1. Background

Announced at the first World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016, the Grand Bargain\(^1\) is an agreement between donors and agencies which sets out a shared understanding, opportunities, and common vision of how to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian aid. Signatories include the main humanitarian donors, UN organisations, major NGO networks as well as ICRC and IFRC.\(^2\)

The Grand Bargain consists of 51 voluntary commitments, made under 10 work streams. With a light overarching structure (facilitation group, secretariat), the main fora to drive forward and to maintain an overview of the implementation of the commitments are the work streams, each of which is convened by two Grand Bargain signatories. Making the Grand Bargain become a reality requires working together collectively within and across work streams and commitments, but also each signatory to take the necessary steps internally. As there is no mechanism to enforce the implementation of the commitments, transparency on the Grand Bargain is key to ensure accountability towards the wider humanitarian community, affected populations and tax payers.

At the Grand Bargain meeting in September 2016 in Bonn, the signatories agreed that an independent annual Grand Bargain report will provide a qualitative trend analysis to see whether the ‘humanitarian system’ is on track to deliver the Bargain in the different work stream areas. The report will be presented at the annual Grand Bargain meeting in the margins of ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment meeting (21-23 June 2017).

In addition to the self-reporting against each work stream by each Grand Bargain signatory\(^3\), the independent, annual report is vital to understand to which degree progress has been made towards achieving the commitments collectively. The independent report will take the information provided in the self-reporting as starting point for the further analysis.

2. Objectives

- Provide an independent and impartial overview of the collective progress made one year after the signing of the Grand Bargain. (That means the "unit of analysis" is the collective work stream, not the individual GB signatory).
- Assess progress made and level of ambition for each work stream and scrutinize the level of ambition in the first year. Provide an estimation of the likelihood of efficiency gains induced by the steps taken (NOT actual measurement of efficiency gains which, as impact of the GB is

\(^1\) See Annex I – ‘The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Serve People in Need’
\(^2\) See Annex II – List of Grand Bargain signatories
\(^3\) Through a light and simple format, each Grand Bargain signatory will describe where they stood at the moment of signing the Grand Bargain (baseline), what concrete steps they have taken since (progress) and what is planned for in the immediate future. As far as possible, they are invited to describe the expected efficiency gains and best practices. These self-reports will be published at the same time as the independent report.
measurable only later, when the GB initiatives have been implemented at an operational level).

- Analyse to which degree the Grand Bargain has stimulated change in the narrative (or individual ‘game changers’) and thinking on humanitarian efficiency and effectiveness.

- Assess the 'Bargain of the Grand Bargain':
  - To which degree is there a quid pro quo between the different work streams (e.g. between transparency and harmonized/simplified reporting, or multi-year planning and funding/reduced earmarking and reduced management costs etc.)?
  - Do the various stakeholders (including among donors, UN organisations, Red Cross movement and NGOs) move forward at a similar pace? What are the factors enabling or constraining progress for each stakeholder?

- Suggest synergies between initiatives, identify barriers and enablers, highlight good practice and areas which require additional effort.

3. Expected outputs

1. An inception note to clarify overall approach, methodology and data collection
2. Report on progress of implementation of the Grand Bargain:
   a. Report, max 10000 words with 2-3 page executive summary
   b. Annexes with details on each work stream as necessary
3. Infographic, animated video or other communication tool for broader audience (outline of product to be agreed by the Facilitation Group)
4. As an annex: Suggested ways of measuring progress on implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments, in collaboration with work stream co-conveners, and data collected against these progress measurements.

4. Methodology and questions

Study questions:

1. To which degree have Grand Bargain signatories made progress in implementing the commitments?
2. Which are the work streams with the biggest substantial progress? Which are the factors that contribute to progress and which are the factors that hinder it? Which need additional attention and effort?
3. To which degree are the progress made to date and the launched initiatives likely to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian assistance?
4. What is the level of ambition in implementing the commitments of the work streams? What are best practices and opportunities for synergies? What are the main barriers and how can they be overcome?

Methodology:

- Desk study:
  o analysis of self-reports of Grand Bargain signatories and background material
review of monitoring by specific stakeholder initiatives, to be suggested by work stream co-conveners (such as NEAR network regarding localization, evaluations done e.g. under commitment 6 of the needs assessment work-stream)

- review of relevant reports, e.g. annual report on WHS, relevant OECD reports, IATI reports, GHD reports, mapping done by ICVA/IASC Secretariat to highlight collective action to implement the Grand Bargain and where it connects to the IASC

- In addition to the indicators explicitly defined in the Grand Bargain and by the work streams, formulate ways of measuring progress on work streams and commitments (as far as possible and in collaboration with work stream leads);
- Data collection against ways of measuring progress, comparative analysis of progress;
- Interviews with GB Sherpa’s and representatives of new GB members on their own strategy to implement Grand Bargain;
- Interviews with technical staff of GB signatories on GB relevant initiatives;
- Interviews with non-signatory stakeholders;
- A "traffic light" or similar, simple graphic system to highlight enabling and hindering factors to the implementation of the Grand Bargain implementation process at the work stream level;

Independence:

The annual report is drafted by independent, external experts who do not belong to any of the Grand Bargain signatory organisations and are not involved directly in any of the GB work streams (e.g. as humanitarian implementing organisations, "Humanitarian to Humanitarian" service provider or else).

Expert team shares draft report with Facilitation Group and signatories for comments and fact checking. Factual errors and methodological weaknesses and unsubstantiated findings are to be corrected. The conclusions and recommendations represent the opinion of the experts who have the final editing rights.

5. Timeline and inputs

Milestones and deadlines:

Contracting: December 2016

Start date: January 2017

Inception video-conference to clarify outline, methodology and data collection with Grand Bargain Facilitation Group: 3 weeks after start (based on inception note)

Inputs from self-report available: Early February 2017 (with updates provided until end of March)

Delivery of draft final outputs: April 2017

Finalization, including lay-out: May 2017

Launch: on the margins of ECOSOC HAS, 21-23 June 2017

Budget: XXX.000 EUR
**Expertise:** Core team of senior experts, assisted by technical experts covering all work stream topics. Graphic designers/publishers/infographist for publication, to be further defined.

**Management:**

- Day-to-day & contractual lead: ECHO and UNWOMEN
- GB Facilitation Group acts as Reference Group which approves expert team, inception note on methodology and final report.
- All GB signatories are invited to comment on draft final report for correction of errors and questions of methodology.