

Grand Bargain in 2019:
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: 14.02.2020

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than **3 pages in total** – anything over this word limit will not be considered by ODI in their analysis. Please respond to all of the questions below.)

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 2019?

Due to a staffing gap, SCHR was not actively engaged in the Grand Bargain to June 2020, but since then has made considerable strides.

SCHR been closely engaged with Results Group 2 which in 2019 replaced the former IASC AAP and PSEA Task Team, and has championed its work at the IASC Principals, EDG and OPAG.

A key success has been the close coordination between [Workstream 6](#) and the [IASC Results Group 2](#), building upon the strength of the Grand Bargain's self-reporting mechanism to develop complementary workplans that should result in concrete reported progress on participation in practice in 2020 and 2021. This is being supported by the US-convened donor discussion on how flexible funding is essential to make participation meaningful, ensuring that response activities and the supporting funding are not locked down during initial donor-implementer discussions and can adapt to new information arising from the participation of affected people.

The work developing the [stakeholder analysis](#) has also provided a framework for understanding why, although there is broad support for participation in theory, delivery in practice has been inconsistent. This has enabled us to identify championing existing participatory response and other key activities for the next two years of the grand bargain, as in the Workstream [Workplan](#) and continue our work to support the incentivising of participation by donors.

SCHR has continued to champion the Core Humanitarian Standard as a commitment for organisations and donors.

Question 2: Please explain how the outcomes/results have or will lead to long-term institutional changes in policy and/or practice.

The links between RG 2 and WS 6 mean that there is one [agreed set of indicators](#) for both individual agencies and collective response to measure the extent to which affected populations are participating in the response to their needs. This will impact on both individual agency response at country and global level, and on collective response at country level through HRPs. This will also impact on the way that key donors measure accountability through the integration with the indicators for DFID's payment by results work with the UN.

Although the collective indicators being developed by RG2 in 2020 will only be a subset of the agreed WS6 indicators, the link between them and the agency-specific indicators means that aggregation should be much simpler and more

credible, and will complement other data such as the [Ground Truth Solutions work](#).

We are also hopeful that reporting by individual signatories in 2020 and 2021 will increasingly report against the indicators, allowing SCHR (for its members) and SCHR and the US (as co-convenors of the workstream) to be able to provide an overview of improvements in participation across the humanitarian ecosystem, albeit at a 1-year remove.

Question 3: 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). Please refer to the Guidelines for definitions of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, which are included in this self-report template package.

In particular, the reporting to the indicators using Sex, Age and Diversity Disaggregated data (SADD) will ensure that participation is gendered, recognising that multiple avenues for participation will be required to ensure that the differing impact of crisis on different groups is considered when designing and adapting responses to inputs from affected people.

Question 4: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments? Please explain how your institution has linked commitments 10.1 - 10.5 with other commitments from other workstreams.

All of the approaches supported by SCHR throughout our Grand Bargain related work are equally applicable in development contexts. As all but one of our members hold both development and humanitarian mandates, we expect considerable influence on our members development activities.

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