

Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

1. All signatories to the Grand Bargain are expected to complete the self-report annually.
2. Reporting should reflect activities and progress that has taken place between January 2017 and December 2017.
3. The self-report requests information by work stream, however, in order to best track progress, signatories are asked to provide as much specific and relevant detail on progress made against each of the 51 individual commitments as possible. A full list of commitments for each work stream is included in the self-report template for reference.
4. The questions contained in this self-report are the same as in 2017, however some work streams include additional question for signatories, at the request of the work stream co-conveners. If you are unable to provide this information, please note the reasons for this.
5. Signatories who have not previously completed a self-report are asked to answer question one for each work stream, to provide a baseline of where your organisation stood when it became a Grand Bargain signatory. Existing signatories can complete questions two to five for each work stream, as your 2017 self-report will have already provided the baseline information sought by question one.
6. Please type your answers immediately below each question asked.
7. Signatories are encouraged to report both on progress made, and where they may have experienced obstacles or challenges to realising their commitments.
8. Signatories are encouraged, where possible and relevant, to reflect on their contributions to the Grand Bargain both as recipients of humanitarian funds and donors of humanitarian funds. This will allow us to capture the transfer of benefits accrued at higher ends of the value chain down to the frontline.
9. Signatories are asked to limit their responses to a maximum of 500 words per work stream.
10. Self-reports are public documents, and will be published as submitted on the IASC-hosted Grand Bargain [website](#) from 3rd June, 2018.
11. Self-reports will be used to inform the 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report, which will provide a collective analysis of the progress for each work stream, and for the Grand Bargain as a whole. The Independent Annual Grand Bargain report will be published prior to the 2018 Annual Grand Bargain Meeting on 18 June 2018, in New York.

12. The 2018 Independent Annual Grand Bargain Report is being prepared by [ODI/HPG](#). Signatories may be contacted by ODI/HPG as part of their research and preparation of the Independent Report.
13. If you require support or advice to complete your self-report, you may direct enquiries to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org].

Gender Inclusion

Signatories are encouraged address to the gender dimensions of their Grand Bargain commitments. For reporting on each work stream, consideration should be given to the guidance provided by the [Aide-Memoire on Gender Mainstreaming in the Grand Bargain](#) that addresses the gender dimensions of resources, capacity, evidence and data, participation, leadership, accountability and communication within the Grand Bargain. Signatories are also welcome to provide additional detail on how they consider they have, at a macro level, ensured their Grand Bargain follow-up is gender-responsive, and to include any examples of good practice that they wish to share. This data will assist in the preparation of the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain report, which will assess the extent to which gender has been considered by Grand Bargain work streams.



2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – [Name of Signatory]

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	5
2. Progress to date.....	5
3. Planned next steps.....	6
4. Efficiency gains	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned	6
Work stream 2 - Localization.....	8
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	8
2. Progress to date.....	8
3. Planned next steps.....	9
4. Efficiency gains	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned	10
Work stream 3 - Cash.....	11
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	11
2. Progress to date.....	11
3. Planned next steps.....	12
4. Efficiency gains	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned	13
Work stream 4 – Management costs.....	14
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	15
2. Progress to date.....	15
3. Planned next steps.....	15
4. Efficiency gains	16
5. Good practices and lessons learned	16
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment.....	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	18
2. Progress to date.....	18
3. Planned next steps.....	18
4. Efficiency gains	18

5. Good practices and lessons learned	18
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	19
2. Progress to date.....	19
3. Planned next steps.....	20
4. Efficiency gains	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned	21
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	22
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	22
2. Progress to date.....	22
3. Planned next steps.....	23
4. Efficiency gains	23
5. Good practice and lessons learned	23
Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	24
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	24
2. Progress to date.....	24
3. Planned next steps.....	25
4. Efficiency gains	25
5. Good practices and lessons learned	25
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	26
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	26
2. Progress to date.....	26
3. Planned next steps.....	26
4. Efficiency gains	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned	27
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement.....	28
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	28
2. Progress to date.....	28
3. Planned next steps.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Efficiency gains	29
5. Good practices and lessons learned	29

Work stream 1 - Transparency

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Publish timely, transparent, harmonised and open high-quality data on humanitarian funding within two years of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul. We consider IATI to provide a basis for the purpose of a common standard.*
2. *Make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances (for example, protection, conflict-zones).*
3. *Improve the digital platform and engage with the open-data standard community to help ensure:*
 - *accountability of donors and responders with open data for retrieval and analysis;*
 - *improvements in decision-making, based upon the best possible information;*
 - *a reduced workload over time as a result of donors accepting common standard data for some reporting purposes; and*
 - *traceability of donors' funding throughout the transaction chain as far as the final responders and, where feasible, affected people.*
4. *Support the capacity of all partners to access and publish data.*

Transparency work stream co-conveners reporting request: How will you use the data from IATI within your organization including, for example, for monitoring, reporting and vis-à-vis other Grand Bargain commitments?

The ICRC does not use data from IATI.

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?

As planned the ICRC carried out in 2017 a feasibility study to assess compatibility of the IATI standard with internal planning, budgeting and reporting systems and applicability of the standard in humanitarian settings.

