ON TARGET?

Accelerating Humanitarian Climate Programming Through the Climate and Environment Charter

February 2025

The **Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations** is a set of seven commitments designed to help organisations systematically respond to climate and environmental crises. The Charter was **developed by humanitarian organizations for the humanitarian sector**, and addresses the unique challenges and responsibilities of humanitarian action on climate and environment.

www.climate-charter.org

About the Authors

The ADAPT initiative works with humanitarian and civil society organisations to support climate adaptation activities in low resource environments, and particularly in fragile and conflict-affected states.

Report produced by Alexa Netty, Paul Knox Clarke, Phili Cool

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following organisations and people for their participation in the development of case studies within this report.

CAFOD – Kemi Akinlaja, Niamh Furey, Vicky Shearer
CARE (Climate Justice Centre) – Ibtihelle Ben Mrad, Thuy-Binh Nguyen, Robert Otim
NDEO – Muna Alhammadi, Salah Aldeen, Abdulwahed Ahmed Alakabodi
Swedish Red Cross – Kristoffer Ristinmaa, Kanika Thakar, Lotta Wode
Welthungerhilfe – Matthias Amling, Michael Kühn, Julia Wensche, Tobias Zahe
Zamzam Foundation - Suleikha Ali Yusuf, Abdikadir Adan

We also extend our thanks to representatives from all organisations who participated in the workshop **'Mainstreaming climate and environmental considerations in humanitarian action'** held in Bangkok in December 2024 for their valuable reflections and contributions to these discussions. In particular, we thank **Foundation for Rural Development Pakistan, COAST, and Islamic Relief Bangladesh** for their willingness to share their work within this report.

Finally, we extend our thanks to Nishanie Jayamaha and Natasha Westheimer of the Climate and Environment Charter Secretariat. You have set the tone for this review and your work continues to drive the sector towards more inclusive, forward-looking action.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organisations ('the Charter') sets out a framework for local, national, and international humanitarian organisations to stand together in reducing the scale and impacts of the climate and environmental crises. Signatories of the Charter agree to work in accordance with six commitments. The commitments cover a range of activities to decrease organisations' impact on the climate and environment and support climate change adaptation. A seventh commitment requires signatory organisations to set targets and measure their progress in implementing the commitments.

The Secretariat of the Climate and Environment Charter commissioned this report to showcase the ways that organisations of different sizes, structures, and mandates are making a reality of the commitments. In addition, the report explores the experiences of signatory organisations in setting and working towards targets for Charter commitments. The report focuses on the experiences of six organisations in particular, but includes references to activities undertaken by a larger number of Charter signatories. The aim of the report is to highlight the variety of ways that these organisations are working on the Charter, and to provide insights and reflections on target-setting that may be useful to other signatory organisations.

Overall, the review found that participating organisations are demonstrating an inspiring diversity of approaches to making the Charter commitments a reality. Activities to meet the commitments included programmes to understand and support community resilience to climate change, as well as a range of approaches to: environmental impact assessments; decreasing carbon emissions; supporting local leadership and the use of local knowledge; understanding and using climate data programme design; collaborating with organisations within and beyond the humanitarian system; and advocating for climate justice. The review found that many organisations were meeting the commitments in more numerous and diverse ways than were captured within their published targets - in effect doing much more than they had committed to do when they set their targets.

At the same time, the path to fulfilling the commitments was not entirely smooth. Constraints that were regularly mentioned included: Difficulties in prioritising climate and environmental threats in a situation of extremely limited humanitarian funding; difficulties in understanding technologies and systems that provide new forms of data or forecasting information; gaps in awareness amongst donors and local communities regarding the importance of climate change adaptation; and lack of coordination within internal teams focusing on the climate and environment.

With respect to the value of setting targets as a tool for fulfilling the commitments, the organisations taking part generally felt that having a framework of targets for measuring progress, and following up on their climate and environment-focused work helped them to move forward in the area of climate and environment. This was not only because setting targets helped organisations to see how they were doing (and take action where progress was slow) but also because the process of setting targets helped different parts of the organisation to coordinate their efforts, and gained attention from leadership and external stakeholders.

The organisations reflected on: the process of setting targets (how the targets were established); the targets they had developed (what they were like); and activities they had undertaken to measure and manage progress against the targets. On the basis of these reflections, some emerging areas of good practice became apparent:

- When deciding how to fulfil the Charter commitments, **consider using a mix of existing activities** (work the organisation is already doing to support community resilience or local leadership, for example) **with new activities**.
- Include people with a **diverse range of expertise and organisational roles** in the process of setting targets.
- Explore a **mixture of ambition levels** within the targets that are set, having some that are fairly easy to achieve, as well as some that are more challenging and will take a higher level of resource and commitment.
- Decide whether targets should describe **either 'the end goal'** of your activities under the commitments **or 'steps towards the goal'** (or both).
- Consider designing targets that are **quantified and time bound**.
- Where targets are not quantified, decide in advance **how the organisation will know if the target has been met**.
- Make targets **clear and easy to understand**: consider how the meaning of the target will be understood by all necessary stakeholders.
- Develop a **plan for monitoring progress** against targets **at the same time** as developing the targets.
- Consider **how progress** against the targets **will be followed up on, and by whom**.
- Consider a **plan for reporting on progress against targets to stakeholders** outside the organisation.

- Consider what you will do **if targets are not on track or not met** - as well as what you will do **if they are exceeded**.
- Ensure **meaningful buy-in and commitment** from across the organisation and avoid setting targets just to 'look good'.
- Remember that there is **no one right way to set targets**, or one correct set of activities that organisations should focus on - each organisation will need to determine what works best for its own particular context.

Background and Overview

Launched in 2021, the Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations (the Charter) sets out a series of seven commitments designed to help humanitarian organisations to systematically respond to the climate and environmental crises. As of February 2025, 462 organisations have signed the Charter.

The first six of these commitments focus on concrete actions and approaches to collaboration, localisation, and evidence-based response efforts that will drive forward climate and environmental work. By signing the Charter, organisations pledge to incorporate these approaches into their work. The seventh commitment calls on signatory organisations to **'develop targets and measure our progress as we implement our commitments'**. Within a year of signing the Charter, signatory organisations are expected to translate the commitments into time-bound targets which are applicable to their organisational work, capacities, and areas of expertise.

The ADAPT Initiative was commissioned by the Secretariat of the Charter to undertake a review, focusing on case studies of six signatory organisations, with the aim of:

- Demonstrating the diversity of options for **programmatic and other activities that make a reality of the commitments**, and which other organisations may wish to emulate, and;
- outlining the **experiences of signatory organisations in setting and working towards targets** and identifying any emerging lessons that other organisations may wish to consider in their own internal change processes.

This review was undertaken between November 2024 and February 2025, and a synthesis of findings is contained within this final report. Part A of this report from pages 8-34 focuses on the approaches taken to make a reality of commitments, whilst Part B from pages 35-53 explores experiences relating to the process of target-setting itself. The report concludes with emerging recommendations from pages 54-57 in Part C.

PART A:
How are Different Organisations Meeting the Commitments of the Climate and Environment Charter?

The commitments of the Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organisations outline a variety of activities that signatories should undertake in response to the climate crisis. These range from supporting communities to better respond to the impacts of the climate crisis, through activities related to advocacy, the use of evidence, and redistributing power, to work on minimising the risks that humanitarian activities themselves pose to local environments and to the climate. The commitments set out within the Charter are as follows:

The Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations
Standing together as local, national and international humanitarian organisations, we commit to:

1) **Step up our response** to growing humanitarian needs and help people adapt to the impacts of the climate and environmental crises.
2) Maximise the environmental sustainability of our work and rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.
3) **Embrace the leadership** of local actors and communities.
4) **Increase our capacity to understand** climate and environmental risks and develop evidence-based solutions.
5) **Work collaboratively** across the humanitarian sector and beyond to strengthen climate and environmental action.
6) **Use our influence** to mobilise urgent and more ambitious climate action and environmental protection.
7) **Develop targets** and measure our progress as we implement our commitments.

This section explores approaches that signatories are taking to meet the first six of these commitments. Activities related to commitment 7 are addressed in section B of the report.

COMMITMENT 1:
Step up our response to growing humanitarian needs and help people adapt to the impacts of the climate and environmental crises

What is this commitment about?

"This commitment is about adapting our programmes to better support and strengthen people's resilience to current and future climate and environmental risks." – *Climate & Environment Charter Guidance Note*

Climate change is already affecting people's ability to survive in many areas where humanitarians work. The deadly impacts of climate change can be short-term (disasters such as floods or tropical storms) or long-term (decreases in crop yields as a result of changes in rainfall patterns, or increased incidence of diseases as vectors such as mosquitoes are able to survive in areas that are getting hotter). Many of these climate effects will get worse over the coming years.

As the climate threat is both short-term and long-term, and is felt in many different ways - in people's livelihoods, health and nutrition - there are a broad range of areas of focus under commitment 1 of the Charter. All of these are about humanitarian organisations changing their work to meet the increased and diverse needs associated with climate change and environmental degradation.

This might mean larger programmes to meet increased needs, but it might also mean a greater emphasis on elements of Disaster Risk Management beyond 'traditional' post-crisis response. These include:

- resilience programming,
- locally led disaster risk reduction efforts (DRR),
- preparedness programming and anticipatory action (AA).

Many of these activities can be considered as, or overlap with, climate change adaptation (CCA). They can often be integrated or mainstreamed into existing humanitarian operations, making these operations better adapted to address existing and emerging risks.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

Case study organisations and those participating in the Bangkok workshop are working on this commitment across a number of technical response sectors including water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and food security and livelihoods (FSL).

One area in which several organisations are engaging is **climate-smart livelihood programming**, such as Climate-Smart Agriculture (within the FSL thematic area), which aims to help communities to be *resilient* to climate change - better able to survive in environments where it is becoming harder to farm every year. Activities connected to this approach include: providing training to community members in methods of farming that are suited to more erratic rainfall (such as mulching and other water conservation techniques); and the introduction of new crops (or in some cases reintroduction of older varieties) that are more resistant to drought or flooding.

Some organisations are also supporting resilience through climate-smart livelihood programmes that help households diversify away from agricultural livelihoods by starting new off-farm income-generating activities and so decreasing the risk that comes from livelihoods that are closely tied to the weather.

Signatory organisations are also working with communities to make **essential resources, such as water supplies, more resilient** to the effects of climate change. One organisation, for example, is using nature-based solutions to increase the amount of water absorbed by the land during periods of heavy rainfall, in order to ensure more abundant groundwater during the rainy season.

A number of organisations are working with communities to help them develop and implement **preparedness plans**. These plans outline practical actions that households and community organisations can take to save lives and preserve livelihoods in the event of weather hazards such as heatwaves and cyclones.

By **linking this preparedness planning to early warning systems** (and, in some cases, to pre-agreed sources of finance), some organisations are also creating **Anticipatory Action** systems[1] to address the weather-related hazards that are becoming more frequent as a result of climate change.

A common theme across many organisations working on commitment 1 is a set of activities to **better understand the risks that people face**, in order to design programmes that take these risks into account.

Challenges and constraints

At the Bangkok meeting, Charter signatories identified a number of constraints to progress around these types of activity, in particular:

[1] In a typical anticipatory action system, activities to respond to a threat are decided in advance in the form of a preparedness plan. These activities are costed, and the budget required to pay for them is set aside in some form of contingency fund. The preparedness plan and budget are linked to an early warning system, and when this system indicates that the hazard (such as a flood or heatwave) is likely to occur, the money is disbursed and the actions taken before the hazard occurs in the early stages of the disaster.

- a lack of knowledge around climate threats among communities, civil society and government;
- a lack of coordination between humanitarian organisations and sectors around climate related activities; and
- a lack of funding for resilience and disaster management activities that go beyond traditional humanitarian response.

But they were also working to address these challenges – for example, by conducting community education and advocacy towards governments, by convening groups of NGOs, and by building on existing activities.

Case Study: Building Climate Resilience Assessments into Programme Design

CARE International, through the CARE Climate Justice Centre, has developed a tool known as the Climate Resilience Marker.

This tool enables teams in any programme including humanitarian response to identify the specific climate risks in that context and consider the extent to which programmes in that location take account of those risks and integrate resilience-building activities to address the risks.

One example of where the Climate Resilience Marker, which is currently in its pilot phase, has been used is in Vietnam. Here, CARE is working with Village Savings and Loan Association groups to engage in pig farming. The CARE Climate Justice Centre team supported the project team to use the Climate Resilience Marker, which helped them to think through how their pig farming project could be affected by climate change, as well as the impacts it could have on the local environment.

Usage of the Climate Resilience Marker will become mandatory across all CARE projects and programmes from June 2025. It is currently encouraged, whilst country teams are provided time to adapt to this new way of working.

