

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

IFRC

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?

IFRC is strongly committed to more transparent humanitarian aid, and already publishes a considerable amount of data and financial information publicly. Consistent with its commitment, IFRC is examining the feasibility of using the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) to publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data. IFRC currently publishes data around the financial flows for its Appeals and Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. It also publishes data around the Federation-wide Data and Reporting System, which includes data about its member societies.

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 IFRC is examining the possibility of publishing information in accordance with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard. IFRC has had two briefing sessions with Development Initiatives and maintained ongoing dialogue on the issue with UNHCR and ICRC, to better assess how to jointly overcome the challenges that humanitarian organizations face when publishing data in line with the IATI. At the time of writing, IFRC is looking into the possibility of working with the IATI Technical Advisory Group to better adapt the standard to the specific needs of humanitarian agencies.

Matching our expenditures (Areas of Focus and Strategies of Implementation) against IATI's activities will require an entirely new coding system to be added to our Results-Based Management framework. Equally the way in which IFRC disburses funds – working advances and cash transfers and the way in which we report (quarterly and monthly) on outputs are not compatible to IATI's activities approach.

Further concerns/barriers have been highlighted in a joint position paper of ICRC, IFRC and UNHCR on IATI and Transparency Commitments 1 June 2017.

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)?

1. **Feasibility Study:** IFRC is planning a feasibility study and considering an IATI prototype around data that the IFRC already publishes related to its Appeals and Disaster Relief Emergency Fund,
2. **Planning System:** IFRC is commissioning a study into an enterprise-resource planning system, which would support IATI reporting. It has also examined several planning systems that support IATI or are sufficiently aligned with activity-based reporting to allow for easy IATI integration.

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 IFRC is a Federation of 190 Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies. Each National Society is an independent domestic legal entity that mobilises national resources as well as international support to meet humanitarian needs. The IFRC is constituted by and for its members, all local and national responders in their own countries. The IFRC is funded by its members through statutory contributions, and also appeals for and disperses funds to its members for emergencies and longer-term programming. In 2016, the IFRC assessed the statutory contributions from all 190 National Societies, and received additional voluntary contributions for 41 National Societies. At the same time, it dispersed funds to 115 of its National Societies for programmatic activities. All IFRC appeals reflect National Society operations, and all IFRC funds spent in emergency response and longer term programming are spent in support of the operation or programme defined, led by, and implemented by our National Societies. Therefore, our current financial systems do not distinguish between money spent by the National Society and money spent by the IFRC. Money appealed for and spent by the National Society is reflected as IFRC spending in IFRC's accounting, as this guarantees adequate financial management and support.

The IFRC's mandate includes provision of organisational development and capacity development support to National Societies, in order to support them to become relevant and sustainable domestic humanitarian actors. As an organization created for its members, the IFRC is always looking for ways to improve support to National Societies provided by the wider Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. In this regard, and together with the ICRC, we are developing a National Society Investment Mechanism to provide more coordinated capacity strengthening and organizational development to National Societies with the ultimate aim of ensuring sustainable and strong National Societies.

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 Society investment mechanism 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 focus on delivering multi-year support towards strengthening their institutional capacities, depending on the particular needs of National Societies in different contexts.

As part of the process of developing this work, IFRC and ICRC convened a learning meeting with National Societies from north and south to share learning on the process of National Society development and to feed this into the Mechanism design.

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)?

IFRC will continue the process of learning from past experience in the support of National Society development.

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?

The IFRC has been implementing cash programming in its modern form since the late 1990s, and began to mainstream cash-responses into operations during the Tsunami response. For the last few years, the IFRC and its membership, have been committed to increasing its operational and institutional capacity for cash transfer programming in relief and recovery interventions. Examples of cash scale-ups in the past include the Haiyan response with 175,000 cash grants distributed to enable affected families to meet their basic needs and their shelter and livelihoods recovery. In Nepal over 94,000 cash grants were distributed to support the basic needs and livelihood recovery of the affected families. Satisfaction rates for cash grants exceeded 95% among recipients.

In 2016, the IFRC also provided cash support, through its Disaster Relief Emergency Fund [DREF] and Emergency Appeal funding mechanisms, to vulnerable people affected by small and medium scale disasters. For example, as a result of the 2015-2016 Mongolia extreme winter weather conditions, over 25,500 nomadic herders were supported with cash grants that enabled them to meet their priority needs as well as the food, and health needs of their livestock. In the Ukraine, 1,300 people with chronic and other health problems received vouchers to buy good quality medicines from the local pharmacies, minimizing the risk that they rely in cheaper, but often fake, medicines available in the local markets. This was in addition to the 13,000 people that received food vouchers and 6,000 people that received NFIs voucher support. Also, since 2016, over 1,100 families in Greece have received several rounds of cash support and around 900 vulnerable Greek families from host communities received a one-off winterisation cash grant support. In Jordan, the IFRC has been providing monthly cash grants to 1,100 refugee families.