On the basis of the feasibility study, the ICRC top management has decided to commence publishing all data to the IATI standards in 2018 for an initial two-year period. Following internal reflection on the compatibility with IT systems and efficiency gains, the ICRC will proceed with manual upload of data for this initial period. The ICRC remains concerned about certain deficiencies it identified in the

standard and how it is adapted to reflect flows of money of humanitarian actors. The ICRC will review whether to continue publishing after this two-year period, in light of how these deficiencies have been overcome.

Throughout 2017 the ICRC additionally, together with IFRC, carried out a series of interviews with different types of IATI publishers, mainly sister National Societies. The ICRC also organised a briefing by Development Initiatives (DI) on IATI, together with UNHCR and IFRC, and participated in the DI IATI briefing in March 2017.

In June 2017, the ICRC co-published a 'Joint Position of ICRC, IFRC and UNHCR on IATI and Transparency Commitments' paper outlining organisational commitments to transparency as well as challenges posed within the existing standard.

Additionally, looking at the issue of transparency from a wider point of view, in May 2017 the ICRC hosted its second Donor Support Group presentation of the ICRC Management Letter 2016, where we share the feedback from ICRC's external auditor and its overview of fraud cases including their management and lessons learnt.

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 commence manual publishing to IATI standard in 2018 for an initial two-year period. Additionally, the ICRC will conduct its third Donor Support Group Presentation of the ICRC Management Letter (2017) including an overview of its fraud cases.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

In line with the ICRC commitment to undertaking a feasibility study of compatibility with IATI standard it; established senior level Steering Committee and recruited a full time EFT position to undertake the study. The ICRC will also engage additional resources in order to manually upload all data to IATI commencing in 2018 for an initial two-year period.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

Following completion of the ICRC feasibility study and internal reflection, the ICRC analysed both the dashboard and the information captured drawing lessons learned throughout the process; a) the totals measure only the quantity of data published by organisations and whether such data is in compliance with the IATI standard – that is, whilst the framework purports to assess data quality, the performance measures are only able to capture whether the data has been filled in, b) organisations that do not use the prescribed or preferred vocabulary have total scores docked resulting in a lower score, c) should totals continue to be represented as an assessment of data quality, there remains a strong risk that the totals will be utilised by IATI users as easy-to-find markers of which aid actors made/did not make visible and public improvements in their data, and d) should this be the case, it

would be important to ensure the standard be truly adapted to humanitarian actors in all their diversity within a multi-stakeholder humanitarian landscape.

Work stream 2 – Localization

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.*
2. *Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.*
3. *Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.*
4. *Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.*
5. *Develop, with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and apply a 'localisation' marker to measure direct and indirect funding to local and national responders.*
6. *Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CBPF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.*

Localisation work stream co-conveners reporting request: What percentage of your humanitarian funding in 2017 was provided to local and national responders (a) directly (b) through pooled funds, or (c) through a single intermediary?¹

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?

¹ The "Identified Categories for Tracking Aid Flows" document agreed through silence procedure ([available here](#)) provides relevant definitions. The detailed data collection form ([available here](#)) may also assist you in responding to this question. Returning this form with your self report is optional, but encouraged.

In September 2017, the ICRC organized an internal workshop to: a) take stock of the institution's experience in engaging with and supporting local and national actors, both within and outside the Movement; b) identify areas where the ICRC could improve its own practice; and c) draw from its operational experience in order to inform the localization discussion as it moves forward.

In October 2017, the ICRC and the IFRC signed a Memorandum of Understanding to establish the National Society Investment Alliance (NSIA), a joint investment fund to provide multi-year financing and support for National Society development. The NSIA focuses on medium, high and very high-risk contexts.

The ICRC actively supports a study of the British Red Cross on "The case for complementarity within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in situations of armed conflict and violence" in three contexts. The objective is to explore how the international and national components of the Movement work in a spirit of meaningful complementarity, and to identify areas where National Societies can be strengthened. The first case study of this project, launched in December 2017 in Colombia is still ongoing.

The ICRC also pursues a number of on-going initiatives aimed at strengthening the role and capacities of National Societies, such as its Safer Access Framework and the Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC) process.

In relation to the specific question of the WS to the signatories, the ICRC does not track its funding in that manner. Our joint programmes with the operating national societies include direct costs for the delivery of a programme, which in turn can be done directly with the ICRC, or in a separate way. Also, it includes within that in-kind and in-cash contributions.

The contributions to local actors other than the operating national society are included in the corresponding programmes (water and sanitation, detention, etc.)

Additionally, the ICRC is more often than not the frontline responder, which would then make the whole calculation inaccurate.

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)?

During 2018 the ICRC, together with the IFRC, will finalise the structure and strategy of the NSIA and launch the application process. The pilot phase will include a limited number of National Societies and be implemented over the coming two years.

Additionally, the ICRC will publish a public report assessing how the ICRC engages with the broad range of local and national actors (e.g. relevant authorities, National Societies, civil society groups, business suppliers and contractors) across its different programmes and in different settings affected by conflict and other situations of violence.

