From commitments to action
Progress Report 2020 - 2021
Charter for Change (C4C) signatories report annually on their progress towards meeting the eight commitments, tracking improvements and areas for further work. Reporting began in 2017 at the global level following the launch of the Charter in 2016. Two years ago, the annual process expanded to collect responses at the country level, increasing the focus on in-country changes, and enabling comparisons between headquarters policy decisions and action. This report analyses the responses of 25 signatories at the global level, and 136 country level responses for the 2020 reporting period.

Progress continues to be made towards the C4C commitments, despite the global disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, although the much-discussed potential for improvements in localisation as a result of the disruptions have not yet materialized. Signatories have made progress towards the 25% target for funding to local and national actors, achieving 23.3% of funding in 2020.

Signatories compliance ranking the other 7 commitments placed commitment #5 the highest, at 4.6, which focuses on advocacy to donors on the importance of national actors (see Figure 1). This was followed by commitment #2, implementing the Humanitarian Principles of Partnership, mirroring last year’s findings. At the headquarters level, commitment #6 on equality received 4.0, an improvement from just over 3.5 in last years’ report where it was ranked lowest. This is despite responses at the country level suggesting a slight drop in the number of partners invited to take part in joint strategy reviews or taking leadership in joint activities.

The C4C commitments are still not routinely shared with local and national partners. Over 30% of country level respondents did not share the commitments with any of their partners, up from 20% in 2019-2020. However, 42% of respondents indicated that local and national partners have shared suggestions for improvement around the C4C
commitments. This suggests increasing awareness of the C4C and other localisation efforts in the sector on the part of local and national organisations, however this does not lessen the obligation of C4C signatories to systematically communicate with their partners about their commitments to equitable partnership and local leadership.

Capacity strengthening, a core focus of the 2019-2020 report, was referenced across qualitative responses in the country level survey, indicating that increased attention is being paid to this area. However, it was the weakest according to global rankings, and accounted for just 3% of humanitarian expenditure down from 6% last year. As fewer signatories were able to report on the financial data for capacity strengthening this year, it is difficult to build a clear picture, and there needs to be more investment in developing mechanisms for financial reporting on this area.

The COVID-19 pandemic, though not a focus of the 2021 C4C annual survey, has provided challenges for C4C signatories over the past year, as for the sector as a whole. During the pandemic however, local actors have clearly demonstrated their capability to mobilise resources and respond to crises. C4C signatories looking ahead should focus on how they can reinforce these capabilities, transforming the ways INGOs work to further empower local and national organisations to deliver principled humanitarian responses in their communities. This report shows that progress is being made and C4C signatories can and should continue to play a key role working alongside local actors to drive the localisation agenda forward.
Charter for Change (C4C) signatories continue to increase the percentage of funding to national and local NGOs. In 2020 reporting signatories passed an average of 23.3% of their humanitarian expenditure to local and national partners, out of a total aggregated annual expenditure of $1.104bn (USD). For the 2020 reporting period, 21 of the 25 reporting signatories were able to provide financial data, transferring a total of $257 million (USD).

Country level respondents were asked to estimate the proportion of their humanitarian budget passed on to local and national actors. Of the 110 responses, 75% reported transferring 25% or more to local and national counterparts, with nearly 60% of respondents reporting transferring over 50% of their budgets. This is a significant difference from the headquarters level reporting. 2

Direct year on year comparisons should be treated with caution as the number and identity of respondents varies between reporting periods. Moreover, a core element of the C4C commitments is improving methods to track and report on this data which can lead to changes in how the proportion is calculated. The results may also be affected by other variables beyond the knowledge of the authors of this report.

Commitment 1: Increase direct funding to southern-based NGOs for humanitarian action

As of 2017, only 0.4% of humanitarian aid was channelled directly to national non-government actors (NGOs and CSOs) for humanitarian work – a total of US$84.0 million out of US$27.3 billion. We commit through advocacy and policy influence on North American and European donors (including institutional donors, foundations and private sector) to encourage them to increase the year on year percentage of their humanitarian funding going to national and local NGOs. We commit that by 2020 at least 25% of our own humanitarian funding will be passed to national and local NGOs. We commit to introduce our NGO partners to our own direct donors with the aim of them accessing direct financing.

Commitment 3: Increase transparency around resource transfers to southern-based national and local NGOs

A significant change in approaches towards transparency is needed in order to build trust, accountability and efficiency of investments channelled to national actors via international intermediaries. We commit to document the types of organisation we cooperate with in humanitarian response and to publish these figures (or percentages) in our public accounts using a recognised categorisation such as the GHA in real time and to the IATI standard.

