



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – DENMARK

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.....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	6
3. Planned next steps.....	8
4. Efficiency gains	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned	8
Work stream 3 - Cash.....	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	10
2. Progress to date.....	10
3. Planned next steps.....	11
4. Efficiency gains	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned	12
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	14
2. Progress to date.....	14
3. Planned next steps.....	14
4. Efficiency gains	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned	15
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	16
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 6 – Participation Revolution	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2. Progress to date.....	20
3. Planned next steps.....	20
4. Efficiency gains	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps.....	23
4. Efficiency gains	23
5. Good practice and lessons learned	23
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	25
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	25
2. Progress to date.....	26
3. Planned next steps.....	26
4. Efficiency gains	26
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	28
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	28
2. Progress to date.....	28
3. Planned next steps.....	28
4. Efficiency gains	29
5. Good practices and lessons learned	29
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	30
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	30
2. Progress to date.....	30
3. Planned next steps.....	
4. Efficiency gains	33
5. Good practices and lessons learned	33

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

- 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?

- Being among the founding members of IATI, Denmark has taken part in the technical development of future solutions.
- Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action *The World 2030* and the redesign of agreements with CSO partner organizations have served to promote greater transparency in the choice of and the resource allocation to partners.
- In 2017, Denmark redesigned its partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs) engaged in development cooperation and humanitarian action. The MFA requires full transparency and accountability to the MFA, the Danish public, local partners and beneficiaries on results from its 17 strategic CSO partners. MFA guidelines for CSO partners require them to achieve full adherence to the IATI standard gradually.
- In February 2018, the MFA hosted a workshop on IATI with its strategic CSO partners.
- With respect to UN partners, Country-Based Pooled Funds and the Central Emergency Response Fund and CSO partners, Denmark has been 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)?

- Learning from the experience from the Netherlands, Denmark intends to incentivise digital traceability, based on the IATI standard, as part of the management routines.
- Expecting revised Type-of-Aid codes to be agreed by DAC (cf. GB work stream 8 on unearmarked financing), Denmark will use this classification of the degree of flexibility to define the required IATI-reporting by partners.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Information on Denmark's cooperation with its partners is easily accessible. This contributes to a more transparent environment for all stakeholders.

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 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?¹

- (a) Denmark does not provide humanitarian funding directly to local and national responders, but provides humanitarian funding indirectly to local and national responders through intermediaries such as UN agencies, INGOs/Danish strategic CSO partners and pooled funds. Denmark provides development funding directly to local and national actors, in countries with Danish bilateral development programmes. Such development funding may also be vulnerability focused and relevant to localization.
- (b) In 2017 Denmark contributed DKK 225 million to UN-led country-based pooled funds. The total 2017 envelope of Denmark's humanitarian funding was DKK 2.375 billion

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

(commitment frame). Thus, Denmark contributed 9.5 per cent of its total humanitarian funding in 2017 to country-based pooled funds.

- (c) Denmark is currently not able to track funding to national and local responders through a single intermediary (=funding to a single international aid organization (including a federated/membership organization) that reaches a local /national actor directly from that one intermediary). This would require extensive information from international aid organisations on their subcontractual arrangements.

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

- 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?

- In 2017, Denmark redesigned its CSO partnership approach. As a result, Denmark selected 17 Danish CSO strategic partners whose engagements cover both development cooperation and humanitarian action for the period 2018-2021. The negotiations around the strategic partnerships allowed Denmark to engage with the CSOs in discussions on how to improve local actor engagements through multi-year investments and capacity strengthening. This opened up for more stable, efficient and predictable working environments for Danish CSOs and their South partners, which depending on context, could include a humanitarian-development nexus approach. At the same time, CSOs were requested to assess the technical barriers that lie before them in terms of rolling out larger localization of aid.
- The strategic partners were required to work with local/national partners and to explain in detail their approach, based on which the quality and depth of their partnerships was assessed. CSOs working in areas affected by armed conflict and recurrent natural disaster were 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, including women and girls.
- The MFA called 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 made clear that it would continue to hold CSOs

accountable to increasing involvement of beneficiaries in the design and response as well as in the monitoring and evaluation, including being verified or certified under the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS). The latter is applicable for all CSOs working in areas directly impacted by conflict, irrespective of funding source.

