CONSULTATIONS ON THE CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT CHARTER FOR HUMANITARIAN ORGANIZATIONS: SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK AND REVISIONS

March 26, 2021

World cloud: *What is the most important issue you would like to see in the charter?*
Results from open consultation with the humanitarian sector: February 9th, 2021.

Introduction

Between December 2020 and March 2021 consultations on the draft Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations have been held through approximately 20 virtual events, several bilateral discussions and via an online form. Over 200 people have been consulted, with detailed feedback provided by over 150 organizations. These consultations led to a revised version of the charter (Draft 2), which was redistributed for final comments. A number of organizations indicated that they were pleased with the second draft. Comments from a small number of NGOs, RCRC National Societies and UN Agencies led to minor revisions, outlined in Annex II.

This document provides an overview of the feedback received on Draft 1 and Draft 2. It highlights the major tension points that have been raised and how they have been addressed in the revised Charter.

Throughout the consultation period, feedback on the draft Charter has been extremely positive. Participants have welcomed the initiative and emphasized the importance of addressing the climate and environmental crises as a sector. Organizations have expressed appreciation for the format and content of the document, and a significant majority have conveyed their willingness to adopt the Charter. The consultative process has also received positive feedback. Many organizations have noted that being able to see an early draft and to provide inputs have been useful to internal efforts to reinforce the importance of integrating climate and environmental considerations into humanitarian action.

Respondents have generally agreed that the draft is ambitious, clear, people-centric, and balanced. When asked during the open consultation for the humanitarian sector whether the Charter would be useful for their organization, 84 percent of respondents said "yes" and 16 percent, "not sure". No organization indicated that the Charter would not be useful for them.

The formulation of **Commitment 1** has attracted the most feedback, centered around the need to emphasize the importance of risk reduction and to clarify the boundaries of this commitment in

relation to environmental implications, along with considerations related to the need for tools to guide implementation and questions related to monitoring and accountability. Substantial feedback was also received on feedback on **Commitment 2, Commitment 3, and Commitment 7**.

Consultation Summary

The development of the Charter has been guided by an Advisory Committee of 19 local and national NGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies, academics, researchers, and experts in the humanitarian, development, climate and environmental fields. The Drafting Team has led 19 live consultations and presentations on the draft Charter. These consultations have been conducted for members of various networks including InterAction, ICVA, the IASC sub working group on climate change and Réseau Environnement Humanitaire; for members of the RCRC Movement in French, English and Spanish and Arabic; for UN agencies; with local humanitarian NGOs; and for the broader humanitarian sector. A consultation form has been available in English, French, Arabic, and Spanish, accompanied by the draft Charter in each of these four languages, since the end of January for organizations and individuals to provide feedback. These presentations and online consultations have allowed 154 organizations to provide feedback (See Annex III for a full list).

RCRC National Societies	**33**	• *National Societies from every region submitted feedback in English, French, Spanish, and Arabic.*
International NGOs	**29**	• *International NGOs provided feedback through the online form, during our open consultations, and through consultations held with the support of humanitarian networks and umbrella organizations.*
National NGO and INGO local/regional chapters	**57**	• *National NGOs and local chapters of INGOs were included in open consultations. Local consultations were held with organizations in South Sudan and India.*
Humanitarian Networks	**9**	• *Networks including ICVA, REH, URD, SCHR and InterAction co-hosted consultations and/or disseminated the draft throughout their memberships.*
UN Agencies and offices	**13**	• *The Charter was discussed in the IASC climate change sub-working group and brought to the attention of IASC members at the IASC RG3 and OPAG meetings. A consultation for UN agencies was held in late February.*
Other (researchers, academics, government agencies)	**15**	• *Academics, researchers, and representatives of government organizations with an interest in the Charter attended our open consultations and provided feedback online.*

Tension Points and Key Issues

Most of the feedback received focused on Commitments 1, 2, 3, and 7, with remaining comments largely addressing the general tone and structure of the Charter. This section summarizes the key

points raised and how they have been addressed in the revised draft. For a more comprehensive table of comments, please refer to Annex I.

Commitment 1

Feedback: Commitment 1 attracted the most feedback of any element of the Charter. This was expected, given that this commitment is the most critical to the core work and mandate of humanitarian organisations. It was suggested to rephrase the heading to better clarify the objective of the commitment, and remove the word "cope" to reflect the larger ambitions of the commitment. There were suggestions to focus the commitment on adaptation, noting that this is and will be the main contribution by the humanitarian sector, and in particular to clearly highlight our role in meeting rising humanitarian needs. Some felt that the commitment was too broad and should be divided. Others felt strongly that the issues are interlinked and should not be siloed. Many called for a stronger emphasis on the importance of strengthening risk management and anticipatory action, and for linking to longer-term development efforts. needs. Suggestions were also made to clarify the meaning of resilience.

