

ICVA

2018 Grand Bargain Self Report

The role of ICVA as a signatory, co-convenor, and Sherpa for the Grand Bargain is unique in that it is not an operational NGO, but rather a network of NGO's that are themselves operational. ICVA's role, therefore, is one of a facilitator, supporting a broad range of NGO partners in their efforts to understand and implement the Grand Bargain commitments.

During 2017, ICVA worked to promote comprehensive implementation of the Grand Bargain across all work streams by:

- Writing "The Grand Bargain, Explained" published in March 2017;
- Co-facilitating with PHAP a March 2017 public webinar on the Grand Bargain;
- Co-organizing and co-facilitating with the Netherlands, the World Bank and Germany the September 2017 co-convenor workshop on synergies between the five donor conditions-related Grand Bargain work streams.

ICVA also commends as a good practice, InterAction's work with ICVA and SCHR to identify NGO co-champions for each of the ten work streams, further ensuring that NGOs have a voice in implementing the commitments of the Grand Bargain.



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – ICVA

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	4
2. Progress to date	4
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned	5
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	9
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	10
4. Efficiency gains	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned	11
Work stream 4 – Management costs	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2. Progress to date	13
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned	14
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	16
3. Planned next steps	16

4.	Efficiency gains.....	16
5.	Good practices and lessons learned	16
	Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	17
1.	Baseline (only in year 1).....	17
2.	Progress to date.....	17
3.	Planned next steps.....	17
4.	Efficiency gains.....	18
5.	Good practices and lessons learned	18
	Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....	19
1.	Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2.	Progress to date.....	19
3.	Planned next steps.....	19
4.	Efficiency gains.....	20
5.	Good practice and lessons learned	20
	Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	21
1.	Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2.	Progress to date.....	21
3.	Planned next steps.....	22
4.	Efficiency gains.....	22
5.	Good practices and lessons learned	22
	Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	23
1.	Baseline (only in year 1).....	23
2.	Progress to date.....	23
3.	Planned next steps.....	24
4.	Efficiency gains.....	24
5.	Good practices and lessons learned	24
	Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	25
1.	Baseline (only in year 1).....	25
2.	Progress to date.....	25
3.	Planned next steps.....	26
4.	Efficiency gains.....	26
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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

From the previous self-report: Since co-chairing the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team starting in 2014, ICVA has supported the HFTT workplan's objective of increasing the transparency of aid flows.

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?

ICVA has continued to be committed to support the implementation of the commitments of the transparency work stream. Internally, ICVA has started the registration process to initiate reporting to the IATI standard and publishing on the IATI site. Because ICVA is a network organization rather than an organization implementing activities in the field, the value of ICVA's publishing of IATI-formatted data is somewhat limited in terms of understanding the flow of aid to people in need. However, ICVA takes seriously its role as a network and will move forward in publishing grant funding from donor governments in the interest of promoting transparency and better understanding the challenges involved in sharing data in the public domain.

In addition, ICVA has continued to engage with the leadership on the transparency work stream throughout the year:

- A regular monthly call is held between Development Initiatives (contracted by the Netherlands to work on transparency issues) and ICVA to discuss how to better integrate transparency with humanitarian financing issues.
- As previously reported, ICVA supported a DI transparency workshop on the margins of the ICVA annual conference, 29 March 2017.
- Also as previously reported, ICVA and OCHA/CERF co-chaired the 25-26 January 2017 IASC HFTT retreat, which included a special working session on transparency. Since then ICVA has circulated to its members a draft IASC HFTT “key messages” document on IATI and FTS.
- Transparency was a key discussion point at the 5 December 2017 meeting of the ICVA Donor Conditions Task Force. That workshop brought together DI along with actors such as Bond UK and Humentum, resulting in a tentative plan to offer increased support to NGOs reporting in the IATI standard.
- At a number of fora during the year, ICVA supported the dialogue between OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS) and DI to develop a plan for piloting the use of the IATI standard by OCHA FTS to collect data on humanitarian financing.
- The IASC HFTT work planning retreat held in January 2018 also included a discussion with the Grand Bargain transparency work stream co-convenor, the Netherlands, and an inter-agency work planning 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)?