- In March 2018, Denmark organised a thematic meeting with its strategic partner CSOs on how to deliver on the Grand Bargain. The meeting highlighted three of the Grand Bargain work streams and Localization (GB WS 2) was one of them.
- As a result, many of the strategic CSO partners are currently strengthening their strategies for local partnerships and are improving their financial tracking systems so that they are suited to track support to local and national actors as well as preparing the organisation to report through the IATI-systems. E.g.:
 - In 2017, Caritas Denmark transferred 88 per cent of its international funding to local partners. The support to the localization agenda was made explicit in Caritas Denmark's new international strategy.
 - In 2017, Danish Red Cross transferred 22 per cent of its humanitarian funding to partner Red Cross National Societies, supporting a strong local funding flow to local Red Cross organisations and their nationwide branches and volunteers. Danish Red Cross has been an advocate on localisation, based on its decentralised and extensive partner National Society network as Red Cross Movement.
 - In 2017, DanChurchAid transferred 24 per cent of its humanitarian expenditure to local and national partners. DanChurchAid supported the localization agenda through its engagement in the Local to Global (L2GP) and Charter for Change (C4C). Equally, DanChurchAid is reviewing its partnership policies and relevance towards delivering to the GB commitments on localisation as well as the MFA's revised partnership criteria. DanChurchAid, directly and through L2GP, has supported the GB work streams on localisation, participation and transparency with technical insight on tracking and monitoring of financial flows to local and national actors in direct collaboration with the consultants tasked by the work stream and the localisation working group to set up the relevant GB financial monitoring. Directly and through its systematic engagement with C4C, DanChurchAid and L2GP have also contributed to finding workable solutions/compromises to the definitions issues, which threatened to halt progress in the localisation work stream.
 - The Danish Emergency Relief Fund (DERF) has a strong focus on local ownership and engagement of local partners. In 2017, 86 per cent of all grants were implemented through local partners, and 69 per cent went directly to project activities and goods for crisis affected people and communities. Local partners are driving factors in identifying needs and crisis alerts.
- In the boards of UN agencies, Denmark has requested multi-year agreements with UN agencies to be reflected in their sub-contractual arrangements with NGO implementing partners, to allow these to plan for a longer time horizon and build their capacities.
- Denmark continued to support the Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) as a mechanism that helps increase and improve assistance by national and local responders – often in crisis situations where international actors have limited access. Denmark also attaches importance to CBPFs' overhead policy which offers equal

treatment to international, national and local actors – allowing national and local actors more funding for investing in capacity building. Thus, CBPFs are assessed to represent a fair, systematized approach to ensuring provision of overheads to national and local NGOs, thus letting them benefit from the same conditions as international humanitarian actors.

- The MFA is also engaging with its UN and CSO partners in discussions on access to pooled funding mechanisms, including for local women's groups.
- In 2017, Denmark continued to be among the top-donors to CBPFs, with a total contribution of DKK 225 million to CBPFs in Lebanon, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Turkey and Yemen.
- Denmark continued to provide support to the NGO consortium ICVA in view of increasing the capacity of local organisations, learning and transparency.
- In 2017, Denmark provided DKK 5 million to Somali and Afghan diaspora groups in Denmark working with humanitarian projects in their countries of origin.
- Denmark provided core support to the ODI/HPG integrated research programme which includes a thematic focus on "From the ground up: understanding local response in crises" for 2017-2019.
- Denmark supported Development Initiatives work, including on localisation and analysis of data.

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 MFA will strengthen its analysis of the proportion of grants transferred to local/national partners, and the proportion required for capacity building and support from international partners. Moreover, it will explore how it can connect to development funding which would bring longer-term perspective and funding to strengthening local and national partners..

4. Efficiency gains

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

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 MFA assesses that the WHS summit has galvanised support among CSOs and strong commitment to the work stream for localization.
- By demanding status of progress from its CSO partners, the MFA has deliberately used its strategic partnerships as a way to incentivise Danish CSOs to make progress on the localisation work stream.
- E.g. several Danish CSO partners engage through the Charter for Change (C4C), in which 31 international NGOs committed to increase direct funding to southern-based humanitarian NGOs, reaching 20 per cent of their funding by May 2018.

