Grand Bargain Self-Reporting Explanatory Guidance

1. All signatories to the Grand Bargain are expected to complete the self-report annually.

2. Self-reports must be returned to the Grand Bargain Secretariat [gbsecretariat@un.org] no later than **Thursday 15 March, 2018**. Any submissions after this date may not be considered by the 2018 Independent Grand Bargain Report.

3. Reporting should reflect activities and progress that has taken place between January 2017 and December 2017.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. Please type your answers immediately below each question asked.

8. Signatories are encouraged to report both on progress made, and where they may have experienced obstacles or challenges to realising their commitments.

9. 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.

10. Signatories are asked to limit their responses to a maximum of 500 words per work stream.

11. Self-reports are public documents, and will be published as submitted on the IASC-hosted Grand Bargain website from 3rd June, 2018.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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 – International Rescue Committee (IRC)

Contents

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?

---

1. Baseline (only in year 1)
Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

IRC had a limited number of grants published as IATI data and, among those published, data was of uneven quality. There was no systematic way of sourcing data from the relevant information management systems, and a lack of formal internal guidance for IATI compliance. IRC was not yet using or analysing its IATI data, and was not deeply engaged with the wider IATI community.

2. Progress to date
Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

IRC recruited a Transparency Adviser to help meets its commitment. Since April 2017, IRC has gone from publishing 5 IATI activities of uneven quality data to publishing 37 activities which offer a more accurate picture of its programming. IRC has dramatically moved up the Grand Bargain transparency dashboard thanks to this progress.

IRC identified the data required for IATI publication, which included coordination across several departments and information management systems. IRC then adapted the systems to capture the information required for IATI publication, created a publication calendar and designated clear roles for publishing and data quality review.

As co-chair of the Bond Transparency Working Group, IRC co-hosted a workshop for NGOs to discuss supporting partners to publish IATI data.

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

IRC is focused on how to produce the data needed for IATI publication. IRC is developing policies which offer guidance on what information IRC should and should not publish and how to interact with partners and donors on IATI commitments.

In addition to awards funded by UK DfID and Netherlands MFA, IRC will publish IATI data for awards funded by Irish Aid, Sida and Danida.

IRC is considering how visualisations borne from IATI data could demonstrate and communicate the breadth of its operations, and seeking opportunities to reduce its reporting burden by publishing IATI data.

IRC will continue to work with peers and lead discussions on how to develop industry best practice.

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

IRC has not yet derived opportunities for efficiency gains from publishing IATI data. However, IATI has been aligned with a number of internal initiatives to push for greater data quality management and organisational measurement, which could pay future dividends.

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?

Identifying publication to IATI is a complex organisational shift, rather than an IT fix, and dedicating appropriate resources – including hiring a dedicated Transparency Advisor to champion IATI and the transparency agenda and align IATI with existing organisational priorities – has been critical. Visualisation platforms (e.g. D-Portal, Grand Bargain Transparency Dashboard) helped to demonstrate progress and highlight the utility of IATI data to IRC decision makers.

IRC has benefitted from joining the Bond Transparency Working Group and sharing ideas to develop best practice, especially given guidance from donors on IATI is often ambiguous or absent.

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.

IRC made major investments to enable its country programs to partner with local organizations more efficiently, and adhere to Grand Bargain principles. IRC launched an agency-wide Sub-Award Partnership Management System (SPMS) to achieve:

1. Better accountability to local partners, and value on partners' input in decisions that affect them and those we mutually serve;
2. A higher level of mutual capacity to collaborate for effective delivery;
3. Improved systems, processes, and policies that enable IRC staff to be better partners to local organizations.

SPMS includes a chapter on Capacity Strengthening, which will support local organizations development more sustainably.

IRC's Violence Prevention and Response Unit formalized Localization as a cross-cutting issue in its 2017-2020 Action Plan and continued to support country programs, local partners and clusters:

1. Through the *Protection in Practice* project, IRC continued to strengthen local capacity in protection mainstreaming. Conducted workshops in 10 locations across 7 countries reaching 254 participants in 52 local partner organizations.
2. Took steps to localize Gender Based Violence (GBV) response. Women's Protection and Empowerment programming in contexts like DRC pioneered working with women-led community based organizations as empowered actors. The *Building Local, Thinking Global* project supports IRC to work with 5 regional GBV response and women's rights networks across Africa and the Middle East to build regional emergency preparedness and response capacity and expertise. This emerged from learnings in the Localizing Response to GBV in Emergencies Brief (Sept. 2017).

IRC made Local Partnerships a Strategic Initiative for 2017. This advances partnership efforts by creating ownership and governance across the organization, guided by concrete objectives, including: rolling out the SPMS; capturing feedback on IRC's performance as a partner; and collecting evidence about benefits of localization.

