



## **InterAction**

### **Grand Bargain Self-Report 2018**

This report provides an update on InterAction's efforts to fulfil its commitments as a signatory to the Grand Bargain. It details activities undertaken throughout the course of 2017.



## 2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – [Name of Signatory]

### Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency .....	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	4
2. Progress to date .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3. Planned next steps .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Efficiency gains .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Work stream 2 - Localization .....	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	7
2. Progress to date.....	7
3. Planned next steps .....	9
4. Efficiency gains .....	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	9
Work stream 3 - Cash .....	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	10
2. Progress to date.....	10
3. Planned next steps.....	10
4. Efficiency gains .....	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	11
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	12
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	13
2. Progress to date.....	13
3. Planned next steps.....	13
4. Efficiency gains .....	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	14
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	16
2. Progress to date.....	16
3. Planned next steps.....	16
4. Efficiency gains .....	16

5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	16
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution .....	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	17
2. Progress to date.....	17
3. Planned next steps.....	17
4. Efficiency gains .....	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	18
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding .....	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2. Progress to date.....	19
3. Planned next steps.....	19
4. Efficiency gains .....	20
5. Good practice and lessons learned .....	20
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	21
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps.....	22
4. Efficiency gains .....	22
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	22
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....	23
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	23
2. Progress to date.....	23
3. Planned next steps.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Efficiency gains .....	23
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	23
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	24
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
4. Efficiency gains .....	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	25

## 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?

### **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?

InterAction recently made upgrades to its grant management systems to include the humanitarian fields represented in the IATI 2.02 standard. InterAction has since updated all of its humanitarian grants and published these to IATI in conjunction with our development grants that InterAction has been publishing to IATI since 2015. Additionally, in 2017, InterAction included the new humanitarian fields in its public member data collection interface [NGO Aid Map](#). NGO data captured through NGO Aid Map automatically updates to IATI regularly.

InterAction provided a presentation at the Development Initiatives (DI) workshop on IATI for humanitarian actors in Washington DC in April, 2017. Following the workshop, InterAction consulted with its members to better understand obstacles and enablers for prospective NGO publishers. These consultations informed a briefing note outlining recommendations for DI's and Grand Bargain signatories' consideration. InterAction participated in an IATI Secretariat call to discuss upgrades to the IATI standard that were specific to Grand Bargain commitments.

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

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

In April 2018, InterAction will host a workshop open data for transparency for humanitarian and development actors. The workshop will focus on supporting InterAction members on how to publish to IATI and will feature an overview of various aspects of IATI including the user community, the initiative, the governance structure and the standard itself. The workshop will also feature a demonstration of Aid Stream, lessons learned from the InterAction [Initiative for Open Agricultural Funding](#) (Open Ag), and a roundtable discussion on how to use IATI data to enhance learning, coordination, and collaboration with implementing partners.

In the next two years, InterAction will be updating and integrating its grant and financial management systems to publish forward looking budget information as part of our organization file and financial transactions as part of our activity file.

InterAction is also focusing on program development, building off a model refined through its Gates' Foundation funded Open-Ag project, to secure funding for a series of field focused pilots that would focus on user needs research to inform how the IATI standard, publication tools, and other activities should evolve to better meet humanitarian needs, capacity strengthening for quality data publishing, and data use.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

As a small and well-coordinated organization, InterAction does not expect to realize efficiency gains through publishing InterAction's own data. Rather, we anticipate these gains will be achieved through using other organizations' data once published to strengthen coordination, collaboration, partnerships, and learning. To increase efficiency around publishing itself, we need to see upstream changes to donor reporting requirements which would reduce duplicative reporting demands through consolidation or harmonization.

## **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?

Throughout 2017, InterAction focused on better understanding the obstacles and needs of publishers, particularly NGOs. Efforts to better understand these needs have been complemented by InterAction's expertise derived from the Open Ag project and also, largely through bilateral, ad hoc discussions with NGOs and other Grand Bargain signatories.

InterAction's success and progress throughout the last year has been, in many ways, attributed to institutional capacity in the form of dedicated staff resources around open data and transparency. These resources preceded InterAction's commitments to the Grand Bargain, but have directly contributed to the organization's ability to realize progress on commitments.

## Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

---

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

Building off of its 2016 *NGOs and Risk* study, InterAction is currently implementing Phase II of NGOs and Risk which examines how national and local NGOs contend with different types of risk, and how risk is managed within national-international partnerships. InterAction kicked-off the study in October 2017 with funding provided by USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. The study will include global and field data collection in complex, conflict-driven crises to build a body of empirical evidence on the risks present in partnerships between INGOs and local NGOs and how they are managed. The study will:

- Build on the Phase I findings by enhancing operational INGO understanding and enabling learning on risk allocation between INGOs and local actors.
- Examine the traditional financial, contractual and institutional support mechanisms INGOs use to assess and mitigate risks with local partners, and the extent to which these mechanisms are effective.
- Enhance action and support by providing analysis on context-relevant risk transfer solutions through educational outreach, information sharing and the development of a best practice guide.
- Provide concrete recommendations on how to identify and manage risk more effectively with local actors. These will be used to encourage improved policy coherence on risk in relevant humanitarian reform processes and with critical stakeholders.

