



## 2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – Australia

### Contents

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

5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	16
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution .....	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	17
2. Progress to date.....	17
3. Planned next steps.....	18
4. Efficiency gains .....	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	18
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding .....	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2. Progress to date.....	19
3. Planned next steps.....	20
4. Efficiency gains .....	20
5. Good practice and lessons learned .....	21
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	23
3. Planned next steps.....	23
4. Efficiency gains .....	23
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	23
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....	25
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	25
2. Progress to date.....	25
3. Planned next steps.....	26
4. Efficiency gains .....	26
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.....	28
3. Planned next steps.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Efficiency gains .....	30
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	30

## 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?

Please see information provided in response to Questions 2 to 5 below.

---

### **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?

Australia has made several changes to data reporting processes, which have increased the quantity and quality of information provided to IATI. In late 2017, DFAT upgraded to version 2.02 of the IATI standard, which includes humanitarian-specific fields. We have increased the potential number of DAC sector/purpose codes reported against each activity. By reporting up to 10 codes with appropriate percentage splits, instead of only one predominant code, we have allowed visibility of more activities with a humanitarian component. In early 2018, Australia began populating the IATI humanitarian-specific fields in our reporting, in accordance with this Grand Bargain commitment.

Australia also continues to input timely and relevant data into the OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS).

In 2017, DFAT launched a new portal on its website for sharing information on major international incidents, including humanitarian crises. This 'Crisis Hub' allows members of the public to easily access up-to-date information on Australia's current humanitarian responses. All information on DFAT's web pages is presented in accessible formats.

### **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)?

We will continue to populate the humanitarian-specific fields in our IATI reports. We will also continue to report our humanitarian expenditure to the FTS and on the Crisis Hub.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

DFAT strives to be accountable and to continually learn from our actions and improve the quality of our work. Our strong focus on performance and transparency supports more open discussion about the performance of the Australian aid program, and individual aid investments. Openly publishing this data, including through the IATI mechanism and on our organisation's website, supports DFAT to be transparent about our funding allocations to the Australian people and to the communities we seek to assist. This is an important step towards putting affected people at the centre of our humanitarian assistance, including when determining needs, in allocation and delivery of relief and when assessing impact. Publishing the data in this manner also assists DFAT to share information with other actors in humanitarian response and in development programming; helping to focus the limited available humanitarian and development resources on meeting escalating need.

### **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?

In November 2016, DFAT adopted a new aid evaluation policy, which seeks to ensure strategic selection of high priority issues for in-depth examination. Under the new policy, DFAT program areas, including humanitarian, identify program-prioritised evaluations at the start of each calendar year. Initial assessments for 2017 found that across the Australian aid program more evaluations were completed on time than in previous years and almost all evaluations and management responses were promptly published on DFAT's website. Two humanitarian evaluations were completed and published in 2017 – these considered both a country (Myanmar) and thematic issue (education in emergencies). DFAT is now implementing the recommendations of both these evaluations in accordance with the respective management responses.

While publishing IATI data increases the transparency of our funding allocations, it does not increase accountability to the Australian public or affected communities unless those we

fund and their partners publish how they spend Australian funds and the results they achieve. To this end, we will continue to encourage our UN and NGO partners to publish IATI-compliant data.

IATI data may provide a useful source for Australia and like-minded donors to assess progress against other Grand Bargain commitments, particularly localisation if data on partners and second layer transaction partners is sufficiently complete and comparable.

## Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

---

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

(a) For 2016-17, 0.19%; for 2017-18, 1.91%;

(b) In 2016-17, Australia provided AUD32 million through pooled funds. So far in 2017-18, Australia has provided AUD22 million through pooled funds. Due to the time lag in reporting from humanitarian pooled funds, information from pooled funds partners is not yet available to report the proportion of 2017 funding provided to local and national actors.

(c) Information not available, as there is no systemic measure for this in DFAT.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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?

### **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?

- DFAT has undertaken internal dialogue to identify a working definition of humanitarian localisation and appropriate monitoring approach, and country-based priorities for localisation.