- Several Danish CSO partners, including MSActionAid and Oxfam IBIS engage in the Start Network and the Shifting the Power project, including the self-assessment tool “the Strategic Humanitarian Assessment and Participatory Empowerment (SHAPE) framework” linked to localisation.
- Localization is a complex process that is challenging to track and quantify. Partnership approaches cannot be assessed on the basis of quantitative targets and definitions only, but must also be evaluated by the qualitative aspects of partnerships.

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?

Please see 2017 self-report:

- Denmark has been supportive of cash-based assistance for several years;
- Denmark supports 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 supports several UN agencies as well as CSO partners, using cash-based assistance in emergency response
- Denmark supplies un-earmarked funding to WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF 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 participated in the Joint Donor Mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon organised by Norway and Germany in collaboration with the World Food Programme (WFP) and UNHCR in February 2018.

- Denmark continues to support several CSO partners using cash-based assistance in emergency response.
- Denmark has redesigned its long-term partnerships with CSOs and has decided to set aside up to 10 per cent of the engagement budget for innovation, which offers the strategic partners a significant new opportunity to innovate, experiment and catalyse efforts such as cash-based programming to seek improved outcome,
- In March 2018, Denmark organised a thematic meeting with its strategic partner CSOs on how to deliver on the Grand Bargain. The meeting highlighted three of the Grand Bargain work streams and Cash-based programming (GB WS 3) was one of them.
- In November 2017, Denmark launched the report "Hack the Future of Development Aid" which among other things looked into how blockchain can make the aid delivery model and cash based transfers more efficient and transparent through the use of cryptocurrency aid transfers.
- Denmark has advocated for taking the approach of always asking "why not cash" when designing humanitarian interventions and considering multi-purpose cash where possible, including to female-headed households.
- Denmark has participated in the Grand Bargain Cash Workstream meeting in Rome in spring 2017.
- Denmark has further participated in the Good Humanitarian Donorship workshop on cash held in Geneva on 15 June 2017.
- Denmark continues to support the EU approach to cash-based assistance and participated in ECHOs briefing on cash for the Good Humanitarian Donorship-group in Geneva in January 2018.
- Denmark provides unearmarked funding to WFP and has been a supporter of WFP's cash-based programming in a number of countries.
- 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 delivered 1 2017 USD 502 million in cash assistance reaching some 8 million vulnerable people in 94 countries.
- Denmark supports Development Initiatives research into "Changing humanitarian financing", including research on cash-based programming in 2017 and 2018.

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 Evaluation Department of the MFA will in 2018 conduct a joint evaluation on cash to document results and generate lessons learned on how Denmark can provide cash-transfers more effectively and coherently, looking across types of interventions and organisations, including the MFA.
- Denmark will continue to consider the 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 also be further strengthened.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- It is still too early to assess this.

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 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

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017.

- 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?

- Denmark recognizes the potential for increased use of technology in humanitarian response. As an example, we are funding Danish Refugee Council's collaboration with IBM on *Predictive Modelling of Mixed Migration Flows*. UNWOMEN, UNFPA, UNDP, and UNICEF receive Danish support for their innovation facilities. The support to Danish CSOs includes criteria for innovative approaches to international development cooperation and humanitarian action and allows the partners to allocate up to 10% of the engagement budget to innovation.
- The MFA incentivizes a results-focused and cost-effective approach from its humanitarian partners, whether UN agencies or CSO 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 raises issues of management costs with UN agencies in the boards. We emphasize the importance of field effectiveness and a high percentage of the budget being used for programme support costs at country level.

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)?

- MFA requires 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

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?

- Comparable cost structures, including overheads, are not yet in place in UN and CSOs.

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?

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017.

