



## 2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – Norway

### Contents

Introduction .....	5
Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	6
2. Progress to date.....	6
3. Planned next steps .....	7
4. Efficiency gains.....	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	7
Work stream 2 – Localization .....	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	8
2. Progress to date.....	8
3. Planned next steps .....	9
4. Efficiency gains.....	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	10
Work stream 3 – Cash.....	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	11
2. Progress to date.....	11
3. Planned next steps .....	13
4. Efficiency gains.....	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	13
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps .....	16
4. Further efficiency gains.....	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	16
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment .....	17

1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
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.....	19
3. Planned next steps .....	19
4. Efficiency gains.....	20
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	20
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding .....	21
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	21
2. Progress to date.....	21
3. Planned next steps .....	22
4. Efficiency gains.....	22
5. Good practice and lessons learned .....	22
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility.....	23
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	23
2. Progress to date.....	23
3. Planned next steps .....	24
4. Efficiency gains.....	24
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	24
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	25
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	25
2. Progress to date.....	25
3. Planned next steps .....	25
4. Efficiency gains.....	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	26
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement .....	27
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	27
2. Progress to date.....	27

3.	Planned next steps .....	28
4.	Efficiency gains.....	29
5.	Good practices and lessons learned .....	29



## Introduction

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the Ministry) is already doing many of the actions under the Grand Bargain work streams, as illustrated in the 2017 self-reporting exercise, which constitutes our baseline. Norway's Grand Bargain commitments are reflected in policy documents and help guide operational decision-making. The Ministry has hosted a series of thematic discussions on Grand Bargain commitments (localisation, cash, reporting) with Norwegian civil society organisations. In addition, the follow-up of Grand Bargain commitments is discussed in annual meetings with all Norwegian civil society partners and international partners that receive funding over the humanitarian budget. We are committed to exploring what more we can do in certain areas, together with our humanitarian partners. This includes a stronger focus on country-level implementation and pilots. In all its work to implement its Grand Bargain commitments, Norway will make sure that there is a focus on gender equality.

The Ministry is in the process of developing a new humanitarian strategy, of which our Grand Bargain commitments will be an integral part. Further measures will depend on the content of our new strategy.

## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report**

### **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?

- **Staff members from Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the Ministry) had meetings with the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) managed by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in Geneva, in 2017, with a view to strengthening our internal reporting capacity and discussing how the quality of reporting can be improved.**
- **Online training and guidance on FTS reporting has been provided for staff at the Ministry.**
- **New templates for grant agreements with the Ministry have been introduced, which contain a clause on transparency relating to contracts, partners and reporting (article 14 of the General Conditions).**

### 3. Planned next steps

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

- **We will continue to work on improving the quality of Norwegian FTS reporting, in collaboration with the FTS team.**

### 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 Norway's cooperation with its humanitarian partners is easily accessible. This creates a more predictable and transparent environment for all humanitarian 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?

- **The use of external data analysis has been valuable for informing internal strategic discussions and our dialogue with partners on issues related to funding.**

## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report.**

### 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.



- **Norway has continued to increase its support to the Country-based Pooled Funds (CBPFs), which allow donors to pool unearmarked funds to support local humanitarian efforts. In 2017, Norway contributed USD 41 million to eleven CBPFs (an increase from the USD 30 million provided to seven funds in 2016), and it remains one of the largest donors to the funds.**
- **We are also a central donor to the IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund, which we see as another important instrument for strengthening local and national first responders.**
- **Over the past year, Norway's engagement relating to the localisation agenda has become more strategic, and has explored what the commitments mean for Norway as a donor. The Ministry has had an ongoing dialogue with Norwegian NGOs that are working through local partners, especially Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and Caritas Norway, and has committed funding to these organisations in order to gain further experience with this operating model, including in the Lake Chad region.**
- **In June 2017, a meeting was held with Norwegian civil society on the topic of localisation, together with the IFRC.**
- **During the Oslo Humanitarian Conference on Nigeria and the Lake Chad Region, co-hosted with Germany, Nigeria and OCHA, Norway ensured that civil society from the region was represented and given a voice. Consultations with civil society in the four affected countries had been carried out by OCHA prior to the conference.**
- **The Nigeria Humanitarian Fund was launched at the same conference, establishing a mechanism for channelling funding to local actors. Norway was among the first donors to contribute to the fund.**
- **Based on the experiences gained from the Oslo Conference, Norway initiated a pilot project with NORCAP on strengthening the capacity of local civil society organisations in Chad and Niger – and of a regional civil society network established during the conference – while responding to the ongoing crisis. Depending on the results from the pilot phase, the project may be expanded to include Nigeria and Cameroon.**
- **The Ministry is engaged in strategic dialogue with organisations about their duties with regard to risk management for local partners.**