The IFRC and its members are also committed to increase the number of National Societies that are operationally ready to deliver quality, timely and scalable cash transfer programming (CTP) through ongoing institutional/cash preparedness. National Society Preparedness work is being done in five National Societies and will be increased in the future.

2. Progress to date

In 2016, 17 IFRC Emergency Appeals (EA) and 10 Disaster Relief Funds (DREF) considered the use of cash based responses. 65 cash staff were deployed to support cash emergency operations and preparedness initiatives. 35% of the IFRC Relief Emergency Funds and Emergency Appeals considered the use of cash responses, but only 15% of the responses implemented included cash.

The IFRC commissioned a Cash Roadmap to guide and achieve the ambition of transforming its humanitarian responses, by being able to deliver cash effectively at scale as a coordinated part of humanitarian action. This Roadmap outlined the path of change that will enable the IFRC to build its position, capacity and capability to support scaled-up CTP across its membership (190 National Societies), the IFRC is now implementing the Cash Roadmap and is currently in a recruitment process.

Since 2016, the IFRC and its members are supporting at least five National Societies increase their cash preparedness and operational readiness. This number is likely to increase in the future and an evaluation of the Cash Preparedness approach and guidance will be undertaken towards the end of this year.

As part of the Cash Capacity Building initiative, the Movement has developed several online and face to face training packages, that range from introduction to cash and markets, to cash online training and CTP, markets and Practical Cash in Emergencies. Since May 2016, over 3,900 people have completed one of those courses, of them 226 completed the face to face trainings. Online trainings are available to internal RCRC and external participants. Participants included members of over 79 National Societies, and come from 104 countries.

IFRC Cash trainings	IFRC Learning platform Intro to CTP	IFRC Learning platform. Intro to markets	Moodle training	CTP 4 days F2F	PECT training
Number of trainings	E-learning on participant request	E-learning on participant request	7 trainings	6 trainings	6 PECT trainings
# Participants that completed the training	2485 participants	1321 participants	118 participants completed the training	126 participants	144 participants
# No of National Societies	79 National Societies	69 National Societies	40 National Societies	12 National Societies	23 National Societies
# of countries	104 countries	89 countries	43 countries	12 countries	28 countries

The RCRC Movement has collaborated to develop the Cash in Emergencies (CiE) toolkit and website, that includes cash and market guidelines and resources, learning, case studies and videos, cash training packages and the RCRC Movement cash training calendar. In 2016 the Movement developed the Rapid Assessment of Markets training package that was piloted in Austria, Pakistan and Damascus. The www.rcmcash.org website has had the following visits since May 2016: 18,046 page visits, 5,255 unique users.

The IFRC has made progress in ensuring our global Emergency Response Units (ERU) are cash ready by developing a new relief cash competency framework and revision of the job descriptions. The IFRC has 188 trained personal on its cash roster.

IFRC engagement in the GB Workstream on Cash

The IFRC attended the first Cash Workstream meeting in Rome (end of May), which was a useful barometer of common positioning and interests on the cash agenda. RCRC participation included the British RC, ICRC and IFRC, and the leading cash agencies were present (WFP, UNHCR, INGOs incl. Save, CRS, IRC etc.) and donors & mission representatives (DFID, ECHO, USAID, Norway, Sweden, Germany), plus OCHA, CaLP, GPPI.

The meeting/workshop was jointly led by WFP& DFID, with a workplan as the desired output. However, the agenda was necessarily broad in an effort to achieve common positions on issues such as terminology etc., and at the close it was not clear on how such a workplan would be developed or by who (it was understood that WFP and DFID would work up a summary document to inform the GB meeting). This is still outstanding.

The overall atmosphere was collegial, and there was broad consensus on a number of issues (including an agreement on terminology – the CaLP definitions). Practically, some of the major issues currently being debated remained unresolved, notably the concerns of the INGOs that they may be excluded through the rationalisation as proposed by ECHO and the reliance of the UN agencies in particular on “last mile” local partner capacity that at present is receiving insufficient attention and is not party to the discussions.

Given the Movement’s commitment to cash IFRC should remain engaged in this workstream, in close collaboration with Movement partners incl. ICRC, and has a key role to play in ensuring due consideration of the critical role of local/national institutions (incl. National Societies) as partners and stakeholders and not solely as distribution and monitoring capacity to be contracted.

