From commitments to action

Progress Report 2021-2022
Executive Summary

This year’s C4C signatory report included a number of additional questions to explore accountability for localisation and quality partnerships. Throughout this report and in the Special Focus section on Accountability and Key Performance Indicators for localisation, you can find detailed findings emerging from these questions. A top priority emerging however is that whilst a number of INGO signatories have made some progress on institutionalising localisation into their organisational systems for governance, staff management, programme oversight, monitoring, evaluation and learning, this appears to be a minority of the INGO signatories to date. Delivering on the C4C Charter and wider localisation commitments needs to shift from something that is endorsed at a policy level in a vague way to something that is systematically factored into the design and performance management of organisations, staff, programmes and partnerships.

Linked to this, this year also underlines how only just over half (55%) of the INGOs that reported have established more systematic approaches to two-way mutual accountability with their local partners.

Fortunately however, C4C INGO signatories have recognised these challenges and over the past year have convened discussions on these issues at a Humanitarian Director level within the C4C coalition, and have advocated for progress on this at a sector-wide level through the Grand Bargain. C4C INGO signatories, in partnership with national NGO endorsers of C4C, led advocacy pressing the Grand Bargain process to identify recommendations for how intermediary agencies (including INGOs, UN agencies and some national organisations) get held accountable for localisation in a more systematic fashion, and how donors can incentivise this. The coming year will demonstrate whether or not and how C4C INGO signatories act on these findings and recommendations to more effectively systematise and action their localisation commitments.

One important challenge with this year’s report has been that only 18 signatories responded to the annual survey - contrasting the 25 who reported last year. The reasons for this remain unclear.
Staff turnover in a number of signatory organisations meant that the survey did not reach the responsible person and a number of signatories highlighted that the overwhelming nature of the humanitarian caseload (with the global consequences of the Ukraine crisis on top of responding in Tigray, Afghanistan, the Covid19 pandemic and other on-going major crises) meant that agencies were simply stretched during the reporting period. Whatever the reasons, the over-reliance amongst INGO signatories on individual staff to compile their agencies’ self-report to C4C further underlines the extent to which INGOs have not yet systematised their monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting on localisation. More positively however, 123 country offices of these 18 signatories contributed to the surveys. This represents a quite impressive range of practitioner level input to the survey, and as participation is optional, not mandatory, it also potentially points to an appetite for reflection on localisation at the country level, which is promising. For all the responses, it should be stressed that this is based on self-reporting and the majority of survey questions are based on perceived performance by C4C signatory representatives.

In conclusion, three potential top priorities for follow-up action by INGO signatories, based on this year’s reporting, are:

1. Establish more institutionalised INGO internal monitoring and tracking systems to measure progress and foster accountability on quality of partnership and support to localisation.

2. Share learning about how to implement effective two-way mutual accountability between INGOs and their local partners and scale up support to good practices on this.

3. Build on the appetite for engaging on localisation at the country level through a more systematic approach to this (including through engagement of INGO country managers on this agenda, and through performance management of them on support to localisation outcomes).
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 funding.

In contrast to the wider humanitarian sector, INGOs participating in the Charter 4 Change (C4C) have made impressive progress on increasing their level of funding to national and local NGOs. Over the past year (2021), signatories reported passing 23% of humanitarian funding to national NGOs at the global level, and at the country level signatories reported that over 56% of their total humanitarian budget was passed on to local and national actors (down from 58.2% last year). This figure is based on reporting from only 16 signatories so not a clear comparison and thus the decrease from last year’s figure may also reflect the smaller number of signatories reporting this year. Data on funding to national NGOs is not consistently captured and published by many INGOs in the sector making it difficult to compare. Notably, the Grand Bargain’s independent review this year highlighted that quality funding is not allocated ‘equitably across different actors’ and that local actors do not feel they are receiving any or a lot of quality humanitarian funding. Arguably, this progress reflects the extent to which INGOs that have signed the C4C Charter may have undertaken deeper, more substantive processes to implement the Grand Bargain commitments than the Grand Bargain signatories whose only mandatory follow-up action is to self-report to the Grand Bargain process on an annual basis.