Australia has expanded support for greater localisation through a range of initiatives:

- Supported research and dialogue into localisation based on local and national priorities;
- humanitarian post tasking to monitor and advocate for localisation priorities in the field with partners, identify local priorities and identify bottlenecks; and
- implementation underway on Pacific Humanitarian Strategy initiatives to support the strategic shift to localisation in the Pacific, including the Pacific Islands Emergency Management Alliance (PIEMA) reformed regional architecture for humanitarian coordination and response, and a register of regional capabilities to inform better-targeted national government requests for assistance.
- sustained, new and multi-year funding for humanitarian pooled funds, which allow direct (country-based pooled funds) and indirect (CERF) access by local and national actors, and which are indicating increasing – yet as yet not systemically reported – funding to local and national actors
- strengthening preparedness and response capacity of NGOs and government and build resilience of Indo-Pacific countries by funding the Australian Red Cross (\$36.5 million 2015-19) and Australian Humanitarian Partnership NGOs (\$50 million 2016-21);
- building the capacity of national governments to integrate sexual and reproductive health into disaster management policies, and building the capacity of local NGOs as first responders, by funding the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) to manage the SPRINT initiative, which;
- pre-positioning Australian civilian specialists in disaster management agencies in Vanuatu, Samoa, Fiji and Tonga, with a Pacific regional specialist in the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC);
- funding prepositioned emergency supplies across the Pacific with WFP; and
- demonstrated support for national leadership of disaster coordination and response through more strongly targeted support to national and local actors according to the ‘as local as possible, as international as necessary’ principle, including in the recent humanitarian response to the Ambae volcano event in Vanuatu.

### **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)?

- Building on significant strengths to date, next steps are currently being considered by DFAT based on review of progress and will be shared as a follow-up to this report. A

possible priority area is identifying, and acting to reduce, internal DFAT barriers to partnering with national and local actors.

#### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- Not available. The focus of strengthened local and national decision-making is more effective aid meeting the needs of affected populations.

#### **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?

- Positive case study examples exist but are outside the reporting year period.
- For Australia, localisation is best defined by national and local actors themselves based on country context and priorities. A binary approach to localisation is unhelpful – achieving the goal of humanitarian action which is as local as possible and as international as necessary requires flexibility to local priorities, a diverse range of formats, and a continuum approach to strengthening national and local decision-making where possible to better meet the needs of affected communities.
- Under the Pacific Humanitarian Strategy, Australia is taking forward strengthening of national leadership and decision-making in Pacific Island countries through capability-building, partnership with local and national actors, better-tailoring international responses to local and nationally-defined needs and requests, and better alignment to national and local capabilities, policies and systems.
- Building shock-responsive social protection systems, and supporting them to play their part in disaster response and recovery, is important in Pacific Island countries, putting cash in the hands of affected people and empowering them to make decisions on relief and recovery priorities, wherever appropriate.
- Australia is committed to all six sub-commitments of the Localisation commitment: there is a risk of being over-focused on the 25% target of putting money in the hands of local actors. More important is having relationships in place first and responding to locally- and nationally-identified needs.



## 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?

### 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 a series of guidance notes under the DFAT Humanitarian Strategy (2016), DFAT launched *DFAT Humanitarian Strategy Guidance Note – Cash Transfers* (December 2017).
- DFAT is funding the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) to increase the scale and quality of cash transfer programming (CTP). Progress to date includes:
  - Support for research and reporting of global progress in meeting commitments and innovation.
  - Developing common markers and definitions for organisations to track and report CTP.
- DFAT continues to participate in the Asia Regional Cash Working Group (ARCWG) and the Pacific Regional Cash Working Group (PRCWG).
  - DFAT supported a cash expert secondee to the PRCWG (April – June 2017). This contributed to local capacity strengthening efforts and assisted to deliver DFAT's CTP training.

- CTP training was delivered on behalf of DFAT by CaLP for staff and partners in Australia and the Pacific (June 2017). In total, 90 participants received training on 'Core CTP Skills for Strategic Planning and Decision-making' or 'The Fundamentals of CTP'.

