



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting

UK Department for International Development (DFID)

Contents

Workstream 1 - Transparency	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps.....	6
4. Efficiency gains	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	7
Workstream 2 – Localization.....	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	8
2. Progress to date.....	9
3. Planned next steps.....	9
4. Efficiency gains	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	9
Workstream 3 – Cash	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	10
2. Progress to date.....	10
3. Planned next steps.....	11
4. Efficiency gains	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	12
Workstream 4 – Management costs	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	14
2. Progress to date.....	14
3. Planned next steps.....	15
4. Efficiency gains	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	16
Workstream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18

3. Planned next steps	19
4. Efficiency gains	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	20
Workstream 6 – Participation Revolution.....	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2. Progress to date	21
3. Planned next steps	22
4. Efficiency gains	23
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	23
Workstream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	24
2. Progress to date	24
3. Planned next steps	25
4. Efficiency gains	25
5. Good practice and lessons learned.....	26
Workstream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility.....	27
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	28
2. Progress to date	28
3. Planned next steps	28
4. Efficiency gains	29
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	29
Workstream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	30
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	30
2. Progress to date	30
3. Planned next steps	30
4. Efficiency gains	31
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	31
Workstream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	32
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	32
2. Progress to date	32
3. Planned next steps	36
4. Efficiency gains	36
5. Good practices and lessons learned.....	36

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each workstream, 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 workstreams.

DFID considers gender equality and women's and girls' empowerment to be integral to ensuring the humanitarian system is as effective, efficient and accountable as possible. DFID's approach to integrating gender equality within humanitarian response aligns with and supports delivery of our Grand Bargain commitments, through such practical measures as:

- Scaled up support for women and girls in crises, including through expanded programmes to address VAWG and sexual and reproductive health and rights in protracted contexts [WS5, WS6 & WS10]
- Gender-responsive programming and protection of the most vulnerable [WS6]
- Work to unite efforts under a single, impartial needs assessment, more transparent, disaggregated data sharing and more multi-year programmes [WS5]
- Ensuring that UK-funded organisations place protection at the centre of their work, including compliance with the UK's International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014, and use of the (IASC) Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action [WS6]
- Supporting the UN Secretary General's zero tolerance policy towards sexual exploitation and abuse and support delivery of a coordinated approach to prevent and respond to gender based violence [WS2, WS6 & WS6].
- Contribute to evidence-based programming on what works to address VAWG in humanitarian settings, including releasing evidence from research initiatives in Ethiopia, DRC, Pakistan, and South Sudan [WS2, WS6 & WS6].

DFID is representing, with OCHA, the Informal Friends of Gender group for the Grand Bargain on this year's Facilitation Group, and will continue to highlight the value of the *Aide-Memoire on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain* to workstream co-conveners as they develop workplans to deliver Grand Bargain commitments.

Workstream 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 workstream 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?

By publishing details of all spending to the IATI Standard, DFID ensures transparency and accountability to taxpayers in the UK, citizens in developing countries, civil society and the private sector.

DFID also actively uses the data published to IATI including by partners for monitoring and communicating information about DFID-funded activities, and for future planning. By using the links between the datasets that have been shared by the different organisations involved in the delivery of a project, DFID is able to see the role of each organisation, the flow of funds to the activity from DFID and other funders and the results being achieved.

DFID also plans to use data from IATI to monitor our GB commitments (e.g. cash, localisation, earmarking) and is exploring use of data to support reporting (e.g. delivery chain mapping).

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

DFID continues to be a champion of aid transparency and to publish information on UK aid (including humanitarian) funding to the IATI Standard. DFID scored 'Very Good' on the 2016 [Aid Transparency Index](#) in line with performance over the past years. The [2015 UK Aid Strategy](#) committed to ensure that all UK government departments spending ODA will be ranked as either 'Good' or 'Very Good' within the next five years.

DFID developed a new Transparency Agenda '[Open aid, open societies: A vision for a transparent world](#)' in 2017 that was launched in February 2018. The Transparency Agenda sets out how DFID will lead global transparency initiatives and standards, improve the value and use of aid data and ensure that transparency delivers impact and strengthens accountability in our partner countries. In addition, it articulates how DFID will work with partners to help to ensure they meet international transparency standards and pass the same expectations down their delivery chains. Specifically, it requires all our partners to publish to the IATI Standard or other relevant international transparency standards and to pass this expectation down the delivery chain. It also acknowledges our Grand Bargain commitments, and places importance on the role of beneficiary feedback.