Charter for Change (C4C) signatories continue to increase the percentage of funding to national and local NGOs. In 2020 reporting signatories passed an average of 23.3% of their humanitarian expenditure to local and national partners, out of a total aggregated annual expenditure of $1.104bn (USD). For the 2020 reporting period, 21 of the 25 reporting signatories were able to provide financial data, transferring a total of $257 million (USD).
When it comes to introducing local and national partners, 40% of country level respondents have introduced all or most of their partners to their donors, a similar result to last year. Only 8% reported not introducing any partners to donors in the past 12 months.

The most common type of funding successfully accessed following such introductions was through Country-based Pooled Funds and UN agencies, though the proportion of funding from government donors and other named donors increased to equal this form of funding [see figure 5]. Many respondents also reported that introductions have led to promising leads, or agreements for funding that will be disbursed in future reporting periods.

The majority at the country level do not contribute financially to country-level grant mechanisms for local actors, with only 16% of respondents having done so, and 25% of respondents said that this option was not applicable to them. However, 40% of respondents have advocated to country level donors for investments to be made in such mechanisms to avail funding to local actors (beyond UN OCHA country-based pooled funds (CBPF)).

The START fund was considered a good example of pooled funding to which organisations have both contributed and encouraged donors to contribute. Signatories’ country level respondents also shared other ways in which they contributed to increase funding to local actors, including:

- **Christian Aid, Myanmar**: have established a Localised Partner Platform with local civil society organisations (CSO) to share their strategy and plans addressing a range of issues with donors such as ECHO, UN OCHA and others.

- **Trocaire, Uganda**: supported an inter-ministerial dialogue on localisation with ministers, members of Parliament and donors to advocate for increased funding and strengthening for localisation in the country.

- **CARE Caucasus, Armenia**: in the aftermath of the Nagorno-Karabakh humanitarian crisis, CARE facilitated access for local CSO partners to the inter-agency humanitarian platforms to strengthen the engagement of local voices and their experience in strategy development and action.

**Commitment 3:**

Though a majority of signatories report that they shared figures on transfers to partners with a wider audience (such as through their websites and annual reports) during 2020, 40% report that they still do not meet this commitment. Only 29% report that they completely or partially reported similar data to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) database.
Commitment 2: Partnership

We endorse, and have signed on to, the Principles of Partnership (Equality, Transparency, Results-oriented Approach, Responsibility and Complementarity) introduced by the Global Humanitarian Platform in 2007.

Signatories have consistently reported improvements in compliance with this commitment. Responses for the 2020 reporting period continue this trend, with commitment #2 ranked second overall in the global survey responses. Country level responses also show progress on practical indicators against this commitment, with 60% of country level respondents now having two-way partnership review and feedback mechanisms in place with all or most of their partners. Similarly, over half have long-term strategic partnerships with all or most of their partners and have discussed the Humanitarian Principles of Partnership with them.

At the country level, 43% of respondents indicate that local and national partners have shared suggestions for improvements on progress towards C4C commitments, even though the majority still report that they do not share these commitments with their in-country partners. When it comes to feedback and reviews of partnerships the data is much more consistent, with 90% reporting that partners had shared concerns or suggestions on how partnership relationships could be improved, a similar number to the last report.

Most respondents had annual feedback and partnership reflection processes embedded at the country programme level. They emphasised the importance of ensuring regular, accessible meetings with partners through flexible scheduling. Feedback is only useful if it is implemented, and agencies shared examples of adjusting their processes to respond to concerns raised.

DCA, Kenya, addressed the need to fast track annual project approval and funds transfer to maximise project implementation within the project period. DCA, South Sudan, responded to partners’ request to have a closed call for proposals rather than just ring fencing funding to a few.

CRS, Tanzania, responded to concerns about program quality and management, particularly financial oversight. In line with partners’ requests, assessments were updated and reporting systems were upgraded resulting in lighter reporting requirements.

Oxfam, Lebanon, received suggestions from partners on clearer communication flows, flexibility in deadlines, room to expand, and involvement in proposal development.
CARE, Turkey, provided greater clarity on division of labour, and division of roles, especially as relates to oversight over quality of implementation.

Tearfund, Haiti, reviewed compliance requirements in response to critiques from partners that the level of compliance is sometimes counter-productive.

And Johanniter, Afghanistan, was able to provide a percentage of the Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) to the local partner in newly negotiated funding, including for funding sourced from pooled funds.

