



Humanitarian Aid

Photo: Cordaid

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Organisation Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague | Publication Date May 2020 | Reporting Period reports received between 1 October 2018 - 30 September 2019 |
| Budget Holder: | | |

Result area 1 - Crisis Response Humanitarian Assistance

RESULTS

Geopolitical instability and protracted crises combined with poverty, rapid population growth and climate change are proving to be a dangerous cocktail. As a result, humanitarian crises are now far more complex, last longer (nearly 10 years on average) and affect many more people than in the past. In 2018/2019, 136 and 132 million people respectively were in need of humanitarian aid. In this period, the Netherlands provided EUR 774 million (2018/19) to address these needs. Indicator 1a shows how many people were reached via Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Red Cross and UN partners with Dutch funding in 2018/2019. It should be noted that these numbers are likely to include double counting. These are partners working in the same countries and it is likely that beneficiaries have benefited from services of various organisations and within multiple sectors.

Quality, appropriateness and effectiveness of aid

To ensure quality of aid, international quality standards are developed, such as the SPHERE Standards and the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS). Indicator 1.1b demonstrates the degree to which the CHS has been endorsed by humanitarian partners. The number of Dutch-funded humanitarian partners that have formally endorsed the CHS is quite low. However, this does not mean that quality standards are not being used by partners to ensure the highest quality of aid. Included in the standards is the involvement of people affected by crisis in all phases of the response, to ensure its appropriateness. Indicator 1.1d provides examples of where and how affected populations have been engaged in the response. Cash-based programming is considered an important tool to give people affected by crisis greater choice and empowerment, and to strengthen local markets (see indicator 1.1.1c).

To ensure effectiveness of humanitarian aid, adherence to International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and Humanitarian Principles, the Netherlands has intensified its humanitarian diplomacy efforts. In specific crises, such as Yemen, Syria and South Sudan, the Netherlands has consistently advocated for humanitarian access, protection of civilians and adherence to IHL (see indicators 1.2.1a, 1.2.1b, 1.2.1c and 1.2b1).

Integration of MHPSS in responses

Crisis victims have an elevated risk of anxiety, depression and other disorders that interfere with a person's normal functioning. Besides directly causing psychological suffering, humanitarian emergencies damage the social networks people need in order to join forces in dealing with problems and working on reconstruction. Mental healthcare and psychosocial support should be a standard part of the package of assistance and services offered to crisis victims. Despite the great need for these services, however, they are not a priority in humanitarian response operations. There is an acute shortage of professionals with the expertise to identify mental health and psychosocial support requirements and provide assistance. From 2019 onwards, all humanitarian partners are encouraged to take mental health needs into account from the very outset of a humanitarian crisis, from needs assessment, to the design of interventions, advocacy and evaluation of programmes. The Netherlands organized an international conference on mental health, "Mind the Mind Now" in Amsterdam, bringing together experts, practitioners, donors and journalists to put this priority on the agenda of the humanitarian sector. Partners have started to show awareness of the importance and are starting to plan and report on MHPSS (indicator 1.1.2.a).

Timeliness and flexibility of Dutch contributions to humanitarian aid

When it comes to humanitarian assistance, the Netherlands has a solid reputation in the international community and in the humanitarian sector. As a humanitarian donor, the Netherlands is known for its reliability, predictability and flexibility. This is extremely important for humanitarian organisations, as it allows them to respond to urgent needs swiftly, to invest in fragile and potentially volatile situations and to respond to neglected crises. Therefore, 61% of all Dutch humanitarian funding is provided unearmarked (see indicator 1.1.1a). In order to increase predictability and stability, funding is provided on a multi-annual basis where possible (see indicator 1.1.1b). The Dutch Relief Alliance for example has currently 8 multi-annual responses to protracted crises. Furthermore, funding that is provided early in the year allows effective planning by humanitarian organisations. Funding to NGOs was largely transferred in the first quarter of the year. However, a delay was incurred due to negotiations on core contributions to UN partners about the inclusion of a clause in funding agreements on the prevention and reporting of breaches of integrity (indicator 1.1.1e).