DFID's two new business cases with the UN and Red Cross Movement respectively make a commitment to work with and incentivise agencies to improve the transparency of humanitarian aid in line with the GB Transparency commitments and our new Transparency Agenda.

DFID has also been actively engaging with the GB Transparency Workstream to ensure that reporting standards and platforms become fit for humanitarian purposes. This specifically included input into consultations on the inclusion of new elements to support humanitarian reporting in the IATI Standard through the [2.03 upgrade](#). Several humanitarian related proposals (earmarking, tracking pledges, localisation, forward looking budget exemptions) were agreed upon and included in the upgrade.

One proposal on tracking different aid modalities (cash, voucher, in-kind) in the IATI Standard is being further developed. DFID has been advocating for a close link with the GB Cash Workstream that we co-convene with WFP. CaLP and ECHO are taking forward work to facilitate agreement and adoption of a standard, systematic, system-wide approach to track the use of humanitarian cash programming under the GB Cash Workstream and are

engaging with international standards and platforms for transparency (i.e. OCHA FTS, IATI, OECD).

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)?

Measuring Cash: As joint co-convenors with WFP of the GB Cash Workstream, we will continue to work with the workstream members on agreeing a standard, systematic, system-wide approach to track the use of humanitarian cash programming. DFID will ensure close linkages with the GB Transparency Workstream and international systems and platforms (IATI, FTS, OECD). DFID will also continue participation in the CaLP Cash Tracking Working Group and contribute to an ongoing scoping study on measuring cash conducted under the GB Cash Workstream. Measuring cash is crucial to enable GB signatories to track progress against our GB Cash commitments.

DFID IATI Upgrade: DFID is in the process of upgrading to IATI 2.02 to allow us to use humanitarian markers.

FTS/IATI Interoperability Pilot: Upgrading to IATI 2.02 would also enable DFID to take part in the interoperability pilot between FTS and IATI led by the Humanitarian Data Centre proposed under the GB Transparency Workstream.

DFID Partners Guidance on using the IATI Standard: DFID Partners Guidance on using the IATI Standard: DFID has developed guidance on publishing to the IATI standard for implementing partners. This supports the commitments set out in DFID's Transparency Agenda and provides implementing partners with clear and accessible information on their responsibilities to produce relevant, timely and high-quality data, under transparency provisions within their agreement or contract with DFID.

4. Efficiency gains

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

There are no efficiency gains to report on transparency yet, but several areas appear promising for future efficiency gains. With improvements to the FTS/IATI interoperability (e.g. through the pilot), we hope that reporting requirements will reduce over time or easier to meet.

Measuring cash through a common standard like IATI would enable us to monitor our GB cash commitments. Specifically, it would provide important information to allow us to understand the value for money of cash in comparison with other modalities across different

contexts. Such information is crucial to identify what forms of aid will best respond to people's most pressing needs while maximising the impact of humanitarian aid in different contexts.

DFIDs partner guidance will support efficiency gains for partners publishing to the IATI standard.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

Bringing humanitarian actors together on the IATI upgrade 2.03 was very useful to gain momentum for relevant changes to the Standard that ensure it is fit for humanitarian purposes (e.g. reporting on localisation and earmarking according to GB workstream definitions). Continued, close engagement of the humanitarian community in an accessible manner on reporting to international transparency systems and platforms is welcome.

Improving IATI compliance and data quality will hopefully facilitate possibilities for data use that could further improve efficiency (e.g. on reporting, coordination).

Workstream 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 workstream co-conveners reporting request: What percentage of your humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders (a) directly (b) through pooled funds, or (c) through a single intermediary?¹

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

¹ The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure ([available here](#)) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form ([available here](#)) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with your self report is optional, but encouraged.

2. Progress to date

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

DFID continues to fund the START Fund which is the first multi-donor pooled fund managed exclusively by NGOs. Projects are chosen by local committees, and in 2015 (latest data available), 42% of START funds went to national and local partners.

DFID has funded the core Disaster Emergency Preparedness Programme (DEPP) up until 31 March 2018. DFID will fund the DEPP Innovation window (£10million) until March 2019.

DFID has funded the Humanitarian Leadership Academy since 2015 to support people to prepared for and respond to crises in their own countries.

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)?

DFID will continue to fund central programmes that support localisation, including the START Fund. DFID will also continue to fund Country-Based Pooled Funds, and will support localisation through its country offices.

