

# Grand Bargain annual self-reporting – DENMARK 2016-2017

## Contents

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

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....                   | 12 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 12 |
| Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding.....              | 13 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 13 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 13 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 13 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 14 |
| 5. Good practice and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....  | 14 |
| Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....                      | 15 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 15 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 15 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 15 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 16 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 16 |
| Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....                      | 17 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 17 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 17 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 17 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 17 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 18 |
| Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....       | 19 |
| 1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....                                | 19 |
| 2. Progress to date .....   | 19 |
| 3. Planned next steps .....                                       | 21 |
| 4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1).....                    | 21 |
| 5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) ..... | 22 |

## **Work stream 1 - Transparency**

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

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

- The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) has for a number of years worked towards more overall transparency in communicating results. The portal OpenAid.dk provides on-line information for the public on development support in financial terms, partners, sectors as well as countries and regions, based on data published daily in IATI-format.
- Danish humanitarian funding is reported to EDRIS, which contains real time information on ECHO and Member States' contributions to Humanitarian Aid.
- Danish humanitarian funding is reported to OCHA's Financial Tracking Service (FTS).

### **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 Danish 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action and the redesign of partnership agreements serve to promote greater transparency in the choice of and the resource allocation to partners.
- Being among the founding members of IATI, Denmark has taken part in the technical development of future solutions.
- With respect to UN partners, Country-Based Pooled Funds and the Central Emergency Response Fund and CSO partners, Denmark is supportive of increased transparency on funding streams.

### **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)?

- Following adoption of Denmark's 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, MFA has embarked on a process of redesigning its partnerships with civil society organisations (CSOs) engaged in development cooperation and humanitarian action. New strategic partnerships (from 2018) will require accountability and full transparency on results to MFA, the Danish public, local partners and beneficiaries, using the IATI-standard. Learning from the experience of the Netherlands, Denmark will work on digital traceability based on the IATI-standard.
- In September 2017, Denmark plans to sign agreements with UN agencies UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF covering both humanitarian and development action, referring to Grand Bargain commitments and the required transparency.

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

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

- Openness about partners and agreements, and easy access to information on Danish cooperation with partners creates a more predictable environment for all humanitarian and development stakeholders.

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

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

## **Work stream 2 - Localization**

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

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

- Denmark recognizes the need to channel more support to local actors to improve sustainability and local/national ownership of crises preparedness, response and recovery
- The MFA has supported capacity strengthening of local and national actors through various instruments and funding channels, on both the humanitarian and development side, encouraging partners to work in a way that reinforces rather than replaces local and national capacities whenever possible.

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

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

- The MFA is redesigning its long-term partnerships with CSOs engaged in international development cooperation and humanitarian action in line with the 2017 Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action.
- Through its redesigned partnership policy for CSOs, Denmark has engaged in discussions on how to improve local actor engagement in the delivery of humanitarian assistance. CSO applicants are assessed on their contribution to the development of a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal and mutually committing partnerships between CSOs in Denmark and in the global South. CSOs working in areas affected by armed conflict and recurrent natural disaster are specifically required to work with capacity building of communities, national and local organisations, local authorities and/or relevant civil society actors aimed at building local capacity to better prepare for and respond to crises, in particular in favour of vulnerable and marginalised groups.
- The MFA is calling on CSOs to strengthen their analysis of the proportion of funding that is transferred to local partners, and the proportion used for capacity development of local partners. Moreover, MFA will hold CSOs accountable to increasing involvement of beneficiaries in the design and response as well as in the monitoring and evaluation.
- In 2016, Denmark increased its contribution to the Country-Based Pooled Funds, a mechanism that we consider important with a view to increasing and improving assistance by local and national responders. In 2016, Country-Based Pooled Funds channelled a relatively large part (18% on average in 2016) of its support to local organisations in 17 major humanitarian crises. With a total contribution of approx. USD 38,2 mio., Denmark was the 5<sup>th</sup> largest donor to the CBPFs in 2016. In 2016, we supported nine CBPFs in Afghanistan, CAR, Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Turkey and Yemen.
- MFA is also engaging with its CSO partners in discussions on access to pooled funding mechanisms, for example in annual meetings with Danish NGOs and in country-based pooled fund meetings.

- Denmark has provided specific support to organisations aiming to increase capacity of local organisations, learning and transparency, for example International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA). Denmark has also provided support to Overseas Development Institute/Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) focusing on research on how to invest in the capacity of local organisations.

