



## **Grand Bargain self-reporting exercise:**

### **InterAction**

This report provides an update on InterAction’s efforts to implement the Grand Bargain. It includes individual NGO member input on activities currently underway that connect to various Grand Bargain initiatives.

## **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?

InterAction's commitment to transparency and openness precedes the Grand Bargain. As of 2015, InterAction was publishing data to International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards and this data can be viewed through the IATI Registry or through a visualization on [NGO Aid Map](#), hosted and managed by InterAction. InterAction also adopted an open information policy in October 2014. InterAction regularly advocates to its membership to adopt IATI standards. InterAction continues to pursue research and opportunities to synthesize and share lessons learned on maximizing efficiencies and innovation in data collection and use. For example, in partnership with UNHCR's Division for Program Manage and Support (DPSM), InterAction developed a concept note and panel for the annual UNHCR-NGO Consultations on the use of social media to supplement data collection in urban environments, drawing on the expertise of Translators without Borders and InterNews.

### **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?

Some of InterAction NGO members reported that they are conducting internal reviews on their ability to adopt IATI standards and increase reporting. Other NGOs indicated that they have launched dashboards for local partnerships that strengthen open-data sharing.

### **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)?

Recognizing that not all NGOs report to IATI, InterAction advocates for NGOs to adopt IATI standards. Publishing information to IATI requires an organization-wide commitment and considerable systems change. The process can be extensive and some NGOs may lack adequate resources to adopt the IATI standard. Multiple NGOs reported they are conducting internal reviews of capacity to use IATI and increase FTS reporting, as well as ongoing initiatives to increase transparency with local 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.

### **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?

Some of these initiatives would benefit from the development of common definitions on how to calculate the percentage of humanitarian programming delivered in the form of cash and standard

categorizations for the types of cash transfer programming. This will support NGO efforts to identify and quantify the value of different types of CTP interventions.

## **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?

Since 2014, InterAction and ICVA, in partnership with UNCHR and the U.S. State Department's Bureau for Population Refugees and Migration (PRM), in order to strengthen partnership via the High Commissioner's Structured Dialogue completed 17 workshops on partnership strengthening at the sub-office and country-office level. These types of platforms are critical to ensuring continued investment in the long-term capacity of local NGO and CSO partners and effectively raising their profile through greater transparency in partnership. InterAction's members reported that they perform strongly in localization in some contexts, particularly where civil society is strong. Some of InterAction's members reported having a defined approach (capacity building, institutional strengthening and accompaniment) and established and tested tools and guidance for staff, partners and other organizations that facilitate partnerships.

### **2. Progress to date**

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

In 2016, an InterAction and ICVA commissioned review analyzed Lessons Learned 2014-2016 on the Institutionalization of the HC's Structured Dialogue. The recommendations included important points around strengthening partnership by continuing to create dedicated space for discussing partnership at the field level between UNHCR and NGOs. InterAction views collaborative dialogues as central to bringing a frontline perspective to the system, building a culture of shared partnership, and making investments in one another's institutional capacities.

Additionally, InterAction and its membership have routinely provided input on various localization discussions. For example, InterAction coordinated member inputs on a localization marker concept paper developed within the Humanitarian Financing Task Team. On the margins of the Habitat 3 conference in Quito, Ecuador, InterAction, its members and several local government officials conducted a networking event on the integrated neighborhood approach at Habitat 3. In addition, InterAction facilitated a shelter and settlements training for local partners. InterAction continues to prioritize incorporating insight from a range of frontline response actors. During field missions, InterAction teams have systematically included consultations with national and local NGOs to better understand and assess their role as protection actors, involvement and influence within the coordination structure, and varied needs to bring their perspective and experience to bear on policymaking.

Multiple InterAction members reported having pursued efforts focused on localization in the past year including developing internal positions and guidance on localization and assessing the best methods to best track funding globally to local partners.

### **3. Planned next steps**

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

InterAction will continue to introduce localization within its existing work where there is alignment. For example, InterAction will host a conversation on localization at its annual NGO Coordination workshop. InterAction plans to develop a research proposal on how INGOs and their downstream partners share and manage risk and associated trade-offs.