4. Efficiency gains

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

DFID expects there to be efficiency gains due to the proximity of local and national actors to the crises and affected population, and decentralisation of decision making, but DFID does not yet have formal evidence of efficiency gains for this workstream.

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 workstream? And why?

The START Fund is going beyond the 25% Grand Bargain funding commitment to look at a comprehensive range of issues necessary to support localisation; genuine partnerships, improved capacity and institutional development, greater participation of affected communities, greater presence and influence of national actors within coordination mechanisms, visibility of roles and results by national actors, and greater policy influence of national actors in international policy debates.

Workstream 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 workstream 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 workstream?

Providing leadership to the humanitarian sector:

- Co-convening the Grand Bargain cash workstream with WFP: delivered first workshop (June 2017), identified co-leads for each priority area of work and supported definition of scope of work for each; supporting delivery of priorities (workshop on cost-efficiency and effectiveness, mapping of use of multipurpose cash (MPC) outcome indicators etc);
- Co-chair of the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) cash workstream with Norway, first event delivered (May 2017); participated to joint donor mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon;

- Engaging with other cash platforms and actors (e.g. part of Steering Committee of the State of the World of Cash report from CaLP; supporting CaLP's work on measuring cash; co-host of the event on digital payments in humanitarian response in June 2017).

Creating incentives for the scale up of cash:

- Developed with Agencies the cash indicators for the DFID's core funding to UN and Red Cross Movement Agencies (through Payment by Results);
- Funding cash programmes in country offices; including new models as Lebanon and Zimbabwe.

Institutionalising:

- Cash is a key part of the new DFID Humanitarian Reform Policy published in 2017;
- Developed DFID's approach to cash and voucher programming in crises (working paper open for feedback);
- Pursuing development of internal markers to measure use of cash.

Investing in Evidence and learning:

- Policy research fund on user journeys to better understand the various systems of delivering, receiving, and using cash transfers;
- REFANI: research looking at nutritional impact and cost effectiveness of cash and voucher based food assistance programmes;
- ODI learning paper on DFID/ECHO approach to cash assistance for refugees in Lebanon.

3. Planned next steps

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

- Continue delivering GB and GHD cash workstream priorities, including the organisation of one event for each workstream in 2018;
- Further investment in evidence (policy research fund on cash and reform);
- Finalisation of internal guidance on funding humanitarian cash;
- Policy thinking on links between humanitarian cash and social protection.

4. Efficiency gains

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

DFID are investing in independent monitoring and evaluation (for example, in Lebanon) and Value for Money (VfM) analysis to appraise this.

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 workstream? And why?

Donor coordination in country to support harmonisation and coherence in cash programming is essential (example of joint donor position paper developed in Iraq).

Programs must adapt the response based on sound context analysis: in Zimbabwe this allowed DFID to support a cash programme from September 2015 to March 2017 to 360,000 vulnerable people to address their household's food needs. In a context of regional cereal shortfall and liquidity crisis, this programme was complemented by the Grain Market Facility that supported maize imports. Without such understanding of the context and development of a market based approach, cash would have been declared unfeasible and opportunities for recipients and local markets would have been missed.

Workstream 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 workstream 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?

DFID has rigorous due diligence requirements, and continues to be one of the most demanding donors in terms of individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes. Whilst at this point in time, DFID is unable to rely exclusively on multilateral systems of assessment, it does draw on this data to support DFID's own assessments. DFID is working with a select group of donors to increase information sharing on due diligence to reduce duplication and burden on partner agencies.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

DFID is a global leader in humanitarian innovation, and is systematically investing in initiatives to improve the efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology. In 2017, the DFID's support included:

- DFID's Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) - launched in 2012 and worth over £54.6m until 2020/21:
 - The Humanitarian Innovation Fund ([HIF](#)) which has funded innovations such as 3D printing, drone technology for aerial mapping, low cost kits to treat post-partum haemorrhaging, emergency wheelchairs, and more efficient water treatment systems, amongst many others, and is working to bring these to scale. These innovations are saving lives, reducing losses and increasing

humanitarian effectiveness, which are core to DFID's commitments in this area;

