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 – Ireland

Contents

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?

We see IATI as a reporting tool and use FTS and EDRIS for internal reporting and monitoring purposes.

---

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?

In 2017 we have begun publishing our organisation file in the most recent version of the IATI standard and have increased the number and range of document links included in this file.

Under Ireland's funding to humanitarian NGOs, the grantee is required to ensure that a procurement policy is in place and that any procurement undertaken in connection with the programme is conducted in accordance with international best practice, in particular in respect of openness, transparency and fairness. Annual reports should include an overview of any procurement procedures (including tendering) implemented under the programme and any update to the procurement policy.

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)?

Ireland will:
- Continue to publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data, via IATI, FTS and EDRIS;
- Increase and improve the quality of the data it produces in relation to its humanitarian funding;
- Better use this data to analyse and communicate the results that can be attributed to Ireland's humanitarian funding;
- Use this analysis as an evidence basis for decision-making about humanitarian funding.

Irish Aid's annual reports will continue to give a detailed analysis of how and where money is spent. This is available [here](#).

In 2018, we will update our latest IATI activity file to a greater level of detail with regard to the descriptions and objectives for our activities. We are starting to include data for description types one and two (General and Objectives) in our activity file at the hierarchy 1 level (the most general level, associated with our budget data).

Over the coming two years we will begin publishing our activity files in the most recent version of the standard. We will also be working to increase the frequency of our publications, aiming for quarterly publication. Both of these should also improve the usability of our data.

Ireland is now for the first time requesting a funds flow analysis from our partners but we have yet to develop this onto a digital platform.

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?

We have improved reporting to FTS and EDRIS and are increasingly using these tools.

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]

Our total humanitarian spend in 2017 across government had not yet been calculated by the time of reporting. For 2016, the percentages were as follows: (a) 0.12%, and (b) 15% (provided to Pooled Funds, the DREF and the START Fund- funds available to local actors). Almost 30% of the projects funded through Irish supported UN Humanitarian funds, were implemented by National NGOs. We were not in a position to calculate (c).

---

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?

---

[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.

Ireland continued to fund the START Fund in 2017 (one of only three donors) - providing €1.3 million to the fund. Decisions on allocations from the fund are made locally to get funding to local responders as quickly as possible. START has committed to an expansion of the network membership to include more national NGOs and is creating national-level Start funds, including one in Bangladesh which is already operational. 69% of projects supported by the START fund were implemented by at least one local partner.

Ireland continued to fund the Core Humanitarian Standard Alliance in 2017. This promotes the Core Humanitarian Standard and the application by local responders of the standard will enable more direct funding of these actors.

Ireland funded the Humanitarian Policy Group in 2017 to undertake research on, inter alia, the challenges faced by local/national organisations when trying to access people in need, with [papers](#) issuing in 2017 and early 2018 on the challenges faced in Ukraine and Syria.

In 2017, for the first time, Ireland's direct humanitarian funding to NGO partners working in situations of protracted crisis was provided on a multi-annual basis. The appraisal criteria for decision-making regarding this funding stream included an analysis of the NGOs' own partnership approaches, and the extent to which they build local capacity, as well as, for the first time, an analysis of the NGOs' flows of funds to the level of local responders.

Funded by Irish Aid, the International Rescue Committee produced a policy brief on the localisation of responses to Gender Based Violence in emergencies.

Ireland continued to advocate for the use of Pooled Funds as a funding modality which allows timely action by local actors, and to advocate for allocations from the Funds to be made to local responders, where appropriate. We took up positions on the Advisory Boards for the Jordan, Lebanon and Ethiopia Pooled Funds in 2017. We also continued to fund the Pooled Funds in DRC, CAR, Turkey, Yemen, Iraq, South Sudan, Sudan and Somalia in 2017. In our appraisals of Pooled Funds' annual reports, and in discussions with Pooled Fund Managers, we monitor how much is allocated directly to local responders and continually advocate for this percentage to be as high as is possible in the context. We also question whether the funds are facilitating access to local/national partners through capacity building and specific training.

