



## 2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting – International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)<sup>1</sup>

### Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency.....	4
1. Baseline (only in year 1).....	4
2. Progress to date.....	4
3. Planned next steps .....	5
4. Efficiency gains.....	5
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	5
Work stream 2 – Localization .....	6
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 .....	12
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

---

<sup>1</sup> This report reflects the steps taken to implement the Grand Bargain by the IFRC Secretariat rather than the IFRC and its 190 National Societies.

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.....	20
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.....	25
3. Planned next steps .....	26
4. Efficiency gains.....	26
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	26
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements.....	27
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	27
2. Progress to date.....	27
3. Planned next steps .....	27
4. Efficiency gains.....	27
5. Good practices and lessons learned .....	28
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement .....	29
1. Baseline (only in year 1) .....	29

2.	Progress to date.....	29
3.	Planned next steps .....	30
4.	Efficiency gains.....	31
5.	Good practices and lessons learned .....	31

## 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?

At this time, the IFRC does not anticipate using data from IATI for monitoring our Grand Bargain commitments, though, as described further below, we are moving forward on using it (as well as other mechanisms) to make our data easier for others to access.

---

### 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?

To date the IFRC has dedicated internal resources to fulfil its commitment to:

*“invest in examining the feasibility of using the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) to publish timely, transparent, harmonized and open high-quality data. We note that reporting to IATI standards may test the current capacity of local and national responders, including some National Societies, and we will identify what specific capacity gaps exist and what actions would be necessary to address them.*

This has resulted in a comprehensive feasibility study, the executive summary of the IFRC's feasibility study may be found at:

<http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/document/iati-feasibility-study-executive-summary/>

And the IFRC's full feasibility study and annexes may be found at:

<http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/document/iati-feasibility-study-full-report/>

<http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/document/iati-feasibility-study-appendices/>

Though, as noted below, the IFRC is moving toward reporting to IATI, it retains its previously articulated concerns that IATI does not currently provide a fully adequate and appropriate basis for assessing data regarding humanitarian work/activities.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The IFRC has planned two specific next steps:

1. A feasibility study for National Societies as independent local actors to use IATI; and
2. By the end of 2018 to publish data on IATI for the IFRC's humanitarian response activities.

As such, the IFRC will dedicate resources to allow for the revision to financial reporting and publication procedures and systems.

As recommended by the feasibility study, we are also exploring increasing the scope of data we will publish on IATI. Our decision in doing so will depend in part on the evolution of the IATI standard itself. The IFRC will continue to offer its advice and perspectives in this respect.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

No specific efficiency gains to be mentioned. However, the IFRC notes that the requirement to publish this data is in addition to donor reporting requirements and consequently questions the efficiency of such.

### **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 IFRC has collaborated with the ICRC and UNHCR as well as held discussions with Development Initiatives as well as the co-conveners of this work stream with a view to ensuring that IATI provides an adequate and appropriate basis for data regarding humanitarian work/activities. The IFRC looks forward to continuing and supporting this important dialogue.

## Work stream 2 – Localization<sup>2</sup>

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?<sup>3</sup>

The IFRC is unable to completely answer this question, though we can provide indicative figures that are relevant to understanding how funding is passed on to member National Societies.

(a) Direct funds

The IFRC in 2017 received **33.7 million Swiss francs** directly from individual, corporate and foundation donations. Funding that does come to the IFRC through this channel is not currently coded in such a way to make it traceable in potential pass through to National Societies as local actors. Please see table 1 below.

---

<sup>2</sup> The IFRC co-convenes the Localisation Work stream 2 with Switzerland.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

(b) Pooled funds

In 2017, and in response to 111 operations, 100 per cent of the IFRC's [Disaster Relief Emergency Fund \(DREF\)](#) allocations of 23,970,284 Swiss francs were made directly to 75 National Societies working in their own countries, who in turn provided humanitarian assistance to 8,299,798 people.

(c) Through a single intermediary

In accordance with the IFRC's [Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance](#), it is the National Society of the country that is primarily impacted by disaster that requests assistance from the IFRC and other National Societies. **As such, all humanitarian assistance provided through the IFRC network is in support of a request from a local actor.**

Assistance can be provided immediately through the DREF and, if requested, the IFRC will work with the National Society to launch an international Emergency Appeal, the objectives of which are defined by the National Society itself, with the support of the IFRC.