INDICATORS

| INDICATORS | Results | Source |
|--|--|--|
| ST_1a Number of people (f/m) reached with humanitarian assistance | <p>Country Based Pooled Funds: 6.878.830</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nigeria: 2.540.493 (female: 1.363.484/ male: 1.177.009) - DR Congo: 337.717 (female: 183.014/ male: 154.702) - Yemen: 804.228 (female: 453.705/ male: 350.523) - Somalia: 185.861 (female: 109.378/ male: 76.483) - Turkey (cross border): 653.497 (female: 358.183/ male: 295.314) - Syria: 325.872 (female: 185.794/ male: 140.078) - Iraq: 1.167.691 (female: 594.968/ male: 572.723) - South Sudan: 863.471 (female: 485.503/ male: 377.968) <p>Unearmarked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNICEF: 500.850 - UNHCR: 852.720 - WFP: 334.080 - UNRWA: 22.000 - CERF: 4.182.000 - ICRC: 1.365.812 - START Fund: 540.544 <p>Dutch Relief Alliance: 3.207.998</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protracted Responses: 2.391.412 - Acute Crises: 816.586 | <p>4000001892; 4000001903; 28544; 28711; 28771; 4000000863; 4000001136; 4000001183; 27463; 27572; 29627; 29749; 4000000029; 4000000086; 4000000397; 4000000899; 4000001160; 4000001161; 4000001163; 4000001164; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001180; 4000001191; 4000001261; 4000001388; 4000001395; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001512;</p> |
| ST_1.1b Percentage of partner organisations that endorse the Core Humanitarian Standard | <p>An average of 28% of all humanitarian partners of MFA are in a phase of CHS certification, self-assessment or verification.</p> <p>All 15 DRA members strive to become CHS certified before the end of 2021. Currently, 7 members are in a phase of self-assessment or verification.</p> | <p>4000001892; 4000000899; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001583; 4000001802</p> |
| ST_1.1d Examples of involvement of people affected by crisis in all phases of the response | <p>The level of involvement of people affected by crisis in all phases of the response varies across partners and responses. The Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) encourage partners to incorporate Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) mechanisms in the various cycles of programming, and require them to establish a formal complaint mechanism to receive feedback. Improving accountability and participation of people affected by crisis is one of the strategic priorities for the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA). To improve its AAP mechanisms, the ICRC adopted the AAP Framework in November 2018. Below are two examples of how involvement of people affected by crisis is operationalized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Nigeria, the DRA Joint Response involved local communities in the selection of their community representatives. Community leaders were involved in the selection and finalization of selection criteria, as well as the identification of beneficiaries. The list was shared subsequently and community members who had complaints regarding the procedure could voice those through the complaint and feedback mechanism. Beneficiaries participated in the implementation stage in various ways, e.g. by participating in the selection of sites for safe spaces and in focus group discussion to decide on the design of a cook stove. Implementing organizations selected volunteers, animators and facilitators to ensure community participation in the delivery of activities. - The Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) was the first CBPF to incorporate a Beneficiary Verification Mechanism (BVM) to reach out to more beneficiaries in remote villages to eventually increase the number of beneficiaries interviewed to assess the quality of services provided to them by YHF partners. | <p>4000001892; 27463; 27572; 4000000029; 4000000086; 4000001160; 4000001161; 4000001163; 4000001164; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001180; 4000001191; 4000001261; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001583; 4000001693; 4000001802; 4000000899; 400000408; 4000001671; 400000196; 4000000634; 400000097; 4000000566; 4000000866; 27467; 27270; 4000000118; 4000000119; 4000000130; 4000000169; 4000000275; 28911; 28877; 28679; 28498; 28367; 28101</p> |
| ST_1.1f Number of HRP that include MHPSS | <p>Of the 23 Humanitarian Response Plans, 15 included a response to MHPSS, though to varying degrees. It is important to note that the most recent HRP was reviewed, but for some countries the 2020 HRP was not yet available. The 2020 plans demonstrate an increased focus on MHPSS, compared to 2019 plans. It is likely that there will be an increase in the number of HRP that include MHPSS. It is likely that the increased focus on MHPSS is due to Dutch advocacy efforts.</p> | <p>MINBUZA-2020.78771</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| ST_1.1g Extent to which responses were timely | <p>The DRA acute crisis block grant enables the alliance to quickly respond to humanitarian crises. Within 72 hours of a sudden onset crisis, DRA organizations are able start the first response activities. Funds for crisis response are transferred by MFA at the beginning of the year and serve as a fund from which the DRA can cover crisis operations.</p> <p>The Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) set targets at fund level, but most funds have the same target of 60 days for standard allocations and 20 days for reserve allocations. Most funds were able to allocate funds much faster than this target. Few funds exceeded the targets with a few days.</p> <p>The Netherlands supports the START Fund for its niche in responding to small underfunded emergencies and peaks in protracted crises. Due to its decentralized decision-making process, the fund is able to allocate funding within 72 hours of an alert being raised. In 2018, the average time between the raising of an alert and the disbursement of funds was 66.2 hours.</p> | 4000001892; 4000000086; 4000000899; 4000001160; 4000001161; 4000001163; 4000001164; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001180; 4000001191; 4000001261; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001583; 4000001693; 4000001802 |
