



Funded by  
European Union  
Civil Protection  
and Humanitarian Aid



**MARCH 2023**

# **IMPLEMENTING THE CLIMATE CHARTER**

Analysis and mapping of expertise available to signatories on the implementation of the Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations

## **FINAL REPORT**

IN RESPONSE  
TO DG ECHO TERMS OF REFERENCE 08\_2022

**INSPIRE+ CONSORTIUM**

**MARION REINOSA / PAUL KNOX CLARKE**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS



<b>1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	6
OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATIONS AND MAPPING .....	8
PROFILE OF ORGANISATIONS/INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED .....	8
ORGANISATIONS' NEEDS AND IN-HOUSE EXPERTISE .....	9
ORGANISATION-TO-ORGANISATION EXPERTISE SHARING .....	11
OVERVIEW OF THE MAPPING .....	12
BARRIERS IDENTIFIED.....	13
GAPS IDENTIFIED.....	14
IDENTIFIED STRUCTURES AND SUPPORT AVAILABLE THAT COULD BE SCALED-UP.....	14
STRUCTURES PROPOSITIONS.....	15
<b>5. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVE

In response to DG ECHO request under the INSPIRE+ Consortium led by Groupe URD, this mapping initiative aims to help DG ECHO promote the implementation of the Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations<sup>1</sup> (the Climate Charter). The overall objective of this assignment was to produce a **snapshot of the support available to signatories** of the Climate Charter to implement commitments 1 and 2<sup>2</sup> (mapping spreadsheet) and **analyse potential gaps and barriers** (analysis report). This is being carried out to inform DG ECHO, the Climate Charter secretariat and donors about what the sector needs and the resources that need to be mobilised to help it adapt to the environmental and climate crisis.

The Climate Charter was launched in May 2021 to catalyse and guide humanitarian actors in addressing and responding to the three planetary crises of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution. Over 300 humanitarian organisations have added their signatures to date, and ten states and the European Union have indicated their formal support. Signatories of the Charter make a commitment to develop targets and implementation plans – a critical step towards ensuring that the Climate Charter results in real change.

The mapping initiative therefore aimed to provide concise and comprehensive analysis of the support available to signatories, with a particular focus on:

- what is already available and how it is accessible to humanitarian organisations;
- the obstacles to accessing it;
- existing gaps;
- existing structures that could be scaled up; and,
- the best structure to provide adequate support.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

Based on early discussions with DG ECHO and the Climate Charter team, this initiative specifically targeted **resources, expertise and support available for smaller organisations with fewer resources**. Recognising that there are already a large number of written resources available, a particular focus was on expertise and resources that were more interactive and could be contextualised to the specific needs of these organisations, such as: online technical helpdesks; advisory support; trainings and communities of practice.

The methodology combined a desk review, an online questionnaire and key informant consultations. This allowed the consultants to get an overall picture, as well as providing the opportunity to explore specific issues in more depth. It also allowed the consultants to collect information from both less resourced organisations and organisations looking for support, as well as from organisations or structures providing a certain type of relevant expertise. This approach was particularly successful in

<sup>1</sup> All information related to the Climate Charter is available here: <https://www.climate-charter.org/>

<sup>2</sup> The Climate Charter includes seven commitments. Commitments 1 and 2 specifically refer to the need to adapt humanitarian aid to the impacts of the climate and environmental crises and to reduce the environmental impact of humanitarian aid:

- Commitment 1: Step up our response to growing humanitarian needs and help people adapt to the impacts of the climate and environmental crises;
- Commitment 2: Maximize the environmental sustainability of our work and rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

capturing organisations' needs and in comparing it with support already available. It thus helped to identify potential gaps, draw up a series of recommendations and propose a number of ways forward.