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

IRC will conduct internal training and staff development, formation of appropriate partnership management structures at the field level, and partners' involvement in piloting methods and tools designed to improve partner relationships and strengthen partners' capabilities.

IRC's Localization of Protection project, which builds on *Protection in Practice*, will continue through 2019. This project is carried out on behalf of the Global Protection Cluster, in partnership with the Global Child Protection Area of Responsibility and Global Education clusters. Lessons will form IRC's contributions to the work stream.

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?

The creation of the SPMS led to effective internal practices of skills building and creating partnership content and tools collaboratively across IRC. A "write-shop" in which 5 chapters of the SPMS were co-written by HQ, field staff and leaders allowed for healthy debates, and development of standardized guidance and tools, leading to greater ownership of good partnership practices.

Collaboration with local organizations has shown good practices. Protection mainstreaming action plans were developed by local partners and 142 'remedial activities' were conducted by local partners to improve protection mainstreaming within humanitarian response programs. IRC released 30 cash awards to local partners totalling $73,400 USD in support of these activities.

IRC sponsored the translation of the Global Protection Cluster Protection Mainstreaming Training Package into Urdu to support local partners in Pakistan and Afghanistan. Translations into Bengali and Burmese will be released in 2018.

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 proportion of IRC assistance delivered as cash increased 10 percentage points, from 6% in FY15 to 17.68% in FY17. IRC continues to expand new digital cash delivery models by pre-positioning digital financial services before a crisis hits and investing in digital preparedness. IRC established our organizational definition of digital payments and measured our baseline use of these payments towards our goal to reach 75% of payments carried out digitally. IRC launched a call to expand the number of electronic payment providers included in the Global Payment Toolkit to increase the speed that we can deliver cash in an emergency. IRC developed a framework to define the market information needed for specific program decision-making to improve the systematic use of market information in the design of humanitarian programs.

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

The IRC plans to roll out standardized cash operating procedures, increase cash use beyond economic wellbeing outcomes, strengthen available technical and operational support structure, and enable greater use of digital payment mechanisms. These activities will be supported with research on the use of cash for health and protection outcomes, and our deeper understanding of how to improve the integration of markets into program design.

4. Efficiency gains

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

IRC is co-leading the Cash Work Stream work-plan priority on cost efficiency and effectiveness—a signatory-wide analysis of cash efficiency and the value of harmonised metrics.

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?

Buy-in from operational, technical, and senior leadership has helped enable implementation of initiatives facilitating greater use of cash. The use of cash in emergency response has been instrumental in building the capacity of country program staff to use cash programming. The IRC's research agenda has advanced our use of cash by increasing the body of knowledge on how best to implement cash. Closer tracking of our use of cash and a separation of tracking cash and vouchers has enabled better monitoring of progress towards reaching the 25% goal.

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:

13

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?

IRC rolled out a cost analysis system as mandatory practice in 2 country offices, and for a subset of projects in a further 5 country offices. IRC incorporated lessons from past analysis on which approaches and interventions achieve greatest reach and impact per dollar spent through its Outcomes & Evidence Framework, which guides program design. IRC published specific examples where cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness informed program design, and drafted two publications documenting the technical details of our methodology and process (to be published in 2018).

To meet our commitment of promoting a common methodology and consistent reporting across the sector, IRC participated in conferences that helped identify 5 implementing INGOs for in-depth follow up. IRC developed a version of our software which can be configured for other NGOs to use, and created a License Agreement to clarify data security and informational rights as other organizations pilot this software.

3. Planned next steps

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

IRC will:
- Roll out our approach to measuring value-for-money and using this evidence in programming decisions to two additional country programs, and continue providing ad hoc support to projects across 30 country offices.
- Partner with other INGOs to pilot this approach within their own agencies, and synthesize lessons from these engagements into an outline for a jointly governed, sector-wide solution for rigorous and consistent cost analysis.

4. Efficiency gains

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

IRC has decreased the time it takes field staff to conduct VfM analyses (from 1+ days to 2 hours), while increasing the rigor of these studies by ensuring they are based on a common methodology. This is saving time in donor reporting and evaluation processes, while increasing the value of the results that these processes generate, because the results are methodologically consistent and can therefore be compared across programs.

From this growing body of VfM data, we are learning what interventions and delivery mechanisms provide the greatest cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness in given contexts. By identifying best practices for program designs that ensure interventions are maximally efficient, we are shifting away from inefficient delivery models towards those that make the best use of resources.

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 development of a Value for Money sub-work stream within the Cash work stream of the Grand Bargain is a promising development, which should allow for greater harmonization of methodology and metrics used at the sector level. This will enable the cash transfer community to harness the power of reporting data to learn what approaches offer greatest value for money, in what contexts, and why. Similar harmonization efforts in other sectors would be welcome.

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 ries) 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?