### **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 Ministry will continue its dialogue with Danish NGOs on localization and will assess the possibility of a localization marker.
- The MFA is planning a revision of its guidelines for support to civil society. The need for transfer of influence from actors in OECD countries to actors in low- and middle-income countries is expected to be reflected in the revised guidelines for CSOs. Denmark will also strengthen its analysis of the proportion of grants that is transferred to local partners, and the proportion required for capacity-building and support from international partners.

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

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

- It is too early to assess potential efficiency gains.

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

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

- This commitment is complex and requires a better understanding of who should be considered a national/local actor or a “local responder”. It is not clarified whether rights-holders and duty bearers, either at the national level of line ministries or local level authorities, may also be included in this category.
- It is also important to understand the implications of ‘as directly as possible’. This requires that we collectively improve tracking of funding streams from global to local.
- The importance of a context-specific approach requires further reflection. Different humanitarian crises require different approaches, with international humanitarian actors playing a vital role in many crisis situations.

## Work stream 3 - Cash

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

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

Denmark has been supportive of cash-based assistance for several years;

- Denmark supported the EU approach to cash-based assistance, cf. the EU Council Conclusions on Common Principles for Multi-Purpose Cash-Based Assistance to Respond to Humanitarian Needs which was adopted by the EU Council in June 2015.
- Denmark supported several UN agencies as well as CSO partners, using cash-based assistance in emergency response
- Denmark supplies un-earmarked funding to WFP, UNHCR et al, which are spent on cash operations in a number of countries.

### 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?

- Denmark has advocated for taking the approach of always asking “Why not cash?” when designing humanitarian food interventions and considering multi-purpose cash where possible
- In December 2016, with support from the Danish MFA, DanChurchAid and the Danish Refugee Council organized a seminar on “Cash At Scale – Danish Perspectives”. The seminar brought together Danish humanitarian actors to discuss their perspectives on, if and how they should take cash to scale in coordinated and effective ways.
- The Danish CSO partner DanChurchAid (undertaking both development activities and humanitarian action) has utilised Danish funding to build expertise in cash transfer programming and E-transfer innovation. DanChurchAid participates in CashCap as well as the Cash Platform (which tries to enable large-scale cash transfer programmes between various organisations). The organisation is also actively involved in the OCHA-based cash coordination group in Geneva.
- Using Danish humanitarian project funds Save the Children made a survey among Syrian IDP beneficiaries in Idleb and Aleppo on the effects of a multipurpose grant. It showed that more than half of the IDPs had been displaced three times or more, whereby the flexibility of the cash grant modality meant they could continue to move if necessary without being burdened by large in-kind distributions. The survey also showed that while the majority of beneficiaries had improved access to food as a result of the grant, 25% said it allowed them to restart livelihood activities.
- Denmark provides unearmarked funding to WFP and has been a supporter of WFP’s cash-based assistance: 38 pct of all food assistance done by WFP is in cash.
- Denmark is a key contributor of unearmarked funding to UNHCR and has been a supporter of UNHCR’s increased use of cash in operations: UNHCR’s cash-based programming reached a value of \$688 million in 2016, a 106% increase from \$325 million in 2015. This means that almost 20% of UNHCR’s budget now goes to cash-based 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)?

- Denmark will consider use of cash in emergencies in all areas of our work, and will continue to engage with our partners to further scale-up multipurpose cash assistance in the projects we fund. Our communication on the importance of use of cash will be strengthened.

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

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

- It is too early to assess this.

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

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

N/A

- The number and volume of Danish humanitarian partners using cash-based assistance has increased over the past few years. Moreover, there seems to be a shift from conditional cash and vouchers towards more unconditional, multipurpose cash assistance.
- Cash-based programming requires a solid knowledge of local markets and local economies
- Cash-based programming cannot replace protection and physical humanitarian presence in complex emergencies.



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

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

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

- Denmark supports and makes use of joint performance reviews, for example MOPAN for UN agencies, and requires reviews from CSO partners.

### **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 MFA requires a results-based approach from its humanitarian partners. In MFA assessment of applications from CSO partners, applicants are assessed on their capacity to deliver results at outcome level in a cost-effective manner. Applicants are also required to document that functioning results-based management systems are in place.
- Denmark consistently raises the follow-up of the Grand Bargain in meetings with our main humanitarian partners, including UN and CSOs. With respect to Country-Based Pooled Funds and the Central Emergency Response Fund, Denmark has supported a cost-effective approach in the transaction chain.

