



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – Save the Children

Contents

Work stream 1 – Transparency.....	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	4
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains.....	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned	5
Work stream 2 – Localization.....	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	7
3. Planned next steps	7
4. Efficiency gains.....	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned	8
Work stream 3 – Cash.....	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	9
2. Progress to date.....	9
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains.....	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned	10
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	13
2. Progress to date.....	12
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains.....	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned	13
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	15

2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps	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	18
4. Efficiency gains.....	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned	18
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	20
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	20
2. Progress to date.....	20
3. Planned next steps	20
4. Efficiency gains.....	21
5. Good practice and lessons learned	21
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	22
2. Progress to date.....	23
3. Planned next steps	23
4. Efficiency gains.....	23
5. Good practices and lessons learned	23
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	24
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps	24
4. Efficiency gains.....	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	26
2. Progress to date.....	27
3. Planned next steps	27

4. Efficiency gains.....	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27

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?*

In future, data generated via IATI from Save the Children (SC) could substitute annual reporting to track progress on commitments including cash transfers, participation and funding to national and local responders. The outcome of the OCHA-led pilot to test the inter-operability of IATI with Financial Tracking System (FTS) could also serve to track the overall volume of expenditure on cash transfers and via national and local response organisations at both national and global levels. In addition, there is scope to use data from IATI to contribute to greater disaggregation of data to track the percentage of funding disbursed in humanitarian, protracted and development contexts.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In May 2016, two members of SC (United Kingdom and Netherlands) were publishing data using the IATI standard. However, the overall capacity of the organisation to meet the full scope of the transparency commitment in the Grand Bargain, which requires internal system capability to report against the IATI standard across the full portfolio of institutional funding, was low. Consequently, SC included the transparency commitment in the future state

analysis to inform the design and rollout of a new internal system for information management and reporting across the organisation.

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, SC moved forward with full integration of the IATI standard in the design of our internal information management system to ensure the organisation can meet the scope of the commitment implied by signature of the Grand Bargain. SC's decision to prioritise the transparency workstream of the Grand Bargain was informed by discussion with Development Initiatives, DfID, OCHA and NGOs with a similar structure. The change management process and technical expertise associated with advancing the transparency commitment requires an initial investment of staff time to develop the technical solution to both integrate IATI and ensure the outcome is flexible enough to meet new requirements. SCI recruited one Information Management Adviser to coordinate the design and rollout of IATI in our information management and reporting system. Concurrently, SCUK has agreed to transition to the use of IATI Version 2.03 in 2018, including the introduction of humanitarian tagging and second-level partner reporting. SCI has registered as an IATI publisher and is publishing data.

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)?

SCI is learning from the experience of SCUK, SCNL and other organisations to design the technical solution to support the integration of the IATI standard in our internal system. This will enable all SC members to report against the IATI standard so that the organisation can ensure there is no break in the transparency chain from institutional donors, UN Agencies to SC.

4. Efficiency gains

Based on internal cost calculations, SC estimates that the integration of IATI in our internal system, including reporting to the platform, will require an initial financial investment over a five-year period. However, SC has identified substantial future efficiency gains if, in the future, the integration of IATI leads to a net reduction in reporting if IATI data can simultaneously populate multiple platforms including FTS and the new UN Partners Portal.

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?

Organisations based in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have developed expertise in developing the technical solution to report against the IATI standard and workshops convened by Development Initiatives, BOND and Danida offered a platform for sharing challenges and lessons learnt. From an organisational perspective, the inclusion of the IATI standard in the future state analysis for the design of reporting and information management systems, informed by mapping and cost analysis, supported the business case for internal change management.

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*

Currently, SC can analyse the percentage of funding disbursed to partner organisations, including consortia members that may include INGOs, as data disaggregation to the level of national organisations has not been included in the design of internal reporting systems that pre-date the Grand Bargain. In 2018, SC will introduce the IASC Localisation Marker to support the disaggregation of financial data to track funding flows from institutional donors and UN agencies to national organisations via SC.

