

Conclusions of the Grand Bargain Rationalization process

The Facilitation Group hosted a workshop with Grand Bargain co-convenors on 14 September 2018 in Geneva to implement the recommendations of the Grand Bargain Annual Meeting on 18 June 2018 in New York. An agreement on core commitments prioritization, work-stream arrangements and indicators to measure progress has been struck, allowing the Grand Bargain to move forward with greater efficiency, accountability and impact¹.

Identification of Core Commitments

1. Co-convenors have agreed to **11 core commitments** (see Annex 1) across the Grand Bargain work-streams (one for each existing work-stream, with two for Localisation). Core commitments are expected to focus the **collective efforts** of co-convenors and signatories. **The other 40 commitments remain equally valid parts of the Grand Bargain**, as individual Signatories will continue with their efforts to deliver them.
2. The core commitments are accompanied by **priority actions** to be undertaken by co-convenors and signatories. For example, the WS3 Cash has developed 8 priority action points to deliver on quality as well as quantity of cash. Co-convenors are expected to add prioritized actions to the core commitments matrix document (Annex 1) within October 31st, 2018.

Work-streams arrangements

3. **WS7 Multi-year funding and WS8 Reduce earmarking will cluster** to focus on improving the **quality of humanitarian funding**. The newly combined work-stream will be co-convened by the current Co-convenors on a rotational basis, with one donor and one aid agency, starting with Canada and ICRC in year 3. In addition, to expand the pool of capacities, a UN agency and a NGO will provide specific technical expertise to support the work-stream.
4. **WS1 Transparency, WS4 Reduced management costs and WS9 Harmonized reporting have agreed to enhanced collaboration** with synergies around data usage as well as harmonization and reduction of overall donor requirements. A synergized work-plan is in advanced discussion. Co-convenors will continue to maintain linkages with the other work-streams.
5. **Co-convenors of WS2 Localization, WS3 Cash, and WS5 Joint needs assessment will continue implementing their work-plans**, with a focus on maintaining momentum and enhanced accountability.

Indicators to measure progress

6. Co-convenors will **identify one or two straightforward indicators to measure the progress of each of the 11 core commitments** by late 2018. The aim is to integrate these indicators into the next annual reporting cycle. These indicators will also provide a means of measuring the progress of the Grand Bargain as a whole. Measuring progress on the core commitments does not change the obligations of the signatories to work towards fulfilment of all 51 commitments.

¹ Annexes 1, 2, 3 and 4 provide summary and bullet point information on the discussions among workshop participants during the various sessions.

ANNEX 1 – Grand Bargain core commitments

PROPOSED CORE COMMITMENT	ORIGINAL COMMITMENT (number)	COMPLEMENTARY COMMITMENTS (number & text)	PRIORITY ACTIONS
WORK-STREAM 1: Greater transparency			
#1	Signatories make use of available data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances.	1.2	CCs to share priority 'complementary' commitments to be added here... •
WORK-STREAM 2: More support and funding for local and national responders			
#2	Increase and support multi-year investments in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination.	2.1	1.4 - <i>support the capacity of partners to access and publish data on humanitarian funding.</i> •
#3	Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25% of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transaction costs.	2.4	2.6 - <i>make greater use of funding tools that increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led CBPFs, the IFRC Secretariat's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.</i> •

WORK-STREAM 3: Increase the use and coordination of cash programming

#4	Increase the routine use of cash, where appropriate alongside other tools. Some may wish to set targets.	3.1 and 3.6	3.5 - <i>ensure that coordination, delivery and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.</i>	•
-----------	--	-------------	---	---

WORK-STREAM 4: Reduce duplication and management costs with periodic functional review

#5	Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.	4.5	<p>9.1 - <i>simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing the volume of reporting, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.</i></p> <p>8.1 - <i>jointly determine on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and initiate this reporting by end of 2017.</i></p> <p>8.3 - <i>be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated.</i></p>	•
-----------	--	-----	--	---

WORK-STREAM 5: Improve joint and impartial needs assessments

#6	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.	5.1	<p><i>5.2 - Coordinate and streamline data collection, to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability, and minimise intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process, led by the HC-RC, with the 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 or sector level.</i></p> <p><i>5.3a – signatories share needs assessment data in a timely manner with appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks.</i></p>	•
-----------	---	-----	---	---

