

Grand Bargain

Luxembourg annual self-reporting 2016-2017

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	3
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	3
Work stream 2 - Localization	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	5
2. Progress to date	5
3. Planned next steps	5
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	6
Work stream 3 - Cash	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date	7
3. Planned next steps	7
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	7
Work stream 4 – Management costs	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	8
2. Progress to date	8
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	9
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	10
2. Progress to date	10
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	10
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2. Progress to date	13

3.	Planned next steps	13
4.	Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	13
5.	Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	13
	Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	14
1.	Baseline (only in year 1)	14
2.	Progress to date	14
3.	Planned next steps	14
4.	Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	14
5.	Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	14
	Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	15
1.	Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2.	Progress to date	15
3.	Planned next steps	15
4.	Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	16
5.	Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	16

Work stream 1 - Transparency

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg follows IATI initiatives and seeks to improve the transparency of humanitarian resources.

Luxembourg reports all its contributions to EDRIS, which transmits the information to the Financial Tracking Service (FTS).

Published national data includes annual reports with funding data and the executive summaries of all external evaluations. These are freely accessible on the Ministry's website.

Luxembourg is also a member of MOPAN.

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?

N/A

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)?

Luxembourg is working on the development of a machine-readable database that will provide programmable aid data with quarterly updates. This system should be available in the second half of 2017.

Luxembourg will also seek to engage further with IATI and Development Initiatives on the question of publishing humanitarian data.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Luxembourg will continue its good practice of concluding Strategic Partnership Agreements, which provide UN agencies and specialised bodies as well as international humanitarian organisations with multi-annual, predictable funding. Our current Strategic Partnership Agreements cover the period up until 2020. Moreover, Luxembourg will also continue to provide yearly funding envelopes to national humanitarian NGOs. In line with our budgetary

procedures (and notably subject to parliamentary approval of the annual budget), these envelopes are renewed on a yearly basis and provide the NGOs with at least the same funding as in the preceding calendar year thus guaranteeing multi-annual predictability as well.

Work stream 2 - Localization

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg recognises the important role played by local and national actors in humanitarian crisis and considers this work stream to be one of the most important in the Grand Bargain.

Luxembourg has been contributing already for several years to Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPF) as well as to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Both funds enable support to local and national responders.

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?

Luxembourg has committed to greater use of funding tools such as CBPFs, CERF and DREF. Luxembourg has almost doubled its contribution to DREF in 2016 (compared to previous years) and has concluded its first multi-annual agreement with CERF in January 2017. The same applies for the CBPF, where Luxembourg's contribution has increased significantly in the last few years: Luxembourg provides annual support to six CBPFs, totalling 1.500.000 euros.

For humanitarian funding, Luxembourg has in principle no barriers in place that prevent the funding of projects of local or national NGOs. Luxembourg already does a number of non-Luxembourg based NGOs directly.

Moreover, the "General Terms and Conditions" for receiving Ministry funding for humanitarian projects have been revised to highlight the question of involvement local actors and local capacity building.

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)?

Luxembourg will increase its contribution to CERF by 5 % in 2018 and will substantially increase contributions to CBPFs. At the Oslo Conference Luxembourg pledged 250.000 EUR to the newly established Nigerian Humanitarian Fund. This support comes in addition to the support already provided for the Syria, DRC, CAR, South Sudan and Myanmar Humanitarian Funds. With this latest contribution, Luxembourg is doubling its initial promise of a 25% annual financial increase to CBPF taken at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul.

Luxembourg has started informal discussion with Luxembourg-based NGOs to debate how to take this question forward within our National Humanitarian Strategy. In the first instance, the

objective of these discussions is to reach greater understanding on how to interpret “as directly as possible”.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

The greater use of funding tools such as CBPFs, DREF and CERF and the fact that the money is allocated through an inclusive and transparent process in support of priorities set out and the fact that funding is available and prioritized at the local level by those closest to people in need, is of great success.