### **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)?

- With the redesigned CSO approach, the MFA will require reviews from its CSO strategic partners during a four-year cycle of the partnership. The purpose is to revisit and re-assess the strategic partners' organizational and financial capacity, including cost efficiency.

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

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

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

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

- Comparable cost structures, including overheads, are not yet in place in UN and CSOs.
- Denmark raises issues of management costs with UN agencies in the boards.

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

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

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

- The MFA primarily uses the Global Humanitarian Overview, the Humanitarian Response Plans and the ICRC appeals to determine needs and regional/country funding envelopes for its humanitarian assistance. The MFA also makes use of assessments carried out by Danish NGO partners.

### **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?

- Denmark is supportive of the collective move towards joint needs assessments and is encouraging its partners to take this approach, rather than using single agency needs assessments, cf. the Danish 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action.

### **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)?

- Denmark considers how to further strengthen coherent analysis and holistic assessment between humanitarian and development actors in protracted crises, as well as a stronger prioritisation of needs and vulnerabilities.

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

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

- It is too early to assess any efficiency gains.

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

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

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

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

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

- Prior to the World Humanitarian Summit, Denmark was actively engaged in the development of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), which was originally launched at a conference in Copenhagen in December 2014. It was made a requirement for all Danish humanitarian partners to become independently verified or certified against the quality criteria of the CHS. Funding was provided for this purpose.
- Denmark also provided funding for the CHS Alliance and for the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative, including the subsidy fund.

### **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?

- Since the World Humanitarian Summit, Denmark has integrated the Core Humanitarian Standard into the Danish 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action making the CHS obligatory not only for humanitarian interventions but also for civil society activities in fragile situations.
- Dialogue has been established with new partners to provide assistance with regards to CHS verification/certification.
- Danish strategic partners are increasingly using technology to secure feedback from beneficiaries in hard-to-reach areas.

### **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 the dialogue with international organisations, networks and other donors about the implementation of the Core Humanitarian Standard.
- An approach to the applicability of the Core Humanitarian Standard in fragile situations is to be further developed.
- Continue to advocate for more involvement of beneficiaries in the design of response and feedback in line with the Human Rights Based Approach to Development, with focus on meaningful participation and inclusion of beneficiaries, and the Core Humanitarian Standard.
- Invest in the M&E skills and capacities of national staff and local partners in fragile contexts and explore new ways of both collecting and triangulating data where access is difficult.
- Look into including standard wording on Accountability to Affected Populations in agreement templates, including under reporting requirements.

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

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

- The purpose of applying the Core Humanitarian Standard as a common humanitarian standard is to be able to provide more relevant, efficient and timely humanitarian response respectful of the needs of the affected populations.

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

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

- Making Core Humanitarian Standard verification/certification a requirement for strategic partners and providing funding as well as guidance has speeded up the process of CHS implementation within the partnership organisations.
- It has furthermore provided a common platform for communication and learning, and several organisations have reported back that their programmatic and operational approaches have become more inclusive to the participation of the affected populations in the decision-making processes.
- Making Core Humanitarian Standard a requirement for national partners can have a positive spill-over affecting their broader international networks.

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

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

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

- In follow-up of the Grand Bargain, Denmark is increasing its multi-year humanitarian commitments in 2016 and 2017. Denmark is also aiming at greater complementarity of humanitarian and development aid streams focusing at more coherent action at country level to address protracted crises.

### **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 follow-up on the Danish 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, the redesign of strategic partnerships with CSOs entails 4-year engagements (2018-2021) with annual commitments (subject to annual parliamentary approval) allowing for a stable, efficient and enabling working environment for the strategic partners as well as their partners in the global South. The strategic partnerships will focus on maximising impact in order to deliver sustainable results for the fulfilment of Sustainable Development Goals and/or alleviation of human suffering.
- Denmark has entered into 4-year agreements with WFP (2016-2019) and UNHCR (2017-2020). The agreement with UNHCR supports solutions-oriented longer-term approaches and partnerships with development actors, including the UNHCR-World Bank partnership.
- Denmark has also provided multi-annual financing for the WB Global Concessional Financing Facility and the WB Program for Forced Displacement, for the Education Cannot Wait Fund, and for the EU Regional Development and Protection Programmes in the Middle East and on the Horn of Africa. This demonstrates Denmark's commitment to provide longer-term comprehensive approaches to displacement crises.