Ireland funded a [research paper](#) on localisation in practice by our NGO Partner Trócaire, together with Groupe URD. Working with Trócaire partners in Myanmar and in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the research examined localisation within the framework of the Grand Bargain, and has provided clear recommendations to Trócaire and other actors on how to responsibly strengthen partnership work with local actors in humanitarian settings.

Irish Aid helped organise a seminar on localisation, as part of a Grand Bargain seminar series in Dublin. This was attended by Irish NGOs and academics, as well as policy makers.

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)?

We will continue to advocate for the use of Pooled Funds as a funding modality which allows timely action by local actors, and to advocate for allocations from the Funds to be made to local responders, where appropriate. We will continue to take up positions on the advisory boards for those Pooled Funds to which we contribute, and intend to continue funding the Funds in DRC, CAR, Lebanon, Turkey, Jordan, Yemen, Iraq, South Sudan, Sudan, Somalia and Ethiopia in 2017. In our appraisals of

Pooled Funds' annual reports, and in discussions with Pooled Fund Managers, we sought to ensure that funding is provided directly to local actors, where appropriate.

We intend to continue to fund the START fund in 2018, and to continue to support the IFRC in its work with National Societies, either through core funding or through the DREF.   We will continue to monitor through flow of fund analyses how much funding our Irish NGO partners ongrant to local partners and will continue to advocate for that to be as high as is appropriate to the context in which they work.

4.   Efficiency gains

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

Measurement of the amount we are providing to local actors through one intermediary has proven difficult to measure and further methodology/tools on this from the workstream would be welcome.

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?

From monitoring visits we have noticed that rapid and uncoordinated efforts to increase the amount of funding going to local actors can burden local organisations that may not have the capacity to manage large grants. Localisation needs to be an ongoing, carefully managed process with sustained technical support and backstopping for local actors if it is to be sustainable. It needs to be very much coordinated or supported by the joint reporting workstream so that it can bring the efficiency and effectiveness gains that are intended.

Some Humanitarian Funds have noted that there is a need to be honest about the challenges relating to localisation. In some contexts inter-ethnic or communal tensions require funds to be extremely conscious of the balance of funding awarded to various local organisations and the make-up of those organisations.

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?

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?

Ireland continues to provide a significant part of its funding as un-earmarked or softly earmarked funds, which allows organisations such as WFP and UNHCR the flexibility to provide cash-based assistance where appropriate.

As part of a Grand Bargain seminar series organised together with a number of Irish NGOs, a seminar on the use of cash for practitioners took place in Dublin at the end of 2017, with CALP and WFP speaking.

Ireland is a supporter of the Start Fund and its project reports provide a source of data on how cash is used in emergencies, across multiple organisations, partnerships and contexts.

As a core funder of the Humanitarian Policy Group, Ireland supported their research on the use of cash in various settings and how to harness the potential of cash transfers, such as their paper on the use of transfers in Mozambique.

We continue to advocate with our NGO partners for the use of cash where appropriate: e.g. Concern in DRC is providing cash based assistance to conflict-affected households, supported by Irish Aid.

Ireland continues to support and build flexible and responsive national systems, such as health systems and social protection systems, that can strengthen targeting and entitlement for citizens based on need and can be scaled up or adjusted in times of greater need, such as the PSNP in Ethiopia. We have continued to advocate with our partners for the increased use of cash programming in humanitarian crises where it is appropriate, and to invest in national registration systems. In Malawi, responding to the 2017/18 lean period, through the INGO consortium Ireland reached 8,000 households with cash based responses and resilience building initiatives.

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)?

We will continue to advocate with our partners for the increased use of cash programming in humanitarian crises where it is appropriate.

Ireland will identify, support and share relevant evidence of the opportunities for cash transfers to be a catalyst for social protection in humanitarian contexts.

Ireland will continue to build and share evidence on the use of cash that can lead to the development of innovative and effective delivery models and standards and guidelines.

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?

Policy and legal restrictions imposed by national governments have limited partners' capacity to undertake cash based programming in some situations.

