

# Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

## ICRC

### Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency .....	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	3
2. Progress to date .....	3
3. Planned next steps .....	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	3
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	3
Work stream 2 - Localization .....	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	4
2. Progress to date .....	4
3. Planned next steps .....	4
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	5
Work stream 3 - Cash .....	6
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	6
2. Progress to date .....	6
3. Planned next steps .....	7
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	7
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	7
Work stream 4 – Management costs .....	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	8
2. Progress to date .....	8
3. Planned next steps .....	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	9
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	9
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment .....	10
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	10
2. Progress to date .....	10
3. Planned next steps .....	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	10
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution .....	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	11
2. Progress to date .....	11
3. Planned next steps .....	12
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	12
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding .....	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	13
2. Progress to date .....	13
3. Planned next steps .....	13
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	13
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	13
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility .....	14

1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	14
2. Progress to date .....	14
3. Planned next steps .....	14
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	15
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements .....	16
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	16
2. Progress to date .....	16
3. Planned next steps .....	16
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	17
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement .....	18
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	18
2. Progress to date .....	18
3. Planned next steps .....	18
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1) .....	19
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1) .....	19

## **Work stream 1 - Transparency**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

The ICRC has always had a strong commitment to transparency. Every year it publishes a public Annual Report on its activities and regularly provides donors with information on its operations and processes, as well as internal reviews and evaluations of its activities at both operational and headquarters levels. In addition, external auditors produce field financial reports which are also shared with donors. The ICRC has always seen transparency as a key enabler of trust and acceptance – two vital factors for the ICRC to carry out its work on the ground.

### **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?

For the first time this May, the ICRC will present the management letter of its external auditors, and information on the handling of and lessons learnt from fraud cases, to the members of its Donor Support Group.

The ICRC has also given thorough consideration to the possibility of publishing information according to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) format. ICRC organised two briefing sessions with Development Initiatives and worked with UNHCR and IFRC to better assess how to jointly overcome the challenges that humanitarian organizations face when publishing data in line with the IATI, a development framework. Subsequently, the ICRC will dedicate resources to allow a short-term, full-time post to report back on what internal changes would be needed in our financial procedures to allow us to use IATI. At the time of writing, the possibility of working with the IATI Technical Advisory Group to better adapt the standard to the specific needs of humanitarian agencies is being looked into.

### **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 2017, the ICRC will invest resources to carry out an in-depth technical study on how to adapt its systems and processes to better match the IATI format, and be able to publish data on it.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 2 - Localization**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

The ICRC works in armed conflict and other situations of violence. As a neutral, independent and impartial organization, it endeavours to seek acceptance from all parties to a conflict in order to be able to carry out its mandate, directly bringing protection and assistance to victims. Therefore, the ICRC is itself a “local (frontline) responder”. The ICRC supports localization as an important approach in humanitarian action, and one that has always been modelled in the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement (the Movement) in its complementarity between global and local actors. On the ground, the ICRC works in a variety of partnerships with local actors, including: relevant authorities; National Societies; civil society groups, and business suppliers and contractors.

The ICRC knows first-hand the value of the knowledge, dynamism and proximity of local actors, who are often first responders to a humanitarian crisis and strongly supports the provision of support and funding tools to national first responders. In December 2015 (before the Grand Bargain was signed) the RCRC Movement message to the World Humanitarian Summit (Resolution 3 CoD 2015) clearly stated that the ICRC and the broader Movement strongly supports the need for strengthening local and national capacities while respecting the complementarity of local, national and international humanitarian action

### **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?

A new National Red Cross and Red Crescent Society Investment Mechanism (NSIM) is being developed by the IFRC and the ICRC to strengthen National Societies, so they are better able to build community resilience and respond to humanitarian crises and armed conflict. The investment mechanism will be used as a pooled fund and will focus on delivering multi-year support towards strengthening their institutional capacities, depending on the particular needs of National Societies in different contexts. Many National Societies are strong and stable, while others are far from reaching their potential. Further investment and accompaniment are needed to ensure that these National Societies develop as sustainable, independent humanitarian actors, recognized and credible in their communities, and trusted partners for the delivery of principled and effective humanitarian action.

