**GHDI 2016-2018**

**Work stream** - **Reporting Requirements:**
**Explore options for harmonized, streamlined reporting, consistent with donor requirements**

**Focus of work**

*As stewards of taxpayers’ funds, GHD donors are expected to exercise due diligence and oversight in terms of humanitarian contributions. Reporting requests to humanitarian partners are one key way in which this responsibility is discharged. In an effort to improve efficiencies and effectiveness of our partners, GHD donors will look for ways to optimize requests for reporting to ensure appropriate oversight while minimizing inefficiencies. To this end, this work-stream will examine the following issues:*

1. **Transparency and frequency**
	1. What minimum information do GHD donors expect to be disclosed by partners? How frequently is formal reporting needed and at which intervals?
	2. Adherence of partners to which minimum standards and principles is expected (for example, to SPHERE, CHS, Others)?
2. **Reporting for Coordination (UN)**

2.1 What type of information do donors want to see from collective reporting? What type of report will best provide information on overall impact of a response? What should be in situational updates? Sector specific reporting?

2.2 To what extent does current reporting (from cluster leads, the HPC, individual UN agencies) address donor needs? Can it be reduced? How frequently is it needed?

1. **Tools to explore to harmonize and streamline reporting to donors**
	1. Development of a joint *narrative* reporting / project proposal template
	2. Financial reporting: Expand use of IATI; improve submissions to FTS
	3. Elaborate criteria to determine the appropriate frequency and volume of reporting, depending upon different factors (context, amount of the award, experience of partner, etc.)
	4. Discuss possible options for harmonizing submission deadlines
	5. Reduction of informal reporting
	6. Based on current GHD good practice: Share and possibly harmonize contracting clauses that can serve as best practice in ensuring consistency with GHD principles in addressing beneficiary participation, support for country-level coordination structures, donor visibility, adherence to standards and commitment to promoting accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness.

3.7 Review experience to date in applying GHD good practice[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Available evidence**

1. ICVA published [“A Comparison Review of UN Project Partnership Agreements for NGO Implementation of Humanitarian Projects”](https://icvanetwork.org/system/files/versions/UN%20Partnership%20Agreement%20Review%201%20June%202015.web_.pdf) (February 2015)
2. VOICE published [“Exploring EU humanitarian donors’ funding and conditions for working with NGOs: Building Evidence for Simplification”](http://lesspapermoreaid.org/documents/VOICE-Study-EU-Donors-funding-and-conditions.pdf) (December 2015)
3. Humanitarian Outcomes published [“Donor Reporting Requirements Research”](http://www.ghdinitiative.org/assets/files/Activities/Our%20Work/Research%20on%20donor%20reporting%20requirements_22%20Feb%20FINAL.pdf) with support from former GHD co-chair USAID/OFDA (Feb 2016)
4. The IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team, led by UNFPA and WFP, published a report on [donor conditions and their implications for humanitarian response](http://www.alnap.org/resource/22372), which included a section on reporting (March 2016)
5. ICVA members commissioned the [Less Paper More Aid](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5C166645%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.Outlook%5CCBIRSKO3%5CLessPaperMoreAid.org) study with a proposed “Framework for Change” for reporting and other issues (published May 2016)
6. NRC commissioned the Boston Consulting Group to capture the impacts of different reporting requirements on NRC
7. The German FFO commissioned a GPPI study “Harmonizing Donor Reporting – Strategies for Implementing the WHS Commitments” (preliminary version published in November 2016, available at the German PM)

**Ongoing processes**

1. UNICEF, UNHCR and WFP are exploring areas for harmonization, including reporting templates
2. The U.S. Government is streamlining its various agencies’ requirements for NGO partners & exploring the use of cluster indicators
3. The Netherlands, UK and Belgium are exploring applications of the IATI data standard
4. ECHO is trying to standardize approaches around indicators, with less narrative
5. The Grand Bargain working group on reporting has held a workshop on Nov. 18, 2016 in Geneva and explores ways to pilot a joint template
6. WHS commitments are followed up via the platform “PACT” run by OCHA

**Expected outcome of the GHD work stream:**

Until mid-2017:

* Survey of GHD members regarding the above issues/questions
* Identifying which tools (listed above) should be pursued
* Possible good practice identified regarding a minimum set of (narrative) harmonized questions or guidelines to for reporting, building on the work of GPPi and previous studies;
* Possible Good practice identified regarding frequency and submission deadlines
* Update on experience to date in applying existing GHD good practice

Until mid-2018:

**Outcome paper** including

* Updating and expanding existing GHD good practice on reporting
* Recommendations to IASC / partners with regard to:
	+ Self-reporting (transparency)
	+ Adherence to humanitarian standards and principles
	+ Reporting requirements for purposes of coordination
* Information regarding existing use of IATI Data Standard and potential recommendation regarding alignment and/or new practice regarding data standards (or alternative approach)

**Membership – Initial Indications of interest:**

Co-leads: Germany, USA

Members: ECHO, Spain, Norway, Netherlands

1. This includes: (1) The use of common indicators when a GHD member requires a tailored funding proposal, aligned with either the partner’s institutional indicators framework, the indicators framework of the Global Cluster, or with the country-level HRP/RRP/appeal indicators approach. (2) The use of universal, program-level reports prepared by multilateral partners at appropriate intervals, including both audited partner financial statements and annual/crisis-specific narrative results reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)