CORE COMMITMENT	RESPONSIBILITIES: 'INDIVIDUAL' (All, Donor or Aid Organisation) or 'JOINT' (All, Donor or Aid organisation)	WHAT ACTION WAS TAKEN IN 2020 TO ACHIEVE THIS COMMITMENT?	WHAT WERE THE RESULTS/OUTCOMES OF THIS ACTION?	WHERE RELEVANT, WHAT RESULTS WERE REPORTED AT COUNTRY LEVEL AGAINST THIS COMMITMENT? (Please specify countries AND results)	HOW WERE CONSIDERATIONS OF GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT[1] INTEGRATED IN YOUR INSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THIS COMMITMENT?	INDICATOR DEVELOPED BY WORKSTREAM CO-CONVENERS	PLEASE REPORT THE REQUESTED DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR
WORK STREAM 1 - TRANSPARENCY							
1.2. Signatories make use of appropriate data analysis, explaining the distinctiveness of activities, organisations, environments and circumstances.	Individual - all	CRS continued to have a dedicated staff person working on IATI in 2021 and is developing an internal system for IATI publishing to improve timeliness and efficiency of IATI publishing, which should be completed in 2022/2023. CRS plans to gradually scale up IATI publishing as this system is completed.	CRS centrally publishes data to IATI for its FCDO-funded projects and uses the humanitarian tags for humanitarian projects. In 2021, CRS was publishing on 7 active FDCO projects, of which 2 are humanitarian response projects. CRS used the d-portal platform to view our IATI data and the IATI validator to check IATI data and identify potential data entry errors.	CRS' use of IATI data for coordination and planning at a local response level is currently minimal, but CRS does provide data to the UNOCHA FTS at the country program level, when funding is received via a UN coordinated appeal.	N/A	Are you (or any of your affiliates) using IATI data and accessing IATI-compatible data platforms and tools (or different data standards/platforms/tools) in order to enable evidence-informed decision-making, greater accountability and learning? [2] (Yes/no question) Can you expand on your above answer, giving an example(s) of how you use or are intending to use data published via IATI, or when applicable via other data standards/platforms/tools?	CRS' direct use of global databases such as IATI for internal data analysis were ad hoc and minimal due to complicated nature of the databases, but has used data analysis and reporting undertaken by others (e.g., the Global Humanitarian Assistance Report), which may pull from IATI and UNOCHA FTS as well as other data sources. Information is used for advocacy and higher-level planning purposes.
WORK STREAM 2 - LOCALISATION							
2.1. Increase and support multi-year investments in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination.	Individual - all	In FY 2021, 67% of CRS' humanitarian projects included capacity strengthening. CRS continued to implement 5 stand-alone CS projects, engaging a total of 120 local organizations in 32 countries. With 3 EMPOWER projects & Respons, 82 local orgs. increased their response capacity & sustainability while CRS works with another 38 local orgs. to improve PSEA/safeguarding systems/structures.	Phase 2 of Empower project began in Latin America/Caribbean after Phase 1 results showed a 43.5% increase in local orgs. organizational & programmatic capacities. PSEA project ended resulting in a 32% avg. increase in local orgs. capacity to identify/respond to SEA allegations and 98% of staff indicating they have the tools and resources needed to handle allegations of SEA.	CRS initiated 2 2-year humanitarian capacity strengthening programs modelled after the EMPOWER Latin America/Caribbean project that covers 12 countries and 58 local partners in West/Central Africa and Asia. The West/Central Africa project is funded by BHA and focuses on barriers to local actors participation in the humanitarian coordination mechanisms.		% of partnership or funding agreements that incorporate multi-year institutional capacity strengthening support for local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % awarded to women-led and or women rights' organizations[3]	Based on preliminary year end data for FY2021, 67% of all CRS humanitarian projects (149 out of 225 humanitarian projects in FY21) included local/national partner capacity strengthening as a core component
2.4. Achieve by 2020, a global aggregated target of at least 25% of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transaction costs.	Individual - all	EMPOWER supported development/implementation of 22 funding agreements between donors and national orgs, with 50% primed by national orgs. CRS increased localization advocacy work by: publishing policy papers; increasing engagement of policymakers, USAID & Congress; testifying to US Congress and organizing meetings between USG and local orgs. to stress importance of local humanitarian leadership	EMPOWER partners awarded $11.79M in funding, $6.87M which went directly to national NGOs. USG showed an increased interest in supporting localization through development of USAID LCD policy whose guiding principles echo CRS/local partners positions and language in the 2022 Appropriations Bill requiring reports on direct funding to local actors and calling for more locally led humanitarian response	In FY21 CRS allocated $1.438 million of direct funding to 8 local orgs in Latin America, Caribbean, West/Central Africa, through 4 donor funded emergency rapid response fund projects with a proposal in the pipeline for a local organization specific RRF to address C19 emergency needs.		% of humanitarian funding awarded as directly as possible to local and national responders, with optional reporting on the % of that funding awarded to women-led and/or women rights' organizations.	Based on currently available data, CRS awarded $54M in humanitarian funding to local/national responders in FY21 (out of a total of $495M in emergency response, totaling 11% of funding). CRS also helped local partners mobilize approx.$7,832,944 in funding directly from donors.
WORK STREAM 3 - CASH-BASED PROGRAMMING							
3.1+3.6. Increase the routine use of cash, where appropriate, alongside other tools. Some may wish to set targets.	Individual - all	CRS completed its cash-readiness support to 8 countries , and expanded to 16 more. CRS developed and is piloting an organization capacity assessment tool for cash-readiness aimed for local partners in select countries. CRS is building local capacity through	CRS CVA is part of agency-wide recommended indicators to be reported annually.	Nigeria led the agency with $10.5 million (50/50 cash and vouchers), with a big jump in scale from $2 million in FY20. CRS' EMECA region included almost entirely cash (not vouchers), led by Greece, Egypt and Iraq.	CRS continues its commitment to protection mainstreaming, and programs use a checklist to support program design and implementation. https://efom.crs.org/wp-	Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	CRS country programs and partners transferred at least $52.7 million in cash.
	Individual - all					Total volume (USD value) transferred through vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs	CRS country program and partners transferred at least $27.5 million in vouchers.
WORK STREAM 4 - REDUCING MANAGEMENT COSTS							