Additionally, InterAction continues to convene its working groups to discuss localization in practice. For example, InterAction's Protection Working Group convened a meeting this year to discuss lessons learned from localization efforts and provide updates on relevant initiatives such as the Child Protection AoR's Preliminary Conceptual Framework for Localization in Child Protection Coordination. During InterAction's annual summit of NGO National Coordination bodies, InterAction led a special roundtable discussion with NGO coordinators on the opportunities and challenges with localization efforts in the field. The discussion featured special insights from the Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief and Development (ACBAR) and the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF).

InterAction continues to integrate "localization" into its existing partnership analysis. For example, InterAction, in partnership with UNHCR and HIAS, incorporated questions related to localization within the 2017 annual UNHCR-NGO partnership survey. 48% of the NGO respondents identified as a national NGO and survey findings were disaggregated to highlight national NGO responses thematically and geographically. The survey asked three questions related to localization.

Similarly, InterAction continued to integrate localization considerations into recent policy and practice missions. Building off of a March 2017 protection field mission, the [findings of which highlighted roles and recommendations regarding local actors](#), InterAction undertook an additional mission that included the perspectives of local and national actors, detailed in the report [Strengthening humanitarian action to address protection issues in Rakhine, Myanmar: Human Trafficking, a case example](#).

InterAction participated and highlighted the importance of partnerships with local governments by engaging with *United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)*, an umbrella



organization for cities, local and regional governments, and municipal associations, in disaster risk reduction and humanitarian response in Paris, October 2017.

### **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)?

InterAction will continue carrying forward the Risk Phase II research. Field research in 2018 will focus on consultations with local actors at the frontline level. Global level analysis will also include an online survey for national NGOs that will be broadly disseminated to ensure the study captures the broad range of local NGO perspectives. The study findings will be available in early 2019 and InterAction anticipates briefings will be held with key stakeholders in the US and in Europe.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

No efficiency gains can be directly attributed to these efforts.

### **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?

Nothing significant to report.

## Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

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

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

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

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

### **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)?

InterAction will continue to play a convening role for NGO thought leadership on cash as needs arise and in line with member contributions and interest. InterAction, through its country and sector-specific working groups, continues to convene thinking about innovative delivery modalities and lessons learned. For example, in March 2018, InterAction will host a briefing on a new toolkit for humanitarian practitioners on GBV considerations in cash-based interventions developed by IRC, Women's Refugee Commission, and Mercy Corps.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

No efficiency gains can be directly attributed to these efforts.

**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?

Nothing significant to report.

## 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?

### **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?

InterAction continues to advocate for more streamlined and responsive humanitarian financing and implementation. For example, in 2017, InterAction published a policy paper on [U.S. Government Humanitarian Reform Outcomes](#) which highlighted recommended outcomes that would lead to improvements in U.S. humanitarian assistance in terms of efficiency, quality and effectiveness in addressing modern humanitarian challenges. InterAction prepared the paper in consultation with 15 NGOs. Recommendations included efforts to review, simplify and harmonize reporting mechanisms, funding instruments for the rapid and streamlined distribution of unearmarked funds, increased multi-year funding, and decreased reliance on pass-through mechanisms and improved partnership agreements, among others.

InterAction continues to advocate for and support efforts to improve partnerships, advocating for streamlined processes and reduced burdens. For example, InterAction facilitated two NGO member consultations on the UNHCR-UNICEF-WFP partner portal. InterAction also participated in the portal launch orientation to explain the mechanisms and facilitated 12 NGO participants in the portal pilot in January 2018. InterAction included the partner portal feedback opportunities into existing its ongoing partnership data collection and analysis.

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

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

InterAction will continue to enhance its work to improve bilateral and multi-lateral partnerships with NGOs through improved policies and practice that enhance collaboration and inclusive decision-making.

Additionally, InterAction's Risk Study Phase II – Local Actor Partnerships seeks to expand the evidence base of the state/strength of INGO-LNGO partnerships in relation to

multidimensional risk and identify areas for collective improvement within INGO-LNGO partnerships.

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

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

Nothing significant to report.

#### **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?

Nothing significant to report.

## 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?

### **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, InterAction convened and led a conference with donors, NGOs and UN Agencies to discuss the need to improve joint assessments for multi-sectoral settlements-based programming and coordination and flexible multi-year funding. Twenty-eight humanitarian organizations were represented.

### **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)?

InterAction is the co-chair of the settlements working group of the global shelter cluster. In this role, InterAction will continue to support collective efforts to roll out pilots for joint assessments for multi-sectoral settlements-based programming.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

Nothing significant to report.

### **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?

Nothing significant to report.



## Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

*Aid organisations and donors commit to:*

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

*Donors commit to:*

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

*Aid organisations commit to:*

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

---

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

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

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

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

In July 2017, InterAction hosted a webinar titled "PSEA: Spotting the early warning signs of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA)." Speakers from ACF and Report the Abuse highlighted potential indicators of increased risk of SEA in humanitarian responses, which should trigger preventive action by individual organizations and collective action by multiple actors.

### **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)?

Nothing significant to report.

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

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

Nothing significant to report.

#### **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?

Nothing significant to report.

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

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

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

---

**Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request:** Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements<sup>2</sup> you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.<sup>3</sup> When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

---

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

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

### 2. Progress to date

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

In InterAction's program development efforts to support our members' work, teams are increasingly using multi-year planning lenses and collaboration across teams to ensure longer term connectivity and relevance. InterAction is increasingly undertaking joint planning and program overview meetings between InterAction's humanitarian and global development teams to examine linkages and collaboration points across longer planning horizons. InterAction also participated in the multi-year planning and funding workshop in 2017 hosted by UNICEF and Canada.

### 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)?

---

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

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

InterAction is seeking longer term commitments from donors for several programs while also integrating longer-term and more predictable and flexible funding into the organization's advocacy work on U.S. foreign assistance.

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

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

InterAction carries multiple grants with program cycles between 15 and 18 months. These longer-term grants allow the organization to be more nimble and responsive. These longer-term program cycles have also encouraged program continuity resulting in increased cross-team collaboration particularly between InterAction's humanitarian and global development teams.

#### **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?

One challenge that remains with multi-year funding is that not all donors share common funding calendars or timelines. This lack of alignment creates limitations on how much an implementing agency can leverage different donor programs that could be mutually beneficial and complementary. This also impedes the degree to which an organization can accurately commit cost-sharing to new donors because grant cycles do not align.

InterAction has been encouraged by greater focus from donors on multi-year approaches, however this does not necessarily translate to multi-year funding. Often multi-year approaches are only guaranteed one year of funding, again requiring the risk for any matching or ensuring program continuity rests with the implementer.

## Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

*Aid organisations and donors commit to:*

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

*Aid organisations commit to:*

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

*Donors commit to:*

- 5. Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020<sup>4</sup>.*

---

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

InterAction continues to integrate the need for flexible funding into all of its foreign assistance advocacy.

### **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)?

Nothing significant to report.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

Nothing significant to report.

### **5. Good practices and lessons learned**

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

In the current environment, we are finding that donors are more willing to provide funds tied to specific projects and deliverables rather than flexible core funding that would allow us to be adaptable in design.

## Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

*Aid organisations and donors commit to:*

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

---

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

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

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

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

In 2017, InterAction supported ICVA by convening a NGO consultation with Washington DC on the ICVA-Germany reporting pilot. InterAction also participated in the reporting pilot workshop launch and engaged with NGOs bilaterally to encourage participation.

InterAction continues to stress the importance of streamlined and efficient reporting mechanisms from donors. For example, in 2017, InterAction advocated for the US government to [develop a common partner reporting framework/template across each of its humanitarian offices](#).

### **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)?

Nothing significant to report.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

Nothing significant to report.

### **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?

Nothing significant 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?

#### 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?

InterAction continues to prioritize development and humanitarian collaboration internally and also engagement with a broad array of actors beyond the humanitarian field. For example, much of InterAction's efforts focused on transparency and open-data in humanitarian action has been informed by InterAction open data programs with development focused NGOs and partners. InterAction teams recently prepared a concept



note for open-data in humanitarian action using a change model developed and refined through its Gates' Foundation funded [Initiative for Open-Agricultural Funding](#).

Externally, InterAction continues to pursue innovative advocacy strategies that target a broad range of influencers in the development and security sectors with the aim of improving outcomes for people in crises. In late 2017, InterAction organized an NGO consultation on efforts to define and operationalize the New Way of Working (NWOW) and humanitarian-development nexus. Discussants included OCHA's Policy Development and Studies branch, a representative from the joint IASC-UNDG-cluster coordination mission for Sudan, and an operational NGO perspective on the materialization of these approaches within the Syria response. InterAction provided a read out from the ad hoc IASC Working Group meeting.

InterAction has also been deeply involved in policy and practice discussion on how to take longer-term, development-oriented approaches to refugee assistance through UNHCR's Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) application. InterAction is on UNHCR's CRRF NGO taskforce and convenes its members to discuss these issues through its Refugee Policy Working Group. InterAction has also advocated around comprehensive and longer-term approaches to assisting refugees and host communities through its [inputs into the process to develop a Global Compact on Refugees](#).

InterAction facilitated discussion with local governments, donors, NGOs and UN Agencies to strengthen implementation of Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) during the Global Platform for DRR in Cancun, Mexico 2017. InterAction will continue to engage in monitoring of the SFDRR and the role of preparedness and response in disaster- and conflict-prone countries.

InterAction is also an active participant in the IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian Development Nexus.

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

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

We plan to provide feedback on future drafts of the GCR focused on greater connectivity between humanitarian/development investments and activities.

### **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?