From an IFRC perspective, Emergency Appeals are analogous to a country-specific pooled fund, in that funding and in-kind is provided by many partners and disbursed to Red Cross/Red Crescent responders in the affected country according to the activities outlined in the Emergency Plan of Action, as agreed with the local National Society. As such, with the exception of earmarked funds provided to the Emergency Appeal (which is the least preferred option in terms of funding) at a detailed project or line-item or sub-geography, an individual donor's funding cannot be traced directly to expenditure undertaken by the local National Society.

Consequently, the IFRC is able to identify income source (as per table 1 below) and the way in which funds are passed on to local National Societies as well as in-kind (as per table 2 below) but cannot currently trace specific funds from source through to recipient.

*Table 1: Source of funding received by IFRC:*

<i>Millions of Swiss Francs</i>	<i>2016</i>	<i>2017</i>
<b>Emergency Appeals</b>		
National Societies	86.0	75.2
Governments	48.5	40.1
Others (INGOs, Multilaterals)	3.8	10.2
(Direct)		
Corporates	2.0	6.8
Foundations	0.7	0.5
Individuals	0.6	0.2
<b>Total Emergency Appeals</b>	<b><u>141.6</u></b>	<b><u>133</u></b>
<b>Thematic Programmes</b>		
National Societies	54.0	57.2
Governments	13.9	13.1
Others (INGOs, Multilaterals)	14.7	19.8
(Direct)		
Corporates	1.0	14.9
Foundations	0.0	10.4
Individuals	0.5	0.9
<b>Total Thematic Programmes</b>	<b><u>84.1</u></b>	<b><u>116.4</u></b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>225.7</b>	<b>249.4</b>

Financially, the IFRC works with National Societies and other local actors in one of two manners. A system of advances and a system of transfers. In both cases, the recipient is required to report back to the IFRC, however, the working modality is determined based on the capacity of the implementing partner. As the IFRC is a membership organization constituted of, for and in support of its member National Societies, its primary implementing partners are the 190 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies who have a total of 473,161 staff and 11,649,519 active volunteers<sup>4</sup>. In some cases, the IFRC works with a local NGO in the delivery of its programmes. This is rare and in such cases is subject to the agreement of the local member National Society.

The table below provides a comparison of programmatic funding (categorized as ‘total Other Resources Expenditure’ in IFRC’s Financial Accounts), it does not compare to whole organisation expenditure as this includes services which are provided to National Societies and other humanitarian actors on a cost recovery basis. We also do not include the “Regular Resources” part of the IFRC’s budget which is primarily funded by Statutory Contributions from IFRC’s members and would not normally be considered “humanitarian funding”.

*Table 2: Provision of funding and in-kind by IFRC to Local Actors:*

<i>millions of Swiss francs</i>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Working advances to RCRC National Societies	62.7	64.3
Transfers to RCRC National Societies <sup>5</sup>	25.0	26.9
Transfers to NGOs <sup>6</sup>	3.0	1.8
<b>Total funding to local partners</b>	<b>90.7</b>	<b>93.0</b>
<b>Relief items, construction, supplies and equipment received in-kind or purchased by IFRC for the benefit of local partners</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>41.9</b>
Total Other Resources Expenditure	253.5	239.0
<b>% funding to local partners vs total Other Resources Expenditure*</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>% in-kind to local partners vs total Other Resources Expenditure*</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>18%</b>

\* Total funding and in-kind to local partners therefore equates to **57%** of total Other Resource Expenditure

### **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?

Strengthening of National Societies is one of the key priorities for the IFRC. The core of the IFRC’s approach to this area continues to lie in accompanying National Societies on their own journeys of institutional development and strengthening. Because this is such a large area of our work, this answer will only provide some illustrative examples

A Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the IFRC and ICRC on 31 October 2017 for the creation of a new joint investment fund, **the National Society Investment Alliance (NSIA)**. The NSIA

<sup>4</sup> IFRC’s Everybody Counts (2018) <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/document/everyone-counts-2018/>

<sup>5</sup> May include transfers to RCRC National Societies working in another geographic context at the request of the local National Red Cross Red Crescent

<sup>6</sup> Primarily includes local NGOs, however, may include international NGOs in certain geographic contexts.



will provide multi-year funding and support for capacity strengthening and organizational development by National Societies, helping them to increase their effectiveness in delivering humanitarian services. Funding support for establishment of NSIA has been received from the governments of Switzerland and USA.

IFRC and WFP have been working closely together throughout 2017 to develop a more collaborative means of partnership for WFP and National Societies. This has focused on developing a **capacity strengthening initiative for National Societies**. This is being tested in four pilot countries (Burundi, Dominican Republic, Pakistan and Sudan) and, in 2017, specific areas of focus were identified by the relevant National Societies (primarily around cash programming, logistics and supply chain and emergency response).