However, some feedback received from partners was difficult for signatories to act on, often related to donors’ funding practices:

“Several partners have asked to be given more time to write proposals, and while Oxfam provided the utmost flexibility in this regard, donor deadlines remained too tight for both Oxfam and partners in multiple instances in the past year.” (Oxfam, Lebanon)

“Partners have requested multi-year funding agreements but these aren’t possible due to the donor funding cycle.” (CRS, South Sudan)

“Partner requested for overhead costs and this has been forwarded to HQ for consideration.” (IRW, Myanmar)

Capacity strengthening is a key area of concern at both the international and local level. Partner feedback particularly focuses on the continued need for models based on inclusivity, equity and inter-partnership learning, raising questions as to how INGOs can more intentionally shape capacity investments to be in line with the Humanitarian Principles of Partnership. A recurring issue in feedback was the need to find a better balance between signatories’ need for oversight and quality control versus sufficient space and autonomy for partners. Capacity support that signatories’ partners felt to be useful and in line with Equitable Partnership included:

- improving political dialogue and joint work in country as part of a long term strategy;
- taking a mentorship approach as opposed to the traditional model of capacity strengthening;
- capacity strengthening activities with flexibility built into project design, allowing signatories to be more responsive to identified needs;
- working alongside partners to engage State and Federal Government Authorities, joining partners for sensitive engagement meetings;
- working together with partners on improvement plans for stronger (resource management) systems;
- working side by side [in responses] to ensure real time learning and skills transfer;
- making support actions multi-annual (at least 5 years) and increasing dedicated funding for capacity investments for more partners in rural areas.
Overall compliance rankings from signatories at the headquarters level remain consistent with last year for commitment #4. This finding is reflected at the country level. While 90% have ethical recruitment guidelines in place, 10% more than last reporting period, there was also a rise in the number that had approached staff from local and national organisations within six months of a crisis, with 26% having done so during the reporting period.

As climate change intensifies cyclones, the Philippines Rural Reconstruction Movement (a partner of Oxfam) is helping local fisherfolk revive a forest that is protecting their lives and livelihoods. PRRM president Raymundo Agaton (right) and members of the Maslog Coconut Farmer and Fishermen Association inspect a mangrove sapling.
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Commitment 4: Stop undermining local capacity
We commit to implement fair recruitment policies to discourage the poaching of staff from national and local NGOs (as this severely undermines their capacity to operate, particularly in the height of emergency response).

We will explore alternatives with our partners such as secondments, mentoring or supporting national surge initiatives.

We will undertake to advocate to donors to make working through national actors part of their criteria for assessing framework partners and calls for project proposals.

Commitment 5: Emphasise the importance of national actors
We will undertake to advocate to donors to make working through national actors part of their criteria for assessing framework partners and calls for project proposals.

Signatories’ self-assessment for compliance with this commitment continues to be positive, averaging 4.6 out of five, and having the highest level of compliance for the 2020 reporting period. This is a modest increase from previous reports where it was ranked second for the 2019 reporting period and third for 2018.

In terms of advocacy focus, 80% of signatories have advocated to donors to include working with local and national actors in their assessment framework and calls for proposals, while 60% advocated for donors to increase year on year the percentage of humanitarian funding going to national and local organisations.

A key success of this advocacy is that many humanitarian donors have now made partnership with local partners part of assessment criteria for decision-making, and donors increasingly recognise localisation as essential to humanitarian response. While these changes cannot be attributed solely to C4C signatories’ individual and collective advocacy, C4C is recognised as an important contributor to driving changes in global and country-level humanitarian discourse.

Examples of success in this area include new UK Funding Guidelines which require INGOs to share overhead costs with local NGOs; a concerted US effort to increase funding for local actors; and Canadian and Danish guidance for INGOs demanding greater focus on working in partnership with local actors; alongside the prioritisation of localisation in the Grand Bargain 2.0.
Compliance with commitment #6 was ranked significantly higher by global level respondents than last year when it was the lowest ranked commitment. However, country level responses to questions related to equitable partnering practices such as joint strategy reviews and decision-making in project design show a drop as compared to last year. Fewer respondents had included all their partners in joint strategy reviews or had partners take leadership in joint activities than the previous reporting period, possibly as a result of the pandemic inhibiting collective strategy review or project design workshops. This reflects a lost opportunity at a time when local actors needed support, and were demonstrating their capacity to organise and implement projects. Such workshops could have provided opportunities to develop the innovative approaches often discussed in the sector. Over 55% of country level responses reported that all or most of their partners took part in their country’s strategy development review, and 60% said that most or all of their partners had taken a leadership role in designing joint activities. Movement restrictions brought by COVID-19 led to sector-wide discussions around a shift to local leadership, as local actors were the only ones able to be present in many crisis situations. However, the responses from C4C actors on commitment #6 do not suggest such change has yet occurred.

**Commitment 6: Equality**

Our local and national collaborators are involved in the design of the programmes at the outset and participate in decision-making as equals in influencing programme design and partnership policies.
Implementation of commitment #7 continues to be the area where signatories struggle to make progress. In the 2020 reporting period, only 12 out of 25 signatories (48%) could report the total funding allocated for capacity strengthening, despite commitments for all signatories to be able to do so by 2020. For those who reported, funding for capacity strengthening represented 3% of total humanitarian expenditure, a significant decrease from last year where it accounted for 6% of expenditure. Given that the majority of signatories still cannot report on this data, it is difficult to build a reliable picture of support for capacity strengthening across the C4C. This is consistent with previous years and suggests that for change to happen in this area more focus is needed both internally by signatories and possibly externally from donors.

