the core commitments from the World Humanitarian Summit and Grand Bargain, including issues related to transparency.

Finland will dialogue with other donors and partners on how to improve the transparency and accuracy of financial flows of humanitarian aid, and promotes increased openness among partners. Finland would like to explore how to support UN agencies to better track and more clearly report on
the use of core funding. Finland stresses the importance of using gender and also disability markers and disaggregating data (i.a.) gender, age and disability) by its humanitarian partners.

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.

   Finland is currently working to enhance its results-based orientation and communication on the results of its ODA to a wider public. For this purpose, open and transparent data is crucial. By the end of 2018 Finland will publish a Results-based Report covering the years 2015-2017, aiming to provide a holistic picture of the results achieved by its development cooperation and humanitarian action. Finland is also putting increased emphasis on the theory of change processes.

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?

   The MFA has collaborated closely with Finnish NGOs in terms of improving the RBM- approach and reporting on results.
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?

Finland has invested significantly in strengthening civil society organizations in developing countries through the work by the MFA Civil Society Unit. In addition to the development cooperation objectives of promoting human rights, transparent governance and poverty reduction, some of the NGOs also provide humanitarian assistance and receive funding from the MFA for their humanitarian work. The MFA channels humanitarian funding only to those Finnish NGOs which have obtained ECHO partnership status. All of them work closely with local partners. For technical and practical reasons Finland does not support local authorities and organisations directly.

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?

Finland continues to be a long-time supporter of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement which has a very strong local base and large field presence in many affected communities. Finland has constantly encouraged its humanitarian partners to work in a way that reinforces rather than replaces local and national capacities whenever possible.

Last year, Finland carried out an evaluation concerning the NGOs receiving MFA Programme Based Support and Humanitarian Aid. One of the recommendations of the evaluation was to pay more attention to the quality of the partnerships with local actors, treating them more as equal partners, not as contracted implementation agents. The evaluation also recommended to invest in strengthening of the capacity of local actors. The MFA has recently finalised its Management Response to the evaluation and has started to implement the recommendations.

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)?

Finland continues to engage in a dialogue with Finnish NGOs on how to best support them to improve the capacity and engagement of local actors in delivering humanitarian assistance. The NGO Platform established for strengthening the dialogue with the NGOs on different policy issues and topics of common interests will be used for discussion about localization.

Based on the evaluation mentioned previously, Finland will revise the principles of its support to the NGOs and better integrate the need to support local actors.

Finland continues to engage with OCHA through the Connecting Business initiative to see how to best support and engage with the local private sector in the humanitarian response.
4. **Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**
Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

This process will take some more time before conclusions can be made.

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?

Finland recognize the importance of seeking effective and innovative ways to support local actors. However, there is a need to further strategize and clarify this commitment.
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?

Finland continues to actively promote the shift from in-kind humanitarian aid towards cash and voucher based assistance. The importance and value of cash-based assistance is recognised in the Finnish Humanitarian Policy (2012).

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?

Finland has promoted this approach through dialogue at the EU COHAFIA working party meetings and at the UN Executive Boards, especially in WFP. Finland has encouraged its NGO partners to systematically consider cash as an important modality from the outset of an emergency and has provided funding to cash based programmes of Finnish NGOs. For example, the Finnish Red Cross has been very active and implemented several cash programmes, and is currently exploring the use of cash in the health sector. The MFA staff have participated in the Red Cross cash training programmes organised by CaLP (Cash Learning Partnership). Finland is currently recruiting a JPO to support the WFP cash programming unit.

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)?

Finland continues to remain committed to the use of cash in emergencies and continues to engage with partners to further scale-up the use of cash assistance in all projects receiving Finnish funding. Finland provides a significant part of its funding in the form of un-earmarked or softly earmarked support, which enables humanitarian agencies to allocate resources in an efficient way and have flexible funding available for cash transfer programming. The MFA also encourages its staff to participate in training concerning the use of cash and social protection schemes.

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.

According to evaluations carried out, the use of cash has improved the quality and efficiency of aid.
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?

N/A

In recent years, many international actors including Finnish NGOs providing humanitarian assistance have increased the use of cash or voucher-based assistance. In addition, in international debates, the use of multipurpose cash assistance has become an important topic. Finland continues to support this trend and sees the use of multi-purpose cash as an important means to modernize and rationalize humanitarian assistance. Finland underscores the importance of integrating gender issues into cash programming.
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?