### **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)?

- **Norway is currently working on a new humanitarian strategy, which will be launched in August 2018. The strategy will address the question of localisation of humanitarian aid and set out how Norway intends to work in order to achieve this commitment.**
- **The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation's (Norad) revised principles for support to civil society will be finalised in the second quarter of 2018. The guidelines highlight the importance of local and national civil society in humanitarian and development response.**

#### **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 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?

- **Localisation is a complex process that is hard to track and quantify. The discussions would benefit from more focus on the quality of the partnerships, not just on quantitative targets and definitions. Furthermore, the importance of context-specific approaches also requires more attention. Different humanitarian situations call for different approaches, with international humanitarian actors playing a vital role in many crises (in line with the Grand Bargain principle that aid should be as local as possible and as international as necessary).**

## 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 the 2017 self-report**

### **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?

- **Norway has chosen to put extra resources into following up the Grand Bargain commitments on cash, and has sought to take a leading role globally in this area, with a special focus on donor coordination.**
- **In the role of co-chair, together with UK, of the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative's work stream on cash, Norway has sought to engage more donor countries in the cash agenda and contribute to better donor coordination. Two workshops have been held at Geneva level, with input from the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), NGOs and the UN.**
- **Following the GHD meeting in June, Norway has together with the US and the UK drafted a letter to be sent to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) on behalf of some donors, asking it to decide on – and issue – clear, actionable guidance on cash coordination leadership. The group of donors has identified the lack of clarity and consensus surrounding cash coordination throughout the**

programme cycle as a key impediment to scaling up and making effective use of cash assistance in emergencies.

- When members of the Grand Bargain work stream on cash met in May 2017, improved donor coordination was identified as one of six action points. Germany and Norway agreed to take on particular responsibility for following this up.
- In order to advance the goal of better donor coordination, Germany and Norway took the initiative to conduct a Joint Donor Mission on cash programming, and organised a mission to Jordan and Lebanon in collaboration with the World Food Programme (WFP) and UNHCR in February 2018. Humanitarian Directors and cash focal points from seven donor countries participated in the mission. The mission was seen as a unique arena for bringing donors and agencies together to identify challenges and overcome hurdles to advancing on cash commitments.
- During the course of 2017, Norway systematically raised and discussed the topic of cash with all humanitarian partners, conveying the message that cash should be considered alongside, or in combination with, other modes of delivery from the outset. Cash has also been a topic in all annual consultations with our humanitarian partners.
- With funding from the UK, Germany, ECHO and Norway, WFP is implementing an *unrestricted single cash transfer programme* for two years starting in October 2017, which provides a single unrestricted cash transfer for food and non-food essentials to the most vulnerable Syrian refugee families in Lebanon. WFP has agreed that the unrestricted single cash transfer programme will be subject to independent monitoring and evaluation (M&E), which will be carried out by a consortium of NGOs led by the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC).
- Norway has initiated a dialogue with Norwegian NGOs on the changing role of NGOs in situations where more humanitarian assistance is delivered as cash by one or several large actors. As part of the consultation process for the new humanitarian strategy, the Ministry hosted a thematic meeting on cash with all Norwegian partners. Representatives from the NRC shared their experiences of scaling up cash in hard-to-reach areas.
- With support from the grants for humanitarian innovation provided by NOREPS (the Norwegian Emergency Preparedness System, a network of public and private actors facilitated by Innovation Norway and funded by the Ministry), UN Women and the private sector have over the past year explored the possibilities that exist for using blockchain technology in humanitarian aid and development. With the support of NOREPS, UN Women and their private sector partners will conduct a pilot project on the ground this spring, focusing on building a secure digital identity and on cash transfers.
- Through the framework agreement with NORCAP (the NRC's expert deployment capacity) Norway has financed the Cash and Markets Capacity Development Roster (CashCap), a roster of cash experts used in multi-agency humanitarian response. Although many organisations have invested time and resources in training their own staff in planning and implementing cash programmes, there is still a lack of skills and capacity in the humanitarian sector.