By using the Climate Resilience Marker as a 'springboard' for exploring and understanding climate and environment risks connected to programme designs, country teams can mitigate any negative environmental consequences of their programmes, and can emphasise approaches to building adaptive capacities to climate change from the outset of project design. Since their 2021 financial year, CARE has supported 49 projects or initiatives in 23 countries that have been shown to measurably improve four million peoples' climate resilience capacities.

In addition to using this Marker at the point of project design, the marker can also be used to facilitate reflection, discussion, and learning within progress reviews throughout the project cycle and evaluations. In this way, the Marker helps teams to

gain a better overview of how they are incorporating climate resilience as a whole, not just at the initial stages of a response.

For example, in Vietnam, following the use of the Marker, the project team subsequently requested CARE Climate Justice Centre to design and conduct a Climate Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis training. This training focused on analysing the ways in which climate change affects pig farming cycles as well as mapping the proximity of pig farms to water bodies and community settlements to identify any risks and potential negative impacts to local environments. Following the completion of this exercise, participating community members took the lead in the development of mitigation measures.

Case Study: Building Climate Resilience Across Food, Water and Shelter in Yemen

Nabd Development and Evolution Organisation (NDEO) has integrated commitment 1 into their work by ensuring that communities have access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities within a changing climate and humanitarian context in Yemen. NDEO was established in 2019 and delivers multi-sector humanitarian response programmes including WASH, protection, shelter and food security. In recent years, they have expanded their work to include a dedicated focus on climate.

Food security – greenhouse project

To build resilience to climate shocks such as drought and extreme weather, NDEO has provided 60 farmers with greenhouses, seeds which are more resilient to climate change, and new types of fertilizers.

The provision of greenhouses has supported community members based in areas which increasingly experience periods of drought that prevent successful growth of crops. These changes in extreme weather patterns are particularly damaging for rural communities who have historically relied almost solely on agricultural activities to meet their food and nutrition needs.

As such, NDEO has been able to support farmers to transition to the use of small, fully covered greenhouses, which are equipped with drip irrigation networks to improve their efficiency relating to water use, agricultural kits to promote more efficient farming practices, and organic seeds.

In doing so, crops are protected from extreme weather fluctuations, and farmers are able to grow an increased diversity of crops throughout all seasons of the year. One of the most notable successes is demonstrated through the fact that, when using the greenhouses, farmers are able to harvest crops across more than six months of the

year, compared to just two months without using greenhouses. Community members also report that the quality of produce is higher.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene – solar pump systems and rehabilitation

NDEO's cross-sector approach also incorporates efforts to improve access to clean water. They have reached more than 20,000 people to date through the rehabilitation of water sources amongst communities living in areas which regularly experience drought. Ensuring that water points are accessible to communities without requiring people to travel long distances is one of the most important steps in supporting communities to withstand periods of low or no rainfall.

Work carried out included the rehabilitation of wells, establishment of water collection tanks, and rehabilitation of water distribution points that connect water sources from wells to areas of local housing. Such interventions can help to build the resilience of communities to disruptions in rainfall and support more continuous water availability despite a changing local climate. All rehabilitated wells also benefitted from the installation of solar pump systems, which use a renewable energy source (the sun) to pump water from wells in remote locations.

Shelter

NDEO also works to rehabilitate community members' shelters which have been damaged by floods, with a focus on construction that is resistant to the effects of future floods. In this way, the organisation is working to meet both current and future needs, and to amplify the benefits of their water and agricultural interventions by ensuring that shelter infrastructure also facilitates community members' ability to safely remain in the regions of intervention.

Bespoke needs assessments through a climate lens

Recognising that awareness and understanding of climate and environmental considerations in Yemen is fairly limited, and most humanitarian organisations have not had the resources or technical capacity to prioritise climate change adaptation, NDEO has also conducted work to better understand the impacts of climate change among the communities with whom they work.

In 2024, they commissioned and published research titled **'Climate Impacts on Women's and Girls' Sexual and reproductive Health in Taiz-Yemen,**[2] which is an example of how best practice in 'stepping up our response' as humanitarian organisations also involves understanding the differing needs, capacities and risks of the differing groups within the communities we seek to support.

NDEO have focused on integrating climate considerations into their wider humanitarian and development-focused work, without always explicitly labelling these

[2] https://www.ndeoye.org/publications/NPUBLI25001

activities as 'climate programmes', as they feel that this has supported them to gain wider acceptance for climate-conscious programming within Yemen's humanitarian and political landscape as well as with donors. They have also ensured that they maintain a focus on inclusion, particularly regarding gender, across all of their work. Whilst some activities, such as the provision of small greenhouses, have been ongoing since before signing the Charter, others, such as research studies, are newer activities.

Case Study: Climate as a Cross-Cutting Strategic Theme

Zamzam Foundation, an organisation based in Somalia which has been operating for more than 30 years, focuses on meeting growing humanitarian needs by prioritising community action and empowerment across all of their responses, with the aim of building the self-sufficiency of communities and their ability to respond to crises.

In parallel, they also focus on peacebuilding efforts and sustainable development, using this 'triple nexus' approach to support communities affected by crises to rebuild, and to address the varied impacts of climate change in Somalia and the complex and inter-related threats of conflict, displacement, and poverty. In Somalia, the effects of the climate crisis are starkly visible: communities can be affected by both droughts and flooding in the same year, and hazards are becoming less predictable, and more severe. Where these communities have been displaced by conflict, they are particularly vulnerable to these climate change-related hazards.

In their work to meet commitment 1, Zamzam foundation have had notable recent success in their food security and livelihoods programming for climate change adaptation. At the time of publishing this report, farmers successfully harvested their first crops in the second year of participating in Zamzam's intersectoral program, with support from international partners. This programme has included GAP (Good Agricultural Practices) training, land preparation, and the provision of certified seeds, aimed at driving long-term benefits in the sustainability of farming practices, and yields delivered.

Until recently, the foundation's work on climate was predominantly in the Food Security Sector. However, in their most recent strategic period, the Zamzam leadership team took the decision to include Climate as its own sector within their five-year strategy. Zamzam's new strategic plan 2025-2030 seeks to explicitly highlight the intersectionality of the humanitarian, development, peacebuilding and climate change aspects of Zamzam's work in a coherent way. This approach is different from previous ones as, within the new strategic plan, climate resilience is incorporated systematically across all strategic areas, in addition to being its own strategic domain. The Zamzam team have developed Key Performance Indicators (or KPIs), which link to their overall five-year strategy as well as to the commitments of the Charter.
To meet commitment 1 under this new strategy, Zamzam intends to adopt a **gender equity and social inclusion (GESI) in climate action framework** to address the

specific impact of climate change on vulnerable communities such as youth, women, people with disabilities and other marginalized groups. Planned activities include training provided to teachers and support staff in climate impacted schools focusing on gender equity and social inclusion, as well as the provision of educational scholarships to girls in underserved communities affected by climate change. Across their shelter programming, Zamzam will also ensure the rehabilitation of homes which have been damaged by climate disasters.

COMMITMENT 2:
Maximise the environmental sustainability of our work and rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions

What is this commitment about?

This commitment focuses on the principle of 'Do No Harm' to the climate and the environment. Many of the activities involved in humanitarian programmes can pose unintended risks to the environment - over-exploiting or polluting water resources, or creating large amounts of plastic waste, for example. And, although humanitarian response may not be the largest source of the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) that are causing climate change, most humanitarian organisations recognise that they need to play a part in global efforts to decrease GHGs. This commitment articulates the importance of understanding, evaluating and reducing both emissions and environmental damage, particularly in connection to supply chain and procurement choices.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

This commitment is one of the charter commitments where the organisations involved in this study are recording the most activity.

With respect to climate change, larger INGOs in particular are developing mechanisms to create baseline **measurements of their GHG emissions,** implementing clear commitments and policies in order to reduce these emissions and collecting data to measure the impact of these policies.

Going beyond GHG emissions to wider issues of environmental impact, a number of organisations are focusing on using tools - either those developed in-house, or sector-wide methodologies such as the Nexus Environmental Assessment Tool (NEAT+) - to measure the likely **impact of proposed activities on the environment**. As a result of assessing environmental impacts of programs and operations, organisations are working to **use natural resources wisely** and take measures to reduce harm or damage to the environment.

One concrete way organisations are considering environmental impact is in their **supply chain and procurement decisions**:

- distributing non-food items (NFIs) without plastic packaging;
- vetting suppliers to ensure that products are not being bought from organisations that have a negative impact on the climate or environment;
- supporting reafforestation activities;
- supporting the introduction of crops that need less use of pesticides than existing varieties;
- purchasing items locally or reducing transit distances;
- moving to cash-based interventions, in part because these interventions allow people to buy what they need and decrease the long-distance transport of physical items that may not be wanted; and
- using nature-based alternatives for packaging or waste management, or shifting to nature-based solutions for operations.

Organisations of all sizes, but especially local and national organisations, are also placing a focus on sensitisation of staff teams, and on **raising awareness** of the importance of recycling and reducing reliance on fossil fuels, especially in contexts where there have been historical barriers to accessing information about climate change.

Challenges and constraints

Organisations taking part in the Bangkok workshop said that, especially in rapid-onset emergency settings, it can be difficult to prioritise environmental and climate considerations. Focusing on environmental issues can be seen to be at odds with reaching as many people as possible or launching programmes as quickly as possible. Some organisations also found that environmentally sustainable options, especially in supply chain decisions, can be more costly.

Other organisations and interviewees highlighted ethical dilemmas that can arise around this type of work. In particular, there are questions as to whether it is ethical to ask the world's most vulnerable and crisis affected communities to participate in efforts to reduce GHGs, given that such communities already do very little to contribute to GHG emissions, and yet are impacted significantly by climate change (this is less an issue for questions of environmental impacts that are more local in nature - such as polluting local water resources).

Some workshop participants found that there could be cultural barriers to focusing on environmental sustainability, as well as a lack of awareness and access to education about climate change and environmental degradation amongst both locally-based partner organisations and community members themselves. In some cases,

organisations felt that government policy in the countries where they worked did not support work to decrease environmental degradation.

Sometimes, a lack of information on GHG emissions, or lack of ability to monitor emissions, can also pose challenges. Some organisations have difficulty in capturing all of the emissions associated with their work, especially those which are connected to partners or supply chain activities outside their direct control. Most organisations focus instead on decreasing those GHGs which are easier to measure, such as those from flights, travel, and office energy usage.

Case Study: Monitoring and Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions (1)

Swedish Red Cross have been working to meet the commitments of their 2019 sustainability policy and plan of action. The policy predates the Charter, but has key links to commitment 2 in particular.

SRC have been measuring some aspects of their carbon emissions for more than 10 years, mainly focusing on emissions related to travel and office consumables. This long period of measurement has embedded a focus on emissions within SRC's organisational culture, and provided a helpful starting point for being able to develop a baseline for travel-related emissions.

In 2019, the organisation set a target to reduce their measured emissions by 10% per year per employee from their 2016 baseline. By the end of 2022, SRC had been able to reduce their net emissions by 38% compared to their baseline. They had achieved this in large part due to a substantial shift away from air travel to rail travel for domestic journeys, as well as through the establishment of second-hand shops, and an asset management protocol that ensures 100% investment in funds with an explicit sustainability strategy.

Case Study: Monitoring and Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2)

CARE has taken a different approach to measuring and reducing emissions. Instead of the stepwise, yearly percentage change goal adopted by SRC, CARE International has committed to reductions by 2030 of at least 50% CO^2-equivalent produced by flights, vehicle, and office energy use, excluding any offsetting.

In order to work towards this, the Climate Justice Centre has developed a framework with a harmonised template and guidance for each CARE entity to develop their own strategy (including establishing baseline, setting targets, and identifying top measures to be taken). The official baseline for consideration has been set as the financial year 2023.

This country specific approach means that reduction targets will differ across response locations, recognising the differing starting points and capacities for reduction from one country to another: so country teams where staff have to fly, because the distances are otherwise too great to cover, or because land transport is too unsafe, are not penalised by the organisation's need to reduce GHGs. Once all countries have developed their strategies and targets, CARE Climate Justice Centre will review overall alignment to global 50% reduction targets, and propose any amendments as needed to increase the scale of ambition within particular entities.

As a bridging strategy, CARE are also engaging in carbon offsetting approaches rooted within their overall commitment to reducing emissions. This is a temporary measure that is not intended to replace a focus on actual reduction targets. In parallel, they engage in advocacy focusing on driving systemic change in the carbon market in pursuit of greater integrity and effectiveness globally, aligning to their 'Vision 2030' goals.

Case Study: Combining Office Greening with Environmental Risk Assessments

CAFOD is changing the way the organisation works in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as well as centring considerations about the local environment into the planning of all programmes.

As an organisation that works largely with local partners, the area over which they have most control are their UK offices. Here they are minimising the use of printed materials within all supporter communications connected to fundraising and marketing. They are also working to reduce energy usage more broadly, for example by turning off lights and through judicious use of heating.