- On-going support to the Humanitarian Education Accelerator launched in 2015 in partnership with UNICEF and UNHCR to support initiatives that have already demonstrated impact, and were ready to scale.
 - The establishment of the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), which now brings together over 50 agencies to share research and lessons on cash based approaches;
 - Support to the Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation (GAHI), a multi-donor initiative to support scaling of successful innovation across the humanitarian sector.
- The Mobile for Humanitarian Innovation programme, which will bring the mobile industry and humanitarian community together to improve how we prepare and respond to emergency situations.
 - Frontier Tech Programme which is supporting such initiatives as Field Ready who make humanitarian supplies in the field using 3D printing, so that vital supplies can be manufactured where and when they are needed during disasters. They have tested this approach in Haiti and Nepal, and expanded their work to Syria and the recent response to Hurricanes Irma and Maria;
 - Establishment of the Global Centre for Disaster Protection to leverage the role of insurance as a potentially valuable instrument for disaster preparedness.

As part of standing partnership management arrangements, DFID regularly advocates for greater collaboration among multilateral partners to deliver improvements in value for money. DFID will be monitoring this issue through the core funding business cases DFID has with the United Nations and Red Cross movement humanitarian agencies.

DFID has rigorous due diligence requirements, and continues to be one of the most demanding donors in terms of individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes. At this point in time, DFID is unable to rely exclusively on multilateral systems of assessment, however does draw on this data to support DFID's own assessments. DFID is working with a select group of donors to increase information sharing on due diligence to reduce duplication and burden on partner agencies.

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)?

DFID will continue to support the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme until 2021. DFID has also recently launched its *Digital Strategy 2018 to 2020: Doing Development in a Digital World* which will establish DFID as a global leader in digital technology and development, in order to have a bigger, faster and more cost-effective impact on the lives of people, including in humanitarian response.

DFID will continue to work with partners and donors to examine the DFID's current due diligence requirements. Where harmonisation and information sharing can reduce the administrative burden on agencies, without compromising DFID's exacting standards for accountability and oversight, DFID will seek to align with others.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Individual projects supported by DFID's investments in humanitarian innovation and technologies have demonstrated positive impact on the efficiency of assistance (see DFID's 2017 external evaluation of The Humanitarian Innovation Fund)², but evidence for system-wide efficiencies remains weak, hindered in part by the challenge of taking innovation to scale, gaps in resourcing and lack of support for innovation in the system.

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 workstream? And why?

N/A

² Andrew Lawday, Clarissa Poulson, Conor Foley TripleLine *The Humanitarian Innovation Fund External Evaluation*
<http://www.elrha.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/HIF-Evaluation-submitted.pdf>

Workstream 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 workstream co-conveners reporting request: What hurdles, if any, might be addressed to allow for more effective implementation of the GB commitment?

The Joint Needs Assessment Workstream has struggled to make progress as quickly as needed. Sustained leadership of the workstream by both Co-Conveners has been a challenge, as has active engagement from wider stakeholders, particularly NGOs. The largely conceptual discussions within the workstream to date have made it difficult to demonstrate practical and tangible change. Pragmatic options to rapidly pilot initiatives at the field-level, in order to explore best practice, are crucial going forward. Clear commitment to action by workstream members, predictable resourcing and dedicated staff working on behalf of the co-conveners to support the work-stream would enable the workstream to drive progress.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

DFID has been an active and engaged participant in the workstream. DFID has supported the development of the Theory of Change and the Work Plan. DFID has maintained regular attendance at, and participation in, workstream workshops and technical meetings.

Progress under the different activities in the Work Plan remains mixed. OCHA commissioned a consultant to undertake a review (now completed) of existing analytical frameworks of humanitarian need to inform the development of a common needs assessment/analysis methodology. This will inform the development of a joint impartial needs assessment methodology, which will be piloted at country level in mid-2018. DFID is keen to support the effective delivery of those pilots.

DFID has prepared a non-paper on ways to link humanitarian and development needs assessments in protracted crises. This has been reviewed by co-supporters of this activity within the Work Plan. Discussion is ongoing with OCHA and the Global Early Recovery Cluster to see how the non-paper may be merged with complementary initiatives by the respective agencies to reinforce traction on this issue.

ECHO is leading on commissioning the INSPIRE Consortium to develop an evaluation criteria for joint needs assessments. DFID has reviewed the TORs and contributed to their further development. DFID has committed to be part of the Reference Group for this piece of work going forward.