Disaster preparedness is one of the primary activities of the IFRC and of each National Society. To support this process, approaches and tools have been developed over the years to help measure disaster preparedness for response capacity. In 2017 a harmonized approach was developed in consultation with the different components of the Movement (which includes IFRC, ICRC and 190 National Societies). This not only supports the enhancement of a National Society's capacity to deliver services in a crisis but also enables the membership to achieve a common approach to National Society Preparedness for Response Capacity Enhancement. The **Preparedness for Effective Response (PER) approach** is designed to empower the National Society to become more creative and innovative in their disaster management actions and contribute to the coordination of the national and global response systems. 2017 saw the PER pilot tested in 10 countries.

This PER's common approach complements the **IFRC's Organisational Capacity Assessment and Certification (OCAC)**, a tool that helps National Societies assess their own development needs. In 2017 OCAC assessments were undertaken by 13 National Societies, bringing the total of self-assessed National Societies to more than 100. In addition to the OCAC, a Branch Organisational Capacity Assessment (BOCA) has been developed and is being adopted and used to support branch development by a growing number of National Societies. 28 National Societies in Asia Pacific and the Americas have or are currently conducting a BOCA.

The IFRC last year supported 54 National Societies to integrate gender and diversity approaches in their emergency response activities through the practical application of the [Minimum Standard Commitments to Gender and Diversity in Emergency Programming](#). This includes continuous training of staff and volunteers and ensuring that procedures, policies and contingency and preparedness plans are inclusive, protective and gender-sensitive. In addition, IFRC has an internationally recognized mandate to support National Societies and public authorities in reviewing and strengthening their disaster risk management laws. Through this work, IFRC and National Societies are promoting gender equality and development of gender-responsive, comprehensive laws and policies relating to DRR through a global study on [Effective Law and Policy on Gender Equality and Protection from Sexual and Gender-Based Violence in Disasters](#).

Regarding funding to local actors please see the answer provided to the specific question on pages six and seven.

### **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 appointment of a Fund Manager for the National Society Investment Alliance (NSIA) is underway. Guidelines on the selection criteria, application, implementation and reporting process for the fund will be finalised over the coming months. They will guide all relevant components of the Movement, both those that will access funds and those that will support and accompany implementation. The NSIA will become operational in 2018.

WFP and IFRC will continue to work together at the country level to ensure complementarity in their support for the identified areas of focus and will consider requests for support from other National Societies. There will be a learning event in April 2018 that will bring all key people working on the pilots together to reflect on progress and to build collective intention going forward.

Ongoing implementation of the Preparedness for Effective Response (PER) approach will take place in 10 countries as well the development of Regional Plans to scale up PER activities. Additionally, minimum standards for National Disaster Response Teams will be revised and a harmonised curriculum will be developed.

It is anticipated that by 2019 the **IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) will have an annual turnover of CHF 30 million**, with access to and use of the fund continuing to increase. 2018 will see the launch of a specific Forecast Based Financing Window for DREF and more can be found in the report for Work stream 10.

#### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

One of the main objectives of the Preparedness for Effective Response approach is to enable the different components of the Movement to achieve a common approach to National Society Preparedness. Furthermore, it promotes and supports National Societies to work with external coordination fora, including the government.

#### **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 IFRC, WFP, National Society capacity strengthening pilot partnership agreed on five principles to guide the relations and provide a basis for mutual accountability, including supporting National Society sustainability, ownership by National Society leadership, respect for different cultures, mandates and constraints, transparency and communication and learning. The experience of the first four pilots will result in guidance materials to encourage thoughtful collaboration in other locations. WFP, IFRC and National Society offices in the Pacific and Zimbabwe are already seeking to align with this initiative.

The Bangladesh Red Crescent has set up a BOCA Lab Hub to support promotion, development and rollout of BOCA in the Asia/Pacific Region and have also taken an active role to support National Societies in other parts of the Region. The Africa Region is planning to use BOCA as a key tool to support National Society development and has initiated a training process in three of its National Societies in 2017; these National Societies will in turn support other National Societies in 2018 and beyond to implement a BOCA.

## 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?

During the course of 2017, the IFRC underwent a thorough evaluation of where the organisation currently stands with regard to cash. This included a review of the opportunities for cash across internal departments, a review of the internal systems and processes, a measure of where the leadership stood with regard to cash programmes and the capacity for delivering cash programmes globally. The resulting Cash Roadmap report identified recommendations for supporting the delivery of cash at scale. The establishment of a Cash Directors Taskforce and recruitment of a cash manager have helped to support the buy in of senior leadership to the cash agenda.

