

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

1. All signatories to the Grand Bargain are expected to complete the self-report annually.
2. Self-reports must be returned to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org] no later than **Thursday 15 March, 2018**. Any submissions after this date may not be considered by the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain Report.
3. Reporting should reflect activities and progress that has taken place between January 2017 and December 2017.
4. The self-report requests information by work stream, however, in order to best track progress, signatories are asked to provide as much specific and relevant detail on progress made against each of the 51 individual commitments as possible. A full list of commitments for each work stream is included in the self-report template for reference.
5. The questions contained in this self-report are the same as in 2017, however some work streams include additional question for signatories, at the request of the work stream co-conveners. If you are unable to provide this information, please note the reasons for this.
6. Signatories who have not previously completed a self-report are asked to answer question one for each work stream, to provide a baseline of where your organisation stood when it became a Grand Bargain signatory. Existing signatories can complete questions two to five for each work stream, as your 2017 self-report will have already provided the baseline information sought by question one.
7. Please type your answers immediately below each question asked.
8. Signatories are encouraged to report both on progress made, and where they may have experienced obstacles or challenges to realising their commitments.
9. Signatories are encouraged, where possible and relevant, to reflect on their contributions to the Grand Bargain both as recipients of humanitarian funds and donors of humanitarian funds. This will allow us to capture the transfer of benefits accrued at higher ends of the value chain down to the frontline.
10. Signatories are asked to limit their responses to a maximum of 500 words per work stream.
11. Self-reports are public documents, and will be published as submitted on the IASC-hosted Grand Bargain [website](#) from 3rd June, 2018.
12. Self-reports will be used to inform the 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report, which will provide a collective analysis of the progress for each work stream, and for

the Grand Bargain as a whole. The Independent Annual Grand Bargain report will be published prior to the 2018 Annual Grand Bargain Meeting on 18 June 2018, in New York.

13. The 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report is being prepared by [ODI/HPG](#). Signatories may be contacted by ODI/HPG as part of their research and preparation of the Independent Report.
14. If you require support or advice to complete your self-report, you may direct enquiries to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org].

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each work stream, consideration should be given to the guidance provided by the [Aide-Memoire on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain](#) that addresses the gender dimensions of resources, capacity, evidence and data, participation, leadership, accountability and communication within the Grand Bargain. Signatories are also welcome to provide additional detail on how they consider they have, at a macro level, ensured their Grand Bargain follow-up is gender-responsive, and to include any examples of good practice that they wish to share. This data will assist in the preparation of the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain report, which will assess the extent to which gender has been considered by Grand Bargain work streams.



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – Netherlands

Contents

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance	1
Netherlands engagement around Gender in humanitarian assistance.....	6
Work stream 1 – Transparency.....	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date.....	8
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains.....	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned	8
Work stream 2 – Localization.....	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
2. Progress to date.....	10
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains.....	11
5. Good practices and lessons learned	11
Work stream 3 – Cash.....	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	12
2. Progress to date.....	12
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains.....	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned	13
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps	16
4. Efficiency gains.....	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned	16

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps	18
4. Efficiency gains.....	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned	18
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution.....	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	19
2. Progress to date.....	20
3. Planned next steps	20
4. Efficiency gains.....	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps	22
4. Efficiency gains.....	23
5. Good practice and lessons learned	23
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility.....	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	24
2. Progress to date.....	25
3. Planned next steps	25
4. Efficiency gains.....	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	26
2. Progress to date.....	26
3. Planned next steps	26
4. Efficiency gains.....	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	28
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	28

2.	Progress to date.....	29
3.	Planned next steps	29
4.	Efficiency gains.....	29
5.	Good practices and lessons learned	29

Netherlands engagement around Gender in humanitarian assistance

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each work stream, consideration should be given to the guidance provided by the Aide-Memoire on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain that addresses the gender dimensions of resources, capacity, evidence and data, participation, leadership, accountability and communication within the Grand Bargain. Signatories are also welcome to provide additional detail on how they consider they have, at a macro level, ensured their Grand Bargain follow-up is gender-responsive, and to include any examples of good practice that they wish to share. This data will assist in the preparation of the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain report, which will assess the extent to which gender has been considered by Grand Bargain work streams.