DFID has agreed to multi-year unearmarked core humanitarian funding to seven UN humanitarian agencies (OCHA, CERF, UNHCR, WFP, Unicef, WHO and IOM) which includes 30% Payment by Results (PbR) that will be triggered only if agencies work together to demonstrate they have reformed their working practices in line with reform commitments – including undertaking joint needs assessments.

Internally, DFID has been advocating for practical implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments at the country level with partner agencies, governments, donors and other influential stakeholders. Country offices are mindful of the need to ensure HNOs and HRPs are based on a single impartial joint needs assessment and prioritised response plan. Furthermore, DFID is discussing internally how to a) develop efforts that strengthen and streamline data collection and analysis to ensure quality and comparability; and b) ensure risk and vulnerability analysis is conducted with development partners and local authorities, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.

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)?

DFID's new UN core funding Business Case (£684m from 2017 – 2021) will comprise 70% unearmarked funds and 30% Payment by Results (PbR). The seven humanitarian agencies under the BC (OCHA, CERF, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, UNHCR and IOM) will have to demonstrate they have reformed their working practices in line with reform commitments. Performance will be assessed using joint indicators which agencies can only achieve by working collaboratively. The two joint indicators for Joint Needs Assessment are as follows:

- By 2021, improved quality of HNOs in line with the GB workstream on the agreed methodology for joint impartial needs assessments and evaluation criteria.
- By 2021, 95% of Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) are prioritised based on a joint impartial and timely assessment of need.

DFID will support OCHA's leadership on the piloting of a joint needs assessment methodology at the field level, (methodology expected to be ready by mid-2018).

DFID will also continue to support ECHO's work on commissioning the INSPIRE Consortium to develop an evaluation criteria for joint needs assessments.

DFID will continue to engage with OCHA and the Global Early Recovery Cluster to see how the non-paper on cooperation between humanitarian and development actors may be merged with complementary initiatives by the respective agencies in reinforce traction on this issue, particularly through engagement with the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian and Development Nexus.

4. Efficiency gains

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

DFID believes efficiency gains will only be meaningfully achieved once needs assessments are separated from the delivery of aid. The Needs Assessment Workstream is overshadowed by a broader problem, referenced as Priority 1 in its' Work Plan: "Competition, mandate and leadership are not conducive to a collaborative approach to needs assessment". There is growing emphasis on the viability of having an independent mechanism that has responsibility for analysing humanitarian needs, supported by third-party monitoring of impact.

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 workstream? And why?

In terms of lessons, it is very clear that diversity of the workstream (which includes UN agencies, H2H organisations, data-focused organisations, agency-specific M&E units and donors), has meant that collaboration and coordination amongst them has been a major challenge. This is compounded by the fact that the JNA commitment, (like the other nine commitments of the Grand Bargain), has no formal accountability framework i.e. we don't know what success looks like, and there is a lack of consensus about how the commitment should be delivered. As a result, the level and extent of engagement from workstream members has been somewhat uneven.

At the Joint Inter-sectoral Analysis Group (JIAG) workshop (held in Rome from 15 to 16 January, 2018), members reviewed the criteria for the development of a conceptual framework for joint inter-sectoral needs analysis. OCHA has done a great deal of work on reviewing need analysis frameworks to determine best practice and has collaborated with key stakeholders to define common factors. The approach and methodology underpinning the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) was highlighted as particularly useful. This process has been positive and a target has been set for June 2018 to have a template methodology for joint inter-sectoral needs analysis in place that can be field-tested.

DFID Country Offices have highlighted the Humanitarian Response Plans for South Sudan and Afghanistan as benefiting from strong joint needs analysis (though not in a particularly methodological manner) which had informed a clear prioritisation of need.

Workstream 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 workstream 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 workstream?

DFID is has dedicated resources to strengthen accountability to affected populations, including through support for a communication specialist NGOs in the Cyclone Irma and Cyclone Maria response, Ground Truth Solutions, CDAC and ACAPS.

DFID has committed in-principle to support system-wide community engagement and accountability mechanisms in large L3 responses in CAR and Yemen.

DFID is finalising a multi-year business case to allow for the rapid funding of the H2H network of organisations, specifically including agencies with specialist expertise in Accountability to Affected Populations.

Accountability to Affected Populations has been integrated as a core consideration within the DFID's UN and the Red Cross Movement multi-year business case. The UN joint indicators for accountability to affected populations are:

- By 2021, 50% of humanitarian plans that include a joint approach to accountability, communication and feedback systems as agreed within the GB workstream on the participation
- By 2021, 100% of Level 3 (L3) responses with a framework for common, system-wide community engagement and feedback in place within three months from activation which informs response decision-making and course correction of the humanitarian response at a country level.

