

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

IRC

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)	4
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	6
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	6
Work stream 4 – Management costs	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date	7
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 5 – Needs Assessment	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	8
2. Progress to date	8
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	9
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	10
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	11
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	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 9 – Reporting requirements	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)	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	14
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	15
3. Planned next steps	16
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	16

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?

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 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?

At the point of endorsing the Grand Bargain commitments, the IRC had committed to greater local partner responsiveness under its 2020 strategic plan, and was reviewing its partnership guidance as had been developed over the preceding years. IRC has been working with national and local partners for many years, working alongside them and providing support and capacity building efforts to strengthen the quality of their programming and management, through a range of approaches developed for their unique contexts and partner relationships.

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 IRC has established a set of tools for strengthening the capacity of civil society actors and partners that support our service delivery programs. Included amongst these are the development of a Partnership Toolkit to guide our work in the Syria region that has helped IRC contribute to building our staff capacity to more actively engage with our local partners. These efforts will help the IRC work more easily and effectively with local organizations and best utilize their knowledge and expertise while reinforcing international and humanitarian standards of leadership, management, and engagement. This will assist local organizations in becoming more accountable, responsive, and transparent. IRC's Emergency Unit also developed a set of guidelines for Partnering in Emergencies, and the Health in Emergencies Strategy has a strong component dedicated to partnership support and strengthening. The IRC is invested in a partnership with Oxfam and World Vision to strengthen the capacity of local partners on protection mainstreaming: a core tenet of humanitarian principles essential for delivering high quality assistance and programming.

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)?

Over the next two years, the IRC is rolling out a revised set of guidelines to ensure more efficient and effective flow of resources to local partners. In terms of technical support and capacity development, our Emergency Unit has committed to strengthening partnerships with CSOs and moving emergency programming towards one of investment in partner's emergency response strategies. Across our other programming, the IRC will leverage the work that went into the Partnership Toolkit, using it to enable country programmes in developing relationships with, working alongside, and supporting / strengthening the capacity of partners.

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?

The [IRC 2020](#) strategy commits the organization to more and faster rescue and relief. Overwhelming evidence shows that cash relief can efficiently reach people in need faster and at a lower cost. Therefore, in 2015, we committed to increase the proportion of humanitarian assistance via cash relief to 25% in our five year strategy. In 2015, cash relief was calculated at approximately 6% of IRC's humanitarian assistance, based on the Horn and East Africa Region procurement data and FY15 organizational expense data.

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 IRC published studies on the [cost efficiency of cash transfers versus non-food item programs](#); a [framework for estimating Digital Financial Services \(DFS\) scale-up needs in humanitarian contexts](#); a [Return on Investment analysis for the expansion of digital financial services](#). The IRC has launched the [IRC cash strategy](#) which outlines objectives to achieve 25% cash relief scale up; the [Cash First position statement](#) defining IRC policy to systematically use cash relief instead of (or, where appropriate, in combination with) in-kind aid. Finally, IRC has set research priorities to test the effectiveness of cash relief to achieve outcomes including women's protection and empowerment, prevention of under-five mortality, and strengthened economic well-being and identify solutions to address the challenges inhibiting faster, more efficient and scaled cash relief.

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 IRC will focus on the development of a Cash Capacity Building Strategy to provide support, resources, and tools required to deliver cash relief programs. The goal is to have Cash Program Prepositioning completed in three countries and a series of internal guidance documents to support country teams as they systematically consider cash relief. Cash is one of the IRC's Organizational Research Priorities. Over the next five years, IRC will build the evidence base of impact and operational research on how best to scale-up the use of cash transfers across IRC outcome areas.

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?

To accomplish its goals in the IRC2020 strategy, the IRC launched a dedicated new team--the Best Use of Resources (BUR) initiative—to increase the efficiency and reach of the IRC and the humanitarian system as a whole. The Best Use of Resources team conducts analyses that compare the costs of a program to the outputs produced (cost efficiency analyses) and the outcomes achieved (cost effectiveness analyses). These analyses support the IRC to compare and cost different approaches and program impact. Between May 2015 and May 2016, the BUR team conducted 10 cost efficiency analyses of key IRC interventions, as well as three cost effectiveness analyses of programs that had an impact evaluation.

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?

