

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

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

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

Gender Inclusion

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



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

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps.....	6
4. Efficiency gains	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned	6
Work stream 2 - Localization	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	8
3. Planned next steps.....	8
4. Efficiency gains	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned	9
Work stream 3 - Cash	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	10
2. Progress to date.....	10
3. Planned next steps.....	11
4. Efficiency gains	11
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).....	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps.....	15
4. Efficiency gains	15

5. Good practices and lessons learned	15
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	16
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	16
2. Progress to date.....	16
3. Planned next steps.....	17
4. Efficiency gains	17
5. Good practices and lessons learned	17
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps.....	19
4. Efficiency gains	19
5. Good practice and lessons learned	19
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	20
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	20
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps.....	21
4. Efficiency gains	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps.....	22
4. Efficiency gains	22
5. Good practices and lessons learned	22
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	24
2. Progress to date.....	25
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	26

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?

At this stage, France's humanitarian data is not available on the IATI GB dashboard. We are working on it.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

At the French level, a focal point is designated to publish all the humanitarian funds managed by the MFA on EDRIS, to ensure that this data is timely, transparent, harmonised and open.

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?

France has commissioned a think tank (Groupe URD) to work on transparency. Its main mission is to map all French humanitarian funding (including outside the MFA), based on a clear definition of humanitarian action, and to design accordingly a joint framework that could be used by all the services involved in humanitarian aid, to improve transparency and accountability.

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)?

Once this study is done, France is going to implement the new framework set up. It has already started to work on the harmonization of DAC and EDRIS reporting.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Having access, on a single database, to every humanitarian project funded by France with all the details is extremely useful to have a global vision of the French humanitarian policy and to transcend divides between the different services that implement it.

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?

It is highly important, both for the workstream 1 and workstream 9, that the administrators of the different humanitarian-related databases (namely DAC [OECD], EDRIS [DG ECHO], FTS [OCHA] and IATI), but also those who administer wider reporting on humanitarian commitments (World Humanitarian Summit, Grand Bargain...) work to harmonize their frameworks and requirements.

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

In 2017, 3.3 M€² of French humanitarian funding went directly to local and national responders. 5.5 M€ went to OCHA's pooled funds. Giving percentages is harder, since the baseline is unclear: a majority of France's humanitarian funding (79.5 M€ in 2017, which accounts for more than half of the total) is unearmarked or softly earmarked and cannot thus be included. Furthermore, we don't have details on the UN local partners.

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.

² Only 2.4 M€ if we take the definition given by the *Grand Bargain* framework. However, we financed for 0.9 M€ several Syrian organizations that are registered, for evident political reasons, outside Syria but are nonetheless fully Syrian.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

At the World Humanitarian Summit, France has made several commitments that are in line with this workstream's orientations:

- *"France commits to develop and establish a "local" marker for its humanitarian programs, as a guideline, in order to assess if a project is well enough designed to ensure that it reinforces and does not replace national and local capacity and to foster partnerships between international and national and local actors."*
- *"France commits to lobby for the increase of the overall portion of humanitarian appeal funding channelled through country or region-based pooled funds to national and local actors and, more generally, to support financial instruments dedicated to national and local actors."*
- *"France commits to strengthening national and local institutional capacity in countries suffering from humanitarian crisis, through the identification of a capacity strengthening mechanism to be launched by 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?

France has started to design:

- *A capacity enforcement mechanism aiming at strengthening NGOs' local partners*
- *A prequalification mechanism aiming at mobilizing local actors in capacity to respond to an urging crisis immediately, and reinforcing the capacities of pre-selected NGOs through an organizational diagnostic*
- *A localization marker, aiming at assessing our commitments towards local actors*

France also allows funding to certain pooled funds (Syria, Lebanon) as they provide efficient mechanisms to support national NGOs and strengthen their capacities.

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)?