Gender equality, the protection of women, men, girls and boys in conflict, and the adequate delivery of humanitarian assistance with regard to the different needs is one of the priority areas of the engagement of the Netherlands. Some of these activities are:

- Implementation of our World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) commitments: access to sexual and reproductive health services; to reduce Gender Based Violence (GBV); respect for women's rights;
- Advocacy in Executive Board of partner organisations, consideration in evaluating program proposals and in project visits. Also focus for NL within "She Decides";
- Policy support through secondments to UNFPA in NY, UN Women's Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response Unit in Geneva;
- Improving Services: Implementation of the Minimal Initial Service Package for Reproductive Health in Crisis (MISP) from the start of the response;
- Start 2018: project with WHO / Global Health cluster (EUR 5 million for 2 years) SRGR services for at least 180,000 women within the health response in Democratic Republic of Congo (Kasai), Yemen, Bangladesh (Rohinya crisis).
- Additional contribution Central Emergency Relief Fund (EUR 11.5 million), unearmarked but with an explicit effort to make it work for the protection of women and girls and report on it.
- Capacity building through implementation of guidelines and training for emergency medical and sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) organizations through the Interagency Working Group for Reproductive Health in Crisis (IAWG).
- Improvement of knowledge and data in collaboration with WHO.
- Bilateral SRHR programs in Yemen, Bangladesh, Great Lakes and Lebanon.
- The SRHR Partnership Jeune S3 focuses on attention for SRHR among young people and groups who are denied these rights in the Central African Republic, North and East Cameroon, North and South Kivu DRC and North Benin.

At the same time, NL continues to advocate for greater inclusion of gender in humanitarian response through its inclusion in the technical workstreams of the Grand Bargain, including in needs assessments, programming, monitoring and evaluation. Equally: as part of greater transparency, relevant data should become available, while giving adequate consideration of data protection needs.

Work stream 1 – Transparency

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.*
2. *Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).*
3. *Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:*
 - *accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;*
 - *improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;*
 - *a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and*
 - *traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.*
4. *Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data.*

Transparency work stream co-conveners reporting request: How will you use the data from IATI within your organization including, for example, for monitoring, reporting and vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments?

So far, NL is not using IATI data from our partners for humanitarian planning purposes. This might change in the future. The NL is however reporting its ODA support within IATI.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As in the 2017 report:

- In 2016, all organisations that received ODA funds from the central Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague, had to report to IATI (replacing bilateral reporting). Since 2016 is the first year, some organisations were given extra time to implement the necessary changes to become IATI compatible, including most UN and humanitarian organisations. Discussions are ongoing, also with other like-minded donors, when and how these organisations can become IATI compatible. The Netherlands also assists with an IATI help desk.
- As co-convenor The Netherlands pushed for the transparency language and commitments in the Grand Bargain.

2. Progress to date

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

- The Netherlands together with the World Bank continued as co-convenor of the transparency workstream.
- Development Initiatives continued to assist in pursuing the transparency commitments, especially with a focus on using the IATI standard. The project on “Monitoring the Grand Bargain commitment on transparency” has been launched at the beginning of 2017. The objective is to increase the availability of timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding to enable better decision-making and greater accountability and learning. A monitoring methodology was developed and shared with Grand Bargain signatories in December 2017.
- The Netherlands facilitated a workshop between IATI, OCHA FTS and the OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data to ensure adequate cooperation between them.
- The Humanitarian Unit in the MFA of the Netherlands is working internally to strengthen its own humanitarian reporting to IATI.
- Technical discussions are ongoing with partners in particular to get to IATI compliance of all Dutch partners that receive ODA funds.

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)?