3. Planned next steps

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

DFID will develop a strategy to implement the activities outlined for donors in the Participation Revolution workstream recommendations document.

DFID will be reviewing NGO funding guidelines to require partners to support 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.

DFID will be working to ensure that accountability mechanisms – specifically whole of response mechanisms - are included in DFID third party monitoring mechanisms in large multi-year responses.

DFID will be considering how to adjust reporting requirements in rapid-onset crises to reflect the Core Humanitarian Standards, and in particular draw out evidence of community engagement and use of beneficiary feedback.

DFID expanding the inclusion of accountability specialists in database of humanitarian advisors available to deploy in crisis responses.

Accountability to affected populations is a major part of DFID's efforts to strengthen sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and safeguarding measures in the sector.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Too early to tell.

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 workstream? And why?

DFID has engaged Ground Truth Solutions to undertake perception survey's in rapid onset crises where the UK has played a major role, such as in the response to Hurricanes Irma/Maria in the Caribbean. Feedback from beneficiaries is invaluable in ensuring DFID adapts and improves the response to crises.

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

In 2017 89% of DFID humanitarian funding (£1,249,000,000) was provided through multi-year programmes (funding provided for two or more years, based on a firm commitment at the outset).

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

Multi-year humanitarian programming is now DFID's default approach to funding. Seventy-one projects in twenty-six DFID country offices now have multi-year humanitarian business cases approved. In 2017, £1,249,000,000 or 89% of all DFID humanitarian funding, was

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

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

provided to multi-year programmes (funding provided for two or more years, based on a firm commitment at the outset).

In 2017 DFID implemented two core funding arrangements to run over four years (2017-2021). These business cases provide the UN Humanitarian system (OCHA, CERF, IOM, WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF and WHO) and the Red Cross/ Red Crescent Movement (ICRC, IFRC and the British Red Cross) with flexible un-earmarked core funds and will be monitored through a single results framework for each business cases.

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)?

DFID at headquarters will be working with country offices to explore how Grand Bargain commitments are being implemented in bilateral, country level agreement, including through multiyear programs.

DFID will also continue to build internal expertise on flexible and adaptive multiyear programming to help scale up more adapted programmes that address future risks. DFID will also promote internal learning through other initiatives, including a 'learning journey' on essential services in crises.

DFID is actively engaging with other donors to shift to multi-year funding models, recognizing the reality of protracted crises and aiming to contribute to longer-term development gains, in the logic of the SDGs.

4. Efficiency gains

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

DFID's use of multi-year funding pre-dates the Grand Bargain. In terms of efficiency gains, an internal review of lessons learned within DFID in 2015 found that:

- Multi-year arrangements save time on 'process' over their full life. Staff report using this time for strategic thinking, support to more complex partner arrangements (e.g. consortia or more strategic relationships), and enhanced monitoring & evaluation. However, a multi-year arrangement is *more* time intensive in the design phase with more DFID and partner resources needed at this stage.
- Alignment of DFID's planning and reporting cycle with partners' planning and reporting cycle, and relevant seasonal cycles should be factored in from the outset; mis-timing in

business case approval can undermine longer-term programmes' chances of demonstrating success.

- DFID needs to (better) communicate to partners and other donors that a multi-year arrangement is in place /possible, and to continually advocate for higher-order (resilience) results on that basis.
- Providing multi-year funding does not automatically lead to multi-year programmes; the 'cascading' of funds from DFID to 'downstream' partners may continue to be handled on an annual basis.
- Partners need time to make organisational adjustments to reflect the ambition and innovation proposed in multi-year business cases. This should be taken into account, with options for a 'transition period' or bridge between activities to maximise the use of DFID funds.
- Multi-year arrangements can facilitate programmes that deliver 'system strengthening' for the humanitarian system in-country more easily than annual approaches.
- Existing standard monitoring tools – designed on an implicit assumption of annual programming – are flexible enough to monitor multi-year funding as long as the supporting documents explicitly determine multiyear targets, and review teams address multi-year issues in the process.
- Flexibility in multi-year design is essential. Although the optimal level of contingency funds is unclear, they are considered essential to respond to unexpected humanitarian need and unexpected humanitarian response system faults alike.

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 workstream? And why?

