



Charter for Change Annual Meeting Report

7-9 December 2021

The Charter for Change (C4C) is an initiative, led by both National and International NGOs, to practically implement changes to the way the Humanitarian System operates to enable more locally-led response. The 2021 Annual Meeting was a series of online events to take stock of progress and share good practices amongst Charter4Change signatories and endorsers in promoting localization efforts. The Annual Meeting was to enable solutions-focused discussions to address the obstacles to localization in INGO-NGO partnerships.

Specific Objectives of the Annual Meeting:

- To share emerging insights, progress, good practices and challenges in delivery of the 8 commitments
- To learn from country-level C4C networking, and encourage more country and regional-level collaboration to advance C4C and localization
- To deepen commitment and accountability of C4C signatories (global and country offices) and C4C Endorsers

Session #1

Charter4Change after 5 years: Stock-take on localization policy and practice

Summary: This session primarily focused on setting the scene for the C4C annual conference. The C4C conference began with five years journey of C4C highlighting the progress and achievements on the Localization agenda in collaboration with international and national NGOs. C4C annual report key findings along with way forward for the signatories; similarly, endorsers' survey report (not published yet) showcased the progress local NGOs have made in the last year. Lastly, three C4C working groups - Capacity strengthening; Advocacy and Endorser taskforce presented annual key achievements and next year work plans.

Key takeaways:

1. Some signatories are developing their own localization indicators not necessarily linked to C4C. Local Partnership Framework should be principally grounded on C4C commitments, mutually collaborating and mutually accountable.
2. The partnership model should be moving away from project-based partnership models to strategic partnerships that may include jointly raising funds and joint advocacy on issues of common interest.
3. Signatories at the global level need to work with field offices and internally advocate to incorporate C4C commitments at the country level.
4. Need to continue to create awareness of C4C among signatories and local actors at the country level; INGO should co-lead to create and strengthen shared capacity for humanitarian response.

Session #2

C4C Country level dialogue outcome session

Localization framework

- Participants agreed that C4C need to integrate localization across the triple nexus (humanitarian – development – peace).
- Identify and respond to the challenges that arise when international actors claim space in countries when registering as local entities.

C4C WG establishment and operationalization in country

- From the respective presentations, it was clear that C4C WGs platforms are necessary to ensure that the CoA are monitored and members share lessons. Countries that do not have this structure are encouraged to setup one. Global secretariat is requested with support of different country WGs to compile different case studies on how to set up and operationalize the C4C WGs
- Endorsers and Signatories operating within a specific jurisdiction are also encouraged to be active members of the WGs. The platforms are also encouraged to seek more collaboration with other platforms
- There is a need to have a simple tool to monitor implementation of Charter of Accountability in the respective countries. C4C global secretariat can support in developing this tool

C4C Cross-Country Collaboration

- From the in-country meetings, it was noted that one of the ingredients for success was the cross learning that was happening. For instance, Kenya learnt from Uganda while Sierra Leone learnt from Kenya. C4C WG chairs presented in different countries. This needs to continue and there needs to be intentionality for it.

Following the Signatory survey report and the Endorsers survey report, the following clearly came out;

1. That the highest level of compliance was with commitment to; advocacy
2. That it is now mandatory for the signatories to submit reports at the global level
3. There is still a gap in commitment to transparency; specifically communicating about the 25% funds to LNNGOS

Key issues to make emphasis on were as follows;

1. Country level implementation of C4C commitments is still wanting
2. C4C/Localization performance management structures need to be put in place
3. There is a need for signatories to stop working in siloed capacities but holistically implement the C4C commitments from HQs to country levels
4. The need for Signatories and Endorsers to continue working together

Highlights from Speakers - Experience sharing

1. The need for meaningful partnership
2. Standardized assessments
3. The issues of some clusters having no space for engagement of endorsers
4. The need to shape, power and resources to the last mile
5. That C4C commitments needs to go beyond NGO sector
6. The need to carry out research and have documentation on localization while recognising the triple nexus in localization and day to day philanthropic spaces
7. Transparency is still key in C4C Commitments and localization agenda
8. C4C should be used to promote the SDGs
9. In DRC; 32 signatories exist but only 02 are willing to support localization namely OXFAM