### **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)?

- DFAT will continue to support CaLP in 2018. Expected partnership outcomes include:
  - CaLP Guidelines for measuring CTP will be available (August 2018). This will inform future practices in measuring CTP.
  - Up to 40 practitioners will be equipped to train and deliver CTP in regional responses.
- DFAT will continue to participate in the ARCWG and PRCWG to address regional CTP interests and challenges.
- DFAT will continue to invest in shock responsive social protection systems in the Pacific.
  - DFAT will co-host with the World Bank and WFP, a government-to-government Pacific Regional Conference on Shock Responsive Social Protection (March 2018).
- DFAT will launch the next *DFAT Humanitarian Strategy Guidance Note on Branding Cash Transfers*.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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**

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?

- Recent reports commissioned by DFAT and World Bank have highlighted that, under the right conditions, cash transfers are not only feasible but also a very efficient method of delivering post-disaster assistance in the Pacific. The Suva CTP training evaluation report highlighted the importance of conducting this training in the region for the first time as a means to consolidate these findings. Critically, however, cash transfer mechanisms must be established prior to the onset of a disaster as a preparedness measure.
- Our ability to quantify the increase in cash programming across the humanitarian program is constrained by inadequate reporting by some partners on allocations of our core, unearmarked funding
  - We are unable to attribute our funding to cash programs in these cases.

## 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?

- Australia is committed to undertaking joint functional, monitoring and performance reviews, donor assessments, evaluations, risk management and oversight processes, wherever possible.
  - Wherever possible DFAT bases its partnership agreements with humanitarian partner agencies on strategic objectives agreed between agencies and supporting donors.
  - Australia requests specific reporting only when alternative sources for the information required are not available
- 

### **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?

- Australia's DFAT and the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade have applied the joint Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for rapid on-set disasters in the Pacific.
- During 2017, DFAT has continued to support the expanded use of technology in delivering humanitarian assistance through partnership support with the Global Humanitarian Laboratory (GHL) and the Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation (GAHI). Australia is the only donor supporting both initiatives.
- Under Australian Humanitarian Partnership agreements, during 2017 Australian Humanitarian NGOs agreed to reduce management costs on all humanitarian response activations over \$1m by 30%. That means the management overhead has gone down from 10% to 7%, which is more in line with UN overheads for similar funding.
  - During 2017 AUD420,000 was redirected from management costs to program delivery.
- Australia supports World Food Programme activities in Jordan. In 2017, this included the introduction of Blockchain technology to deliver cash to refugees.
- In December 2017, DFAT released a new Environment and Social Safeguard Policy for the Aid Program consolidating DFAT's approach to managing safeguards in the aid program. All investments must be designed and implemented in accordance with the safeguards principles.

### **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)?

- DFAT will expect partners to demonstrate reductions in duplicative and inefficient management arrangements with sub-contracted or implementing partners.
- DFAT will expect partners to demonstrate the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with new technology and innovation.
- DFAT will identify further opportunities for joint monitoring of humanitarian assistance in the Pacific region, including through the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework developed with the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- Agreement by humanitarian NGOs under the Australian Humanitarian Partnerships program to reduce management costs on humanitarian response activations over \$1m by 30%, reducing management overhead from 10% to 7%, has meant AUD420,000 reallocated to direct implementation of humanitarian activities during 2017.

### **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?

(N/A)

## 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?

- Aid organisations need to work collectively and overcome organisational and technical barriers to undertake joint needs assessments in partnership with national and local actors.
- Joint and high-quality needs assessment must form the basis of prioritisation and humanitarian financing in humanitarian crisis contexts.

- A functional and fit-for-purpose UNOCHA working in effective collaboration with donors, aid organisations and national governments, adapted to country context, is important to this effort. UN agencies must support UNOCHA in this role.
  - Australia prioritises the strengthening of national and local leadership and decision-making in disaster preparedness, response and recovery
    - This includes strengthening of national capabilities for needs assessment, planning and response, wherever possible;
    - And alignment to national policies and priorities.
  - Humanitarian Response Plans should be able to clearly explain within the document (and qualitative reporting on the process, if required), how joint needs assessments and analysis, (including of need severity and priority needs), have informed and strengthened response decision-making, specifically the definition of response priorities.
- 