IRC continued to invest in Client Responsiveness, Protection Mainstreaming and Gender Equality teams:
- Developed and tested a comprehensive Resource Kit and provided bespoke technical assistance to country teams.
- Drafted standards of Good and Great practice against which country programmes report and plan how they will improve their client responsiveness and commitments to gender equality. IRC designed a project to employ performance management approaches to measure and improve behaviour.
- Advocated for IRC's leadership to model responsiveness and promote it among their teams through messaging and resources.

- Invested in developing our partner feedback approach, through which we will promote responsiveness towards partners and support their capacity development in this area.
- Continues to prioritise Gender Equality and rollout Protection Mainstreaming organisation-wide through technical assistance and integration into other programming standards and practices.
- Produced a [Protection Mainstreaming Toolkit](#), on behalf of the Global Protection Cluster and in partnership with OCHA's Inter-Cluster Coordination Support Section, which includes guidance for Humanitarian Coordinators, Humanitarian Cluster Teams, Inter-Cluster Coordinators, Cluster Coordinators, Donors, and Operational Actors on promoting and tracking adherence to Participation & Accountability principles. The toolkit is part of OCHA's standard Terms of Reference for Inter-Cluster Coordinators and was promoted through the Global Cluster Coordination Group.
- Developed a [study of practices and barriers to client responsive project design](#), including how to increase the capacity of and incentivize staff to deliver client responsive programming.

3. Planned next steps

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

IRC will:
- Further invest in Client Responsiveness, Protection Mainstreaming and Gender Equality, aligned with IRC's 2020 strategy.
- Complete and test its Client Responsive Programming Resource Kit, and roll it out across all IRC programming.
- Further invest in guidance and tools (e.g. performance management frameworks for programmes and staff members) and research into the effectiveness and efficiency of our Approach and its impact on client participation and accountability.
- Continue to support rollout of the Protection Mainstreaming toolkit through the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) Helpdesk and follow-on briefings. The GPC will launch a user survey to obtain feedback on the toolkit's use in the field; lessons will inform revisions and be shared through the work stream.

4. Efficiency gains

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

Increasing capacity across the IRC to deliver our commitments has generated greater understanding and buy-in across the organisation for prioritising and investing in these areas at a country level. Many country programmes that have used the new resources and received technical assistance have reported improvements in the quality of the design and implementation of their activities intended to promote participation and accountability. Country teams are gradually seeing efficiency gains in time better invested.

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 IRC's commitments imply country programmes improve their ways of working (e.g. gains in participation and accountability) while meeting growing humanitarian needs in a challenging funding environment. To secure buy-in from teams in this context, it has been important for IRC to support its country teams' prioritisation efforts and increase incentives through strong leadership messaging, resource investments and provision of high quality and accessible resources and technical assistance. IRC's Approach to Client Responsive Programming is also somewhat unique; it equally emphasises the creation of an enabling environment for client responsiveness and implementation of a high quality feedback cycle.

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[2] you have provided (as a donor) or received <u>and</u> 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?

IRC continued to roll-out its Outcomes and Evidence Framework (OEF) in all country programs. Country programs updated their Strategic Action Plans (SAPs), which outline priority outcomes over the next 3 years. These SAPs, plus our theories of change and technical expertise, informed by the best available evidence, provide a strong basis for advocating, developing and responding to multi-year funding proposals.

At end 2017, 75% of IRC proposals adopted OEF's theories of change, using a more holistic and long-term approach to programming.

IRC developed 16+ evidence reviews identifying the most effective interventions in health, education, economic wellbeing, safety and power.

---

[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.

IRC engaged with external actors to develop outcome-driven, evidence-based multi-year programs that are responsive to local contexts. In particular:

- USAID Education Sector Council asked IRC to present on the OEF to promote its adoption by its staff.
- IRC senior leaders spoke at an UNGA side event on our progress on evidence for learning, accountability and solutions in education in emergencies.
- IRC was invited to join the Interagency Working Group on Non Communicable Diseases in Emergencies to help define indicators, research approaches and guidelines, contributing to foundational work on a new topic.
- The Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) invited IRC to be on its advisory group for the Cash Transfer Program Knowledge Hub, used IRC's Evidence Maps as a potential model, and is exploring collaborating with IRC to apply the technology and processes to their work.
- IRC, in partnership with the Institute for Development Studies and Crown Agents, leads the Humanitarian Learning Center, which leverages operational learning and academic insights to improve humanitarian response.

3. Planned next steps

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

IRC plans to:

- Continue monitoring the implementation of its country-level SAPs
- Update the OEF with the most recent evidence of effective interventions.
- Continue to streamline the OEF with indicators that enable better measurement
- Review interventions to ensure investment in the most impactful ones and inform research agendas.

