

# Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

## WVI

### Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction.....   | 4  |
| Work stream 1 - Transparency .....                                | 5  |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 5  |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 5  |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 5  |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 6  |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 6  |
| Work stream 2 - Localization.....                                 | 7  |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 7  |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 7  |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 8  |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 8  |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 8  |
| Work stream 3 - Cash .....  | 9  |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 9  |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 10 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 11 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 13 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 13 |
| Work stream 4 – Management costs .....                            | 14 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 14 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 14 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 14 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 14 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 14 |
| Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment .....                            | 15 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 15 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 15 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 15 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 15 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 15 |
| Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution .....                    | 16 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 16 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 16 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 16 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 16 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 16 |
| Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....              | 17 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 17 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 17 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 17 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 17 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 17 |
| Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....                      | 18 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 18 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 18 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 18 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 18 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 18 |
| Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....                      | 19 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 19 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 19 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 19 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 19 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 19 |
| Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....       | 20 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 20 |

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 2. | Progress to date .....   | 20 |
| 3. | Planned next steps .....                                       | 20 |
| 4. | Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 20 |
| 5. | Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 20 |

## **Introduction**

World Vision (WV) remains committed to working with donors, humanitarian organisations and NGO Networks to reform humanitarian funding so that more and better funding reaches implementing organisations at field level. With this in mind, we have engaged regularly with SCHR, ICVA, VOICE and InterAction on Grand Bargain issues as well as several peer NGOs. We are also engaged in the IASC Humanitarian Finance Task Team (HFTT) and UNOCHA's Pooled Fund Working Group. As an NGO signatory to the Grand Bargain we were present in the Grand Bargain meetings in Bonn in September 2016 and are on the mail list for signatory e-mails.

Despite the above we have found a key challenge in communicating the Grand Bargain internally and with our NGO peers is the lack of communication about progress. Over the past few months it has been difficult to get a sense of the bigger picture on the Grand Bargain (GB) and the most effective ways for organisations like WV to engage. To maximise its potential, the GB should be attracting a very diverse coalition of organisations to implement some of the most tangible commitments, especially NGOs at the national and regional levels.

WV welcomes the recent appointment of the Secretariat and looks forward to better communications around the GB to help build momentum with a growing pool of potential implementers. We urge that more support is needed for the new secretariat to ensure a stronger communications strategy, greater momentum at field level, and effective linkages between GB work streams. In order to mobilise the broad range of constituents it would also be really useful if the various parties to the GB did more official communications about its value. For example, having development ministries promote the GB at global and regional levels would help build momentum in implementing organisations.

## **Work stream 1 - Transparency**

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

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

When the Grand Bargain was signed we were reporting regularly on FTS and annually on our development programmes in IATI. During the writing of the Grand Bargain we advised SCHR and ICVA on positioning on FTS and IATI on behalf of the NGO community. At the time we were represented on the board with IATI so it was useful to bring an NGO board perspective to the FTS and GB discussions. This work with ICVA also included presenting the issue of transparency to the ICVA member states briefing on the Grand Bargain in Geneva.

### **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?

Internally we have used the momentum created by the Grand Bargain to do three things on Transparency. Firstly we have significantly increased our reporting on FTS from about 90 million USD per year to 180 million. An internal review was conducted to see how we could better report on FTS which involved drafting a business case and several meetings/ calls with FTS staff. 180 million is more representative of our global humanitarian grants portfolio but there are gaps because currently UN funding is not counted once it passes to us. As one of WFPs biggest partners and a significant partner of UNHCR, UNICEF and OCHA this makes a difference on our numbers. Currently we are engaging with OCHA staff behind FTS to provide feedback on recent updates on the system.

Secondly, we have engaged on the Grand Bargain Transparency work stream with the Dutch Government to provide an NGO perspective into the TOR for the Development Initiatives consultancy that is now taking place. We have supported this work by feeding into draft messaging on the differences and links between IATI and FTS and participated in the March consultation in Geneva on IATI. Another aspect of our external facing work on transparency has been to regularly flag linkages between transparency and other work streams such as localisation and reporting. There are some contradictory tensions around reducing overheads and having more streamlined reporting but also being more transparent.

Thirdly we have set up an informal internal working group to bring together our staff working on FTS, IATI and two funding offices where the donors are particularly keen on IATI reporting. (Netherlands and UK). We have started talking about how to bring together our development and humanitarian external transparency architecture across a 1.5 billion USD field spend. Many of the requirements of IATI are met by a dedicated team in WV that works closely with our global finance system, so it is important to set up the group to be able to respond to developments in the coming months.