What has changed: The revised Charter seeks to address these concerns in several ways. The word "cope" is no longer used, and the commitment's heading explicitly calls for the sector to step up our support for adaptation efforts and our role in meeting rising humanitarian needs. The text of the commitment now clearly emphasizes the focus on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, and links the need to reduce risk and vulnerability to our ways of working through anticipatory action, preparedness and longer-term response. The commitment more clearly specifies how we achieve this through integrating climate and environmental science, data, and local and indigenous knowledge into our programmes and operations.

Commitment 2

Feedback: Feedback on this commitment largely focused on the impact the Charter would have on how organizations operate. The reference to the 2050 target of net zero emissions attracted significant attention. Many organizations expressed concern that this target was not ambitious enough. Some were concerned that the inclusion of any specific targets would make the adoption more difficult. It was underscored that reaching net zero would rely on support and cooperation with actors beyond the direct influence of the humanitarian sector, and there were several questions about the use of carbon off-setting and other tools to achieve this objective. Many flagged that the Charter could be used as a tool for internal advocacy for stronger environmental policies within organizations, but that implementation would require tools, guidance, and support. It was suggested that referring to environmental and climate sustainability in the heading of the commitment did not reflect the reality of an unstable climate, and that the target should more explicitly refer to the centrality of greenhouse gas emissions.

What has changed: The reference to the 2050 target of net zero emissions has been removed. This addresses concerns both that it is not ambitious enough, and that its inclusion would complicate adoption. Suggested targets that both reference and exceed the 2050 target of net-zero emissions will accompany the Charter to guide the development of organization-specific targets.

A call for reducing greenhouse gas emissions is now included in the heading, and the role of carbon-offsetting is framed as a tool to be used only to compensate for unavoidable emissions. The new text refers to maximizing environmental sustainability, rather than environmental *and climate* sustainability, and directly references the principle of "do no harm."

Commitment 3

Feedback: This commitment attracted significant feedback on how the term "working closely" meant in practice and on how to best frame this critical collaboration. Feedback from National RCRC Societies and local NGOs noted the need to ensure that collaboration was meaningful and inclusive. It was suggested that the Charter should clarify that communities alone are not responsible for their resilience, and that the role and responsibilities of others to are acknowledged. There was broad consensus on the importance of integrating local and indigenous knowledge. It was also suggested that the Charter better recognize the right of communities to accessing information about the risks they face. With respect to this commitment and the Charter more broadly, it was suggested that the Charter should use the term "community" intentionally and sparingly.

What has changed: The revised Charter speaks of embracing the leadership of local actors and communities in climate and environmental action, language intended to incorporate both respecting and actively enabling or promoting, where relevant. The text further clarifies our responsibility by referring to the inclusive and meaningful participation and leadership of people at risk. References to communities have been contextualized, and where possible defined. To address feedback about sharing information, the revised draft notes the role of humanitarian organizations in supporting people to be better prepared for climate and environmental risks. The importance of local and indigenous knowledge remains critical to this commitment and to Commitment 1.

Commitments 4 and 5

Feedback: While broadly accepting of the language noted in these commitments, a number of organizations noted the importance of increasing our own capacity and producing accessible data as a prerequisite for more effective action.

What has changed: Following feedback on Draft 2 the order of commitments 4 and 5 have been swapped. Commitment 4 now refers to increasing our capacity, and commitment 5 to working collaboratively across and beyond the humanitarian sector.

Commitment 7

Feedback: Many organizations asked about the obligations and timelines attached to the Charter, demonstrating the need for further clarity on these elements in our communication around the Charter, or potentially in the Charter itself. It was suggested that the Charter needs to recognize that the development of baselines and targets will take time and that organizations adopting the Charter should therefore not be expected to provide these the moment they adopt the Charter. In

addition to developing minimal and ambitious targets to accompany the Charter, some organizations suggested developing a benchmarking system of measuring compliance with targets and the relative level of ambition between the targets various organizations set. It was also suggested that this commitment should also underscore that organizations should be held accountable to targets that they have set internally, notably by the people with whom we work.

What has changed: In the revised Charter this commitment recognizes the importance of accountability to people with whom we work in its first sentence. The commitment preserves the urgency of the charter by committing to rapidly develop targets and action plans while acknowledging that this process will take time. The commitment maintains a pledge to invest necessary resources and now notes that the support of donors will be essential.