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.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Internally, SC established the Humanitarian Partnership Working Group to streamline policies and procedures to improve the quality and efficiency of partnership in humanitarian response. SC tracked the developments on the IASC Localisation Marker but had not yet adapted our internal financial reporting system to align with the definition.

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, SC focused on strengthening operational capability to work with local and national responders including the development of new policies, procedures and tools to support partnership and capacity building. Outcomes include the revision of SC's Emergency Preparedness Planning tools to reflect involvement and cooperation with national and local responders; the rollout of a new Humanitarian Partnership Toolkit and recruitment of Roving Partnership Advisers to deploy to response teams and ensure partnership with national organisations is integrated into the response planning and implementation cycle. In accordance with SC's commitment to promote sector-wide access to capacity building and training, SC signed a Memorandum of Strategic Intent with the Humanitarian Leadership Academy (HLA) and is working with the HLA to co-develop a number of appropriate and accessible capacity building materials for roll-out at global level and HLA centres in the Philippines, East Africa and Jordan. Finally, SC commissioned analysis of the implications of the commitments associated with Workstream 2 – and interdependencies with Workstream 6 – outlining a set of recommendations to progress in Year 3.

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 2018 – and in line with the transparency commitment – SC will focus on aligning internal financial tracking of funding flows to partners with the IASC Localisation Marker to ensure consistency in reporting figures. In link with SC's role as the co-lead for the Global Education Cluster, SC is developing a set of training modules that can be accessed by national organisations to support engagement in all clusters.

4. Efficiency gains

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

In 2018, SC will commission research to assess the efficiency gains associated with localisation by examining models in a range of humanitarian contexts. SC's research will contribute to an improved understanding of cost efficient modalities of delivering humanitarian aid, which will inform future decision making on how to approach and support localisation in different contexts.

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?

Internally, analysis of the implications of the commitments outlined in the localisation workstream for SC's partnership and humanitarian strategy offered clarity on priorities for Year 3.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In Year 1, SC focused on improving our operational capacity to deliver Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) at scale, partnership with other organisations and building the evidence base to support CTP with a focus on child-sensitive outcomes. In recognition of the specific role of NGOs in the design, delivery and monitoring of CTP, SC established the Collaborative Cash Platform to support sector-wide efforts to develop a collaborative approach to humanitarian 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?

In 2017, SC prioritised further investment in internal supporting systems (finance, awards and operations) to improve our overall capability to scale-up the delivery of CTP, partnership and research to build the evidence base for CTP. SC introduced a new coding structure to offer a more detailed breakdown of CTP volume across all responses (including different mechanisms and modalities) as part of a system-wide effort to track the overall disbursement of resources via cash transfers. SC is finalising a new Cash Operations Manual, which includes minimum steps for cash preparedness, to guide decision-making at field level for non-technical leads and co-developed training modules on CTP with Cash Learning

Partnership (CaLP), World Vision International, British Red Cross and Oxfam that targets Team Leaders and Deputy Team Leaders. At the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) level, SC is working with the Global Shelter Cluster to deliver training on shelter outcomes of CTPs for shelter practitioners.

In the research field, SC is primarily focused on building the evidence base for child-sensitive outcomes of CTP. In 2017, SC undertook a [systematic review](#) of child outcomes of CTP, including analysis of the evidence gap. The review is feeding into both organisational strategy for 2019-2021 and partnership with other child-focused organisations. In line with SC's focus on ensuring system preparedness for CTP, research to document the Value for Money of Cash Preparedness was undertaken in Nepal and Bangladesh (forthcoming).

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 2018, SC will develop a new Global Humanitarian Cash Strategy informed by research conducted in 2016-2017 and lessons learnt from non-emergency cash based approaches such as the Household Economy Approach and Cash Plus for Nutrition outcomes. SC is conducting research to build evidence of the potential CTP outcomes for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) with a specific focus on the needs and experiences of children. This research is designed to address the gap identified in the SC's review of the evidence gap around CTP outcomes for children conducted in 2017. SC will collaborate with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) as part of a five-year research project with a number of academic institutions to assess on research on the impact of CTP on health outcomes.