10. C4C requires a consolidated approach to work
11. Some countries like Turkey have limited information on C4C and were learning from the C4C Annual Assembly and hoped to be connected with other Endorsers in the middle East and care International committed to doing so . <https://charter4change.files.wordpress.com/2021/12/c4c-annual-country-dialogue-meetings-newsletter-final.pdf>

Session #3

C4C Endorsers group deep dive

- It's important that local actors reclaim its role to play in leading both locally and community-led risk informed humanitarian and development interventions in line with localization.
- There's a need to have a shift in mindset to embrace this important role to play and likewise the framework of the triple nexus for a holistic and comprehensive resilience, empowerment, and development.
- Strategic partnerships between and among signatories and endorsers at global and country levels including the role to play of donors and the private sector could bring lasting change and impact to the localization agenda at global and local levels.
- It is important for local actors to reclaim their role in leading risk-based, community-led humanitarian and development interventions in line with localization.
- Within the framework of localization. There is a need to change mindsets to accept this important role and, likewise, the triple-link framework for sustainable development.
- A mindset shift is needed to embrace this important role and the triple-bind framework for holistic and comprehensive resilience, empowerment and development. Strategic partnerships between and among signatories and adherents at the global and national levels, including the role to be played by donors and the private sector, could bring lasting change and impact to the localization agenda at the global and national levels.
- Nevertheless, one thing is certain, many INGO signatories are not yet ready to:
 - Deliver on their commitments;
 - Support local actors to the point where they are considered and empowered to fulfill their missions;
 - To avoid stigmatization, abusive generalization, exclusion and discrediting;
 - To avoid decisions, planning, and conceptions that always come from the top to the bottom and not the other way around;
 - To do the best possible to put local actors at the center of humanitarian and development actions.

Session #4

The Charter of Accountability of Endorsers (COA)

Summary: the CoA session focused on increasing awareness of the CoA amongst signatories and endorsers, as well as how to move the agenda forward in the next few years in C4C. the participants heard the benefits and challenges from the perspective of community member, endorser and signatory. Later through group work, practical solutions were shared and mapped. The participants were all in agreement on the importance of CoA.

Accountability is a responsibility of all. Of the community partners, of the L/NNGOs (directly implementing or intermediaries), of international partners and donors. All should be contributing and enabling of institutionalizing an accountability mechanism at all levels. The Charter of Accountability is the commitment demonstrated by the C4C endorsers. They need to walk their talk and enabling support from their international partners as well in terms of inclusion in partnership agreement, provision of necessary

capacity strengthening support, peer-to-peer or cross-learning and support to enable the local actors/endorsers to cascade the Charter of Accountability to community level.

Key takeaway:

1. We are all at different levels at owning CoA, but the direction of travel is agreed and clear. More push is needed to institutionalize CoA
2. It is not just about the COA and signing on to it. It is endorsers responsibility to walk the talk. NNGOs are intermediaries and need to be accountable to people in crisis
3. Before asking for more accountability by INGOs, NNGO needs to move towards more trust, ownership and transparency towards communities
4. This can only be done if the capacities of the local actors are really shifting to that direction. Most of our time and investments has been on upwards accountability.
5. C4C and CoA should be part of partnership agreements and it should not cost.
6. Continued exchange of ideas / best practice/ within regions / across regions if we can keep that track, we will be in a good way.