### **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)?

Currently the financial system for transparency appears to be taking shape between IATI and FTS. It is not clear how the two will work together in practice as the timescales for reporting on each are very different. (IATI allows for retrospective reporting annually while FTS wants to be a coordination tool at the national level). In the coming months we will see to see how implementation tensions like this are resolved between the two approaches, monitor the costs of reporting and how this fits with the other commitments in the Grand Bargain.

During January WV had conversations with OCHA FTS about piloting the new version of FTS that is complementary to IATI. As OCHA's requirements become clearer we will investigate the feasibility of implementing or piloting this new version in March and April.

Most humanitarian actors would agree that transparency is a good thing for the sector. It would be good to have a discussion in this work stream to unpack the details of what this means in practice. Who do we need to provide transparent data for, what decisions need to be made and what will the incentives be for busy field staff to populate transparency systems with regular and updatable data. Providing data costs staff time and money, and in a resource constrained environment it would be good for this work stream to move forward on the GB commitment to look at capacity support for organisations of all sizes. Greater transparency is welcome but we need a costing model beneath it that enables the costs of doing this to be recovered in each grant from humanitarian donors.

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

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

Currently no efficiency gains have been realised from this work stream and it is likely in the future that any efficiency gains are more likely to be system wide than felt on an organisation by organisation level. The big efficiency gains in the future are likely to be gained from being able to track how funding flows through the system from original donor to final implementer. When FTS can track this it could open up scope to assess what are the most efficient routes for funding. Currently we have no comparable data about this so no way of being able to compare the true costs of CERF, pooled funds, direct awards etc.

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

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

The transparency work stream does not have as much visibility in the NGO community as other work streams. Focussing on pre-existing systems like FTS and IATI has saved a lot of time in the development of systems but the discussion is still at a technical level. The work streams that have done the best work in attracting NGO action have been those with a tangible impact on field operations.

## **Work stream 2 - Localization**

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

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

World Vision has been engaging with other NGOs in the localisation discussion since the publication of the Financing report “Beyond the Crisis”. To date WVs position has been that a diverse set of approaches are needed to deliver national and local response. Sometimes this will be through indigenous local organisations and sometimes through national affiliates with genuinely national governance structures.

### **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?

World Vision has engaged with the IASC HF TT working group to develop the localisation marker. In December we conducted limited field consultations with our national affiliates to get their perspectives on the emerging definitions of local and as directly as possible. These have been fed into Development Initiatives work. We have also engaged on the issue of localisation raising the need to consider the role of national affiliates regularly in various financing for and working groups. We have had bilateral discussions with several government donors on the role of affiliates in localisation and contributed to various NGO platforms thinking on the issue in Germany, UK, Canada, Australia and the US. We have also been engaging with Development Initiatives and the IASC working group on the localisation marker to promote a practical and diverse approach to the definition of local capacity. A diverse range of models are needed to ensure that localisation can thrive given the wide a variety of different humanitarian contexts worldwide.

During 2016 we have advanced our local partnering tools and approaches – combining experience across multiple countries into one set of materials. Currently we lack the systems to adequately track how much of our funding is going to local organisations as per the emerging Development Initiatives definitions (as part of the IASC work on the localisation marker). However, a survey of 11 of our 14 largest humanitarian operations found that 7% of our humanitarian funding is currently being distributed to organisations that would be defined as local by the current draft DI definition. More funding goes to National responders outside of this definition and in other geographic locations.

Using the momentum of the Grand Bargain we have held discussions with our senior leadership (Global President, Global Governance and Humanitarian Affairs leadership) to develop an internal humanitarian position on localisation that will be rolled out across all 95 offices in April. We have also developed an internal plan to increase the provision of partnering and support services to other organisations to implement the suggestions of the position paper.

### **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)?

Disseminate WV position internally to encourage greater partnering and provision of support services to other organisations.

Begin to track how much funding we distribute to other organisations (currently we only do this on a country by country basis and not globally) to monitor progress towards the 25% target.

Work with our funding offices and top 10 humanitarian offices to better document and increase our work on localisation.

Continue to engage with the IASC localisation marker group and the work stream to get definitions of localisation that are coherent fair and that can be taken to scale. Advocate to take the discussion towards thinking about the practicalities of taking localisation to scale.