By moving to a 'default' multi-year approach to humanitarian funding, DFID is not only realising the benefits of eliminating the administrative and programming demands of annualised (or even shorter) funding cycles in protracted humanitarian settings (yearly preparation of new proposals for similar activities, short and unpredictable contracts that lead to high staff turnover, procurement at short notice and high cost, etc), but also the 'higher order' potential benefits, related to strengthening the skills, relationships, and systems that are used to respond to humanitarian needs and so changing the nature of possible interventions.

Workstream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

Aid organisations commit to:

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

Donors commit to:

- 5. Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020⁵.*

Earmarking/flexibility workstream 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)

Twenty-eight per cent of DFID's humanitarian funding is unearmarked. This is comprised of 17% in core funding (an increase from 15% in 2016) and 13% is provided through country-based pooled funds (a decrease from 16% in 2016, due to fluctuations in demand for funding in different humanitarian contexts).

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

DFID is unable, at present, to track whether funding is 'softly' or 'tightly' earmarked as DFID's financial systems are currently unable to systematically track the degree to funding is earmarked, and are reliant on manual cross-verification. Solutions are being explored to improve the monitoring of earmarking within DFID.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

Twenty-eight per cent of DFID's humanitarian funding is unearmarked. This is comprised of 17% in core funding (an increase from 15% in 2016) and 13% is provided through country-based pooled funds (a decrease from 16% in 2016, due to fluctuations in demand for funding in different humanitarian contexts). DFID remains the largest donor to country-based pooled funds.

DFID are unable, at present, to track whether funding is 'softly' or 'tightly' earmarked as DFID's financial systems are currently unable to systematically track the degree to funding is earmarked, and are reliant on manual cross-verification. Solutions are being explored to improve the monitoring of earmarking within DFID.

3. Planned next steps

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

In 2017 DFID implemented two core funding arrangements to run over four years (2017-2021). These business cases provide the UN Humanitarian system (OCHA, CERF, IOM, WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF and WHO) and the Red Cross/ Red Crescent Movement (ICRC, IFRC and the British Red Cross) with flexible un-earmarked core funds and will be monitored through a single results framework for each business cases.

From 2018, DFID will introduce 'Payment by Results' (PBR), making 30% of core funding to multilateral humanitarian partners conditional on their delivery of Grand Bargain commitments. PBR indicators were agreed in consultation with agencies and link directly with their own commitments and priorities emerging from the World Humanitarian Summit

and Grand Bargain. The performance targets are ambitious and can only be achieved if agencies work together.

DFID has a long-standing commitment to core funding, however internal financial systems are not able to systematically track the degree to which funds are earmarked (noting that earmarking can be to varying degrees, by country or by sector). Solutions are being explored to improve the monitoring of earmarking within DFID.

4. Efficiency gains

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

There continues to be a lack of clarity around how agencies use core funding, and evidence for efficiency gains through its use. DFID would welcome further research by the sector into this issue.

There is a critical need for Country Based Pooled Funds to report more comprehensively on results and impact, in order to clearly demonstrate the value of softly earmarked contributions to the pooled fund mechanisms. At a minimal this means reporting on the number of beneficiaries reached vs targeted, disaggregated by sector/cluster, sex, age and geographic area, as well as total number of disabled beneficiaries, provided within 12 months of activity completion.

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 workstream? And why?

DFID's considerable support for the CERF at global level and country pooled funds contribute to our Grand Bargain commitments to unearmarked funding, but we see there to be significant potential for these funds to further incentivise other Grand Bargain commitments in the field, such as through allocating funding to joint impartial needs assessments, increased cash programming, improved accountability to affected populations and increased support for local partners.

Workstream 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 workstream 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 workstream?

DFID has engaged with the Reporting Working Group on reporting and the roll out of the pilot reporting template.

DFID is participating in the harmonised reporting template pilot in Somalia and Burma.

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)?

DFID is undertaking a desk-based review of a purposive sample of country offices to assess DFID's reporting requirements in a range of operational contexts. This assessment will be used to identify means by which to strengthen DFID's delivery of this Grand Bargain commitment, and link to other initiatives, such as an internal review of DFID's approach to results reporting.

DFID will continue to engage with the Reporting Workstream and, where possible, at the country level, explore where it is possible to harmonise results reporting with other donors, including through on-going engagement with the country level pilot reporting template.