Some of our partners have raised issues with us about cash coordination and how the introduction of parallel systems in some contexts has led to much confusion and potential for efficiency losses.

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?

Ireland supports and makes use of joint performance reviews such as MOPAN rather than undertaking individual assessments, and encourages their use by other donors also, where feasible. Ireland provides over 30% of its humanitarian funding in the form of core support and accepts harmonised reporting from UN agencies, the ICRC and the IFRC. This reduces management costs and aids overall efficiency. We are also aligning any humanitarian and development funding provided to the same organisation in order to reduce the burden of managing numerous grants to the same organisation. We have also contributed heavily to the development of a Common Performance Framework for the OCHA-managed Humanitarian Pooled Funds and the annual results report of CERF.

---

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?

Ireland supports and makes use of joint performance reviews such as MOPAN rather than undertaking individual assessments, and encourages their use by other donors also, where feasible. Ireland provides over 30% of its humanitarian funding in the form of core support and accepts harmonised reporting from UN agencies, the ICRC and the IFRC. This reduces management costs and aids overall efficiency.

Given that Irish Aid funds many of the same NGOs for both humanitarian and development programmes we are increasingly joining up engagement, grant management and reporting processes in order to reduce the burden on our partners. In 2017, our NGO partners for the first time will submit one joint report on their humanitarian and development funding. These partners are increasingly using technology and real time data to inform management decisions.

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)?

Ireland will continue to advocate for core funding and harmonised reporting among donors, including through our engagement on the unearmarked workstream.

We will increase our joint monitoring visits (humanitarian/development) including seeking participation from mission staff in order to ensure coherence of approaches between HQ and field level. We are working with other donors on shared thematic issues e.g. best practice on safeguarding approaches.

We will continue to monitor the common performance framework across the Humanitarian Pooled Funds.

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?

Not enough progress has been made on this to date, with local actors, in particular, under pressure due to different assessment and reporting requirements.

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?

The costing of HRPs needs to be accurate. Methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis would allow comparability of the scale of needs across crises and enable funding prioritisation.

---

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?

Ireland's humanitarian funding decisions continue to be informed by evidence-based, analytical assessments of need. In particular, Ireland promotes joint needs assessments and increased focus on the use of the Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment tool in rapid onset crises.

Irish Aid's Emergency Response Fund Scheme (ERFS) is a funding mechanism for established NGO partners, which pre-positions a defined amount of funds with NGOs to facilitate immediate response in the initial weeks after the onset of a sudden emergency or spike in an existing protracted crisis, allowing time for and prioritising rapid assessment of need, including joint needs assessments, which avoid duplication.

Ireland is a strong supporter of the CERF and applications for CERF funding are based on a field-driven process that gives RC/HC overall authority to determine priority activities for funding and submitting a consolidated allocation request to the ERC. The strategy for the use of CERF funds is based on collective priorities, eliminating duplication or overlap and avoiding fragmentation of funding amongst several disjointed or small projects.

Ireland advocates for strong adherence to this methodology and also engages with the Humanitarian Fund managers on complementarity between CERF and CBPF funding.

Irish Aid's system for appraisal of humanitarian proposals systematically checks for alignment with humanitarian response plans and engagement in cluster coordination mechanisms.

Ireland's Country Categorisation of Needs tool prioritise crises according to risk and needs, based on a number of risk and vulnerability indicators. This tool, based to a large extent on the EU INFORM Index is shared with NGO partners at the beginning of each year to guide their applications for funding.

The rollout of a joined up mechanism for development and humanitarian funding mechanisms for Ireland's NGO partners in 2017, was intended to promote joint risk and vulnerability analyses, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming within NGO 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)?

Ireland will continue to support the development of, and advocate for, joint context analyses, joined-up planning and coherent programming. We will encourage NGO partners to carry out joint analyses and programming where appropriate.

We will continue to seek for coherence between CERF and Humanitarian Fund allocations and for CERF allocations to consider the availability and use of other resources, such as government funds, donor funding, and country-based pooled funding.

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 countries) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

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?