Luxembourg is in regular contact with its national NGOs in order to exchange best practices as they work closely with a wide range of local partners on the field. Special attention is given to the localisation marker debate and the importance of local capacity building.

Work stream 3 - Cash

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg recognizes the potential and value of cash-based assistance. Already before the Grand Bargain was signed, Luxembourg co-financed projects of NGO partners implementing limited programs emphasising on cash-based assistance.

Furthermore, Luxembourg also supported in June 2015 the establishment of common principles for multi-purpose cash-based assistance to respond to humanitarian needs the EU's Committee on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid (COHAFA).

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?

Luxembourg is supporting cash-based programming in WFP and UNHCR and continues to fund NGO projects that incorporate cash-based assistance (both conditional and unconditional).

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)?

Luxembourg will continue to support cash-based programming and is very interested in further studies on the risks and benefits of cash programming.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

Work stream 4 – Management costs

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg supports innovative solutions that help improve humanitarian coordination and help reduce management costs.

Through its www.emergency.lu platform Luxembourg provides satellite connectivity for humanitarian coordination and needs assessment and IT solutions such as tracking software and digital versions of field manuals and user guides for humanitarian agencies.

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?

Luxembourg strives to use shared procurement approaches and to avoid duplication or/and supplementary national donor assessments wherever possible.

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)?

Luxembourg will undertake a self-assessment for donors against the Core Humanitarian Standard with CHS Alliance in the second half of 2017.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Luxembourg will continue to favour shared procurement approaches and to avoid duplication or/and supplementary national donor assessments wherever possible.

Our national NGOs use as simplified version of the ECHO templates, thus reducing duplication.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg has always been a strong advocate of a strong and impartial needs assessment and is in favour of developing a better joint understanding of needs, capabilities, and appropriate response.

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?

We encourage our national NGO to participate in common needs assessment to enhance coordinated humanitarian planning and cooperation.

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)?

N/A

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Luxembourg conducts no national/individual needs assessments and avoids duplication.

Luxembourg financially supports the work of UNDAC and is a member of International Humanitarian Partnership (IHP).

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg engages in regular exchange with the NGOs that receive Ministry funding.

Luxembourg provides an annual flexible funding envelope to its main humanitarian NGO partners, which allows them to adapt their projects to changing circumstances on the ground.

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?

Luxembourg has engaged in a dialogue with its national humanitarian NGOs and field offices/embassies on strengthening local dialogue and feedback.

The inclusion of the needs of the most vulnerable form an integral part of the National Humanitarian Charter that the Luxembourg Government co-signed with its main humanitarian NGOs in May 2016.

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)?

N/A

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Luxembourg has signed a jointly elaborated “national humanitarian charter” with Luxembourg-based humanitarian NGOs in May 2016. With a special focus on inclusion of vulnerable groups. The “General Terms and Conditions” for Ministry funding have also been adapted in this light and special attention will be given to the involvement of local actors and local capacity building.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In line with GHD principles, Luxembourg was already committed to improving the quality of its funding by increasing the predictability and timeliness, while emphasizing on multi-year funding as well as a more flexible funding for humanitarian crises. Multi-year flexible funding arrangements (covering 4-to 5 year periods) are in place with ICRC, WFP, UNHCR, OCHA and UNISDR.

Similarly, Luxembourg is a long-standing supporter of pooled funds. In 2016, Luxembourg allocated 5,5 million euros to UN pooled funds, which were comprised of a contribution to the Central Emergency Response Fund (4,5 million euros) as well as a contribution to the mutual funds in CAR, DRC, South Sudan and Syria (250.000 euros to each Country Based Pooled Fund).

Moreover, Luxembourg-based humanitarian NGOs receive an annual (flexible) funding envelope.

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?

Multi-year funding instruments are in place both at the national and international level. Luxembourg has committed to multi-year funding in Afghanistan, RCA, Mali, Syria, DRC. In most of those cases, there has been a coordinated approach between humanitarian and development planning tools, the general assumption being that while humanitarian funding will decrease over time, development funding will have to increase proportionally.