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

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

- As part of the Grand Bargain follow-up, the MFA will allow for greater flexibility within the scope of existing and new framework agreements, including the approval of multi-year planning and programming in protracted crises in agreement with the organisations concerned.
- Denmark is planning to enter into multi-year agreements with further UN agencies, among others UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA (subject to annual parliamentary approval), covering both humanitarian and development action, in 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2017. The multi-year agreements will require implementation of Grand Bargain commitments.

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

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

- Increased flexibility within the framework agreements will likely lead to increased predictability and lower administrative costs, and enable more responsive programming.

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

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

- More multi-year financing will require a stronger focus on multi-year collaborative planning and response plans and stronger links between humanitarian and development actors, without undermining the commitment to principled humanitarian action. At the same time, it is important for a donor like Denmark to balance the need humanitarian partners have for more predictable financing with the need for flexibility in our budgets so as to be able to respond to acute crises.

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

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

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

- In accordance with Good humanitarian Donorship principles, Denmark provides significant amounts of flexible humanitarian funding. This includes the core support to WFP, UNHCR, UNRWA, OCHA, ICRC, Central Emergency Response Fund and County-Based Pooled Funds, as well as thematic support and softly earmarked regional humanitarian support.

### **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 MFA continues to see flexible financing as key to ensure agility and responsiveness in crises situations. This also entails flexibility across the humanitarian-development nexus, promoting more coherent approaches in response to conflict, fragility and displacement.
- Denmark's total humanitarian commitments in 2016 amounted to more than USD 335 million, of which approx. USD 85 million were core contributions to UN organisations and ICRC. Thus, in 2016, Denmark reached, and indeed exceeded, the global target of 30 % of humanitarian contributions that is non-earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020, by end of budget year 2016.
- In 2016, almost USD 100 million were allocated for strategic partnership organisations, both UN organisations and Danish CSOs. Of this allocation, almost USD 25 million were provided as flexible funds.
- Denmark aims at incentivizing coherent action and collective outcomes, in line with WHS commitment to the New Way of Working. Denmark is therefore providing significant levels of pooled funding: In 2016, Denmark provided USD 15,3 million in unearmarked funding to the CERF and ranked as its 9<sup>th</sup> largest donor. In 2016, Denmark provided USD 38,2 million to the Country-Based Pooled Funds (categorized as softly earmarking) and ranked as the 5<sup>th</sup> largest donor to CBPFs.
- In the current Humanitarian Partnership Agreements with UN agencies (UNHCR, UNFPA and UNICEF) and CSOs in 2017, flexible funds are included to enable the strategic partners to react swiftly and in a flexible manner to an immediate humanitarian crisis, through the deployment of personnel and through economic and material contributions.

### **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 its redesigned Strategic Partnerships with CSOs, CSO partners will from 2018 have the autonomy to reallocate up to 30 per cent of the agreed partnership budget.
- Strategic Partnerships with CSOs will, where relevant, contain both humanitarian and development funding.

- New guidelines for CSO support will entail flexibility in the use of humanitarian vs. development funds in sudden and protracted humanitarian crisis situations, allowing strategic partners to work effectively across the humanitarian-development nexus.

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

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

- More flexibility within framework agreements is likely to reduce administrative costs.

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

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



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

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

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

- Denmark is very flexible with partners reporting, cf. ICVA report on “Less paper, more aid”
- In the case of funding for UN organisations and UN and ICRC appeals, the MFA accepts the organisation’s annual reports.
- Denmark does not require a mandatory reporting template. The MFA generally approves partners’ own format for reporting.
- When assessing multilateral partners’ organizational capacity, Denmark uses MOPAN assessments rather than conducting own performance assessments.

### **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?

- Denmark has strongly supported harmonized reporting, i.e. in the case of Country-Based Pooled Funds, where one global report will be produced in the future allowing comparative approaches across different funds based on the same indicators.
- In the redesign of its CSO support, Denmark requires CSO partners to have results-based management systems in place for monitoring and reporting on results.

### **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)?

- Denmark already has a light reporting system, but will further explore different avenues to reduce and harmonize reporting requirements, while upholding the need for accountability and focus on results and outcomes.
- Joint reporting where Denmark is a co-donor will also be considered.
- Participation in the pilot on harmonisation of reporting requirements will be assessed on the basis of whether it is likely to bring efficiency gains to our partners in the country cases selected.
- Danish partner organisations will be required to report in IATI format, cf. workstream 1 on Transparency. This may lead to easing reporting requirements to the MFA further.