When it comes to reducing broader environmental impact (beyond GHG emissions) in programming, including working with partners, CAFOD (alongside other Caritas organisations), have developed an Environmental Stewardship Tool. First designed in 2019, the tool has subsequently been introduced across the international programme. The tool helps users to think through the potential impacts of development and humanitarian activities on the environment and identify the level of risk that these activities pose to the environment. It then provides a broad set of suggested approaches, organised by sector (with separate approaches for WASH, for food security, for nutrition work and so on), to help minimise any environmental impact and to encourage teams to incorporate regenerative activities within project design.

Case Study: Combining Programme Activities with an Enabling Governance Framework

NDEO is working to develop a climate policy in order to provide a framework around which to develop their efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve environmental sustainability.

They are also exploring options for transitions towards renewable energy sources within their programming, including through the installation of solar systems in rural areas of Yemen to support farmers in accessing water sources, and through prioritisation of waste management in partnerships with suppliers.

This is an example of 'work in progress' being carried out to make a reality of the Charter commitments. The activities on renewable energy and waste management are first steps, and the basis for NDEO to progressively build capacities in new areas. These activities are supported by policies which explicitly state the organisation's commitments and protocols, providing 'guardrails' for an iterative approach to making progress in new areas.

COMMITMENT 3:
Embrace the leadership of local actors and communities

What is this commitment about?

Local communities are the first and last responders in any crisis situation, but historically their participation and capacity has been undermined by 'top-down' approaches to humanitarian assistance, that see local communities as 'beneficiaries' and local actors as 'implementors' as opposed to true partners.

This commitment is therefore about bridging and sharing capacities between humanitarian responders and local communities, and increasing the power of local communities in the choice, design and implementation of activities. In practice this can mean:

- Working to centre indigenous knowledge in the design of activities related to environmental protection and climate adaptation.
- Ensuring that communities have access to information about risks and new technologies to ensure meaningful, informed decision-making.
- Decentralising funding and decision-making.
- Recognising existing community capacities and supporting the development of new capacities, as needed.

- Helping communities to fully engage in larger structures of power and decision-making, such as local and national government bodies and financial service providers.

Where programmes are built on local knowledge and expertise, and under the control of the people they serve, they are more likely to be relevant to the local social and environmental context, and more likely to be sustainable.

The commitment also identifies the importance of inclusion, ensuring the participation of all sections of communities. Unless programmes build on knowledge from all sections of affected communities, they run the risk of losing opportunities to enhance quality, and risk contributing to the very inequities that reduce the adaptive capacities of communities in the face of crises or shocks.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

Many signatory organisations are **supporting community-led activities** in a broad range of areas. These include: increasing the resilience of food and water supplies to climate change; developing schemes for water harvesting and environmental protection; and creating preparedness plans for use in event of weather hazards such as floods and heatwaves. In some cases, these activities are supported by the transfer of funding to community organisations.

These community-based activities are often accompanied by programmes to **enhance communities' awareness of climate change**, and by capacity development for individuals or community-based organisations.

Importantly, several Charter signatories at the Bangkok meeting highlighted their work to support communities to **engage with local and national government structures**: an important avenue for ensuring that local voices are incorporated into decision-making in the long term.

Considering **responsible exit strategies**, and mechanisms to ensure that local responders and communities are equipped to preserve the sustainability of any positive programme effects as far as possible, are also important considerations when meeting this commitment.

Several organisations are also working on **nature-based solutions (NbS)** within their programme activities to decrease environmental impact or reduce climate risks. NbS, as the name suggests, focus on using the **local natural environment and ecosystem** to support the wellbeing of both people and nature, and are often connected to ways of co-existing with nature that communities have used for generations. As such, this focus on nature-based solutions offers an alternative to imported 'technical' solutions.

Signatories are also incorporating a focus on **reaching marginalised groups** within their work, as part of efforts to meet this commitment by enhancing the participation of all sections of society. Though gender mainstreaming - including work to support women take on leadership roles - is one of the most common areas of focus, a number of organisations are also working to ensure that the voices of other parts of society are included in programme design and implementation – particularly children and people with disabilities.

Case Study: Supporting Local Actors to Develop Anticipatory Action Frameworks and Organisational Resilience

Welthungerhilfe, an organisation focused on ending hunger and improving food security, recognises the important relationship between the ability to meet this commitment and delivery of equitable approaches to partnership between international and local NGOs more broadly. Like many international organisations, they had been working on issues of localisation before signing the Charter as part of their work to meet the Grand Bargain commitments[3]. In particular, they focus on providing flexible funding, and on supporting organisational resilience within partner organisations by committing to providing an equitable share of administrative costs as a lump-sum. This is important because it provides local partners with flexibility to maintain structures and processes, where historically this has not been the case within many humanitarian partnerships with international actors. This has meant that they have not had funds to operate sustainably in the longer-term, build their capacities or raise their own funds. The lump sum approach is designed to address this problem.

WHH also builds locally led anticipatory action and emergency response capacities and structures within country offices, partner organisations, and communities. This has included supporting greater capacity for coordination, setup or access to Early Warning Systems (EWS) or other forecasting data. In addition, mandatory planning processes are incorporated in all regions of operation which focus on enhancing the capacity of locally based colleagues to understand and use climate information in programme design. It ensures humanitarian processes and activities are based on local initiatives and adds value to priorities and activities communities identify and, in some cases, have already started.

Case Study: Supporting Nature-Based Solutions and Inclusion

Foundation for Rural Development Pakistan (FRD) focuses on centring local leadership and indigenous knowledge in their work, rather than imposing external

[3] The Grand Bargain is a platform bringing together donors and aid organisations who have committed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the humanitarian action. Now in its third iteration, signatories have committed to implementing quality funding and accountability mechanisms, amongst other cross-cutting thematic commitments. https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain

approaches. They prioritise Nature-based Solutions (NbS) across their programmes, including soil and water conservation activities in flash flood-prone areas which help to decrease the risk of damaging flooding and contribute to enhancing the 'recharge' of underground water sources.

The NbS measures implemented by FRD for soil and water conservation build on local knowledge. The measures include dry stone masonry, check dams and surface water ponds, and plantation on marginal lands (which have little agricultural or production value), to help to stabilize slopes and reduce the velocity of flash floods when they are experienced.

FRD also supports inclusive participation and economic access by women members of the communities they work in by prioritising income-generation activities accessible to women, such as establishing walnut-farming nurseries. Activities such as these, where community members are supported to preserve, improve, and make more sustainable use of local natural resources, using knowledge that exists in the community, can have positive effects on local leadership capacities, as the long term development and management of the activities relies on skills and resources that do not have to be brought in from outside.

Case Study: Two-Way Capacity Sharing

Zamzam Foundation hosts training sessions for farmers focused on climate-smart agricultural practices, with a focus on supporting farming communities who have used traditional methods of agriculture for generations to be able to adapt, preserve, and restore their food security in the face of recurrent climate shocks.

Recently, Zamzam Foundation partnered with Zamzam University of Science and Technology, who conducted a series of studies and workshops focused on novel and inclusive experimental farming approaches. This initiative brought together rural farmers to find ways of adapting traditional farming methods to incorporate more innovative techniques such as greenhouses, drip irritation and hydroponic farming, which help to support climate resilience and conserve water usage. The focus on adapting, as opposed to erasing, traditional knowledge and local approaches is a cornerstone in their approach amplifying and welcoming local leadership within their food security programming.

In addition, Zamzam is also planning to initiate a local library dedicated to indigenous knowledge focused on climate and environmental studies. The vision for this in-house library is to be able to document their 30 years of experience supporting local communities in Somalia, as well as to collect and store locally produced knowledge to facilitate the integration of local wisdom and experience into future efforts to reduce poverty and strengthen sustainable development. The Zamzam team reflected that *'by fostering a deeper understanding of both global and indigenous approaches, the library*

will play a key role in building adaptive capacity and advancing climate resilience within communities and the region as well.'

Case Study: Building Capacity to Lead Climate-Focused Work

In their domestic work, **Swedish Red Cross** have trialled incorporating sustainability ambassadors within their local and regional volunteer networks. This approach - which is still to be further developed - aims to decentralise ownership of, and capacities for, driving greater climate and environmental protection within local communities.

COMMITMENT 4:
Increase our capacity to understand climate and environmental risks and develop evidence-based solutions

What is this commitment about?

If the humanitarian sector is to step up its response to climate and environmental threats while minimising its own impact, organisations need to have a better understanding of both short- and long-term climate and environmental risks and opportunities. It is only by understanding these risks that humanitarians can choose the most effective actions to decrease them and incorporate these considerations into programmes and operations. This is a new area for most humanitarian organisations, who do not have experience of regularly using climate data or engaging with climate science. Staff have to learn where to find information, how to interpret it, and how to incorporate it into decision-making and programme design. This better understanding of risk can then underpin activities under other commitments (particularly 1,2 and 6).

Information about climate and environmental risks does not only come in the form of scientific forecasts. Local and traditional knowledge should also be an important part of understanding risks: humanitarian organisations should be searching out this knowledge, ensuring it is made part of the conversation, and working on ways to bring different types of knowledge together (see also commitment 3). By focusing on these various forms of knowledge, Charter signatories will be better able to recognise trends, make informed decisions, and equip themselves and their communities to respond to climate and weather events which are becoming more severe and more unpredictable.

The commitment is not only about understanding existing data. It is also about generating and sharing data and evidence about risks and about 'what works' in terms of with climate

and environment programming. It is important that this evidence is communicated, within and beyond the sector, including within affected communities themselves.

Humanitarian agencies, with their specific focus on vulnerability, are particularly well placed to understand and share evidence on the ways in which different elements of the population - women and girls, elderly people, and people with disabilities, for example - are affected in different ways by climate change, and the different capacities that they have to address these risks.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

The organisations participating in this study were working to meet this commitment in a number of different ways.

Some organisations were working with **external or multi-stakeholder research and data initiatives** such as the Jameel Observatory and with global context monitoring initiatives such as the Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS Net).

A number of initiatives, especially within international NGOs, focused on **increasing organisations' capacity to understand climate and environmental risks** at the programme level. Typically, organisations were doing this through the development and 'roll out' of climate and environment assessments, which are used to understand climate or environmental risk as part of programme design. In common with many types of humanitarian assessment, these methods tend to be developed and used by individual agencies, rather than by the system as a whole - which may represent a missed opportunity to share approaches and experiences.

A number of signatories are also engaging with **advances in technology** to better understand, or respond to, risk – by using drones to map climate risks, for example, and conducting electro-resistance surveys to map the location, depth, and properties of aquifers.

Some organisations are focusing on **contributing to the production of new knowledge** directly. For example, one participating organisation has committed to incorporating research focused on 'greening' humanitarian action within every new response activation that they participate in. Others are collaborating with universities to support research in areas such as nature-based solutions, aquaculture, and Disaster Risk Reduction. They are also working with communities to conduct research and develop knowledge, and with elements of communities, such as children and small business owners, to understand specific vulnerabilities and capacities.

Challenges and constraints

Some organisations reported that the pace of scientific information and developments was simply too rapid to keep up with, making it overwhelming for teams to decide which

sources of information were most relevant for them to use, as well as how to access it. Other organisations pointed to culture and capacity challenges within organisations, whose teams typically tended not to be used to interpreting and using this sort of information.

Working with community members on the use of these information and data sources can also be a challenge, especially when information is not available in local languages, or where the information suggests to communities that they may need to make large scale and destabilising changes. Another common challenge is that of 'last mile' data: often forecasts are available from government authorities in the capital city, but there are no mechanisms to transmit them to local organisations or to communities.

Case Study: Understanding Climate Risk - Incorporating Risk Analysis into Anticipatory Action

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) works with partners such as meteorological agencies, regional climate fora, and scientific experts within humanitarian organisations to adapt and utilize forecasting models like *Ready Set Go*, *GloFAS*, and *seasonal cyclone outlooks* to predict hazards and their potential humanitarian impacts on food security, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and livelihoods. Analysing historical hazardous events (like droughts) and their impacts can help identify local risk factors (such as declining water sources and pastoralist migration patterns) and inform early warnings for anticipatory actions.

Anticipatory action (AA) can be defined as 'acting ahead of predicted hazards to prevent or reduce acute humanitarian impacts before they fully unfold'[4]. As the name suggests, implementing this approach requires that a response is set in motion before the onset of a shock or disaster. The approach is based upon the idea that by equipping communities to be able to take action before a climate or weather event hits, the ensuing consequences are likely to be less severe, or more manageable.

Anticipatory action requires a good understanding of climate-related risks. high-quality predictive data (of when a heatwave is about to happen, for example) is required in order to know when to scale-up humanitarian activities or start new activities. As action is being taken (and funding disbursed) before a disaster hits, the quality of the forecast (and an understanding of variability around the forecast) is vital to the success of the approach.

Scientific indicators for detecting and characterizing meteorological hazards (like the SPI for drought) further help identify potential risks. Combined with community observations, such as changes in bird and animal behaviour, these indicators make it possible to determine

[4]https://www.unocha.org/anticipatory-action#:~:text=Anticipatory%20action%20is%20acting%20ahead,impacts%20before%20they%20fully%20unfold.

critical thresholds that trigger the roll-out of anticipatory measures before the hazard occurs or its peak impact is felt.