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

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

It is not clear if the localisation agenda will lead to efficiency gains. While the budgets of local NGOs may be lower than other types of partners it is far from clear if the increased support that they will require will result in reduced costs over all. Independent research is needed to get an idea of the system wide benefits of engaging with more smaller local organisations and to advise on if current sector funding models are adequate to meet the different cost structures that will be needed across the system. (E.g. more money for capacity support and contract management vs lower overheads and salary levels for implementers)

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

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

The localisation marker is proceeding well because the GB text was clear about who should do it – the IASC. Also it was building on an interest and level of momentum that existed before the GB particularly among key NGOs. Finally there is a good coalition of donors, UN agencies and NGOs working together on the marker.



## Work stream 3 - Cash

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

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

World Vision's programming and policy work around the Grand Bargain and other key platforms is guided by our accountability to the commitment we made at the World Humanitarian Summit to 'deliver 50 per cent of its humanitarian aid through a multi-sectoral and multi-purpose cash first approach by 2020, where context appropriate and to leverage digital payment and identification systems and shared value partnerships with others, such as with Master Card, to track the delivery of assistance from donor to beneficiary.'

World Vision has engaged in cash transfer programming at scale in a variety of contexts and continues to do so by making best use of its competitive advantage in relation to presence, outreach with the community and our relationships with the private sector of the organisation.

Key facts:

- *In 2015, World Vision provided 32 per cent of its food assistance and 25 per cent of its multi-sector humanitarian assistance as cash programmes.*
- *In 2015, food assistance cash transfers benefited 2.1 million vulnerable people.*
- *Since 2012, World Vision has implemented food assistance cash programmes in 29 countries throughout Sub Saharan Africa, Asia, Middle East and Eastern Europe, and Latin America.*
- *World Vision's global cash transfer portfolio<sup>1</sup> is in the Middle East and Eastern Europe (54 per cent), followed by East Africa (23 per cent), Southern Africa (7 per cent) and West Africa (6 per cent).*
- *Globally, World Vision is one of the leading NGO implementers of cash transfers.<sup>2</sup>*
- *The UN World Food Programme (WFP) is World Vision's largest partner for cash transfer programmes. Donors supporting World Vision's cash transfer programmes include: DFID, ECHO, Global Affairs Canada (GAC), and USAID.*

To support reaching our commitment, based on an analysis of our competitive advantage and a strong commitment to quality, World Vision has invested in four key areas. These areas not only reflect WV's commitments at the WHS and GB but also respond to recommendations made by different global processes including the High Level Panel on Cash convened by DFID, the ECHO 10 principles, CaLP's Agenda for Cash, ECHO's Guidelines (exact name) and CaLP's Global Framework for Action.:

1. Increase the routine use of cash in operations, including:
  - a. Increase the percentage of humanitarian assistance WV delivers through cash
  - b. Develop and employ common markers to track cash programming within WV
  - c. Identify and address internal and external barriers for WV to increase the use of cash programming

---

<sup>1</sup> Total portfolio figures from 2009- July 2016

<sup>2</sup> Cash Learning Partnership (2016). *Cash Atlas Map*

2. *Build and maintain institutional capacity to deliver cash programming, including:*
  - a. *Strengthen capacity at the strategic level*
  - b. *Strengthen capacity at the operational level*
  
3. *Increase the quality of WV cash programming, including:*
  - a. *Contribute to best practice through research and information sharing*
  - b. *Design and implement cash programs based on evidence, beneficiary inclusion, effectiveness and efficiency*
  - c. *Design and implement cash programs based on local systems when possible*
  
4. *Invest in new delivery, research and advocacy models for cash programming*

## **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 line with its WHS commitments, World Vision is investing in:

### **1. Increasing the routine use of cash in operations:**

*From October 2012 and September 2016, the percentage of World Vision's food assistance programming delivered as cash increased from 13% to 27%*

*The number of beneficiaries reached through cash programmes across World Vision increased four-fold, from 600,000 to 2.3 million.*

*WV is also working to develop effective ways to track the cash programming portfolio more accurately across our 484 million USD humanitarian portfolio for financial year 2016.*

*WV recognises the need to build a more coherent approach to the increase use of cash across sectors and has therefore established an inter-departmental Cash Unit.*

### **2. Build and maintain institutional capacity to deliver cash programming:**

At the operational level, World Vision has built an internal pool of cash experts who can be deployed in emergencies. It is also in the process of finalising a capacity building plan for mainstreaming cash across functions and sectors to be first piloted in the Asia Region.

At the strategic level, World Vision has launched a global process to embrace the disruptive change that cash programming presents by defining and anchoring our cash culture to better deliver on our commitments

### **3. Increase the quality of WV cash programming**

World Vision is an active member in a number of key inter-agency cash technical working groups; co-chair of the Global Food Security Cluster - Cash and Market WG, member of CaLP's Board and TAG, as well as CashCap's Steering Committee.