4. Efficiency gains

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

As a member of the Collaborative Cash Platform, SC has undertaken a review of all steps in the programme cycle from design, contracting to monitoring to assess duplication. The review was designed to assess where NGOs can both collaborate more efficiently to reach more people with CTP and decrease costs associated with overall delivery of CTP by developing inter-operable systems.

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 collaboration between NGOs in the Collaborative Cash Platform has reinforced technical expertise and contributed to the development of a collaborative framework to guide the design and delivery of CTP by INGO members that is intended to reduce duplication and improve scale and quality of CTP. In 2018, the focus will be on developing an online system, with support from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), to support an online

platform that will enable members to share information on context pre-crisis and support overall preparedness for determining the appropriate use of cash in different contexts.

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 and progress (only in year 1)

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

Internally, 2016 was the start of a three-year internal initiative to reduce management costs and improve efficiency through the consolidation of internal systems for information management and reporting, human resources and surge personnel. The alignment of internal management systems for information management, people and procurement will reduce overall management costs associated with our own operations and enable SC to offer transparent information on cost structures for operations.

2. Planned next steps

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

In 2018, SC will launch the first phase of the deployment of one system for Human Resources (HR) that will enable us to manage our people and talent more effectively and reduce overall management costs. In addition, the organisation will focus on Supply Chain Transformation, especially around the development of our procurement function and rollout of the associated Procurement Manual and Policy. The final state analysis will be applied to coding, which will ensure that all of our financial systems use one global coding structure so that we can offer better access to data and contribute to improve the reporting ecosystem.

3. Efficiency gains

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

Efficiency gains associated with streamlining internal processes for HR, finance and logistics will reduce the overall management costs of the organisation.

4. 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?

NTR.

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?*

There is strong alignment between commitments in Workstream 6 and ongoing processes in the IASC, most notably the review of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC).

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

SC routinely participates in both inter-agency needs assessment processes as part of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) and inter-agency rapid needs assessment designed to assess the impact of new shocks. In line with accountabilities associated with Cluster Lead Agency, SC's Global Education Cluster Team includes deployable Cluster Coordinators and Information Management (IM) to support coordination and strengthen data collection and monitoring.

In line with SC's commitment to scale up cash transfer programming, including the use of multi-purpose cash grants (MPG), SC identified a gap in the inter-agency assessment methodology relating to the collection of information required to establish if cash based cash based interventions are a suitable response option, alone or in combination with other modalities. This is a major impediment to designing CTP that are integrated into broader responses.

As part of the ECHO funded Enhanced Response Capacity (ERC) Consortium for the Uptake of Multi-Purpose Cash Grants (MPC) including SC, OCHA, CaLP, Danish Refugee Council and Mercy Corps, the initial scoping for the [Basic Needs Assessment](#) (BNA) was initiated. The inter-agency work to develop the BNA spans three of the Grand Bargain workstreams (cash, needs assessment and participation). A basic needs approach that focuses on beneficiaries' perspectives is necessary because affected people are not passive recipients of aid: they are actors that make decisions, prioritise their needs, and routinely interact with markets or (public/semi-public) service providers to satisfy them. While the market (available goods and services including financial service providers) play a key function in people's ability to meet their basic needs an overreliance on sector specific market data when designing response programmes can lead to responses that do not optimally meet the needs of beneficiaries across the full spectrum of needs. A basic understanding of affected households' perspectives on these matters allows for triangulation and validation of information, resulting in selection of assistance modalities that genuinely "put people in the centre".