To ensure effective anticipatory actions, WHH provides technical training on forecast interpretation and monitoring systems and equips practitioners with the knowledge and practical skills needed to set actionable thresholds and implement anticipatory measures.

Case Study: Environmental Stewardship Tool

CAFOD's Environmental Stewardship Tool is a mechanism for programme design and assessment that has been developed and successively implemented across the organisation since 2019. It aims to help staff to better understand, and take into account, the potential of risk to the environment from humanitarian programming.

The tool is more 'light-touch' and faster to implement than traditional full-scale risk assessments such as NEAT+. The initial protocol could take field teams approximately two-three hours to complete, ensuring that extensive documentation and reporting burdens don't act as a barrier to engaging in the process of understanding environmental risks.

The development of the tool has been accompanied by a focus on sensitisation and awareness-raising across the wider organisation about the importance of adapting programmes to minimise environmental risks. CAFOD team members reported that one of the biggest perceived successes of this approach is the fact that environmental assessments have now become *'embedded within our programme quality approach'*.

COMMITMENT 5:
Work collaboratively across the humanitarian sector and beyond to strengthen climate and environmental action

What is this commitment about?

This commitment focuses on the importance of cooperation in driving better outcomes for people affected by climate, environment, and humanitarian crises. For this reason, commitment 5 has links to, and even underpins, the other commitments: all of these activities will have greater impact, and can be conducted more efficiently, where they are undertaken across multiple organisations working together.

This requires real collaboration in a number of different directions: between humanitarian organisations themselves, as well as between humanitarian organisations, governments, development actors, financial institutions, climate organisations and human rights organisations, to name a few. The nature of the partnerships will differ depending on context: an organisation working in disaster preparedness may need to work with the government ministries responsible for disaster planning and for meteorology, as well as with other development organisations. An organisation working on climate resilience may work with universities, the ministry of agriculture, and weather insurance providers.

The nature of these collaborations will also differ depending on the issue to be addressed: in some cases, it will be information sharing, in some sharing resources, and in some joint design and implementation.

Collaboration between organisations of different sizes is emphasised within the wording of the commitment guidance, underlining the importance of working relationships between local, national and international actors. For INGOs, this often relates to their ways of working with local partners and civil society groups, alongside collaboration with other actors such as local and national disaster management authorities, academics, financial institutions and beyond.

Several case study organisations noted that they are 'dual mandate' organisations; in other words, their mission includes both humanitarian and emergency assistance efforts and longer-term development work. In these cases, collaboration within an organisation to bridge gaps and break down silos relating to the humanitarian / development divide can be just as powerful as external collaborations.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

Many of the actions that signatories are taking to fulfil this commitment relate to **building relationships with organisations outside the humanitarian system**. A number of organisations are working with **universities** – researching issues from nature-based solutions to climate adaptive aquaculture, and developing joint courses in areas such as DRR. Signatories are also developing relationships with the **private sector** in areas such as waste management, and increasing engagement with government, including with elements of government (such as ministries of environment, or hydromet services) that they may not have worked with before.

With respect to **collaborative work within the humanitarian sector**, signatories are engaging in a diverse array of forums that support coordination, capacity sharing, and complementary approaches to working alongside affected communities. One such forum is the Risk Informed Early Action Partnership, or REAP, which supports collaboration around early warning, anticipatory action, and related areas with a strong relationship to climate programming. Another is the OCHA-UNEP Joint Environment Unit's (JEU) Environment and Humanitarian Action Network .

Shared tools, such as the NEAT+ tool, mentioned earlier, and the SPHERE Guide to Nature-based Solutions to Climate Resilience in Humanitarian Action - can also serve as important bases for collaboration, allowing different organisations to form the same understanding of situations, and work in similar ways.

One key **platform for learning and coordination** is, of course, the Charter itself. Events such as the 'Mainstreaming climate and environmental considerations in humanitarian action' workshop co-hosted by the Climate and Environment Charter Secretariat create opportunities for signatory organisations to come together and share learnings, co-create solutions and generate ideas to overcome new challenges, and reduce the feelings of isolation and overwhelm that can so often come with work connected to the climate crisis. In terms of connecting beyond the humanitarian sector, the Charter Secretariat has held webinars such as "Towards COP29: Peace-Climate-Humanitarian Collective action" which brought together Climate Action Network International (CAN-I), the peacebuilding Community of Practice (CoP) and humanitarian actors to share collective action in advance of the Conference of Parties (COP) meeting in 2024.

Encouraging further opportunities for participation, knowledge-building and resource-sharing amongst signatory organisations is an exciting area for the future of collaboration amongst humanitarian actors.

Challenges and constraints

Organisations pointed to siloed ways of working, often fuelled by competitive donor and funding landscapes, as barriers to fostering deeper collaborative approaches.

Occasionally, there can also be tensions where collaborative or standardised approaches, such as NEAT+, are felt to be too intensive or not applicable for an organisation's response context, leading them to develop their own bespoke tools and markers. Whilst this can have positive effect at the level of the individual organisation, the multiplicity of different tools can sometimes impede collaboration and lead to duplication in the efforts involved to design such tools.

Some case study organisations also highlighted the fact that it can be very daunting for organisations who have not previously been strongly involved in climate change adaptation and connected activities to participate in climate conversations. The high level of jargon, changing terminology, and political influence of powerful states at a number of the major climate conferences led some organisations to report that these events could feel very exclusive. Some interviewees said that the barriers posed to engagement in discussions was another way in which the legacies of colonial approaches to 'aid' show up in today's climate and humanitarian response efforts. This suggests that the simple act of focusing on the removal of barriers to learning and collaboration could be one of the most impactful ways for organisations, especially larger INGOs, to support the meeting of this commitment.

Moreover, and with links to commitment 3, local and national organisations reported continued challenges in engaging with partners and donors in a way that truly fosters two-way capacity sharing, agency, and power. This hinders positive collaboration efforts for all organisations involved.

Case Study: Collaboration to Drive Climate-Related Research

Welthungerhilfe has prioritised the recruitment of a research coordinator within their staff team. This role is responsible for steering collaboration with research institutions and gathering learnings and innovative insights on the key strategic topics for WHH. Academic institutions and other research-focused bodies tend to have strong capacities and specialised expertise across a wide range of technical areas, making them better placed to conduct in-depth research and analysis than a typical humanitarian team. Additionally, humanitarian-academic collaborations support the removal of 'silos' in knowledge creation and production: humanitarian response organisations can provide valuable practical insights to inform academic research, whilst academic departments may be better informed about other learning and studies taking place globally.

Research co-produced through these collaborations includes the following pieces:

- Sustainable Integrated Farming Systems for Mitigation and Adaptation of Climate Change with Smallholder Farm(er)s in India
- Climate resilient food systems for multiple-resource users in Niger
- Climate risk analysis for Identifying and Weighing Adaptation Strategies in Nepal

- REPRESA - REsilience and PReparedness to tropical cyclones across Southern Africa (Malawi & Madagascar)

Other organisations spoke to the value of conferences, events, and other fora for shared learning as being supportive in meeting this commitment, and in helping other actors to do the same.

Case Study: Attendance at Global Climate Events

NDEO continually prioritises attendance at COP, and has also participated in MENA Climate Week and Youth4Climate events. The organisation highlights the challenge that lack of funding can place on their ability to resource such events, indicating a space for the donor and funder community to also engage in driving this form of collaboration. However, they have found that their ability to learn about key themes and terminology used in international climate discussions has benefitted from participation in such events, and that they provide opportunities to take away new ideas that could apply to their work.

There is great value in ensuring that organisations such as NDEO, who have in-depth knowledge about the impact of climate change on communities, participate in international decision-making fora. By contributing to international and multi-stakeholder events such as COP, national and locally based NGOs are able to provide unique insights into the realities of the climate crisis on some of the most impacted communities in the world. Without wanting to place this responsibility solely on the shoulders of local and national actors, by ensuring that spaces like COP include meaningful participation from locally expert organisations helps to ensure that conversations about climate and environmental crises don't neglect the perspectives of those who are disproportionately impacted by them.

COMMITMENT 6:
Use our influence to mobilise urgent and more ambitious climate action and environmental protection

What is this commitment about?

This commitment focuses on positively influencing decision-making and policy-making related to climate action and environmental protection. This applies both the activities within, but also outside the humanitarian sector, recognising the unique position that many humanitarian organisations have in being closely connected both with communities with limited decision-making power and with government donors; and in

being able to garner trust and multi-stakeholder buy-in through maintaining a focus on the humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence.

How are signatory organisations meeting this commitment?

A number of signatory organisations, especially those with a global footprint and/or federated structures, have a **dedicated advocacy department** which is responsible for communicating key messages and calls to action externally.

Some organisations spoke to the fact that **influencing climate policy within countries** where they are headquartered is more important than their advocacy efforts connected to climate within countries of humanitarian operation. This is because of the disproportionate contributions that the wealthiest countries make to greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental degradation. Working with the public and with governments in these countries could strike at the root causes of climate change.

In addition, a number of organisations are also working on **advocacy within the sector**, to influence the decision making of donors or other funders, and to raise awareness of the importance of intergovernmental support to nations and communities in situations of crisis through funding for climate adaptation and 'Loss and Damage'. In addition, organisations engage in 'softer' advocacy with funders relating to the importance of including budget lines for climate research, DRR, and other climate-adaptive programming approaches.

Challenges and constraints

Some interviewees highlighted the fact that climate advocacy efforts are often quite fragmented amongst different humanitarian organisations, and that a lack of centralised, coordinated 'asks' and key messages can undermine the strength of a collective voice. To address this, the Charter has attempted to collate and share updates and policies during key meetings, such as COP29. While this is useful, coordinated action also requires that organisations put aside some of their specific concerns to create a joint narrative.

Others pointed to the fact that governments of many countries, especially those countries who have been the worst affected by the impacts of the climate crisis and extreme weather patterns, are difficult to engage with in relation to climate and environment considerations. There can sometimes be a 'trade-off' whereby humanitarian actors are forced to prioritise access and security considerations over advocacy efforts. In some regions, fragile government structures may also simply not have the capacity or willingness to engage in such discussions.

Case Study: Leveraging Collaborative Advocacy Centred on Enhanced Climate Justice

CARE refers to the importance of their role participating in UN climate meetings including COP and other relevant climate change conferences as having a 'watchdog' effect. CARE calls out instances where climate justice, in other words an emphasis on equitable and fair climate action, is not at the centre of decision making, recognising that marginalised and vulnerable populations often bear the brunt of climate change impacts, despite contributing the least to the problem.

As an organisation, CARE centres much of its advocacy around climate finance, resilience and gender equality. The organisation acknowledges the value and importance of collaboration with local actors using community-based tools and approaches to '*strengthen our collective voice and power to jointly achieve this goal'.*

CARE is well positioned through their dual-mandate nature, as well as through the presence of their dedicated Climate Justice Centre, to be an effective voice calling for more ambitious climate action from the Global North. Through their advocacy work, CARE engages in a range of activities including facilitating access to media representation, leveraging their convening power, and ensuring that the setting of their advocacy agenda is co-created with other like-minded organisations and networks.

Some of CARE's advocacy efforts include the development of policy briefs and position papers for annual COP meetings, events and other relevant policy and advocacy moments focused around priorities connected to finance, adaptation, Loss and Damage, gender and mitigation.

Many of CARE's published reports and advocacy outputs use success stories and case studies from their climate justice efforts (including humanitarian response programmes) to raise awareness of the importance of supporting and scaling up responses that promote enhanced community resilience and wellbeing when faced with climate and environment shocks. Recently published articles include '**Resilience in action as early warning committees protect communities in Somalia',** and '**The Hidden Consequences of Climate Finance'.**

Case Study: Network-Based Efforts to Influence and Mobilise

COAST Foundation is a national NGO in Bangladesh. COAST works on effective promotion of human rights, development, and engagement in advocacy at national and international levels. Their advocacy seeks to contribute to positive change in policies and practices which tackle the adverse impacts of climate change, and promote better localization of humanitarian assistance.

In addition to their work as an independent entity, COAST also acts as the Secretariat of EquityBD, a network of NGOs and civil society organisations which have a variety of thematic campaign areas including climate justice. Much of their advocacy work uses their local expertise to call for tailored actions in response to global agreements or agendas.

For example, in preparation for COP29, COAST and other civil society organisations (CSOs) in Bangladesh participated in a united campaign which urged their government to adopt a self-dependent climate plan fighting the impacts of climate change.

They did so due to substantial concerns that the global pledge of $300 billion annual climate finance pledge agreed at COP is insufficient and likely to create intense competition among developing nations, making it challenging for Bangladesh to effectively use this funding due to gaps in readiness, skills, and negotiation capacity.