WORK-STREAM 6: A participation revolution

#7	Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian county team (HCT) and cluster/sector	6.1	6.4 - <i>build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.</i>	•
-----------	--	-----	---	---

	mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.		6.5 - <i>fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.</i>	
WORK-STREAM 7: Increase collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding				
#8	Signatories increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding. Aid organisations ensure that the same terms of multi-year funding agreements are applied with their implementing partners.	7.1	8.2 - <i>Donors commit to 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.</i> 8.5 - <i>Donors commit to progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30% of humanitarian contributions that are non-earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020.</i>	•
WORK-STREAM 8: Reduce the earmarking of donor contributions				
#9	Donors progressively reduce earmarking, aiming to achieve a global target of 30% of humanitarian contributions that are unearmarked or softly earmarked by 2020.	8.2 and 8.5	7.1 (proposed core commitment 8) - <i>Signatories increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding. Aid organisations ensure that the same terms of</i>	•

	Aid organisations reduce earmarking when channelling donor funds with reduced earmarking to partners.		<p><i>multi-year funding agreements are applied with their implementing partners.</i></p> <p>9.1 (proposed core commitment 10) - <i>simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing the volume of reporting, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.</i></p> <p>4.5 (proposed core commitment 5) – <i>Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.</i></p>	
WORK-STREAM 9: Harmonise and simplify reporting requirements				
#10	Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing the volume of reporting, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.	9.1	<p>8.1 - <i>jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.</i></p> <p>8.3 - <i>be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is</i></p>	•

			<i>allocated (for example urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management).</i>	
WORK-STREAM 10: Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors				
#11	Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination 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.	10.4	<p><i>5.7 - conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in line with humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming</i></p> <p><i>7.3 - strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions, while respecting the principles of both.</i></p>	•

ANNEX 2 - Ensuring appropriate working arrangements to achieve agreed core commitments

Work-streams 7 & 8

- Agreement to cluster the two work-streams into one, focused on – ‘Enhance quality funding through reduced earmarking and multiyear planning and funding’
- Will work towards core commitments 7.1, 8.2 and 8.5
- Developing work plan that includes priority actions:
 1. Mapping and analysis of quality funding (WS 1 may be able to help)
 2. Advance existing agreements on multiyear planning
 3. Articulate specific linkages with other work-streams
- Ways of working:
 - Will have 2 rotating co-convenors, drawn from current 4. Will also have 1 NGO and OCHA in some kind of leadership role
- Challenges:
 - Ensuring dedicated capacity of co-convenors
 - Outreach to other work-streams

Work-streams 1, 4 and 9

- Agreement to focus on increasing ‘co-working’ around specific areas of action including field level pilots.
- Each of the three work-streams will remain engaged with other relevant work-streams outside of this grouping.
- Developing action plan that identifies actions to be worked on together. Will be shared in coming week(s).

Work-streams 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10

- Considered overarching questions including:
 - How can signatories use/better exploit the catalytic role that the Grand Bargain can play on long-standing issues of concern (e.g. scaling up cash, etc)?
 - How can CCs better coordinate and sequence actions across different work-streams given the differing priorities and capacities of each work-stream?
 - How can signatories better monitor themselves, hold themselves accountable?
 - How can signatories arrange themselves in order to get more traction, to be more productive? Still too siloed.

ANNEX 3 - Political Challenges

Macro-level issues identified:

- How to incentivize progress by signatories and work-streams?
- How to demonstrate the Grand Bargain's impact at country level?
- How to move from a framework of principles to holding ourselves accountable for our implementation of them? Is there appetite to hold ourselves accountable?
- How to better leverage the group of Sherpas to overcome political obstacles? How to use their role/function more productively?

ANNEX 4 - How to measure progress?

Key questions discussed/to be discussed:

- What basic parameters for measuring progress? Core commitments as the basis?
- Need to ensure macro indicators are feasible – i.e. what data is available and possible to obtain?
- Work concurrently at work-stream and Sherpa (or Principal?) level.
- How to tell the narrative of what is being achieved through the Grand Bargain? Sherpas can assist in determining what indicators helpful to form that narrative.
- How to evidence or report on what is happening at country level? Look at chain from policy level 'progress' to what changes at country level.

Next steps:

- Agreement to have select group (EP plus Sherpas plus select CCs/FG?) meet separately to discuss overall approach and work towards developing a handful of 'indicators' for macro level narrative on progress across the Grand Bargain.
- Each WS propose indicator for its core commitment – share with FG.