### **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)?

The ICRC (with IFRC) will continue to work on the NSIM, aiming for a soft launch at the 2017 ECOSOC HAS and seeing concrete outcomes within the next two years.

**4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 3 - Cash

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

In recent years, the ICRC has scaled up its use of cash transfer programming to respond to the needs of conflict-affected people. Therefore the ICRC was already using forms of assistance such as vouchers or unconditional cash grants provided during relief operations; cash grants as part of microeconomic initiative programmes; and cash-for-work activities aimed to restore livelihoods and rehabilitate community infrastructure.

### 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 number of beneficiaries assisted through cash transfer programming has increased from **190,000 people in 2012 to 1.43 million in 2016, across 35 countries.**

Cash has been used mainly as part of ICRC programmes promoting economic security, representing 20% (CHF 61 million in 2016) of the direct costs of economic security programmes worldwide. This growth has been made possible by internal and external training and other capacity-building initiatives for ICRC staff; standardized procedures; technical tools and guidance; and the integration of cash and market specialists to provide direct support (e.g. coaching in programme design and implementation) to delegations.

The ICRC is able to track whether cash is restricted (vouchers) or unrestricted (cash) through its accounting systems. Since early 2016, there are specific accounting codes for vouchers for food, agro, miscellaneous commodities, or value vouchers, and cash transfers (unrestricted).

Whether the cash is conditional or not, is outlined in the narrative of project proposals. As cash remains a modality rather than a programme in itself, the monitoring and evaluation processes are the same as those developed for other kinds of assistance. All projects follow the principles of Results Based Management. Aside from the various reports produced along the project management cycle (assessments, proposals with intervention logic, monitoring reports and evaluations), an internal application (EcoSec Program Management Tool) allows for creation of statistics regarding type of intervention, modality, location, quantity of assistance, type (status and gender), and number of beneficiaries assisted.

The ICRC is also an active member of the International Red Cross Red and Crescent Movement's Cash Peer Working Group, which has contributed to the increased use of cash transfer programming by driving the development of technical guidance, tools and training materials for implementing such programmes.

### **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)?

By taking steps to institutionalize the use of cash transfer programming, the ICRC aims to reach a financial target of **CHF 124 million in direct costs for cash transfers across its operations by 2021**. It plans to achieve this goal by:

1. Increasing the budget allocated for such programmes
2. Exploring cash-based assistance to meet needs in the health, water and habitat, and protection sectors
3. Devising and implementing an institutional strategy to integrate cash transfer programming across the different ICRC operational departments, while strengthening the capacities of support services
4. The ICRC will also closely coordinate with Movement partners to help bolster the capacities of National Societies to provide cash-based assistance.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 4 – Management costs

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

**Coordinated procurement:** The ICRC and the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) established a Quality Social and Environmental Procurement Working Group (QSE), which promotes inter-agency collaboration, sharing of information and best practices, and to develop synergies in the areas of quality assurance, product development and manufacturing standards for major relief items. Since 2011, the IFRC, United Nations International Children’s Fund (UNICEF), UNHCR and the ICRC have been using identical or similar technical specifications for relief items such as family tents, thermal blankets and mosquito nets; later on, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) followed suit. Doing so has enabled these organizations to shape the market for these items.

### 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?

**QSE:** Within the QSE working group, the ICRC shares processes, tools, and means of quality control of the most delivered relief items. It also provides support and training to UNHCR and IOM. In November 2016, the ICRC renewed its agreement to perform quality control free of charge for the other organizations, reducing management costs by utilizing tools and processes that have already been developed by the ICRC. In particular, these processes and tools ensure the organization pays for actual goods ordered and received.

**Reference on manufacturing standards for relief items:** The ICRC has a 2016 reference document on manufacturing standards for the production of relief items, which it applies to the relief items it purchases. This document has also been proposed to the other organizations within the QSE working group (IFRC, UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM and MSF) as an inter-agency standard. These processes and tools allow the organization to engage in sustainable and responsible procurement.