4.5. Make joint regular functional monitoring and performance reviews and reduce individual donor assessments, evaluations, verifications, risk management and oversight processes.	Joint - donors					N/A[4]	N/A
	UN agencies					# of UN agencies adopting the UN Partner Portal to harmonize UN processes for engaging civil society organizations/non-governmental organizations, and reduce duplicate information reviews/requests of partners.	
	Civil society					% of civil society organizations/non-governmental organizations partners of the UN agencies adopting the common UN Partner Portal process.	The reporting responsibility for this specific target is with UN agencies that are using the Portal

WORK STREAM 5 - NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

5.1. Provide a single, comprehensive, cross-sectoral, methodologically sound, and impartial overall assessment of needs for each crisis to inform strategic decisions on how to respond and fund, thereby reducing the number of assessments and appeals produced by individual organisations.	Joint - all	In general, CRS does not lead the organization of multi-sectoral Needs Assessments. Based on the specific context, we may: participate if one is organized and we are invited to take part; take needs assessments templates or geographic coordination into account as feasible for our own data collection; and/or share our internal needs assessment data with others.	One area where CRS is involved in leading assessments is when we are the lead/co-lead for a Cash Working Group (CWG). During CY2021, this included Guatemala, Honduras, the Philippines and Nigeria. In these locations, we supported joint action on market assessments/monitoring and setting of MEB values, which will often include/impact multiple sectors.	In 2021, Empower project supported a comprehensive needs assessment to identify the information needs and preferences of Venezuelan migrants residing, in transit or with the intention of staying in Brazil or Ecuador. Results were used to design the MigraSegura platform, which led to Caritas Brazil and Caritas Ecuador contributes to increased access to accurate, reliable and updated information.	It is factored into our protection mainstreaming approach.	Which challenges have you identified and which actions have you been taking over the past year to strengthen humanitarian needs assessments and needs analysis in field locations and at headquarters? To which extent are these actions contributing to better joint (multi-stakeholders) inter-sectoral needs analysis in the field?	Organization of a joint needs assessment can be complicated creating delays in the response. A pre-developed standard/contextualized Multi-sectoral Assessment tool can lessen delays, especially if partners are trained in its use. Also, orgs. are often requested to fund their participation (i.e., personnel, logistics) in a needs assessment, which can be an obstacle for smaller/local orgs.
	Joint - all			In 2021, after the La Soufriere Volcano eruption, EMPOWER in collaboration with Caritas Antilles supported the development of the needs assessment tool to identify needs of affected population. This initiative was led by the local authorities in SVG where active members of the coordination platforms provided inputs and feedback to finalize the tool that would be used to collect data.		On a scale of 1 – 10, with 10 being the highest, please identify at what level of priority within your organization you consider the work to support coordinated needs assessments and analysis? What steps has your organization taken over the past year, if any, to ensure the requisite capacity is available to undertake this work.	We are continuing to increase our staff & local partner capacity to undertake needs assessments in general and we're continuing to engage/lead at the Cash Working Group level for joint market assessments/monitoring; and that we're using specific projects to enhance work on coordinating responses (including needs assessments) in rapid on-set contexts and to increase capacity & participation of local