The ICRC will also strengthen and mainstream its accountability framework fully incorporating coordinating, partnering and strengthening of local capacities (*see Workstream 6 on Participation Revolution*).

The SMCC process will focus further development on awareness, interoperability and resource mobilization leading towards the Council of Delegates 2019.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Some on-going processes related to this workstream (but predating the signing of the GB) have led to some efficiency gains. This is the case for instance within the SMCC process, where in South Sudan and Ukraine there has been significant improvements with increased alignment and complementarity between Movement partners resulting in an enlarged operational footprint of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and more efficient National Society development.

As for other processes (NSIA, study by British RC, Accountability to Affected People, etc.), it is too early to assess impact this early into the processes.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

The use of the SMCC mindset and tools (contingency plan, Mini-summit, country plans) allows National Societies to be more solidly placed at the center of the decision-making process.

Work stream 3 – Cash

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.*
- 2. Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.*
- 3. Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.*
- 4. Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.*
- 5. Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.*
- 6. Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.*

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?

The ICRC decided to increase its operational budget and diversify cash-based interventions in order to reach more beneficiaries where possible. Therefore, the number of beneficiaries assisted through cash transfer programming (CTP) increases year on year with 1.38 million people reached in 2017 across 35 countries, with expenditure of CHF 64 million. The 2018 budget for CTP has increased to CHF 80 million. This growth has been made possible by; a) training and other capacity-building initiatives, b) standardized procedures, c) technical tools and guidance, and d) the integration of cash and market specialists to provide direct support (e.g. coaching in programme design and implementation) to delegations (ICRC field offices).

To date, CTP has been used mainly as part of ICRC programmes promoting economic security, with some limited use in terms of protection, water, shelter, healthcare and other areas. However, in 2017, the ICRC created a new position of Institutional Cash Transfers & Markets Specialist, responsible for developing the institutional strategy for Cash Transfer Programming (CTP). This position will support and foster institutional capacity building and alignment across all programme areas, in order to

increase and broaden the scope of CTP as an integral and multidisciplinary part of ICRC's response to the needs of people affected by armed conflicts and other situations of violence.

In 2017 the main activities included; a) drafting of a provisional CTP Strategy for the ICRC, b) feasibility mapping of CTP across all sectors, c) updating internal CTP Standard Operating Procedures, and d) additional changes to ICRC financial systems to allow more specificity in financial reporting on CTP (both cash and vouchers).

The ICRC is also a signatory member of CaLP since 2017, and an active member of the International Red Cross Red and Crescent Movement's Cash Peer Working Group. In 2017 the group created a draft RCRC Movement Strategic Framework for CTP (to be formalised in 2018), and continued to drive the development of technical guidance, tools and training materials for implementing CTP. In 2018, ICRC will co-chair this group.

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 CTP, 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:

- Increasing the budget allocated for such programmes; budget increased a further 20% to CHF 83 million in 2018
- Exploring CTP to meet needs in the health, water and habitat, and protection sectors; a) Feasibility mapping underway with areas identified for CTP expansion including; access to healthcare, ensuring safe shelter, restoring family links, and livelihood support, and b) pilot projects identified in all areas abovementioned for 2018.
- Devising and implementing an institutional strategy to integrate CTP across the different ICRC operational departments, while strengthening the capacities of support services; a) draft CTP Strategy to be adopted in 2018 with formal roadmap, b) financial accounting system updated for more detail in CTP financial reporting from 2018 onwards, c) assessment of programme reporting to identify any needed adaptations for CTP, d) resources agreed for dedicated Logistics Cash Specialist to work on internal systems and building logistics capacity in CTP in 2018.
- The ICRC will also closely coordinate with Movement partners to help bolster the capacities of National Societies to provide cash-based assistance; a) RCRCM CTP Strategic Framework in draft, to be finalized in 2018, b) commitment made to build capacities of three National Societies in CTP over the next three years (linked with wider Movement efforts in capacity building, and c) ICRC co-chair of RCRC Movement Cash Peer Working Group for 2018.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Due to better integration of CTP SOPs in delegations (including standard templates/guidance for financial service provider contracting that significantly reduces contracting time), and in the provision of additional technical support from Regional CTP Specialists to delegation programmes, the ICRC has shortened CTP implementation processes in operational contexts. In terms of money spent, whilst cost is a relevant factor and ICRC compares the cost of in kind versus CTP in its analysis on a programme by programme basis, the ICRC does not have centralized information on 'money saved' (for example by switching modalities, or by selecting one FSP with cheaper rates over another). Any such cost savings simply allows the ICRC to assist a greater number of people.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

At a global level, ICRC has committed more resources in terms of human resources, training opportunities, technical support etc. to CTP activities in delegations. The investment in CTP expertise in the ICRC's Economic Security Unit saw a vast increase in CTP (190'000 people assisted in 2012 to 1.38 million assisted in 2017), and as such ICRC recognized the need to devote adequate resources to this file. This has led to ICRC's decision to resource a position devoted solely to the mainstreaming of CTP across the institution, which is also starting to pay dividends in terms of enabling a clear strategy, developing a clear roadmap, and identifying blockages and solutions.