Information was gathered in three steps:

- **An extensive desk review**, looking at support in both the humanitarian and development sectors. This covered our own networks and lists of existing resources, such as the ICVA Climate and Environment Action Compendium and resources identified by the Climate Charter, DG ECHO and networks such as the Humanitarian Environment Network (REH). It also included online searches targeting specific types of support and geographical areas, and the websites of organisations at the forefront of environmental and climate change issues, and who have produced relevant resources, such as CARE. This first step therefore allowed the team to identify key expertise providers and relevant support.
- **Consultations with key informants engaged in providing support to other organisations**, to identify relevant key organisations or groups of people providing expertise and collect recommendations regarding the specific expertise needed in the sector and ways to support organisations. Key informants were initially identified from the consultants' own networks as well as through online searches on specific topics of interest. These initial informants provided suggestions for additional informants. In total 66 informants were interviewed.
- **A broader consultation** based on a questionnaire developed in English, French and Spanish distributed via key focal points, networks and clusters to get a second round of data both from organisations providing support and organisations in need of assistance.

Although the identification of needs was not a request from DG ECHO and the Climate Charter team it seemed necessary to do this exercise simultaneously in order to understand the current state of the sector and organisations' internal capacities, identify relevant resources, potential gaps and shortcomings, and develop coherent recommendations.

### 3. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

This mapping exercise has certain limitations, and it may have been influenced by several factors and constraints, in particular the following:

- **The timing of the mission** was not ideal, with the difficulty of mobilising key actors and organisations on the subject due to COP 27 and then the end of year break. This resulted in delays in the planning and revision of the timeline. The quality of responses, the time available to some stakeholders and the ability to share the questionnaire effectively may have been influenced by this factor.
- With respect to the questionnaire, in particular: while the response was very good, **respondents were self-selecting and do not necessarily represent a cross-section of the sector**. This has been taken into consideration in the analysis below.
- As mentioned earlier, a broad range of resources and support are already publicly available. From the outset of this exercise, it was recognised that it was **not feasible to map all resources**, although the aim of this assignment was to concentrate on useful and actionable resources and expertise.
- Some relevant expertise was difficult to identify due to its **invisibility** (no dedicated website, internally developed but shareable tool, inter-agency exchanges, informal communities of

practice, etc.). On the other hand, highly visible resources, generally developed by large organisations, are rarely updated and maintained (due to high turnover, lack of updating) and little used by the organisations. **The means of accessing certain expertise/resources was unclear**, and the mapping tab may not be entirely accurate on this criterion.

- In relation to the above constraint, from the beginning, a point of vigilance was raised in terms of **quality control of data and support identified as relevant**. Considering the difficulty of developing solid assessment criteria, it was decided to focus on resources and support that have a proven record of expertise in their field, such as having already provided services to organisations from the sector or having published relevant documents.
- Despite having been able to obtain a large amount of data and responses, it was challenging to reach the local level and **mobilise local actors, and small and national organisations**. The same observation was made regarding the difficulty of identifying locally available resources which are more likely to respond to local realities.
- As the work progressed it became apparent that **some key concepts and terms were not understood or were misused**. Although there is a general need to raise awareness, this may have had an impact on the outcomes of the analysis, and particularly the results of the questionnaire. The same applies to language barriers. Although the team was able to interact in English, French and Spanish, language was a definite barrier to bringing forward needs and recommendations from the field.
- It is important to recognise that – particularly with respect to commitment 1 – **the difference between climate-informed humanitarian action and other forms of humanitarian action is not always clear-cut**. Community-based contingency planning, or WASH resilience activities, are relevant in all flood-prone environments: they become much more relevant as a result of climate change, but the difference is in scale, not in the type of activities. Similarly, activities which have often been particularly associated with ‘stepping up the response’ to climate-related needs, such as anticipatory action or risk-sharing, are of interest to many humanitarians, not just those focussing on climate. As such, identifying resources for support of commitment 1 can be challenging, as many practitioners may not think of them as being ‘climate related’.
- The consideration of how to step up the response to climate change is a relatively new area in the majority of the organisations contacted (and particularly the larger international organisations). As a result, **much basic knowledge, and many of the basic tools, are not yet readily available**. In many cases, humanitarian practitioners are only now becoming aware of the need for this expertise and these resources, and so are **not in a position to say, yet, exactly what they need in terms of knowledge and skills**. Many humanitarians have not considered the issue at all. To give one example (of many): shelter experts were not aware of whether any guidance exists on how to make emergency shelters safe in contexts experiencing heatwaves but were also not convinced that this information would be useful. The countries in which they are working can expect a 60% chance of extreme heat in any given year within the next decade.
- Given the dynamism of the sector, **many resources are currently under development**, and it will be necessary to update this mapping. The same applies to resources that have been mapped but are financed by projects with funding that is set to end. This raises **the question of the sustainability** of the resources, which remains a crucial point in this exercise. It also suggests that any future knowledge management activities conducted by the Climate Charter secretariat, once it is established, should incorporate an ongoing mapping function, to capture resources that become newly available, or that are no longer available.