### **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?

- Australia advances the commitments of the Needs Assessment work stream through practical and coordinated actions with partner governments, aid organisations and donor partners. This includes through:
  - capacity building national governments to lead disaster preparedness and response efforts; and
  - through close collaboration with partners on response activities, which minimize duplication.
- Australia's deployment program 'Australia Assists' helps our partners prevent, prepare for, respond and recover from disaster, fragility or conflict. Through the program, specialists have helped to build the capacity of Australia's partners, including the National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) of our neighbouring Pacific countries
  - This includes contributing to the commitments of the Needs Assessment work stream by dedicating resources and specialists to transparently and collaboratively strengthen data collection and analysis, in support of leadership by national governments.
- We demonstrated a high level of coordination with FRANZ partners (New Zealand and France) through recent natural disaster response events in the Pacific including Ambae Volcano (Vanuatu)
  - Daily coordination between this small group of leading international response partners supported Pacific Island Government responses and reduced duplication, including in needs assessments.

### **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)?

- Australia supports a strengthened, effective and fit-for-purpose international humanitarian system in which organisational and technical barriers to joint work including needs assessment, are overcome. Joint and high-quality needs assessment must form the basis of prioritisation and humanitarian financing in humanitarian crisis contexts.
  - We will advocate for this with partners and in international engagements.
- Australia prioritises the strengthening of national and local leadership and decision-making in disaster preparedness, response and recovery
  - This includes strengthening of national capabilities for needs assessment, planning and response, wherever possible;
  - And alignment to national policies and priorities.

#### **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 countries) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

See progress at 2)



## 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?

### **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?

- Australia has strengthened quality, accountability and people management through support for the application of the Core Humanitarian Standard **(CHS)**.
  - The CHS places **communities and people affected by crisis** at the centre of humanitarian action.
  - In May 2017, Australia supported and participated in a CHS workshop for the Pacific in Auckland
- All Australian NGOs that receive funding are signed up to the ACFID Code of Conduct, which is aligned to the CHS.

- Australia provides regular channels for engagement by non-government stakeholders on humanitarian, displacement and migration issues, including through regular consultations and reference groups.
- Australia continue to encourage our humanitarian partners to prioritise working with and through local partners, and regularly raise this as a priority issue in partnership discussions, and donor engagement mechanisms such as UNHCR's Standing and Executive Committee.

### **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)?

- DFAT has expressed interest to participate in a pilot of the CHS Alliance self-assessment tool for donors and funding entities in 2018.
- We will encourage our UN partners to report against the IASC Principals commitments to AAP and our NGO partners to report against the CHS.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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**

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

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 agreements<sup>2</sup> you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.<sup>3</sup> When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

The reporting period for this report of calendar year 2017 includes two Australian financial years: 2016/17 and 2017/18. Of core humanitarian funding partnerships, in 2016/17 100% of core funding was multi-year, totalling AUD133.3m, of which 99.2% was fully non-earmarked. In 2017/18, of a total core funding amount of AUD134.5m, 83.3% was multi-year (so AUD124.5m), and 96.3% was fully non-earmarked. The reduced rates of multi-year funding in 2017/18 was in core funding to OCHA, to ensure alignment of future multi-year support to the preparation of a new strategic plan during 2017. The reduced rate of non-earmarked funding was because of soft earmarking to support OCHA's operations in the Asia-Pacific region and in response to one-off change management costs requested by OCHA. Quantitative data on efficiency gains is not available. Five per cent of WFP funds were also soft earmarked in both years.