- Together with interested stakeholders, clarify the understanding around the greater transparency commitments and the objectives of different transparency tools and standards.
- Showcase examples in which more and better quality data is used for better planning and reporting.
- DI will work with Grand Bargain signatories to raise awareness of the IATI Standard, improve technical capacity to publish and use humanitarian aid data and to continue to ensure that the Standard meets the needs of the humanitarian community.
- At the same time, we will support Grand Bargain signatories and the wider humanitarian community to monitor progress against the transparency commitment.

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Too early to assess.

Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.*
2. *Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.*
3. *Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.*
4. *Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.*
5. *Develop, with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and apply a 'localisation' marker to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national responders.*
6. *Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CPBF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.*

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

- (a) NL does not directly support local and national responders
- (b) NL contributed 38.5 million EUR to pooled funds, and according to OCHA statistics, 26,8% of the CPBF allocations for the 7 crises to which NL contributed to CPBF's in 2017 (CAR, DRC, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, Syria and Somalia) was to national NGOs (26,8% of 38.5 is 10,3 million EUR)
- (c) The NL supported the Dutch Relief Alliance with 57.8 million EUR, which implemented around 17% through local partners (17% of 57.8 = 9,8 million).

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Same as in the 2017 report:

The NL made 4 specific commitments:

- 1) NL is committed to build humanitarian capacity of local/national responders:
Base line: in 2016 the Netherlands invested EUR 1.7 million in capacity building of national organisations to be better prepared to respond to future crises.
- 2) Unearmarked support can be provided to foreign NGOs.
Base line: There are no legal impediments to channel money to national responders
- 3) The NL is supporter of using Country Based Pooled Funds as a channel for funding national responders. The NL will continue to increase its contributions as a proportion of humanitarian assistance.
Base line: in 2016 the NL contributed EUR 60 million or 14% of its humanitarian spending to CBPFs.
- 4) The NL will reduce reporting requirements of national responders by accepting reporting via IATI and by harmonization of donor requirements
Base line: in 2016 NL humanitarian partners were informed that from 2017 onwards reporting must happen via IATI open data standard.

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?

- Ad 1): Humanitarian capacity building: in 2017 EUR 2.15 million was spent on preparedness. The main objective of the program is to improve the response capacity of 5 national Red Cross/Red Crescent organisations.
- Ad 2): Regulations: No legal blockages for transfer of (un)earmarked funding to non-Dutch organizations.
- Ad 3): CBPFs as channel for funding local responders: In 2017 the NL has supported CBPFs with approximately EUR 38,5 million.
- Ad 4): Reporting via IATI: NL has communicated to all partners that it accepts reporting via IATI; the NL is co-leading the transparency work stream of the Grand Bargain (see transparency workstream); reducing reporting requirement through harmonization is one of the long term goals of both the transparency and the reporting workstreams.

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)?

- Ad 1) In the next few years, the NL will aim to increase investments in “preparedness” to increase the capacities of local actors for early action; The NL is active member of the local capacity work stream of the GB and interested to share experiences.
- Ad 2) No further activities: base line is the end stage
- Ad 3) CBPF channel: in 2017 multi-year core contribution commitments with a number of UN partners come to end. While budget discussions continue in Parliament, it was decided that for 2018 one year contracts for institutional core funding would be signed with key partners. The Netherlands is currently in the process of reformulating its development and humanitarian policies, with the intention to further comply with Grand Bargain commitments. 2018 is however a transitional year, also regarding the continuation of multi annual financing commitments.
- Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA): The NL has renewed the funding of a coalition of Dutch humanitarian NGO’s (EUR 60 milion/year for the period 2018-2021). Part of the agreement is that DRA-members will both play an active role in capacity building and in funding of activities of local partners.
- Financial incentives will be given to NGO-partners who outperform as compared to the targets set in the approved proposal.
- Ad 4) The NL will continue to work to improve the humanitarian reporting standard in IATI and support other organisations in making the change to IATI reporting. The NL is supporting the since November 2017 operational OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data in The Hague