Community Accountability Committees experience from a community members perspective:

Amina:

- *Accountability committee faced challenges as the community found it a hard concept however they ably convinced the members it's for the benefit of everyone.*
- *The committee developed a complaints and feedback mechanism for the community for example posting activities or any updates on social media (Facebook) and also installed the complaints box in the clinic, a place where everyone can access.*
- *With the trust built, the community started contributing to community projects through involvement in decision making projects.*
- *Accountability is now a practice in the community with all the various stakeholders and has attracted other Agencies to work with them due to their credibility and organization.*
- *Amina is now a village council member working to promote accountability within her community*

Paul: War Child Canada

- *It's Really critical that we voice opinions on platforms where we can and think creatively about how we shift the focus away from people who sit in concentrated power towards organizations that are doing the work on the ground.*
- *Many international NGOs are facing issues from donors like ECHO, FCDO, USAID who are placing complicated compliance requirements on local and national actors. INGOs need to do our part in advocating to donors about why it's so critical that they revise their approach to compliance. We can do better, the lack of trust in local and national actors is very apparent.*

Reflections: Discussions from breakout sessions on COA

- There is need to have a clear approach on what accountability means at community level for proper applicability.
- How will all the key stakeholders hold the signatories to account. Need to try several methods and see what works So that it is not just ticking a box.
- Internally INGOs are supporting the charter of accountability and C4C amidst lack of proper awareness on the two concepts so that it is clear how support can be provided to the endorsers.
- We must dialogue with the local partners to institutionalize the Charter of accountability

- Many organizations haven't kicked off the conversation on charter of accountability at country level this suggests so there is need to do a mapping the country level to understand which organizations are interested in the CoA.
- We must conduct a situational analysis in terms of needs for INGOs and National NGOs.
- In Iraq, endorsers and INGOs have collaborated to convene national and subnational conversations on the COA and has been appreciated by Iraq NGOs. This Conversation will be followed up and the progress will be shared with C4C network.
- It would be interesting to look at how the CoA links to donor compliance requirements that are imposed on both INGOs and NNGOs and looking at the CHS and what links could be found.
- C4c and CoA should be part of our partnership agreements between our signatories and endorsers, and indicators can be developed for that.
- create platforms integrating National and International NGOs in order to strengthen the synergy of actions and especially the sharing of experiences so that one can learn from each other in order to carry out the activities of positive actions in favor of communities. -Strengthen especially the capacity cooling system of National and Local NGOs so that the messages (sensitizations) are well received
- From signatories its more about shifting the power to enable local orgs to really deliver. Internally it is clear that not all is clear from field to global that information is walking the talk is not happening. There is need for training on the COA for local and endorsers. Iraq example needs to be replicated.
- we are at different levels of owning the CoA at different orgs and we are on the right track and we need to put in more action how it is being institutionalized and then wider in communities where we are working.

Session #5

How C4C best contributes to country level dialogue and transformative change (Grand Bargain process and beyond)

Key takeaways

- There is still a gap between GB commitments at global and national levels. The NRGs are an attempt to make sure localization is realized and to facilitate better commitments to the GB made at local levels bringing commitments to the national and international level
- The idea at the moment is that NRGs can be established wherever there is energy and a need for them. However, it has not been determined what kind of support will be available to create these at the moment.
- NRGs can be a 'safe space' where different actors can share experiences and hold each other accountable
- NRGs should align with existing processes at country level, like C4C groups, and streamline these processes. Different models can serve different needs but NRGs most insist on including perspectives from local partners.
- NRGs need to include all actors, from donors, to national actors to very local and grassroots frontline workers.

Reflections and Discussions from the session

- To create transformative change, we need to hear more about parallel localization processes to create synergies between these processes.
- In some countries, the discussions on localization have not started despite the presence of signatory NGOs, hence the need to:
- *Level mapping of each country to identify who is involved in these processes*