On the provision of adequate administrative support, 60% of signatories have no organisational policy related to this requirement. When asked why they do not have

**Commitment 7: Robust organisational support and capacity strengthening**

We will support local actors to become robust organisations that continuously improve their role and share in the overall global humanitarian response. We undertake to pay adequate administrative support. A test of our seriousness in capacity building is that by 2020 we will have allocated resources to support our partners in this. We will publish the percentages of our humanitarian budget which goes directly to partners for humanitarian capacity building by 2020.

Omar lives at his homestead in Mororo, in Tana River County, with his 19 dependents, including one child with a mental disability. The family relied on 2 farms with mangoes, maize, beans, and other crops, before recent floods washed away all of their crops. In recent years, floods killed most of his cows. Now the family has some sheep, goats, and chickens. In the 2020 floods, Omar and his family were warned with enough time to gather their belongings and avoid losing any livestock. With money he received from the Kenya Cash Consortium, Omar is supporting his family while they replant anew, and saving to buy more livestock in future months.
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such a policy, many responded that though there was no internal policy, it was standard practice. Other signatories are working on making this an element of future policy, though some noted the difficulty of getting agreement across the whole organisation, while one noted that donor agreement was needed first. Despite this, nearly two-thirds of country level respondents report that they provide core and administrative costs to all of their partners.

CRS are introducing agency level KPIs which measure local leadership against core C4C commitments: documented examples of capacity strengthening; total value (USD) secured from donors by local partners as a result of CRS contributions. These will be further complemented by policies currently under review to support 5% of core and administrative costs in funding to local partners, and to develop a system to track funding for capacity strengthening.

In addition to publishing the budget going to capacity strengthening, and provision of administrative support, signatories invest in capacity strengthening activities to further improve local and national actors’ role and share in humanitarian response. In terms of the types of activities undertaken, country level respondents report that the most common areas were finance systems and financial performance improvements; technical service delivery improvements; and proposal development. These were also the most common areas in the last report.

Beyond organisational capacity strengthening support for individual partner organisations, C4C signatories have been important contributors to local and national actors’ collective activities to network, coordinate, and advocate for locally-led humanitarian action. Over 60% of country level respondents have actively supported this with at least some of their partners over the past 12 months, and nearly 30% had done so with all their local partners.

CRS: in Bangladesh, commitment to local leadership has led to promoting local partner staff to be Co-Lead of the Shelter and Settlement Cluster and Chair for the Localisation technical working group.

Oxfam: in Somalia, the country office issues joint statements with partners, as well as writing statements and supporting local actors’ advocacy without including Oxfam branding. In the Philippines local partners were supported to be part of the steering committee of consortia usually led by INGOs.

Trocaire: in Sierra Leone, country office staff advocated to the Government and INGOs for national NGOs to be appointed as coordination lead. As a result the COVID-19 coordination in each district has been co-chaired by an INGO and NNGO representative.

Help: in Kenya, part of the grants to partners go towards supporting locally-led networks and activities that increase advocacy for locally-led humanitarian action.

Cafod: in Zimbabwe, they supported research on the state of localisation in Zimbabwe and sharing of the findings in several fora including the HCT.
Nearly 85% of global level respondents indicated that their organisations promoted all or most of their national and local partners in communications materials, while just over 70% of country level respondents did.

Beyond communications and media materials, C4C signatories are also asked whether they credit the work of local and national partners in their reports to donors, thereby enhancing transparency on how and by whom humanitarian action is implemented. Both global and country level responses were positive, with 64% of headquarters respondents and 73% of country level respondents stating that they explicitly include all their partners in reports. There remains a slight discrepancy between the two levels, however the gap is smaller than in previous years.

**Commitment 8: Promoting the role of partners to the media and the public**

In any communications to the international and national media and to the public we will promote the role of local actors and acknowledge the work that they carry out, and include them as spokespersons when security considerations permit.

Nearly 85% of global level respondents indicated that their organisations promoted all or most of their national and local partners in communications materials, while just over 70% of country level respondents did.

Beyond communications and media materials, C4C signatories are also asked whether they credit the work of local and national partners in their reports to donors, thereby enhancing transparency on how and by whom humanitarian action is implemented. Both global and country level responses were positive, with 64% of headquarters respondents and 73% of country level respondents stating that they explicitly include all their partners in reports. There remains a slight discrepancy between the two levels, however the gap is smaller than in previous years.
COVID-19: Voices of local actors are not given enough respect

Though the annual surveys on progress towards the C4C commitments did not focus specifically on lessons learned during the ongoing pandemic, the changes to both everyday life and humanitarian assistance necessarily had an impact on members of the C4C movement. Here we share some of the key observations and lessons learned from local actors engaged in the response.