Over the past year, a number of the C4C INGO signatories met to discuss the potential for their agencies to adopt and implement “why not local?” policies, which would require their agencies to more systematically direct funding to local actors unless there were explicitly stated, context-specific rationales to directly implement programming or fund international agencies. In the discussion on “why not local?”, several signatories highlighted how their agencies manage competing imperatives: imperatives to support local actors versus imperatives to maintain or grow their own resources to ensure organisational sustainability. Different INGOs are starting at very different places in seeking to grow their percentage of funding to local actors. Some C4C signatories have always been partnership-based agencies (ie. only funding local actors, not directly implementing programming), whereas others have directly implemented projects and shifting towards supporting local partners is a more radical change for them. Over recent years, some major government donors have gone through political changes (eg. UK) which mean they have radically cut their aid budget and especially funding to civil society (both INGO and national NGO) for political reasons. This has brought pressures on INGOs in those contexts to sustain themselves as organisations able to mobilise funding from the general public or potential future governments for humanitarian work, including channelling this funding to local actors.
Advocacy to donors on direct funding

A lot of work has been done to encourage direct funding to local and national actors including: support with funding applications; introductions between donors and local partners; and some signatories being sub-leads on projects allowing partners to take the lead. Despite this progress, there are still barriers for local and national actors trying to access direct humanitarian funding. Some of the barriers highlighted in this year’s country level survey include a reluctance from donors who don’t have the “required faith and trust in local organisations’ capacity” and a recognition by some that “most of our donors want to work with them [local actors] through us”. There are also contextual barriers for example, in Libya and Cuba, INGO country level offices reported that there are very limited or no opportunities for partners to directly access funding.

Many respondents continue to seek ways to introduce local and national partners to their donors where 34.8% of country level respondents have introduced all or most of their partners to their donors. However 10.4% reported not introducing any partners to donors in the past 12 months, an increase from last year’s 8%. The most common type of funding successfully accessed following introductions was through country-based pooled funds, other UN funds, START, EU and other government donors.

At country level, most signatories do not contribute financially to country-level grant mechanisms for local actors, with 19% of respondents having done so (where 32% reported this was not applicable to them). 33% of respondents (n=109) reported advocating to country level donors to invest in mechanisms such as this to support funding to local actors (beyond UN OCHA country-based pooled funds (CBPF)).

As recognised last year, the START fund was again considered a good example of pooled funding. Many signatories mentioned engaging with the START network in different ways including through country level hubs and networks. Action Aid Nepal supported the establishment of the START network Nepal chapter by contributing financially in 2021.

Country level respondents shared further ways they have engaged in increasing funding to local actors. A frequent theme this year was a move towards INGOs being co-leads or sub-leads on applications allowing local partners to take the leading role:

**CAFOD, Syria office:** Three organisations (2 local NGOs and CAFOD) formed a consortium to apply for funding with the local partner being the lead organisation. Our project was selected and it was the first time our partner has led on an EU-funded grant.

**Trocaire in Malawi:** We have arranged a number of national level dialogues linked to our GBV and Livelihoods work which has provided a space for partners to showcase their work directly to donors and INGO peer organisations providing them an opportunity to build relationships with potential donors.

**Oxfam Palestine-Gaza:** In the last year where the partner capacity has reached a significant level, Oxfam has followed a new model where Oxfam encouraged the partner to lead the application with Oxfam as a co-applicant introducing the partner to WFP. WFP has promised enhancing their support to the local partner where Oxfam added value can be covered thus Oxfam decided to leave the partnership. WFP have recently signed a partnership agreement with the Oxfam local partner.

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

The commitment to strengthening partnerships continues to see progress amongst signatories. Over half continue to report having long-term strategic partnerships with all or most of their partners and have discussed the Humanitarian Principles of Partnership with them. Despite this only 55% of country level respondents reported having two-way partnership review and feedback mechanisms in place with all or most of their partners – a slight decrease from last year. As the Grand Bargain Caucus on Intermediaries has proposed that all intermediaries – including INGOs – should establish such processes of feedback on partnership quality, and that donors should require this through their funding, hopefully the next year will bring progress on this.

At country level, 77% indicated that partners have shared concerns or suggestions to how partnership relationships can be improved, which is impressive. However only 32% reported that local and national partners have shared suggestions for improvements on progress towards C4C commitments, which may be related to the low percentage of those that share the C4C commitments with partners. A number of INGO signatories discuss localisation and partnership issues with their partners without explicitly referencing the C4C commitments, as they have internalised those commitments into their own organisational processes and/or refer to their local partners’ own frameworks and principles to guide such discussions.