- *Analyze the situation of each other's needs and interests*
- *Coordination of actors to federate efforts.*
- Within the Grand Bargain Localization Workstream, there is an ongoing discussion on working across the Nexus to fundraise for capacity-strengthening (ie funding for capacity-strengthening might be more effectively raised by addressing development donors & funding instruments, in contrast to humanitarian ones)
- CARE believes that national and local organizations working closely with crisis affected people are best placed to operationalize the Nexus. Local and national organizations are already deploying the necessary flexibility at local level to respond to both immediate lifesaving needs while addressing the drivers of crisis, of poverty, of conflict, of climate change....
- LNNGOs do not define themselves as only humanitarian, only development or only peace actors. LNNGOs base their work on the needs on ground, and quickly adapt and shift focus and priorities based on the needs of the community. In C4C, we still use 'Localization of Humanitarian Aid'. Perhaps it is time to expand our definition to reflect C4C's diverse membership.
- Doing the above will also make it possible for signatories to be more deliberate about how we share capacities with local and national actors to support their mandate across the entire continuum of aid. This will enable signatories to mobilize resources from their long-term development budgets to support longer institutional development of national and local actors, with a more longer-term view.
- The challenge is in the silo'd way of funding humanitarian emergencies, limiting longer term collaborative actions on development, humanitarian and peace interventions. This undermines our ability to partner with each other effectively, especially from a long-term strategic partnership perspective, which is the focus of C4C
- For us to address triple nexus, we will need to relook at how we have framed the Charter for Accountability. We need to replace the word humanitarian and include triple nexus on some commitments
- Perhaps advocacy for more country-level funding through consortiums or platforms which are required to demonstrate that local leadership could help?
- When funding is negotiated in donor capitals, that inevitably makes local leadership harder -
- Within the facilitation group, there is wide awareness that similar structures are already in place in some contexts. There is a desire to see whether there is value in restructuring or rebranding existing structures, not to steam-roll over them.
- Marina Prodanovic from OCHA asked how to approach countries that expect support from global organizations that launch initiatives reminiscent of the NRGs. How will NRGs be launched? What countries will be 'invited in'? Is it possible to employ a double-pronged approach to also reach countries where we have low or none indication that localization processes are taken place? How do you prompt a 'local' response?

Session #6 –

Winds of Change – Challenges and Opportunities applying C4C Commitments to Climate Action

1. Climate and environment is a major issue for all humanitarian sector
2. C4C commitments are super relevant for climate response
3. We need to move beyond talking and focus on action
4. This needs to include limiting our environmental impact, not just with climate programmes
5. Local actors need to be at the front of climate response, and everything that goes with that, otherwise it will not be successful

1. To follow-up on our C4C Humanitarian Directors meeting, we will **prioritise supporting change at the country-level**; as this is where there is the most scope for influence and innovation. Context-specific examples of local leadership can inspire global change.
2. We will collaborate as Humanitarian Directors to **encourage our Country Office leadership to energetically collaborate at the country level**; and we will follow up with them on this over the coming year. This will involve **focusing on a limited number of contexts** and later potentially expanding from these. It could involve collaboration through C4C country-level working-groups, National Reference Groups or other country-level initiatives.
3. We will explore scope to convene **exchanges about good practices** on topics of shared interest; involving relevant colleagues including Heads of Finance/Audit. Over the coming months, we will scope the potential for inter-agency dialogue on one or two of the following potential priorities:
 - a. Addressing **Due Diligence** barriers to localisation and unnecessarily duplicatory or incoherent approaches.
 - b. **Overheads costs**: Clarifying and addressing our internal, as well as donor, obstacles to fair, adequate and consistent approaches to ICR.
 - c. **Fundraising and design of consortia to support local leadership innovation** at country level; building on learning about good and bad practice in such collaboration from past and on-going initiatives like ALTP, Shifting the Power, TOGETHER and others.
 - d. **“Why not local?” policies** to review decision-making on opting for direct implementation versus supporting partners.
 - e. **Key Performance Indicators to incentivise localisation** at global or country-level to incentivise localisation.

Obviously, **consultation with local partners will be key** on the above issues. This will also factor in expertise of our partners on issues like inclusion and feminist humanitarian leadership. However, inadequate progress on localisation requires INGO signatories to do their part to ensure organisational change, buy-in and leadership. As HDs, our focus will be on catalysing this to ‘get our own house in order.’

4. To secure wider organisational buy-in, we will **refine the above ideas through consultation with key stakeholders in our agencies** (including Country Directors and Funding/Finance/Compliance staff) and **meet again end January 2022** to plan next steps. Consultation with other C4C stakeholders will also happen between now and then.

