

Grand Bargain in 2021:

Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: SCHR

Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview):

Gareth Price-Jones, Executive Secretary, schr@ifrc.org

Date of Submission: February 15th 2022

Grand Bargain in 2021

Question 1: Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2021?

The big win in 2021 was securing the GB 2.0 Framework itself – SCHR was a key penholder for the framework and two annexes (on the Caucuses and the Reference Groups) and chair of the FG while much of it was agreed and was able to successfully transfer and mobilise support for ideas from the NGO Constituency, including both local and International NGOs aligned with the Charter4Change, to the wider Grand Bargain membership.

The concept of National Reference Groups with direct access to powerful humanitarian decision makers at country level is a particular outcome we consider important, as is Enabling Priority 2, which captures vital elements of localisation and participation, and agreement on the Outcome pillars. We're excited how the Facilitation Group's work in the first half of 2021 was taken forward and developed in unanticipated ways by local actors in the latter half of the year, suggesting a genuine enabling shift in power.

An additional significant gain has been the recognition of Local NGOs as an independent constituency with sometimes different objectives to INGOs – the replacement of SCHR as the NGO constituency representative by separate local and International representatives on the Facilitation Group is important.

Although they may seem obvious, these gains were *not* a foregone conclusion, with some powerful actors at the end of 2020 considering that these discussions had reached an end point and supporting closure of relevant workstreams. SCHR members (and non-members) supported the SCHR secretariat in the effort with both strong inputs and with bilateral lobbying and advocacy.

A final key achievement to note was the success of our convening role in resisting through both Grand Bargain and IASC channels an effort in mid-2021 to introduce the ICVIC top-down mechanism for participation and accountability, which ran counter to wider Grand Bargain approaches.

Question 2: Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 1 (quality funding).

*Enabling priority 1: A critical mass of quality funding is reached that allows an effective and efficient response, ensuring visibility and accountability.
(For ease of reference, see Senior Officials Meeting recommendations [here](#).)*

SCHR considers the development of policy thinking of quality funding over the first five years of the Grand Bargain to be a significant gain – the political process of securing donors’ support for this has been essential. The new GB framework, and particularly the caucus being formed at the end of 2021, will be essential to grow a frank understanding between the now five constituencies of what quality funding looks like from the perspective of donors, UN agencies, The Red Cross, the INGOs, and Local NGOs – our current assessment is that the different constituencies still have very different understandings of what quality funding looks like – for most local and international NGOs the flexibility, freedom and power *already* granted to UN agencies would constitute quality funding, whereas UN agencies presumably expect more. Honest discussions and better shared understanding about this in the coming year are essential, as is efforts to address information and knowledge asymmetries.

Question 3: Briefly explain how the outcomes contribute to achieving the Grand Bargain 2.0 enabling priority 2 (localisation and participation).

Enabling priority 2: Greater support is provided for the leadership, delivery and capacity of local responders and the participation of affected communities in addressing humanitarian needs.

The securing of both localisation and participation in the GB 2.0 framework is essential to Enabling Priority 2, and the new Caucus and Reference Group structures are already enabling some progress.

In particular, in terms of the renewed focus on political shifts as recommended by ODI and others, this stated framework is essential to creating subsequent political pressure on powerful humanitarian actors to change. As the Intermediaries Caucus was only just starting to explore at the end of 2021, this is enabling a focus around issues of legitimacy and identity that had not emerged in previous discussions within workstreams, and this provides local actors and affected people with a political lever to incentivise and reward positive change, particularly at the frontline political level.

The caucuses support this by supporting frank, inclusive discussions in a safe space which towards the end of 2021 was already enabling representatives from the INGOs, Red Cross and UN agencies in particular to be frank about the internal dynamics that have disincentivised changes to intermediary roles to date.

However, we still have substantial progress to make – the learning curve for relatively new and under-resourced local-centric networks at both country and

global level means that its essential that this political focus is maintained, and expectations managed and supported with a positive narrative that recognises the progress already made and supports (rather than blocks) future progress.

SCHR remains concerned that widely-repeated narratives that fail to recognise the limited progress achieved to date invite cynicism and disengagement, and enables those actors who actively seek to block change

Grand Bargain and cross-cutting issues

Question 4: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women’s empowerment¹ in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard? (Please outline specific initiatives or changes in practice and their outcomes/results).

SCHR members continue to advocate strongly through the FoGG, something that the SCHR Secretariat has supported consistently while engaging with workstreams, the Facilitation Group and Caucuses. See also the Excel sheet.

Question 5: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments?

SCHR has not *collectively* dedicated time to the Nexus conversation due to limited capacity, but individual members, notably Oxfam, have and will reflect this in their individual reports.

Question 6: Has your institution taken any steps towards improving risk sharing with its partners? If so, please describe how.

SCHR has invested heavily in supporting better analysis of risk, particularly as it relates to Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment. This includes work related to Localisation, Participation and Quality funding, as it requires better resourcing of Signatories to better share the risk, which currently lies overwhelmingly with frontline and local actors. As this is not a specific GB priority, I won’t cover it in more detail here, but the Grand Bargain framework has been consistently supportive of this work.

¹ Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available [here](#).