| ST_1.1.1a Percentage of Dutch unearmarked humanitarian funding | 61% | |
| ST_1.1.1b Percentage of Dutch multi-year humanitarian funding | 75% | |
| ST_1.1.1c Percentage of humanitarian funding provided as cash assistance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRA: 22% on average - WFP: 35% - UNICEF: 6,8% - UNHCR: 20% | 4000001892; 4000000086; 4000001161; 4000001163; 4000001164; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001180; 4000001191; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001583; 4000001693; 4000001802; |
| ST_1.1.1e Percentage of humanitarian budget disbursed in Q1 | 16% | |
| ST_1.1.1f Number of programs by partners that achieved Gender & Age Marker (GAM) score 3 of 4 | <p>Not all partners provide data on this indicator. The CBPFs use a slightly different scale, in which scores 2a and 2b correspond to scores 3 and 4 of the GAM. Data is based on project proposals, rather than monitoring visits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nigeria HF: 60 projects (85%) - DRC HF: 103 projects (89%) - Somalia HF: 110 projects (92%) - Turkey HF: 105 projects (86%) - Iraq HF: 75 projects (89%) - South Sudan HF: 213 projects (95%) | 28655; 4000001191; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001448; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001583; 4000001802 |
| ST_1.1.1h Examples of increased coherence between Dutch funded humanitarian assistance, development cooperation and peace building interventions | In view of the prevention of human suffering, the Netherlands aims to enhance linkages between humanitarian assistance, sustainable development and peace building. In 2019 the OECD DAC adopted a Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus, with input from the Netherlands. This Recommendation serves as the framework in which the Netherlands will operationalize the linkages between the different interventions. | |
| ST_1.1.2a Examples of integration by partners of MHPSS in needs assessments and responses | <p>Overall, examples of integration of MHPSS in the responses of humanitarian partners were scarce. However, the assessed 2020 HRP demonstrate an increased focus on MHPSS as an integral component of the humanitarian response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DRA Iraq Joint Response: World Vision International initiated a non-specialized MHPSS integration in Iraq, the so called 'Problem Management Plus' module. In addition, specialized MHPSS services were provided through psychologists and psychiatrists. Through community recreational centres, 6.209 children were supported with MHPSS services. - In 2018, the ICRC continued its work with Movement partners to align efforts on psychosocial support and strengthen mental health services in humanitarian crises. In collaboration with the IFRC and the Swedish and Danish Red Cross, the ICRC launched a new project on mental health. | 4000001164; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001448; 4000001583 |
| ST_1.2.1a Number of Dutch advocacy efforts for access, protection and IHL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed statement by multiple donors, among which the Netherlands, on donor principles and action in South Sudan to ensure donors can contribute to humanitarian aid that is in adherence with humanitarian principles. The statement has been presented to the Speaker of the Transitional National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of South Sudan. - Multiple letters (by donors including the Netherlands, International NGOs and the Humanitarian Coordinator) were sent to Houthi authorities to address breaches of humanitarian principles and to advocate for unhindered access of humanitarian workers. | |
| ST_1.2.1b Number of trainings to partners (e.g. Clingendael, INSO, Geneva Call) and own diplomats/policy officers on issues of access, protection and IHL | <p>Clingendael Humanitarian Negotiation Facility: 14</p> <p>Turkey Humanitarian Fund: 3</p> <p>ICRC: 47 (of which 1 can be attributed to Dutch funding)</p> | 27577; 29627; 4000001448; 4000001461; 4000001583 |
| ST_1.2.1c Availability and use of Dutch humanitarian diplomacy strategy and action plans | 4 action plans (Rohingya crisis, South Sudan, Syria and Yemen) developed and used. | |
| ST_1.2b1 Conflict and Hunger is addressed in resolutions at the UN Security Council and at the Human Rights Council; | <p>The Dutch effort on this theme has three pillars: 1) advocacy on behalf of victims of food insecurity caused by conflict and denouncing breaches of International Humanitarian Law in this regard; 2) prevention of food insecurity caused by conflict, and 3) strengthening accountability mechanisms for man-made starvation.</p> <p>In 2019, the Netherlands advocated for the inclusion of starvation in non-international armed conflicts as a warcrime in the Statute of Rome.</p> <p>The Netherlands was successful in addressing C&H in resolutions of the Human Rights Council. C&H was addressed in resolutions on Yemen and Syria.</p> | 28655 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Assessment of the results achieved across the entire result area 1 | |
| Assess achieved results compared to planning: | C. Results achieved as planned |
| Reasons for result achieved. | In general, in the context of continuously rising humanitarian needs, the international community has managed to assist millions of people in need. Although funding was not sufficient to cover all needs worldwide, generosity of communities, donors and the public remains high. The Netherlands remained a large donor and gave more than its fair share to large-scale crises such as Syria, Yemen, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Iraq. |
| Implications for planning. | The Netherlands continues to provide (mainly unearmarked) humanitarian support to UN, Red Cross movement and NGOs to reach people in need. With regard to NGO funding, an unearmarked contribution transferred at the beginning of each year for acute crises will enable timely and efficient crisis response. In the coming year, efforts to make timely contributions and to effectively use diplomatic and political power for conflict resolution and good humanitarian conditions will continue. |
| Result area 2 - Preparedness | |
| Humanitarian Assistance | |