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

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

- Reduced administrative burdens for both partners and donors.

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

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

- Too soon to report.

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

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

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

- Denmark has been at the forefront of progressing better solutions to humanitarian-development coherence, also prior to the Grand Bargain. This has been done through support to development-oriented comprehensive approaches to protracted displacement crises, providing support for resilience of displaced people and host communities.
- Denmark is the co-convenor of the work stream on humanitarian-development engagement in the Grand Bargain and since the signing of the Grand Bargain has led advocacy efforts and operational solutions with humanitarian and development partners.
- The 2030 agenda with the sustainable development goals has focused international attention on leaving no one behind. In 2016, Denmark has followed up with the 2017 joint Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action aiming at greater coherence and impacting on Denmark's internal organisation as well as on its interaction with international partners.

### **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?*

- Since the launch of the Grand Bargain at the WHS, Denmark has been co-leading the operationalisation of commitments of workstream 10 on humanitarian-development engagement.
- Denmark has launched its 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action. In line with this joint strategy, Denmark works with its international partners to incentivize better joint-up humanitarian and development assistance to address both short-term and long-term aspects of humanitarian crises, fragility and violent conflicts.
- Through its 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, Denmark is increasingly applying a longer term development approach to addressing displacement in fragile and conflict-affected states and regions. Important focus areas are livelihoods and as well as service delivery, including health and education in emergencies, as we see these sectors as important in paving the way for long-term self-reliance and resilience.
- In line with the Danish 2017 Strategy, the MFA is promoting the use of joint context, risk and vulnerability analysis, joint needs assessments and joint planning and coordinated programming frameworks, driven by inclusive national priorities and collective outcomes, to address both short-term and long-term needs of vulnerable people. Full respect for humanitarian principles is ensured, especially in active conflict settings, where principled humanitarian action is of paramount importance.
- The 2017 Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action has triggered a redesign of Danida's long-term partnerships with civil society organizations, increasing Danish CSOs' strategic alignment with Danish priorities and the nexus between their humanitarian and long-term development engagement. Partnerships with CSOs will

include both their humanitarian and long-term development engagement in one single integrated agreement.

- Denmark has demonstrated its commitment towards strengthening the coherence of humanitarian and development action through its proactive support to advance the implementation of The New Way of Working (NWOW) at country level. The focus of NWOW is on achieving collective outcomes that will reduce needs, risks and vulnerability, thereby addressing both short-term and long-term needs through coherent humanitarian and development action.
- The NWOW operational roll-out was commenced through a high-level workshop in Copenhagen on 13-14 March 2017. The workshop brought together high level representatives from Member States, multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, UN entities, ICRC, and NGOs and was co-led by Denmark, OCHA, UNDP and the World Bank. The workshop focused at country-cases in Ethiopia, Uganda, Somalia and Yemen, but also showcased other efforts at coherent humanitarian-development work in Burkina Faso, CAR, Sudan, etc. The workshop highlighted UN-WB joint work on the humanitarian-development-peace roll-out, and the ongoing work on the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), especially in Ethiopia, Uganda and Lebanon. The workshop showcased a series of initiatives for coherent action at country level.
- A meeting on NWOW was held at the World Bank Spring Meetings on 22 April 2017 in Washington D.C. led by the World Bank, Denmark, OCHA, G7+ and UNDP. This meeting brought forward the role of governments in the implementation of NWOW across the humanitarian–development-peace communities. Bringing together high level representatives from Member States, multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, UN entities, ICRC and IFRC, and NGOs, the meeting identified and discussed the resources, steps, and systems needed to support governments, national stakeholders and local actors in implementation of NWOW.
- The MFA has provided financial support for a number of partnership initiatives aimed at strengthening the humanitarian–development nexus particularly between the UN and the World Bank Group in situations of fragility, conflict and violence.
- Denmark is committed to finding durable solutions for refugees and IDPs and supports the roll out of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) at country level both politically and financially.
- Denmark has supported the engagement of the World Bank Group in this area, including through funding for its Program for Forced Displacement. Denmark is also supportive of addressing refugee crises through the new IDA sub-window for refugees.
- In 2016, Denmark supported Middle Income Countries hosting large refugee populations through its contribution of unearmarked funding of DKK 100 mio. for the World Bank-administered Global Concessional Financing Facility for three years. In this manner Denmark has provided infrastructure, health services and jobs to refugees and host communities, especially in Jordan and Lebanon.
- Denmark’s commitment to a comprehensive approach to assist refugees is also demonstrated through Danish lead on the EU Regional Development and Protection Programme in the Middle East and Danish three-year commitment to the EU Regional Development and Protection Programme on the Horn of Africa.
- Denmark has contributed DKK 75 mio. for the Education Cannot Wait fund for education in emergencies, which was launched at the World Humanitarian Summit. The three-year