### 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)?

- **Norway remains committed to playing an active role internationally to further advance the use of cash in the humanitarian field, including by testing out new models for delivery.**
- **Norway will continue its work within the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative, where its current mandate ends in June 2018.**
- **Norway will continue to be actively engaged in the Grand Bargain work stream on cash.**
- **Norway's new humanitarian strategy will establish that cash is the preferred mode of delivery in humanitarian response when appropriate, while acknowledging that it is not the right mode of delivery in all environments and will in most cases have to be accompanied by other response options.**

### 4. Efficiency gains

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

- **The use of cash as a mode of response can provide multiple benefits across the humanitarian field; first and foremost by giving the affected people greater dignity by involving them in decision-making about how their needs can best be met, and by stimulating local markets. Various studies have shown that people prefer the use of cash, and that cash assistance leads to increased purchasing power, a higher level of food security and a decrease in negative coping mechanisms. Furthermore, cash can contribute to improved coordination and cooperation among actors, as well as increased effectiveness and efficiency and greater accountability.**
- **As humanitarian actors increase their use of cash and more large-scale delivery schemes are tested, we expect to see further efficiency gains and wider acceptance of cash programming.**

### 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?

- **By paying considerable attention to cash in our ongoing dialogue and annual consultations with all our partners, Norway has contributed to raising awareness and strengthening its partners' commitments.**
- **The concrete action that has had the greatest impact in bringing the agenda forward is the Joint Donor Mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon, organised together with Germany, WFP and UNHCR.**
- **In general, donor coordination and joint messages have proved to be the preferred way of working.**
- **Gender analysis and gender mainstreaming should be used as a matter of course for cash benefit programmes.**

## 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?

- **Please see 207 self-report.**

**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?

- **Norway recognises the potential for increased use of technology in humanitarian response. As an example, we are funding the NRC's Digital Transformation Strategic Initiative, through our partnership agreement with the organisation. In this way, we are supporting the NRC's ambition to use data and technology to improve delivery.**
- **The Joint Donor Mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon helped illustrate the importance of technology for joint needs assessments and monitoring. It also illustrated how text messages and call centres can be used to improve communication with affected people. Another main finding from the Joint Donor Mission was that the wealth of data that exists could be used more effectively, and seen as a common good that can be used to improve programming across the system. All partners should make the most of technology to ensure appropriate access and appropriate data protection.**
- **In 2017, through a special Norwegian grant scheme mechanism on innovation in the humanitarian sector, Norway funded 11 separate innovation projects run by humanitarian civil society organisations, providing NOK 19.1 million in total. This included the funding of pilot projects on community-based surveillance, on the use of blockchain technology for open loop payments, on remote sensing of water systems, on making blockchain technology work for women and girls in crisis, and on the Internet of Things for climate early warning and recovery.**
- **In 2016 and 2017, Norway has funded a Humanitarian Innovation Platform that has led to improved collaboration on humanitarian innovation among Norwegian NGOs with humanitarian mandates (NOK 4 million in funding provided in total).**
- **The Ministry primarily supports and makes use of joint performance reviews, for example carried out by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN), rather than commissioning individual donor assessments.**

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

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

**- In 2018, Norway will launch a new grant programme for humanitarian innovation, with an innovation lab component and a scaling programme component. The programme will be developed in close collaboration with Innovation Norway, the Norwegian Government's instrument for innovation and development of Norwegian enterprises and industry, with a view to promoting humanitarian innovation in partnership with the private sector.**