RESULTS

A fast and effective response saves lives, so it is important for national and local institutions and organisations to have adequate response capacity; they bear primary responsibility for protecting their people and are the first to arrive on the scene. Improved response capacity of institutions and organisations will reduce the risks for affected population and damage to properties and result in overall decreased humanitarian needs. Preparedness is about the ability of local actors (public authorities, civilian organisations, Red Cross/ Red Crescent and local companies) to respond quickly when disaster strikes or is imminent. In 2018/ 2019, the Netherlands continued to invest in preparedness of local actors to respond to crises.

Response plans and simulations

Response plans are crucial to enable a fast and adequate response when a crisis hits or is imminent. Such plans include a mapping of actors and their mandates and are based on the risk profile of a certain country. The Netherlands invested in the development of national and local response plans via the Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC) (see indicator 2.1a). To ensure rapid activation of these plans, as well as completeness, response simulations should be conducted. Indicator 2.1b shows the number of simulations funded by the Netherlands.

Increased funding for local actors

Funding must be available for local humanitarian organisations to enable their response to crisis. The Grand Bargain - a set of commitments agreed upon by donors and humanitarian organisations - has set the target of 25% of funding being allocated to local organisation as directly as possible. The Netherlands does not provide funding directly to local organisations, but does so via its humanitarian partners (e.g. Country Based Pooled Funds, DRA and UN partners). Indicator 2.1.1a shows the performance of several partners against the previously mentioned target. The START Fund increased its efforts in this area. In 2018/ 2019 the organisation developed a strategy to decentralize to several countries and regions to increase the number of local and national members with access to the fund.

Capacity strengthening

Capacity strengthening of local actors was done via the specific preparedness programmes (with the NLRC and MapAction). In 2018, the NLRC provided multiple trainings in five countries (Central African Republic, Lebanon, Mali, Occupied Palestinian Territories and Zambia) to increase capacities of national societies on various issues relating to the response. MapAction provided humanitarian actors with crucial data gathered at the disaster scene and visualizes the data in the form of maps. In 2018, MapAction ran five preparedness missions to ensure partners are equipped to respond quickly and improve information sharing in difficult operational contexts. These mission included trainings in mapping and data management methodologies.