## 4. FINDINGS

This initiative was appreciated by the organisations and individuals consulted. Many organisations in need of support expressed their intention to sign the Climate Charter, and for many of them, this mapping exercise enabled them to assess their internal capacities and needs and make a baseline diagnosis.

This enthusiasm reflects the dynamism within the sector regarding climate and environmental issues and the willingness of organisations to make strong commitments. However, more support is needed to help the sector fully implement this transition.

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The mapping exercise showed that **a wide variety of resources are available in a number of different forms**. Examples include:

- Awareness raising tools such as the Climate Fresk<sup>3</sup> and other serious games, were particularly relevant for building basic knowledge around climate change, its causes and its impacts;
- Incubators such as CEWAS Lebanon<sup>4</sup> had already successfully supported local organisations to connect with other sectors, especially the private sector and initiated collaboration between aid organisations and local small and medium enterprises (SMEs);
- Internal expertise in a number of organisations;
- Tools to assess environmental impact, such as the NEAT+<sup>5</sup> and the EST<sup>6</sup>;
- Online communities of practice and working groups within organisations and between organisations;
- Technical and online “helpdesks” – generally on specific topics, where users are able to submit written questions.
- Training courses and materials.

Informants had some interesting ideas regarding the development of knowledge sharing mechanisms. There was a general emphasis on the need to promote them and to keep them going (communities of practice, for example, tended to die away without a moderator asking questions and bringing people into the conversation), and the importance of being clear on the nature of the information and expertise available *and* on the nature of the audience for whom the resources or communities were designed. Where resources or expertise required specialist knowledge to use (such as in the fields of insurance-based action or anticipatory action), they would not be of use to the generalist user, and generalists could become frustrated by this. While the focus of this work was not to answer questions related to the design of any future knowledge sharing, it is important to recognise that initiatives to date have met with varying levels of success and that it may be important to consider ‘lessons learned’ before investing in technical helpdesks or communities of practice.

<sup>3</sup> The Climate Fresk is an innovative, efficient and accessible tool to help participants understand climate change from a scientific point of view. More information is available here: <https://climategresk.org/>

<sup>4</sup> CEWAS in Lebanon supports entrepreneurs at all stages: ideation - incubation - acceleration and scale-up. They build enabling ecosystems, and offer technical assistance, finance support, tailor-made coaching & trainings, as well as ensure good governance and integrity. More information is available here: <https://www.cewasmiddleeast.org/our-activities>

<sup>5</sup> NEAT+ refers to Nexus Environmental Assessment Tool (NEAT+). The NEAT+ is a rapid and simple project-level environmental screening tool that allows humanitarian actors to quickly identify issues of environmental concern before designing longer-term emergency or recovery interventions. More information is available here: <https://neatplus.org/>

<sup>6</sup> The EST is the Environmental Stewardship Tool developed by Catholic Relief Services. More information is available here: <https://efom.crs.org/environmental-stewardship-tool/>

As well as these more-or-less formalised approaches to sharing expertise, informants also spoke about **agile and informal forms of inter-organisational solidarity** which allows for knowledge and practice sharing. This sharing occurs at policy level, but also, critically, brings up expertise from national and international organisations' operations on the ground. This type of support enabled several organisations with limited resources to create informal consortia to access specific environmental and climate expertise. Some also highlighted the strategic role of these agile and informal forms of support as they allow local and national organisations to find their place and share their experience. In our view, they are valuable as they can stimulate locally-led approaches to environmental sustainability and climate action.