### **4. Further efficiency gains**

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

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

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



## Work stream 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report**

### **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?

- **Norway continues to use 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 Ministry also provides funding for ACAPS and makes use of their assessments.**
- **Through field visits carried out during the year, Norway has seen the need for common needs assessments as a tool for ensuring a full understanding of the humanitarian situation and ensuring a coherent response.**
- **The importance of common needs assessments was one of the main findings of the Joint Donor Mission on cash programming to Jordan and Lebanon. While significant progress has been made in the two countries in terms of coming together to improve delivery for the affected people, there is still a need for greater harmonisation of the programme cycle. Donors appreciated the common needs assessment and common targeting approach used in Lebanon, and would like to see this used in Jordan, too. The group of donors agreed on the importance of optimising the effectiveness of our assistance to vulnerable people, including in ensuring protection, while further streamlining operations to avoid duplication and parallel systems.**

### **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)?

- **Norway will continue, together with other donors, to advocate more joint 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.

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

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

- **Norway acknowledges that cooperation between humanitarian and development actors on assessments in protracted crises can be challenging, but welcomes the commitments that have been made to move in this direction when appropriate.**

## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report.**

### **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 its annual consultations with its partners, the Ministry highlights beneficiary participation as a crucial cross-cutting goal in humanitarian assistance.**
- **Norway strives to play a leading role in this work stream, and promotes the issue at UN board meetings etc.**

### **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)?

- **Norway will continue to advocate increased beneficiary involvement in the design of response and feedback.**

- **The Ministry is looking into including standard Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) wording in agreement templates, including under reporting requirements.**
- **Accountability to affected populations will be a cross-cutting principle in the new humanitarian strategy.**

#### **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?

- **Documenting qualitative changes in AAP results is a challenge, as is the case with all qualitative results. It is important that UN agencies and other humanitarian organisations provide examples of good practice and lessons learned. Organisations should continuously review and revise their practices on the basis of this.**

## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report.**

### **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, the percentage of multi-year funding was 21.4 % (NOK 1.237 billion).**
- **The pledge to Syria and its neighbouring countries (2016-2019) continued to make up a substantial proportion of Norwegian humanitarian aid. As part of this pledge, Norway had ongoing multi-year letters of intent to support the work of UNHCR and UNICEF.**
- **In February 2017, Norway made a three-year pledge (2017-2019) to provide humanitarian and development funding for the Lake Chad region.**
- **In December 2017, Norway pledged to provide the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) with multi-year funding over a four-year period.**
- **Norway has approved multi-year planning and programming for selected protracted crises in multi-year agreements with Norwegian NGOs.**

---

<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](#).

### 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)?

- **Two multi-year agreements with Norwegian NGOs will be renegotiated and signed in 2018.**
- **As Norway is in the process of developing a new humanitarian strategy, further measures will depend on the content of the new strategy.**

### 4. Efficiency gains

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

- **The increased number of multi-year pledges and framework agreements enhances predictability and reduces administrative costs for Norway and for recipients of Norwegian funding.**

### 5. Good practice and lessons learned

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

- **Multi-year financing makes it necessary to focus on multi-year collaborative planning and response plans. Norway is committed to principled humanitarian action, but sees the need for response plans that can better link the activities of humanitarian and development actors in protracted crises, with a view to reducing vulnerability and building resilience.**

## 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:

**2017:**

- **Unearmarked contributions: 23.4 %**
  - **Softly earmarked contributions: 9.2 %**
- 

### **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 the 2017 self-report.**

### **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?

- **Norway has reached the Grand Bargain target of 30 % non-earmarked or softly earmarked humanitarian contributions.**

---

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

- **With the new multi-year agreement with CERF, Norway has committed to substantial amounts of unearmarked funding out of its total humanitarian budget.**

### **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)?

- **Norway remains committed to continuing to meet the Grand Bargain target.**
- **As Norway is in the process of developing a new humanitarian strategy, further steps will depend on the content of the new strategy.**

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

- **The increased flexibility for recipients provided by unearmarked funding and more comprehensive framework agreements will reduce total 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?