The inter-departmental Cash Unit is finalising a strategy to modernise and mainstream delivery systems globally to increase efficiencies.

#### **4. Invest in new delivery and advocacy models for cash programming**

*World Vision is working with Assessment Capacities Project<sup>3</sup> to develop inter-agency market analysis services;*

*World Vision is supporting MasterCard to develop humanitarian Know Your Customer (KYC) standards*

World Vision maintains a set of up-to-date project design and management tools. World Vision has adapted its [Last Mile Mobile Solution](#) (LMMS) digital beneficiary management, monitoring and evaluation system for cash programming.

MasterCard and World Vision are partnering to improved aid delivery via digital identity and electronic payment services that include LMMS and the MasterCard Aid Network. They have tested both systems in the Philippines and Nepal and are now introducing this technology in Mozambique. World Vision has also worked with SPLASH for the Ebola response, Visa in delivering cash to refugees in Rwanda, EcoNet Wireless in Zimbabwe; and MTN in Swaziland.

**During the** ECOSOC – HAS 2106, World Vision co-organized with WFP a high level multistakeholder event on cash transfers, co-chaired by the Governments of Jordan, Netherlands and UK, with panellist from World Bank and the senior technical advisor to the High Level Panel on Cash.

### **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)?

World Vision believes that embracing the cultural and systemic change that cash programming presents and adapting to it, will be crucial to maintain our ability to provide the best service to those who need our assistance and those who fund us. To this end World Vision has created an interdepartmental Cash Unit to design and implement a strategy that will allow us to anchor our cash culture, refine our promise and develop a plan to better deliver it. This strategy will look at our core capabilities in the face of external developments to define our WV way of doing cash based on our principles and vision. We will also develop global statement of purpose to define the types of cash models of delivery we will invest in and the measures of quality we will apply to review and learn from our work (effectiveness, efficiency and inclusiveness measures). This cash strategy will also help

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.acaps.org/who-we-are>

us define the different links in the cash value chain and define the level of engagement we can and should have in each based on our competitive advantage.

*The actionable plan of this strategy will be to develop a structure within which WV cash programming can grow investing in four strategic capacity nodes: our environment, our people, our finances and our systems.*

Other specific activities linked to the development of the Cash Unit will include

*Strengthen the capacity of WV's humanitarian financial reporting system to track our cash transfer portfolio in aggregate across multiple sectors (currently our financial tracking systems can only track our food assistance-related cash transfer in aggregate)*

***At the Senior Leadership level: Developing trainings appropriate for National/Regional Senior Leaders to equip them to support cash programming.***

***Revisions of key Human Resource tools and processes (integrating cash capabilities requirements in job descriptions (as appropriate)***

- *Updating of operational tools to reflect industry best practice*
- *Build/test a centralised web-application to prepare field staff to design and track the delivery of cash across sectors and countries, as part of the evolving LMMS<sup>4</sup> eco-system.*
- *Develop a digital payments strategy and scale cash preparedness, with a focus on high-risk / fragile countries.*
- *Engaging with WFP on interoperability between SCOPE and LMMS*

- Research, evaluation and learning. World Vision is undertaking a number of activities in this area including evaluations on health, protection, food security impacts, strengthening inter-agency market analysis tools and systems, KYC standards, recovery lending.

*-World Vision will continue to strengthen its engagement in key forums and initiatives as outlined in the previous section, in particularly working to align with CaLP's research, learning and advocacy agenda*

- *Develop and test a one-card system that flattens World Vision's LMMS with MasterCard Aid, an online/offline e-voucher solution.*
- *Support the deployment of digital ID payment systems. A LMMS/MC-Aid solution has been piloted in the Philippines, Nepal and is now being scaled with 5 other NGOs in Mozambique.*
- *Scale the identity standards project with MasterCard, Oxfam, Save the Children, Mercy Corps, Vision Fund and Action against Hunger (ACF). The aim of this project is*

---

<sup>4</sup> World Vision's Last Mile Mobile Solutions is a digital registration and identity solution

*to enable beneficiaries to receive a single standards-based, trust-marked card for identity and entitlements.*

- *Link World Vision's LMMS to third-party payment gateways so LMMS is able to safely and securely push payments out across third payment networks.*
- *Humanitarian cash transfers is a policy and advocacy priority for World Vision, in particular ensuring efforts to scale up cash transfers 'work' for both the humanitarian industry but more importantly, for the most vulnerable children and families.*