General Comments

Reflecting different capacities

Throughout the consultations, it was noted that the capacities of organizations of varied scale and mandates to operationalize the Charter will be highly variable and that this needs to be clearly reflected. It was suggested that communities of practice and other methods of exchange to pool knowledge and resources, contextualize commitments, and nurture cooperation accompany the charter after its adoption. The revised text aims to reflect this through Commitments 2 and 5 that commit to providing greater support, while Commitment 4 speaks of producing and sharing data and analysis wherever it is feasible to address capacity disparities.

Working with partners beyond the humanitarian community

Participants noted that the ability of organizations to fulfill their commitments may be dependent on external factors related to progress in other sectors, specifically those of shipping, logistics and procurement, and government investment, as well as the willingness of donors to support this transition. In the revised Charter references to the critical role of donors have been added to Commitments 5 and 7, and working with partners beyond the humanitarian sector remains the core objective of Commitment 5.

Furthermore, many have asked if the Charter could be adopted by non-humanitarian organizations, e.g. development organizations, whilst others felt that the charter would be most effective if specifically focused on the humanitarian community. Following a discussion on the rationale for a focus on humanitarian organizations, this approach appeared to receive broad consensus, so the focus on the humanitarian sector was maintained. The introduction makes clear that signatories will be humanitarian organizations. Further clarity on this point can be found in the Q&A that has been produced alongside the revised draft.

Climate justice and Loss and Damage

A number of organizations called for more explicit recognition of the responsibility of wealthy countries in contributing to the climate crisis, and therefore of their responsibility to address its

consequences. While being sensitive to the politics surrounding these issues, the revised text recognizes that those who have contributed least to the problem are hit hardest by the impacts and includes a call to address loss and damage associated with the impacts of the climate and environmental crises.

Donor reactions and funding implications

Organizations have expressed concern that the funding required for making humanitarian action more climate-sensitive would not be additional but would reduce the funds available for critical humanitarian functions, putting capacity to respond at risk. Organizations have emphasized the importance of preserving the humanitarian sector's ability to respond to emergencies while adapting their programs to be more climate sensitive.

As referenced above, the revised Charter includes several additional references to the critical role of donors. The text of Commitment 7 notes the transition and maintenance costs that these commitments will require. The Charter reaffirms the importance of maintaining the sector's ability to respond to emergencies in Commitment 2.

References to IHL, SDGs, human rights and other frameworks

The Charter currently refers to the Paris Agreement, Sendai Agreement, SDGs, and "other relevant international agreements, including international human rights law and international humanitarian law" in the introduction. Some organizations have called for an explicit reference to the SDGs to be included in the body of the Charter and to be referenced in the targets that will accompany it.

The revised Charter maintains the reference to those frameworks that are most widely relevant, but as the list of potentially relevant frameworks is long, we have decided not to expand it.

ANNEX I: Summary of feedback on Draft 1

General comments and answers to guiding questions

Comment	Action or response?
Are the structure, length and format of the Charter suitable?	
Can we better distinguish the two core commitments from the 5 that follow?	We do note the distinction between these, but there was strong feedback that **all** the commitments are essential, therefore no change has been made.
Why a charter and not a declaration of principles?	Identifying the best way to frame or describe this document has not been simple. When we sought specific feedback on this, a charter appeared to have general support and there was no indication of greater support for an alternate, so the title has been kept as charter.
	Although the commitments in the Charter are voluntary, we feel that framing them in a Charter lends them an urgency and necessity that is appropriate to the scale of the crises we face.
What does it mean to sign on to the Charter?	The Charter is a statement of commitment. Organizations signing on to the Charter should be committed to addressing the climate and environment crises, both in the programs they implement and the way they work. Organizations will be expected to sign on to the Charter and indicate when they will realistically be able to establish targets to measure its implementation.
Are we are missing important elements? If so, which ones?	
We need to highlight the necessity of measuring the impact of our activities. Resources and tool sharing will be critical to help smaller organizations meet their commitments.	This is a critical component of the Charter. We have incorporated references to measuring our impacts and sharing tools throughout the text, most explicitly in Commitment 2, Commitment 4, Commitment 5, and Commitment 6. We will expand on this element in an accompanying document outlining suggested targets.
We need to explicitly mention national authorities, donors, and the "role of everyone": logisticians, fleet managers, technicians, management.	We have added a reference to national authorities in Commitment 5 and bolstered language noting the role of everyone throughout the text. In the introduction we speak of "galvanizing collective action" and in Commitment 6 we call for ambitious action at all levels.