As a member of the RCRC Movement ICRC continues to engage in CTP with other RCRC partners in order to maximize the resources, knowledge and learning. For example, in Nigeria the ICRC is working actively with British Red Cross to build CTP preparedness capacity of the Nigerian Red Cross.

In terms of field-level lessons learned, ICRC has noted and acted upon the need to scale-up multi-purpose cash in emergency response. In addition, the CTP SOPs have been significantly updated for logistics processes (with tools, templates, specific guidance etc.) and a dedicated Logistics Cash Specialist has been hired.

Work stream 4 – Management costs

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Reduce the costs and measure the gained efficiencies of delivering assistance with technology (including green) and innovation. Aid organisations will provide the detailed steps to be taken by the end of 2017.*

Examples where use of technology can be expanded:

- Mobile technology for needs assessments/post-distribution monitoring;*
 - Digital platforms and mobile devices for financial transactions;*
 - Communication with affected people via call centres and other feedback mechanisms such as SMS text messaging;*
 - Biometrics; and*
 - Sustainable energy.*
- 2. Harmonise partnership agreements and share partner assessment information as well as data about affected people, after data protection safeguards have been met by the end of 2017, in order to save time and avoid duplication in operations.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 3. Provide transparent and comparable cost structures by the end of 2017. We acknowledge that operational management of the Grand Bargain signatories - the United Nations, International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and the NGO sector may require different approaches.*
- 4. Reduce duplication of management and other costs through maximising efficiencies in procurement and logistics for commonly required goods and services. Shared procurement should leverage the comparative advantage of the aid organisations and promote innovation.*

Suggested areas for initial focus:

- Transportation/Travel;*
- Vehicles and fleet management;*
- Insurance;*
- Shipment tracking systems;*
- Inter-agency/common procurement pipelines (non-food items, shelter, WASH, food);*
- IT services and equipment;*
- Commercial consultancies; and*
- Common support services.*

Donors commit to:

5. *Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.*
-

Management costs work stream co-conveners reporting request: What steps have you taken to reduce the number of individual donor assessments (if a donor) or partner assessments (if an agency) you conduct on humanitarian partners?

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?

Quality Social and Environmental Procurement Working Group (QSE): Within the QSE working group, the ICRC shares processes, tools, and means of quality control of its most delivered relief items. Additionally the ICRC also provided support and training to UNHCR and IFRC, and organises monthly monitoring of the implementation of the quality management system. In November 2017, as per previous years, the ICRC renewed its agreement to perform quality control free of charge for other organizations thereby 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.

Coordinated procurement: Collaboration with the above-mentioned organizations was also pursued and deepened. In 2017 the ICRC launched joint tenders with IOM for family tents and with IFRC for blankets.

Sourcing and audits: The QSE working group shares suppliers audit outcomes, and audits were opened to external participants i.e. Swiss Red Cross and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC. The ICRC additionally performed two audits on behalf of the UNHCR, and shared framework agreements with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement and IOM.

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)?

During 2018 supplier production capacities will be shared through the QSE with a common tool, and joint procurements are planned with QSE members and the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. The ICRC will also provide support and training on quality control and quality management to IOM, as well as quality management and joint procurement sharing.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Efficiency gains associated with reducing duplication of management and other costs are defined through both the processes undertaken and reduction in spending. Through the QSE; a) duplication of management tasks and associated waste of time and resources are avoided, b) appropriate quality delivered by suppliers (i.e. longer life lasting of goods) reduces distribution frequency and reinforces the value for money amongst humanitarian organisation, and c) specification definition determines the appropriate quality level and hence avoids 'over quality'.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

Through the QSE, best practices for quality management (Quality Control, and QSE audits) have been shared amongst members and market shaping has concentrated the procurement power of humanitarian organisations.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.*
2. *Coordinate and streamline data collection to ensure compatibility, quality and comparability and minimising intrusion into the lives of affected people. Conduct the overall assessment in a transparent, collaborative process led by the Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator with full involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team and the clusters/sectors and in the case of sudden onset disasters, where possible, by the government. Ensure sector-specific assessments for operational planning are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated plan of assessments at inter-cluster/sector level.*
3. *Share needs assessment data in a timely manner, with the appropriate mitigation of protection and privacy risks. Jointly decide on assumptions and analytical methods used for projections and estimates.*
4. *Dedicate resources and involve independent specialists within the clusters to strengthen data collection and analysis in a fully transparent, collaborative process, which includes a brief summary of the methodological and analytical limitations of the assessment.*
5. *Prioritise humanitarian response across sectors based on evidence established by the analysis. As part of the IASC Humanitarian Response Plan process on the ground, it is the responsibility of the empowered Humanitarian Coordinator/Resident Coordinator to ensure the development of the prioritised, evidence-based response plans.*
6. *Commission independent reviews and evaluations of the quality of needs assessment findings and their use in prioritisation to strengthen the confidence of all stakeholders in the needs assessment.*
7. *Conduct risk and vulnerability analysis with development partners and local authorities, in adherence to humanitarian principles, to ensure the alignment of humanitarian and development programming.*

Needs assessment work stream co-conveners reporting request: What hurdles, if any, might be addressed to allow for more effective implementation of the GB commitment?