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

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

*n/a*

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

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

- A whole of organization approach, from Senior Leadership to the field, is necessary to support significant scale up of cash
- In part, the industry's ability to scale cash will depend on the rate at which resources to do cash transfers become available. As the majority of our humanitarian cash programming is realized through grants from donors, this is a key limitation to scale up.
- Training alone will not be sufficient to deliver quality cash programming- coaching and mentoring of staff is needed and key systems need to be put in place
- Demand for capacity building has rapidly outstripped supply – more investment in capacity building in the industry is needed, as lack of staff capacity is another key limitation to scale up Its not clear to World Vision how inclusive the Grand Bargain follow up process is in terms of opportunities for NGO who are strongly supportive of the Grand Bargain to be involved, beyond the reporting function. Given the seismic shift that cash scale up is bringing to the industry, and the vast depth of direct field experience and capacity that NGOs bring, it is suggested that a more substantive role for NGOs in the Grand Bargain follow up process be clearly articulated and implemented.

## **Work stream 4 – Management costs**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment**

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

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

World Vision conducts needs assessments at the start of each humanitarian operation and as needed by the situation on the ground.

### **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?

World Vision has attended the consultation workshop in Brussels in March that was hosted by ECHO and co-chaired a discussion at the Asia GB consultation on this workstream. We have also worked with ICVA, CARE and ACAPs to help determine what the key issues are in this workstream for NGOs to consider.

### **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)?

At the time of submitting this report WV was still discussing internally how to engage on this workstream.

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

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

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

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

## **Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution**

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

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

World Vision has written beneficiary accountability into our humanitarian systems, policies and work streams. We regularly participate in the various working groups on this topic in the sector at national and global levels.

### **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?

World Vision is engaging in this workstream through its engagement with SCHR.

### **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)?

As it becomes clearer what this workstream will contribute to the participation agenda, World Vision will engage as appropriate.

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

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

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

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



## **Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding**

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

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

World Vision aims to provide multiyear funding to our national affiliates and local partners wherever the “source donor” makes this possible. Most of our funding in humanitarian situations is from grants awarded by UN, bilateral or other multilateral donors. We pass the multiyear aspect of this on to national affiliates and partners whenever possible.

### **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?

World Vision is currently in the process of hiring a consultant to study on the benefits to programming responsiveness, reduced administrative costs and comparative operational advantages of multi-year funding in different contexts. This work is being aligned with the IASC Humanitarian Finance Task Team’s work plan on multi-year funding and is intended to compliment a simultaneous study being undertaken by NRC, FAO and OCHA.

As part of the VOICE Grand Bargain task force we have worked to draft a position paper on MYF and plan an event for the European Development Days in June.

We have communicated to our relevant national affiliates the places where OCHA is planning to pilot multiyear funding in Africa.

### **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)?

Review and share study results to better understand what the benefits in World Vision’s experience have been of MYF in conflict, food insecurity, etc.

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

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

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

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

## **Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility**

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

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

World Vision would like to work with other parties in the Grand Bargain to ensure that NGOs and other front line responders get equal benefit of any reductions in earmarking for other actors in the system.

### **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?

World Vision has done an analysis of earmarking levels in our organisation to provide to the workstream leads as requested by ICVA.

### **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)?

Follow up with the workstream to find out what the benefits could be for NGOs and other front line responders.

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

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

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

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

## **Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements**

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

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

World Vision supported the idea of reduced/ simplified reporting requirements and partner assessments prior to the Grand Bargain. We fed some information into the Less Paper More Aid initiative about the number of prequalification processes we have been put under by dealing with the major UN agencies and 18 bilateral donors.

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

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

As part of Less Paper More Aid and the Voice Grand Bargain task force we have fed back into the GPPI template (10+3) and how NGOs could use this. We participated in the March workshop between donors and implementing organisations on the template and have identified up to three contexts where we could serve as a pilot test partner for the new framework.

### **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)?

Participate in the field pilot of the GPPI reporting template and through the planned in-country communities of practice identify lessons learned. Continue to support the project at a global level through ICVA-Less Paper More Aid and VOICE.

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

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

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

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

It has been really welcome to see the Grand Bargain provide some political momentum and will behind the objectives of the Less Paper More Aid initiative.

## **Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement**

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

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

World Vision is a multi-mandated organisation working in humanitarian and development programming in over 95 countries worldwide.

### **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?

Currently World Vision is not engaging in this workstream due to the need to focus on other workstreams, particularly multiyear funding.

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

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

Continue to monitor this workstream in a light touch manner.

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

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

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

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