---

### 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?

---

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

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

- Australia has commenced implementation of an AUD 220 million, multi-year humanitarian program for the Syria crisis, which includes multi-year funding agreements with UN agencies and other humanitarian organisations responding to the crisis within Syria and Syrian refugee and host community needs in Jordan and Lebanon
  - As part of this program, during 2017 we expensed AUD 49 million under multi-year funding agreements.
- In December 2017 we finalised an Investment Design for a AUD 100 million multi-year humanitarian and stabilisation program for Iraq. This followed a commitment of Australia’s Prime Minister and Foreign Minister on 25 April 2017 to support the restoration of public services in newly liberated areas in Iraq, assisting displaced people to return home and begin rebuilding their lives. The announcement is available at <[https://foreignminister.gov.au/releases/Pages/2017/jb\\_mr\\_170425.aspx?w=tb1CaGpkPX%2FIS0K%2Bg9ZKEg%3D%3D](https://foreignminister.gov.au/releases/Pages/2017/jb_mr_170425.aspx?w=tb1CaGpkPX%2FIS0K%2Bg9ZKEg%3D%3D)> and the Investment Design Summary is available at <<http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/iraq-humanitarian-and-stabilisation-package-investment-design-summary.aspx>>
- In 2017 we also developed a multi-year Afghanistan and Pakistan Regional Humanitarian Strategy. Under the strategy we are making flexible multi-year commitments to WFP, OCHA and UNFPA. This was announced by the Foreign Minister on 9 March 2018, see <[https://foreignminister.gov.au/releases/Pages/2018/jb\\_mr\\_180309.aspx](https://foreignminister.gov.au/releases/Pages/2018/jb_mr_180309.aspx)>

### 3. Planned next steps

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

- In 2018 DFAT plans to enter into multi-year funding agreements under the Iraq program, including with UNMAS, UNFPA, UNDP, and NGOs.
- We will continue to explore further opportunities to develop multi-year planning and funding mechanisms in protracted crisis where possible.
- DFAT will continue to engage with likeminded donors to encourage multi-year funding agreements to promote efficiencies through economies of scale with humanitarian partners.
- We will actively monitor our multi-year commitments and anticipate that we will conduct a meta-evaluation of the impact of multi-year funding in 2018.

### 4. Efficiency gains

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

- Development of multi-year agreements has created some internal efficiencies because we are no longer drafting/ negotiating new funding agreements with partners each year for those crises.
- One year into commencement of Australia’s Syria Crisis Humanitarian and Resilience Package, it remains too early to tell if efficiencies will be gained. DFAT continues to seek evidence from with partners on the benefits of multi-year funding compared to single-year funding.

- It will be critical for partners receiving multi-year funding to demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness gains to donors providing this form of funding.

### **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?

- Our move towards designing multi-year packages for protracted crises (first Syria, then Iraq, with more planned) has helped Australia to better articulate its longer-term priorities and areas of focus, be more strategic in terms of our partner selection and invest more in M&E, which we hope will yield results in the next two years.
  - To achieve desired results, the multi-year funding commitments to primary partners need to be matched by (a) multi-year planning processes and (b) multi-year forward commitments to secondary partners.
  - Initial reflections are that neither will occur unless a critical threshold of funding from all sources is received by primary partners as multi-year.

## 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 2020<sup>4</sup>.*

---

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

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

Of the core funding provided to UN Humanitarian partner agencies by Australia, 99.2% was fully non-earmarked in Financial Year 2016-17, and 96.3% in 2017-18. The 0.8% in 2016/17, repeated in 2017/18, represented AUD2,000,000 provided to WFP for sector-specific but geographically unspecified funding. In addition in 2017-18, 15% of UNOCHA partner funding was soft earmarked, including \$1.5 million geographically soft earmarked (to the Asia-Pacific), and \$200,000 requested by UNOCHA for one-off change management costs. In addition to core partnerships funding, Australia provides country earmarked funding in response to UN and other appeals following disasters or in complex emergencies.

---

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

---

### **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?

- No steps in addition to baseline reported in year 1. Australia's strong commitment to core, unearmarked funding demonstrates confidence in our multilateral partners and our support to efficient and effective 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)?

- DFAT will continue to seek an equivalent level of visibility and evidence of impact for core funding as for earmarked funding among our partners to enable us to report progress against our other GB and WHS commitments.
- DFAT will identify opportunities to make the funding chain from multilateral to implementer shorter, quicker and less administratively heavy. Progress on the Grand Bargain commitments, including on streamlining partner assessment processes, could add real value to achieving further efficiency from unearmarked funding arrangements.
- DFAT will encourage partners to develop a transparent methodology for needs-based allocation of core resources.
- Where appropriate, DFAT would like multilateral partners to consider the WFP Model of Accountability for Multilateral Funding, which increases the transparency of where donor core funding is allocated within WFP operations.
- As well as a transparent methodology for the allocation of core funding, we will work with multilateral partners to determine the tangible, on-the-ground benefits achieved from core funding, including the dollar-value benefit of core funding (eg \$1 of unearmarked funding = \$1.XX of earmarked funding in terms of benefits achieved). Such evidence helps us make the case to political decision-makers to continue prioritizing non-earmarked funding.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- As with multi-year planning and funding, DFAT continues to seek evidence from with partners on the efficiency benefits of un-earmarked funding compared to earmarked funding.