Case Study: Leveraging New and Existing Networks

Islamic Relief Bangladesh operates within a context that is especially impacted by the effects of climate change. Bangladesh's low elevation and geographic position make it vulnerable to cyclones, flooding, intense monsoon rains, and storm surges, and these hazards are being increased by climate change.

In this challenging context, Islamic Relief has developed new approaches to bring diverse actors together to amplify messaging about climate and environmental issues. These include the creation of a faith-based organisation network which will collectively support the Charter's commitments, and engaging with Clusters who will now also integrate the Charter into their ways of working.

As a form of indirect donor advocacy, Islamic Relief Bangladesh is including costs associated with making a reality of the Charter commitments within project budgets. To further develop its public messaging, the organisation is also in the design stages of a Climate and Peace campaign. Additionally, IRB is actively engaged with the Bangladesh government to develop a roadmap on using green technologies for the construction sector.

Case Study: Bridging the Local-National-International Divide

Welthungerhilfe is working to support its country office teams to engage in climate advocacy at the national and international level. The organisation does so recognising that situations of governmental fragility or a lack of respect for human rights amongst elected or de-facto authorities can pose additional challenges in terms of who to direct advocacy efforts towards.

WHH also recognises that there is limited capacity for states experiencing multiple effects of the climate crisis, requiring multiple different actions, to implement proposed changes. As such, they place a focus on amplifying messages and advocacy priorities from country offices to funding bodies and governments in European donor states. This serves as a channel for the experiences of communities in these states to reach an international audience.

To ensure that advocacy activities are better suited to the specific country situation, WHH has focused on gradually shifting power and decision-making responsibility towards country offices, who are increasingly taking the lead on the development of proposals focused on climate action, and on messaging around these proposals, within their respective operating contexts.

In parallel, the organisation's external relations team transmits these messages towards European governments and leadership structures, with whom the organisation has existing relationships. These relationships, and the fact that Germany and other European nations already have demonstrated interest in efforts to combat the effects of the climate crisis and reduce emissions, provide an effective 'entry point' for information from impacted communities.

PART B:
Experiences and Lessons Learned in Setting Targets Against the Charter Commitments

This section considers the experiences of the six case study organisations in setting and working towards targets – particularly the process of setting and following up on targets, the nature of the targets, and the benefits gained through the process.

As such, it relates specifically to commitment 7 of the Charter: Develop targets and measure our progress as we implement our commitments.

What are Targets and What is Target-Setting?

Target-setting is a process which is widely used in organisations to achieve progress, improvement, or change. Broadly speaking, it **consists of setting objectives** that **represent the progress or improvement** that the organisation wishes to achieve, often in a **specific area of its work**. Targets are distinct from vision or mission statements, which tend to be broader, less concrete and more aspirational descriptions for the future of the organisation as a whole. Generally, however they are formulated, targets describe a state that can be considered to be 'met', or 'not met', and as such can be used as a reference point to assess progress compared to intentions and desired changes.

Targets come in many forms. These can include:

The objective itself, or something that represents the objective, but is easier to measure: The target might be **the objective itself** ("by 2026, we will incorporate an assessment of key climate risks in all new project designs"). But where an organisation's objective is broad ("we will help communities to understand the risks of climate change") the target might be **an indicator that represents the objective but is easier to measure** and which helps the organisation to see whether it is achieving the objective (in this example, because it is hard to measure whether the organisation helped all communities to understand the risks of climate change, a target may be: "x% increase of knowledge of climate change in surveys of 12 communities, compared to baseline surveys").

The destination or the route of travel: Similarly, the target might be the ultimate 'destination' – **the ultimate objective** – (which is often some distance away - "by 2030, we will reduce our GHG emissions by 50%") or it might refer to **a point on the 'route of travel' towards this objective**, (which can be closer - "in the next 12 months, we will reduce our GHG emissions by 15%").

The ultimate objective or steps to the objective: Targets can be formulated at various levels. They can relate to **what the organisation hopes to achieve** "we will ensure that the impacts of climate change on marginalised communities are made clear to donor countries", **or to the things that they will do to achieve this** "we will hold five meetings with donors at which we present the outcomes of focus groups". In the language of project design that is used by many organisations, the **first kind of target is an 'outcome'** the **second is an 'output' or an 'activity'**. The box below gives more examples of the difference between activity-based targets (that measure steps to the objective) and outcome-based targets, (that measure an indicator of the objective)

Example: NGO A Supports Local Communities in a Flood-Prone Region, Focusing on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

NGO A works in a flood prone region. They have seen that, after floods, cases of diarrhoea rise, particularly among young children. They recognise that there are many reasons for this. Sometimes floodwater enters wells and contaminates the communities' drinking water. The floodwater also damages toilets, and so people are forced to defecate outdoors, which spreads disease. And because there is less clean water, people may not wash their hands after defecation.

NGO A decides that, as flooding is becoming more of a problem because of climate change, they need to act to decrease diarrhoea among children. They do not have the funding to protect all of the wells and toilets from flooding, but they can support communities by providing training on hygiene and water sterilisation, and materials for storage and sterilisation of water.

Now they want to set targets for these activities.

The overall goal of the work is to decrease the incidence of diarrhoea after flooding. They could set a target for this goal (something like: "*significantly decrease the incidence of diarrhoea after flooding*" - or, if they want to be more precise - "*in the six weeks after a flood event, incidence of diarrhoea will be 50% lower than after previous flood events*"). But these targets are very hard to measure, because they would need to have good information about the incidence of diarrhoea. Such high-level targets are also difficult because the NGO cannot achieve them by itself - their work will help to solve the problem, but to completely solve the problem, many more activities would be required.

So, in most cases, the NGO will set targets that show whether they have been successful in taking steps towards the goal.

These might be **Activity-**based targets: "*By 2026, NGO A will have designed an awareness-raising session focused on safe hygiene practices*" Designing the training in one important activity that has to take place in order for the training to happen: it is a first step towards the goal.

Or they might be **Output**-based targets: "In the next six months, 100 community members will have received training from NGO A relating to safe hygiene practices and water containers and sterilisation materials". The training and distribution of materials is the 'output' - it is the thing that all of the activities create, and which NGO A is responsible for. It is a second step towards the goal.

Or they might be **Outcome**-based targets: "80% of surveyed families who have received assistance from NGO A demonstrate improved understanding of handwashing and safe water storage practices". The change in behaviour is the expected outcome of the training and distribution. It is what the community themselves do as a result of the work of the NGO (the output). It is a third step towards the goal.

NGO A now has to choose at which level they want to set their targets - and they may choose a mixture of these different levels

More, or less, precise targets: One commonly used approach to target-setting is to set what are known as **SMART targets**. Standing for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound, this approach to targets is widely used in both management and evaluation contexts. The SMARTer the target, the more precisely it is defined, and the more it takes into account the organisational reality. The example below highlights the key features of each element of a SMART target.

Example: SMART Targets Relating to Climate And Environment

Specific: 'We will ensure that local communities are trained in initiating community-based disaster risk reduction protocols based on defined triggers'

(Non-specific: 'community members receive training in climate change')

Measurable: 'We will conduct 15 training sessions'

(Less measurable: 'we will conduct a series of training sessions')

Achievable: 'We will reach 300 families at risk of displacement with shelter rehabilitation support'

(Less achievable: 'we will prevent future displacement in targeted regions')

Realistic: 'We will reduce our international flights by 30% compared to our 2022 baseline'

(Less realistic: we will ban all international travel)

Timebound: 'By 2026, we will have developed a climate policy'

(Not timebound: 'We will urgently work on developing a climate policy')

This review looked at the degree to which case study organisations used SMART targets when working on the Climate and Environment Charter. While the organisations used SMART targets to different degrees, there was a general consensus that a SMART approach - or at least adoption of some or all of the SMART principles - was useful , and could be a good starting point for organisations looking to develop actionable targets that can be followed up on systematically.

This is not to say that the SMART approach is a 'magic bullet'. Though it is a relatively commonplace and well-known approach, organisations may experience challenges developing targets that meet all of the SMART criteria. This is particularly true where targets relate to an outcome or an ultimate goal: these are sometimes difficult to quantify, and it can be difficult to know at the outset what is a realistic timeline, or level of ambition.[5] Circumstances can also change, meaning that what was achievable in 2024 is not in 2025. As such, targets may need to be revised to better reflect an organisation's evolving progress, financial position, or strategy, and can be iteratively added to or adjusted. Targets may also need to be revised based on emerging or evolving operational contexts, especially in fragile and conflict-affected areas, which may impact the feasibility and priorities of operations and programmes.

[5] May Britt Bjerke, Ralph Renger, Being smart about writing SMART objectives, Evaluation and Program Planning, Volume 61, 2017, Pages 125-127, ISSN 0149-7189, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.12.009.

Overall Trends in Target-Setting

Amongst case study organisations, there were different approaches to setting targets. Some organisations published targets connected to each commitment individually, and some published a smaller number of general targets relating to the Charter as a whole, without specifying which commitment(s) they applied to.

Organisations who used these 'general' targets tended to base these on climate-related work that they were already doing (particularly around commitment 2 - maximising environmental sustainability) with targets relating to existing goals and focus areas which already had established organisational buy-in.

By contrast, **organisations who were relatively new to working on climate and environmental issues**, or who were smaller and had more limited resources, tended to develop targets that were linked to each commitment in turn. Some organisations reported using the commitments as a **starting point to develop ideas** for new activities and then developing targets for these new activities as part of this exercise.

Across the six organisations reviewed, there were also observable trends in the ways that targets tended to differ by commitment. These trends included:

1) **Differences in the number of targets set for different commitments.**
    - Overall, there were a relatively larger number of targets set against commitments 1 ("step up our response") and 2 ("rapidly reduce emissions") than for other commitments. These targets also tended to be more specific to each organisation than the later commitments: the targets referenced the particular type of programming, screening tools, or method of emissions reduction employed by each organisation.
    - Commitment 3 ("embracing local leadership") typically received the fewest number of associated targets (although, interestingly, most organisations were working on the issue of local leadership - but not necessarily as part of their work on the Charter)
    - Targets for commitments 4-6 were often formulated in a way that was a broader articulation of best practices relating to partnerships or coordination, and tended to be less specific and more aspirational than targets for commitments 1-3.

2) **Variation in the activities chosen to be included in targets.** Overall, the activities covered within targets, and the way in which targets were written, varied widely.
    - In international NGOs, targets relating to the widespread usage of **tools** for climate and environment impact assessment were commonplace, and

quantitative targets relating to the reduction of **greenhouse gas emissions** were also included by those organisations who had prior policy commitments in place.

- For national NGOs, targets often focused on reaching people through programme interventions, especially connected to commitment 1.

Secretariat Support to Humanitarian Organisations on Target Development

A two-person Charter Secretariat team serves as a referral hub to support and connect organisations to implement the Charter commitments in four core areas:

1. Connecting signatories to experts and resources within and beyond the Charter network to access **technical guidance** in implementing Charter commitments.
2. Serving as a **knowledge-sharing** platform to share Charter-related resources, collaborating in developing knowledge products, and exchanging lessons learned and best practices from the Charter community.
3. Strengthening **communications and engagement** with Charter signatories through developing and enhancing platforms for partnership, learning, and coordination.
4. **Promoting, disseminating, and advocating** for the Charter, and the implementation of its commitments, within the humanitarian community.

As part of its work in these areas, the Secretariat is available to all charter signatories for consultations on target development. With designated *Target 'Office Hours,'* signatories are invited to arrange meetings with one of the Secretariat team-members in order to brainstorm, troubleshoot, or update on the target development process. Signatories are also invited to email the Secretariat (Secretariat@climate-charter.org).

Support on target development includes but is not limited to:

- Reviewing and providing feedback on draft targets.
- Helping organisations understand if and how to leverage existing strategies, policies, or programmatic priorities as a basis for developing targets.
- Supporting organisations with creating a plan to develop targets.
- Providing resources or presentations to focal points on the Charter framework to serve as a basis for discussing target development.
- Sharing examples of targets from other organisations with similar operational contexts.
- Connecting organisations to other signatories to exchange lessons learned on target development.

Beyond support on developing targets, the Charter Team is available to help signatories work towards advancing the commitments more broadly. This can include helping organisations identify and navigate existing and relevant guidance and information relevant to climate and environmental action, or connect with existing expertise and resource centers on a variety of technical subjects.

Why Targets? Understanding the Value and Purpose of Target-Setting Amongst Signatory Organisations

It is entirely possible to work on issues of climate and environment without setting targets. Moreover, while the process of setting and reporting on targets is one of the commitments of the Charter (commitment 7), only a minority of signatories have done so.

So, why set targets? And for those that did develop targets, what did they expect to achieve by setting them, and has the experience proved valuable?

What does the literature indicate about target-setting in this context?