Some of InterAction's members who were not signatories to the Grand Bargain, but signatories to the [U.S. NGO Commitments to the WHS](#) which have strong connectivity to various Grand Bargain work streams, have extensive plans for partnership and capacity strengthening in the years to come. A few examples of next steps that were reported included commitments to leverage private resources for multi-year humanitarian capacity strengthening for partners, developing a more robust Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) for partnership and capacity strengthening, developing internal and external guidance and tools for effective partnership and capacity strengthening, and modifying internal financial and partner tracking tools to measure the total percentage of global budgets channeled through local actors.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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

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

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

## **Work Stream 3 - Cash**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

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

InterAction and its members have a history of engaging and leading discussion related to using cash as a modality in humanitarian contexts both through consortia members' participation with CaLP and by convening thought leaders in the US. For example, in 2014, InterAction hosted a workshop on cash programming in humanitarian contexts and developed multiple case studies among which included a scoping study on electronic transfer preparedness in the Philippines, cash transfers and protection considerations for programs in Jordan, and coordination challenges related to CTP.

### **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?

Last year, InterAction supported a small urban learning program designed to facilitate peer-to-peer learning on good, replicable practices within urban areas. The last learning visit focused on cash; two representatives from a local NGO in Greece spent a week with members of the Lebanon Cash Consortia to learn from their experience. The local NGO has since launched their own cash-card assistance program in Greece (supported by UNHCR and the EU) to support Syrian refugees and other peoples on the move.

InterAction's members continue to dedicate resources to learning from and scaling cash interventions where context appropriate. InterAction's members participate in a range of cash learning initiatives from global platforms like the Electronic Cash Transfer Learning Action Network (ELAN) to program specific learning opportunities. Some examples of some of InterAction's members include changes to financial tracking tools to better calculate and report on volume of humanitarian programming that uses cash, training local partners in cash modalities to improve preparedness and local capacities, and pursuing research opportunities of how cash can meet the needs of vulnerable groups in, in particular women and girls.

### **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)?

Examples of some of InterAction's members forward planning on next steps include dedicating more staff and resources to advancing cash-based modalities, launching cash-readiness initiatives, developing toolkits and SoPs to support field analysis and program design, revising internal policies to support cash uptake in programming, adopting a stronger learning strategy in relation to existing programs using cash modalities, and expanding participation in global learning knowledge platforms such as CaLP and ELAN.

**4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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

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

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

## Work stream 4 – Management Costs

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Since 2014, InterAction, in collaboration with ICVA, has led a program to improve UNHCR-NGO Collaboration for more effective protection, assistance and durable solutions. The collaboration aims to institutionalize key partnership initiatives. InterAction views this collaboration as critical to key objectives in the Management costs work streams, namely around harmonizing partnership agreements and providing transparent and comparable costs structures. One NGO member had already commissioned a study on donor conditions.

### 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?

InterAction engages with members to facilitate feedback and input on the rollout of UNHCR's Framework for Implementing Partners. InterAction has facilitated member feedback in relation to the harmonization of partnership agreements and partner assessments and the development of UNHCR's partner portal. InterAction convened input and provided guidance on the partner portal and harmonization initiatives pursued jointly by UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP. InterAction regularly convenes member feedback on new policies such as UNHCR's procurement policy and its draft guidance on partnership agreements.

### 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)?

InterAction, in partnership with HIAS and UNHCR, will facilitate the annual survey on [UNHCR-NGO Implementing Partnerships](#), examining the progress being made systemically to strengthen partnership between UNHCR and NGOs in the field. The survey solicits the perspective of UNHCR and NGOs along key points within the planning and grant-making process. In light of the UNHCR-led efforts at harmonizing grant-making processes amongst UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP, the survey will include questions on usage and expectations moving forward for the Partner Portal, the online platform intended to be the 'one-stop-shop' for partners to find solicitations and manage their portfolios for the three agencies named above. Findings will be shared within various Grand Bargain work streams (namely the *Reducing Management Costs* but also *Reporting* and potentially *Localization*) as well as at the annual UNHCR-NGO consultations, with UNHCR's Partnership Unit, UNHCR's Implementing Partner Management Service (IPMS), Regional Bureaus to facilitate country-level follow-up on specific issues, within InterAction and ICVA's memberships, and PRM and other stakeholders.