The importance of indigenous and local knowledge and expertise could be emphasized more.	In Commitment 1 we speak of local and indigenous knowledge as part of our commitment to increasing effectiveness. We also note its importance in Commitment 3 on local leadership.
Loss and damage, specifically addressing contexts where it is very difficult to reduce emissions, and the economic dimension of how state and non-state actors benefit by adopting the commitments.	See reference in the introduction to addressing loss and damage associated with the impacts of the crises.
Cross-sector and cross-theme: Can we mention peace and conflict actors? Can we discuss the issue of gender? How can we reference COVID-19? How can the Charter align with the SDGs?	We believe it is critical to work across and beyond the humanitarian sector. Commitment 5 lists several essential partners. Noting that an exhaustive list of critical issues would be impossible to include, we have strengthened reference to social situations and positionality, health, and the importance of protecting the rights and lives of future generations.
Is the level of ambition right?	
Yes: the commitments here are high level, needed, and in line with donor requirements. **But:** concerns about being over ambitious in setting targets and being unable to operationalize them, especially organizations without an existing environmental lens. Achieving these ambitions will be dependent on enhancing the capacity of local actors.	We have removed the reference to the 2050 target and will expand on targets that are feasible and ambitious in an accompanying document. We have tried to reflect an ambitious and urgent tone in the text, while acknowledging that implementing and operationalizing changes will take time and that different organizations will have different starting points (Commitment 4, 5, 6). The role of local actors is central to the Charter and reflected throughout.
Important to note that while limiting our footprint would shift our ways of working and change our approaches, this must not be "at the expense of our humanitarian mission and mandate."	It is important that the Charter recognize and highlight our responsibilities as humanitarian organizations first and foremost. This point informs the language in the introduction and is explicitly stated in Commitment 2.
Would your organization find this Charter useful? How would you incorporate the Charter into your organizational goals/commitments?	
Yes: It is raising critical issues, orienting action and can be used in advocacy. This charter would inform internal climate action plans, be incorporated into global strategies, governance and advocacy programmes, and form a common commitment by humanitarian agencies. **But: questions around practicality**. There are several charters/compacts relating to climate and environment in the NGO space. The value-add of signing this one will have to be clear. What is the specific ask of the Charter?	Details on how to operationalize the Charter will come from many sources: organizations themselves are working on this kind of guidance, and the Charter will be accompanied by tools and suggested targets. The Charter asks us to commit to changing how we work and how we relate to the earth. It is intended to be a living document that remains relevant into the future. It does not replace other initiatives but rather serves as a flag around which the sector can rally all its efforts to address these crises.

Is the tone and language right? Is the text sufficiently people centric and focused on our role as humanitarian organizations?	
The climate crisis is very much a humanitarian crisis and calls for action that both alleviates suffering and makes our response more effective, localized and sustainable. It could note "double-burden" of vulnerable populations who require assistance *and* are at risk of any consequences to that assistance that a greening process might entail.	We have reviewed the document to ensure clear references to the heightened risk of those who have contributed least to climate change. We have also made note of our responsibility to protect lives and strengthened the language referring to our identities as humanitarian organizations. In Commitment 1 we pledge to focus on "those who are the most at risk," and in Commitment 2 make sure to stress the need to maintain our ability to provide "timely and principled humanitarian assistance."
It could focus more on climate justice. The main issue will be whether the transparent enforcement of environmental legislation as well the responsibility of industrial countries will be encouraged.	As humanitarian organizations, our focus is on those most vulnerable who, as we note, often contribute least to climate change. Making sure that we act collectively to address the needs of these communities is one way to address the fundamental injustice of how these crises are felt. In the text we also refer to Loss and Damage, implying a link to addressing disparities in cause and cost.
The language is currently very much couched in crisis and risk. There may be benefits to promoting positive language about the kind of world we are working towards.	We have included positive action focused language where possible and note the imperative to protect the lives and rights of future generations. We have consolidated our reference to risk and focused on making language action-oriented. In Commitment 4, we have also referred to potential opportunities. However, we also believe that these crises are among the most severe we have or will ever face and believe this document should reflect that gravity.
We should note the right that communities have to information on the risks they face. Informed communities are best-placed to address crises and change circumstances.	We have endeavoured to address this issue in the text. This need is now reflected most clearly in Commitment 3, where we pledge that our action will be guided by the leadership and experience of local actors and communities at risk. We commit to supporting them in better preparing for the risks they will face, and to ensuring meaningful and inclusive participation and local leadership throughout programme cycle. In Commitment 5 we now pledge to share our knowledge and insights to help shape people-centred, climate resilient and inclusive development.
Can we clarify definitions and terminology? For example, what do we mean by "resilience"?	To address this concern, the Charter is accompanied by a terminology in annex, and we have simplified language throughout the new draft wherever possible.
Is it clear that this charter is equally applicable to local and international humanitarian organizations, while recognizing the differences in power, capacities and funding and the need to address this imbalance?	
Explicitly calling for the full participation of local organizations in this charter **while** acknowledging power dynamics and different capacities would strengthen the text.	We have worked to address this concern in Commitments 2 and 5, where we pledge to embrace the leadership of local actors and communities, commit to providing our support, note the importance of meaningful participation, and pledge to enhance

9

	cooperation across the sector. In Commitment 4 we also speak of sharing data as one way to address capacity disparities.