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?

Ireland finances and supports initiatives promoting women's participation and empowerment in fragile and conflict-affected states. As part of our NGO appraisal process, we seek information on the systems set by in place by partners to ensure accountability to beneficiaries, partners and other key stakeholders, including how they will participate in the planning and implementation of the programme of work and what feedback mechanisms are in place. Irish Aid's joint funding mechanism for development and humanitarian NGO partners places a firm emphasis on participation approaches. This has been monitored and reviewed during field visits, in particular.

Some of the UN Humanitarian Funds funded by Ireland have reported progress in carrying out stakeholder surveys and establishing complaint and feedback mechanisms in order to improve accountability to affected populations e.g for the 73 projects funded by the Yemen Humanitarian Fund in 2016, , 15 had established feedback and complaint mechanisms.

Complaints response mechanism are now increasingly becoming the norm in all humanitarian responses supported by Ireland. Hotlines are now available for beneficiaries.

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)?

Ireland will ensure through our appraisal, monitoring and evaluation systems that humanitarian assistance builds upon and reinforces existing local capacities of the affected communities, addresses their identified needs, and ensures accountability to those affected.

In discussions with Humanitarian Funds funded by Ireland we will push for further establishment of feedback and complaint mechanisms.

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?

The move from annual to multiannual funding enabled our partners to take a more participatory approach that is driven by community identified needs rather than donor reporting cycles.

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 agreements[2] you have provided (as a donor) or received <u>and</u> 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.

In 2017, multiannual agreements to the value of €55m (over two years) were agreed. Details on these are below. As total humanitarian spend for 2017 was not yet available at the time of reporting, the percentage spend could not be provided.

---

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?

New two-year multiannual funding agreements were signed with ICRC and OCHA in 2017 to a value of €24.8 million. In 2017, Irish Aid's humanitarian funding mechanism for NGO partners (Oxfam, Christian Aid, Plan, World Vision and Trócaire) has transitioned to a multi-annual approach, initially for a two year period covering 2017-2018. The total value of this over two years is over €28 million.

A two-year partnership was agreed with IRC in 2017 for gender and protection programming, at a value of €2.2 million.

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)?

---

[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.

Longer partnerships, ideally to be aligned with ICRC and OCHA's strategic plans, will be considered from 2019 onwards, as will multi-annual agreements with a number of other multilateral humanitarian partners.

Irish Aid intends to move from a two to a three year funding cycle with NGO partners in order to support further alignment with development programming and enable a more outcome-oriented, longer-term approach.

4. Efficiency gains

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

From the partners' side, the use of multi-year MoUs has reduced inefficiencies relating to short-term personnel or procurement contracts.

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?

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 2020[4].*

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)

Our total 2017 humanitarian spend across government has not yet been calculated. In 2016 we provided the following percentages:

- Unearmarked contributions (over 30%)
- Softly earmarked contributions (18%)
- Country earmarked contributions (15%)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (18%)

    Funding was also provided via the EU.

---

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

---

[4] 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?

In 2017 Ireland provided unearmarked core funding to a number of UN and other humanitarian organisations, including UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, UNRWA, OCHA, IFRC and the ICRC. This flexible funding is allocated on the basis of need and can be used to support humanitarian operations. Ireland is determined to provide its humanitarian funding as flexibly as possible, so as to ensure that its partners are empowered to use it where it is needed most.

Ireland has been among the ten biggest donors to the UN's Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) since it was established, and it commits to maintaining strong support for the CERF, to ensure the immediate availability of humanitarian funding in the aftermath of global crises and for under-funded emergencies. Our contribution to CERF for 2017 was $23.9 million, compared with $13.8 million in 2016. Ireland also took up a position on the CERF Advisory Board in 2017.

Ireland is a strong supporter of the UN Common Humanitarian Funds, which seek to ensure that funding is accessible to those on the ground who are best placed to act. Ireland is active in ensuring effective oversight of the management of these funds, as an efficient softly-earmarked tool which allows flexible and rapid allocation of funding on the ground. We increased our contribution in 2017 to $36.6 million compared with $30.5m million in 2016.