- 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 Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action *The World 2030*.
- Denmark provides UN agencies and ICRC with flexible core funding that enable them to do needs analysis and response plans.
- Denmark's supports coordinated humanitarian needs-based response through OCHA, as well as Country-Based Pooled Funds and the CERF.
- Denmark supports collective efforts towards reducing needs and vulnerabilities through *The New Way of Working*, requiring governments, multilateral aid organizations and development banks, civil society to work together across humanitarian, development and peacebuilding
- Denmark is strengthening coherent analysis and more joined-up planning between humanitarian and development actors in protracted crises, as well as a stronger prioritisation of needs and vulnerabilities. E.g. Danish bilateral development programmes in in Somalia, Afghanistan and Uganda.
- Danish Red Cross has been a leader and advocate on the development of a revised approach to needs assessments within the RC Movement. Emphasis is made on stronger joint assessments and collaboration, but at the same time promoting and using the unique Red Cross access to an enormous and comprehensive network of volunteers in even remote communities as key informants, taking advantage of their knowledge and understanding of the local context.
- Denmark works to ensure that its international partner organisations and pooled funds include the needs and vulnerabilities of girls and women in humanitarian action. Funding proposal from Danish partner organisations are assessed according to how well they fall within Humanitarian Response Plans and target groups in need of strengthened protection because of specific age-, gender- and/or disability-related issues;
- Denmark supported Development Initiatives' work on "joined-up" data on needs as the basis for "joined-up" humanitarian and development action, with a focus on displaced populations and their host communities, and also including a strong gender dimension.

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 continue, together with other donors, to advocate for more joined needs assessments and data sharing.

4. Efficiency gains

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

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

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?

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

- 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.
- 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 and to enhance accountability to communities and people affected by crisis.

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 (CHS) 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.
- The CHS has been incorporated into the guidelines for strategic partnerships and in the review-guidelines.
- All Danish humanitarian strategic partners have been independently verified or certified against the quality criteria in the CHS or are in the process to become so.
- A CHS introduction workshop for Danish civil society organizations who are operating in fragile situations has been carried out in order to inform about the CHS and establish a dialogue about CHS verification/certification.
- The Danish Emergency Relief Fund (DERF), which is applicable by civil society organisations without strategic partnership, has been established. The DERF bases itself on the quality criteria of the CHS, and a new approach to CHS verification/certification of pooled funds is being elaborated in cooperation between the DERF and the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI).
- Denmark is among lead advocates for inclusion and engagement of marginalised groups in humanitarian action, with particular focus on women and womens' groups, persons with disability and youth, including by signing up to the *Charter for Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action* and as member of the *Compact for Young People in Humanitarian Action*.
- Danish strategic CSO 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.
- A coordinated approach to due-diligence requirements will be elaborated in cooperation between the MFA and the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI) in order to avoid duplication and overlap between systems.
- 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 CHS.
- 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

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

- The aim of applying the CHS is to make the humanitarian response more appropriate, relevant, effective and timely. Strategic partners that have gone through a CHS verification/certification process report that the CHS has made a difference in the way they are working and that their organizational approach has become more people centered.

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?

- Making the 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.
- As a concrete example of good practice, the strategic partners who have already gone through a CHS verification or certification process have better Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) safe-guarding systems in place than those who have not yet finalized the process.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

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

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

- In follow-up of the Grand Bargain, Denmark increased 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?

- Denmark sees multi-year planning and funding as key to incentivizing more effective and joined-up humanitarian-development work in fragile contexts.
- Denmark is working on blending humanitarian and development aid streams to fund vulnerability-oriented interventions in protracted or recurrent crises. Concrete action was taken e.g. in Ethiopian and Kenyan contexts where multi-annual bilateral

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

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

development programme interventions in the context of drought, famine and displacement were initiated in 2017. Similarly, in Uganda responding to displacement was included as one of the overriding objectives within the multiannual bilateral development programme. Likewise, multi-year development funding support was provided for durable solutions for Somali displacement-affected populations (2018-2020).