Systems and procedures are currently under review with the revision of the global SOPs for cash as well as exploring current and new systems for the delivery of cash at scale. The cash team has also input into the Minimum Standards for Gender, Diversity and Disability in Emergencies Handbook. At the end of 2017, a Global Framework Agreement was signed with a data management service provider which will support improved transparency in scaled up cash approaches. Capacity strengthening with National Societies forms the core of the IFRC's cash ambition and a standard National Society preparedness approach for cash is currently being rolled out and supported by members through an active working group.

The IFRC is also strengthening the use of innovation and technology with regard to cash and in November 2017, a grant for innovation was awarded to the IFRC to explore, through a partnership between the Movement and the private sector, the creation of digital identity and open loop payments systems for cash distribution.

### **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 the coming two years, the Movement, through its investments in preparedness, systems and the development of increased capacity, will deliver against ambitious targets. A key focus for 2018 will be the ability to measure in real terms the actual delivery capacity of the Movement. Due to the way that the systems are designed, this has been a challenge to collect to date at the global level (and in particular for National Societies' domestic cash programmes). Identification of cash focal points across technical teams is already allowing for the routine consideration of cash in all programmes and it is expected that by 2020, the IFRC will be in a position to support up to 2.5m affected people in any one disaster, routinely support 1m affected people per year and regularly deliver CHF100 million in any one year - more than three times the budget currently expended.

The steps of the Cash Roadmap take the IFRC on a journey to increasing the scale of cash programmes. Clear milestones have been identified which take the organisation forward in a systematic way over the course of five years. The focus for 2018/19 will be laying the foundations for cash which will include training, preparedness and investment in partnerships for capacity and growth. 2019 – 21 will build upon the foundations, promoting National Societies as the Partner of Choice in response, strengthening of the auxiliary role with Governments and developing sustainable funding models for cash programmes.

Through the support of the British Red Cross and other Movement partners, 2018 will see the development of a Cash Learning Hub for use across the Movement. This will allow for one central point of knowledge and information to support evidence for cash programmes, practical support to implementing cash at scale, sharing of best practice and links with partners and academia to continue to innovate through the use of data and technology to push the cash agenda forward.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

The standardised approach to capacity development allows for efficiency gains through predictability and a modular approach in line with National Society requirements for preparedness. During 2017, a Global Framework Agreement was signed with a data management company. We are currently in the pilot phase of this roll out but there are already evidencing opportunities for speed in delivery, an ability to target an increased number of households, fewer manpower resources necessary for the work and access to instant information which can be fed back into the programme for on-the-spot adjustments where required. The routine consideration of cash is beginning to show benefits especially with regard to impact on the logistics strategy and warehousing requirements and it is hoped that these will ultimately reduce costs of operations.

### **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?

Establishing a director- level taskforce has significantly advanced the cash agenda across departments. The roll out of the Cash Roadmap began (with the first target region being Asia) and there is increasing interest and support for the development of a plan for National Societies to deliver cash at scale.

The development of the Cash Learning Hub for the benefit of learning across the Movement will allow for knowledge and information around cash to be held in one place and intelligently inform the work of the Movement as it progresses. The first pilot will be available for use in April 2018. 2017 also brought a number of interesting partnerships and with further focus on capacity and systems, we hope to continue to develop the status of National Societies as partners of choice in the coming year.

## 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?

Launched by Resolution 4 of the Movement's 2013 Council of Delegates<sup>7</sup>, and extended at the 2015 Council of Delegates, the "Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation" (SMCC) initiative has gained significant momentum in the past two years (2015 – 2017), improving the Movement's capacity for efficient large-scale emergency responses. Directly supported by over 40 National Societies, implementation of SMCC has initiated a gradual change process and fostered a positive "SMCC spirit" among Movement components (IFRC, ICRC and 190 National Societies), positioning the Movement on the "front foot" in the evolving humanitarian ecosystem.

Findings presented in the [Progress Report to the Movement's Council of Delegates 2017](#) were based on data gathered in various settings as well as from close monitoring of five specific contexts chosen as country "laboratories" (Haiti, Philippines, South Sudan, Syria and Ukraine) that benefited from a greater focus from the project's coordination team. SMCC implementation has translated into a number of achievements which are grouped into three categories in the Progress Report, namely coordination, preparedness and response.

Last year saw the launch of four 'One International Appeals' for Nigeria, South Sudan, Yemen and Myanmar the objective of which is to provide a more coherent and complementary approach to resource mobilisation in large-scale emergencies with ICRC and IFRC agreeing to launch only one appeal in country. The effectiveness and efficiency of such a joint approach will be assessed in 2018.