What kind of targets would be useful to include? On which specific elements?
Specific recommendations on targets: • **Average annual reduction targets** (%) or targets per specific type of interventions • **GHG emissions** (quantative) • **Community Engagement** (qualitative) • **Localization and building local resilience** (quantitative/qualitative): minimum % of resources to local level, • **Measuring the evidence of risk analysis informing programmatic design and operational practices**. • **Capacity support target:** minimum percentage or resources spent for capacity strengthening activities for the local level.
Engagement with the private sector to invest in climate resilience across value-chains.
Milestones and benchmarking systems for charter signatories to set their own targets and for charter members to achieve joint goals would be useful. The idea of having minimal targets would be very interesting; they don't have to be mandatory but can provide guidance.
Targets should be science based, leverage existing targets, and build on the common agenda of the SDGs.

What form of support/guidance (please specify) would you require to adopt and implement the commitments in the Charter?
Carbon accounting, waste management tools, baseline measuring tools, and science-based targets.
Establishment of communities of practice around implementing and monitoring the Charter. Coming up with commitments will be difficult for networks and alliances of organizations with very different capacities, and sector-wide support will be key.
Communication tools that present each commitment with existing examples/success stories/best practices. Training on advocacy, institutional capacity building and strengthening, situational preparedness and response on climate change mitigation and adaptation matched to the commitments in the Charter.
Clarity on enforcement measures, monitoring and reporting mechanisms, signatory window, support modality.
Opportunities to socialize the Charter: translations, clarity on branding and ownership, a website, webinars, fact sheet and Q&A.

10

Specific comments on the text

Comment	Action – comments take on board, how / why?
INTRODUCTION	
The introduction focuses on environmental degradation that results from climate change. Can we refer to environmental degradation resulting from other types of pollution as well?	Throughout the text we refer to the environmental and climate **crises**. We recognize that there are a plethora of crises and in the introduction refer to some of them by listing what we need to do to change—namely cut emissions, halt environmental degradation, adapt to risk, and address loss and damage.
Can we clarify that humanitarian organizations will still respond, but will struggle to meet rising needs?	We now say that as local, national and international humanitarian organizations, we are deeply worried about the scale of the crises and our capacity to respond to rising needs.
The Charter should acknowledge the scale of the threats we are facing. Our future is at risk even if we immediately halt all emissions.	We now open the introduction by noting that these crises threaten the very survival of humanity.
The text needs to stress that the poorest and most vulnerable are the most affected, while having contributed least to the crisis, and therefore the need for justice L&D. The alleviation of poverty is crucial to adaptation. At the same time, we are all already in a crisis, not just "them."	In the first paragraph of the introduction we note that the crises affect all aspects of **our** lives, but that those least responsible are often most at risk. We raise the need to address loss and damage in the second paragraph. We now also note our responsibility to protect the lives and rights of present and future generations.
PURPOSE	
What do we mean by the word "community"?	Where possible we have replaced references to communities with more specific language and now use it only twice (in under Commitment 2, on embracing local leadership). In both cases we have provided further contextualization.
We need to be firm *and* flexible when speaking of commitments and should make expectations clear and language inclusive.	We have clarified the language about commitments and expectations and note specifically the importance of individual capacity and mandate.
Can we include references to other existing frameworks and concepts, such as the Precautionary Principle, Convention on Biological Diversity / Global Biodiversity Framework?	Although these frameworks inform much of the work behind the Charter, it would be impossible to provide an exhaustive list of relevant frameworks. Those that are explicitly named are among the broadest and most widely relevant. We envision that other frameworks will be referenced in specific targets that organizations develop to put the Charter into practice.
COMMITMENT 1	
We need to strengthen the top line and revisit the word "cope." Possible reframing to commit to making all programmers and operations climate-smart	We have removed the word "cope" and rephrased the Commitment. Without using the specific term "climate-smart" we have tried to strengthen the Commitment to cover that and