Eyokia Donna Juliet – Policy Dialogue Expert with Community Empowerment for Rural Development (CERFORD), Uganda, preparation for Humanitarian Leadership Conference, 2021:
When the COVID-19 crisis began last year, many expats ran back to their home countries, leaving local aid providers taking all the risks at the front lines. Despite this, the voices of local actors are still not afforded enough respect. INGOs are well equipped. But because donors don’t take care of our overhead expenses, local actors struggle. For example, we hire staff and train them but when a project ends, they have to go. In the next emergency, we have to start over again. And because we can’t pay well, we are always at risk of losing staff to INGOs. The online meetings and webinars that have accompanied the pandemic have given local actors direct access to decision makers, such as people working in government ministries. This is very positive. But local actors still aren’t in charge of the agenda, and they are cast in the role of listeners. Webinars enabled access but didn’t change attitudes.

Mai Jarrar – Head of Women and Development at East Jerusalem YMCA in Palestine, interview early 2021:
COVID-19 proved that we [NGOs, international organisations, and local organisations] can’t always reach communities in time, we can’t be the first responders. COVID-19 taught us to take a step back and let communities do their work.

Keumala Dewi – Executive Director of PKPA Indonesia, preparation for Humanitarian Leadership Conference, 2021:
In crises like these, donors and grantees must trust each other more than ever. The problem with the system is with the layers of decision making. Those working at the grassroots – where the knowledge of what’s actually happening in the communities sits – never have a chance to talk to the real decision makers. Local organisations are at the frontier. We are the first to enter disaster areas. In the pandemic, we were the first to see and experience its effects. When mothers and children reported abuses, we didn’t say, ‘sorry, we’re working from home.’

Nanette Regina Antequisa, director of ECOWEB, Philippines, interviewed early 2021:
Individuals really help each other. They continue to help others, despite the fact that their own businesses have been closed. The youth are taking a lot of initiative. They are not part of NGOs, but they link with other communities and groups to create new networks. So, there really is this capacity within local communities that will reveal itself in disaster situations.
Conclusion

The Charter for Change, launched in 2016, set out concrete targets to advance the localisation of humanitarian aid and change the ways of working of its signatories. Since then it has been a key driver for change and advocacy in the sector, and has grown to 35 signatory INGOs and 340 local and national NGO endorsers to the Charter supporting its goals and holding INGOs accountable. Considerable progress has been made to meet the commitments, including 25% funding directly to local partners, but other core commitments are still to be met.

In 2020 it was decided that the C4C would continue past its stated end date, and the Future of Charter for Change sets out the key areas of focus as the C4C moves into the next phase. As highlighted in the 2019-2020 annual report, the centre of gravity of the localisation debate, and changes in practice, must move to the country level, and country level reporting was introduced to support this goal.

This year further survey questions were introduced to understand signatories’ contributions to driving country level changes. Respondents were asked whether they have financially inputted to joint mechanisms for funding local actors’ responses, and while a significant majority have not, nearly half have advocated to donors to invest in country level mechanisms that enable access to funding for local actors beyond UN country based pooled funds. Others put crisis modifiers in every proposal or project, which can be used to release further funds for local partners to respond to additional crises within a crisis. Actively supporting local actors to network, coordinate and advocate for locally-led humanitarian action was felt to be an area where the C4C can contribute, and the majority of country level respondents have done so with at least some of their local partners. Examples in this report focused on promoting local actors to leadership roles in existing coordination structures, suggesting there is room for growth in facilitating advocacy coordination between local actors.

At the global level signatories were asked if progress against C4C commitments is a performance indicator for country leadership. Currently only 30% regularly measure this, however many organisations are in the process of integrating this into future strategies and policies. Others noted that performance against C4C commitments is
taken into consideration during programme review despite the lack of a formal metric. This supports findings that country level respondents are often implementing even where global policy does not require it. Signatories do not generally have policies in place requiring funding for local actors’ administrative costs, however at the country level respondents overwhelmingly report providing such funding to their partners.

Advocacy remains a core strength and the C4C has helped to shape the agenda around localisation at the global and country level. Signatory contributions around commitment #5 in this report celebrate successes with key donors increasing focus on localisation. There remains a disconnect however between high level global policy and action on the ground. At the global level signatories advocate to donors to increase the year on year funding going directly to local and national partners, yet only half of local and national partners introduced to funders by signatories at the country level succeed in securing direct funding, mostly through the UN and CBPFs.

Signatories show progress against areas highlighted for improvement in the 2019-2020 report. Signatories’ self-assessment on complying with the Humanitarian Principles of Partnership remains high, and though engaging in longer-term strategic partnerships remains challenging for some, the majority do have such partnerships in place. Questions remain about how these relationships ensure leadership for local actors on joint activities and signatories’ strategic directions, with some changes in involvement possibly explained by disruptions due to the pandemic.