The IFRC, completed its change process last year, with 22 divisions streamlined into nine, and four USGs reduced to three. IFRC also opened its new Global Service Centre in Budapest in July 2017, which now houses the bulk of the IFRC's IT operations.

### **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)?

To sustain the traction of SMCC progress gained to date, recommendations outlined in [Resolution 1 adopted at the Movement's 2017 Council of Delegates](#) build on the encouraging advances while focusing investment on areas that combine operational cost-benefit and donors' interests to achieve the best humanitarian impact. It has therefore been agreed to focus in the next phase (2017 – 2019)

---

<sup>7</sup> The Movement's Council of Delegates is when all components – IFRC, ICRC and 190 National Societies come together. This is distinct from the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent where all Movement components come together with all State Parties' to the Geneva Conventions.

on a) increasing SMCC literacy and fostering a global mindset for coordination and cooperation; b) enhancing interoperability and alignment of support and services, especially in security and logistics c) continuing to build on successful examples of joint resource mobilisation (including further improving the concept and mechanism for the 'One International Appeal' (whereby the IFRC and ICRC agree to launch only one Appeal in country).

#### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

As evidenced by the feedback received, many activities undertaken under the SMCC Plan of Action improved the accessibility of coordination tools and mechanisms for National Societies. For instance, the Movement Response Cycle, forming the basis of the Movement coordination online toolkit, enables all Movement personnel to obtain relevant information and examples for successful coordination. Collective preparedness at the field level has been enhanced by introducing specific tools, such as Movement country plans and contingency planning. Through their implementation, these tools have contributed to increased transparency and trust between Movement partners. In addition, harmonized National Society development approaches, featured in the SMCC Plan of Action, also led to improved communications between Movement components.

The Global Services Centre has brought savings of CHF 2 million a year and sits alongside the Europe Regional Office in new premises granted by the government of Hungary. As a result of a Global Efficiency Study, the IFRC have been able to rationalise office locations and functions as well.

In 2018 – 2019 the IFRC will roll out a new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System which will provide improved connectivity and allow for greater efficiencies and streamlining of systems. Additionally, the reorganisation of the IFRC has allowed for more predictable and consistent funding in senior leadership at the country level.

#### **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?

In addition to the specific actions listed in point 4 above, feedback received from field experience confirms the benefits of improved coordination and cooperation on the delivery of operations, improved institutional relationships at field level and National Society capacity development.



## Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment<sup>8</sup>

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?

---

---

<sup>8</sup> As footnoted in the Grand Bargain text, this workstream only applies to those who actively take part in the HRP process and consequently this does not apply to IFRC.

**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 signatories) 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 IFRC continues to invest towards institutionalizing and operationalizing Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) standards and common approaches across the Red Cross and Red Crescent network.

Institutionalizing CEA: strategies and guides:

- The IFRC has an agreed roadmap for strengthening CEA for effective local leadership in place and now has a cross departmental taskforce.
- At the 2017 Council of Delegates, participants called for a Movement-wide commitment to further integrate CEA across all programmes and define common CEA benchmarks. IFRC is now working towards defining a set of CEA minimum standards and commitments.

- [The Movement CEA guide and toolkit](#) is being widely adopted across the network and is now available in three languages. It has inspired localised guides such as the volunteers' guide developed by the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society.
- A Movement brief guide on ['How to Use Social Media to Better Engage People Affected by Crises'](#) is guiding innovative approaches particularly in urban resilience programmes.

#### Operationalizing CEA:

- IFRC created and hired in 2017 a new Manager position in headquarters to oversee a Community Engagement unit and further operationalize CEA throughout the organization;
- CEA is a core competency of the IFRC's Surge Competency Framework that is now informing the revision of the surge recruitment and training approaches;
- From the 66 emergency response operations that included a CEA component in 2016 and 2017, 50 of them were in the first three quarters of 2017. In particular, CEA activities have been strengthened and scaled up in the migration response in Europe, Caribbean Hurricane response and plague outbreak operation in Madagascar among others.
- "Virtual Volunteer" developed by IFRC to help migrants access reliable and practical information and support wherever they are, was accessed nearly 88,000 times by more than 34,000 people in Italy, Greece, Sweden and the Philippines.