The ICVA Secretariat plans to start publishing in the IATI standard for selected grant funding during 2018. Externally, ICVA will continue to encourage greater transparency, including use of the IATI standard, through the activities outlined above. In particular, ICVA will look to support the planned joint IATI-FTS pilot work by linking that effort with the ongoing harmonized narrative reporting pilot co-led by Germany and ICVA.

4. Efficiency gains

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

No efficiency gains have yet been noted. For ICVA, it is unlikely that any significant efficiency gains would be associated with the transparency work stream.

In general, reporting through the IATI system will require an additional workload on staff. In the humanitarian space, additional effort is required to understand the links between IATI and FTS and ensure proper publishing of data. For organizations doing more direct work with beneficiaries, it is possible that efficiencies could be achieved if there is good alignment between internal management systems, different types of donor reporting and the IATI standard.

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?

One of the greatest hurdles to implementation of the transparency work stream is the lack of understanding of the IATI framework and its application to humanitarian work. Through a number of the actions outlined in the ‘progress’ section above, 2017 appeared to be a year

during which there was improved understanding and acceptance of IATI in relation to humanitarian work. That being said, there is still significant work to be done to ensure NGOs have the proper capacity to effectively report using the IATI standard.

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

From the previous self-report: ICVA has long been promoting greater respect for, inclusion and support for national and local NGOs – including through our “NGOs in the Humanitarian Reform” projects, our “Principles of Partnership” campaigns, our work on the UNHCR-IFRC-NGO Structured Dialogue on Partnership and Spring 2016 conference on complementarity.

With relation to the commitment on the better use of pooled funds, ICVA’s Humanitarian Financing Working Group provides feedback to the CERF secretariat on underfunded emergency allocations and the OCHA-NGO platform on country-based pooled funds.

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. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

As co-chair of the IASC HFTT, ICVA has participated and supported the “IASC+” working group (or Localization Marker Working Group) to develop a localization marker as per the Grand Bargain.

ICVA is promoting greater investment in capacity through its partnership with UNHCR to systematically invest in national NGO partners’ capacity.

ICVA supports the national NGO representative serving in the Pooled Fund Working Group, including coordinating an application and selection process and through covering flight/accommodation to attend PFWG meetings.

ICVA is a member of the Regional Advisory Group for the ‘Humanitarian Horizons’ Research project, funded by DFAT, that looks at localization in Asia-Pacific.

ICVA has organized a number of workshops discussing localization:

- Co-organized with ADRRN a multi-stakeholder dialogue on Localization in Action in Asia (Bangkok, December 2017) with over 100 NGO participants, 70% of which were national NGOs.
- Supporting discussion of Review of Grand Bargain Principles and localization in the Rohingya Response (Bangladesh & Geneva, March 2018).
- Discussion for National NGOs to provide feedback on donor practices to Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Initiative members (Geneva, March 2018).

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)?

ICVA will release a paper ‘Localization Examined’ to better explain the current state of discussion, localization initiatives, best practices and challenges for NGOs.

ICVA’s NGO Fora Support Programme provides structured and ad-hoc support to national NGO Coordination Fora to help them with a range of topics including strategic planning, governance and membership, along with providing tailored operational support.

Promoting NGO voices at the regional and global level: This advocacy support is particularly useful for national NGOs that cannot maintain an office in regional or global humanitarian hubs. On selected issues, ICVA supports travel of national NGO representatives to engage directly with donors, host governments and UN agencies.

Regional Representation and Regional Working Groups: ICVA’s Regional Representatives in Africa, MENA and Asia work to engage directly with NGOs and NGO networks in the regions, ensuring better alignment between global, regional and national perspectives. The Regional Working Groups provide a structured means for national NGOs to engage on key issues.

Supporting UNHCR’s operational guidelines for complementary capacity strengthening: As part of this initiative, ICVA assists in organising country workshops to raise awareness with NGOs of the guidelines, identify capacity gaps and develop country-specific capacity strengthening work plans.

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team (ICVA is co-chair): Key initiatives that ICVA is championing to have a positive impact on localizing aid include harmonising UN partner capacity assessments, simplifying and harmonising donor reporting requirements and increasing multi-year financing to promote linkages between humanitarian and development programming.

