NGOs still believe that the Grand Bargain is a unique process to improve humanitarian action, but we are concerned by the absence of significant efforts dedicated to risk transfer and risk sharing.

We’re limited by the lack of clarity on the quid pro quo and future potential efficiency savings: Some NGOs are actively resourcing change, but the costs associated with, for example, the integration of IATI into internal management systems can act as a disincentive to adoption. We know it’s likely these costs will be offset in the future, provided the integration of IATI leads to a reduction in reporting requirements for example, but further clarity is needed on how related Grand Bargain commitments will come together.

Many of the changes required to meet the commitments of the Grand Bargain take time, because technical changes in projects frequently take more than one project cycle, and because culture changes require proper change management processes. This needs to be factored into the timeframe and monitoring mechanisms. We also should not arbitrarily choose a “sunset” date for the GB or its workstreams, without tying such decisions to significant measurable progress.

The Grand Bargain requires sustained political engagement both within institutions and across signatories, to identify and progress collaborative actions that will result in the greatest potential gains. We need to come together to prioritise the key commitments which will trigger transformative results which reach beyond the signatories alone.

Over the past year, attention has increasingly shifted towards the relevance of Grand Bargain commitments to field operations. We welcome and will support our members to engage in country level dialogues on what the Grand Bargain means for affected people, and providers of humanitarian assistance and protection, and efforts in support of country-level funding decisions and modalities which advance Grand Bargain commitments.