Some of the key themes that recurred in the feedback from partners included: increased need for capacity strengthening; funding and resourcing concerns, including requests for advocacy to donors on financial procedures; requests for partners to be more involved at all levels of project design, budget reviews and more. One focus that was mentioned less but still significant was the need to improve communication between signatories and their local/national partners. Some shared specific examples of how feedback has been taken on board and integrated into ways of working.

Christian Aid, Sierra Leone have introduced a standing item of ‘Wellbeing’ on the agenda for monthly review meetings.

Oxfam, Iraq shared that feedback on the attitudes and behaviour of field staff led to further training of field staff on “Better Partnering” and disseminating C4C commitments across the organisation for better understanding and action.

In South Sudan, the combined CAFOD-Trocaire office has responded to local partners concerns about the untimely disbursement of funds by establishing pre-financing mechanisms to step in when funds from back donors are delayed.

Oxfam, Myanmar reported increased flexibility to support partners following the impact of the banking crisis in the country and challenges with transferring funds after receiving partner feedback: “We continue to provide ICR to most of our humanitarian partners, accept alternative bank accounts and allow agent fees for money transfers.”
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.

Similar to last year, more signatories report sharing figures on their transfers to partners through their own agency’s methods for public data and information sharing (e.g. websites and annual reports), rather than through the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) database. The survey did not enquire into the reasons for low reporting into IATI. Others in the humanitarian sector have highlighted concerns over how practically useful the IATI system is once data is inputted to it.
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.

This year, 76% of global INGO responses indicated that they have an ethical recruitment policy in place. Making good progress, only 18% reported approaching staff from local and national organisations within six months of a crisis for recruitment within their organisation – this is a significant decrease from 26% last year.

In Ukraine, the NGO Resource Centre, a national organisation focused on capacity-strengthening, monitoring, evaluation and learning efforts developed ‘Ethical Recruitment Guidelines’ and tabled these for endorsement at the UN/NGO Humanitarian Country Team level. There has also been follow-up within specific clusters (e.g. education) to seek endorsement and action by both INGOs and the wider range of actors involved in the humanitarian response.

C4C signatories have also supported this initiative and the guidelines reference the C4C Charter. Issues arising from advocacy on these guidelines have included the following: Donors in particular, but also international agencies, have emphasised the very context-specific nature of national legislation on recruitment and human resources practices for humanitarian agencies both in Ukraine and in the headquarters of international agencies, as being predominant factors in their approach to staff recruitment. These considerations were cited as a main factor inhibiting INGOs or others in endorsing the guidelines, as doing so first requires engagement by staff with the relevant legal experts who are sometimes not based in the context and busy supporting emergency responses and wider programming globally and so err on the side of caution.

CAFOD’s local partner Caritas Poland staff and volunteers distribute aid packages to refugees who have made it across the border from Ukraine into Poland.
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Commitment 5: Emphasise the importance of national actors

Emphasising the importance of national actors to donors was ranked first for compliance to commitments by signatories for the second consecutive year.

In the context of the Grand Bargain 2.0 process, donors increasingly recognise localisation as a major area of ‘unfinished business’ in terms of the commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit. Whilst various factors have contributed to this, it is clear that initiatives such as C4C, the Grand Bargain and others are building momentum in the donor sphere and creating an appetite for localisation-focused funding and policy. Some of the progress recognised by INGO signatories this year included:

**DENMARK**: The new round of Danida Strategic Partnerships with Danish civil society organisations prioritized equal partnership and local leadership in the programmatic approach requirements ‘including transfer of funds, ownership and decision-making power to local partners’. C4C INGO signatories played active roles in advocating to the Danish government to make this shift.

**EU/ ECHO**: Building on ECHO’s 2021 communication ‘EU’s humanitarian action: new challenges, same principles’, ECHO continue to progress on their localisation commitments including through continued investment in strengthening local capacity and preparedness, favouring environmentally friendly and local procurement, supporting localised financing models and upcoming development of an equal partnership policy. Over the past year, several C4C INGO signatories also played lead roles in instigating and co-organising (alongside the C4C secretariat) an in-depth workshop between ECHO staff, the European INGO network VOICE and national/local NGO representatives from C4C ahead of the European Humanitarian Summit 2022.

**Dutch Relief Alliance**: The Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) has been advocating for, and embedding, localisation in its policy documents, strategies, and implementation plans for a number of years; with C4C INGO signatories playing lead roles in the alliance to press for more comprehensive approaches (including to press for more generous approach to overhead costs and involvement of local actors in decision-making of the DRA-funded ‘joint responses’ at country level).