### **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 following are ongoing activities and initiatives:

- The Movement is working towards defining common benchmarks to measure the quality and effectiveness of our work and a more predictable, systematic and evidence-based approach. The Movement-wide approach will be further discussed at the next Council of Delegates in 2019.
- IFRC is developing a set of Minimum Standards for CEA to be endorsed by the IFRC leadership and inform policy development.
- CEA approaches and activities are being mainstreamed in the surge optimization process and informing the revised assessment, planning and implementations procedures (including deployment system) across the network.
- Regional workshops and trainings will be held throughout 2018 to strengthen the capacity of National Societies regarding community engagement.
- IFRC continues to be a core member of the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI) which aims to organise a collective service to address the need for a more systematic and coordinated approach to communications and community engagement with affected people.
- IFRC is further developing its overall accountability framework which will include specifically CEA as well as considering further integration of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

According to a 2017 CEA mapping in Asia Pacific and Africa, CEA is strongest in the assessment and planning phase with levels of information sharing and participation declining during implementation. Between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of National Societies' reports having a system for collecting feedback and complaints to improve programmes and operations. CEA is included in about 50 – 60 per cent of National Societies organizational strategies, yearly plans, frameworks or SOPs and 30 – 40

per cent of staff job descriptions. Enhancing transparency, communication and feedback systems are priority areas for improving effectiveness and sustainability of Red Cross and Red Crescent programmes.

### **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 IFRC and Ground Truth piloted an approach to better understand and strengthen how migration services in Italy and Austria incorporates the preferences, aspirations, and expectations of migrants. The clear majority of migrants feel that their opinions have been taken into consideration and trust levels are extremely high revealing a successful community engagement approach. The methodology is being expanded within countries and across regions to promote a systematic feedback approaches. A number of successes and best practices [have been documented](#) and more are available on the [CEA library](#).

IFRC is working closely with its National Societies, the ICRC, and other partners for example OCHA, UNICEF, Internews, Translators Without Borders and Ground Truth towards enhancing feedback and rumour tracking approaches 'glocally' to ensure more predictable, systematic and evidence-based accountability approaches.

## 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 agreements<sup>9</sup> you have provided (as a donor) or received and provided to humanitarian partners (as an agency) in 2017, and any earmarking conditions.<sup>10</sup> 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?

We have updated and revised the IFRC Plan and Budget 2016-2020 to incorporate improvements in objective-setting and proposed measurements. We have also moved ahead with data collection against indicators and are gradually improving our ability to report against them. IFRC operational planning is based on the five-year results framework, but still has only a one-year outlook.

During 2017, one signatory to the Grand Bargain provided multi-year funding to IFRC:

**The United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID):** DFID and IFRC in 2017 signed an MoU in which DFID committed to provide up to GBP36 million in unearmarked funding over four years. The first year the full amount of GBP9 million is unearmarked, with the subsequent three years having 30 per cent of the funding linked to the achievement of agreed-upon results.

The 2017 income represented less than three per cent of voluntary income received by the IFRC for the year.

---

<sup>9</sup> Multiyear funding is funding provided for two or more years based on a firm commitment at the outset

<sup>10</sup> For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).

In addition, the Government of New Zealand in 2015 signed a three-year agreement with IFRC to provide unearmarked funding of NZD200,000 per year.

We also highlight two key multi-year partnerships in support of key programmatic areas:

**Floods Resilience Alliance:** IFRC has been a member of this Alliance, supported by Zurich Insurance, since 2013. The Alliance seeks to develop a model for delivering effective community flood resilience programmes at scale and contributes to shaping the flood resilience agenda of policy makers and donors.

**WMO Global Framework for Climate Services Adaptation Programme in Africa:** IFRC has been engaged in this programme, supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, since 2014. First phase funding was allocated for 2014-2017, with the goal of increasing the resilience of people most vulnerable to the impacts of weather and climate-related hazards.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

IFRC will add this commitment, and indeed other Grand Bargain commitments, to the agenda of its Donor Advisory Group meetings in 2018, with the objective of developing a plan with donors to achieve this, and other Grand Bargain, commitments.

IFRC in 2017 began a process of scoping the possibility of moving to multi-year operational plans and this approach is currently underway in its response to the population movement in Bangladesh.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

IFRC is not yet able to evidence the efficiency gain associated with the multi-year funding provided by DFID as this was only agreed in 2017. However, the multi-year funding provided by Zurich and WMO have provided for a more consistent approach to programming and longer term planning which is key for resilience mainstreaming.

### **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?

Multi-year operational plans will have to be tailored to the needs of donors if they are to result in multi-year funding commitments. IFRC plans to engage with its donors on this issue in 2018.

## 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 2020<sup>11</sup>.*

---

**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)

Please see below

---

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

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

---

<sup>11</sup> For the Grand Bargain definitions of earmarking, please see Annex I. Earmarking modalities, as contained with the final agreement, available [here](#).