France aims at implementing these tools by next year. France will also pursue its reflection on how to better support pooled funds, taking into account the funds available.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N/A

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*
2. *Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*
3. *Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*
4. *Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*
5. *Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*
6. *Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In 2017, France has given 49,3% of the amount of its Food aid to cash transfer programs, versus 15,5% to programs implementing in-kind products.

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?

Commitment 1: already done before signing the GB

Commitment 2: supporting WFP on implementing multipurpose cash transfer (one multiagency card)

Commitments 3 and 4: French NGOs are fully involved in specific working groups on these subjects, and participate to community practices meetings.

Commitment 5: To ensure that operators implement good quality baseline surveys in order to select beneficiaries, and have set up monitoring systems on the impact

Commitment 6: Cash transfer used to support local markets, especially in the border zones of regions facing famine and in new conflicts-free zones that are in reconstruction.

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)?

France supports preferably operators that set up cash transfers, when appropriate.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Implementation of multipurpose cash transfer that allows the improvement of local markets and simplify the way the aid is given.

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?

For example in Lebanon, the network of retail shops, allows to support local employment and fosters local market, in addition to aid beneficiaries.

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?

France does not conduct individual donor assessments.

It seems to us that this workstream concerns mostly aid organizations, since France assessment, evaluation, verification and oversight process is already very light.

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?

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)?

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?

To define its humanitarian response and funding, France relies largely on the needs assessment realized by UN agencies, DG ECHO (Index INFORM, Liste des crises oubliées, cadre d'analyse intégré) and their implementing partners. France also relies on other information sources thanks to its diplomatic network. This information is also used in interministerial meetings to ensure that humanitarian analysis, planning and programming is based on a common assessment.

The importance of a humanitarian response based on quality and precise needs assessment is a key element of the dialogue between France and UN agencies.

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?

France has developed its dialogue with UN agencies on this topic, especially in the context of the Syrian crisis, to ensure that humanitarian assistance is delivered based on thorough needs assessment, taking into account information provided by humanitarian partners, and in conformity with humanitarian principles.

This issue has been raised with international partners in fora such as the United Nations and the International Syria Support Group.

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)?

France will continue to highlight this issue in its operational and institutional dialogue with UN agencies, and DG ECHO

4. Efficiency gains

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

A precise needs assessment is key to ensure that as many people in need as possible receive the necessary assistance. It is also an important accountability element with regards to the way humanitarian funding is used.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

When issues are raised by multiple stakeholders, it enhances the strength of the message.

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?

This workstream's commitments mostly concern donors. France's project financing instruments are already quite flexible and enable programme adaptation in response to community feedback.

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?

France will adopt for at its bilateral funding the harmonized donor reporting pilot set up by the co-convenors of the Grand Bargain work stream number 9, which will enable to receive more

consistent data on participation and accountability to the affected population (how the project has been designed and managed to maximize accountability toward the affected population).

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)?

France will advocate that these commitments should be fully taken into account in its dialogue with the donors it funds.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Participation reinforces humanitarian aid's impact and its acceptance. It empowers the beneficiaries, in line with the Grand Bargain's commitments on localization.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

N/A

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.
2. Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.
3. Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements³ you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.⁴ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

At the London Conference in 2016, France committed to allowing 200 M€ of grants between 2016 and 2018 to Syria and neighbouring countries in order to respond to the Syrian crisis.

France has also developed interministerial meetings to strengthen its reflection on joint and multiyear planning and programming.

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?

So far, almost all the commitments made at the London Conference have been met. Coordinated reporting mechanisms have been developed to ensure that France meets its commitments.

³ Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

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

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)?

France will continue to develop its reflection on multiyear planning and programming, notably with regards to multiyear humanitarian response plans, within its national legislative framework in this matter.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Having a multiyear prospective clearly allows the donor to have a more precise vision of its commitments and how it can organize planning and programming to meet them.

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?

Inter

Coordination mechanisms at the interministerial level is an efficient mechanism to develop a multiyear prospective.

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 2020⁵.*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given) : 23% vs 17%*
- Softly earmarked contributions (given) : 3,5% vs 2,5%*
- Country earmarked contributions (given) : 29% vs 42 %*
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given) : 44,5% vs 38,5%*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

See above.