2. Progress to date

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

The second phase of the Basic Needs Assessment (BNA) initiated in Year 1 included field-testing of the methodology in [Nigeria \(Borno State\)](#) and the second pilot was recently completed in the Somali region of Ethiopia in February 2018. The Guidance and Toolkit have been developed and reviewed in line with lessons learnt from field-testing the methodology. To support inter-sector response analysis in a way to consider CTP among other intervention modalities, SC has developed and tested in Nigeria and Ethiopia (in conjunction with the BNA) [Facilitator's Guide for Response Options Analysis and Planning](#) (ROAP).

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)?

By mid-2018, lessons learnt from the field-testing of the BNA and the ROAP in Nigeria and Ethiopia will inform the finalisation of guidance and toolkit in full consultation with OCHA and all Cluster Lead Agencies.

4. Efficiency gains

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

NTR.

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?

Lessons learnt from the pilot phase of the BNA in Nigeria and Ethiopia will be shared with workstream signatories in early June 2018.

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?

SC was committed to the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) on Quality and Accountability at the global level and considered CHS as the framework for improving accountability and participation in our responses. In 2016, SC initiated the process towards third-party verification by Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI) against the CHS. In addition, SC is part of inter-agency efforts to develop and test common approaches to child participation in needs assessment processes.

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?

SC has integrated CHS in response management procedures and revised the methodology for Real-Time Review (RTR) to embed the CHS in all responses. SC's approach to RTR is

aligned with the CHS to include an assessment of participation and accountability informed by feedback from affected communities.

SC worked with our counterparts in the Steering Committee on Humanitarian Response (SCHR) and co-lead of the Participation Workstream to develop a field-based analysis of barriers and opportunities for participation. SCHR Humanitarian Directors travelled to Uganda and Northern Iraq to conduct a [Peer Review](#) of organisational practices in participation. Humanitarian Directors met with staff, partner organisations and stakeholders to understand what further investments need to be made by our individual organisations and as a collective to put the participation of people and national organisations at the heart of our humanitarian response work.

In Bangladesh, Save the Children conducted consultations with 140 Rohingya children living in Cox's Bazaar in December. Children what they perceive as their pressing needs in the camps in order to inform our humanitarian response activities. Their replies are recorded in the report [Childhood Interrupted](#), published together with Plan International and World Vision, and which includes recommendations on how to improve camp conditions to ensure children feel safe.

In October 2017, we carried out a similar assessment in the provinces of Kasai Oriental and Lomami in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Over 1,700 children from 37 villages told us that their key priorities are having access to education and their family having sufficient food and water. As a result, we have increased our focus on education in our emergency response in the area. Consultations are carried out in a number of ways, using focus group interviews, yes-no-maybe games, and activities where children can draw or act out their responses. All consultation projects include a feedback phase that utilises specifically developed child appropriate material to explain the outcomes of the project.

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)?

SC received third-party verification against the CHS in July 2017 and has initiated a four-year cycle of learning and improvement on quality and accountability across the organisation.

4. Efficiency gains

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

NTR.

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?

SC's external verification against the CHS provided an independent, evidence-based analysis to inform internal investment in a four-year cycle to strengthen child and community practices. SC's involvement in the peer review of participation practices and the focus on

field-level learning to inform next steps in the workstream offered space for critical reflection of the factors that need to be in place to facilitate participation and underlined the limitations of current approaches to needs assessment.

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?

SC analysed children's rights and planned on multi-year cycles including 2016-2018 Country Strategic Planning Cycle. SC participate in multi-year Humanitarian Program Cycles where available and in the majority of our humanitarian response strategies are multi-year including phases of transition and recovery as well as 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?

NTR

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 2018, SC is investing in updated Child Rights Situation Analysis (CRSAs) to inform the development of multi-year strategic plans in all countries where SC is operational.

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.

NTR.

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?

NTR.

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)*

**A proportion of SC's funding is unearmarked or softly earmarked. In recent years, we have established mechanisms to maximise the efficiency of such flexible funding through the establishment of internally managed pooled funds in which no further earmarks are applied by the organisation.*

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](#).

NTR

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?

NTR

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)?

NTR.

4. Efficiency gains

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

NTR.

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?

NTR.

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?