	other requirements around anticipatory action, recovery, and specific vulnerabilities of individuals and populations.
Can we clarify our reference to risk analysis and risk reduction and highlight intersecting risk, sharing data, and anticipatory action?	We have more clearly referred to reducing risk and addressing vulnerabilities in the revised text by, among other changes, bringing the mention of risk into the headline. We expand on the need to share information in Commitments 4 and 5.
The Charter might refer directly to the Global Commission on Adaptation's principles for locally-led adaptation. The importance of indigenous and local knowledge and expertise could be emphasized more.	We have strengthened the Charter's references to local and indigenous knowledge in Commitment 1 and Commitment 3 to reflect its importance. Although we have not explicitly referenced the locally-led adaptation principles they will inform the tools and suggested targets that will accompany the Charter.
We need stronger and clearer references to gender, migration, displacement, poverty, conflict.	We distinguish between individual characteristics and people's situation and acknowledge how both have great bearing on their vulnerability to risk.
COMMITMENT 2	
For environmental mainstreaming to be structurally implemented it must be embraced by leadership. How can we reflect this?	By referencing the importance of "sound environmental policies" we are calling on policymakers, including those at headquarters, to better account for climate and environmental considerations.
Is it necessary to include the reference to the 2050 target? There are concerns about ambition **and** feasibility: the practicality of net zero emissions as NGOs, what role donors play in reaching net zero emissions, the role of offsetting. However, we know the 2050 target is not sufficient.	We have removed the explicit reference to the 2050 target, primarily because we repeatedly heard that it is not ambitious enough, but also because a few organizations question their ability to achieve such targets in the absence of broader changes to transports, production, etc. We will be suggesting the adopting of ambitious targets, recognizing that this will have to be adapted to organizational capacity. On offsetting we now say we will measure and significantly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, in line with global goals, and only afterwards seek to compensate for unavoidable emissions by supporting high quality emission reduction projects.,
How can we reflect the reality that we do not have a stable climate, so cannot really be sustainable? What does it mean to be environmentally sustainable?	We now contextualize the reference to sustainability by calling for organizations to "maximize" our environmental sustainability. With respect to climate, we note the specific role reducing emissions has and commit to significantly reducing emissions while taking "all feasible measures" to avoid, minimize, and manage our impact.
COMMITMENT 3	
We need to be more explicit about what "working closely" means.	We have reworked this commitment to better describe what we intend to do and address problematic language. We now insist on embracing local leadership, supporting people,

12

	learning from local, traditional and indigenous knowledge, and ensuring meaningful and inclusive participation.
We must be careful not to imply that communities alone are responsible for their own resilience, as this is also the responsibility of governments, civil society, private need language referencing supporting national authorities).	We have reworded the commitment to more clearly spell out how we relate to communities and clarify that we are not putting the burden on them alone: rather, this commitment commits us to embrace local leadership, provide support, and learn. We now reference the important role of authorities and other partners in Commitment 5.
COMMITMENT 4 (Commitment 5 in previous drafts)	
Living up to the Charter may require a mental shift from all of us.	In Commitment 7 we say that shifting our ways of working may "entail changes in our mindset and approaches." The importance of knowledge—where it comes from, how we share it, and what we do with it—is an essential piece of the Charter.
With regards to communication, can we emphasize that information disseminated must be understandable to all, user-focused, demand driven, and include local knowledge?	Using communications and IT adequately plays a key role in risk reduction. We refer explicitly to sharing relevant and accessible data and analysis when feasible. In Commitment 3 we note the importance of helping people better understand risks, including by sharing knowledge. We also note the importance of meaningful and inclusive participation in all elements of programming.
COMMITMENT 5 (Commitment 4 in previous drafts)	
How does this commitment change how things are done? What will be different?	We have simplified this commitment to articulate the breadth of collaboration, making specific reference to the importance of cooperation between local, national and international actors, and to sharing knowledge and insight, two channels where current efforts are not sufficient.
Can we be clearer about who we intend to work with?	We reference donors explicitly to recognize that their support will be essential. We do not attempt an exhaustive list, as any list we come up with will either be incomplete or made redundant in the future, but note that we must work with environmental, development, and human rights actors, international financial institutions, researchers, the private sector, and donors. We intend for this commitment to drive broad, deep, active collaboration wherever and whenever necessary or beneficial.
COMMITMENT 6	
What is the link between this Commitment and Commitment 3?	We call for decision-making to be informed by evidence of people's experience to reflect the need to bring in the voices of affected communities.

