

**Grand Bargain in 2020:
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: 15/02/2021

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than **5 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.)

Grand Bargain in 2020

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 2020?

Given its relatively small resources as a one-person secretariat, SCHR's main result in 2020 has been **strong representation of the NGO constituency** in the Facilitation Group and across the Grand Bargain, including strong narratives around **relative power of different constituencies** and the need for political dialogue to drive change among constituencies that already hold power within the humanitarian ecosystem. This has included **regular consultation with the constituency**, particularly in partnerships with groups including the NEAR Network, who have chaired several constituency calls, and A4EP who successfully joined the Grand Bargain in 2020. This engagement has supported strongly political proposals in 2020, including development of the idea of reference groups to increase political pressure to drive potentially uncomfortable change in 2021 and onwards.

SCHR has worked closely with its member IFRC to **support localisation** through the Grand Bargain, including convening joint calls between Workstream 2 Localisation and Workstream 6 Participation Revolution.

SCHR's role as the Co-Convenor of Workstream 6 Participation Revolution has been critical in terms of connecting with IASC Structures, most notably IASC Results Group two, which continued to work closely with WS 6 in 2020, with several joint meetings. Particular outcomes here include the **active championing of participation initiatives**, including the RCCP shared service and individual examples of participation in practice. A further key outcome is the **creation of a Donor Dialogue on AAP**, which is reported in more detail in the Workstream Co-convenors report, but which is likely to result in stronger coordination and alignment between donors on their participation requirements, and better understanding and delivery of those requirements in practice.

Question 2: 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.

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

SCHR has remained committed to **engagement with the Friends of Gender Group (FoGG)** throughout 2020, providing a specific briefing to the group while chair of the FG, and relaying and championing the FoGGs requirements into the proposal on the future of the Grand Bargain.

In addition, SCHR has supported the **gendered definition of and indicators** of participation through its co-convenorship of Workstream 6 Participation Revolution.

Question 3: 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.

SCHR's members are overwhelmingly Dual Mandate, and all the approaches supported by SCHR through both Workstream 6 and its role on the facilitation group continue to be equally applicable in development contexts, and build on approaches such as the SDGs, ensuring cross-nexus applicability.

In its engagement with the Grand Bargain SCHR has also continuously championed the position that the Nexus workstream has been mainstreamed throughout the Grand Bargain, rather than closed – a distinction that has been lost on some signatories.

Grand Bargain 2016-2020: Overall achievements and remaining gaps

Question 4: What are the 2-3 key achievements/areas of most progress by your institution since 2016? Please report on your institutional progress for the period 2016-2020, **even** if your institution did not become a signatory until after 2016.

SCHR has played a key role since the start of the Grand Bargain in **co-convening Workstream 6 Participation Revolution and championing the workstream's efforts**. The achievements of that workstream are **detailed in the Co-Convenors Self-Report**, but include the development of a clear definition and the institutional cementing of Participation as a Key Work Area for the SCHR in 2019, which influences the efforts of all its members.

As well as building political support for Participation as a practical approach to response programming, SCHR has led work on **identifying and overcoming blockers to participation in practice**, as outlined on the [Stakeholder Analysis](#) published by the workstream in 2019. SCHR has also supported the inclusion of participation as a specific area that Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinators are now performance managed to, ensuring there is a clear accountability mechanism.

This work has **assured an alignment of incentives for RC/HCs, Country Directors, and organisations seeking funding** towards both the theoretical

inclusion of affected people in response decision making, as well as the practical implementation of that commitment.

SCHR has been a champion of the **Core Humanitarian Standard** since 2016, which is a key indicator of transparency as well as being incorporated into indicators for several workstreams. Almost half of SCHR members are now certified, or in the process of being certified, by HQAI for their delivery to the CHS, while others use the standard in other ways.

SCHR has also played a key role in **building support for the Grand Bargain** as a structure supporting wider change in the humanitarian ecosystem, both among its members, the NGO Constituency that it represented from 2016-17 and 2019-2021 and among the wider signatory group.

Question 5: What, in your institutional view, have been the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories, as a collective, since 2016? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think most progress has been made collectively by signatories.

Recognition of **Participation** as a desirable and practical way to approach humanitarian response programming – prior to 2016 this was seen as somewhat utopian and threatening to the role of expertise, with many actors struggling to envision what participation would look like in practice. This is now **clearly defined**, and the **growing evidence base** for best practice ensures that participation in practice is being delivered in more responses worldwide.

The Grand Bargain has also driven much wider acceptance and critical scrutiny of **localisation**, and of wider **power and risk dynamics** within the sector, though there remains substantial work to do.

Question 6: What has the Grand Bargain not been able to achieve in its five year tenure? What outstanding obstacles, gaps, areas of weakness still remain after five years, in terms of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian action? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think there remain key gaps or obstacles.

Two Emergent areas (and Risk, see below) continue to need particular attention and political leadership.

The first of these is the **transfer of power and accountability from donors and big humanitarian agencies to affected people and those taking most risk to deliver humanitarian aid**. Many of the conversations around Localisation and Participation continue to be relatively shallow, with powerholders assuming that no real change in the way that response is designed and delivered will be required. This is also reflected in practical conversations about the accountability balance between those paying for response and those delivering it and receiving it.

The second, related issue, is how much **donors can relinquish power** over their funding given prevailing political support for institutional funding via taxpayers. This is critical to moving forward the discussions around quality funding.

In addition to the emergent areas, which are addressed by the new enabling priorities provided by the Facilitation Groups proposal, are several technical solutions that **remain blocked by organisational politics**. This is most notable around cash, where a technical proposal about coordination remains blocked by organisational concerns that funding may be cornered by a particular agency, and transparency and efficiency gains where the initial investment needed to install systems in individual agencies (such as automated reporting to IATI or the implementation of Money Where it Counts definitions of expenditure) has **not received sufficient political and financial investment** at either the organisational or collective level to make them happen.

Risk and the Grand Bargain

Question 7a: How has risk (financial, operational, reputational, etc) affected your institution's implementation of the core commitments since you became a signatory to the Grand Bargain?

Although risk has not affected SCHR Implementation of the Grand Bargain, they may have impacted on Member implementation. These include the risk that new ways of working may limit our ability to meet humanitarian needs (see blog [here](#), published in Jan 2021, which highlights some of these concerns) or may pose existential risk to our member organisations if they proved unable to adapt to them effectively.

The particular risks of improved tracking of fraud and sexual exploitation and abuse has, over the period of the Grand Bargain, highlighted how more accountability can, in the short term, negatively impact on the ability of organisations to deliver humanitarian assistance, resulting in an inappropriate focus on legal and fiduciary risk and insufficient focus on the risk that insufficient or poor-quality aid results in greater human suffering. We continue to work on ensuring aligned incentives to ensure longer-term improved trust and credibility through such efforts and avoid an unhelpful focus on minimised support costs or penalising those who improve transparency.

In particular these risks may have impacted on progress on Workstreams 1, 2, 5, 6

Question 7b: How has your institution sought to mitigate or address these risks to enable implementation of the core commitments?

SCHR, through its internal structures, has been able to foster **direct conversations between leadership of its members and local organisations** with regular engagement with local NGO bodies since 2019 and through member participation in the Charter4Change since its founding. This has enabled open conversations and **better shared understanding of expectations and**

constraints. The Grand Bargain has also provided a unique platform for engagement with Donors that is not available through other forums, as well as providing the office of the Eminent Person to enable frank exchange and discussion around political drivers of change.