WORK STREAM 6 - PARTICIPATION REVOLUTION

6.1. Improve leadership and governance mechanisms at the level of the humanitarian country team and cluster/sector mechanisms to ensure engagement with and accountability to people and communities affected by crises.	Joint -aid organisations	CRS makes an effort to participate in HCTs either directly or via representation of INGO Forums and to support/encourage participation of our local partners in regional and sector coordination platforms globally.	Globally - CRS remained engaged with the recently disbanded IASC PSEA and AAP Task Team members (replaced by the IASC Results Group 2 on Accountability) and joined the newly formed CHS Alliance PSEAH Contact Group which provides a space for members to exchange information and share good practices. In FY21, 5 local orgs. from EMPOWER project began participating in 5 clusters/platforms	In DRC, the CRS Strengthening Partners in Protection Against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Project Team and the PSEA Task Team jointly conducted a virtual end-of-project learning event in November to share general lessons learned from the project and to address future coordination among participants to strengthen Accountability to Affected Populations efforts. The event was attended by 73 persons.	Gender is a central element to PSEA.	N/A[5]	N/A
	Joint -aid organisations					N/A[5]	N/A

WORK STREAM 7+8 - ENHANCED QUALITY FUNDING

7.1.a. Signatories increase multi-year, collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding. Aid organisations ensure that the same terms of multi-year funding agreements are applied with their implementing partners[6].	Individual - all	CRS has the flexibility within our private resources to provide multi-year funding to local/national partners and carry out multi year planning. We continue to advocate to donors to provide multi-year funding - pass this on to CRS and national partners we support.	Less burden on local partners, less time renewing agreements. Avoid staffing gaps and high staff turnover - especially at the partner level.	CRS EMPOWER project has assisted its local partners, Caritas Colombia and Caritas Brasileira, to directly access multi-year funding from USDOS/PRM for the Venezuela Crisis response in both countries.		% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	Cannot measure at this time
	Individual - all					% change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year.	Cannot measure at this time
	Individual - all					% of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organizations to implementing partners	Cannot measure at this time
8.2. and 8.5. Donors progressively reduce earmarking, aiming to achieve a global target of 30% of humanitarian contributions that is unearmarked or softly earmarked by 2020. Aid organisations reduce earmarking when channeling donor funds with reduced earmarking to their partners.	Individual - Donors					% of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by aid organizations that are unearmarked/softly earmarked	
	Individual - Aid organisations	CRS passes on donor flexibility to partners, but we don't measure this indicator. CRS also ensure a high level of flexibility when allocating private funds to local partners - sets no limits on cost categories, accepts adjustments needed to meet agreed upon objectives and accepts adjustments in outcomes based on any identified change in response context.	Funds are used with the level of flexibility needed to maximize program outcomes.			% of unearmarked/softly earmarked humanitarian funding that is allocated by aid organizations, with flexibility, to implementing partners	In most cases CRS passes the same level of flexibility to our partners. However, we do not measure this indicator.

WORK STREAM 9 - HARMONISED REPORTING

9.1. Simplify and harmonize reporting requirements by the end of 2019 by reducing the volume of reporting, jointly deciding on common terminology, identifying core requirements and developing a common report structure.	Individual - all	CRS harmonized reporting from 64 countries on key common outcome indicators for aggregated analysis/reporting across our programs including results of C19 responses using 9 common indicators. 2 new common indicators will be tracked in '21: # of children accessing safe & supportive environments in emergency contexts; # of HHs with increased ability to cover from shocks and stresses	Results for harmonized indicators in humanitarian projects include: 343,230 gained access to safe/dignified shelters & homes through 36 projects; $38,409,811 distributed in cash and vouchers through 54 projects, 1,211,863 people gained access to basic drinking water through 29 projects, and Covid response programs reached 28,384,006 people through Sept '21		Several indicators are disaggregated by sex to track participation by women and girls. Beginning next year we will also be using a harmonized gender indicator to track increases in women's input into household decision-making.	Are you using the common reporting template as the standard for reporting by your downstream partners? if yes, on which level (global, limited scope (e.g. regional) If your scope is limited, please specify how and why?[7]	N/A

HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

10.4. Perform joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis, and multi-year planning where feasible and relevant, with national, regional and local coordination in order to achieve a shared vision for outcomes. Such a shared vision for outcomes will be developed on the basis of shared risk analysis between humanitarian, development, stabilisation and peacebuilding communities.	Joint - all	Promoted community-led disaster risk management in development/DRR programs to ensure a participatory process that includes key stakeholders: community, government, private sector. Included identification of community-implemented small projects with monitoring plans developed and managed by the communities. Social cohesion added as priority area in emergency strategy.	Through CRS' USAID/CMM project addressing peacebuilding/social cohesion issues in CAR, an emergency strategy was developed alongside local partners following election violence in Jan 2021 that led to displacement, an interrupted growing season and disrupted transport routes. The strategy built conflict-sensitivity into the emergency cash/NFI responses and facilitated community dialogues.	In E. Uganda, CRS/LNGO piloted a Community-led Disaster Risk Management approach in landslide & flood prone areas for the 1st time in many of the communities and is now mainstreaming protection considerations into this process. In NE Nigeria communities integrated conflict & natural hazard sensitive DRR actions into their village development plans to ensure risk informed development.	Our participant identification was based on vulnerability criteria that privileged female-headed households. Our assessments included separate FGDs for women and men.	N/A[8]	N/A