**Coordinated procurement:** Collaboration with the above-mentioned organizations was also pursued and deepened. In November 2016, the World Food Program participated for the first time.

**“OSCAR” supply chain process:** The ICRC has recently begun implementing a new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) supply chain tool and process, known as the "OSCAR" project, in order to optimize its procurement process and increase the agility of its supply chain. "OSCAR" aims to establish collaborative planning, improve global visibility within the supply chain and generate business intelligence that supports evidence-based decision-making. The ICRC aims to have this new tool cover 80% of the financial value of its procurement costs by the end of 2018, and 100% by the end of 2020. In 2016, coverage rose from 31% to 54% of the financial value of ICRC's procurement.



### **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)?

Throughout 2017, inter-agency joint procurement for family tents (ICRC and IOM) and for synthetic blankets (ICRC and IFRC) is already underway. Joint procurements for other household items will be implemented in 2018, with QSE members and the Movement. To reinforce this joint sourcing initiative, the results of factory audits for every major procurement will be made available to all Movement components and to other QSE members. The procurement quantities granted through this process, and instances when contracts have been breached, will also be shared.

At the end of 2017, the ICRC will renew its agreement to perform quality control checks for other organizations free of charge, and to train controller teams from other organizations.

**OSCAR:** The ICRC will gradually increase the OSCAR tool coverage of the financial value of its procurement costs over the next two years.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

### **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?

### **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)?

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 6 – Participation Revolution

### 1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Accountability to affected populations (AAP) is an integral part of the ICRC's operational model, which is based on working in close proximity to affected people. This is reflected through the approaches developed by the operational departments, which recognize the importance of engaging directly with beneficiaries.

### 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 concept of information as a form of aid and the operationalisation of it is core to the latest revision of the [ICRC's external communication doctrine](#) launched in 2016 (see principle 4. Empower people through information). The ICRC is therefore continuing to make progress in this area to provide life-saving, useful and actionable information to affected populations. However, we still face challenges in ensuring that we do this consistently within its delegations and across programmes, and importantly, that more good practices are timely and predictably rolled out across all contexts throughout the management cycle. We see that improvements on engagement with and accountability to affected communities often lack a systematic and predictable approach (including to monitoring and documentation) and that this has undercut learning opportunities and evidence of ICRC's performance and progress. The ICRC is currently completing internal consultation with a number of its delegations on its first Institutional Framework on Accountability to Affected People (AAP) to try to address the aforesaid issues and other related ones. The Institutional Framework will be public as soon as it is finalised.

In addition, in order to strengthen its activities in this area – which are operational and part of the day-to-day activities of many delegations – the ICRC is investing in providing support to delegations through: investing in resource personnel in Geneva; developing briefing documents, tools and other guidance; and providing delegations with training and technical support. It also intends to organize training and workshops with conflict-affected populations, using a multi-sectoral approach, and other events. The ICRC will produce research on the topic, and conduct its activities working more closely with the IFRC.

ICRC is also currently working on a new Information Environment Strategy (IES) that will be more focused on affected people, partners and donors and on leveraging external data to adapt to digital disruption and respond to growing needs and ambitions. This should mean that our internal processes should improve in order to have greater capacity to turn different forms of feedback into action in a more effective and transparent way, when necessary/possible.

In the meantime, the ICRC has made significant progress on how we manage hotlines in a number of delegations improving how calls are analysed, trends and data visualised and feedback and complaints acted on, when relevant. Also, a number of “integrated solutions” are also being piloted

in our assistance programs (e.g. cash transfer programming) that ultimately contribute to more effective and accountable humanitarian action.

In terms of partnership on this issue, in January, the ICRC and the IFRC launched its first **Community Engagement and Accountability Guide** for the Movement. This is a major milestone as we ultimately aim, over the next 3 years, at developing, with a number of National Societies, a Movement-wide approach on AAP. We understand the Guide has been very well received within the sector and look forward to continuing contributing to the discussion and standardisation. In that sense, we are currently co-developing an e-learning module on the same topic for this year.