Work stream 4 – Reduction of Duplication and 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?

As indicated in our joint IFRC-ICRC Movement Commitments to the Grand Bargain, the IFRC seeks the reduction of duplication and management costs through realizing collaborative efficiency within the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. The primary way that the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement is realizing collaborative efficiency is the Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation process (SMCC), mandated in our Council of Delegates resolutions in 2013 and 2015. Efforts in this regard have particularly proceeded on developing a “one Movement appeal” in major emergencies, and efforts towards joint procurement and logistics.

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?

Since the signing of the Grand Bargain, there has been one major new emergency --- Hurricane Matthew in Haiti. For Hurricane Mathew, the RCRC Movement launched a single appeal, which covered the response of the IFRC, its members, and the ICRC. As part of this agreement, we have also developed funding modality agreements that include the forfeiture of overheads, and have resulted in savings.

ICRC-IFRC joint Movement response to the famine has generally been well received by major donors. The “SMCC spirit” facilitated joint plans in ongoing drought response in the horn of Africa. Somalia, Yemen, Ethiopia and Kenya saw a smooth and relatively quick agreement on joint appeals. Efforts for a coordinated approach may sometimes hamper effectiveness of the operation, and response speed, e.g. Nigeria required longer discussions and the discussions are still ongoing to finalise a plan for South Sudan since early April.

In three recent disasters, Bangladesh (typhoon), Myanmar (typhoon) and Philippines (increase in violence and conflict) the principles and mechanisms of SMCC - sharing of information, joint planning, presentation of one Movement – have been employed to improve coordination to deliver results for affected populations.

The IFRC and ICRC have undertaken joint tendering for some relief items (common specifications) and the Framework Agreements are under finalization as of end of May 2017. In the course of May 2017, IFRC launched a review of stock pre-positioning across the Movement, aiming to optimize and better utilize the stock across the Movement, and include a review of what, where and how much shall be included in stock pre-positioning.

In February 2017, a detailed plan of action was developed to leverage coordination across the Movement, identifying key priorities for 2017-2018: National Society Capacity development, leveraging cash programs, stockpiling, and identifying which steps of the procurement process can be leveraged across the movement.

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)?

Current progress on SMCC will be presented at the Council of Delegates in 2017, to take stock, review progress, and provide guidance on future action. Additionally, in the anticipated revised SMCC Plan of Action it is proposed to share management costs as well as to continue work on security, logistics and resource mobilisation to streamline systems where possible and improve efficiencies. There is also an agreement between ICRC and IFRC not to double charge costs.

The IFRC will finalize the stock pre-positioning review prior to the end of 2017, for implementation during 2018.

Develop a road map by end of 2017, beginning of 2018, for leveraging the coordination (including tools) across the Movement for National Society capacity development.

Launch early 2018, a review to explore additional avenues in optimizing the overall supply chain across the Movement.

As part of the SMCC process, five country labs have been established focusing efforts to take forward agreed action points and ensure that advances are made in country level coordination and cooperation. These countries are: Philippines, Ukraine, South Sudan, Haiti and Syria. In addition, Joint Implementation Teams (JITs), made of technical focal points from both organizations continue to focus on developing specific support to ensure adequate implementation of the approved Plan of Action.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment¹

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?

¹ As footnoted in the Grand Bargain text, this workstream only applies to those who actively take part in the HRP process.

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?

Working in partnership with communities is at the heart of the work of the National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies' (IFRC) commitment to engagement of and accountability to communities has been a strategic priority, reflected in Strategy 2020 as well as in a plethora of policies, processes and initiatives, both at institutional and operational levels, that support engagement with and accountability to communities. Within the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, IFRC has numerous policies and initiatives linking with Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA). These include:

- RCRC General Assembly resolution: IFRC's commitment to a people-led approach is highlighted in the 2013 Resolution DD/6.4/1 on Beneficiary Communication;
- Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance: There is a strong emphasis on CEA with a rule specifically on beneficiary engagement² and a principle³ stating: "*We ensure that our assistance is appropriate, efficient, effective, and accountable...*";
- National Societies' Minimum standards for CEA: There are various examples of minimum standards developed for different parts of the Movement including by the IFRC and NS operating in East Africa and the Indian Ocean Islands (EAIOI) who developed a set of accountability to communities' minimum standards and a supporting toolkit and training programme.