Session #7 –

‘Intermediaries’ – How to incentivize localization?

How C4C can support the Grand Bargain Caucus on the role of intermediaries

- From polls: Risk-sharing & Capacity-Strengthening; Donor perceptions of risk; Access to funding; Inequitable partnerships.
- Local NGOs break-out: Context-specific partnerships; More locally-led consortia; More proportionate due diligence; “Locals choose the international” rather than reverse; Identify local capacity to support contextualized local-to-local capacity-sharing; Capacity-strengthening with plan for transition to local leadership; Quality funding metrics, not just 25%
- INGO break-out: More comprehensive risk-sharing as priority in partnerships, Overheads; Organizational culture change & institutional auditing; Rigorous measurement against localization

metrics including focus on gaps & challenges; Each signatory transparently articulating its role and contribution to localization in each context and being held accountable to this.

- Follow-up: Refine recommendations to the Caucus; and agree individual or collective commitments to change by C4C members that are intermediaries to 'practice what we preach' & inspire others.

Session #8

The Future of C4C: Reflecting on individual and collective ways forward

Objectives of the session:

1. Reviewing Day 1 and 2 of the C4C Annual Meeting and developing a common understanding on what we discussed
2. Reflecting on five years of C4C and identifying key priority areas for C4C in 2022
3. Developing a roadmap for C4C and defining an action plan for 2022

Presentation on summaries of Day 1 and 2

Summary of Day 1 and Day 2 of the C4C annual meeting are available here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wv0lvC5TYXDuWGMrtJOiqaxaSGp7RdOJ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=100072652666974875054&rtopf=true&sd=true>)

Break-out sessions: what are the key priority actions for C4C?

In groups, the participants were asked to answer the two following questions:

1. Which are the other global processes, e.g., Grand Bargain, the Climate Charter, etc., with whom linking C4C would yield better results on localization? What strategies/action points would you suggest to promote linkages with them?

Outcomes for Q1

- Speak with one voice, not as individual organizations, but as C4C
 - Advocate on climate change
 - Climate has not been talked about much in the discourses, it should be connected with the charter and should be incorporated at country-level dialogue
 - C4C network to be engaged in the development of new guidance on the Eco policy with the European Union
 - localization is the new frontier for national development
 - Country specific & contextualization of localization process
 - The Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) for Quality and Accountability
 - Engage in 3 caucuses to move faster on localization process
 - Make sure that other initiatives take localization into account
 - National groups should be linked with Grand Bargain
 - Connections with other initiatives as the Grand Bargain seems to be far away for local actors, they are not involved
2. Role of intermediaries is crucial for better delivery on the eight points of C4C. Even a caucus has been established to make the role of intermediaries better. In your experience, what have been the key barriers for robust partnership between signatories and endorsers? What actions should be undertaken to overcome them?

Outcomes for Q2

- Coordination between headquarters and country level C4C signatories needs to be strengthened
- Greater engagement with donors to ensure they tailor their funding calls to localization
- Strengthen partnership between endorsers and signatories to ensure commitments are actualized on the ground
- Map and identify what are the shared priorities of INGO signatories' own local partners and the wider community of national endorsers in each context (some signatories are partnering with non-endorsers, unclear how their approach to localization is tracked, and scope to link them into the C4C process)
- Ensure signatories and partners use the same accountability tools and use their strengths to complement each other.
- Reach out to other INGOs that are not signatories to get them engaged into the C4C conversation.
- Have exchange platforms on good practices in local partners leading on framing partnerships
- Joint advocacy for C4C
- Check whether donor's global support for localization translates into country-level narrative in their relationship with signatories (e.g. feedback on SIDA)
- Difference in implementation between HQ and country-level implementations of the C4C commitments
- There's a need for longer term partnerships in the projects
- The narrative between national and global level needs to change
- The country offices often are not ready for the commitments made at the global level
- The global actors are trying to use a blueprint on the country level which does not always fit

Kai Hopkins: It's time for action not for talking!