DFID will explore, with partners, the establishment of collaborative data portals to allow greater access to reliable, timely data which can be access and analysed by both partners and donors. This will reduce the need for additional or ad hoc reporting as it will enable direct DFID (and partners) to access any necessary information directly.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Too early to report. In time, DFID anticipates efficiency gains to be evident among downstream delivery partners, and will continue to advocate for any improved efficiencies to be cascaded throughout the delivery chain.

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 workstream? And why?

N/A.

Workstream 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 workstream co-conveners reporting request:

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the workstream 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 workstream?

Over the reporting period, the DFID continued to spend more than 50% of its resources in fragile and conflict-affected states and regions.

This year, DFID has developed several policies and guidance notes aimed at development and humanitarian experts to support longer-term programming in crises. This includes a new Education policy, Education in crises guidance note and a Sexual and Reproductive health guidance note. The new UK Humanitarian Reform Policy, published in October 2017, emphasises the importance of investing in resilience and addressing the humanitarian-development nexus.

In year 1, internal analysis found that DFID operated through a blend of development and humanitarian approaches in 16 countries out of 19 surveyed. In 11 of those countries DFID was operational in at least two sectors through development approaches, alongside humanitarian interventions. This year, DFID has responded through a blend of development and humanitarian approaches in 18 out of 23 countries surveyed. In 13 of those, DFID is operational in at least two sectors through development approaches, alongside humanitarian interventions. This enables us to bring in a wider range of expertise and tools to tackle need, vulnerability and risks. Through these investments DFID is supporting e.g. longer term interventions to support health systems, education, water infrastructure, governance and economic development in crisis.

DFID has also invested £140 million (including a recent £30 million for a 21-month extension) in a programme to build resilience and adaptation to climate extremes (BRACED). The BRACED programme aims to help some of the poorest people cope with extreme weather events, and to improve local and national policies and institutions to better integrate disaster risk reduction, climate adaptation and development approaches in 13 countries across the Sahel, East Africa and Asia. BRACED specifically sets out to capture, understand and disseminate learning on what works for resilience.

DFID is also supporting learning, evidence and data initiatives for improved responses. DFID is implementing a £10 million research programme on forced displacement implemented through the World Bank and UNHCR. DFID also launched a £15 million research project on shock responsive essential services. To help scale up innovative risk financing, DFID set up the Centre for Global Disaster Protection in 2017 with the World Bank and Germany to help other countries strengthen their disaster planning and their access to disaster risk financing.

DFID is actively engaging in global initiatives that support this commitment. The UK strongly supports the aims and the practical implementation of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, agreed as part of the New York Declaration at UNGA 2016. DFID is providing political, technical and policy support for its roll out and have pushed to ensure the CRRF forms the core of the Global Compact on Refugees, alongside a new programme of

action. The refugee compact is a chance to embed a longer term, more sustainable response that boosts self-reliance by delivering jobs, education and better services to both refugees and host communities, while better co-ordinating the international response. It builds on the approach that the UK has championed in countries including Jordan, Lebanon and Ethiopia through refugee compacts.

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)?

DFID will continue to invest in refreshing policies and internal tools, guidance and processes.

DFID will invest in using the learning from its programmes to inform and assist countries with plans to build resilience to natural disasters. DFID will continue to provide technical assistance in other areas to DFID country offices and other stakeholders, to support innovative approaches.

DFID will also continue to build internal expertise on flexible and adaptive programming to help scale up more adapted programmes that address future risks. DFID will also promote internal learning through other initiatives, including a 'learning journey' on essential services in crises.

4. Efficiency gains

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

DFID has not yet conducted comprehensive reviews on efficiency gains.

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 workstream? And why?

In general it is too early to measure success in terms of DFID's overall impact on risks, need and vulnerability in affected countries. Internally, where we have seen more effective or efficient approaches to crises, it involved more collaborative multi-sectoral teams that brought humanitarian, development and peacebuilding expertise together and broke down siloes.

DFID has several teams (Better Delivery, the Building Stability Framework team, the Protracted Crises Hub, Humanitarian Policy & Partnerships Group and the Climate and Environment Department) that provide technical support to country offices and drive policy

work. These teams have been supporting DFID offices with portfolio review and programme design.

DFID has produced internal documents to help operationalise policies, in particular the Protracted Crises Discussion Paper, guidance for DFID country offices on the new Humanitarian Policy and the Building Stability Framework. These papers have been catalytic to support cultural change within and beyond UK institutions, create new champions and promote peer to peer learning.