Ireland will continue to support Country Based Pooled Funds and has taken on positions on the Advisory Board for the Jordan, Lebanon and Ethiopia Pooled Funds in 2017.

Ireland's unearmarked funding, as a percentage of total humanitarian spend, was over 30% in 2016.

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)?

Ireland will continue to provide at least 30% of its humanitarian funding as unearmarked or softly earmarked, and advocate with other donors to do likewise.

Ireland will continue to support Country Based Pooled Funds and to play a role on Advisory Boards.

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 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?

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?

Ireland accepts annual global reports for UN organisations and the ICRC and IFRC, rather than requesting specific reports. Furthermore, these organisations' appeals are used as a basis for funding allocations- no tailored proposal or appeal is necessary. Standardized reporting templates for reporting by our NGO partners have been developed in order to ensure clarity and consistency.

Concurrent application and appraisal processes for Ireland's development and humanitarian funding mechanisms for NGO partners, from 2017, as well as joint monitoring visits, have simplified reporting procedures for our NGO partners, meaning a reduction in the reporting burden on NGO partners in 2017.

The joining up of development and humanitarian reporting cycles has avoided duplication of efforts and made the process more efficient both for partners and Irish Aid.

We are supportive of the new 8+3 format under the harmonisation of reporting work-stream and of OCHA rolling this out for all Humanitarian Funds in the next round of allocations. CERF will also use the new format globally.

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)?

We will continue to explore ways to simplify and harmonise reporting by partners and continue to advocate for the use of common reports by donors, where possible, and for the implementation of the gender and age marker in order to capture results better.

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 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?

At country level, significant flexibility has been provided to our missions with aid budgets to ensure that monies can be re-programmed to be more responsive to humanitarian needs. These missions are, in addition to supporting refugee responses, in many cases also exploring development investment in refugee hosting areas in order to address high levels of poverty among host communities, as well as the depletion of natural resources. Such an approach should bolster development gains, and contribute to a holistic approach at national level to humanitarian/development issues.

---

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?

A concurrent application and appraisal process for development and humanitarian funding mechanisms was introduced for Ireland's NGO partners from 2017, with a view to increasing coherence between relief, recovery and development interventions in protracted crisis situations (many due to conflict) - all context-appropriate. Humanitarian and development teams carried out one joint monitoring mission of an NGO partner in receipt of funding for both humanitarian and development programming in 2017.

Humanitarian programming is now taken into account when drawing up our bilateral Country Strategies, and included where appropriate, thereby leading to more adaptability and flexibility in our programming. In 2017, a revised process for multi-annual planning was approved. The process now supports the preparation of results-oriented, context-specific programmes of engagement.

Ireland has provided €2.5 million to the First Phase of the EU Regional Development and Protection Programme which focuses on innovative and durable solutions to the Syrian refugee crisis, working across the nexus.

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 new planning process for Country Strategy Papers will be rolled out for Liberia, Sierra Leone and Kenya in 2018, bringing a more systematic approach to how we approach humanitarian and development programming. In 2018, as part of a mid-term review of our strategy with Uganda, we will undertake a study on how to take a more integrated approach to humanitarian programming in the country.

Humanitarian and development teams will increase the number of joint monitoring missions of NGO partners in receipt of both humanitarian and development funding in 2018. Testing what nexus looks like.

Ireland has undertaken to support the piloting of the operationalization of the humanitarian-development nexus by the EU in Nigeria and Uganda.

Ireland will continue to use engagement with multilateral organisations to ensure more responsive and joined up approaches to humanitarian and development planning and funding as well as to highlight the importance of SDGs mainstreaming.

Ireland will continue to encouraging our NGO partners to work in a more coherent way across their humanitarian and development programming.

Ireland is providing flexibility to partners in receipt of development funding where humanitarian crises arise, allowing adaptive programming e.g. in DRC currently or in Sierra Leone following 2017's mudslides.

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 now enhanced internal collaboration and coherence across Irish Aid.

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?