Localization Community of Practice: In the coming months, ICVA will support an online community of practice for NGOs on the theme of localization, where NGOs can easily access resources related to localization.

4. Efficiency gains

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

No efficiency gains can be directly measured and attributed to these efforts.

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?

ICVA commends IFRC and Switzerland for their effort to include diverse voices in regular calls on the implementation of this work stream, and for the 30 November 2017 workshop to exchange between practitioners on research and evaluation.

ICVA's and ADRRN's "Localization in Action in Asia" workshop was committed to 50%-50% participation of national NGOs and delivered over 70% out of more than 100 participants. This intentional effort should be made to ensure discussions of localization prioritize inputs of national and local actors.

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?

From the previous self-report: ICVA is not operational and cannot deliver cash-based assistance.

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?

ICVA's position has remained relatively unchanged, and cash programming is not a core focus of the organization. A number of ICVA's member organizations do engage in cash-based programming, and to the extent that ICVA can facilitate their engagement in appropriate dialogue on cash programming, it will continue to do so.

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)?

N/A

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 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- *Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - *Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - *Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - *Biometrics; and*
 - *Sustainable energy.*
2. *Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
4. *Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

- *Transportation/Travel;*
- *Vehicles and fleet management;*
- *Insurance;*
- *Shipment tracking systems;*
- *Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH, food);*
- *IT services and equipment;*
- *Commercial consultancies; and*
- *Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*
-

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

From the previous self-report: ICVA has long advocated for the UN to come together with regard to its approaches towards NGOs, including through the commissioning of a study comparing UN partnership agreements with NGOs. ICVA has also long advocated, with its members, for improved approaches to partner capacity assessments, including through its study on PCAs and Less Paper More Aid.

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?

During 2017, ICVA engaged in a couple of key activities that also overlap with the previous reporting period:

- On 25 January 2017 the HFTT held a session to decide on next steps to improve the interoperability of partner capacity assessments.
 - Following the meeting, a TOR for the study was drafted, and finally in November, funding via OCHA was secured and a consultant selected to lead a field study in Somalia and Turkey. The field work was initiated in December 2017, and results can be updated in the next self-report.
- On 31 January 2017 ICVA hosted the first-ever workshop bringing together UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and OCHA and NGOs so UN agencies could brief NGOs on their ideas to harmonize partner selection, due diligence, agreement templates, budgets, reporting and shared audits. They strategized a process to consult a broader range of NGO partners. ICVA and UNHCR co-presented this effort at the 23 March UNHCR-Japan-hosted workshop on reducing duplication and management costs.
 - In December of 2017 it was agreed to move forward with a survey to assess the burden of partnership agreements on NGO partners of UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and OCHA. ICVA completed the draft of the survey with input from UNHCR prior to the end of the year, and it will be distributed after final input from other partners in 2018.

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

There is an additional important link to be made between the cost structure and financial reporting work undertaken by NRC in 2018 under work stream 4 and the reporting pilot work co-led by ICVA under work stream 9. As options to pilot financial reporting are identified in 2018, a

decision will be made on whether there should be overlap with the harmonized narrative reporting pilot locations and participants.

4. Efficiency gains

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

No gains noted to date.

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?

Besides work stream 9 on reporting, this work stream has some of the greatest potential to develop pilot projects. It has been quite successful to group these work streams together in thinking through how to better harmonize and simplify work in the field from a project cycle perspective, as well as how to better sequence and link the Grand Bargain work streams. This effort to link work streams was reflected in the “Commitment to Complementarity” paper jointly developed in March 2017 by the “donor conditions” work streams and updated in October.

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?

[From previous self-report: ICVA is not operational and does not participate in needs assessments.](#)

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?

N/A

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)?

N/A

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 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?

From previous self-report: ICVA commends the work of SCHR and other NGOs to advance this work stream. ICVA's Board Chair participated in the 22 January 2018 "Participation is Power" conference.

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?

N/A

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)?

N/A

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 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements² you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.³ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

[From previous self-report: ICVA has long advocated for multi-year funding, including through NGO statements at the UNHCR Executive and Standing Committee 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?

[As previously reported, ICVA and OCHA/CERF co-chaired the 25-26 January 2017 and 24-25 January 2018 HFTT retreats, which included working sessions related to multi-year planning and funding.](#)

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)?