4. Efficiency gains

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

The OEF allows country programs to identify theories of change and assess the outcomes that best correspond to the needs of their clients. Teams have been able to plan ahead and engage stakeholders beyond short-term outcomes. This has saved the organization time and transaction costs of renegotiating goals every few months and has been more successful with donors that provide multiyear financing.

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?

Early engagement and collaboration with external actors have led to notable advances towards this commitment. Through early discussions with SIDA, demonstrations of the interactive OEF and a suite of Adaptive management tools, the idea of testing a different multi-year funding model emerged. This model will be focused on outcome measurement while maintaining the flexibility to adjust interventions and strategies based on predictable

and unforeseen changes. The IRC has also provided input based on our OEF to Johns Hopkins University work to help NGOs integrate research, ToCs, and monitoring into program design. The Bridge Collaborative has asked to partner with the IRC to use the OEF to develop a comparable framework bringing together evidence from the global health, development and environment research communities. This step would make the iOEF completely open source.

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[4].*

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.

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 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?

1 – IRC started participating in harmonised reporting pilots led by UNHCR and Sida in Iraq. For UNHCR, reporting using new templates has been completed. For Sida, first reporting is in 2018.

2 – IRC made significant investment in business systems that will improve the quality and efficiency of reporting and information management.

Organisation-wide, IRC invested in an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system (currently in development), which will replace several existing systems with a single system, while adding significant new functionality. The ERP will increase the speed at which IRC can access information related to its financial transactions, acquisition and use of assets, and flows of funds to partners. It will improve the speed and granularity of financial reporting internally and to donors, and through integration with other systems, will allow for deeper analysis of financial information alongside other performance indicators, allowing reporting and information management to better inform programmatic planning and decision making.

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

1 – IRC will continue to participate in harmonised reporting pilots, as well as working groups or discussions related to UNHR and Sida pilots planned for Iraq, Myanmar and Somalia.

2 – IRC will continue throughout 2018 and 2019 to develop and pilot the ERP system. A dedicated, full time project team is in place, and will continue to be throughout the project life cycle.

4. Efficiency gains

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

1 – The harmonised reporting pilots have shown promise, and internal feedback on the initiative overall and the specific reporting formats has been positive. As yet, due to the early stage and the limited scope of the pilot, it has not been possible to identify efficiency gains. IRC is optimistic that future efficiency gains will present over time, and would be highly likely if the approach were broadened to other donors.

2 – As the ERP is still in its development stage, the efficiency gains which will accrue over time are yet to be realised.

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?

IRC:
- Developed a brief on the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in East Africa, based on its rollout in Uganda, Tanzania and Ethiopia, highlighting challenges and progress towards bridging the humanitarian-development divide in protracted refugee crises. Disseminated the brief at an event, co-hosted with Save the

Children during UNGA, with heads of IRC, Save the Children, Amnesty International and leadership from UNHCR and the Canadian government.

- Disseminated findings from a study group, co-led with the Center for Global Development, on best practices for refugee compacts, including recommendations for multistakeholder approaches, collective outcomes, and joint planning. The report was launched at an event featuring leadership from IRC, CGD, the World Bank, and the Jordanian government.
- Partnered with the Ugandan government and UN agencies on a Uganda Solidarity Summit side event on the role of humanitarian, development NGOs and civil society in addressing the humanitarian-development nexus to support refugees and host communities. The event focused on reform of the humanitarian system to include multiyear financing and capacity to cope with refugee influxes.
- Produced with the Norwegian Refugee Council, Danish Refugee Council, and Save the Children a report on durable solutions to inform the Global Compact on Refugees. The report offers 10 recommendations around asylum, safe and voluntary returns, third country solutions, integration and inclusion. The report was released a side event at the UN High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection, and shared with Member States, UNHCR, and other stakeholders.
- Continued as a partner on durable solutions platforms in East Africa (ReDDS) and the Syria response region (DSP).

3. Planned next steps

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

IRC will:
- Develop research, generate field tested policy recommendations, and actively participate in piloting new approaches to bridging the humanitarian-development divide. This will include country case studies that look at progress of new financing and processes and offer recommendations for how processes and policies could achieve greater impact for refugees and host communities.
- Advocate with the World Bank around its new financing to refugee contexts to help ensure it meets the needs of refugees, with a focus on collective outcomes and multistakeholder engagement.
- Active participate in the Global Compact on Refugees consultations, and work with key NGO partners, including other large implementing humanitarian agencies such as DRC, NRC, Save the Children and Oxfam, as well as via NGO coalitions, such as InterAction and ICVA, to provide feedback to UNHCR on drafts of the Global Compact's Program of Action.

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?

Taking a field-based and field-driven approach to developing recommendations for the Global Compact on Refugees and deployment of new financing streams seems, from an advocacy perspective, to have filled a gap of lessons from the field in global-level discussions; still, more needs to be done to incorporate the voices of refugees directly.