- Denmark has concluded multi-year agreements with WFP (2016-2019), UNHCR (2017-2020), UNICEF (2017-2019), UNFPA (2017-2019), UNRWA (2017-2021), UNDP (2017-2019). Denmark's use of multi-year financing aims at enabling international aid organisations to do multi-year planning and programming in protracted crises
- Denmark has provided multi-annual financing for the WB Global Concessional Financing Facility (2017-2021), the WB State and Peacebuilding Fund (2017-2020), including for the HDP nexus and Forced Displacement windows and for the Education Cannot Wait Fund (2017-2018).
- Denmark has entered into 4-year agreements with 17 Danish CSO partners (2018-2021) allowing for them to deliver more sustainable results for the fulfilment of the SDGs and alleviate human suffering. Denmark's use of multi-year financing aims at incentivising CSO partners to do multi-year planning and programming in protracted crises.
- Denmark participated in Grand Bargain Multi-Year Planning and Funding consultation workshop 12-13 September 2017, highlighting the linkages between workstream 7 on MYPF and workstream 10 on the humanitarian-development nexus in protracted crisis.
- Denmark supports Development Initiatives' research on "Changing humanitarian financing", including designing and piloting a methodology for measuring multi-year funding as well as recommending how to better report it in the future.

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 is working on strengthening its joined-up humanitarian and development analysis of needs and vulnerabilities for its bilateral development programmes and strengthening multi-year flexible planning and programming in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.
- Denmark continues to support the synergies between workstream 7 on MYPF and workstream 10 on the humanitarian-development nexus.

4. Efficiency gains

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

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 increased multi-year funding provided by donors requires 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.
- Focus of Denmark is on best practices that join up humanitarian and development interventions, with a view to reducing needs and vulnerability and building resilience, and which work on the ground.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

Aid organisations commit to:

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

Donors commit to:

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

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

2017:

- **Unearmarked contributions – 25.5 per cent**
- **Softly earmarked contributions – 9.5 per cent**

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

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

- 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 Country-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.
- **In 2017, Denmark reached Grand Bargain target of 30% of non-earmarked or softly earmarked humanitarian contributions:**
- Denmark's total humanitarian commitments in 2017 amounted to more than DKK 2.375 billion, of which DKK 605 million were non-earmarked core contributions to UN organisations, CERF and the ICRC.
- In 2017, in addition, Denmark provided DKK 225 million in softly earmarked contributions for Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs).
- **Thus, in 2017, in total Denmark reached DKK 830 million in non-earmarked or softly earmarked funding. This corresponds to 35% of Denmark's humanitarian funding being non-earmarked or softly earmarked in 2017.**
- In 2017 Humanitarian Partnership Agreements with UN agencies (UNHCR, UNFPA and UNICEF) and CSOs, flexible funds totalling DKK 667 million were included to enable the strategic partners to react swiftly and in a flexible manner through the deployment of personnel and through economic and material contributions for rapid use in sudden onset or rapidly deteriorating situations during the year.
- In its redesigned Strategic Partnerships with CSOs for 2018-2021, CSO partners have from 2018 the autonomy to use up to a maximum of one third of the agreed partnership budget as flexible funds.
- Denmark co-financed Development Initiatives research on "Changing humanitarian financing", including work on developing a more comprehensive and detailed baseline on unearmarked funding, track annual progress and making recommendations for better reporting and traceability.
- Denmark has submitted a proposal to DAC, on the revision needed of the Type-of-Aid codes in order to monitor the degree of earmarking.

3. Planned next steps

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

4. Efficiency gains

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

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 visibility provided on results of unearmarked funding will help maintaining high level of unearmarked 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?

Cf. Denmark's Self-report 2017:

- 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 UN-led 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.
- Denmark encourages its CSO partners to use own formats for reporting as long as a number of predefined strategic priorities are addressed, including approach to local partnerships and capacity development. The MFA further calls on Danish CSO partners to give importance to learning and value-for-money and focus on outcome-level changes with reference to the SDGs.

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 continuously engages with its CSO partners to take stock of the most appropriate formats for reporting.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Too early to report on efficiency gains, but the topic is addressed in technical reviews of Danish CSO partners.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

- Too early to report.

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?"

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Cf. Denmark's self-report 2017:

- 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 and UNDP have been the co-conveners of the work stream on humanitarian-development engagement in the Grand Bargain and since the signing of the Grand

Bargain have made efforts towards policy 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 2017, Denmark followed up with the 2017 joint 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?