As noted above, the exercise also showed that **many humanitarian actors are not aware of the need to take climate into account in their programming** (particularly in areas related to commitment 1) **and have not given the issue any serious thought**. As a result, it is not entirely clear what sort of knowledge and skills are required to make progress on commitment 1 in many sectors, including WASH, shelter, food security and livelihoods and health, although the gaps are becoming more evident as more organisations attempt to engage with the issue. As a result, the humanitarian sector has not yet brought together basic skills and guidance in many key areas.

**This is not to say that this knowledge does not exist. Many of the necessary skills and expertise exist outside the sector** (in the development sector, or the private sector), **or are embedded in country offices or in the experience of national, local and community-based organisations** which have been on the front line of responding to climate change for some years. National, local and community-based organisations, in particular, would benefit from the opportunity to distil their experiences, and to share their knowledge in global debates. This is happening, to a degree, in many of the existing communities of practice around resilience and adaptation. As well as providing much-needed understanding and expertise to the community as a whole, this would also support the localisation agenda, which will be an important element of transforming the humanitarian system to respond to the scale of the climate crisis. Many international organisations also have rich resources of expertise in their country offices and programmes but are not (yet) drawing on and systematising these resources.

With respect to commitment 2, the situation appeared slightly different. Among international agencies, in particular, there appears to be more awareness and engagement with the issue of environmental sustainability than there is with the issue of climate-related disasters. There are also a number of well-known tools (such as NEAT+). Interviewees note the importance of donor requirements (particularly those of ECHO and Global Affairs Canada) in bringing these issues to the fore. However, the consultations did not enable the team to assess if there is any form of transfer of expertise between international organisations and their national and local counterparts.

This failure of some organisations to draw on their own internal resources is mirrored across the sector. The mapping shows that where resources are available, they **are often fragmented** (available in multiple places through multiple networks) and that potential users of resources do not know where to find the resources that are relevant to them. **Another significant constraint to accessing knowledge and expertise is financial**: where organisations have sought expertise, they have often done this in the form of consultants, and the cost of these consultants (or, presumably, of hiring internal staff) may be preventing organisations from moving forward on the agenda. It is important to note that, even where (written) resources and tools are available, interviewees suggested that they can be too complex to be used without specialist knowledge and skills, and that understanding and using them can be time-consuming or simply impossible.

The **desire to be better able to use the tools and resources that are available**, as well as a recognition that real transformation in this area would require long-term processes, rather than the simple implementation of pre-existing solutions, may well be behind the strong desire that respondents to the questionnaire felt for training activities, and more generally for **support that would help them to more fully build their own expertise**, rather than receiving expert knowledge from outside the organisation. Active engagement in discussion and learning (through participation in training, access to training resources, and participation in meetings) seemed to be preferred to receiving advice and expertise from others (consultants or helpdesks).

Finally, on the complex societal issues of the triple global crisis, this exercise further illustrates the **need to look beyond the aid sector** (humanitarian and development) to develop new and effectively transformative approaches.


### OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATIONS AND MAPPING

Over the limited time of this consultancy, around **150 resources were mapped** and **195 people were consulted** (66 people interviewed; 129 people completed the questionnaire), representing a wide range of resources, organisational types and geographical coverage.


#### PROFILE OF ORGANISATIONS/INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

Of the people consulted, **almost 20% were from national, local and community NGOs and organisations**. All the organisations/individuals who completed the questionnaire were asked if they were **in a position to provide support/expertise or were looking for support/expertise, or both**. Half of the respondents answered both, illustrating the willingness of organisations to share their expertise and experience with each other. This inter-organisation solidarity was a key finding of this analysis, and more details are given in the following sections.