A number of participatory programming methodologies across many technical sectors have paved the way to fostering increased participation, such as the Vulnerability and Capacity assessment (VCA) approach, Community Based Health and First Aid (CBHFA), Participatory hygiene and sanitation transformation (PHAST); through to frameworks, toolkits and guidance, for example the Resilience Framework that includes a strong focus on community engagement, the top factor for an enabling environment for community resilience and the Gender and Diversity Minimum Standards and toolkit for emergencies that mainstreams accountability throughout. These approaches have been tailored to emergency settings and recover operations.

Most importantly, the 'participation revolution' is put into practice every day by hundreds of thousands of volunteers who are on the frontline of responding to all types of disasters and crises. We thrive to continue supporting these volunteers to inform, listen to, be accountable to the communities they serve.

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?

² Rule number 5

³ Principle number 9

Moving towards a Movement- wide approach to AAP: Completed and launched the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement CEA Guide, toolbox and training package, piloted in the first Movement CEA workshop in July 2016. The CEA guide aims at strengthening National Societies communication with and accountability to communities and securing community engagement in the design and delivery of programmes and operations.

At the policy level, both the IFRC and the ICRC are working towards developing their respective policy frameworks spelling out minimum standards and commitments (with a clear reference and connection to the Core Humanitarian Standards). The Movement approach to AAP will therefore bring together the areas of synergy in core principles and actions structured around the programme cycle while recognising the parameters and limitations of the joint approach. This work will possibly culminate in a resolution on AAP for the Movement at the International Conference (2019). The next Council of Delegates (2017) will have a workshop to discuss the way forward on the resolution.

Operationalizing CEA approaches: supported trainings and engagement and accountability initiatives in several Regions and countries, including fostering better communication with communities, piloting feedback mechanisms, including in partnership with other organizations, and developing Accountability to Communities Minimum Standards.

Innovations and digital community engagement: expanding the IFRC-UNICEF partnership to scale up the use of the U-Report tool in Asia-Pacific, Americas and Africa, as a community engagement platform and large-scale messaging mechanism designed to enable exchange, amplify voices and foster accountability. Launched the virtualvolunteer.org, a Red Cross and Red Crescent web application that helps people migrating access reliable and practical information and support wherever they are. The platform will expand to strengthen migrant’s feedback approaches.

Communication and community engagement collective service: IFRC working closely with UNICEF, OCHA, CDAC Network and other organizations to define and roll out the collective service initiative. Concept paper and plan prepared focusing on pilot countries for testing the approach and Steering Committee meeting held to define the next steps.

Held the first regional [Red Cross Red Crescent Asia Pacific Movement community engagement training \(Bangkok, 18-21 May\)](#) engaging National Societies, IFRC and ICRC participants from eight countries. This training will foster a stronger operational Movement-wide approach to AAP and contribute to a more localized and coordinated approaches to engagement and accountability

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 IFRC, as part of a pledge to operational excellence, has made a commitment to “invest in processes of continuous improvement and innovation, promoting a culture of accountability” and “help establish performance standards”. In particular, the IFRC will continue to:

- Support a coordinated approach: continue to support the establishment of a common communication and community engagement collective service, with focus on defined pilot

countries and the engagement of local actors to inform a more systematic locally-driven collective response towards engaging with communities and sustaining participation and dialogue.

- Strengthen Red Cross and Red Crescent capacity to roll out CEA approaches in humanitarian response: roll out capacity building and knowledge sharing initiatives, including the development of a Movement CEA e-learning course.
- Scale up innovative feedback mechanisms and analyse existing ones to inform and recommend the most effective systems and information management platform to be used by the Red Cross and Red Crescent. Expand on existing perceptions surveys initiatives and ensure they are carried out regularly with at risk and affected people and communities to assess knowledge, engagement and satisfaction levels with the support they have received and gather people's voices towards fostering community-driven solutions.
- Define the development of a CEA policy and framework with a set of minimum actions and commitments. The Red Cross Red Crescent Council of Delegates workshop planned in November 2017 will outline the way forward.
- Expand and enhance existing innovative community engagement approaches/dialogues platforms for hard-to-reach groups, including through the use of technology.

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.

Working in partnership with people and communities leads to better quality programming, which supports the goal of reducing vulnerability and building safer, more resilient communities. In the Red Cross and Red Crescent humanitarian response, CEA approaches and activities helps to improve programme quality by increasing their reach, impact and levels of accountability to communities.

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?

In terms of multi-year planning, IFRC has launched a five year plan and budget at the end of 2015. The plan reflects the organization's focus on building resilient communities which entails long term investment. The IFRC is looking to build multi-year partnerships with governments that would allow for long term investment in communities and support to National Societies. The organisation had very few multi-year partnerships at the time when the Grand Bargain commitments were signed and it represented less than 10% of the organisation's turnover in a given year. One of the difficulties that we have encountered is that even when we sign a multi-year partnership with the government the funding instalments remain annual. This challenges our financial systems and those of other organisations as the multi-year partnerships don't translate in the financial systems as multi-year funding.