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The NL considers Pooled Funds as an important and efficient tool to support local and national actors as directly as possible, given the proximity of the decision making to actors in respective crises. Providing funds directly to national and local actors would significantly increase the administrative burden of these organisations and of the humanitarian unit in the MFA in Den Hague. The NL will therefore continue to work towards greater access of national and local actors to Humanitarian Pooled Funds. In its support to NGO’s in the Netherlands, MFA encourages these NGO’s to adhere to the 25% target for local and national implementers.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Same as in the 2017 report:

- Almost all Dutch humanitarian contributions are given as either core or unearmarked contributions to organisations or crises (e.g. pooled fund). The receiving organisation can decide how to use these funds best. If cash is the preferred option, then the organisation is free to use it as such and the Netherlands in fact strongly encourages the use of (multi-purpose) cash whenever suitable in its dialogue with humanitarian organisations.

2. Progress to date

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

- The Netherlands continues to be in favour of the use of cash (“Cash, explain why not?”) and encourages receiving organisations to use Dutch funds for that purpose. However, more earmarked financial support for cash would mean less unearmarked contributions, which contradicts standing policy.

- Capacity building: As part of its capacity building around CTP, the NL co-hosted in August 2017 a learning event on CASH with Dutch humanitarian NGO's in which e.g. CaLP and ODI participated.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The Netherlands will urge for more use of cash with its partner organisations or other donors, through the approach of "explain why not cash". As part of its innovation engagement, the Netherlands intends to focus on innovative solutions around Cash Transfer Programming, e.g. use of blockchain technology, data and data protection.

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The Netherlands has taken the decision to focus on specific aspects of Cash Transfer Programming, namely the use of blockchain technology and use of data, including data protection. It has proven to be useful to identify this specific niche in order to complement existing engagement by other donor partners and where possible facilitate scaling up.
- The learning session (with e.a. CaLP) for DRA members was successful and clearly highlighted the need for continuous capacity building of partners around CTP.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- *Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - *Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - *Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - *Biometrics; and*
 - *Sustainable energy.*
2. *Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

3. *Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
4. *Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

- *Transportation/Travel;*
- *Vehicles and fleet management;*
- *Insurance;*
- *Shipment tracking systems;*
- *Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH, food);*
- *IT services and equipment;*
- *Commercial consultancies; and*
- *Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*
-

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

The Netherlands continues to conduct its own internal assessments of partners, based on existing information without additional burden on implementing partners.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Same as in the 2017 report:

- Use of innovation: The Netherlands invests in innovation as a means of increasing efficiency and humanitarian impact. The Netherlands specifically supports the scale-up of promising innovations and encourages the use and impact of data. The Netherlands e.g. supports WFP in scaling up its use of mobile technology and data to carry out vulnerability assessments and thereby decrease costs.
- Harmonising partnership agreements: The Netherlands works with its own partnership agreements. Whenever possible, as with the 'Education Cannot Wait' funds, we are committed to harmonized agreements. In those cases, we are one of the most flexible donors.
- Functional reviews: The Netherlands currently relies to a large extent on coordinating bodies as the pooled fund working group, ODSG etc. for oversight and coordination. If applicable The NL prefers to join joint assessments/evaluations etc., but we also still have our own monitoring system in place that we will use if needed.

2. Progress to date

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

The focus of the NL has largely been around encouraging innovation and use of technology to stimulate greater efficiency and potential reduction of management costs.

- The Netherlands supported OCHA in the establishment of the Center for Humanitarian Data in Den Haag, which was opened in December 2017. The Center has the potential to boost a higher quality of humanitarian data, increase better and smarter data usage, and facilitate sharing of data.

- The Netherlands has asked its NGO partners in the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA = Dutch consortium who collectively plan their crisis response) to dedicate five percentage of the project support to innovation within their programming. This has the potential to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the assistance.
- The Netherlands has further simplified its procedures with the Dutch Relief Alliance, allowing multi-year funding for chronic crisis response and providing a block grant for acute crisis response.
- The Netherlands supports the Dutch Coalition of Humanitarian Innovation (DCHI), the Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation (GAHI), and the Humanitarian Innovation Fund (HIF).
- The Netherlands does not conduct its own organisational assessments of members of the Dutch Relief Alliance but uses the eligibility criteria of the ECHO Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) to assess NGOs.
- Within the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, departments make joint use of scorecards to assess multilateral organisations' effectiveness.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The Netherlands will continue to support humanitarian innovation with dedicated support as part of its project funding. The Netherlands will act as a convener and accelerator to stimulate innovation. The main focus areas of innovation will be around data, financing mechanisms, engaging the private sector and support to innovation platforms.
- The NL will continue to rely on existing partner capacity assessments rather than conducting its own.