In 2019-2020 it was also noted that moving to locally-led action as the dominant modus operandi would require action on partners’ feedback and suggestions for real change to take root. Responses remain consistent in this report, with local partners continuing to share feedback and suggest changes to signatories’ country level staff – some of which signatories stated they were able to act on. This area needs to be explored in more depth, to see whether such feedback results in meaningful change. Moreover, self-reporting may not reveal critical feedback that has not been acted upon. For a more accurate picture of signatories’ compliance with equitable partnership practices, self-reported progress should be examined alongside reviews by their partners.

For locally-led action to become the norm, robust conversation and debate is needed between INGOs and local and national organisations. However, a significant proportion of signatories’ staff and structures at country level continue not to inform local partners about their C4C commitments as a matter of course. This notwithstanding, there is growing awareness of the C4C and localisation agenda and increased scrutiny of signatories’ progress (or lack of it) by C4C endorsers and networks of local actors at the global and national level.

The reporting mechanism did not include questions about the impact of COVID-19, though some local actors’ experiences and views have been highlighted in this report. The pandemic created new challenges for humanitarian assistance, but also promised a watershed moment for the sector to put localisation commitments into action. This year’s reporting did not evidence such an accelerated shift towards all signatories meeting all C4C commitments. However it does present pointers to areas that require continued attention and investment, such as:

- shifting the weight of the localisation agenda to the country level, in all signatories’ country programs, especially those that have lacked engagement with the agenda to date;
- developing global policies that support country level work on localisation and ensure the performance of country leadership is evaluated against commitments;
- continuing support for local actors to access and engage with local and national coordination mechanisms, and investing in local actors’ efforts to shape more appropriate forms of engagement (e.g. national Grand Bargain 2.0 structures);
- ensuring that partners overhead and administrative costs are covered to build ever more robust organisations;
- translating advocacy to action so that changes in global donor policies result in more opportunities for local and national actors, and signatories pass on gains in quality funding to partners;
- supporting country specific and locally-led models of capacity strengthening, advocacy and response.

Ultimately, much of the strength of the Charter for Change initiative lies in its ability to drive collective action, through collaborative investments and advocacy, as well as by signatories and endorser modelling viable models of locally-led humanitarian action. Reporting on progress over the past period has once again surfaced a profusion of individual investments and actions that demonstrated impact, unlocked funding, and put pressure on other actors to follow suit. Higher levels of engagement by signatories with local and national NGO endorses, and more collaboration and coordination among different C4C signatories - in addition to individual shifts in pro-localisation partnership practices - would further reinforce the momentum for transformation at national and sub-national levels, and enhance accountability to the agenda among local actors and communities.
Annex 1: Signatories of the Charter for Change

ActionAid
Asamblía de Cooperación por la Paz
CAFOD (Catholic Agency for Overseas Development)
CARE
Caritas Denmark
Caritas Norway
Caritas Spain
Christian Aid
Church of Sweden (Svenska Kyrkan)
Cordaid (Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid)
CRS (Catholic Relief Services)
DanChurchAid
Diakonia
Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe
Finn Church Aid
Help – Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe
HelpAge International
Human Appeal
Humedica
ICCO
International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)
Islamic Relief Worldwide
Johanniter International Assistance/
Johanniter-Auslandshilfe
Kerk in Actie
Kindernothilfe e.V.
Norwegian Church Aid (NCA)
Norwegian People’s Aid
Oxfam
Rescue Global
SCIAF (Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund)
Street Child UK
Tear Australia
Tearfund
Terram Pacis
Trócaire
WarChild UK
World Jewish Relief
Xavier Project

Signatories that reported are indicated in bold

C4C signatories (as of June 2021):
Annex 2: Non-INGO endorsers of the Charter for Change:

Access Development Services
ACT Alliance
Action Africa Help International (AAH-I)
Action Des Volontaires Pour La Solidarité Et Le Développement
Action Entraide
Action For Development
Action for Human Rights and Education Initiative-Uganda
Action for Improvement of Food Child and Mother Action for Women and Awakening in Rural Environment
Action Pour la Promotion de la Santé de la Mère et de L’Enfant
Action Pour le Volontariat à Dubreka
Actions Pour la Promotion Agricole et Sanitaire
Adamawa Peace Initiative
ADES – Agences de Développement Economique et Social ONG
Adeso
Adilet
Adonai Health and Development Foundation
Adult Literacy Centre
Africa Development Aid
Africa Humanitarian Action
Africa Peace Service Corps
African Children’s Voice
African Women and Youth Action for Development
Agile Internationale
Aides aux Personnes Démunies (APED)
Airavati
Akkar Network for Development
ALDI International
Amani Initiative
Amel Association
American University of Nigeria
Amity Public Safety Academy
Amity Volunteer Fire Brigade