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?

On multi-year funding, we have actively engaged with governments that are currently not supporting IFRC on a multi-year basis to find ways to build multi-year partnerships. The basis of this dialogue is IFRC's five year plan and budget.

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)?

We will continue to advocate to governments for multi-year funding including creating funds such as the National Society Investment Mechanism which allows governments to make multi-year investments in National Society capacity building (linked to the localization commitment as well).

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?

The below table sets out our levels of earmarking in over the past four years: 2014-2016.

<i>percentage</i>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Unearmarked*	15%	20%	11%	17%	17%
Softly Earmarked	7%	7%	4%	5%	3%
Earmarked	26%	25%	26%	23%	31%
Tightly Earmarked	52%	47%	59%	55%	49%

It is worth noting that the majority of our unearmarked funds come from the statutory contributions of our members, rather than from bi-lateral donors.

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?

While the amount of unearmarked funds that receive is in the control of donors, we are fundraising for our five year Plan and Budget (2016-2020), and seeking largely thematic funding, which is considered “softly earmarked”.

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)?

We will continue to seek unearmarked funds, which allow for greater flexibility and effectiveness and response, from our donors.

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 IFRC has an established planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, and has been tracking progress of its programmes and operations along the global set of objectives, as identified by its Plan and Budget 2016-2020 “PARTNERING FOR MORE RESILIENT COMMUNITIES”. These objectives, guided by the IFRC Strategy 2020, have been mapped against the Sustainable Development Goals to ensure that IFRC work is linked to the global humanitarian context.

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?

In 2016 IFRC was involved in the discussion led by UNICEF around development of a universal inter-agency data sharing tool (eTool). While its development is underway, IFRC has been exploring options for the development of a web-based platform for programmes and operations planning, management and reporting.

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)?

Based on the research performed in 2016, the IFRC plans to develop an organisation-wide online platform (subject to organisational decisions regarding the IT platform) to ensure that its programmes and operations are planned for, managed and reported on in a more effective way, and the data can be shared and is compatible with the sector standards.

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?

IFRC is a Federation of 190 Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies, who are present before, during, and after crises hits. Our National Societies are mandated to provide health and care services, social services, and implement a wide variety of development programmes. However, IFRC is exempt from this section due to the references to stabilization and the strict adherence of the IFRC and its National Societies to the principles of Neutrality and Independence. Nonetheless, IFRC made a specific commitment to scale up the use of Forecast-based Financing in the context of the Grand Bargain, in order to demonstrate its innovative efforts to link preparedness, response, and longer-term resilience and development activities. The self-report below addresses that commitment in particular:

When the Grand Bargain was signed, there were ongoing Forecast-based Financing (FbF) pilot projects implemented by the International Red Cross/Red Crescent National Societies in Uganda, Togo, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Peru and Bangladesh supported by, among others, the German Red Cross and the German Federal Foreign Office under its framework of the *Action Plan for the Humanitarian Adaptation to Climate Change*.

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 IFRC has already made significant progress, effectively doubling its support to forecast-based financing since the WHS with pilot projects now starting in 8 new countries. In support of the Action Plan, the IFRC and the German Red Cross convened the fourth Dialogue Platform on forecast-based financing in December 2016, bringing together over 100 humanitarian practitioners, climate scientists, donor agencies and government representatives. In addition to exchanging lessons learned and expertise for further developing the FbF methodology, the representatives at the Platform discussed the positioning and potential integration of FbF in the global humanitarian funding tools. In response to regional demand, the IFRC and German Red Cross have convened an Asia-Pacific Dialogue Platform in Vietnam in June 2017. With the technical leadership of the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre progress has been made to strength synergies with scientific institutions and the private sector to develop a solid methodology and alternatives for Forecast-based Financing. Relevant actions have taken place to engage with the hydropower dam sector to improve flood risk management using forecast.

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 line with our commitment to scale up forecast-based financing and support National Societies to increase preparedness for early action, IFRC is organizing a consultation process to assess funding mechanism options in coordination with the German Red Cross and the German Government. The IFRC will also focus on existing pilots and future potential pilot projects on FbF in the coming two years. With the experiences from these pilots, the IFRC will play a convening role, bringing together scientists,

practitioners, and policy-makers at the national, regional, and global levels to share experiences and learn about best practices in FbF.