Capacity strengthening has yet to be included in humanitarian programming in a structural manner. In 2019, the Netherlands continued its dialogue with the Dutch Relief Alliance on the integration of capacity building in their responses (see indicator 2.1.1c).

| INDICATORS | Results | Source |
|--|--|--|
| ST_2.1a Number of (national/local) Dutch funded response plans | NLRC Response Preparedness program: 3 | 28677 |
| ST_2.1b Number of Dutch funded response simulations | NLRC: 6 | 28677 |
| ST_2.1.1a Percentage of funding channeled to local partners (incl. examples) | Not all partners report on this indicator yet. - The CBPFs supported by Dutch funding allocated on average 28% to local organisations, with large variances, however, between funds (the Syria and Iraq HFs allocated merely 6 and 9% to local organisations respectively, while the Syria Cross Border HF allocated 51% via local organisations). - DRA: 21% - UNHCR: 21% - UNICEF: 36% | 28677; 400000086; 400000899; 400001160; 4000001191; 4000001388; 4000001412; 4000001423; 4000001460; 4000001461; 4000001462; 4000001512; 4000001693; 4000001802 |
| ST_2.1.1c Number of advocacy efforts to urge for capacity building activities for local responders to be included in humanitarian aid programs | - The Netherlands remained an important advocate for the localisation of humanitarian aid. The CBPF is an important funding mechanism in this regard, as local organisations have direct access to the funds. In 2018, several funds provided capacity trainings for local organisations. Such trainings were mainly focused on the CBPF guidelines and making sure that local organisations qualify for funding. The CBPF evaluation stated, however, that these trainings proved beneficial for access to funding from other donors. - DRA has included localisation within its multi-annual strategy and has been encouraged in 2019 to set up new localisation initiatives that include capacity building and increased implementation by local partners. | |

Assessment of the results achieved across the entire result area 2

| | |
|--|---|
| Assess achieved results compared to planning: | D. Results achieved poorer than planned |
| Reasons for result achieved. | Overall, the results on preparedness have been poorer than expected. There are several reasons for this. First, the planning of activities have been delayed due to long negotiations with a potential new partner. Second, a partner organisation experienced significant delays in the implementation of its preparedness program. This has led to the realisation that efforts in this area take a long time, which must be taken into account when setting goals. Localisation as a normative concept has gained traction. Although no system-wide shift has been made towards localisation of the response, humanitarian partners are nearing one of the Grand Bargain targets of allocating at least 25% of funding to local organisations. More efforts in this area are still needed. |
| Implications for planning. | In 2020, the Netherlands will examine options to increase efforts on response preparedness. |
| Result area 3 - Effective Humanitarian (eco-)system Humanitarian Assistance | |

RESULTS

Although 2018 saw a record amount of funding being spent on humanitarian aid worldwide, the funding gap at the end of the year still amounted to 49%. Despite the absolute rise in funding for humanitarian aid, the pace of growth has slowed, rising by just 1% from 2017 to 2018. In addition, needs have been growing consistently over the past few years. The persistent funding gap as well as the increasing complexity of humanitarian crises, stresses the importance of strengthening the humanitarian aid system to make it more efficient and effective.

Grand Bargain

The Netherlands is signatory to the Grand Bargain – a set of commitments agreed upon by donors and humanitarian organizations with the aim to improve efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian aid. Donors and humanitarian organisations pledged, among others, to be more transparent, to work as directly as possible with local organisations, to include where possible the people receiving aid in all phases of the response (see indicator 1.1d) and to increase the use and coordination of cash programming (see indicator 1.1.1c). In addition, donors pledged to increase the percentage of non-earmarked and multi-year contributions (see indicator 1.1.1a and 1.1.1b). In 2019, Minister Kaag took on the role of Eminent Person and has thereby become responsible for driving the Grand Bargain forward and catalyzing change within the framework of the bargain. Indicator 3a provides examples of where progress has been made against the Grand Bargain commitments.

