

| CORE COMMITMENT | RESPONSIBILITIES: 'INDIVIDUAL' (All, Donor or Aid Organisation) or | 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 | 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 | 1) Reported against activities using data analysis and developed a new Plan and Budget 2021–2025 2) Data analysis at activity level through FDRS published in the EveryOneCounts report 3) Launched a global view of the who-what-where (3w) tool on the GO platform 4) Contributed to methodology improvements for the IASC EWEAR group, co-led the development of INFORM Warning hazard monitoring concept. | 1) Greater availability and use of data for decision making and greater transparency, from programming to reporting. 2) Foundations built for the release of a risk module on the GO platform. 3) 95% of NS continued to regularly report COVID-19 activities, indicators and situational analysis through the GO platform. | 1) Reporting of financial emergency needs, including for COVID-19 and allocations at country-level. | 1) FDRS provides data insights which are disaggregated by sex and age. It also includes NS data disaggregated by disability. FDRS data for 2020 will be published mid-February. 2) The GO 3w includes information on male, female and other in terms of people targeted and reached. | 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? | No |
| 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 | 1) Study on the impact of National Society Development featuring case studies in 5 countries 2) Development and roll out of revised OCAC* methodology and expansion of BOCA* to Europe, Middle East and North Africa 3) More structured National Society preparedness approach in 84 NS alongside short term readiness measures 4) 3rd round of NSIA* disbursements and revitalised CBF* | 1) Evidence that show how long-term NSD investment have contributed to increased community well-being, social cohesion, and resilience 2) Revised OCAC methodology now capturing best practices and adoption of an internal verification mechanism 3) All 142 NS COVID responses recognised by and included in their respective national government's COVID response and recovery plans | 1) 2 NSs (Iraq and Russia) piloted the revised OCAC and BOCA methodology and BOCA facilitators' training in Europe and MENA 2) NSs from Kenya, Jordan, Morocco, Fiji, Solomon islands, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Tonga, Cameroon, Sierra Leone, Venezuela, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Eswatini, Zambia, Palau, Turkey, Tajikistan, Belize assessed their response mechanisms | 1) Organizational Assessment Toolkit for PGI developed and launched in Africa region. 2) Developed a safe-guarding self-assessment framework for NSs. | % 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] | |
| 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 | In accordance with the IFRC's Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance, it is the National Society of the country that is primarily impacted by disaster that requests assistance from the IFRC and other National Societies. As such, all humanitarian assistance provided through the IFRC network is in support of a request from a local actor. | 1) 19 Emergency Appeals launched for CHF 197 million to support 2,847,808 beneficiaries. The Global COVID19 Appeal launched in 2020 revised in 2021 to CHF 670,000,000. 2) DREF allocations for 2021 supported 136 operations by 87 NS for a total amount of CHF 29,826,677 and CHF 10,830,423 as start up loans to Emergency Appeals including for previous years | Ethiopia, Sudan, Djibouti (regional) Mozambique, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia (regional appeal), Kenya, Somalia, DR Congo, South Sudan, St Vincent & Grenadines, Haiti, Afghanistan, Myanmar, Philippines, Croatia, Belarus, Algeria, Lebanon (revision from Beirut Explosion Appeal), Iran, Pakistan and Tajikistan (multi-regional appeal). Movement wide COVID 19 global appeal revision. | Protection, Gender and Inclusion (PGI) was included as a key cross-cutting programmatic intervention in all emergency appeals in 2021. | % 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. | In 2021, 67% of IFRC funding was passed on to National Societies ** Please see IFRC footnote below |
| 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 | In 2021 the RCRC Movement delivered CHF870m+ (excluding overheads) to more than 10.2m people across 116 countries, continuing to demonstrate the important role of cash in IFRCs work. The appetite for cash across the membership continued to grow with around 100 NSs now undertaking cash preparedness activity for accountable and effective approaches to addressing need. | For IFRC DREF and Emergency Appeals, we continue to see the use of cash in Emergency Appeals and DREFs (approx. 38%), with cash now being regularly considered as a default response mechanism. The IFRC has set itself an ambitious target of 50% humanitarian action to be delivered by cash by 2025. 2021 also saw a strengthening of cash and data management approaches with the development of data protection guidelines for the use of CVA and systematic training for all National Societies across the IFRC network. | Country level results for cash and voucher assistance is reported through the Cash Hub. https://cash-hub.org/resources/cash-maps#map1 | Gender continues to play an important mainstreamed aspect of our cash programmes. Surge training for NS and IFRC staff based on minimum standards for protection, gender and inclusion are ongoing. | Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs | 2021: CHF870m+ |
| | Individual - all | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Total volume (USD value) transferred through vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs | Our system does not allow us to differentiate cash from voucher payments. |