The literature review that formed part of this study suggested that setting, working towards, and achieving targets has powerful effects on motivation and attention - research on Corporate Carbon Targets suggests that substantive, well-defined targets are ultimately linked to carbon performance improvements.[6] The effectiveness of targets is influenced by the way in which they are developed and used. Research into goal-setting theory indicates that the nature of a goal, feedback provided about progress, and impact of conflicting goals and group dynamics can all moderate the effectiveness of any goal-setting approach.[7] Other factors connecting to the success of target-setting include institutional support and 'buy-in' across the organisation, the establishment of common terminology, and connections to wider monitoring and management processes.[8]

On the other hand, target-setting may actually have negative effects if it is not done well. For example, some research suggests that incorrectly formulated targets can work as a barrier to effective action, because they feel impossible to achieve and so lead to feelings of overwhelm or disempowerment. Additionally, uncertainty on how to meet ambitious targets, specifically related to a lack of resources, knowledge and motivation, can cause

---

[6] Bjørn, A., Tilsted, J.P., Addas, A. et al. Can Science-Based Targets Make the Private Sector Paris-Aligned? A Review of the Emerging Evidence. Curr Clim Change Rep 8, 53–69 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-022-00182-w; Dahlmann, F., Branicki, L. & Brammer, S. Managing Carbon Aspirations: The Influence of Corporate Climate Change Targets on Environmental Performance. J Bus Ethics 158, 1–24 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3731-z

[7] Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15(5), 265-268. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00449.x

[8] Eubank, D. (2023) Sustainable Goal Setting for Climate Action: What Leaders Value Defines How They Take Action. In Driving Organisational Change for Climate Change in The Handbook of Climate Change Leadership in Organisations: Developing Leadership for the Age of Sustainability (1st ed.). Routledge

organisational disruption and a reduced likelihood of targets being acted upon.[9] The literature also suggests that in some cases, target-setting can be a 'performance' that does not truly drive change. Having targets that are too easy to achieve (ones based solely on "low-hanging fruit") undermines the potential of target-setting in both corporate and humanitarian settings.[10] These easy targets can be a form of 'virtue signalling' or 'green washing', making the organisation look good, without having to do anything substantial to improve performance on the issue.[11]

Overall, there is evidence to show that, when well-informed, developed with positive intent and ambition, and acted upon accordingly, the process of setting targets can drive focus and impact within an organisation. Both academic and grey literature on the virtue of target-setting and the process of setting targets, demonstrates that the ways in which targets are set, acted upon, and measured needs to be thoughtfully considered and implemented in order to fit organisational culture and in turn drive maximum effect.

What did signatory organisations understand to be the value of targets?

Case study organisations agreed that the process of setting targets for the Climate and Environment Charter had a positive impact on their ability to make progress on climate and environmental issues. The only exceptions to this were in situations where activities and targets were already in place before the organisation signed the Charter. In these cases, interviewees found the original target-setting process useful, but didn't feel that publishing targets against the Charter commitments that were similar to those that had previously been developed increased their ability to make progress beyond the initial targets and frameworks that were already in use.

Overall, case study organisations and workshop participants who had engaged in setting targets as part of their planning for climate and environmental activities were able to identify a number of benefits to doing so, including:

- **Providing a management tool** - one of the most common arguments for the use of targets in an organisation is that they are a management tool; a concrete way in which progress can be tracked and assessed. Several organisations found that

[9] Dahlmann, F. (2023) Corporate Carbon Targets: The Role of Goal Setting in Driving Organisational Change for Climate Change. In The Handbook of Climate Change Leadership in Organisations: Developing Leadership for the Age of Sustainability (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003343011

[10] Sitkin, Sim & See, Kelly & Miller, C. & Lawless, Michael & Carton, Andrew. (2010). The Paradox of Stretch Goals: Organisations in Pursuit of the Seemingly Impossible. Academy of Management Review. 36. 10.5465/AMR.2011.61031811

[11] Montier, E., Weingärtner, l. and Klassen, S. (2022) The Potential for Anticipatory Action and Disaster Risk Finance: Guiding the Setting of Humanitarian Targets; Dahlmann, F. (2023) Corporate Carbon Targets: The Role of Goal Setting in Driving Organisational Change for Climate Change in The Handbook of Climate Change

setting and measuring targets was useful in managing progress around the commitments. This seemed to be particularly true where targets were formulated in a quantifiable or time-bound way, as this made it easy to see whether they had been 'met' or 'not met' and gave a clear indication of what was and wasn't working within programming so far, allowing for adjustments. However, in order for targets to be useful as a management tool, it was important to have mechanisms to measure progress and to use this measurement in decision-making: the targets on their own were not enough.

- **Providing structure and a direction of travel** for the organisation's efforts to realise the commitments. While most organisations already felt an alignment of values between their work and the Charter commitments, and were motivated to work on climate and environmental issues, the process of setting targets helped clarify what, exactly, they were aiming to achieve and what they had to do to achieve it. As one participant said, without targets *"it would be like getting into an airplane without knowing your destination".*
- **Increasing internal coordination** - Where the process of target-setting had included people from across the organisation (which was not always the case) it served to bring diverse activities together under a single framework.
- **Making the organisation accountable for progress** – some interviewees shared that, having made an external commitment through publishing targets, members of the organisation felt a greater level of accountability connected to their work in this area. There was a sense that deprioritising efforts became less possible once a public commitment of an organisation's targets was made.
- **Engaging with donors and funders** – a few organisations indicated that participation in the Charter, including through publishing targets, may be a positive step in being able to demonstrate commitment to climate and environmental considerations, and to attract funding opportunities.
- **Demonstrating leadership** connected to climate and environment – this was particularly the case where climate mainstreaming was already a cornerstone within an organisation's mission. Several interviewees mentioned the importance of showing leadership in this area to the public in donor states, to communities receiving support, and to partner organisations.
- **Increasing the scale of ambition** – in several cases the process of setting targets led organisations to expand on their pre-existing work and ambitions relating to climate and environment. In some cases, this was because the process of deciding how best to meet commitments and to measure whether they had been met led to the introduction of new activities. In other cases, discussions on how ambitious

the targets should be led to the creation of 'stretch' targets, and an increased level of ambition.

- **Building morale** – by being able to champion and celebrate the collective efforts to meet published targets, some teams involved in climate and environment issues (especially in organisations with a more recent focus on climate and environment), felt that they had an 'anchor' for motivating colleagues. It should be noted, however, that this was only really successful where the target process, and the Charter more broadly, was widely communicated within the organisation.
- **Being part of a collective effort that brings the sector together, and which unites peers.** Organisations felt positive about being part of a collaborative initiative and were keen to contribute alongside others. Publishing targets that talk about tangible work being done or planned, as opposed to solely signing the Charter and working on such efforts privately, strengthens the sense of being part of a larger movement for change.

Not all organisations felt that they had obtained all of these benefits, however, and organisations fell – very broadly – into one of two groups. Where organisations believed that targets were an opportunity to state aspirational, planned, or new ideas for meeting commitments, they tended to also view them as a mechanism to inspire further progress and change, and to focus on the more morale-oriented benefits. By contrast, where organisations viewed targets as an accountability mechanism, often for activities already underway, they were more likely to view targets as having benefits related to management and coordination, as well as outward-looking benefits in terms of publicising their work.

The Process and Ownership of Setting Targets: Who Was Involved?

The process of setting targets differed depending on the size of the organisation, number of people involved, and the extent to which there were relevant pre-existing policies, activities and/or targets already present within the organisation.

The importance of a focal point

Most organisations had **one or two people who were responsible for leading the development of targets**. Generally, this was **a single focal point** within a climate and environment workstream (or, in smaller organisations, an individual with a particular interest in climate and environment) who drove the target-setting process forward,

sometimes accompanied by **a counterpart within the senior leadership team who acted as 'champion'** of the workstream.

There was one case where members of the senior leadership team across all functions were involved in consultation around the targets, but the review did not find examples of affected community members being involved in the design of activities and/or targets to meet the Charter commitments. Several organisations made efforts to sensitise the commitments and targets amongst country offices and all team members after finalising the targets.

Limited engagement?

The fact that a relatively small number of people were typically involved in setting targets may explain why, at least in some organisations, there was a substantial bias towards setting targets for some commitments as opposed to others. In a few cases, only some Charter commitments have targets, and these are typically connected to the focus area of those leading the process. For example, environmental working group members may be better placed, and predisposed to, setting targets connected to commitments 2 (environmental sustainability) and 4 (understanding risk), whilst an accountability specialist or other programme quality professional may be better placed to speak to work on targets around partnerships or localisation, but may not have been involved.

This may also explain why there was sometimes an incongruity between the diversity of activities that organisations engage in which have relevance to the Charter, and the targets set against relevant commitments: In some cases, organisations were doing many activities that related to the Charter, but had not included these activities in their targets.

Deciding what to capture – how did organisations choose what to include in targets?

The first decision for most organisations when it comes to setting targets for the Charter related to whether they should focus only on activities that they were already doing which contribute to meeting the Charter commitments, or consider whether to add new activities or approaches to their ways of working.

While this is a decision that goes beyond target-setting, and is more about the broader question of how the organisation moves forward with its climate and environmental ambitions, the process of setting targets was generally a part of this discussion, and in some cases it was the target-setting process that led to this decision.

The next step in the process is for organisations to **decide which of the things they are doing (or plan to do) will be translated into targets**. Many organisations have not captured all activities within Charter targets and are meeting the commitments much more broadly than their targets might suggest. And even where an area of work is

captured, most organisations are doing many different things under this area (for example, under commitment 1: 'Stepping up our response', the organisation might be conducting risk assessments, training staff, building resilience into existing humanitarian activities, and creating new activities specifically to deal with climate-related risks) but may not want to set targets for them all.

How did organisations make decisions about what to include?

There were various strategies used by different organisations to address this challenge, including:

- **Reusing / updating existing targets or commitments -** Organisations with a **pre-existing climate policy** and / or connected targets tended to use this as the basis for their Charter targets, suggesting a 'repurposing' approach building on existing work. Respondents felt that this approach of harmonising Charter targets with existing frameworks avoided having multiple uncoordinated efforts in connection to climate and environment, but the downside was that opportunities to embrace discussions about potential new ways of working, and opportunities to set targets against commitments not closely linked to existing policies and frameworks, were often lost.
- **Focusing on just a few areas of work to drive concerted impact** - Some organisations recognised that they were working on a wide variety of activities across all, or most of the commitments, but that if they set targets for all of these activities, it might be difficult to track progress, and lead to confusion. Instead, they set targets for just some of the activities, with the intent to increase the number of targets in the next round.
- **Selecting targets that are emblematic of wider approaches** - When organisations needed to set targets against a broad range of activities, they tended either to select those activities that they thought were **particularly important** (as indicators of general progress in an area, that stood for all of the other activities as well) or to **set targets at higher levels – outcomes to which all of the activities would contribute** (see the section on level of ambition, below). So an organisation with multiple activities under commitment 1 might choose 'conducting risk assessments in all programmes' as an indicator that would show that progress was being made, or they might say "all programmes incorporate adaptations to meet climate risks", as this target would be the result of all of their work in assessment, training and climate programme design.
- **Leveraging support from the Secretariat of the Climate and Environment Charter** - Many organisations agreed that the published guidance from the Climate and Environment Charter Secretariat in relation to each commitment was

helpful to them. Organisations also referred to having **looked at other signatories' published targets** to provide ideas and inspiration. Several organisations described times that they had reached out to Secretariat coordinators for personal guidance and to answer questions, especially where they were unsure how to build on their existing work and efforts.

The Nature of Targets: What are the Targets Like and How Do They Vary Across Organisations?

The way that targets are designed and worded can have substantial effects on how much action they inspire and facilitate. Across the six organisations, there were real differences in the types of target that were set - and even within a single organisation, there were differences between the targets related to different commitments.

Though some best practices and common pitfalls emerged, **it appears that there is no one right way to describe a target** - different modalities work best for different actors.

This section presents the **various ways that targets different across and within organisations**, which may be useful to other organisations in their thinking on developing targets.

Some of the elements that differed across and within organisations were:

1) **Level of ambition –**

   Ambition can be understood as the **extent to which change is required in order to meet a target.** A target that is not at all ambitious is one which would almost certainly be met even if the organisation made no changes to its ways of working or any increases in effort connected to the target. By contrast, an ambitious target could be one which requires substantial shifts in an organisation's activities in order to meet it, one where there is a degree of uncertainty as to whether the target could be met, or one which relies on factors that are outside of a signatory's control.

   Almost all respondents agreed that targets should be ambitious, saying that the process of setting targets would be most useful where it created a sense of urgency and required increased effort to achieve. As such, it was felt that an ambitious target had the ability to **push an organisation towards higher levels of performance** than they would otherwise realise.