- **In Norway's agreement with OCHA, the combination of unearmarked funding to core activities and earmarked funding to the CBPFs, Norcap and GenCap has given greater flexibility, predictability and control.**



## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report**

### 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?

- **Norway is participating in the pilot project on harmonisation of reporting requirements.**

### 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)?

- **Norway will consider accepting annual reports (as opposed to project reports) from more partners. One example is the new multi-year partnership agreement we are entering into with the Norwegian Red Cross, where we are moving away from project reporting by donor to a consolidated annual report for the international programme as a whole. Norad and the Ministry have agreed to accept a common report for all areas except the financial report. This will simplify reporting procedures, and give an overview of the impact of the programme as a whole and of the various funding streams.**
- **When co-financing projects or programmes with other donors, Norway will accept joint reporting where this is feasible.**

### 4. Efficiency gains

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

- **Joint reporting has so far proved useful. It reduces the administrative burden on Norway and its partners. We expect efficiency gains both for Norway as donor and for the recipient organisation, as reporting will be more streamlined and strategic.**

## **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 alternative procedures for reporting used by the NRC in Syria have proved beneficial for ensuring that humanitarian aid is delivered to hard-to-reach areas.**
- **Participating in the reporting pilot project has not necessarily reduced the reporting burden on our partners, but Norway's objective is that the pilot will lead to reduced reporting requirements for humanitarian implementers collectively.**

## 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?

- **Please see the 2017 self-report.**

#### **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 Ministry remains committed to taking a comprehensive approach that both addresses the immediate humanitarian needs and identifies durable solutions for those affected by crisis. In 2017, the Ministry launched a new white paper on development, where this is one of the focus areas. In 2017, the Ministry also**

launched a new strategic framework for Norway's engagement in conflict prevention, stabilisation and resilience building.

- Norway remains committed to supporting full implementation of the 2016 QCPR resolution (71/243), including the provision on the need to work collaboratively in humanitarian emergencies to move beyond short-term assistance towards contributing to longer-term development gains, with the aim of reducing need, vulnerability and risk over time.
- Norway's engagement to promote education in crisis, the multi-year Syria pledge, efforts to increase the use of cash programming, and the increased focus on funding for national and local responders and multi-year funding are all examples of our efforts to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus.
- Norway's efforts to promote education in situations of crisis and conflict is one concrete example of how Norway is implementing the commitments of this work stream. Norway has helped to push education higher up on the global agenda. Norway is a major contributor to the Education Cannot Wait fund for education in emergencies (launched at the World Humanitarian Summit) and is actively engaged in efforts in this area. In 2017, the target of allocating at least 8 % of the humanitarian budget to education efforts was achieved.
- In the Syria crisis response, we strive to promote durable solutions and early recovery. Here, too, we are one of the main donors to education. In 2017, Norway doubled its contribution to the Global Concessional Financing Facility in support of Syrian refugees and host communities in Jordan and Lebanon.
- Norway is committed to finding durable solutions for refugees and internally displaced people, and supports the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework process both politically and financially.
- Norway supports the UN-World Bank Group partnership, by funding analyses and pilot projects on strengthening the humanitarian-development nexus. Norway also supports the ongoing review of the New Way of Working (which looks particularly at lessons learned from country-level implementation), in collaboration with OCHA and UNDP.
- Norad is working actively on the humanitarian-development nexus and is currently planning measures to increase access to sustainable energy in humanitarian crises/refugee camps. Moreover, Norad is continuing to develop a portfolio on health and humanitarian assistance and to work on promoting education in situations of conflict and crisis.

### **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)?

- **Norway's designated budget allocation to transitional assistance to countries affected by conflict will be increased in 2018. The allocation will be used for**

**strategically important measures to prevent and resolve crises as well as to promote stabilisation as a basis for peacebuilding and long-term development.**

- **Norway's new humanitarian strategy will consider the humanitarian-development nexus and follow-up of the Grand Bargain. We are interested in further exploring how we can provide incentives for more joint action when appropriate.**
- **Norway will continue its ongoing work and initiatives under this work stream.**

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

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

- **The humanitarian-development engagement work stream is a challenging one. Progress is hard to measure. However, ensuring this work stream's success will benefit people in need, particularly people suffering under protracted crises.**

#### **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?