| 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 | For the COVID 19 response operation, IFRC conducted two Real-Time Lesson Learning (RTL) exercises and 3 Federation-wide data collection and analysis rounds. A ToR for a Federation-wide evaluation of the COVID-19 response was also developed in 2021. | The focus of the RTL exercise was to document lessons around NS response capacities and IFRC network abilities in response to COVID 19 emergency | Data collection and analysis on the COVID 19 response were gathered from 178 NSs and can be found here : https://adore.ifrc.org/Download.aspx?FileId=476427 | All indicators related to people reached included details on sex and age disaggregation. | % 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 - * Pls note that the IFRC did not commit to the NA commitments and does not conduct joint NA with external partners | 1) Development of Emergency Needs Assessment Learning pathways. 2) Survey design e-training was designed to support National Societies' capacity and competencies strengthening to perform primary data collection. 3) Revision of the ENAP and HIAC training content. 4) Set up and activation of dedicated DREFs to fund multi-sectoral needs assessment. | Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies built their competencies and are becoming stronger in need assessment as part of the disaster and crisis response cycle. Overall, IFRC wider needs assessment capacity has been increased. 2 sudden onset crises were supported with dedicated assessment and analysis capacity. | 1) An assessment cell was deployed to the DRC operation Mount Nyiragongo Eruption, Complex Multi-hazard Emergency. 2) 20 of IM & Assessment Surge deployment in 2021 to coordinate and implement humanitarian assessments and analysis. | 1) All IFRC operations including needs assessments have to ensure a minimum level of participation from various members of affected communities including men, women, boys, girls, people with disabilities etc. | 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? | N/A |
| | Joint - all | | | | | 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. | N/A |
| 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 | | | | | N/A[5] | N/A |
| | Joint -aid organisations | 1) Co-led with WFP the IASC Task Force on Accountability to Affected People to develop a proposal for humanitarian leadership on what needs to be done collectively 2) Continued to co-lead with UNICEF and WHO the Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) Collective Service in support of the COVID 19 response | The recommendations made by the Task Force were presented to IASC OPAG in December 2021 and will be part of the workplan of the IASC restructure on AAP. IFRC has put its name forward to co-lead the new IASC Task force on AAP. | Thanks to IFRC's thought-leadership at the inter-agency level, many National Societies, supported by IFRC, are exploring or currently coordinating RCCE/CEA coordination groups in most regions. This is a deliverable as part of the ECHO PPP that IFRC and EU National Societies have secured. | IFRC hired an information management expert to mainstream PGI in our community engagement and information management efforts. | 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 | 1) IFRC currently does not have a system which allows it to systematically record multi-year planning and resource allocations to its partners. Development of an ERP system which could enable us to do so in the future continues. 2) Through our global flagships we developed 5-year targets and will report progress annually. Additionally, we have developed a multiyear case for support for migration. | 2) Multi-year pledges decreased compared to prior years. | | Flexible funding allows IFRC to allocate resources to programmes that might not get dedicated funding, such as supporting gender programming throughout all of our operations. Unfortunately we do not receive sufficient flexible funding to cover all of our anticipated programming. | % of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year. | Only 8% of pledges received in 2020 were multi-year.**** |
| | Individual - all | | | | | % change of humanitarian funds provided by donors or received by organizations that are multi-year. | 3%, however multi-year pledges are at their lowest level in the past 10 years in CHF value, but higher than in 2020 as a % of total pledges, because the total pledge value in 2020 was very high due to Turkey ESSN and COVID-19 appeal. |
| | Individual - all | | | | | | % of multi-year humanitarian funding received that is allocated by aid organizations to implementing partners |
| 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 channelling 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 | 25% of all cash pledges were unearmarked* and 1% softly earmarked*. 22% of cash pledges against emergency appeals were earmarked at appeal, country or thematic area level only without financial reporting required. 78% of emergency cash pledges were highly earmarked. |
| | Individual - Aid organisations | 1) IFRC's global COVID-19 appeal maintained earmarking restrictions, preventing thematic or geographical earmarking below country-level 2) IFRC continued to uphold its minimum pledge earmarking threshold at 100,000 CHF which has significantly reduced the number of highly earmarked pledges | Unearmarked and softly earmarked funding up from prior years, thanks to higher level of pledges to DREF in 2021. | Although the figures continue to fluctuate, currently over 50% of IFRC's COVID-19 operating budget will be implemented by National Societies. | Earmarking can be helpful to ensure mainstreaming of PGI. | % of unearmarked/softly earmarked humanitarian funding that is allocated by aid organizations, with flexibility, to implementing partners | N/A |
| WORK STREAM 9 - HARMONISED REPORTING | | | | | | | |