A multi-year funding agreement (covering 2017-2018) was concluded with CERF.

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 share of multi-annual commitments will be increased to 60% by 2020. Moreover, in 2017, Luxembourg will allocate more than 6 million euros to UN pooled funds and plans to allocate a contribution in the first half of 2017 to the mutual funds in CAR, DRC, South Sudan, Syria, Nigeria and Myanmar (250.000 euros to each Country Based Pooled Fund).

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Currently the share of multi-annual commitments is at 50% of overall humanitarian funding.

Luxembourg will continue its good practice of concluding multi-year funding agreements, which provide UN agencies and specialised bodies as well as international humanitarian organisations with multi-annual, predictable funding. Our current Strategic Partnership Agreements with WFP, ICRC, UNHCR, UNISDR and OCHA cover the period up until 2020.

Moreover, Luxembourg will also continue to provide yearly funding envelopes to national humanitarian NGOs. In line with our budgetary procedures (and notably subject to parliamentary approval of the annual budget), these envelopes are renewed on a yearly basis and provide the NGOs with at least the same funding as in the preceding calendar year thus guaranteeing multi-annual predictability as well.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

In line also with GHD principles, multi-year and increasing un-earmarked funding has long been a priority for Luxembourg.

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?

Luxembourg will continue, together with its humanitarian partners, to foster multi-year funding agreements and un-earmarked funding.

Current multi-year funding agreements (Strategic Partnership Agreements) with WFP, ICRC, UNHCR, UNISDR and OCHA cover the period up until 2020. The level of non-earmarked funding varies depending on programmes but the general approach is to avoid earmarking altogether or to choose soft earmarking whenever possible. This objective has been stated clearly in the current multi-year funding agreements.

In an effort to increase un-earmarked funding, Luxembourg has also increased its contributions to country-based pooled funds by 50%.

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)?

Overall, Luxembourg intends to raise its level of un-earmarked and softly earmarked funding to 40% by 2020.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

Current level of non-earmarked funding varies depending on programmes but the general approach is to avoid earmarking altogether or to choose soft earmarking whenever possible.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg is very much in favour of a harmonized and simplified reporting

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?

N/A

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)?

Our national NGOs use as simplified version of the ECHO templates, thus reducing duplication.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

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

Luxembourg strongly believes in the need of safeguarding humanitarian principles and at the national level endeavours to maintain separate funding for humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and stabilization activities respectively. With this caveat in mind, Luxembourg strives to bridge the gap between prevention, humanitarian response and long-term recovery.

Whenever national humanitarian appeals are launched (as was the case in October for Haiti), development actors are associated in information session so that they can start planning a long-term approach already at the start of an emergency and are aware of the actions taken by their “humanitarian” counterparts. This improves coherence and coordination between the immediate humanitarian response and rehabilitation/reconstruction activities that will come in at a later stage.

Moreover, the “General Terms and Conditions” for Ministry funding include a “resilience funding instrument” which enables a bridging activity for reconstruction activities provided there is a clear link between the initial humanitarian project and the subsequent project.

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?

Luxembourg has committed to multi-year funding approaches in many humanitarian contexts (Afghanistan, CAR, Syria, Mali, Niger etc.) and aims to have a coordinated approach between humanitarian and development financial planning tools, the general assumption being that while humanitarian funding will decrease over time, development funding will have to increase proportionally.

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)?

Luxembourg will seek to further promote synergy and complementarity between humanitarian and development actors in the sectors of health (transition to health systems) and nutrition (food security and resilience), notably in Mali and RCA. However, there cannot be a one-size fits-all approach and a context specific approach will be important.

Luxembourg has also engaged with UNHCR on a study exploring how humanitarian principles can be safeguarded in a humanitarian-development nexus approach.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

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

N/A

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

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