### **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?

- Australia as a principled humanitarian donor has strong interest in advocating against greater earmarking. Recent donor earmarking trends have damaging effects on smaller donors like Australia who are left paying for agencies' less attractive administrative costs. This could be an important disincentive for donors like Australia who also need to be accountable to political decision-makers for achieving value-for-money.
- It is difficult for core funding donors to justify the decision to provide core funding without a clear results story on its effectiveness and impact, particularly in the immediate geographic region in which we have political and public expectations of achieving impact. This is a particular issue for Australia because of our Indo-Pacific focus, which differs from the Africa/ Middle-East focus of the majority of donor agencies.
- Amending management fees/ 'programme support cost' could be an incentive to greater non-earmarked funding of multilateral partners. Waiving programme support costs for core funding while applying or increasing it for earmarked funding could assist in generating improved non-earmarked funding.



## 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?

### **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?

- DFAT continues to identify all possible opportunities to use existing and common reporting by humanitarian partners, before any request is made for specific reporting by the partner agency.
- Australia's multiyear humanitarian resilience package in response to the Syria crisis involves a significant proportion of funding earmarked to the country level. The narrowing of the sectoral focus to protection, education and livelihoods has enabled a stronger focus on monitoring and evaluation to capture results and enable learning. Australia has jointly agreed high-level performance expectations in contracts with partners on each thematic priority. Progress is assessed primarily based on analysis of performance indicators in partners' existing reporting. This assessment of progress informs Australia's monitoring visits, annual review and High Level Consultations. Each partner is encouraged to conduct at least one independent evaluation over the duration of the package. Australia is taking a similar approach, clearly stating performance expectations and drawing on existing reporting, in the multiyear humanitarian and stabilisation package in Iraq.
- Together with New Zealand, Australia is piloting a new Humanitarian Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for rapid onset disasters in the Pacific. The Framework emphasises the importance of ensuring all data collected is disaggregated by gender, age and disability. It incorporates the Core Humanitarian Standard and will support tracking of commitments made by Australia and New Zealand during the World Humanitarian Summit.
- Australia is actively participating in the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) for M&E to support the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR). GFDRR has strengthened its M&E system in order to collect and report both quantitative and qualitative data at output and outcome level, enabling the aggregation of grant-

level data for trust fund and Portfolio-level reporting. Indicators track gender, resilience to climate change and citizen engagement.

- We participated in the Sendai Indicator Working Group that agreed common terminology for DRR endorsed by the UNFA in February 2017.
- DFAT has incorporated GB reporting requirements into the internal templates used annually to assess Aid Investment Quality.

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

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

- In line with GHD principles, Australia seeks to agree Strategic Partnership Frameworks with multilateral partners and to draw on universal, program-level reports prepared by multilateral partners in the humanitarian sector, including both audit financial statements and annual/crisis-specific results reporting. Strategic Partnership Frameworks set out the agreed strategic objectives and related performance expectations, drawing on existing performance indicators of multilateral and other partners to inform assessments of performance. Through these Frameworks we seek to clarify the basic reporting on the impact of our humanitarian assistance to affected populations that we require for our partners.
- Australia continues to seek basic results information on humanitarian assistance reaching the affected population, demonstrating performance against expectations, enabling learning and strengthening the case for donor funding. Common annual reporting, including against budgets, is essential to meet the high standards for transparency and accountability in line with the commitments of aid organisations under the WHS and Grand Bargain in particular providing clarity on results and achievements.
- In developing common or joint reporting with other donors, Australia will work closely with partners to ensure that donors are provided with adequate information and visibility for their contributions, in order to maintaining support for unearmarked funding.
- Australia will also focus on the partnership practices that reduce the onerous and duplicative reporting burdens on sub-contracted implementing partners, particularly where Australia provides multiyear funding.
- Australia continues to request data disaggregated by sex, age and disability status as a contractual requirement for funding, request partners to include persons with disabilities and DPOs in the collection and analysis of data and request evidence that this data is used to improve the effectiveness of programming.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- No gains identified at this time.