[Multi-year planning and funding has been considered as a possible area for joint pilot work with harmonized narrative reporting. As the work stream leads develop these options, ICVA will continue to engage to discuss linkages.](#)

² Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

³ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

4. Efficiency gains

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

None to report.

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?

Multi-year planning and funding has also been included in the group of donor conditions work streams and as part of the Commitment to Complementarity outline under work stream 4 above.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and to initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.*
2. *Reduce the degree of earmarking of funds contributed by governments and regional groups who currently provide low levels of flexible finance. Aid organisations in turn commit to do the same with their funding when channelling it through partners.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated (for example, urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management)*
4. *Increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognising the contribution made by donors.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020⁴.*

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

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

From the previous self-report: ICVA supported the production of an HFTT analysis of “Donor Conditions and Their Implications for Humanitarian Response,” which included a chapter on earmarking.

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?

No specific action taken.

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)?

The earmarking work stream continues to be a candidate for potential links to the harmonized narrative reporting pilot.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Nothing to report.

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 earmarking work stream has also been included in the group of donor conditions work streams and as part of the Commitment to Complementarity outline under work stream 4 above.

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?

From the previous self-report: When the Grand Bargain was signed, ICVA, with support of members, published *Less Paper More Aid*, which included proposed Frameworks for Change related to reporting, partner capacity assessments and audits. ICVA and Germany hosted an April 2016 workshop with Grand Bargain Sherpas to learn from this study and craft commitment language.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

As reported previously, ICVA and Germany co-convened a meeting in Berlin on 24 March 2017 that brought together donor governments, UN agencies and NGOs to discuss the proposal to pilot a harmonized narrative reporting pilot. It was agreed at the meeting to move forward with pilot planning in Iraq, Myanmar and Somalia.

In June 2017, Germany and ICVA made a joint decision to implement the pilot based on the number of donor participants committed to the pilot at the time. ICVA's role in the pilot is to work with participants at the HQ and field level to ensure a proper orientation, assist with resolution of issues and support general implementation. As of 2017 year-end, there were 7 governments, 7 UN agencies and 16 INGOs committed to participation in the pilot.

Note on gender inclusion: At the March 2017 pilot planning meeting, the topic of gender (among other cross-cutting themes) was a significant point of discussion. The current version of the "8+3" narrative reporting template used in the pilot does not include gender as a separate reporting element. The report sections on "overall performance" and "affected populations" both include guidance to disaggregate monitoring of results by gender.

When considering which elements are most appropriate to include in a reporting framework, it is important to distinguish the reporting framework from programmatic standards. A reporting framework must be flexible enough to effectively work with a wide range of project approaches, objectives, and indicators. The most appropriate and effective way to ensure that gender is included in project objectives is to focus on the assessment and design phases of the project cycle. These design components of project work are outside the scope of the reporting pilot. The

“8+3” reporting framework is set up such that projects including gender components in their design would also report on gender in the “measuring results” section of the template.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The initial rounds of reporting using the harmonized template will be collected for analysis during the first quarter of 2018. A mid-term review of the pilot will be completed based on these reports and additional field data collection to be conducted by GPPi on behalf of Germany. Results of the mid-term review and other collected feedback will inform how the harmonized template can be improved for the second part of the pilot.

4. Efficiency gains

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

This will be a specific question addressed as part of the mid-term review in 2018.

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?

Although the pilot work led by Germany and ICVA for this work stream is relatively simple in design, the level of turnover in staff of participants, combined with internal participant communications that can be complex, requires a continuous effort to keep participants informed on the pilot. Communications is an area that requires constant attention and improvement to make the reporting pilot work, as perceptions can easily outweigh even the best technical solutions.

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?

From the previous self-report: ICVA participates in the IASC Humanitarian-Development Nexus Task Team meetings. ICVA co-chairs the IASC HFTT, which includes the humanitarian-development nexus as one of four objectives.

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?

ICVA has participated in various meetings associated with this work stream. On October 2017 ICVA published [“The New Way of Working Examined”](#) to improve understanding of this global process.

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)?

ICVA will soon publish a paper on the World Bank's new financing instruments for refugees and will hold a 20 March 2018 conference on "Navigating the Nexus: NGO perspectives."

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