## 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 tables below present a six-year analysis of the earmarking (unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked and tightly earmarked) of development and emergency appeals funding provided to the IFRC.

In dollar terms, 2017 saw both an increase in cash pledges (CHF 334 million vs CHF 267 million in 2016) and an increase in unearmarked pledges (CHF 57 million vs CHF 45 million in 2016).

The proportion of funding to IFRC that is earmarked or highly earmarked remains stubbornly high, at 80 per cent (the same as 2016), though the proportion of funding that was tightly earmarked (45 per cent) reached its lowest level in the past six years, down from 49 per cent in 2016.

### Cash pledge earmarking on development funds, 2012-2017

<i>CHF millions</i>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Unearmarked	38.9	63.4	37.5	50.7	45.1	56.7
Softly Earmarked	18.4	22.7	12.9	15.5	9.3	10.9
Earmarked	65.4	80.2	89.6	70.9	82.4	115.7
Tightly Earmarked	132.3	149.6	203.9	167.2	130.4	151.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>255.0</b>	<b>315.9</b>	<b>343.9</b>	<b>304.2</b>	<b>267.2</b>	<b>334.5</b>

  

<i>percentage</i>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Unearmarked	15%	20%	11%	17%	17%	17%
Softly Earmarked	7%	7%	4%	5%	3%	3%
Earmarked	26%	25%	26%	23%	31%	35%
Tightly Earmarked	52%	47%	59%	55%	49%	45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The earmarking analysis for funding to emergency appeals, below, shows a decline in tightly earmarked funding for emergency appeals (41 per cent in 2017 compared with 55 per cent in 2016 and 70 per cent in 2014).

### Cash pledge earmarking on Emergency appeals 2012-2017

<i>CHF millions</i>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Earmarked	38.0	52.9	54.5	54.1	60.0	92.0
Tightly Earmarked	65.1	69.2	128.2	106.5	73.2	62.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>103.1</b>	<b>122.1</b>	<b>182.7</b>	<b>160.6</b>	<b>133.2</b>	<b>154.8</b>

  

<i>percentage</i>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Earmarked	37%	43%	30%	34%	45%	59%
Tightly Earmarked	63%	57%	70%	66%	55%	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The IFRC is exploring ways to strengthen its 2018 annual report to provide donor visibility, including particularly for donors providing unearmarked funding. In addition, we are working with specific donors on ways to increase the visibility of their unearmarked contributions.

### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

The slight decrease of tightly earmarked funding for emergency appeals and for development programming provides more flexibility to IFRC in allocating funding to areas of greatest need.

### **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 Swedish government provided for the first time a substantial, completely unearmarked (CHF 5.3 million) contribution to the IFRC.

The Swiss government transformed part of its earmarked contributions (CHF 1 million) into an unearmarked contribution.

## 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?

The IFRC's General Assembly decided that from 2016 onward no pledge-based reports will be provided for financial contributions of less than CHF 50,000. Partly because of this decision the number of narrative and financial reports produced for donors has dropped by 25 per cent since 2015 as shown in the table below:

Number of narrative and financial reports	
2015	2,433
2016	2,099
2017	1,809

### 3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The IFRC is investing in an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, while it is still being debated which technology will be chosen, it has been confirmed that the planning and reporting process will be part of this ERP or linked to it. The new web-based system should facilitate the future reporting obligations of the IFRC and hopefully contribute to a further reduction of the reporting workload.

### 4. Efficiency gains

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

See above under the progress to date for a measurable reduction in number of reports.

## **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 above for the lessons learned from deciding on a minimum threshold for reporting.

## 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?

By the end of 2017, 13 Red Cross Red Crescent National Societies were implementing pilot Forecast Based Financing (FbF) projects.

Supported by the German Federal Foreign Office's Action Plan for the Humanitarian Adaptation to Climate Change, IFRC and partners convened the fourth and fifth Dialogue Platform on FbF in December 2016 and October 2017 respectively, bringing together each time over 100 humanitarian practitioners, climate scientists, donor agencies and government representatives. In addition to

exchanging lessons learnt and expertise for further developing the FbF methodology, the representatives at the Platform explored new partnership and collaboration to further scale up FbF.

In December 2017 the IFRC established the FbF Window to its Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF), to provide eligible National Societies with funding for pre-defined early action, based on forecasts. The mechanism will use a trigger-based decision-making process with no other criteria than the reached trigger for the release of funds. A dedicated financing mechanism, the FbF Window shall strengthen the collective efforts to support early action thus encouraging the mobilisation of additional funds from various sources that are needed to scale up no-regret early actions.