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

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

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other rief) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.*
- 2. Develop common standards and a coordinated approach for community engagement and participation, with the emphasis on inclusion of the most vulnerable, supported by a common platform for sharing and analysing data to strengthen decision-making, transparency, accountability and limit duplication.*
- 3. Strengthen local dialogue and harness technologies to support more agile, transparent but appropriately secure feedback.*
- 4. Build systematic links between feedback and corrective action to adjust programming.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Fund flexibly to facilitate programme adaptation in response to community feedback.*
- 6. Invest time and resources to fund these activities.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 7. Ensure that, by the end of 2017, all humanitarian response plans – and strategic monitoring of them - demonstrate analysis and consideration of inputs from affected communities.*

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?

The ICRC established a senior position to oversee work on Accountability to Affected People (AAP) and bring together staff working on gender, diversity and disability inclusion, community engagement, and community based protection.

An institutional framework on AAP was defined and shared with delegations to highlight key expectations on two way communication with affected communities and their participation in decisions that affect them.

An AAP self-assessment was piloted in six delegations, so as to identify areas for improvement.

An independent evaluation of its policy and practice on AAP and diversity inclusion in its operations was commissioned. Its aim was to confirm the relevance of the institutional framework, set up a baseline and identify priorities for action. The final report is due mid-2018. In the meantime, the ICRC participated in the SCHR peer review on AAP.

In order to better support the integration of participation within staff practice, the ICRC integrated as a core competency a “client / person centric” dimension that will be part of staff appraisal from 2018 onwards.

The ICRC completed a feasibility study to generalise the use of multi-channel contact centres at delegation level, to more consistently respond to feedback. It partnered with Ground Truth Solutions to conduct community perception and satisfaction surveys in the Philippines and Afghanistan.

Together with the IFRC and other members of the Movement, ICRC worked on a joint approach to community engagement and accountability, co-organising a workshop on CEA at the Council of Delegates 2017, and co-publishing several guides.

The report ‘Humanitarian Futures for Messaging Apps’ was published to better understand the opportunities and risks of messaging apps in humanitarian action.

The ICRC established a steering group and appointed a business analyst to conduct an internal review of existing “hotline” solutions and processes within the ICRC, other humanitarian organisations, and the private sector in order to design "contact centers".

In parallel, ICRC and OCHA designed the “hotline in-a-box” toolbox. This 6-month project, was launched in September 2017.

Training for delegations on Community Based Protection continued. This is a people-centered and multi-disciplinary approach in which communities are engaged to shape our humanitarian response, leverage existing capacities and reduce people’s exposure to risks.

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 2018, the ICRC will complement its evaluation on AAP and diversity inclusion in operations and refine its improvement plan and address gaps based on the findings and priorities. This process will be supported by an AAP self-assessment tool to be used at delegations by the end of 2019 and re-used on a yearly basis as part of the annual planning cycle.

Sector specific guidance will be revised to integrate AAP (inclusive of diversity and disability), as well as training modules.

The ICRC will publish a Discussion paper on the subject from a collaboration with the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative (HHI). Following the report on messaging apps, the ICRC will publish a report on humanitarian metadata, in collaboration with Privacy International.

Together with other Movement members, it will continue to develop a joint approach on Community Engagement and Accountability focusing on sector standards, Grand Bargain commitments and the specificities of the Movement. The ICRC and IFRC will launch an e-learning module to CEA based on the CEA 2017 Guide for the Movement.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Efficiency gains are primarily found in the synergies derived from bringing together advisors working on diversity inclusion, disability inclusion, community based protection, community engagement and AAP. i.e. in terms of the number of people able to provide support on any of these topics, and the additional simplicity for users at field level and the resulting improved buy in from field staff.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

See under point 4.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments and document the impacts on programme efficiency and effectiveness, ensuring that recipients apply the same funding arrangements with their implementing partners.*
- 2. Support in at least five countries by the end of 2017 multi-year collaborative planning and response plans through multi-year funding and monitor and evaluate the outcomes of these responses.*
- 3. Strengthen existing coordination efforts to share analysis of needs and risks between the humanitarian and development sectors and to better align humanitarian and development planning tools and interventions while respecting the principles of both.*

Multi-year planning and funding work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please report the percentage and total value of multi-year agreements² you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.³ When reporting on efficiency gains, please try to provide quantitative examples.

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?

Multi-year Planning

The reforms to field-level planning were implemented as anticipated in the summer and autumn of 2018, making it possible to formally capture and track multi-year programmes in the new institutional Planning and Monitoring Tool (PMT). Analysis of PMT data shows that 69% of all General Objectives (higher-level outcomes) and 47% of all Specific Objectives (lower-level outcomes) are currently multi-year. Near every delegation, across all of the ICRC regions, has made use of the multi-year function of the PMT including for example Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Mali, Myanmar, Syria, Ukraine and Yemen.

The ICRC also conducted evaluations of two ICRC priority multi-year institutional initiatives in 2017 (Health Care in Danger and addressing Sexual Violence), with the implementation of recommendations from these now underway.

Multi-year contributions received by ICRC.

² Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

³ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

Amount of multi-year funding (as per contracts signed in 2017): CHF 680.1 million

Of which,

Non-earmarked: 68.3%

Regionally earmarked: 0.2%

Country earmarked: 30.5%

Tightly earmarked: 1.0%

Amount of multi-year funding (amount available for implementation 2017): CHF 287.1 million

Of which,

Non-earmarked: 50.8%

Regionally earmarked: 0.1%

Country earmarked: 47.9%

Tightly earmarked: 1.2%

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 aspect of the new Planning and Monitoring Tool will be rolled out in 2018, allowing for more systematic capturing of monitoring data for multi-year programmes.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

The new annual field planning process has been reduced from 33 weeks to 14 and is thus more efficient. The Planning and Monitoring Tool allows for more effective tracking of multi-year objectives, as the same indicators can now more easily be tracked consistently over time.

5. Good practice and lessons learned

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?

Regarding Multi-year planning, as mentioned above, the monitoring will only start at the end of 2018, so we cannot report on lessons learned yet.

In relation to multi-year contributions received by ICRC, these come from a variety of donors, with a different conditions attached. Whilst this type of contributions isn't new, it has increased in the past few years. The ICRC isn't today in a position to determine lessons learned. It remains confident that, by the end of the multi-year contributions, these best practices will become clearer.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Jointly determine, on an annual basis, the most effective and efficient way of reporting on unearmarked and softly earmarked funding and to initiate this reporting by the end of 2017.*
- 2. Reduce the degree of earmarking of funds contributed by governments and regional groups who currently provide low levels of flexible finance. Aid organisations in turn commit to do the same with their funding when channelling it through partners.*

Aid organisations commit to:

- 3. Be transparent and regularly share information with donors outlining the criteria for how core and unearmarked funding is allocated (for example, urgent needs, emergency preparedness, forgotten contexts, improved management)*
- 4. Increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognising the contribution made by donors.*

Donors commit to:

- 5. Progressively reduce the earmarking of their humanitarian contributions. The aim is to aspire to achieve a global target of 30 per cent of humanitarian contributions that is non earmarked or softly earmarked by 2020⁴.*

Earmarking/flexibility work stream co-conveners reporting request: Please specify if possible the percentages of 2017 vs 2016 of:

- Unearmarked contributions (given/received)
- Softly earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Country earmarked contributions (given/received)
- Tightly earmarked contributions (given/received)

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?

⁴ For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

On the evolution of contributions:

	2016	2017
Non-earmarked	22.59%	21.71%
Loosely earmarked	7.29%	6.41%
Country earmarked	54.75%	56.66%
Tightly earmarked	15.37%	15.22%

On the evolution of dialogue with donors:

In 2017, the ICRC shared an update with its Donor Support Group (DSG) on the impact and added value of unearmarked funding. The DSG was also able to have a dialogue on the use / the need for unearmarked funding with the ICRC Directors in early 2018 during the DSG Policy Forum. Additionally, the Director of Operations discussed this issue with all donors during the launch of the Renewed Appeals in late 2017.

This allowed the ICRC to better grasp the difficulties donors have to provide flexible funding and will therefore work towards meeting those concerns in the future (see section below)

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 further deepen its discussion with donors in the first half of 2018, highlighting the financial flows of unearmarked funds. Also, it will work towards enhancing the visibility of unearmarked contributions.

Additionally, the ICRC will continue to enhance its dialogue with policy makers in the public sphere of its main donors.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Thus far, we have not seen an increase in flexible contributions. (See table in point 2)

In fact, the flexibility in the overall contributions from donors (who supported however the total amount of the Appeal) has decreased. The decrease in flexibility of our funding has translated into a pattern of increasing negative balances brought forward in our underfunded operations. Seeing how this burden each new budget from the outset, the ICRC is in dire need of reversing the trend, for the negative effect cannot be sustained in the long run.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

The DSG and the ICRC have started to have a thorough dialogue on the need/use of unearmarked contributions. This is very much welcomed by the organisation. Therefore, we plan to continue further in this line of specific dialogue with donors, both from a multilateral and from a bilateral point of view. The ICRC very much appreciates this new level of open and frank dialogue.

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

- 1. Simplify and harmonise reporting requirements by the end of 2018 by reducing its volume, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.*
- 2. Invest in technology and reporting systems to enable better access to information.*
- 3. Enhance the quality of reporting to better capture results, enable learning and increase the efficiency of reporting.*

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?

ICRC continues its active engagement in taking in the needs and requirements of donors whilst matching its capacity to ensure efficiency at the highest level. In this view, the ICRC has been working on enhancing its performance management processes, practices and systems to better capture outcome based programming and in 2017 introduced news tools for its annual planning process (as well as multi-year planning) across its operations.

In addition, the ICRC Business Intelligence programme continues to further develop ICRC's capacity to capitalise on available information to make evidence-based management decisions improving performance across the board. The management of data, measures and indicators will improve data quality, avoid duplications (thereby reducing the reporting workload). The ICRC top management also decided to commence publishing all data to the IATI standards in 2018 for an initial two-year period (see Workstream 1).