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- The opening of the OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data and the support to DCHI in the Humanity Hub have created an innovative 'buzz', which is creating interest among other organisations and institutions to work and innovate together.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.*
2. *Coordinate and streamline data collection to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability and minimising intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process led by the Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator with full involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters/sectors and in the case of sudden onset disasters, where possible, by the government. Ensure sector-specific assessments for operational planning are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated plan of assessments at inter-cluster/sector level.*
3. *Share needs assessment data in a timely manner, with the appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks. Jointly decide on assumptions and analytical methods used for projections and estimates.*
4. *Dedicate resources and involve independent specialists within the clusters to strengthen data collection and analysis in a fully transparent, collaborative process, which includes a brief summary of the methodological and analytical limitations of the assessment.*
5. *Prioritise humanitarian response across sectors based on evidence established by the analysis. As part of the IASC Humanitarian Response Plan process on the ground, it is the responsibility of the empowered Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator to ensure the development of the prioritised, evidence-based response plans.*
6. *Commission independent reviews and evaluations of the quality of needs assessment findings and their use in prioritisation to strengthen the confidence of all stakeholders in the needs assessment.*
7. *Conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in adherence to humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.*

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

Increase awareness of the importance of high quality data, enable appropriate sharing of data sets while ensuring protection of individual data.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As in the 2017 report:

- The NL does not carry out its own assessments, and has no intention to do so in the future. We do advocate for joint context and risk analysis, prioritized assessments and planning of humanitarian and development partners in preparation for and after a crisis occurs.

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?

- Supported closer collaboration, including joint assessments and analysis, by the Dutch NGOs of the Dutch Relief Alliance in view of their Joint Responses.
- Stimulated better data sharing and analysis through the opening of the Centre for Humanitarian Data; together with FTS and IATI; hosted a workshop for experts from IAIT, FTS, Development Initiative, and the Centre for Humanitarian Data to work more closely together to provide better quality data and data analysis for the humanitarian sector.

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 support to collaboration between data experts, aiming to strengthen the quality of data and analysis.
- Consider an external evaluation of a needs assessment

4. Efficiency gains

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

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

- N.a.

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*
- 2. Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*
- 3. Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*
- 4. Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.*
- 6. Invest time and resources to fund these activities.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 7. Ensure that, by the end of 2017, all humanitarian response plans – and strategic monitoring of them - demonstrate analysis and consideration of inputs from affected communities.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As in the 2017 report:

The NL made the following commitments:

- 1) Through support for open data, affected people will be informed about aid streams affecting them, which will help them influence aid delivery where they live.

Base line:

- *NL is requesting all partner to use the IATI open standard for reporting.*
 - *The NL committed at the WHS to support the development of the OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data.*
- 2) The NL actively promotes the application of accountability principles and standards:
Base line: NL expects that implementing partners put the IASC accountability standards (UN organisations) or accountability standards as specified in the CHS into practise and report on this (via IATI)
 - 3) The NL will advocate for inclusion of local partners including local private sector in responses
Base line: NL advocates for this in all relevant meetings with partners

- 4) The NL is supporting the development of a Generosity Tracker (GT) to map the local and national support of communities to disaster affected people.

Base line: basic concept for a GT developed and launched.

- 5) NL funds programmes and commits to advocate for inclusion of the voices of the most marginalised groups, especially women, girls and the disabled.

Base line: NL expects from all partners to assess the needs of the different groups (by age and gender) of crisis affected people and develop programmes that meet the needs of the most vulnerable, especially women, girls, disabled.

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?