To date, the IRC has published [a standard methodology](#) for assessing the cost efficiency and cost effectiveness of humanitarian programs, and conducted 10 cost-efficiency and three cost-effectiveness studies using that methodology and data on IRC projects. We have made these studies [publicly available](#), including the placement of actionable steps to improve program efficiency in our [online evidence tool](#). To meet our commitment for systematic cost analysis across every IRC project, we have developed [a Systematic Cost Analysis \(SCAN\) software](#) which enables program staff to conduct methodologically accurate analyses quickly, using already available data. We piloted this tool with five IRC projects, and are now preparing to roll it out systematically in two country programs. The IRC is also putting together [a coalition](#) of implementing agencies who can test, guide, and champion the ongoing development of the SCAN tool for sector-wide use.

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 IRC will roll out our systematic costing tool as standard practice in two country programs, as well as for individually selected projects in other country programs. The experience in these two “exemplar” countries will help us to understand the resources and training necessary to support full organization-wide rollout of systematic cost analysis in subsequent 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?

The IRC's 2020 Strategy puts the people who IRC's aid is intended to benefit at the center of our decisions: in that strategy, we have committed to systematically and deliberately using the feedback of our aid recipients in our decision making. Reflecting the lack of progress in advancing Accountability to Affected Populations over the last forty years, the IRC recognizes the need to invest in identifying new strategies and testing new approaches, in order to shift policy and practice in support of greater responsiveness and accountability.

Prior to the IRC 2020 Strategy, there were a number of organically developed approaches to accountability and to the practice of listening to clients in use across the organization. At the time of making the Grand Bargain commitment, the IRC had initiated investment in a team mandated with developing a new, coherent and comprehensive approach for the organization. This initiative and the early learning generated, was already securing the IRC's name as a thought leader in advancing accountability to affected populations and greater responsiveness in humanitarian programming.

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 IRC is generating learning about the most effective and efficient ways of capturing client perspectives – we have partnered with others, and drawn learning from our own experience. We have articulated our own approach to client responsive programming, based on industry best practice and learning. We are undertaking research to understand how to stimulate the drivers of change in support of responsiveness, and making investments into strategies to shift incentives. An initial [Client Responsive Programming Framework](#) has been developed based on an extensive IRC document review and multiple consultations with IRC staff and with peer agencies. Finally, we are continually expanding our network and partnerships through which to continue to promote debate and progress.

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 IRC is codifying its approach to client responsive programming, through further testing and development of the practices outlined in the Client Responsive Programming Framework. We are working closely with other initiative leads, senior management and IRC country programs to align the approach and commitments to others which have been made under the 2020 Strategy. We will be investing further in strategic project development, with the aim of further developing our understanding and capacity to deliver responsive programming, and in order to provoke further developments in industry policy and practice.

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 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?

Prior to the IRC 2020 strategy, the IRC had made several steps towards an outcome-driven evidence-based approach. For example, our education work shifted from a focus on access to a focus on learning. However, we had not developed a systematic way to focus on clearly defined outcomes that can be consistently measured across all the contexts in which we work. Neither had we articulated how these outcomes could be achieved. With the recently designed Outcomes and Evidence Framework (OEF), our staff and partners can identify outcomes that are feasible within a given context and explore the attached theory of change to inform their program planning. They can use this framework as a basis to advocate for/demonstrate the necessity of multi-year planning and funding to achieve the desired outcomes.

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?

IRC has developed an interactive outcomes and evidence framework (iOEF) that contains the tools needed to design effective programs. IRC staff have access to (i) outcome definitions and indicators for measuring those outcomes, (ii) theories of change that describe the pathways for achieving those outcomes and (iii) the best available quantitative evidence on interventions that can contribute to that outcome. The iOEF was rolled out through workshops, webinars and conferences inside and outside the IRC. In the last quarter of 2016 alone, the iOEF had over 2000 users from 98 different countries. The IRC has also engaged several donors in the sharing and improvement of the OEF. To date, the OEF has been shared with teams within the UN, World Bank, USAID, DFID and SIDA. We have shared the iOEF in large public forums including the World Humanitarian Summit, the What Works Global Summit, The Evidence Aid Conference, and 31st ALNAP Annual Meeting. We have engaged key peers such as the World Food Program, World Vision, Mercy Corps and other NGOs in exploring how we can collaborate to use and improve the framework for designing and reporting on multi-year programs using common outcomes, theories of change and metrics/indicators.

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)?