Panel session: Reflecting on last five years of C4C, and prioritization of concrete actions for the next five years

Panelists were asked to reflect on what they think is important for the future of C4C, the successes they are already seeing, the challenges and learning experiences they/their organizations have had in the course of their engagement with C4C, and concrete steps they would propose in the context of C4C for 2022. Panelists were asked:

1. If you think about your experience so far with the Charter for Change: What has enriched you? What has amazed you? What made your engagement difficult at times? What kept you motivated?
2. If you look to what extent the voices of beneficiaries and civil society from the Global South are currently being heard, and how their role and influence in the humanitarian sector has changed since 2016: What keeps you up at night? What makes you mad? What are the things that nag at you?

Mai Sabi Jarrar (Palestine): The annual meeting has been really, really rich and shows the progress which has been made and where we are heading. This is amazing and there is a difference between this meeting and others, the endorsers are much stronger and more involved now which is obvious and very important.

We have been talking more about global issues, about the endorsers' countries, their regions and the system as a whole. Of course, the signatories are still there and committed and helping, but this year I see a lot of commitments for C4C, above 500 endorsers, we are raising awareness to local participation.

There are differences between the endorsers - some talk about strengthening capacities, and now that we have capacities, we as signatories need to ask ourselves what comes next. Long term projects for example, more transparency and we need to do more coordination. We have a lot of signatories in third world countries, why don't we work together, keep and use resources to fund other things? C4C is a place where we can really coordinate.

Next year, we have to start discussions on how partnership on localization land should look like. What is different in these partnerships? And what is the role of intermediators: how would it look like? If we move with the agenda of localization, would big organizations look smaller? These are real fears, we need to discuss these issues frankly. What would be the role of the people, of the intermediaries? We need to continue advocacy and support people on different platforms like cafes, which starts to provide them with information and data they need on their platforms. Let us strategize more and protect each other! Let us be one united front and strategize on that!

Amanda Schweitzer (US): Having been part of C4C from the start was a great opportunity to see the change, the number of growing participants on the local level. One important action is continuing to build trust and equal partnership. We have to figure out how to insure mutual accountability, capacity sharing and need to require a paradigm shift and a shift on our mindsets around donors. Relationships need to be deepened – this helps to facilitate. We also need to find a way to change the role of intermediators.

Key actors in the past have been donors and government and I would like to see a change in that, we need opportunities so that actors can participate more directly, by assisting the workstream e.g. C4C is an incredible avenue which will hopefully change the system. The key points I would identify are: develop a government influence strategy, advocate in terms of the triple nexus, finding ways to support C4C issues on the local level – e.g., by localization groups, showing we are proactive with our signatories, identifying ways on strength and knowledge for the local actors.

Tirtha Prasad Saikia (India): I have been working with floods, conflicts and other local disasters, lately with distribution. I haven't been aware of C4C and its processes and Grand Bargain before becoming a partner of C4C in 2017. After that, C4C has been a stepping stone, we gained confidence, we are getting credibility for that and got recognition both on a global and also regional level. Being a hyper local organization, we have the capacity to work where we are needed and save lives.

Let us build a plan on how to strengthen local capacities, promote local organizations and enhancing country level dialogue because all of this is very important. There are a lot of problems and challenges on the local level, also with other organizations, which need to be addressed. We can hold donors accountable in this process which is important for us right now. Helping local organizations to build a network is important, (hyper)local organizations work together in a mechanism, but the most control and power is exercised by global organizations – there needs to be a shift of power to the local level. I believe C4C provides a lot of opportunities.

Michael Solis (Kenya): The country level meetings have been very interesting and it is quite an interesting change that they exist. They make it more practical to expand into the triple nexus. C4C working groups themselves are great – we need to invest in these groups properly though we also need to be mindful as a network that these groups have their costs through our funding and commitments. We do have a lot to celebrate as achievements, however we still need to apply critical analyses: some reports for the annual C4C joint report are not submitted, and it is important to recognize that not all reports are being generated. We need to start proving that localization works generating more actual evidence on a scientific basis which is good to show to the donors and to convince them further of the relevance of localization as well. We need to improve and involve more as C4C is evolving.