Transparency and Accountability

Transparency and accountability are essential to enhance decision-making, as well as trust. To enhance transparency, the Netherlands is an advocate for open data systems, such as the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). Indicator 3.2a demonstrates the number of signatories to the Grand Bargain (including both humanitarian organisations and donors) that report to IATI, which shows a slight increase in 2018 compared to the year before. Indicator 3.2.1a lists the partnerships with organisations that enhance transparency and accountability of humanitarian organisations and the sector as a whole, such as the Centre for Humanitarian Data that improved publishing and use of data for better decision-making. In addition, ALNAP is supported in its mission to enhance accountability and learning by improving the quality, availability and use of knowledge and evidence from previous responses.

To ensure accountability to affected populations (AAP), engagement of affected communities in all phases of the response and the ability to provide feedback and share complaints are essential (see indicator 1.1d). Preventing sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH) has been, and continues to be at the centre of Dutch efforts in this regard. In collaboration with the UK, the Netherlands developed a pilot project in Jordan and Bangladesh to strengthen accountability mechanisms for victims of SEAH in a sustainable manner. These pilots are also aimed to increase international support for external accountability mechanisms. In addition, in 2019 the arrangements with humanitarian UN organisations have been amended to include a clause on the preventing and addressing SEAH. Indicator 3.2b explains the common approach on AAP used within the DRA.

Leadership & Coordination

Leadership and coordination are key elements of any effort to enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance. The Netherlands endorses and supports the central role of the UN and UN Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA) in leading and coordinating international responses to emergencies, and the role of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in responding to refugee crises. To further enhance coordination, the Netherlands funds organisations and coalitions that facilitate coordination of the response. Indicator 3.1.2b shows that in 2019, 44% of all funds were allocated to such organisations. A large portion of the Dutch humanitarian budget is allocated via the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA), a coalition of 15 Dutch NGOs that work collaboratively in joint responses, as well as on policy development. The Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) are another important mechanism for crisis specific allocations. The funds enable a coordinated response, against the priorities of the Humanitarian Response Plan of a certain country and strengthening the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator.

Innovation

Innovation of humanitarian aid has the potential to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and quality of aid. The Netherlands invests in innovative solutions, and the capacity and knowledge of humanitarian actors to implement these solutions. Indicator 3c gives an example of an innovation that has reached scale an improved the efficiency of WFP's work. As bringing innovations to scale takes time, the examples of Dutch-funded innovations that have proven impact are still scarce, but will likely increase over the coming years. Indicator 3.1.1a shows the number of innovation projects that have been supported via partners such as the DRA Innovation Fund, the Humanitarian Innovation Fund and the Humanitarian Grand Challenge. The Netherlands supported innovation at various stages: innovations that are still being developed; innovations that are being piloted and innovations that are past proof of concept and are ready to scale. Indicator 3.3.2 demonstrates the number of guidance notes/ tools and papers developed by partners that improve knowledge on innovation processes. The Netherlands invests in such knowledge to improve management processes and ultimately to increase the level of success of innovation projects.