Some interviewees also felt that as there was no external oversight of the targets - no requirement, for example, to report back on progress to the Charter Secretariat – there were no significant consequences from missing a target. While some respondents felt that this type of external accountability might support even more ambitious action, others felt that the freedom to set ambitious targets without fear of negative recourse was helpful. On the other hand, some respondents felt that the lack of external oversight gave them the **freedom to 'start small' and increase the ambition of their targets in future.**

2) Level of result

There was some variation amongst published targets as to the level of result expressed, with some targets pitched at the activity level whilst others referred to outputs or outcomes (see the section on 'what is target-setting' above) **Typically, activity and output-based targets are easier to observe and quantify** and as such easier to assess in terms of whether they are met or not met then outcome level targets (it is easier to say, for example, that you have trained 100 staff - an activity - than to say that programme staff are consistently taking climate risks into account in the design of programmes - an outcome).

These lower levels of result often fit better with a 'SMART' approach to target-setting (see section 'smart targets' above). However, some organisations felt that the public-facing Charter targets were not the place to speak to detailed activities or outputs. Instead, they felt that the activities were simply part of achieving changes and it was these changes that should be the target of any work to meet the commitments. **Some respondents expressed a preference for publishing higher-level commitment-based targets**, feeling that these better articulated their overall ethos and commitments to an external audience, but also already had KPIs (key performance indicators) related to the Charter commitments in their internal documents, which were expressed as activities and outputs, and they did not need to repeat or duplicate these.

3) Internal or external-facing targets

Most organisations used mostly or exclusively 'internally-facing' targets; in other words, targets that speak about **what the organisation itself will do**, as opposed to the changes that will occur amongst affected community members or other stakeholders. These were typically formulated in an active voice, such as 'NGO X will develop/train/implement….'.

Only rarely did organisations direct targets towards community members themselves, and in these cases, the target was formulated as 'NGO X will (drive a certain change in communities) by doing…..'. This links to an organisation's sphere of influence, as well

as to level of ambition and level of result. It takes more ambition to say that your actions will lead to change in a community than to talk about actions entirely under your control.

In terms of the level of result, changes at the level of the community are generally a result (outcome level) of things that the organisation has created (outputs) based on things the organisation has done (activities). It makes sense for organisations to set **targets based on what they are able to control,** and – as noted above – it is often easier to measure activities than it is to measure outcomes.

4) Timeliness

The SMART target approach suggests that targets should be 'time-bound' and include a date for reaching the target. **Most organisations specified timelines**, generally relating to a given year by which an activity should either be commenced, or by which a target should be accomplished. Where organisations had chosen to set **targets for new activities** that they were not currently doing, these **timescales were sometimes found to have been unrealistic**, especially where funding for new programmes or approaches needed to be sought. Where a **target related to implementation across all of an organisation's work**, for example of a screening tool, or of a way of working such as elevating local perspectives within decision-making, **timelines were typically not set.** This may be because organisations found it hard to assess how long it would take to reach these targets, or because this type of target is seen as a continuous way of working as opposed to a single activity that is completed at a specific time.

5) Quantification

This refers to assigning a **numerical value** to a target (training 100 staff, or starting climate programming in 30% of operational countries, for example), and has links to measurability and specificity within the SMART framework. **Many organisations made attempts to quantify their targets**, particularly in relation to commitment two, where absolute or relative values of reductions in greenhouse gas emissions are easy to express as percentages. Organisations were also able to quantify a **target number of people** to be reached, or percentage of country offices or staff trained on or using a particular approach or tool. In other cases, often linked to the broader **outcome-based targets** or 'value statement' style targets, any quantification was linked to **universality**, such as 'all programmes/staff/country offices will….'.

- There were some examples of organisations setting fairly subjective, **non-quantified targets** which were open to a high degree of interpretation. For example, some targets referred to conducting 'many' activities of a certain type, 'promoting' or 'scaling up' approaches, or 'making a tangible change in….'.

Upon reflection, interviewees often felt that this approach was **not well suited to being able to assess progress** or understand whether targets were being met effectively or not. One respondent indicated that, after trying to use these targets, the team realised that they were **more like statements of ambition** than useful targets.

- Several organisations expressed an **intent to revise** their targets, either because timelines had changed or passed, or because they wished to ensure greater measurability. Where initial targets had not been easy to measure (non-quantified, or not time-bound), this was often because MEAL colleagues had not been involved in the design process, or because there had been a **lack of baseline data** (in particular for new or planned activities) and this meant that organisations struggled to know how to set a realistic quantified target.

Monitoring and Management – How are Organisations Following Up on Targets?

At the time of this report, there is no formal mechanism for signatories to monitor and report on targets, considering the voluntary nature of the Charter. The Charter Secretariat counts on organisations to establish internal monitoring and management mechanisms that are most suitable and aligned with their existing monitoring and evaluation processes. Some organisations report the results of this monitoring on a voluntary basis to the Charter, and others don't. As such, monitoring and management of targets varies between organisations.

The ability to measure and follow up on progress against targets is partly determined by the nature of the targets themselves, and partly by other processes and mechanisms (largely around Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)) that the organisation may or may not have in place.

What factors affect measurement of targets?

1) The nature of the target itself

It is clear that some targets are easier to measure progress against than others. Specifically, targets for which a **baseline already exists,** for which an activity or approach is **quantifiable**, and where there is a **defined timeline** tend to be easier to measure.

By contrast, vague language tends to reduce ability to easily assess progress. It is easier, for example, to measure and take action on "a 30% decrease in carbon

emissions compared to 2019 levels by 2026" than it is to measure and take action on "a significant future decrease in carbon emissions".

Whilst **activity and output-level targets are often observable** and therefore easier to set and track indicators against, outcome-based targets, which are often more ambitious, are still possible – albeit generally more difficult – to measure. Increasingly, MEAL teams are using approaches such as outcome harvesting to **capture contributions to outcomes and impacts in complex environments over longer timeframes**, recognising that focusing only on activities and outputs can lead us to neglect the **true purpose** of any such work.

2) **Availability of data**

Several respondents reported that, on reflection, they wished that the process of target-setting within their organisation had included a discussion on how each target would be measured. In some cases, it was only later that organisations came up against the challenge of not having information to know if targets had been met or not, or of having to set up new information collection systems to measure progress against targets. Other organisations intentionally limited targets to cover only things that they knew they were able to measure. Between these two extremes - setting up whole new information collection systems for targets on the one hand, and only setting targets that can be assessed using existing information on the other - there may be a middle ground in which organisations are able to develop a small number of new processes for establishing baselines and collecting and analysing information for targets that are particularly important to capture, whilst also having a majority of easily measurable targets.

3) **Ability to analyse collected data**

Many organisations were able to demonstrate excellent practices for the collection of standardised data, including across country offices. The second step in this process relates to the **consolidation and analysis** of such data, and this can be an **area which is overlooked until the data has been collected**, and so where organisations can find that they lack capacity if time and skills for analysis are not built into monitoring processes ahead of time. This is especially true where there are inconsistencies in data collected, leading to challenges in comparability.

What factors affect the management of targets - meeting targets and taking action if they are not met?

Regardless of the way that targets are designed, organisational capacity for - and interest in - following up on any targets is a defining factor in determining the extent to which targets are useful and supportive of activity and change.

There are several organisational processes that can support, or hinder, continued engagement with targets:

1) **Alignment with strategic aims**

   Where organisations were able to include targets, or similar objectives, within their **overall strategy**, it was much more likely that the targets would be monitored and action taken if they were not being met. This, of course, was most likely to happen in organisations which had already decided that addressing the causes and / or results of the climate and environmental crises was a core part of their mission.

   By contrast, where Charter targets were not seen as being central to the organisation's mission, where climate and environment activities were entirely **separate from any other organisational activities,** or where they partially **duplicated** other work and existing targets relating to climate and environment workstreams, they were at **biggest risk of falling off the organisation's agenda**. Some respondents said that if they were collecting data about progress towards other climate and environment goals, or updating targets connected to another framework or specific funding proposal, they would **often not translate these updates** to the Charter targets as well.

2) **Wider policy support**

   In some cases, **complementary organisational policies** were already in place to support the implementation of climate and environmental activities, making it easier to achieve targets. These included **travel policies, risk assessment policies, and partnership guidelines**. In these cases, there was often a very clear 'go/no-go' procedure in place around certain actions, supporting clear decision-making. So, for example, a clear policy limiting the use of air travel to certain specified situations would decrease air travel across the organisation and make it easier to achieve targets related to decreased carbon emissions. While such policies were helpful, they **did not guarantee that targets would be met**, however. For example, if the number or scale of operations the organisation was conducting increased massively, the total number of flights that met the specified conditions might actually increase. To a degree, these problems can be addressed by being thoughtful about how targets are written (a target that decreases the number of flights per person employed by the organisation, for example, rather than decreasing the total number of flights). Nevertheless, the continual changes experienced in many humanitarian contexts can be a very real factor inhibiting organisations from meeting targets.

3) **Communication to leadership and the wider organisation**

   Many respondents regretted not having placed more of a focus on developing plans for communicating progress against targets with internal and external stakeholders.

Sharing this information keeps a focus on the issue of climate and environment and can motivate enthusiasm and action. In cases where data collection and analysis is part of centralised reporting, this is likely to be included in any pre-existing communication and accountability system. But in cases where new systems were created to monitor the Charter targets, there was not necessarily a system for publicising results. In other cases, this tended to depend on the degree to which leadership followed up with enquiries about progress against targets.

4) Accountability within the organisation

The inclusion of work connected to the Charter in **role descriptions,** and assessments of individual, team and organisation performance are important in ensuring that targets are met, and if they are not met, that action is taken. Few organisations specifically referred to the inclusion of Charter targets in individual or team workplans or 'performance management' mechanisms, but almost all organisations had **clarity relating to the person or people responsible** for championing commitments and targets, even if the **exact mechanisms for doing so weren't always clear.** Challenges with **staff turnover and funding constraints** did leave some organisations in situations where there was no designated focal point who had ownership of the workstream, which tended to stall progress and diminish institutional memory.

5) Organisational culture

Some organisations may be accustomed to working within a **target-based framework**, with a strong focus on results-based management, key performance indicators, targets, and other similar approaches. Other organisations may have a very different organisational culture, and see themselves, for example, as being more 'purpose driven' than 'target driven'. In organisations without a history of using targets and related processes, it can be harder to use a target driven approach to the Charter commitments. In such cases, connecting targets to organisational mandates and visions for change may fit better within a culture.

6) Intent to revise targets

In Interviews, representatives of three of the six signatory organisations said that they had already, or are actively intending to, revise their initially published targets. They felt that the **process of regular revision was important**, as it allowed for the development of better targets on the basis of organisational learning, and for **increased ambition** around the targets as the organisation became more skilled and comfortable at working on climate and environmental issues.

PART C:
Emerging Recommendations on Target-Setting

Signatory organisations embarking on the process of setting targets against the Charter commitments for the first time, or those looking to revise and update their targets, could consider the following ideas and recommendations:

When deciding how to fulfil the Charter commitments, consider the balance of new vs. existing activities

Before setting targets to measure the progress of climate and environmental activities, signatory organisations first need to decide what these activities will be. In doing so, organisations may wish to consider a balance of activities and approaches that includes both those that are already part of an organisation's way of working, and those that are new or aspirational. Almost all organisations will already be working on some activities related to Charter commitments that could be further expanded or emphasised within programming (perhaps around resilience building, localisation, coordination or advocacy), and it's important not to forget about these as they are likely to be areas in which organisations can demonstrate progress in making a reality of the commitments most easily. Including only activities that are not currently being carried out by the organisation is likely to be more difficult, and there may not always be guarantees that ideas for new approaches can be implemented, given funding and programme constraints. Finding a balanced approach ensures that organisations are stretched to consider how they can broaden their approach to meeting the commitments, whilst also being able to demonstrate meaningful progress.

Aim to include people with a diverse range of expertise and roles within the process of setting targets.

This will make it more likely that organisations are able to effectively capture their current work, and realistic future progress, across all commitments, which are often connected to very different functions within an organisation.

Explore a mixture of ambition levels within targets.

Setting only targets that are already being met, or will be met without any changes or additional effort, is not likely to be transformative for an organisation's ability to make a

reality of the Charter commitments. At the same time, setting targets which are near-impossible is likely to be demoralising for team members and other stakeholders.

Decide whether you will design targets to describe either 'the goal' or 'steps towards the goal' (or both).

Targets which are focused solely or mostly at the level of activities and outputs (such as 'we will rehabilitate X number of water points') are often easier to monitor, but don't necessarily give the same information about the effectiveness and success of the actions taken. Conversely, targets which refer to outcomes or impacts for communities (such as '80% of community members have safe and reliable access to clean drinking water in situations of flooding') can be harder to directly measure, but tend to be more reflective of the ultimate vision or purpose of meeting the commitments. In many cases, a mixture may be most appropriate. Balancing measurability with targets that relate to the overall purpose of actions taken is important when setting targets.

Consider designing targets that are quantified and time bound

These two characteristics often have an important effect on an organisation's ability to monitor targets and develop successful action plans. By knowing the size of result required, and by when, the work needed to meet a target is much easier to understand. Making targets quantified and time bound are two of the five elements of SMART targets: organisations could consider whether using at least some targets which are formulated according to the SMART methodology would support their ability to ensure follow-up and drive progress.