Finland is a flexible donor and currently provides more than 40 per cent of its funding as core support and the rest as softly earmarked funds. Finland is also a long-time supporter of the UN CERF. The allocation of Finnish humanitarian funds is based on the OCHA coordinated Global Appeals and Humanitarian Response Plans and on the ICRC’s Annual Appeals. From UN agencies and ICRC Finland accepts harmonised reporting. This ways Finland aims at reducing the reporting burden and management costs and supports the increase of overall efficiency of agencies.

The MFA guidelines highlight that in implementation and financial management of operations, the partner organisation must strive for cost-efficiency and effectiveness. In procurement and other actions, partners must observe the principles of good governance and anti-corruption. In terms of evaluations and multilateral partners’ organizational capacity, Finland does not carry out its own performance assessments, but uses i.a. the findings from the MOPAN network. Cost-efficiency is one of the important topics that the MFA pays constant attention to when analysing appeals and funding proposals.

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?

Finland has consistently raised the follow-up of the Grand Bargain in meetings with the main humanitarian partners. Last year Finland organised a special event during the WFP Executive Board to promote the use of un-earmarked funding. Finland has consistently advocated for core funding and harmonised reporting among donors and at the Executive Boards of different UN agencies.

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)?

Finland has also underscored the importance of flexible, un-earmarked funding in the context of the United Nations development reform. In order to be effective, the reform has to be backed up by adequate levels of core resources. At the same time, the UN must be fully committed to ensuring accountability and maximum results for the resources.

Finland has reviewed the recommendations of the evaluation concerning NGOs receiving Finnish MFA Programme Based Support and Humanitarian Aid. This included assessing the possibility to move from project-based humanitarian financing towards financing that better support the efficiency gains. Finland is currently in the process of looking into ways to promote a multi-year planning perspective also in the support to NGOs.
Finland will continue to actively advocate for flexible core funding and further harmonization of reporting and procedures, in close collaboration with other like-minded donors.

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.

   Multi-year, flexible funding has proved to be especially important for humanitarian agencies which implement their programs in rapidly changing environments, requiring a high degree of operational adaptability.

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?

   Lobbying for un-earmarked funding is essential, as flexible, multi-year funding is a pre-requisite for more efficient humanitarian action.
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?

   Humanitarian activities supported by the MFA and carried out by aid organisations must be compatible with Finland’s Humanitarian Policy and adhere to the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence in the implementation of humanitarian assistance. The Finnish Humanitarian Policy underscores that humanitarian assistance should be given solely based on needs.

   Finland does not carry out needs assessments of its own, but applies the assessments made by UN agencies, the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, NGO community, ECHO, FEWSNET and other reliable partners in order to build a solid picture of the global humanitarian needs. The Global Humanitarian Overview and the Humanitarian Response Plans coordinated by OCHA and the ICRC appeals are used as a basis to determine the allocation of Finnish humanitarian funding, in particular in protracted crises. It is expected that the Finnish NGOs ensure to the extent possible that their operations are included into the Country Response Plan.

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 most important principle of humanitarian assistance for Finland is that funding is based on verified and quantified needs. Finland has developed funding guidelines that indicate the criteria and procedure to determine the countries and sectors to be prioritised for assistance in a given situation.

   Finland continues to actively promote well-coordinated and common needs assessments among different humanitarian actors at the Executive Boards of UN agencies.

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)?

   Finland continues to advocate for common needs assessments and also for joined analysis and joined-up approaches between humanitarian and development actors in protracted crises.

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.

   Over the years, need assessments have improved significantly. The Dashboards used by OCHA provide a useful snapshot of a situation.
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 ries) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Finland has followed with great interest the development of EU Cash Guidelines and is committed to their application.
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

1. Baseline (only in year 1)
Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Promoting gender equality continues to be a long-standing priority for Finland. It is a key issue in Finnish development cooperation as well as in humanitarian assistance. Finland has actively promoted the needs, rights and active participation of women and girls in the planning and decision making with regard to humanitarian assistance. Finland has recently finalized its third national action plan on Security Council resolution 1325, with commitments also related to humanitarian assistance.

Within the spirit of leaving no one behind, Finland has promoted the inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian crises and raised the importance of addressing their humanitarian and protection needs and active involvement in all assistance efforts.

