Charter for Change: From commitments to action

Progress Report 2017-2018
Overall

- AR17-18 New: self-assessment of progress against commitments, testing C4C against the Rohingya Refugee Response reality

- C4C: important role as a platform for collaboration and joint advocacy
  - Exercising influence on the global humanitarian policy dialogue
  - In a few countries, C4C emerging as an important platform for local and national dialogue and advocacy (and coordination?); C4C endorsers’ leadership on advocating for GB and C4C in practice
  - This role was reinforced at the 2017 C4C Annual Meeting in The Hague

Continued from 16-17:

- C4C incorporation in new international strategies, organisational emergency response approaches, communications strategies, new partnership policies, or reporting on C4C commitments to program quality committees and organizations’ senior most leadership

- Discrepancy between awareness/buy-in of commitments between HQs and country program levels

- Differences in implications: Partnership-focused signatories & signatories w mixed direct-implementation/partnership approaches
More socialisation of C4C with local/partner organisations needed?
Ca. doubling of C4C endorsers since April 2017 (234 today)
Overall:

**Figure 1:** Average compliance of the C4C signatories

**Average Compliance C4C signatories 2018**

- C1-Funding flows
- C5-Emphasise the Importance of national actors
- C6-Address subcontracting
- C8-Communication about partners
- C2-Principles of Partnership
- C7-Capacity Strengthening
- C3-Increase Transparency
- C4-Stop undermining local capacity

**Figure 2:** Average progress on C4C commitments since last year

**Average Progress C4C signatories April 2017 - 18**

- C3-Increase Transparency
- C5-Emphasise the Importance of national actors
- C8-Communication about partners
- C7-Capacity Strengthening
- C6-Address subcontracting
- C2-Principles of Partnership
- C4-Stop undermining local capacity
Commitments 2 & 6: Partnership and Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership / PoP</th>
<th>Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Signatories to PoPs and/or similar principles (network-specific, organisation specific)</td>
<td>- Business as normal approach → need to avoid complacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Verification: external certification (CHS, 7 orgs)</td>
<td>- Shift in operating model - adjusting internal systems and tools to incorporate stronger partnership approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges:
- ‘Either/or’ discussion → different and contextual ways of working with partners
- Fragile contexts and war zones (local orgs’ structures/governance under stress)
- Behaviour change, in the heat of a response
- Better & more resources for strengthening partners’ systems

→ Formalising and mainstream PoPs in docs
→ Raise awareness on PoPs (internally & with partners)

Challenges:
- Organisational culture
- Discrepancies across teams and regions
- Fragile contexts and org capacity vs. the humanitarian imperative (e.g. Sth Sudan, Mali, Northern Nigeria, DRC)
- Donor preference for technical specialisation, operational delivery at scale

→ Internal strategies, improving consistency of partnership approaches
→ Redress imbalances btw. INGO and local actor capacities

A ‘Partners’ Charter’: expect transparency on budgets, shared learning, fairness, staff behaviour, complaints handling, etc.

Conducting structural needs assessments with partners ahead of design stages
Commitment 4: Stop undermining local capacity

- diversity in compliance, Least progress made
  - Not an issue (signatories who work entirely through partnerships)
  - Compensation policies highly challenging
  - Not prioritised

- ethical recruitment policy (4 agencies)
- strengthening country-specific or regional surge capacity
- raising awareness among country colleagues
- inclusion in partner contracts
Commitment 5: Emphasize the importance of local actors

2nd highest overall compliance

- More awareness and interest among donors, joint discussions on how to best support local and national actors
- Bilateral meetings (hq & country levels), collective meetings and influencing
- Increase in funding to pooled funds
- Institutionalisation of C4C advocacy to donors still needs attention

Challenges:

- trend: Major donors preferring fewer partners
- Donor preference for high volume of funds and no’s of beneficiaries
- Interest in investing in strong/large national NGOs → less focus on capacity strengthening of smaller actors, less diverse field of local and national humanitarian actors
  - Risk mitigation scenarios, collective provision of practical solutions to donors
  - More joint planning among humanitarian and development programming
Special report on C4C and the Rohingya crisis refugee response

Figure 11: C4C signatories' average compliance with the charter's commitments in the Rohingya crises refugee response. Data for C1 was not available.
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