Where targets are not quantified, organisations should decide in advance how they will know if the target has been met.

If targets are not quantified (perhaps because they are at a higher level which is more difficult to quantify) it is still useful to decide how the organisation will know if a target has been met. Depending on the wording of the target, this might be very self-explanatory, but in other cases, carefully considering what constitutes 'enough' progress, and how you will know, will be important.

Make targets clear and easy to understand: Consider how the meaning of the target will be understood by all necessary stakeholders. Whether the SMART target approach is taken or not, it is important to ensure that there is enough specificity within the language of the target to ensure that any other member of the team (and/or external stakeholder) would understand what is being worked towards to meet any given target.

Develop a plan for monitoring progress against targets at the same time as developing the targets

Reflections from organisations generally suggested that it is best to consider how progress on targets will be monitored, or assessed, during the process of target-setting rather than afterwards. If an organisation doesn't have the capacity to monitor progress against a particular target, this doesn't mean that it should necessarily be excluded as a target, but it is important to be aware of this, and to make a plan to follow up on progress in the future. It is recommended that an organisation currently has the capacity to monitor at least some of the targets set, with a plan in place to be able to establish baselines or monitoring approaches for those targets where processes are currently not available. In some cases, considering novel approaches to monitoring and evaluation, such as Outcome Harvesting, or Most Significant Change approaches, may be supportive of assessing progress against more outcome-based targets.

Consider how progress against targets will be followed up on, and by whom.

Within an organisation, it's important to be able to track progress against targets. However, it's just as important to have a plan in place for who will be responsible for doing so, as well as for who will be accountable for driving progress within the organisation, and for taking action if monitoring shows that targets are not being met (this might be the same person, or one person might be responsible for monitoring, and another for taking action if the monitoring shows that targets are not being met). These responsibilities can usefully be included in team or individual workplans, where organisations have these. Often, having a high-level stakeholder (such as a board member or member of the senior leadership team) requesting periodic updates on progress against targets can ensure that targets don't get deprioritised under competing workloads. Considering plans for internal communications surrounding awareness-raising of the commitments, and celebrating progress made, is also important.

Consider a plan for external reporting on progress against targets

To demonstrate further accountability and share learnings with other organisations about what is working well and less well, signatory organisations may consider public reporting, such as through annual reports or climate-focused sections of a website.

Consider what you will do if targets are not on track, or not met, as well as what you will do if they are exceeded

Having a contingency plan for revising targets, or adjusting workplans in order to better meet targets, ensures that there is a continuous loop of follow-on from monitoring and communication efforts. Sometimes, gauging what level of progress might be considered

realistic, or ambitious, within a given timeframe can be difficult, especially given the unpredictable nature of humanitarian crises and the wider funding and political environment. This means that factoring in periodic reviews, at which point targets could be revised, may be very helpful. These revisions could reflect progressively increased ambition, organisational learning based on targets that were not quite delivered on, and the building of capacity in new areas - for example, commitments where organisations did not initially set targets, but have now been able to expand their ways of working into.

Ensure meaningful buy-in and commitment from across the organisation - and avoid setting targets just to 'look good'.

Where targets are set for the sake of setting them, but without sincere efforts made to meaningfully work towards progress or follow up on targets, there is a risk that targets become a form of 'greenwashing' that gives the impression of positive movement without real action to back it up. Ensuring that relevant stakeholders understand not only the importance of setting targets, but the importance of making the commitments a reality, is likely to be the best way to mitigate this.

There is no one right way to set targets

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that there are many different approaches that can be taken towards setting targets against, and making a reality of, the Charter commitments. **There is no one right way to set targets, or one correct set of activities that organisations should focus on.** Though a number of organisations have used approaches described within this report successfully, different methods may work for different organisations, and embracing the current position, capacities, and ethos of each individual organisation is likely to be the best recipe for success.

Annex 1. Methodology

The approach to this review revolved around a consideration of the activities and experiences of six organisations. The Charter Secretariat issued a call for participation to Charter signatories, inviting organisations that had set targets to take part in the research. To be eligible for inclusion in the review, organisations were required to:

- Have been a signatory to the Climate and Environment Charter for at least 12 months.
- Have already published targets on the Climate and Environment Charter website.
- Demonstrate some form of action towards these targets, whether through reporting, revision, or programmatic implementation.

From among the organisations that volunteered, selection was conducted with the aim of capturing a diverse range of organisations, considering: organisational structure (federations and single organisations); size; and location (both local and national organisations and international organisations, headquartered in the Global North and Global South).

These criteria were established to ensure that the selected case studies reflected meaningful engagement with the Charter's commitments, allowing for a richer understanding of the target-setting process and its practical implications.

Case Study Review

Once the six organisations had been selected, the overall review consisted of four key elements:

1. **Literature review**: the review team conducted a literature review, focused on the process of setting and using targets to drive progress within humanitarian organisations and other climate-focused initiatives. This included a review of approaches to targets taken within other humanitarian commitment-based initiatives such as Grand Bargain and Charter for Change, as well as academic literature on benefits and obstacles of effective target-setting, and the process of target-setting itself, focusing on climate change related targets where possible.

   Documents in the review included both academic and practitioner literature, centring on articles including themes of target-setting, humanitarian targets, developing target strategies, indicator setting, indicators and standards in development, objective setting, the Charter for Change, the Core Humanitarian Standards and the Grand Bargain. In total, more than 14 documents were systematically reviewed using a mixture of inductive and deductive coding. The

review aimed to identify barriers, enablers, and success factors relating to target-based approaches to organisational improvement and change.

2. **Questionnaire:** Participating organisations completed an online survey, outlining their current activities against the six commitments, and the approaches that they were taking to setting and using targets. They also provided the team with background documentation related to their process of setting and following up on targets, including examples of strategic planning or monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) documents related to their activities under the Charter.

3. **Key informant interviews:** The review team conducted a total of 18 semi-structured key informant interviews across the six participating organisations, with between two and four participating representatives from each organisation.

The guiding questions for these interviews were as follows:

- What **activities** are organisations undertaking in order to meet the commitments of the Charter?
- What was **the process of setting targets** against the Charter commitments like?
    - **Who** was involved, and what were the **steps followed**?
    - How did organisations **decide what to capture in targets**, and what **type of targets** did they choose to set?
- How do organisations **monitor or follow up** on their progress against set targets, and how do these targets connect to wider organisational structures, procedures and ways of working?
- What do those involved in work connected to the Charter understand to be the **value or purpose of having set targets** against the commitments?
- What **learnings or recommendations** are emerging that could support **organisations who have newly signed** the Charter and are seeking to develop their first set of targets, or those who are looking to **revise** their existing targets?

Table 1: Case Study Organisations

Organisation	Date of Charter Signature	Organisation Type
CAFOD	October 2021	Faith-based international NGO with UK headquarters, typically working through partners
CARE International (CARE Climate Justice Centre)	July 2021	Global confederation of 14 National Members and 4 Affiliates, with US headquarters, working through direct implementation as well as through partners.
Nabd Development and Evolution Organisation (NDEO)	June 2022	National NGO operating in Yemen, established in 2019 focusing on multi-sector humanitarian and development efforts.
Swedish Red Cross (SRC)	July 2021	Swedish Red Cross National Society, part of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. SRC operates in Sweden through a network of volunteers, as well as internationally, by collaborating with other Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.
Welthungerhilfe (WHH)	July 2021	International NGO focusing on food security, headquartered in Germany with a number of country offices, typically focusing on direct implementation.
Zamzam Foundation	September 2021	National humanitarian organisation operating in Somalia for over 30 years, focusing on health, education, economic development and peacebuilding.

4. **Focus Group Discussion:** Finally, the review team held a focus group discussion on target-setting in the context of the Charter at a workshop co-hosted by the Climate and Environment Charter Secretariat, the ADAPT Initiative, and Community World Service Asia. This workshop, titled "**Mainstreaming climate and environmental considerations in humanitarian action**" was held in Bangkok in December 2024, and brought together a number of organisations operating in the Asia-Pacific region to consider and exchange experiences in operationalising the Charter.

In addition, an analysis of the best practices and activities undertaken by workshop participants was carried out to identify approaches to meeting the commitments that were distinct from those taken by case study organisations. A supplementary

documentation review was undertaken for three organisations who participated in the workshop (Foundation for Rural Development Pakistan, Islamic Relief Bangladesh, and COAST).

Analysis

The interviews were transcribed, and these transcripts and other documents were coded in MaxQDA by the review team using a mix of deductive coding (based on the literature review and the experience of team members) and inductive coding (based on the contents of the interviews themselves).

The thematic analysis approach which was employed sought to identify illustrative examples of activities that the organisations were taking to fulfil the commitments, as well as recurrent themes and areas of divergence connected to target-setting approaches.

Potential limitations

The main limitations included:

- The relatively small sample size of case study organisations (which means that the experience of the organisations is illustrative, but not representative of Charter signatories as a whole);
- Challenges with institutional memory relating to the process of initial target-setting due to staff turnover (which made it difficult to obtain answers on some elements of the target-setting process); and
- Challenges in separating organisational processes connected to the Charter from those connected to wider climate and environmental workstreams within a given organisation.

These were mitigated as far as possible by purposively selecting organisations representing national, international, partner-based and federated organisational structures to ensure as broad a set of illustrative examples as possible, and by conducting multiple interviews per case study organisation, and comparing interviews with internal documentation, in order to build as complete a picture as possible of the target-setting process.

Annex 2. Bibliography of Reviewed Articles

Dahlmann, F. (2023) Corporate Carbon Targets: The Role of Goal Setting in Driving Organisational Change for Climate Change. In The Handbook of Climate Change Leadership in Organisations: Developing Leadership for the Age of Sustainability (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003343011

Dufour C, Geoffroy V, Maury H, Grünewald F. Rights, standards and quality in a complex humanitarian space: is Sphere the right tool? Disasters. 2004 Jun;28(2):124-41. doi: 10.1111/j.0361-3666.2004.00248.x. PMID: 15186360.

Dutch Relief Alliance (2024) Lessons Learned from the Risk Sharing Pilot in Humanitarian Programming, available at: https://dutchrelief.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Lessons-Learned-from-the-Risk-Sharing-Pilot-in-Humanitartian-Programming.pdf

Dutch Relief Alliance (2024) Grand Bargain 3.0: The story of the Dutch Relief Alliance: https://voiceeu.org/publications/grand-bargain-30-the-story-of-the-dutch-relief-alliance.pdf

Eubank, D. (2023) Sustainable Goal Setting for Climate Action: What Leaders Value Defines How They Take Action. In Driving Organisational Change for Climate Change in The Handbook of Climate Change Leadership in Organisations: Developing Leadership for the Age of Sustainability (1st ed.). Routledge

International Rescue Committee (2018) Seven steps to scaling cash relief: Driving outcomes and efficiency, available at: https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/2747/irccashbrief12ppfinal.pdf

Mair S, Jones A, Ward J et al (2018) A Critical Review of the Role of Indicators in Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals. In: Leal Filho W (Ed) Handbook of Sustainability Science and Research. World Sustainability Series. Springer, Cham: 41-56. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63007-6_3

Metcalfe-Hough, V., Fenton, W. and Manji, F. (2023) The Grand Bargain in 2022: an independent review. HPG commissioned report. London: ODI, available at: www.odi.org/en/publications/thegrandbargainin2022anindependentreview

Montier, E., Weingärtner, l. and Klassen, S. (2022) The Potential for Anticipatory Action and Disaster Risk Finance: Guiding the Setting of Humanitarian Targets, available at: https://www.preventionweb.net/publication/potential-anticipatory-action-and-disaster-risk-finance-guiding-setting-humanitarian

Nadig, A. (2021) How standards contribute to the humanitarian sector in Otegui, D.F., & Yoder-Bontrager, D. (Eds.). (2021). The Humanitarian Machine: Reflections from Practice (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003139867

Sonny S. Patel, Bernard McCaul, Gabriela Cáceres, Laura E.R. Peters, Ronak B. Patel, Aaron Clark-Ginsberg, Delivering the promise of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (FCAC): A case study of the NGO GOAL's response to the Syria conflict, Progress in Disaster Science, Volume 10, 2021, 100172, ISSN 2590-0617, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2021.100172.

Tiernan, A. Irwin, K. Weatherhogg, A. & Agyeman, A.M. (2024) Shifting Power in Aid - How Christian Aid is Contributing to Locally Led Development: Progress 2023/24, available at: https://www.christianaid.org.uk/sites/default/files/2024-10/shifting-power-in-aid-.pdf

UN Water (2024) SDG 6 Country Acceleration Case Study Jordan, available at: https://www.unwater.org/publications/country-acceleration-case-study-Jordan

UNDRR (2020). Monitoring the Implementation of Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030: A Snapshot of Reporting for 2018. Bonn, Germany. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), available at: https://www.undrr.org/publication/monitoring-implementation-sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030-snapshot

Other (unpublished) resources included review of KPIs, published research, and MEAL documents from case study organisations.