Announcements (C4C Award and C4C Secretariat rotation)

This year's "Heroes of Charter for Change"-award goes to the late Mrs. Ritah Nansereko and everything she has done on the country and global level. Juliet Donna was a close second and her efforts and contribution to C4C were appreciated.

The Charter4Change Secretariat rotation was announced, and the secretariat will be rotating from C4C Endorser Humanitarian Aid International (HAI) in India to C4C Endorser Community Empowerment for Rural Development (CEFORD) in Uganda in 2022.

Closing remarks of Smruti Patel:

I am both surprised and proud of the movement and the achievement which has been made. What I take from this year's annual meeting and also the past five years is that we can really achieve something. The role of endorsers is taking more and more space in our discussions and this has to happen on the local and global level. Building trust is our main topic and we need to move forward and be careful in terms of looking forward too much: there might be dilemmas if we do not pay enough attention on the C4C commitments and look too much on others.

It has been an honour to be connecting with you and work together and we need to make sure everybody has a space in this. We need to leave space for the local actors so that they can lead discussions and get confidence and capacity in leading.

Resources from all Sessions

The slides, recording and chat from all sessions are available here:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11ujXJwSGtzs89N0oKeszCYG-UdOYXr?usp=sharing>

2021 Global C4C Annual meeting 2021 action points

Action	Lead	Participants	Timeline	Comments
Engage INGO country offices to integrate and promote Charter of Accountability (CoA) at country level	Signatories	Signatories		There was a concern that whilst signatories HQs are committed to the CoA, this in some instances is not the case with some Country offices.
C4C to integrate localization across triple nexus (Humanitarian – Peace – Development)	C4C Coordination group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4C Endorsers task group • C4C reporting group 		
Support establishment of in – Country C4C Working Groups (WGs)	Global Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4C Endorsers task group • C4C Coordination group • Signatories in respective countries • Endorsers in respective Countries 		C4C WG was cited as a critical structure to ensure engagement of signatories and endorsers in the localization agenda and CoA
Facilitate learning across different in countries C4C WGs	Global secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4C Coordination group 		An example was provided where Kenya C4C WG learnt from Uganda and later shared experience in Sierra Leone
Compile different case – studies on how to set up in – Country C4C WGs	Global secretariat	In – Country C4C WGs		This would support Countries that are interested in setting up a WG learn from their predecessors
Develop simple tools to monitor Charter of Accountability implementation at Countries level	C4C reporting group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4C Endorsers task group • C4C Coordination group 		
Connect endorsers in Turkey with other endorsers in middle East	CARE	Endorsers in middle East		
Conduct advocacy on strict donor compliance that exclude LLNGOs	C4C Advocacy group	C4C Endorsers task group		

Action	Lead	Participants	Timeline	Comments
Meet to plan next steps from engaging key stakeholders in signatories' agencies (including Country Directors and Funding/Finance/Compliance staff)	INGO Signatories Humanitarian Directors	Global secretariat	End January 2022	
C4C network to be engaged in the development of new guidance on the Eco policy with the European Union				
<p>Explore scope to convene exchanges about good practices on topics of shared interest; inter-agency dialogue on one or two of the following potential priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Addressing Due Diligence barriers to localisation and unnecessarily duplications or incoherent approaches. 6. Overheads costs: Clarifying and addressing our internal, as well as donor, obstacles to fair, adequate and consistent approaches to ICR. 7. Fundraising and design of consortia to support local leadership innovation at country level; building on learning about good and bad practice in such collaboration from past and on-going initiatives like ALTP, Shifting the Power, TOGETHER and others. 8. "Why not local?" policies to review decision-making on opting for direct implementation versus supporting partners. 9. Key Performance Indicators to incentivise localisation at global or country-level to incentivise localisation. 	<p>C4C Capacity Strengthening group</p> <p>Humanitarian Directors</p>			<p>There is already work going on with regards to Due Diligent Pass - porting under Capacity Strengthening Group</p>