How do we strengthen this Commitment without qualifying it based on organizations' mandates and capacities? Can we refer to many types of measures beyond only agreements? .	We have removed the reference to mandates and capacities here and broadened our call for better implementation to include international agreements, national laws, policies, and plans. Our call is now to actors "at all levels" to reflect ambition and urgency,
COMMITMENT 7	
Can we strengthen the reference to accountability?	We now commit to rigorously measure our impact and rapidly ensure our commitments are translated into targets and action plans. We have added language noting the need to "seek feedback from the people we serve" to reflect the importance of accountability to local actors and communities.
Why don't we refer explicitly to the role of the RCRC movement and other major organizations in mitigation these efforts? Does supporting each other refer to partners too?	This Charter is a sector-wide document and does not explicitly name any organization, network, or movement. We must all support one another, as a sector, to meet our commitments, including mitigation efforts.
What do we mean by "we will invest"? Changes in how we work might also bring savings and benefits of working more effectively (less resources wasted, less time spent on travel etc.)	Shifting our ways of working may entail significant transition and maintenance costs, and therefore support and investment. We also expand on the term "invest" to mean "the necessary resources to achieve our commitments…"
What other targets and standards do we envision beyond those related to measuring and reducing our GHG emissions?	A series of suggested targets is being developed and will accompany the charter. In addition to emissions standards we have heard calls for targets on, among other things, community engagement, localization, M&E, and capacity building.
ANNEX: Terminology	
Climate and Environmental Crises: Can refer to formation and transmission of zoonotic disease.	
Environmental Sustainability: Should emphasize the need to maintain essential ecosystem goods and services (there are five).	
Mitigation: It does not directly 'reduce the rate of climate change'. It eliminates or offsets emissions.	
Resilience: Broader definition required, as UNDRR definition is focused on disaster reduction. Here we should refer to. Climate, social and community resilience aspects.	
Nature-based solutions: If included, definition needed.	

ANNEX II: Summary of feedback on Draft 2

Most feedback on the second draft of the Charter was extremely positive. Comments that echoed points already raised on previous drafts are reflected above. New comments that led to revisions to the second draft are listed below.

Comment	Action – comments take on board, how / why?
INTRODUCTION	
Can we use this section to ensure that the scope of the crises and the types of action we need to take are fully reflected?	The text references the need to halt biodiversity loss in addition to existing references to emissions, environmental degradation, adaptation, and loss and damage.
How can we stress the need to accelerate efforts and match the enormity of these challenges?	The charter now speaks of a responsibility to accelerate our actin and mobilize others to do the same.
PURPOSE	
Is there a way to broaden our reference points to include environmental agreements that have implications for our work?	In addition to humanitarian and human rights law, the Charter now refers to environmental law in the section outlining guiding documents and standards.
COMMITMENT 1	
Recent work on resilience advocates for the management of multiple and intersecting risk of shocks and stresses across and within systems. How can we take this into account?	The text now refers to shocks and stresses, as well as longer-term changes. The heading of the commitment has also been broadened to refer to our response to growing needs and our help to people as they adapt to the impacts of these crises.
The text does not bring out the core role of humanitarian organisations in terms of their unique role and ability to respond to rising humanitarian needs	The text now starts with our commitment to step up response to growing humanitarian needs, while acknowledging that what we will have to do differently is support people to adapt. Adapt is taken here to include disaster risk reduction and anticipation, but that is explained in the explanatory text below.
COMMITMENT 2	
How can we make sure that this commitment considers the full scope of our work and activities?	The heading now refers to the environmental sustainability of our work. The commitment now also refers to the environmental impact of *all our work* when discussing the necessity to implement sound environmental policies and conduct assessments.
This commitment is broadly about our efforts to "do no harm." Can we be clear about this?	This comment has been raised throughout the drafting process. To be clear about the nature of this commitment, it now explicitly refers to the principle of "do no harm."
COMMITMENTS 4 and 5	

15

Can the Charter better reflect the fact that increasing our capacity is a prerequisite to other steps?	The order of the Charter has been modified to better reflect this logic. Charter now moves from increasing capacity, to working collaboratively, to using our influence to mobilise action.
"Working collaboratively" needs to reflect the importance continuity in both responding to emergency needs of people affected and addressing together the root causes of risks and vulnerabilities across and within sectors.	Commitment 5 (previously Commitment 4) now speaks of working across sectors to "ensure a continuum of risk management efforts."
COMMITMENT 7	
How can we stress the urgency and necessity to act, even if our actions will take time?	The Charter now calls on organizations to translate commitments into time-bound targets and action plans within a year. The text still acknowledges that organizations may need to review targets, and commits too supporting one another in the process of implementation.
ANNEX: Terminology	
We have edited the definition of Mitigation to read *Mitigation (of climate change)*. This aligns the definition with our definition for Adaptation.	