**The Netherlands**: In the yearly parliamentary letter regarding humanitarian aid, the NL minister for development cooperation stated that they ‘continue to strengthen the position and capacity of local and national humanitarian actors,’ and that this year the NL is working on quality financing partnerships, which includes elements like direct financing, risk sharing and requiring DRA members to share ICR with local partners.

**USAID**: Proactively requested connections to local actors through its own partners and are revising their emergency grant guidelines. USAID have set a goal of 25% of direct funding to go to local actors in the next 5 years and for 50% of projects to have significant local engagement. Again C4C INGO signatories have played active roles in pressing for
these changes, and for clarity to ensure that funding reaches genuine local organisations (not INGOs that equate having national staff with being ‘local’ as organisations, etc).

**Australia:** DFAT grant opportunities and the Australian Humanitarian Partnership have included specific design and reporting requirements related to design of programs and funding local and national organisations, further embedding localisation of aid requirements and guidance aligned with IASC definitions of localisation.

**Canada:** Global Affairs Canada, under the collective influence of the Canadian NGO sector (and the Grand Bargain globally), has started allowing INGO partners to budget up to 7.5% ICR (as direct costs) for each partner involved in the response.

**START Fund:** Continues to roll out national and regional hubs and this has seen an increase in local and national organisation membership which positions them better to secure donor funding.

**Irish Aid:** Supporting localisation and participation is central to Ireland’s decision-making process regarding which partners to fund and what type of funding to provide.

**United Kingdom:** New FCDO International Development Strategy worrying in a shift towards UK self-interest aid strategy, however, it does maintain commitments on lessening bureaucracy, simplifying due diligence, and devolving decision-making to the country level. New NGO Humanitarian Funding Guidelines mandate that INGOs should provide equal level of overheads to local partners. During COVID, there was an increase in direct funding to local and national actors. C4C INGO signatories have again been proactively pushing for FCDO to do more both on global thematic policies and on direct funding to local NGOs in specific contexts like Syria and Myanmar.

A WASH Simulation exercise for District Disaster Management Committees in Uganda to enhance their capacity to respond to Emergencies. Participants were trained on Hygiene Promotion, Sanitation, Water treatment and Water supply through CEFORD Uganda in Partnership with Uganda Red Cross, LWF Uganda, Dan Church and CSBAG Uganda, with funding from EU-ECHO.
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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.

Progress continues to be made on ensuring local and national actors are involved in joint project design and decision-making. 43% of signatories reported an increase in all or most partners taking a leadership role in joint activities and designing of projects, higher than last year’s 38.3%. Additionally, 59% of country level respondents reported that all or most of their partners took part in their country’s strategy development and review process this year.

The Grand Bargain Intermediaries Caucus – which C4C signatories led in advocating for – reflected the challenges and possibilities of intermediaries supporting locally-led humanitarian action in their paper ‘Towards Co-Ownership’. Particularly relevant here is the emphasis on increasing the role of local and national actors in formal leadership functions in humanitarian coordination and the requirement that local and national actors play a more visible role in programme steering, with demonstrated participation in planning and decision making.
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.

Reflection on this commitment was two-fold, firstly focussed on funding for administrative support and capacity strengthening, and secondly reflecting on other activities and advocacy around capacity strengthening. The term ‘capacity strengthening’ is vague and poses the possibility of being used as a ‘buzz word’ for organisations to give the impression they are compliant when the reality is that their efforts centre more on basic aspects of project reporting and compliance to donor expectations, rather than investing in a more comprehensive approach to institutional development and sustainability. One issue raised both by some INGO signatory reports, and by wider discussions in the sector, is that the discourse about capacity-strengthening needs to shift away from vague assertions like ‘local actors lacking capacity’ and recentre more on tangible propositions for how international and local actors can work in partnership to better understand and address whatever capacity issues may exist in a spirit of complementarity. In feedback from partners, capacity strengthening remained one of the most frequently mentioned themes requiring further support, including a shift from generalised ‘capacity strengthening’ towards one-to-one mentoring and more tailored training.