Finland requires that humanitarian organizations receiving Finnish funding incorporate gender equality and disability issues in their policies and operations. Finland actively advocates and uses its leverage in in the Executive Boards of UN Funds and Programmes as well as in the international financing institutions and other multilateral fora to this end.

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 order to highlight the needs and rights of persons with disabilities and to transform humanitarian practices, Finland has actively promoted the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities into Humanitarian Action, launched at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul.

As a follow up, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) established a time-bound Task Team to oversee the specific task of developing globally-endorsed guidelines on the inclusion of persons with disabilities. Finland has supported the work of the Task Team through UNICEF. The guidelines are developed with active engagement of a broad range of stakeholders, giving special attention to the full inclusion of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations.

In addition, Finland continues to be committed to playing a leading role in terms of the inclusion of persons with disabilities into humanitarian action and consistently promotes the issue at board meetings and in negotiations, including the Global Compact for Refugees. Finland has promoted the Charter through organising and participating in events on the topic, including WFP Executive Board, UNHCR, ECOSOC humanitarian segment etc., and by raising the issue in consultations with its partners.

In collaboration with World Vision, Finland has supported the development of simple and low-cost water and sanitation technological solutions and innovations that help the daily life of people with disabilities in refugee camps in Kenya, Uganda and Iraq.
Finland has also supported actions aiming at strengthening the protection of persons with disabilities in forced displacement situations. As part of a project implemented by UNHCR in partnership with Women’s Refugee Commission, technical support for capacity-building has been provided, training material and networks with disability actors have been developed, and work towards institutionalization of disability inclusion has progressed.

In January 2018, Finland hosted the Global Action of Disability Network (GLAD) meeting in Helsinki, bringing together bilateral and multilateral donors, UN agencies, organizations of persons with disabilities as well as the private sector and foundations.

The Minister of Foreign Trade and Development of Finland together with her colleagues from Australia, New Zealand and Luxemburg have presented a letter to the UN Secretary General on the need to strengthen the inclusion of disability issues in the context of UN reforms.

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)?

Finland is committed to encouraging humanitarian partners to put in place the necessary technical capacity and dedicated disability focal points to ensure coordination and coherence, and to commit financial resources from their organisation's regular budget to strengthen disability work. Finland also advocates for meaningful involvement of persons with disabilities and their organisations in the needs assessment, design, implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian preparedness and response programs, including in the appropriate coordination and oversight mechanisms.

System-wide efforts are required to strengthen accountability, monitoring and reporting on disability. Agencies should also ensure that all development and humanitarian data is disaggregated by disability, age and gender. Disability data should be collected using the ‘Washington Group Question Sets’, and that the allocation of funding should be tracked using the disability policy marker developed by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee.

Finland continues to promote gender-responsive humanitarian response and champion universal access to sexual and reproductive health and rights for women and adolescent girls through active policy dialogue, funding and advocacy. Also the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 remains a priority for Finland as we are currently implementing our third national action plan on 1325. Finland promotes the mainstreaming of gender equality in humanitarian assistance also through the implementation of the Grand Bargain.

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.

Gender equality is a key issue for increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian aid. Research has shown that resources put in the hands of women are well used and meet the needs of
households. Targeting assistance to people with disabilities and including them as active agents of change can help the humanitarian system to better fulfil its live saving objectives.

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?*

We hope that the Disability Guidelines will be ready by the end of this year and prove to be successful in terms of promoting the rights of persons with disability and enhancing accountability and transparency.
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?*

Multi-year core funding continues to be an integral part of Finland's humanitarian policy and practice. The MFA has signed multi-year framework agreements with several UN agencies including UNHCR, WFP, ISDR, UNRWA and OCHA, and also with the ICRC. These agreements provide predictable and flexible core funding for the agencies to ensure an effective humanitarian response.

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?*

Finland has further enhanced its multi-year humanitarian commitments in 2017 by increasing the core funding to ICRC. In addition, Finland has granted support to the UNICEF No Lost Generation initiative in Syria through a multi-year funding agreement from the development budget. The share of un-earmarked, multi-year funding has increased to more than 40 per cent of the total humanitarian budget.

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)?*

Finland continues to provide multi-year core funding through existing agreements with humanitarian partner organisations. Finland will continue to advocate for increased core funding among the donor community.

