

## International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC)

Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) Update 2013 progress rating:



MAR 2011: *Good Value for Money for UK Aid*

Progress assessment	
Summary	<b>Commitment to improve the capacity of National Societies, widen partnerships, including with private sector and improve financial management. Mixed progress in developing countries.</b>
Baseline	
<p>IFRC is a global humanitarian network that carries out relief operations to assist victims of disasters, and combines this with development work to strengthen the capacities of its 187 National Societies.</p> <p>The MAR highlighted several strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale and reach of the organisation means that it is a critical humanitarian actor and it is often the first to respond to humanitarian emergencies on the ground.</li> <li>• IFRC has a clear gender policy and promotes gender policies within National Societies.</li> <li>• IFRC operates cost effectiveness: striving for cost control in its logistics and decentralising process.</li> <li>• IFRC has a clear mandate, strategy and effective governing body.</li> </ul> <p>The MAR also highlighted several weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The capacity of National Societies is variable.</li> <li>• Despite some improvements, performance management is not yet sufficiently embedded in</li> <li>• Strong financial reporting and systems are in place at secretariat level, but country level systems are more limited.</li> <li>• There is no formal mechanism that allows donors and partner governments to collectively hold IFRC to account.</li> </ul> <p>DFID's reform priorities for the MAR Update were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• leadership and capacity of National Societies and performance and financial management in developing countries – assessed under <u>strategic and performance management</u> and <u>financial resources management</u>;</li> <li>• partnerships outside the Red Cross Movement – assessed under <u>partnership behaviour</u>;</li> <li>• Accountability through, for example, establishing a donor support mechanism – assessed under <u>transparency and accountability</u>.</li> </ul>	
Summary of overall progress	
<p>IFRC is addressing the MAR reform priorities to varying degrees. Key accomplishments to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steps to improve the performance of National Societies by developing strategic plans and increased resources focussing on planning, monitoring and evaluation;</li> <li>• Innovative ideas to save money, for example reducing the average monthly cost of</li> </ul>	









renting a vehicle (by NS) by more than 30%;

- Accountability to donors improved following the establishment of a Donor Advisory Group.

Challenges remain and the pace of reform and uptake appears slow:

- New initiatives to understand and address the capacity constraints of National Societies (Organisational Capacity Assessment and Certification process) have yet to have traction across the organisation.
- Implementation of the Federation-Wide Reporting System is low, which limits IFRC's ability to measure results and improve performance.
- IFRC needs to exert more influence over NS to curb poorly performing projects and to capacity build NS to recognise and address these issues themselves.

**Progress against reform priorities**

MAR reform component	MAR 2011 score	Progress rating	MAR Update score, if any change
<p><b>Strategic and performance management</b> New policies and systems are in place, with a focus on performance management. However, the full impact of changes are not yet realised at field level.</p>		 Reasonable progress	
<p><b>Financial resources management</b> There have been some positive steps but more is to be done to curb poorly performing projects and to build capacity – a priority in order to deliver results in future years.</p>		 Some progress	
<p><b>Partnership behaviour</b> There are established private sector partnerships and clusters at the global level, improved joint working with agencies outside the Red Cross movement.</p>		 Reasonable progress	
<p><b>Transparency and accountability</b> Ability to effect change at NS level still has some way to go. More work is needed on holding NS and IFRC to account by stakeholders.</p>		 Little or no progress	