Core Funding

The need to provide core funding to local actors has been discussed greatly in the humanitarian sphere. It is widely recognised that this allows organisations to become more sustainable, expanding beyond project-based delivery and strengthening their organisational capacity and planning in the longer term. Where only one third of signatories indicated that they have an organisational policy in place for overheads, in practice, Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) is regularly provided to local actors by most signatories. CAFOD was one organisation who cited having a policy of sharing overheads 50/50 with partners on institutional donor grants. Others shared that whilst they have no policy, they ensure a sufficient amount is allocated for core and admin costs. Many signatories voiced that they are in the process of developing policies around ICR’s for local organisations, including CRS, Trocaire and Cordaid. The challenge continues that some donors don’t allow core costs to be included in budgets requiring further advocacy at donor level.
This reflects the findings of this year’s research, instigated by C4C signatories and led by Development Initiatives, UNICEF and Oxfam under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) workstream on the allocation of overhead costs. At its core, the research revealed a huge inconsistency across the board on the provision of ICR. As reflected in this report, very few INGOs and UN bodies have policies in place though many are in the process of developing them. In practical terms, where provision of overheads exists despite this, it is often led by negotiation or on a case-by-case basis meaning it can vary considerably between programmes even within the same organisation. Whilst the research identified a number of good practices, it also drew out some of the barriers to provision of overheads including a lack of transparency around how much funding reaches local actors including overheads, lack of common cost classifications, potential financial implications and regulatory barriers. In light of this, they recommend that organisations provide ICR without delay, prioritise organisational buy-in and develop organisational policies for more consistent approaches. Additionally, advocacy is required to publicise the issue and create more opportunities for dialogue between local actors and donors, recognising the role donors play in incentivising change.

Besides provision of ICR, signatories shared other ways they have contributed to capacity strengthening activities in the last year. 60% of signatories reported that with all or most of their partners, they contributed to local and national actors’ collective activities to network, coordinate and advocate for locally led humanitarian action.

Amongst these activities were support for stakeholders and government representatives to visit partners and projects, as well as opportunities for local actors to speak at high level events. Other activities included:

Numerous country level respondents pointed to encouraging local actors to participate at cluster level or national level. In one UN funded project, CAFOD’s partner Women for Change has been supported to become a GBV subcluster lead in South Sudan. Oxfam, Palestine-Gaza nominated one of its WASH partners to join the Humanitarian Pooled Fund assessment panel where they engaged with UN agencies, INGOs and local ministries.

Many INGO signatories have taken an active role in supporting the establishment of or accompanying country level Charter 4 Change working groups. Oxfam DRC accompanies the C4C network in DRC in advocacy at the provincial, national and international levels. CAFOD & Trocaire in Partnership have supported the organisation and facilitation of the South Sudan country level meetings alongside a national NGO.

Oxfam, Burkina Faso: Through the establishment of the Humanitarian Thematic Group (HTG), whose main mission is to mobilise all civil society organisations to advocate and represent the voice of national and local humanitarian actors for a quality and sustainable response.

Oxfam, Bangladesh have established a network called ‘Women’s Rights Organisations Working in Rohingya Response’ and connected women’s rights organisations with other international agencies for influencing and networking.

CARE Nepal has established a Humanitarian Partnership Platform (HPP) providing local organisations opportunities for peer learning, mentoring and collective action to influence humanitarian architecture to be inclusive and accountable and also address the different needs of diverse populations in preparedness, response plans and policies of local governments.
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.*

At 67%, a similar percentage of country level respondents indicated that they promoted all or most of their national partners in their communication materials as last year. However, there was a decrease where 72% of global level respondents reported that they did this compared to last year’s 84%.

Beyond communications and media materials, respondents also indicated whether they credit the work of local and national partners in donor reports as part of enhancing transparency of local actors. Responses were positive and both higher than last years, with 93% at global level and 84% at country level crediting partners in donor reports.
Special Focus: Accountability and KPIs for Localisation

In June 2021, the Grand Bargain process launched a Caucus on the role of intermediaries, welcomed by Charter 4 Change members. Through an online workshop in December 2021, and the responses of the C4C annual survey, key over-arching findings identified: a significant gap between intermediaries’ endorsement of localisation commitments at global level, and implementation or accountability for these in practice; the need for a more aligned and harmonised approach to the accountability of intermediaries by institutional back donors; the need for donors to hold international intermediaries accountable for localising their response; and calls to recognise local responders’ capacities and risks (including a recognition of the importance of ‘risk sharing’ and having organisational capacity development plans).

A number of good practices, challenges and obstacles were identified in the report. One of the most interesting of these is the progress INGOs are making on establishing Key Performance Indicators (KPI) specifically relating to localisation and partnership quality. Examples of these KPIs include things like monitoring growth in number of partnerships; self-assessment of relationships on a spectrum of transactional to strategic; documenting examples where local partner capacity was strengthened, and more. Establishing more KPIs like these could really allow C4C signatories to hold themselves more accountable by more easily monitoring progress on the commitments.