As the iOEF continues to be rolled out, all IRC country programs have used the outcomes in the iOEF as the basis of their strategic action plans for the next four years. Each country has identified three to five priority outcomes and will use the corresponding indicators to measure programmatic progress each year. Together with technical teams, our country programs are beginning to use the theories of change to develop programmatic strategies based on their five-year plan for supporting meaningful change in the lives of conflict-affected people in each country with an IRC office. This is a fundamental shift towards taking a longer-term view for program planning (and aligning funding to it). We have several examples where this cross-sectoral, multi-year planning with flexible funding has

been successful. Our work in the Middle East in partnership with DFID has yielded two long-term programs, which has allowed for collaboration across several partners and opportunities to use the OEF to guide our planning and report consistently on outcomes while remaining flexible and adaptive to the shifting contextual dynamics.

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?

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 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?

As part of the IRC's strategic measurement initiative, the Monitoring for Action (MfA) effort is specifically designed to improve the quality and use of project data. Among other objectives, MfA aims to ensure that staff have a clear understanding of the purpose of and expectations around monitoring, have clarity around their responsibilities, and have the capacity to fulfil them. It is also working to ensure that institutional commitment to improving data quality and use is demonstrated through establishment of the accountability mechanisms, support structures, and resources needed to shift the organizational culture from monitoring of action to monitoring for 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?

The IRC has developed and rolled out new monitoring standards that are improving the type of data we collect, the quality of our data, and our staff's capacity to use data for course correction. These new standards are accompanied by tools, staff resources, and an organization-wide commitment to prioritizing the use of data. One critical tool is a web-based DHIS2 information management system (IMS). The new IMS provides a single, common data management system for all country programs, while providing global access for all staff, built in analytical capabilities, mobile compatibility, and long-term data storage.

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 Monitoring for Action initiative has been successfully rolled out to all IRC country programs. The next phase of the project will focus on enhancing foundational capacities and improving structures. Emergency Monitoring Standards are being piloted in Uganda around refugee response and the new standards will be applied in all future IRC emergency responses.

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?

Financing, policies, and planning to support refugees as currently designed are not fit to support the “new normal” of protracted displacement. A vast majority of the refugees that IRC serves, find themselves in an environment with limited solutions and opportunities. Displacement lasts on average 10 years; traditional durable solutions are unattainable to the majority. The IRC seeks to change policy and practice so that refugees—and the communities and countries that host them—are provided assistance which allows them to live in dignity and be self-reliant during their displacement and to find durable solutions.

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 IRC with the Center for Global Development led a study group which put forward recommendations for developing refugee compacts. As well, the IRC has actively engaged the EU in the development of their Migration Partnership Frameworks including in Niger, Mali, Ethiopia, and Nigeria.

In 2016 the IRC called for a Million Jobs Challenge to explore opportunities for job creation for refugees in Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan. At the London Conference anniversary the IRC evaluated progress against the Jordan Compact and outlined lessons learned through its work on Million Jobs Challenge initiative.

Along with the Danish and the Norwegian Refugee Council, the IRC has established the Displacement Solutions Platform for the Syria crisis to provide research, advocacy, and capacity building on solutions.

The IRC/ReDSS report on Early Solutions in the Horn of Africa, makes clear recommendations to the UNHCR and Member States in the Horn of Africa which seek to engage with stakeholders, especially civil society organizations in setting the norms and standards for the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF). The IRC has actively engaged with the UNHCR led CRRF Task Team in Geneva and during its missions to the pilot countries.

The IRC in the Horn of Africa contributed to the development of the ReDSS Durable Solutions Toolkit, which was used in the series of capacity building workshops in five countries in 2016. The Toolkit was developed with the guidance and participation of Solutions Alliance members and others including, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the World Bank, UNHCR, humanitarian and development donors, DRC, IRC, NRC, Save the Children, Refugee Consortium Kenya and InterAid Uganda.

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)?

IRC will advocate around three new financing streams and policy initiatives related to the humanitarian/development nexus—the development of the World Bank lending instruments for refugee-hosting countries, EU Migration Partnership Framework Agreements and the CRRF pilot/Refugee Compact development. This includes continuing to develop research, generate field tested policy recommendations, and actively participate in piloting new approaches in two of IRC's regions while lifting lessons learned to global policy makers.

The CRRF and proposed Global Compact on Refugees in 2018 present a significant opportunity to anchor best practices; therefore, IRC and allies will continue to invest in the collection and presentation of evidence from field-proven practice, to ensure that the CRRF is characterized by viable approaches to durable solutions.

IRC continues as the civil society representative to the Solutions Alliance Governing Board. In this capacity, the IRC will enhance its engagement strategy in 2017 to crowd-in key actors and recommendations. Capacity building workshops will be expanded to ensure civil society and other stakeholders can actively engage in solutions dialogues.

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?