These new processes will improve the capacity of the ICRC to manage field operations using results information, allow for data and trend analysis at different levels of the organisation and increase both the accuracy and efficiency of data its provides to its donors through its standard reporting and adhoc reports to donors.

In 2017, the ICRC highest governing board also determined to undertake a comprehensive analytical assessment of ICRC's donor reporting requirements, incorporating the evolution of those needs and adaptations as may be required within existing reporting systems.

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 continue efforts to align its processes and mechanisms for meeting both internal and external reporting requirements. The objective is to optimise institutional reporting while reducing internal transaction costs. Tasks will include accommodating relevant donor requirements in the ICRC's emerging Institutional Performance Framework and reviewing the content, structure, timing and audience of ICRC's standard reports.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

The new processes presently mean an additional effort in time and resources for the ICRC. It is generally assumed that, eventually, these initiatives will lead to overall gains in efficiency, but this cannot yet be perceived.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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

Aid organisations and donors commit to:

1. *Use existing resources and capabilities better to shrink humanitarian needs over the long term with the view of contributing to the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals. Significantly increase prevention, mitigation and preparedness for early action to anticipate and secure resources for recovery. This will need to be the focus not only of aid organisations and donors but also of national governments at all levels, civil society, and the private sector.*
2. *Invest in durable solutions for refugees, internally displaced people and sustainable support to migrants, returnees and host/receiving communities, as well as for other situations of recurring vulnerabilities.*
3. *Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts.*
4. *Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.*
5. *Galvanise new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources to crisis affected states through Multilateral Development Banks within their mandate and foster innovative partnerships with the private sector.*

Humanitarian-Development engagement work stream co-conveners reporting request:

What has your organisation done to operationalise the humanitarian-development nexus at country level?"

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?

Throughout 2017, the ICRC sought greater synergies with development finance and development actors in protracted conflicts and fragile contexts but always as a humanitarian actor and not a development actor. The ICRC has continued to roll-out its policy and methods for working in protracted conflict environments, confirming its approach across the nexus. The ICRC has formalised

this within internal management tools, and adapted organisation-wide approaches for results-based planning to incorporate multi-year planning that is contextually driven. It has continued internal and external socialisation around the need to work both short and long-term, and how the ICRC can achieve this while staying neutral, impartial and independent.

In 2016, the ICRC reported that discussions with the World Bank on partnering for impact were underway. In 2017, this bore fruit in Somalia and the ICRC collaborated with the World Bank to increase its drought response footprint and boost the resilience of affected communities. Such approach has been a good practical example of humanitarian capabilities and development resources joining forces in a complementary way, to attain a greater impact. The ICRC's work in Somalia is representative of its approach to straddling of the nexus, combining emergency relief activities such as food distribution and nutritional support all the way to the rehabilitation of settlement water infrastructures, the construction of clinics, or the seconding of community animal health worker's networks.

In Yemen, the ICRC is responsible for the majority (approximately 70-80%) of water supply in the country needed to address immediate emergency needs, while maintaining system resilience as much as possible. In the Sahel, where the ICRC sees a confluence of drought, food insecurity, climate change and migration (alongside conflict) it is working to increase resilience through support to livelihoods. These activities can link with, inform, and be strengthened by development actors.

In 2017, the ICRC has also worked hard to galvanize new partnerships; for example, the ICRC is working on a new pilot with Philips diagnostics on reducing mortality in children under five years of age.

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 plans to continue developing/strengthening its relation with certain development actors, based around these three main pillars:

- Continue to explore and engage with selected IFIs in order to leverage greater financing possibilities
- Exchange knowledge and expertise with these same IFIs.
- Increase humanitarian diplomacy clout on issues of common concerns.

4. Efficiency gains

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

The new processes presently mean an additional effort in time and resources for the ICRC. It is generally assumed that, eventually, these initiatives will lead to overall gains in efficiency, but this cannot yet be perceived.

5. Good practices and lessons learned

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?

See under Point 2.

Gender Inclusion – the ICRC approach at the macro-level

Being accountable to people affected by conflict is a key element of our identity, and the essence of ICRC's operational model, based on the fundamental principles of *humanity* and *impartiality*, together with proximity to affected people. Physical and digital **proximity** are crucial for understanding people's self-identified needs, their priorities, specific vulnerabilities but also people's capacities and coping mechanisms.

Diversity inclusion is an integral part of our approach to being accountable to people affected by conflict (see workstream 6). We cannot be accountable if we are gender blind and neither can we be gender sensitive if we don't have participatory processes in place. **Disaggregating data**, both at the assessment, implementation and monitoring stages provides evidence based insights of how a situation is affecting people based on their age, gender or disability. It also helps understand the various degrees to which different populations are satisfied with the relevance or effectiveness of our programs, which in turn provides more specific indications of what we need to adapt or improve.