In the consultations around the *Global Compact on safe, orderly and regular migration, and the Global Refugee Compact*, the IFRC has emphasised the need to protect life, ensure access, meeting basic needs of all migrants and [give special protection to children on the move](#). In 2017, the IFRC provided assistance and protection to 9.2 million people, more specifically to internally displaced, migrants, refugees and host communities through a variety of emergency and long-term interventions.

In partnership with WFP, the Turkish Red Crescent (TRC) is implementing its Emergency Social Safety Net Programme through KizilayKart. The TRC has reached 1,186,358 people with approximately 296 million CHF during 2017 with each beneficiary receiving approximately 30 CHF per month.

The IFRC's [RoadMap to Community Resilience](#) is aimed at operationalising the IFRC's [Framework for Community Resilience](#) by promoting joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible, using a multi-stakeholder approach. 2017 focused on building the capacity of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in the Road Map to Community Resilience approach. A global pool of 95 trainers was created through a global training of trainers (ToT) in March in Korea and two regional ToTs in July in Panama and in September in Addis Ababa. These trainers supported the piloting of the roadmap in target communities in 12 countries. Three communities in Kenya, Zimbabwe and Kiribati/Tuvalu have completed the pilot testing in 2017, and the other communities will follow suit in 2018.

### **3. Planned next steps**

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

Taking into account the complexity of the task and the potential for game-changing lessons learnt, IFRC will be supported by two Advisory Groups comprised of experts. A Scientific Advisory Committee will be formed to enhance the efficiency and credibility of the FbF Window through scientific advice and peer-review. To assess quality of submitted Early Action Protocol – as a proposal tool for proposed early action - against the quality standards and support decision making, a Validation Committee will be formed to ensure the coherence and integration of the FbF Window as one of the IFRC's tools for early action while maintaining robust learning and promoting an evidence-based approach. IFRC and partners will continue to support National Societies to develop the FbF approach.

In November 2017, the IFRC's General Assembly adopted a [Global Strategy on Migration and its Road Map](#), which articulates National Societies' and the IFRC Secretariat's core strengths and common purpose on migration, setting out aims and objectives to be achieved over a five-year timeframe from 2018 to 2022.

The Pakistan Red Crescent (PRC) has initiated discussion and drafting of a MoU with the Benazir Income Support Programme (BISP, the Government of Pakistan's Social Safety Net) on beneficiary data sharing. Planned in March 2018, a signing of a MoU will be done to provide access to the beneficiary data of the BISP programme to allow PRC to reach beneficiaries quickly after a disaster.

IFRC's RoadMap to Community Resilience: next steps for the coming two years are the finalisation of the pilot testing in the remaining nine countries, a learning workshop at the end of 2018 and the possible revision and digitisation of the RoadMap. Following step will be an active promotion and

communication across the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement as the standard methodology for multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis.

#### **4. Efficiency gains**

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

The FbF Window increases a predictable supply of funding for the implementation of FbF and addresses the restrictions of yearly humanitarian aid budgets. The mechanism funds “targeted” early action that specifically addresses and responds to an elevated level of risks based on a forecast. To overcome the key barrier to efficiency, the fund’s disbursement for trigger-based action will not be contingent upon multi-layered and protracted decision-making processes or political considerations. Attaching the FbF Window to the DREF will strengthen linkages, data sharing and decision making between the phases of intervention between preparedness and response. It will minimise administrative burdens for National Societies by the utilisation of a one-stop facility.

#### **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?

With the FbF methodology, forecasts have successfully triggered early action by National Societies in Peru, Togo, Bangladesh and Mongolia in 2017. For example, as communities in Bangladesh braced themselves for Tropical Cyclone Mora and the monsoon flooding, the Bangladesh Red Crescent activated its FbF mechanism the day before the cyclone hit; nearly 2,300 households received a grant of 5,000 taka (60 euros). This grant allowed families to meet their immediate needs when the cyclone hit, rather than having them wait for humanitarian assistance to arrive sometime after the cyclone. One key result was a crucial sense of dignity and empowerment amongst the communities at risk by enabling them to protect their safety and livelihood ahead of the disaster.

The IFRC has invested in the development of innovative tools and approaches building on our community engagement strengths. An example is the **Virtual Volunteer** ([www.virtualvolunteer.org](http://www.virtualvolunteer.org)) a web-based platform allowing migrants to access life-saving information which has already reached more than 35,000 people in several countries. We have enhanced our global knowledge base through the establishment of the Smart Practices microsite sharing some 60 practices from National Societies in assistance, protection, advocacy and social inclusion; and have launched a MOOC on Migration in collaboration with EDRAAK and Queen Rania Foundation in Arabic.