As the study involved organisations of all kinds, and not only signatories of the Climate Charter, questionnaire respondents and some interviewees were asked whether they had signed the Charter. The results showed that most of the organisations involved were either signatories or were considering signing it ('not yet'). Many in the latter group suggested that they would need to assess their capacities first and make preliminary changes to be able to commit.



**SITUATION OF THE ORGANISATION**



**SIGNATORIES OF THE CHARTER**




**ORGANISATIONS' NEEDS AND IN-HOUSE EXPERTISE**


Of the organisations consulted through the questionnaire, almost half of them said that they **have already used or sought out expertise and resources** to mitigate the environmental impact of their activities and/or adapt their activities to address climate change.

Many of the organisations consulted said that they were part of communities of practice who discuss climate and environment issues and activities. Through these structures, many of them share experiences, learn from other organisations, and develop partnerships.


**HAVE YOU EVER USED OR SOUGHT OUT EXPERTISE / SERVICES / RESOURCES**




**ORGANISATIONS WHO ARE PART OF COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE/NETWORKS**



**EXPERTISE AND SUPPORT NEEDED**



Regarding the needs identified by the panel of people and organisations consulted, organisations were looking for support in all the areas considered in the questionnaire: for the majority of topics, between 45% and 70% were looking for support. Elements that were particularly requested were climate and environment financing and disaster preparedness for climate-related disasters.




These identified needs should be seen in the context of the expertise already available in-house. According to the consultations, a good number of organisations have strong expertise in disaster preparedness and the development of resilient livelihoods programmes (note that these were also among the areas with the highest demands for expertise). Access to humanitarian and other finance to address climate-related challenges appears to be a key challenge, while mitigation aspects such as carbon footprint assessments are areas where many organisations do not yet have dedicated expertise or capacities.

**ORGANISATION-TO-ORGANISATION EXPERTISE SHARING**

Drawing on this in-house expertise, as illustrated above, the majority of organisations surveyed are willing to share their expertise with other organisations, particularly in relation to advocacy, climate risk preparedness and early warning systems, and anticipatory action. Additionally, some organisations with technical knowledge, such as Geographic Information Systems (GIS), technical reconstruction, nature-based solutions, technology and digitalisation, among others, are willing to extend their expertise to other organisations. However, the majority of these organisations are not yet in the position to do so due to various constraints, such as financial and human resources limitations.



Ways of sharing resources and expertise vary, but the most popular is in-person or online meetings. There was some support to the idea of providing training, a positive sign given the desire of so many organisations to receive training or training materials.



**OVERVIEW OF THE MAPPING**

The resources and expertise mapping highlighted the **diversity of forms of support and areas of work**. The mapping identified **20 different sources of support**, including academia, research centres, networks, communities of practice, private companies, consulting firms, think tanks, incubators, programmes, tools, training, support desks, regional platforms, intergovernmental agencies, and funding initiatives. The most common forms of support were NGO-to-NGO support, networks and platforms.

Regarding expertise available regionally, there are potential gaps as **some geographic areas were more represented than others**. For example, Asia and Africa seemed to be better resourced in terms of climate-disaster preparedness than MENA. However, the difficulty of reaching local organisations and the fact that this mapping was only conducted in English, French and Spanish, need to be taken into account. It is very likely that we failed to identify less visible key resources at the local level.




Finally, the mapping illustrated how difficult it is to **identify the means of gaining access to resources and expertise**. A lot of the expertise identified had resources publicly available online. However, it was not always clear whether tools came with support or whether there was follow up support after capacity building activities. Some sources of support charged a fee to gain full access to their expertise, for example via a membership, and it was often impossible to understand the extent to which advisory services were free. Some resources could only be accessed via a generic email or request form, making it challenging to assess the accessibility of certain support.

## BARRIERS IDENTIFIED

Although a substantial number of resources and support is available, a number of barriers prevent small and less resourced organisations to benefit from them.