16

ANNEX III: Organizations engaged in Charter consultations

Between December 2020 and March 2021, 154 organizations attended consultations or provided feedback on the Charter. They are listed here in alphabetical order:

ACT Alliance	Caritas South Sudan
ACT Alliance MENA	Child Rights and Care Organization
ACT Forum Tanzania	Childfund India
ACTED	Church World Services
Action Contre la Faim	Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure
Action for girls and women survival (Liberia)	Colombian Red Cross Society
Action for Integrated Sustainable Development Association (Ethiopia)	Corus International
All India Disaster Management Institute	CRS
Alliance for Empowering Partnership	Danmission Tanzania
Anglican Overseas Aid	European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network	Dignidad y Justicia en el Camino A.C.
Association du développement et de la promotion de Droit de l'Homme (Mauritanie)	Dirección de Protección Civil del Municipio de San Luis Potosí (Mexico)
Association la nouvelle génération, climat (Tunisie)	DRC
Association Mauritanienne pour le Développement et l'alphabétisation (Mauritanie)	Egyptian Red Crescent Society
Australian Red Cross	EHA
Austrian Red Cross	ELCT HQ (Tanzania)
Belgian Red Cross	Empower Youth Africa (South Sudan)
British Red Cross	Environmental Law Institute (USA)
Bulgarian Red Cross	European External Action Service (resilience)
CAFOD	FAO
Canadian Red Cross	Finn Church Aid
CARE	Finnish Red Cross
Caritas Lebanon	Fondation Clarina Bastia (Haiti)

17

Foyer de Lutte Contre la Malnutrition (RDC)

French Red Cross

Fundación ASTUR (Uruguay)

Gambia Red Cross Society

Gandhigram Rural Institute-Deemed University

German Red Cross

Green Response Working Group

ICRC

ICVA

IFRC

IM Swedish Development Partner (MENA)

Independent Minds Association (Ghana)

Initiative For The Development of Africa (Ghana)

InterAction

International Catholic Migration Commission

IOM

Iraqi Red Crescent Society

IRC

Irish Red Cross

Islamic Development and Relief Agency (South Sudan)

Islamic Relief

Islamic Relief Germany

Italian Red Cross

Jamaica Red Cross

Japanese Red Cross Society

Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement Cameroun

Kenya Red Cross Society

Kulmiye Aid Foundation (Somalia)

Kuwait Red Crescent Society

Le Ville de Lyon

Loughborough University

Lutheran World Services

Lutheran World Services Cameroun

Malawi Red Cross Society

Maldivian Red Crescent Society

Manusha Desai, Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas & Co

MARS, MPN Egypt/India

MSF

MSF Greece

MSF Lebanon

National Bureau of Asian Research (India)

National Institute of Disaster Management (India)

Nigerian Red Cross Society

Nile Sustainable Development Organization (South Sudan)

Norwegian Church Aid

Norwegian People's Aid

Norwegian Red Cross

Norwegian Refugee Council

Oxfam

Oxfam France

18

Oxfam HK

Oxfam Kenya

Oxfam Quebec

Oxfam Senegal

Oxfam South Sudan

Palestine Red Crescent Society

Pentecostal Church Development & Relief Agency (South Sudan)

PIANGO

Plan International

Première Urgence Internationale

Programme d'Appui à la Lutte contre la Pauvreté pour l'Émergence et la Restauration d'un développement durable (RDC)

Red Crescent Society of Islamic Republic of Iran

Red Crescent Society of Turkmenistan

RedR India

Refugee Consortium of Kenya

Relief International

Réseau Environnement Humanitaire

Risk Informed Early Action Partnership

Rural infrastructure and human resources development Organisation Rihrdo (Pakistan)

Saferworld India

São Tomé and Príncipe Red Cross

Save the Children

Save the Children India

Sechenov University, Moscow

Seeds India

Senegalese Red Cross Society

Settlement Services International Australia

Smile Again Africa Development Organization (South Sudan)

South Sudan NGO Forum

SPHERE

SPHERE India

Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response

Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency
Operations section – Resilience unit

Swedish Red Cross

Swedish Royal Technical Institute

Swiss Red Cross

Tearfund

The Netherlands Red Cross

The Sudanese Red Crescent

Ugandan Red Cross Society

UN REDD

UNAIDS

UNDP

UNDRR

UNECP World Conservation Monitoring Centre

UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

UNFPA

UNHCR	weADAPT
UNICEF	WFP
Union pour le Développement et la Coopération (Guinée Conakry)	World Vision
UNOCHA	World Vision India
URD	WWF
USAID	WWF Latin America
VSO Myanmar	Yemen Red Crescent Society