AMUDECO
Anchalik Gram Unnayan Parishad
Anglican Development Services North Rift
Applied Research Institute
Arab Renaissance for Democracy and Development – Legal Aid
Ard El-Insan (AEI), Palestinian Benevolent Association
Arid Land Development Focus
Arua District NGO Network
Arysh (Public Association)
Ashroy Foundation
Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development, Inc.
Assistance for Humanitarian Missions-International
Asociación Benposta Nacion de Muchachos
Asociación de Desarrollo Agrícola y Microempresarial
Asociacion para la Educacion y el Desarrollo
Association Congo Amkeni ASBL
Association des Acteurs de Développement
Association de Développement pour la Paix et la Reconstruction en République Démocratique du Congo
Association des Facilitateurs pour le Développement Intégré
Association des Femmes du Secteur des Industries Extractives du Niger
Association for Integrated Development
Association for Rural Poor
Association Locale pour le Développement Integral
Association Nigérienne pour le Traitement de la Délinquance et la prévention du crime
Association of Voluntary Actions for Society
Association Tunisienne De Défense des droits de l’enfant
Asta Sansthān
ASVSS
Bader Charity Organization
Baikunthapur Tarun Sangha

Balaod Mindanaw
Bangladesh Model Youth Parliament (Protiki Jubo Sangsad)
Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication
Barokupot Ganochetona Foundation
Basmeh & Zeitooneh
Belay Rehabilitation Center
BENEFANCE
Beyond Aid and Relief
BIFERD
Bod Diou Dans La Rue
Building Foundation for Development
Bureau Ecuménique d’Appui au Développement
CAF India
Care and Assistance For Forced Migrants
Care for the Physically Challenged and Destitute Foundation
Caritas Arua Diocese
Caritas Bangladesh
Caritas Butembo-Beni
Caritas Development Goma
Caritas Developpement Niger
Caritas Kotido Diocese
Caritas Lebanon
Caritas Moroto Diocese
Caritas Nepal
Caritas Nigeria
Caritas Sri Lanka
Caritas Ukraine
Caritas Uvira
Cash Learning Partnership
CEDERU
CENADEP
Center for Disaster Preparedness Foundation
Center for Protection of Children
Center for Social Integrity
Center for Support of International Protection
Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Centre
Human Rights Movement “Bir Duino-Kyrgyzstan”
Humana People to People Congo
Humane Mission Africa
Humanitarian Aid International
Humanitarian Development Consortium
Humanitarian Relief and Development Council
Humanite Plus
Hygiene et Environnement Communautaire au Congo
Indonesian Society for Disaster Management
Indonesian Student Association for International Studies
INHURED International
Institut Bioforce
Institute for Social and Economic Development Assistance (ISEDA – Public Fund)
Instituto da Infancia
Integrated Child Service
Integrated Risk Management Associates
Integrated Volunteers Network
InterAid
Iranian Lifequality Improvement Association
Iraqi Institution for Development
ISDE-Bangladesh
Jabilia Rehabilitation Society
JAGO NARI (Barguna Nari Jagaron Karmoshuchi)
Jindal School of International Affairs
Jireh Doo Foundation
Joint Learning Initiative on Faith & Local Communities
Joint Strategy Team
Jordan Hashemite Charitable Organisation
Jordan Health Aid Society International
Jordan Paramedic Society
Just Project International
Justice Development and Peace / Caritas Onitsha
KALU Institute
Kapoeta Development Initiative
Kisima Peace and Development
Kitumaini Association for the Development of Health of the Mother and Infant
La Generale d'assainissement et de protection de l'environnement du Congo
Lawyers for Human Rights
Le Ceprossan Asbl
Lebanese Association for Human Promotion and Literacy (ALPHA Lebanon)
Legal Resources Centre
Libyan Humanitarian Relief Agency
Life at Best Development Initiative
Livelihood Improvement Programme of Uganda
Lizadeel
Local Communities Development Initiative
Lotus Kenya Action for Development Organization
Lutheran World Service India Trust
Manna Development Agency
Mavi Kalem Social Assistance and Charity Association
MAYANK Anti-Corruption Coalition
Mercy Malaysia
Mercy Vincent Foundation
MIDEFEHOPS
Moral and Charity Organization for Human Rights
MONISHA
Moroto Nakapiripirit Religious Leaders Initiative for Peace
Mosala Group
Nakere Rural Women Activist
Naseej for Development, Relief & Human Rights
National Humanitarian Network
National Relief and Development Corps
National Secretariat for Social Action (NASSA) / Caritas Philippines
New Life Charitable Trust
North-East Affected Area Development Society
Not1More
NPCYP
Nuba Foundation
Nuba Relief Rehabilitation and Development Organization
Oasis of Restoration Foundation
OFADEC
Ohaha Family Foundation
Omarang Charity Association for Multipurpose
ONG Eau Vie Environnement
Organisation au Service d'Actions Humanitaires
Organisation des Jeunes pour la Promotion des Initiatives Communautaires
PACODEVI
Palestinian Benevolent Association
Palestinian Vision Organisation (PalVision)
Participatory Research Action Network
Partners in Community Transformation
Partnership for Faith & Development
People Empowering People
People’s Disaster Risk Reduction Network, Inc.
People’s Federation for National Peace and Development
Positive Attitude to Life Initiative
PRISNA
Programme de Promotion des Soins de Santé Primaire
Programme for Helpless And Lagged Societies
PRO-VIDA, Asociacion Salvadorena de Ayuda Humanitaria
Public Foundation “Bio Service”
Public Fund “Mehr Shavkat”
Rakai Counsellors’ Association
Ranaw Disaster Response and Rehabilitation Assistance Center
REACH-Rehabilitation, Education and Community Health
Rebuild Hope for Africa
REDESO
Réponse aux Catastrophes et aux Initiatives de Développement
Research and Development Foundation
Réseau de Coopération pour la Transparence et la lutte contre la Corruption
Rhema Foundation
Rock Centre Asbl
RONHD
Rural Agency for Community Development & Assistance
Rural Initiative for Community Empowerment West Nile
Samudaik Kalyan Evam Vikas Sansthan
Sangathita Gramunyay Karmasuchii / Organized Village Development Program
Sante et Developpement
SAR Peru- Salvamento, Auxilió y Rescate
Save Humanity Africa
Sawa for Development and Aid
Seeds India
Settlement Council of Australia
Shabab Peace and Environment Action Group
Shafak
Shaiq Tahir Azzawi Charity Organization
Shami Coalition
Shar for Development
SHARP – Pakistan Society for Human Rights and Prisoners' Aid
Shoola-Kol (Public Association)
SHSA
Signature Research Centre
SIKAT (Sentro para sa Ikaunlad ng Katutubong Agham at Teknolohiya Inc. or Center for the Development of Indigenous Science and Technology)
SKS Foundation
Smile Again Africa Development Organization
Snazzy Hope Foundation
Society Voice Foundation
SOCOAC
Solidarité Chrétienne pour les Urgences et le Développement
Somali Rural Development Organisation
Sorouh for Sustainable Development Foundation
SORUDA
South Sudan Grassroots Initiative for Development
Spectrum - Sustainable Development Knowledge Network
Stand for Change and Unity
START Network