Understanding exclusion factors and responding to specific vulnerabilities: understanding the roles women, girls, boys, men and older people traditionally play and who controls resources in the household and the society helps understand possible barriers to accessing humanitarian response. Do any gender or age groups (or sub-groups, e.g. single mothers) in the society face discrimination, including in their ability to access humanitarian assistance? Do these groups have specific needs in terms of assistance and protection? If an action intends to target only one or a few specific groups, what other groups might need to be involved in order to preempt the consequences of not involving them (e.g. tensions, stigmatisation, failure of objectives, etc.)? Adopting this lens means making special efforts to assess needs of people in hard-to-reach locations, such as people who are not in camps, are in less accessible geographical areas or staying with host families. The same applies to 'at-risk' people – such as those with disabilities, older people, housebound individuals, children and adolescents.

Understanding the fabric of vulnerabilities: A gender, age and disability lens in our analysis helps to deconstruct "the affected population" and better understand what specific needs and capacities women, girls, boys, men, older people and people with disability may have or what specific threats they face. A conflict or emergency may impact people differently based on their gender, age group, or the fact that they have a disability. The same goes for capacities to cope with, respond to, recover from and prepare for future crises.

Community meetings may not allow to reach this understanding as socially marginalised or discriminated people may not attend them or may be reluctant to speak up. Older people may find it physically impossible to get to the meeting place or may have difficulties understanding conversations in a crowded space. Women may be restricted in their ability to attend, as it may not be socially acceptable for them to join public meetings, or they may not want to leave small children behind. Children may lack the self-confidence to speak up in front of an adult congregation. They may also have difficulty understanding abstract concepts and conversations. In many situations, humanitarian organisations therefore need to take special measures to ensure that all people relevant in a given context can participate in a meaningful way.

Team composition is also a factor to take into account. Older people may, for example, not be comfortable about sharing their concerns with a young humanitarian worker and women may be reluctant to talk to male teams. It might not always be possible to have this kind of

diversity in all teams but being aware of this factor can allow to understand it can be a barrier and account for it.

This is why we integrated together with this guidance a set of questions to allow staff to better account for gender, diversity and disability inclusion when assessing a given situation or co-designing programs:

- *Do you disaggregate data for the identified vulnerability and capacity factors using at a minimum sex, age and disability?*
- *Do you assess who is not accessing programs, analyse barriers and address them?*
- *Do you identify specific vulnerabilities and offer corresponding programs when relevant?*

Evidence based programming & Monitoring and Evaluation

To ensure the selection of priorities and assessment of progress is evidence based and that we build our approaches from the field up, the ICRC commissioned an **external evaluation** of the institution's approach and practice on AAP and diversity inclusion (including gender, disability, age and other diversity factors), with results expected in June 2018. Additionally, **gender and diversity** considerations have been integrated into the revised AAP self-assessment tool, which will enable us to monitor delegations' progress and challenges in a more granular way, and support delegations to undertake more nuanced analyses and adapt program design and implementation accordingly.

Field guidance and support

An **AAP institutional framework** has been developed to guide its work (see elements specific to gender and diversity above). The **framework on Diversity and Inclusion** in operations will be consolidated by the end of 2018, taking into account - and building upon - the findings and recommendations of the independent operational evaluation currently underway.

We insist in particular on the need to avoid concentrating only on programs that address gender based vulnerabilities but ensure that we take a gender and diversity lens to all programs, highlighting in particular in our problem analysis guidance that:

Representativeness: *The needs of affected communities should not be assumed but identified through assessments that engage them in an ongoing discussion to find appropriate responses. Work with formal leaders and community committees (including women's committees if they exist) but don't speak only to community leaders, or the loudest and most visible persons. You can't be sure they represent all members of the community fairly and need to check what they tell you is accurate. Be aware of various interest groups and power relations in the target community. How is the community organized; who makes the decisions and who is left out? Does our assessment reach women, people with disabilities, the elderly, children or minority groups? If they are not included in the assessment, the program might not meet their needs. The objective is to hear directly from all relevant groups, so we can cross-check what the leaders tell us.*

Vulnerabilities and capacities: *people affected by conflict will have both vulnerabilities and capacities. When faced with a crisis, people resort to coping mechanisms, some of which can be harmful. They however also constantly find ways to adapt to the situation they are faced with. Note that vulnerabilities are not equal to population traits or categories but are the result of a combination of contextual factors. Gender or disability can be factors of vulnerability in some contexts but are not vulnerabilities per se. It is most often the combination of specific factors (socio economic status, education, location, culture, etc...) and individual traits of identity (age, gender, disability) that define the degree of vulnerability.*

Finally, in order to improve program outcomes for women and girls, we would like to stress the importance of linking different programs to ensure a holistic response, which is part of the ICRC's multidisciplinary approach.

- By linking health and economic security programming for example, we aim to ensure that **survivors of sexual violence** benefit from a continuum of care encompassing several health services (e.g. mental health and psychosocial support, and clinical care through primary health care or hospital services), and also benefit from **cash programming**, to strengthen their resilience, and capacity to cover their needs and those of their families.
- We have also found a reciprocal benefit in that women are able to – and do – use part of what they receive to cover costs linked to accessing health services.

We also seek to strengthen the **resilience** of women and girls by reducing their exposure to various threats and to harmful coping strategies through our **community based protection programmes**. Activities helping to achieve this objective include: *self-protection measures, risk education awareness, assistance aiming to reduce risk exposure, engagement strategies, community self-organisation and social cohesion*.