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.*

Flexible funding can increase the efficiency gains of agencies, for example WFP is able to buy food with un-earmarked multi-year core funds when the market price is at a favourable level.

5. Good practice 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?*

From Finland’s perspective it is crucial that donors with large aid volumes will change their current practices and in future provide a bigger part of their funding as un-earmarked. Finland is actively promoting and supporting this shift.
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?

Finland has provided non-earmarked and flexible funding to UN agencies for more than a decade, in line with the principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD). Finland earmarks the funding to UN agencies, the ICRC and the IFRC funding only by country or region. Otherwise, the above-mentioned organisations can independently decide on the use of the funds within operations for humanitarian ends. A considerable part of the assistance is granted annually in the form of core funding to several organisations, including ICRC, ISDR, OCHA, UNHCR, UNRWA and WFP. In addition, Finland is a strong supporter of UN CERF.

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?

Before joining the Grand Bargain, the portion of the un-earmarked funding of Finland's humanitarian budget stood at 32 per cent, including the amount allocated to UN CERF. Since then, it has further increased (see the response to the previous question/reference to increased core funding to ICRC) and is now over 40 per cent.

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)?

Finland will continue promoting the good practice of providing un-earmarked funding among donors.

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.

See the response to the previous question.

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?

In terms of UN organisations and the ICRC, the MFA does not need any specific report but uses the annual reports of these organisations. For the NGOs supported by the Finnish humanitarian funding the MFA has developed reporting templates to clarify the reporting requirements.

In terms of the ICRC and UN partners, the MFA does not need an application or proposal, but uses the organization’s appeal as basis for funding allocations. In addition, Finland uses the organization’s global report for reporting.

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?

See the response above.

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)?

Finland will continue to explore ways to simplify, harmonise and reduce the reporting burden by its humanitarian partners. Finland will encourage its partners to further develop the communication on results and outcomes of the assistance, instead of reporting on inputs.

Finland will continue to promote the need to include gender analysis and gender disaggregated data in the global reports at the UN Executive Board meetings and in bilateral consultations.

Finland will promote system-wide efforts to strengthen accountability, monitoring and reporting on disability. Agencies need to ensure that all development and humanitarian data is disaggregated by disability, age and gender. Disability data should be collected using the ‘Washington Group Question Sets’, and the allocation of funding should be tracked using the disability policy marker developed by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee.

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.

The annual report on development and humanitarian assistance by the Finnish MFA is very much based on data and information obtained through the global reports of the ICRC and UN agencies.
5. **Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)**

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

Too early to report on this.
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?

Finland has promoted effective linking of humanitarian assistance, reconstruction and development cooperation for more than a decade. In the case of Finland, linking is mostly implemented through EU, World Bank and UN multilateral cooperation and NGO activities. Finland promotes the implementation of the humanitarian and development nexus by influencing the policies of multilateral organizations, developing flexible operating mechanisms and providing funding for transition activities.

Finland has promoted disaster risk reduction (DRR) through the implementation of the Sendai framework and building of resilience through development cooperation with the aim of reducing future humanitarian needs.

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 MFA has actively promoted the humanitarian – development nexus by organizing in-depth internal discussions and by developing a memo on the organization-wide actions required to enhance the humanitarian-development nexus in Finnish development policy. Finland has developed a Syria-Iraq strategy to bring humanitarian and development work closer together in its own work. Finland has supported the Syria Regional Response Plan and Refugee Plan, based on the view that the complex situation requires a comprehensive response and better alignment of humanitarian and development assistance. Finland has also supported the No Lost Generation initiative. Finland supports the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework process and is committed to finding durable solutions for refugees and IDPs.

The Unit for Humanitarian Unit and Policy from the MFA has participated in the discussions over ‘the New Way of Working’ and supports its further operationalization in the field.

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)?

Finland will revise its humanitarian policy and funding guidelines next year. This process provides an opportunity to review current practice and decide how to best further strengthen the humanitarian and development nexus.
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?

Having common platforms for joint analysis, planning and programming between humanitarian and development actors is critical for designing more comprehensive responses to crises and for using resources with maximum efficiency. A positive example of joint planning is the Syria Integrated Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP).

Flexible, multi-year funding is an important pre-requisite for implementing the humanitarian and development nexus.

It is important to apply a flexible approach but at the same time to respect the different mandates of various actors and the humanitarian principles.