Interestingly, most C4C signatories still do not have a policy in place measuring performance of country directors against progress on localisation.

Evaluating the home of a family in Guatemala who received support for repairs and rebuilding after Hurricanes Eta and Iota in 2020. In Guatemala, CRS works closely with Caritas Alta Verapaz, community leaders and local authorities.
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Conclusion

Whilst most reporting signatories indicated some good progress on many of the C4C commitments, the low response rate at headquarter level remains a concern. Despite this, meaningful and lasting progress is being made on localisation and it is clear that initiatives such as C4C and the Grand Bargain process are building momentum for change as seen in the changes to donor policies and procedures too.

Internally, progress needs to be made on institutionalising these C4C commitments, including ways of reporting. These issues need to be part of an ongoing reflective and active process instead of a last minute scrabble for reporting.

The progress around overheads costs/ICR is an exciting area where there is clearly momentum in the sector. There is still advocacy to do to overcome institutional and back donor barriers that prevent signatories being generous and consistent in their approach. However, many signatories voiced that they are in the process of developing organisational policies on this theme leaving us hopeful that by next year we will see huge progress in the institutionalisation of providing core costs to local and national actors.

Additionally, the ‘Localisation Funding caucus’ and ‘Intermediary caucus’ continue to offer opportunities in the coming year to follow up on partnership processes and it is important for signatories to be involved in those conversations.
INGO signatories of the Charter for Change:

- ActionAid
- Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz
- CAPOD (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)
- Danish Church Aid
- 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
- TerraPacis
- Trocaire
- WarChild UK
- World Jewish Relief
- Xavier Project
Annex: Non-INGO endorsers of the Charter for Change:

Access Development Services
ACT Alliance
Action Africa Help International (AAH-I)
Action Des Volontaires Pour La Solidarite Et Le Developpement
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 Sante de la Mere et de L'Enfant
Action Pour le Volontariat à Dubreka
Actions Pour la Promotion Agricole et Sanitaire
Adamawa Peace Initiative
ADES - Agences de Developpement 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
Amita 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
Ard 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 Amkendi ASBL
Association des Acteurs de Developpement
Association de Developpement pour la Paix et la Reconstruction en Republique Democratique du Congo
Association des Facilitateurs pour le Developpement Integré
Association des Femmes du Secteur des Industries Extractives du Niger
Association for Integrated Development
Association for Rural Poor
Association Locale pour le Developpement Integral
Association Nigérienne pour le Traitemnt de la Délinquance et la prévention du crime
Association of Voluntary Actions for Society
Association Tunisienne De Défense des droits de l'enfant
Astha Sansthan
ASVSS
Bader Charity Organization
Baikunthapur Tarun Sangha
Balaod Mindanaw
Bangladesh Model Youth Parliament (Protiki Jube Sangsad)
Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication
Barokupot Ganochetona Foundation
Basmeh & Zeitounah
Belay Rehabilitation Center
BENENFANCE
Beyond Aid and Relief
BIFERD
Bon Dieu 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 Development 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
Human Mission Africa
Humanitarian Aid International
Humanitarian Development Consortium
Humanitarian Relief and Development Council
Humanite Plus
Hygiène 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 (ISED – 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
Jablia 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
Livelhood 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 Lutheran Network
National Relief and Development Corps
National Secretariat for Social Action (NASSA) /Caritas Philippines
New Life Charitable Trust
North-East Affected Area Development Society
NotiMore
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 (PaiVision)
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 Dagged 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
Samudai Kalyan Evam Vikas Sansthan
Sangathita Gramunnay Karasuchi / Organized Village Development Program
Sante et Developpement
SAR Peru - Salvamento, Auxilió y Rescate
Save Humanity Africa
Saw for Development and Aid
Sends India
Settlement Council of Australia
Shabab Peace and Environment Action Group
Shafak
Shaik Tahir Azzawi Charity Organization
Shaml Coalition
Shar for Development
SHARP – Pakistan Society for Human Rights and Prisoners’ Aid
Shoolai-Kol (Public Association)
SMHA
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
STEWARDOWOMEN
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
Taekulo Somali Community
Tigone 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
TrioDuoI Multipurpose Cooperative Society
Udyama
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
Ydeboraha 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