Also, importantly, through the Communicating with Disaster Affected Communities (**CDAC Network**)<sup>1</sup>, the ICRC has contributed to the development of the Communication & Community Engagement Initiative led by UNICEF. We have had a number of meetings with UNICEF and are aware of the developments and the challenges ahead. While the IFRC has a greater level of involvement in this initiative, the ICRC remains a strong supporter and advocate for the CDAC Network.

Last but not least, the ICRC is the current chair of the **Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR)** that is one of the key platforms on the “participation revolution”. In that sense, the ICRC is very much engaged in this particular commitment within the Grand Bargain.

### **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)?

AAP will be integrated more systematically within the ICRC’s programme cycle, and performance on accountability to affected populations will be better documented.

The ICRC plans to test a multi-disciplinary monitoring tool and framework; field staff will then be trained on these tools, which will be rolled out progressively throughout all ICRC field operations.

The ICRC will continue to contribute to shaping international best practice on making the “participation revolution” a reality, particularly through its membership in the CDAC Network and other humanitarian forums.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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?

---

<sup>1</sup> [The ICRC hosted the Network 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Members’ Forum \(July 2015\) & a roundtable discussion with DFID \(September 2016\).](#)

## **Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Multi-year planning (MYP) and programming is already a common practice in the field when the needs require a medium- to long-term response, for example for water infrastructure and hospital programmes.

### **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?

Recognizing that our approach to practical MYP in the field was not supported or captured by our internal planning and monitoring system, which followed an annual cycle, ICRC has developed a new process and information management tool for planning and monitoring. This will support the planning and monitoring of multi-year activities across all field delegations. The rolling out of the new process and tool will commence in 2017, and both the process and the tool will begin to be effective for the planning exercise for 2018.

### **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)?

The ICRC is finalizing the business rules around its new multi-year planning process. The roll out of this new process and its practice and tools will be facilitated by a strong institutional change management component, which will include internal communication initiatives and training for staff. Guidance on multi-year programming will be part of the planning exercise for 2018, which begins in August 2017; however, some aspects – namely the multi-year financial perspectives – will come at a later stage.

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 8 - Earmarking/flexibility**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Unearmarked funding is crucial to maintaining the ICRC's capacity to operate rapidly, independently and based on the most urgent needs and vulnerabilities of conflict-affected people, rather than on media attention or political interest. This type of funding also allows the ICRC to conduct activities in potentially volatile areas – developing emergency preparedness and its network of local actors before the outbreak of an armed conflict – and to provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and mid- to long-term development, easing the transition from relief work to development initiatives.

If the ICRC were unable to cover funding gaps with unearmarked contributions, it would have to fundamentally change its operational approach. For example, operations in Israel and the occupied territories have rarely been funded up to 50%. In recent years, the level of unearmarked, as a proportion of total ICRC income, has decreased. In 2016, this level reached a record low, amounting to only 23% of total income.

Thus, despite very strong overall support from the donor community that enabled the ICRC to break even financially in 2016, many underfunded contexts will start 2017 with a negative balance.

### **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?

Bilaterally with its donors, the ICRC has been working on ways to provide greater recognition to its donors who provide flexible funding; on developing an appropriate and compelling narrative for donors; and on ensuring a transparent process regarding the way it allocates its flexible funding.

Multilaterally, the ICRC and Sweden are the co-conveners of this workstream. Their agreed-upon joint objective for the first year of the Grand Bargain is to set a baseline for better understanding where we stand regarding the earmarking of contributions – setting a baseline of which organizations receive the most or the least unearmarked contributions, and which donors provide the most flexible funding and for what reason. This initiative also seeks to analyze the trend within the past few years, to determine whether this is a trend that is improving, with less earmarking of funds or worsening as more contributions are earmarked, or more tightly earmarked. To this end, the ICRC has carried out a survey with humanitarian agencies, while Sweden has discussed the issue with donors; this will enable the two actors to draw from more information and better analyze the issue, and develop policy recommendations for the second year of the Grand Bargain.