⁵ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

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?

France has continued its efforts to reduce the part of earmarked funding in its humanitarian funding, as the results above show.

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 raise awareness among all stakeholders on the importance for humanitarian organizations to have more unearmarked thus flexible funding, including by encouraging organizations themselves to explain in front of stakeholders their needs in this regard. France will also stress the need for a reliable reporting of the use of unearmarked funds, in order to be fully transparent and accountable towards national taxpayers.

4. Efficiency gains

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

There is a clearer sense among French stakeholders that unearmarked thus flexible funding allows for more efficiency for humanitarian organizations, as they can react more quickly if a specific context demands so. But efforts to raise awareness must be pursued.

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?

It is very efficient to raise awareness when organizations themselves make the case for more unearmarked funding, giving concrete examples and explaining efficiency gains.

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?

French reporting mechanisms are considered extremely light and flexible by our operating partners. However, there was a lack of harmonization between France's different humanitarian funds' reporting frameworks. Furthermore, our reporting requirements were insufficiently structured to get a homogeneous level on information on the projects we financed.

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?

France has decided to adopt the harmonized donor reporting pilot set up by the co-convenors of the Grand Bargain work stream number 9. This effort in favour of simplification and harmonization is going to be a significant axis of its new humanitarian strategy, set up to be adopted on March 22.

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)?

France is going to implement the pilot and provide its returns and its partners' returns to the Grand Bargain to help improve it. If the pilot proves successful, it will advocate for its expansion.

4. Efficiency gains

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

N. A.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

The fact that this work stream has focused its efforts on a concrete pilot project was especially helpful to implement the commitments, and should be a model for the other work streams.

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

France has filled the gap between humanitarian and development at an institutional level by creating a post-conflict and stabilization unit within the MFA and a crisis and post-conflict unit within the French development agency (AFD).

New funding has been given to transcend humanitarian and development divide: a 100M EUR/y "Peace and resilience Fund"/"Vulnerability Facility" was created to set up multi-year programs focusing on protracted crises.

Coordination between MFA and AFD has been formalized through monthly meetings.

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 CICID (interministerial committee for international cooperation and development that took place on February 8 2018), France committed to “reinforce the articulation between the short-term instruments of emergency response (humanitarian, stabilization) and the long-term instruments [...] and to contribute to the implementation of the humanitarian-development nexus”. This commitment, taken at the highest level, at the heart of France’s multiyear development policy’s roadmap, has put the nexus high on the agenda.

France also adopted at the CICID a strategy to tackle fragilities, for which humanitarian-development engagement is an important tool. The French development agency adopted a framework for vulnerabilities, and the “Peace and resilience Fund” financing has been doubled to reach 200M EUR/y in 2020.

The substantial increase of French humanitarian funding decided at the CICID (from roughly 150 M EUR/y to 500 M EUR/y in 2022) will also enable France to engage resources outside of pure emergency response.

In practice, France supports the re-launching of agriculture in zones freed from conflicts, for example in CAR, Iraq and Nigeria, in order to foster employment and agricultural value chains. France also supports the implication of local authorities in order to allow their resettlement in the territories (example : supporting school feeding in North of Mali or in CAR).

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)?

Transcend humanitarian-development divides is going to be a key axis of France’s new humanitarian strategy. To this end, the humanitarian desks at the MFA and the French Development Agency will commit to design (for each context where this is relevant) a long-term strategy, and will coordinate their calls for proposals.

It is also important to focus on women and young people, in order to involve them in the recovery. France supports programs targeted to these populations and has set up a gender marker on 100% of its Food Aid programs

4. Efficiency gains

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

The ability to ensure the durability of an emergency action, within a context of constrained humanitarian budget, and to be able to tackle all the needs of a population, whether they are

vital or socio-economic, has been extremely useful for the beneficiaries and for the long-term results of our policy.

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?

Fostering a better interpersonal knowledge (and understanding of each other's issues and needs) between humanitarian and development teams through regular exchanges is essential.