## **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?

- Common annual reporting, including against budgets and providing clarity on results and achievements, should meet the high standards for transparency and accountability in line with the commitments of aid organisations under the WHS and Grand Bargain. In the absence of high quality, evidence-based reporting from partners it will be difficult to sustain other GB commitments.

## 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?"

Please see information provided under Questions 2-5 below.

---

#### **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?

- Australia continues to provide core and un-earmarked funding that can be used for activities across the aid spectrum

- In 2016-17, Australia provided AUD\$251m in core funding to global humanitarian and development partners.
  - This includes AUD\$25 million to UNHCR in 2016-17 to help them meet the needs of populations of concern, and to seek durable solutions for them.
- Australia also increased contributions to pooled funds, cash-based and resilience programming.
- Australia is increasing the use of multi-year programming in protracted crises to ensure that long-term predictable support is available to work across the humanitarian-development spectrum (see Workstream 7 report).
- As part of our World Bank partnership (AUD\$774.45 m committed for 2017-18 to 2019-20), Australia supports the Crisis Response Window, which is bridging the gap between humanitarian relief, recovery and economic growth.
- Australia provided AUD\$120.3 million for disaster risk reduction efforts in FY16-17.
- Australia also funds the World Bank's Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (AUD\$4.1 m / year; 2017-20) supporting Indo-Pacific governments to undertake resilient recovery and reconstruction, and to reduce the cost of future disasters.
- Australia partners with the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction to implement the *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-30* in the Indo-Pacific region (AUD\$1.9m/ year; 2016-2019).
- Australia is taking a multi-hazard, disaster risk reduction approach to Australia's aid investments in the Pacific. AUD\$300 million will be spent on climate change and disaster resilience activities in the Pacific from 2016-2020, including AUD\$75m for disaster preparedness.
  - Australia supports regional programs and partnerships that utilise technical expertise, helping to address the challenges of climate change in the Pacific, including to support:
    - climate and weather services;
    - governance programs to improve risk-informed decision making;
    - hazard scenario impact mapping; and
    - climate change information services.
- Australia works with governments in the Indo-Pacific region to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and reach of their social protection systems. In 2016/17 Australia's total support for social protection was AUD\$65.6 million
- Australia is also a generous resettlement country, granting 15915 humanitarian visas from 1 January to 31 December 2017. Australia provides comprehensive settlement support services for humanitarian entrants, including healthcare, education, income and psycho-social support.

### **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)?

- Australia will continue to explore further opportunities to develop multi-year programs in protracted crises.
  - In 2018 we will roll out our Iraq Package which seeks to meet both the humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable conflict-affected populations in Iraq, and assist communities become more resilient and stable.

- Australia will continue to engage with likeminded donors to encourage multi-year funding agreements to promote efficiencies through economies of scale with humanitarian partners.
- In 2018, Australia will roll out the Australia Pacific Regional Climate Change Action Program (APCCAP). APCCAP is an AUD\$75 million regional investment that will increase the effectiveness of Australia's support for climate change action and resilience in the Pacific.

#### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- Development of multi-year agreements has created internal administrative efficiencies. DFAT continues to seek evidence from with partners on the further efficiency benefits of multi-year funding, pooled funds and core funding.

#### **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 indicative success of Australia's multi-year package in Syria and neighbouring countries has provided the catalyst required to initiate multi-year packages that bridge the humanitarian/development divide in other fragile and/or conflict affected countries experiencing a protracted crisis.
- Through previous investments in climate and disaster resilience, we see opportunities to align our humanitarian and development spend through risk-informed approaches to our investments
- Closing the humanitarian-development divide involves broadening our dialogues beyond NDMOs to include line ministries and finance ministries.