- Ad 1): ongoing. Discussions with partners and support to partners to adapt their systems for IATI reporting and support to IATI secretariat to further develop the IATI humanitarian reporting standard is taking place.
- Ad 2) Ongoing activity. In 2017, DSH has organised a hackathon for humanitarian aid, in cooperation with PWC and OCHA. Participants from all over the world with different backgrounds (amongst others data analysts, humanitarian aid workers, policy makers and designers) have worked together to develop innovative prototypes to give beneficiaries in a crisis a stronger voice. The prototype that was developed would give beneficiaries a platform to provide feedback about the aid they receive, but also to bring remote victims in more close contact with aid organisations so that aid can become more targeted.
- Ad 3) Ongoing activity.
- Ad 4) The basic concept of the Generosity Tracker is further developed. In collaboration with ODI, Civicus and Development Initiatives a 2 year project has started to research how local humanitarian assistance is organised (in kind aid and financial aid) and how this can be traced. The NL is contributing EUR 0,4 million to the research project, managed by ODI in London. First research visits executed and results collected in Uganda.
- Ad 5) Ongoing activity.

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)?

- Ad 1) continuation of efforts to spread the use of IATI; continued support to the OCHA Centre for Humanitarian Data. The NL will continue to support OCHA and call upon humanitarian agencies and donors to provide data, make use of data and stimulate collaboration between data centres in order

- Ad 2) Ongoing, the NL is looking at ways to ensure greater compliance of correct staff behaviour inside organisations and in relation to affected populations (compliance with CHS) and to adapt subsidy regulations.
- Ad 3) Ongoing
- Ad 4) In Summer 2017, a workshop with donors and stakeholders was organized to fine tune the research questions and approach and to discuss the results of the inception studies in 3 pilot countries and design next phases of the project. In November 2017 the research started in Uganda.
- Ad 5) Ongoing activity.

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Too early to assess.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.*
2. *Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.*
3. *Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.*

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements² you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.³ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

NL multi-year commitment: EUR 258 million, which is 63,7 % of our total humanitarian budget in 2017

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As in the 2017 report:

- The Netherlands has given over 60% of its 2016 humanitarian aid budget via multi annual commitments.

2. Progress to date

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

- In 2017, the Netherlands has given over 63% of its 2017 humanitarian aid budget via multi-annual commitments.

3. Planned next steps

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

² Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

³ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

- The Netherlands is currently in the process of reformulating its development and humanitarian policies, with the intention to further comply with Grand Bargain commitments. 2018 is however a transitional year, also regarding the continuation of multi annual financing commitments.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Multi-annual commitments not only contribute to more efficient and flexible humanitarian aid, but are also easier to administer and monitor.
- Multi-annual commitments increase the ability of partners to plan and program ahead. As such, the Netherlands is a predictable partner. Together with providing multi-annual unearmarked contributions, the Netherlands enables an efficient use of funding.
- Internally, multi-annual, unearmarked contributions are the most efficient use of resources with regards to administrative costs. More earmarking and more annual contributions would require more staff to administer the funds.

5. Good practice and lessons learned

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

- Too early to assess.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

Aid organisations commit to:

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

Donors commit to:

5. *Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020⁴.*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given): 2016: 52 % / 2017: 63,7%
- Softly earmarked contributions (given): -----
- Country earmarked contributions (given): 2016: 45 % / 2017: 32%
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given): -----

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As per the 2017 report:

- Almost the entire Dutch humanitarian budget is spent either completely unearmarked or softly earmarked e.g. via CBPF or to a specific crisis. The Netherlands deliberately allows for flexibility and relies to a large extent on the competence of the receiving organisation.

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

- The Netherlands does receive information on how unearmarked funds are used and spent. This information is however often too general, too late and does not fully support the arguments for the use of unearmarked funding.

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?

- Ad 1: The Netherlands has asked receiving organisations to report on unearmarked funding in a more concrete and timely manner. In order to inform Parliament and the public, it is key to have information on how overall programming budget (to which unearmarked funding contributes) is used and spent. We continue to have this dialogue with our partners. We urge partners to show the importance of unearmarked funding and to recognize donors who do give unearmarked funding in such a way, that it is made more attractive to become a member of this group.
- Ad 2: No actions taken, The Netherlands does already comply with the target of unearmarked 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)?