### 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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



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

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

## Work Stream 5 – Needs Assessment

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

InterAction dedicates resources and involves its independent specialists to support humanitarian coordination, particularly in relation to where it has relevant technical expertise (e.g. protection and shelter and settlements). For example, in 2016 and 2017 InterAction teams made 4 field missions to in-country NGO Consortia to support the strengthening of analysis, humanitarian collaboration and response planning.

### 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?

While not in direct alignment with Grand Bargain, InterAction’s work on advancing a Results-Based Protection framework and activities to roll out and support operationalization of the IASC protection policy reinforces the spirit of various sub-commitments of the Grand Bargain work stream on *Needs Assessments*.

### 3. Planned next steps

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

In 2017 and 2018, InterAction will launch a formal Learning Network to promote results-based and outcome-oriented approaches to protection, document and disseminate examples, facilitate peer learning, and systematize good practice. This pilot will involve NGO country level teams, NGO HQs, and donors collaborating to implement the key elements of results-based protection: continuous context-specific analysis, outcome oriented methods, and designing for contribution. Findings from the pilot will be shared with various Grand Bargain work streams (namely *Needs Assessments, Participation Revolution, Multi-Year Financing & Planning, and Humanitarian-Development Engagement*)

InterAction NGOs reported a high-degree of coordination at the field level on assessments citing improvements to community-based disaster preparedness guidance related to local risk and vulnerability mapping, and actively promoting the importance of field-level coordination for assessments.

### 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

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

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

## **Work Stream 6 – Participation Revolution**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

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

InterAction's commitment in Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) is best reflected by its extensive engagement on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA). This shows alignment with various commitments within the *Participation Revolution* work stream (e.g. *build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming*). Since 2010, InterAction has hosted a suite of open-source training modules and tools developed by an active PSEA Community of Practice that regularly meets to support NGO capacity to address sexual exploitation and abuse, through both prevention and 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?**

InterAction's PSEA working group convenes regularly and is currently working to identify the early warning signs of increased risk of sexual exploitation and abuse in humanitarian response. In 2016, InterAction introduced a discussion module on SEA for InterAction's annual workshop for global NGO Consortia, reaching more 15 representatives from 13 NGO consortia bodies. Multiple of InterAction's members noted that accountability to affected populations a centerpiece to humanitarian programs, noting that they currently have established beneficiary feedback mechanisms embedded in MEAL frameworks, established commitments to protection mainstreaming, and an approach that orients analysis around context specific considerations and local input.

### **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)?

InterAction's thematic working groups will continue to advocate to improve leadership, governance and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure that aid is responsive and accountable to people and communities affected by crises. For example, InterAction's GBV Working Group recently submitted a comprehensive series of recommendations to UNFPA to collectively strengthen our collective efforts to respond to and prevent GBV. InterAction will evaluate to what extent it can engage with the Participation Revolution work stream's plan of action, assessing where linkages can be built. Some of InterAction's members noted efforts to strengthen area-based coordination are expected to help advance aims to build participation and strengthen accountability. Additionally, some members plan to strengthen capacity building initiatives with the Core Humanitarian Standard, providing input on the work stream's forthcoming Plan of Action, and developing an online training module on MEAL in Emergencies that includes a section on Accountability.

### **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?

InterAction members noted that there are established beneficiary feedback mechanisms in many programs, but tracking and coordination around feedback follow-up, and the quality of follow-up and response remains challenging.

## **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?

InterAction is not currently actively engaged on this work stream.

### **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)?

InterAction will be consulting with its membership to assess where it is best placed to engage in this work stream. NGOs reported that they would like to contribute to discussions on the benefits of multi-year funding and build connectivity between complimentary GB work streams.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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

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

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

## **Work Stream 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?

InterAction is not currently engaged actively on this work stream.

### **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 (optional for year 1)**

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

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

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

.