financial contribution demonstrated Denmark's commitment to a comprehensive approach to assist refugees in protracted crises.

- Denmark has been a strong supporter of preparations for EU Council Conclusions on "Operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus", adopted by FAC/DEV Council on 19 May 2017. This follows EU Council Conclusions of 12 May 2016 on the "EU approach to forced displacement and development" which Denmark has also proactively supported. Denmark has also supported linkages of development and humanitarian action in "The New European Consensus on Development", adopted by the EU Council on 19 May 2017.
- Denmark has taken on the role as co-lead, together with Japan, of the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative's work stream on the humanitarian-development nexus. A concept note has been prepared, and the first meeting was held in February 2017. Follow-up action was decided on, including an information gathering after the high-level meeting of the GHD in June 2017.
- In view of supporting national systems to increase social protection programmes, Denmark has supported the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) in Ethiopia which aims at enabling the rural poor facing chronic food insecurity to resist shocks, create assets and become food self-sufficient. We see this as an alignment of humanitarian and development efforts with strong government ownership to reduce needs.

### **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)?*

- Rolling out the Danish 2017 Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action, among others with a mapping of policy and operational initiatives by Denmark as well as potential initiatives to increase coherence and effectiveness inside the MFA.
- As one of the first steps taken, Denmark has initiated an open application round for strategic partnerships with CSOs involving both development and humanitarian funding which is expected to come to its conclusion in the summer 2017.
- The MFA considers additional funding for supporting country-level roll out of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) as well as for the UN/WB-led Humanitarian-Development-Peace Initiative in countries affected by fragility, conflict and violence.
- Denmark will review possible synergies with CRRF and the UN-WB Humanitarian-Development-Peace Initiative in Danish bilateral development programmes in Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Myanmar, Tanzania and Uganda.

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

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

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

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

- Future work in operationalising The New Way of Working should recognize that NWOW is a multi-stakeholder agenda that requires the active engagement of all stakeholders: national governments, local authorities, national and international civil society, bilateral and multilateral partners, humanitarian actors, development practitioners and peace-builders.
- Widespread acknowledgement now exists of the benefits of seeking greater coherence between humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding approaches to establish a framework for strengthening refugee self-reliance and resilience among affected communities and institutions. Game-changing initiatives introduced in 2016, including the New York Declaration and related Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), the EU's new development policies on forced displacement, the new World Bank policies, approaches, and financing instruments for refugees and host communities, and "the New Way of Working" approach, demonstrate concrete, positive changes in how all major stakeholders will address displacement from now on.

With respect to further operationalizing coherent ways of working, including the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, the following lessons learned:

- Effective responses must begin with a joint political economy assessment of the displacement context, with operational actors then determining their collective objectives, priorities, and way forward through a collaborative and on-going process. These actors, comprised of UN agencies, civil society actors, donors, local authorities and others, understand best how to respond, and should not be influenced by political processes happening elsewhere. Such assessments should be the basis for dialogue on policy and operational options for governments to then decide on.
- Host governments must be in the lead to the extent possible, with the involvement of all relevant government ministries, beyond those ministries or departments traditionally tied to refugee response, and with support for gradual capacity building if necessary. Parallel systems do not create the committed engagements needed to effectively support longer-term resilience and self-reliance.
- Including forced displacement issues in national development plans is a prerequisite for the design of truly comprehensive interventions and the achievement of needed additionality.
- A whole-of-society approach must be applied to comprehensive responses to displacement, with partners implicated early in the process. All actors must be provided the space to contribute and be heard - and it must be recognised that leadership from a plurality of partners is needed for the response to be successful. While a neutral entity can facilitate collaboration, it is only when all engage that an effective way forward can be identified. Comprehensive processes cannot succeed if a single actor attempts to take ownership and overriding responsibility.