| INDICATORS | Results | Source |
|------------|---------|--------|
|------------|---------|--------|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| ST_3a Assessment of progress against Grand Bargain commitments | <p>In 2018 and 2019, steps were taken to streamline the structures of the Grand Bargain and to provide a clearer focus for collective efforts, which led to progress on various workstreams. In 2018, 68% of signatories reported results against each commitment, compared to 52% in 2017.</p> <p>The workstreams focusing on localization of aid, cash programming and harmonization of reporting requirements were performing best. The use of cash programming has increased even before the Grand Bargain developed, but it proved a valuable platform to coordinate and consolidate cash programming efforts. Although there has been no system-wide shift in terms of localizing aid, the Grand Bargain has helped establish localization as a key normative principle of humanitarian action. This is reflected in programming of humanitarian partners (see indicator 2.1.1a). In an effort to harmonize reporting, the 8+3 template was developed which seeks agreement on 8 indicators across humanitarian donors and organizations and allow donors to add only 3 additional indicators. This template was rolled out in 2018 and is used among others by the DRA and the CBPFs.</p> <p>The Netherlands has taken up strong leadership with the role of Minister Kaag as the Grand Bargain Eminent Person. Implementation focused across different commitments, with an emphasis on improved risk-sharing in the humanitarian sector; maintaining and advocating a high degree of quality funding through our partners; co-convening the workstream on transparency with the World Bank, and investing resources and capacity to fill the different gaps in the humanitarian development - peace nexus. The Netherlands is on track with its GB commitments and participates actively in the GB discussions with its co-signatories.</p> | https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12734.pdf |
| ST_3c Examples where scaled innovations improved efficiency or effectiveness of humanitarian assistance | <p>- The Netherlands invested in the development and diffusion of the 'mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping' (mVAM), a project by WFP that uses mobile technology to track food security trends in real-time, providing high-frequency data that supports humanitarian decision-making. WFP has reported an improvement in the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of collecting household level information for food security monitoring. Where face-to-face surveys cost USD 20 - 40 per household per questionnaire to implement, monitoring via SMS costs USD 5 - 6 and live calls USD 7 - 9 per questionnaire. An independent evaluation found that mVAM is able to collect data at low costs in difficult contexts and that high frequency monitoring can be efficiently achieved.</p> | 27891 |
| ST_3.1.2b Percentage of NL funding through mechanisms that support greater coordination among humanitarian organisations. (e.g. CERF, Pooled Funds, DRA) | 44% | 4000002626; 4000002651; 4000003001 |
| ST_3.2a Number of humanitarian organisations and donors that report in IATI (via Grand Bargain monitoring) | 2017: 44 (72%) 2018: 47 (80%) | https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12734.pdf |
| ST_3.2.1a Examples of partnerships with organisations that enhance transparency and accountability of humanitarian organisations and donors (e.g., Generosity Index, DI, ALNAP, Center for Humanitarian Data, Ground Truth Solutions) | In 2018, the Netherlands funded four partners that enhance transparency and/or accountability: Development Initiatives; KUNO; ALNAP; Centre for Humanitarian Data. | 27607; 27764; 29448; 400000194; 400000246; 4000000277; 4000002450; 4000001923 |
| ST_3.2b Number of HRP and JRs (DRA) that include a common approach to AAP and include community based feedback mechanisms, including for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse | Within DRA, there were 8 shared AAP mechanisms, in different stages of development. In the Netherlands, there is one mechanism through which reports of breaches of integrity are reported. | 4000001892; 28655; 4000000899; 4000001160; 4000001163; 4000001164; 4000001165; 4000001166; 4000001167; 4000001180; 4000001423 |
| ST_3.2.2 Number of humanitarian responses in which humanitarian assistance is assessed by i.e. Ground Truth Solutions | Ground Truth Solutions was provided a grant for three years at the end of 2019. Results on this indicator are expected in 2020. | |
| ST_3.3.1a Number of innovations supported (aggregated by stage in the innovation process) | <p>The Netherlands contributed to 18 innovation projects, mainly via innovation funds managed by partner organisations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale phase: 5 - Proof of concept: 1 - Pilot phase: 11 - Invention: 1 | 27891; 27908; 4000001920; 4000002067; |
| ST_3.3.2 Number of research papers/ guidance notes developed and shared to inform sector learning on innovation management (including M&E of humanitarian innovation). | 6 | 4000001920; 27891; 27908; 4000001149; 4000001583; 4000002067 |
| Assessment of the results achieved across the entire result area 3 | | |
| Assess achieved results compared to planning: | C. Results achieved as planned | |
| Reasons for result achieved. | In 2018/ 2019, the Netherlands continued its efforts to improve transparency, accountability, leadership and coordination as planned. In 2019, efforts to further the Grand Bargain were increased, with Minister Kaag taking the role of Eminent Person. With respect to preventing SEAH, efforts were increased as well, which resulted in the development of two pilots as detailed above and the amendment of arrangements to include a clause on SEAH. The increase of achievements on innovations were the result of new partnerships concluded in 2018 and 2019. | |
| Implications for planning. | In 2020, efforts to strengthen the humanitarian system will continue. To improve accountability of humanitarian responses (rather than the sector as a whole, which is done by ALNAP) the Netherlands has embarked on a partnership with Ground Truth Solutions at the end of 2019, which will enable learning about the efficiency, effectiveness and quality of Dutch-funded humanitarian aid. | |

* Find more information on the projects on Openaid.nl with the activity numbers listed under 'Source'