The reality for these organisations is that their **internal financial, human and technical capacity is limited**. As a result, many of them do not know what expertise to look for. In large organisations with a local presence, some offices also reported a lack of visibility internally for a climate and environment focal point who could directly support them in transforming their practices and adapting their operations. The cost of services was also identified as a major barrier to accessing resources. This is probably one of the parameters that encourage organisations to join networks and communities of practice.

In parallel, many informants said that they do not know where to look for support and expertise, thus illustrating the difficulty of the majority organisations consulted to navigate in a fragmented landscape. Being able to find resources easily is also a key challenge identified by the mapping. On the other hand, in the interviews, the organisations who provide expertise and services said that it was difficult to know what organisations' real needs were in order to adapt their resources to these. **Many organisations reported that the resources available are too generic and are not adapted to their local or intervention context**. And finally, some informants mentioned a **language barrier**, highlighting that most of the resources publicly available are in English, French or Spanish.



## GAPS IDENTIFIED

The mapping and analysis initiative identified several gaps:

- Given the fragmentation of the resources available, access and links to relevant expertise need to be compiled so that organisations can be pointed in the right direction.
- Some organisations highlighted that translating the Climate Charter commitments into concrete internal actions and strategies was difficult but necessary. There are a number of constraints in this regard. In some cases, there is no guidance yet. In others, the guidance and resources are not considered particularly appropriate as they tend to focus on short-term perspectives rather than long-term ones, and are therefore not sufficiently ambitious. Many resources are also too generic and 'global' in their focus. In this sense, work needs to be done to help organisations adapt the commitments to their context.
- Organisations also mentioned the difficulty of defining standardised or appropriate targets for individual organisations (i.e. streamlining methodologies).
- As mentioned earlier, there is a need to bridge the gap between the resources available and the lack of general and technical knowledge about climate and environmental issues to ensure organisations can access these resources. This can be done through capacity building activities, workshops, and training, especially for complex topics such as climate finance.
- Some interviewees also pointed out that locally led approaches and knowledge are not being profiled or fed into the development of tools and guidance.
- Regarding adaptation, there is a need for capacity building in risk and vulnerability assessments and robust data needs to be made available to ensure that activities take local contexts into account.
- Finally, many resources available are project-funded, and it is not clear if they will still be available in the near future.

## IDENTIFIED STRUCTURES AND SUPPORT AVAILABLE THAT COULD BE SCALED-UP

Generally, the written resources and guidance that are available are not considered to be particularly useful by the organisations consulted. Nevertheless, some process-based tools, such as the EST and the NEAT+, were described as "particularly helpful" and "useful" to help transform ways of working. At the same time, some organisations pointed out that the NEAT+ recommendations need to be improved as they are too generic and can lead to misconceptions and 'maladaptation'. Some respondents indicated that a climate and environmental component should be included in the revised version of the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) and in the Sphere Handbook.

Formal and informal networks, communities of practice and working groups were identified as efficient resources that could be scaled up or rethought. These collaborative structures help to share knowledge, accelerate exchanges and pool resources. However, there are a lot of them, and they are not all equally useful, making it difficult to choose a particular one. Moreover, depending on the area of work and the region, they sometimes overlap and lead to duplication.

## STRUCTURES PROPOSITIONS

Building on this analysis and mapping, it appears important to address two issues in developing new structures.

The first is to **address the fragmentation of resources**; a list needs to be made available that directs organisations to reliable resources and expertise. This list would need to be able to evolve, organisations would need to be consulted regularly to identify their expectations, and new expertise adapted to the sector would need to be developed.

At the same time, the need for **capacity building** was identified throughout the consultation. Building on the dynamism within the sector on environmental and climate topics, it therefore seems critical that in-person training<sup>7</sup> should be available to allow organisations and individuals to internalise and build expertise in order to transform their practices.