Steps to Life Nigeria
STEWARDWOMEN
Strategies for Northern Development
Strengthening Participatory Organisation
Support Agency for Sustainable Living
Support for Peace and Education Development Program
Support Yemeni Society Organization for Development
Syria Relief
Taakulo Somali Community
Tagore Society For Rural Development
The Big Smile
The Federation of Ethnic Communities’ Councils of Australia
The Indonesian Society for Disaster Management
The Organisation for Children’s Harmony
The Uganda Association of Women Lawyers
The Victim Relief Alliance
Titi Foundation
Touch Africa Now
Transcultural Psychosocial Organisation
TrioDuol Multipurpose Cooperative Society
Udya
Uganda Land Owners Association
Uganda National NGO Forum
Ukraine NGO Forum
UNASO (Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organization)
Union Paysanne pour le Développement Rural Intégré
Union pour la Promotion, la Défense des Droits Humains et de l’Environnement
Universal Just and Action Society
Universal Network for Knowledge and Agency
Village Community Development Initiatives
Vision for Humanity (ViFoH)
Volunteer Corps Nepal
Volunteer Efforts for Development Concerns
Wajir South Development Association
Waves of Success Foundation
West Nile Youth Empowerment Centre

White Life
White Smile NGO
Women’s Action for Self Empowerment
Women Aid Vision
Women and Children in Support of Community Development Initiative
Women in Humanitarian Response in Nigeria Initiative
Women Now, for Development
Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling
Women’s Right to Education Programme
World Voices Uganda
Ydeborahs Foundation
Young Aid International Humanitarian Organization
Young Power in Social Action
Young Women Creating Opportunities and Networks for Economic Transformation
Youth Empowerment Center
Youth Leadership Forum and Giving Back Movement
Youth Net and Counselling
Youth Social Advocacy Team
Zanjireh Omid International Charity Institute
Zion Emergency and Disaster Rescue Unit
Endnotes

1. In the country level survey respondents were not required to answer every question, and number of respondents will vary for each question.

2. This difference between country level estimates and headquarters financial reporting may reflect a number of factors, not least that calculations at country level would not usually include HQ and regional office expenditures.


Participants analyse protection challenges and opportunities in a specific part of Gaza city during a co-design workshop in 2019 in preparation for community-led activities there. The workshop brought together staff of among other CFDA, MAAN, East Jerusalem YMCA, DanChurchAid, ACT CoS, Christian Aid and L2GP.
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