- The Netherlands is currently in the process of reformulating its development and humanitarian policies, with the intention to further comply with Grand Bargain commitments. 2018 is however a transitional year, also regarding unearmarked funding.
- The Netherlands will intensify its dialogue with partners to stimulate better demonstration of humanitarian results and to strengthen the evidence-base for unearmarked contributions. Some sort of results based financing is currently considered as a possible solution.
- In the Dutch Relief Alliance, result based finance has been introduced, based on the strategic plan of this consortium. Still a learning process

4. Efficiency gains

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

The efficiency gains resulting from the combination of unearmarked funding and more transparent, open data reporting are in lower administrative requirements for donors and recipient organisations.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Good practice: the Netherlands considers a high percentage of unearmarked funding of our overall budget a 'good practice'.
- Lessons learned: reference to high percentage of unearmarked contributions does not provide significant enough weight to be included fully in consultations among donors and humanitarian organisations at country level. It appears that country specific contributions continue to be the entry ticket for different groups, including access to partners.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*
- 2. Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*
- 3. Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As per the 2017 report:

- The Netherlands has made reporting to IATI compulsory as of 2016/2017. Harmonization of reporting requirements is an important objective related to the introduction of the open data reporting model. Intention is to apply the 'report once, use often' principle.

2. Progress to date

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

- The Netherlands continues to only have 'light' reporting requirements, given the high percentage of unearmarked contributions.
- The Netherlands hosted a workshop of the '5 donor requirements workstream' in Geneva in 2017 to ensure greater synergies between the work of these workstreams.
- As co-lead of the transparency workstream we work together with the co-convenors of the reporting workstream, and our partner Development Initiatives will liaise with ICVA and Germany to ensure our actions are compatible.
- Through the support of the Dutch Relief Alliance, partners of a Joint Response are requested to submit one joint report instead of several individual ones. This facilitates report writing and report analysis.

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)?

- Ongoing consultations with the reporting workstream;
- Consideration to pilot the reporting template with our Dutch NGO partners as part of our Joint Responses.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Light reporting requirements and a joint report from DRA partners reduces administrative costs of the MFA and its partners.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Our light reporting requirements for our partners is a good practice. A lesson learned is that in spite of the light reporting requirements, partners need to more clearly report on the results that they have achieved.

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

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

- The Netherlands supports humanitarian assistance with largely unearmarked funding and works with its embassy network to ensure the complementarity of their project funding at country level.
- The Humanitarian Unit in The Hague is in close contact with other units and embassies to encourage greater vulnerability-focus of non-humanitarian support.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

As per the 2017 report:

- The Netherlands humanitarian budget increased in 2014 with the establishment of the Relief Fund of 570 million EUR for the period 2014-2017. This is a flexible fund.
- In this fund a budget for reception of refugees in the region and preparedness was reserved.
- In 2015 the humanitarian budget for resilience in the Syria region increased with an additional 110 million EUR.

2. Progress to date

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

- The Humanitarian Unit in the MFA supported refugees, displaced and IDPs with humanitarian assistance while the Unit focussing on Migration and Displacement provided support for more durable solutions, including for education, basic services, agriculture, economic growth and employment. The respective contributions were discussed between the two Units.
- The Humanitarian Unit in The Hague contributed to the more development- and political-focused engagement of the NL Embassies in fragile contexts, providing input and analysis from a vulnerability angle in their annual planning processes.
- The Stabilisation Division in the MFA combines the Units for humanitarian assistance, migration, rule of law and justice, thereby enabling a close cooperation between the programs and projects, while respecting the needs based principled humanitarian assistance.

3. Planned next steps

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

- The Humanitarian Unit will increase its outreach to colleagues in the Units for Migration and the one for Development and to the NL Embassy Network, to strengthen the alignment and coherence of the NL support. The objective is to address humanitarian needs, while strengthening resilience of the most vulnerable and support those left behind.

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 assess.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Too early to assess.