<sup>7</sup> Although many of the organisations consulted did not specify what kind of training they were looking for, some expressed the need for training in how to use tools and approaches to meet donor requirements, especially with respect to commitment 2. For commitment 1, the responses varied and were more related to the need to increase knowledge of what climate change will mean for operations.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, this mapping exercise allows us to make the following recommendations to improve support to small and less resourced organisations in their efforts to implement the Climate Charter:

### Awareness:

- **Interviewees and respondents to the questionnaire suggested that there was not always leadership support for activities related to climate (mitigation or programming).** The Climate Charter team should continue to advocate for the importance of this area. They also noted that donor considerations are important in creating awareness and interest. To the degree that Climate Charter stakeholders are involved in discussions with donors and other stakeholders, this is an important issue to address.

### Resource development:

- Considering the existing needs, the fragmentation of resources and expertise available, and the difficulty for signatories to turn commitments into action, there is a need to **secure a dedicated support function or entity, such as a secretariat.** The Climate Charter does not yet have such a support function, but an informal team of stakeholders are currently trying to establish one. This entity could help signatories to put the Charter commitments into practice by informing and referring them to the resources available.
- **There is a shortage of resources and guidance in key areas around commitment 1.** While it may be beyond the capacities of the secretariat to produce this guidance, they should advocate for it. There is a need for technical support in the following areas: WASH, Shelter and Health; climate and environmental financing; and programme design, such as the integration of cash and social protection programming.
- **At the same time, there is untapped experience and expertise available in some countries.** A dedicated fund for local resource exchange, particularly for national organisations and countries with significant expertise in environmental and climate risk management would be extremely useful. South-South and South-North exchanges are essential in the context of climate change, which can affect any part of the world, and would gain to become a new strategy to share expertise and resources. These options could also participate in overcoming language barriers.
- **The Charter commitments are broad enough to allow each organisation to turn them into concrete actions.** However, translating the climate charter commitments into national strategies/commitments is a challenge. Inspiring examples should be an important tool to bridge this gap. The Climate Charter would benefit from helping organisations to turn commitments into solid implementable actions.

### Access to resources:

- **The fragmentation of available resources and expertise is real and constitutes a major barrier in accessing quality expertise.** Consequently, there is a need to catalogue expertise within a reliable and easily accessible structure. It seems critical to find a way to make a list of relevant resources available such as a map or an interactive database that directs organisations to reliable resources and expertise, without developing another website or platform, which might lead to confusion.
- Given that new resources are constantly being developed, **any resource directory or database should regularly be updated.** In parallel to this, there is a need to look at the knowledge

management process more broadly to ensure that resources are still relevant, are up-to-date and are improved over time.

- Interviewees and questionnaire respondents suggested that written documents and guidance, while useful, is not sufficient, and that **in-person training should be available to allow organisations and individuals to internalise and build expertise and be able to contextualise it to their situation.**
- **There was only limited support for the idea of an online technical 'helpdesk':** any further development of this idea should, at the least, try to obtain more information about what has worked and what has not worked for other organisations who have tried similar approaches.
- There was more support for the idea of peer-to-peer exchange and learning. There is already a large and complex ecosystem of networks, alliances and communities of practice, some of which are formal, and many of which are informal. **It may be worth considering an approach which supports existing mechanisms, rather than creating new ones.**
- However, many of the more formal communities of practice (which have been developed for use, rather than being organic networks of colleagues) are not particularly successful. If the secretariat takes this approach, it should **consider which communities of practice (CoP) might be worth supporting and taking an iterative and gradual approach to support.** If the Secretariat decides to develop a CoP, it should also **invest in learning lessons** from the many existing activities in the climate, development and humanitarian spheres.
- Finally, although the signing of the Climate Charter is an important step, with regard to environmental sustainability and mitigation aspects, **some actors consulted would like to go further than the greening of aid and would like to contribute to establishing environmental sustainability.** It would be interesting to look at this issue in terms of giving back to the environment and helping affected communities to move towards a more sustainable way of life. This could create another level of ambition.

# INSPIRE +

## **Main Researcher**

Marion Reinoso - [mreinoso@urd.org](mailto:mreinoso@urd.org)

## **Coordination Team :**

Pierre Brunet - [pbrunet@urd.org](mailto:pbrunet@urd.org)

Laurent Saillard - [lsaillard@urd.org](mailto:lsaillard@urd.org)