- In line with Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Action *The World 2030*, 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.
- 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.
- 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 important.
- In line with its strategy, Denmark has redesigned its long-term partnerships with CSOs, strengthening strategic alignment with Danish priorities and the nexus between their humanitarian and long-term development engagement. Partnerships with CSOs 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.
- Denmark continued its support to the operational roll-out of The New Way of Working. After having hosted a high-level workshop on NWOW in Copenhagen in March 2017, and co-organized a NWOW round table discussion with the World Bank, OCHA, UNDP and g7+ finance and development ministers at the World Bank Spring Meetings in April 2017, Denmark participated in the conference on NWOW in Istanbul in May 2017 and in the NWOW regional workshop for Eastern and Southern Africa, held in Entebbe, Uganda, on 30 November-1 December 2017.
- The MFA is providing financial support to the H-D-P window under the World Bank's State and Peacebuilding Fund, which entails support for UN and World Bank Group collaboration in pilot countries affected by 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, in Uganda, Kenya and in the region affected by Somali displacement.
- Denmark has supported the engagement of the World Bank Group in this area, including through funding for its Global Program for Forced Displacement. Denmark is also supportive of addressing refugee crises through the IDA sub-window for refugees.
- Denmark is supporting Middle Income Countries hosting large refugee populations through its contribution of unearmarked funding of DKK 337,1 mio. for the World Bank-administered Global Concessional Financing Facility for 2017-2021. In this manner, Denmark helps provide infrastructure, health services and jobs to refugees and host communities, especially in Jordan and Lebanon.
- Supplementary humanitarian allocations to civil society organisations operating in Iraq and in relation to the Syria-crisis are assessed , i.a., on their ability to demonstrate a hum-dev approach.
- Denmark's commitment to a comprehensive approach to assist refugees is also demonstrated through Danish lead on the European 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 applied an approach joining up humanitarian and development work in its bilateral development programmes in Uganda, Bangladesh, Myanmar and Somalia.
- In 2017 and 2018 Denmark is supporting the Education Cannot Wait Fund, providing education in emergencies. Denmark is committed to a comprehensive approach to assist refugees in protracted crises, including providing education.
- In 2018, Denmark supports the EU in "Operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus", specifically in Uganda as a pilot country.
- As co-lead together with Japan on the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative's work stream on the humanitarian-development nexus, Denmark co-organized an event in October 2017 in Geneva where stakeholders shared their experiences on strengthening humanitarian-development joined-up work at country level.
- In view of supporting national systems to increase social protection programmes, Denmark is supporting 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 and vulnerability.
- Denmark participated in a workshop on "Greater Coherence across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus" held in November 2017 in OECD, Paris. The workshop explored operationalization of the HDP nexus and focussed at good practices in working towards collective outcomes.
- Denmark participated in the World Bank's Fragility Days in March 2018, highlighting best practices across relief and development, e.g. in famine crises on the Horn of Africa, in Uganda and Syria.
- In March 2018, Denmark organised a thematic meeting with its strategic partner CSOs on how to deliver on the Grand Bargain. The meeting highlighted three of the Grand Bargain work streams and Humanitarian –Development engagement (GB WS 10) was one of them.

- Denmark supported Development Initiatives' 2018 research on coherent approaches to resourcing for risk/response/resilience. DI's research also explore how joined-up data can improve coherent responses in protracted and recurrent crises, in line with the New Way of Working.

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)?

- On 7 March 2018, it was decided by Kristalina Georgieva and the Grand Bargain Facilitation Group in consultation with Co-Convenors UNDP and Denmark that workstream 10 should cease as a separate workstream, and that the humanitarian-development nexus should be applied in all work streams 1-9. This was done to ensure an integrated approach to the humanitarian-development nexus within the Grand Bargain, rather than "compartementalizing" it in workstream 10.
- In follow-up to this decision, Denmark is working as Grand Bargain signatory to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus in Grand Bargain workstreams 1-9, where relevant.
- A hum-dev approach is included as a criteria during consultations on the development assistance chapters of the Danish Finance Act.
- New country programming procedures are being prepared and will included both humanitarian and development aspects.
- Denmark will pursue an increased coherence and alignment of humanitarian and development instruments in Syria's neighbouring countries.

4. Efficiency gains

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

- Too early to report on efficiency gains.

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?

- New Way of Working must be upheld as a multistake-holder agenda, relevant not only to the UN, but also to the World Bank and MDBs, to governments and civil society.

With respect to settings of refugee-hosting countries:

- 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.