## **Work Stream 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?

### **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?

Through its structured dialogue with UNHCR, InterAction works systematically to invest in shared institutional capacity and advance simplicity and harmonization through collaborative systems improvements for partners. For example, InterAction has engaged with UNHCR on the development of its partner portal system, working to convene NGOs to provide feedback on the platform and contribute recommendations on refinement and roll-out. In March 2017, InterAction convened an NGO consultation with UNICEF, WFP and UNHCR to discuss the importance of harmonization and simplification of a shared portal. InterAction participated in the Grand Bargain Reporting work stream workshop in March 2017.

### **3. Planned next steps**

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

In 2017, InterAction will continue to engage as needed with the various country-based NGO Forum and other convening mechanisms to provide support around the enhanced framework implementation. InterAction will consult broadly with members around harmonization and simplification of reporting, incorporating feedback and lessons learned into ongoing engagement with UNICEF, UNHCR and WFP as they work towards a common partner framework and more partner assessment and due diligence modalities. InterAction's and its membership stress the importance of both harmonizing and simplifying partner assessments, proposal and budget formats, and reporting formats (narrative and financial). InterAction will continue to work with UNICEF, WFP and UNHCR to enhance partnership and opportunities for systems reform then maximize shared efficiencies. As progress on harmonizing reporting templates gains momentum, InterAction will consult with its membership and NGO networks in the field in order to facilitate greater integration of a frontline perspective in this work stream.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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

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

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

## **Work Stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development Engagement**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

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

InterAction had limited engagement on the HDN preceding the Grand Bargain though highlighted it as a commitment at the WHS. Preceding the Grand Bargain, some InterAction members reported an ability to effectively link humanitarian and development programming in several contexts, ensuring programs were able to adopt a resilience and recovery orientation as soon as possible. Some NGOs reported that they integrated emergency preparedness and emergency training into both program design for ongoing development activities but also strategy development for country portfolios.

### **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?

InterAction is working internally to strengthen cross-team functionality and connectivity within its structures. The aim is to better identify interdisciplinary opportunities for collaboration and synergies across development and humanitarian experts and also engage a more robust multi-disciplinary constituency within InterAction's membership and external stakeholders. InterAction's shelter and settlements working group is leading in developing practitioners' knowledge and understanding in relation to settlements and relevant Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) approaches. In partnership with Global Communities, InterAction released a brief report highlighting the early recovery successes and constraints of the Yogyakarta earthquake shelter response. The SSWG and IA members were successful in highlighting several issues related to humanitarian challenges in urban areas and disaster risk reduction in the final draft of the New Urban Agenda released at the Habitat 3 conference in Quito, Ecuador. InterAction is a member of the IASC's Humanitarian Development Nexus (HDN) Task Team.

In February 2017, InterAction developed two case studies on the HDN focused on DRC and Nigeria. These case studies formed the foundation for a discussion facilitated by InterAction with NGOs, an effort aimed to launch a new dialogue platform related to HDN. The meeting included a series of breakout sessions and group work to unpack different dilemmas and opportunities emerging from the two case study contexts. In March 2017, InterAction launched a Joint Famines Working Group bringing together NGO policy experts and practitioners from both development and humanitarian divisions. These multi-disciplinary platforms are critical for collective analysis and partnership that aims to increase prevention, mitigate risk and prepare for early action but also to collectively anticipate and secure resources.

Some NGO members reported they are scaling the integration of risk analysis and preparedness into development programming, examining means of adjusting staffing composition to ensure high-quality technical support along the entire nexus of humanitarian and development interventions, analyzing cash interventions through the lens of social safety net strengthening, and taking into consideration DRR at the programmatic and strategic planning level.



### **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)?

InterAction intends to use its current platforms for membership engagement to consult, inform and develop concrete steps, where feasible, on how to further translate elements of the humanitarian-development nexus for actionable use by field teams. InterAction is producing a report analyzing the outcome of the HDN member thematic meeting to inform recommendations for follow up. This includes drawing on NGO case studies and sharing of relevant technical expertise on making effective linkages between humanitarian and development programming.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organization 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?