Internally, SC invested in the design of a new online information management and reporting system that is being upgraded to include the IATI standard. In future, this should enable SC to generate data on programmatic outputs that can be used across different information management platforms thereby simplifying the reporting process (for SC) to some platforms. In line with ongoing work to reduce management costs, SC developed a methodology for cost allocation (shared costs) across all funding received from insitutional donors and UN Agencies so that SC can offer transparent and comparable data.

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, SC rolled-out the Effort Reporting Cost Allocation Methodology in approximately 50% of Country Offices and is on track for 100% completion rate by mid- 2018. SC shared the methodology and outlined the change management process associated with the roll-out of one aspect of harmonised reporting requirements with NGO signatories of the Grand Bargain in the context of ongoing work to harmonise reporting requirements. SC has also endorsed the NGO Principles on Shared Costs.

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 2018, SC will transition to one online information management and reporting platform and, pending the full integration of IATI Version 2.03 (including humanitarian tagging and results-based outcome reporting) assess the feasibility of docking the 8+3 narrative report to our internal automated information management and reporting system.

4. Efficiency gains

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

The inclusion of the IATI standard in the scope of design for SC's information management and reporting system means that, in theory, future data generated via IATI can be exported to populate other reporting platforms. This may reduce the need for paper-based reporting on some commitments (e.g. cash transfers, percentage of funding flowing to national and local responders) and populate results-based reporting platforms that include IATI as the basis for a shared reporting 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?

Lessons learnt by NGOs on the technical requirements process required to ensure the uptake of new reporting procedures highlights the need to invest – and share – in change management across the full workstream. The financial costs associated with the integration of the IATI standard require further clarification about the level of alignment between harmonised reporting requirements and transparency workstream.

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?"

In 2017, SC introduced a 20% window in our internal seed funding mechanism to enable country offices to access flexible funding for early action interventions and funded eight Emergency Preparedness Pilots (EPPs) including partner organisations to contribute to preparedness for disaster response.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

SC had established expertise in early warning and early action through initiatives such as the Household Economic Approach (HEA) and development of the Situation Response Analysis Framework (SRAF) and technical expertise in the design – and support – to national social

protection systems and safety nets in a number of countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia Pacific. In response to multiple mixed migration flows, SC established a specialised Migration and Displacement Initiative (MDI) bringing together a cross-disciplinary team to design and deliver an integrated programmatic response to needs of children on the move.

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?

From the financing perspective, lessons learnt from multiple responses to slow-onset crises underline the cost-effectiveness of investment in preparedness and access to flexible funding to support early action interventions. In 2017, SC introduced a 20% window in our internal seed funding mechanism to enable country offices to access flexible funding for early action interventions and funded eight Emergency Preparedness Pilots (EPPs) including partner organisations. SC has established a new Context Analysis and Foresight Unit networking of regional analysts and informing engagement in global level predictive forecasting networks including IASC EWEAR and IPC

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)?

SC is finalising a new Resilience Strategy informed by a review of programming approaches in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia Pacific to cyclical, forecasted crises to guide internal investment in risk-aware development programming and early adaptive humanitarian response. SC will release evidence generated from early action pilots in Ethiopia, Niger and Somalia (forthcoming) and will continue multi-year research on pathways for youth and livelihood transitions in sub-Saharan Africa.

4. Efficiency gains

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

NTR.

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?

NTR.

Additional information

In 2017, Save the Children launched a new and updated organisational Gender Equality Policy that incorporates various global standards and forms the road map for ensuring gender equality is at the heart of all of our work. Alongside the policy, relevant program guidance and toolkits were rolled-out for use by our country offices and partners. This includes information on how to conduct a gender analysis to ensure a high level of analytical data.

We also launched a Gender Equality Marker to measure gender equality in our work. Related to this is a new organisational key performance indicator against which all proposals and concept notes to donors are measured, defined as a % of new program proposals submitted that are gender sensitive or gender transformative. This percentage increased from 30% in March to 53% in December 2017.