The ICRC has not taken steps (either bilaterally or in its role as co-conveners of this workstream) at this stage to coordinate/agree with other organisations on how to report to donors on unearmarked/softly earmarked funding.

### **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)?

The ICRC will implement the measures currently being developed regarding recognition of donors providing unearmarked funding, a compelling narrative to encourage donors to contribute unearmarked funds, and transparency in allocation of unearmarked funds.

**4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 9 – Reporting requirements**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

The ICRC shares information with its donors through a variety of channels, including direct communication with ICRC staff in the field or at headquarters, during meetings, through general communications through its website, and specific reports written for donors.

ICRC reporting can be divided into cyclical standard reporting and ad hoc reports. Standard reporting consists of the Appeal, where the ICRC presents its yearly plans per delegation to all its donors; and the Midterm Report and Annual Report, which explain the implementation of the operations until the end of May and the end of December of the current year, respectively. All standard reports include a narrative of the roll-out of operations, as well as financial reporting on the level of funding and the level of expenses per country each year. At the start of the last quarter of each year, the ICRC shares a “renewed appeal” with donors, which presents the level of funding of each delegation, and the outstanding financial needs of the organization. Standard reporting that meets donor requirements is an efficiency measure as it ensures optimal use of resources.

Ad hoc reporting consists of updates on different issues – policy and operational issues – which the ICRC chooses to share with its donors through a dedicated platform. Specific reporting is shared with a given donor when requested, if appropriate.

### **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 ICRC will maintain its dialogue with donors on reporting, regarding ways to improve its reporting and better match the needs of donors for detailed, timely and transparent information on the ICRC and its activities. It will remain receptive to any changes the workstream of the Grand Bargain might bring about.

Taking into account measurable efficiency and humanitarian gains, feedback from donors and also from this workstream, at this point the ICRC does not plan to change its standard reporting. However, the ICRC has advocated for links between this workstream with the transparency workstream to increase.

### **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)?

### **4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement**

### **1. Baseline (only in year 1)**

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

The Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement was not able to commit to this workstream in its entirety because of its distinct role (see the footnote in Grand Bargain text). Nonetheless, it remains strongly committed to enhancing its engagement with development actors.

### **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 ICRC developed a [policy document](#) that examined its approach in protracted conflict and the intersection of development and humanitarian aid based on field data, and explained concrete actions it sees as necessary for progress. The report concluded that the fluidity of protracted conflicts creates humanitarian challenges but also opportunities for humanitarian response which secures “development holds” and holds off reversals in the development of conflict-affected areas. This is particularly important in urban settings, where preventing the collapse of essential services can not only make a major difference in the everyday lives of conflict-affected people, but also reduce the costs of post-conflict development. Thus, it is important that development holds are understood as a humanitarian intervention, particularly in discussions with conflict-affected states.

ICRC experience working in this nexus shows that more than a division of labour, the response to protracted conflicts needs a common purpose between humanitarian and development actors, focused on needs and outcomes. Cooperation on long-term humanitarian action should remain needs and outcome-focused at all times. This is critical to avoid ideological development and ensure impartiality throughout cycles of violence and peace. Development actors also need to come in earlier and be even more prepared to work in hard-to-reach-areas. We must have a holistic, innovative and responsible approach with an increasingly diverse range of public and private sector stakeholders.

While development holds make a principled contribution to development, development work requires a different type of engagement with affected governments. Therefore, investment in development holds should not be made at the expense of investment of gains in development.

### **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)?

The ICRC has been exploring possible collaboration with development actors, in particular the World Bank Group and the African Development Bank; several pilots are in the pipeline. At the time of writing the ICRC is in intense discussions with the World Bank to partner in Somalia to address the ongoing food crisis.

A key enabler is to fully involve the people and communities affected by violence to really understand their needs, to codesign and implement an effective responses that helps bolster their resilience, and ultimately to helping ensure the sustainability of programmes. ICRC will therefore continue to strive to link up its work in the “participation revolution” workstream with this one.

**4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)**

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 (optional for year 1)**

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?