see detailed chart below

see detailed chart below

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 9.1. Simplify and harmonise 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 | Federation-wide work on COVID-19 and highlights of National Society work were added to 2021 annual reporting to better illustrate the reach and impact of the IFRC network. IFRC continued to use a results-based matrix, regarding its operations, achievements and impact | Despite further improving the quality of its annual report and continued measures to minimize reporting requirements, in 2021 IFRC was required to produce 1,842 reports for its donors, 5% more than in the previous year. FDRS data for 2020 was published in November 2021 (add link) | The Annual report featured a greater focus on impact at the country-level, providing examples of activities and results as indicative of how the IFRC supports National Societies. | FDRS provides data insights which are disaggregated by sex and age and disability. FDRS data collection and disaggregation standards are now being applied in several large-scale monitoring exercises, particularly for the monitoring of the COVID-19 global appeal. The FDRS team produced videos, tools and guides to support National Societies in their data collection and data disaggregation efforts | 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] | IFRC continues to use a pledge based reporting template that is based on the 8+3 template |
| 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 | 1) 10 new Early Action Protocols were approved and funded by the Forecast based Action by the DREF in 2021 for different hazards. 2) IFRC is contributing to efforts to scale up the Forecast-based Financing approach through an inter-agency collaboration led by OCHA | The Forecast based Action by the DREF Allocated CHF 1.1M for readiness, prepositioning and additionally committed CHF 1.8M for activation of the early actions. | Following countries now have approved plan of actions with clear coordination mechanisms to anticipate various hazards: Philippines-floods, Ethiopia -floods, Uganda – floods, Vietnam - heatwave, Niger – drought, Bangladesh – floods, Kyrgyzstan-heatwave, Kenya – floods, Bangladesh - cyclone, Tajikistan – heatwave | Protection Gender and Inclusion in Anticipatory Action working group was established to accelerate the mainstreaming and integration of PGI across all processes of anticipatory actions together with the Anticipation Hub. | N/A[8] | N/A |

| Localisation data 2012-2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| CHF millions | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
| Working advances to RC national societies | 67.0 | 56.3 | 54.8 | 57.4 | 62.7 | 64.3 | 59.2 | 48.5 | 47.6 | 38.0 | 55.6 | |
| Transfers to RC national societies | 32.3 | 23.8 | 16.0 | 23.4 | 25.0 | 26.9 | 17.9 | 8.0 | 42.4 | 35.3 | 25.1 | |
| Transfers to NGOs | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | |
| COVID-19 appeal transfers to NSs | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 71.0 | 74.8 | 14.6 |
| Turkey ESSN cash for beneficiaries transferred to Turkish RC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 369.3 | 359.8 | 72.9 |
| Total funding to local partners | 99.7 | 81.2 | 72.3 | 83.5 | 90.7 | 93.1 | 80.7 | 60.1 | 533.9 | 513.3 | 132.8 | |
| Other Resources expenditure excluding COVID-19 & ESSN | 287.3 | 277.2 | 290.0 | 336.0 | 253.5 | 239.0 | 245.3 | 240.7 | 237.8 | 240.6 | 264.7 | |
| COVID-19 appeal expenditure | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 135.9 | 139.9 | 27.6 |
| Turkey ESSN expenditure including cash for beneficiaries | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | 403.2 | 390.8 | 79.4 | |
| Total Other Resources Expenditure | 287.3 | 277.2 | 290.0 | 336.0 | 253.5 | 239.0 | 245.3 | 241.0 | 777.0 | 771.3 | 327.3 | |
| % local partners vs total OR expenditure | 35% | 29% | 25% | 25% | 36% | 39% | 33% | 25% | 69% | 67% | 41% | |
| Relief items, construction, supplies & equipment received in-kind or purchased by IFRC | 46.7 | 60.4 | 78.6 | 69.4 | 55.8 | 41.9 | 43.2 | 35.2 | 75.7 | 86.4 | 59.3 | |
| % vs total OR expenditure | 16% | 22% | 27% | 21% | 22% | 18% | 18% | 15% | 10% | 11% | 18% | |
| All cash pledges | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
| Cash pledges (CHF thousand) | 213,293 | 269,728 | 312,955 | 266,771 | 243,827 | 348,323 | 225,575 | 819,950 | 939,447 | 332,259 | 397,213 | |
| Number of cash pledges | 1,471 | 1,565 | 1,559 | 1,663 | 1,326 | 1,191 | 993 | 1,054 | 1,063 | 1,041 | 1,293 | |
| Number of pledge-based reports | 1,292 | 1,390 | 1,736 | 1,443 | 1,235 | 1,367 | 1,095 | 1,200 | 1,107 | 967 | 1,283 | |
| Average pledge value (CHF thousand) | 145 | 172 | 201 | 160 | 184 | 292 | 227 | 778 | 884 | 319 | 307 | |
| Average number of reports per pledge | 0.88 | 0.89 | 1.11 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.04 | 0.93 | 0.99 | |
| Average report 'value' (CHF thousand) | 165 | 194 | 180 | 185 | 197 | 255 | 206 | 683 | 849 | 344 | 310 | |

| Multi-year pledges | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| CHF thousand | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
| Regular Resources | - | 147 | - | - | 401 | 39,423 | - | 413 | 414 | - | 4,080 | |
| Other Resources | 22,004 | 38,635 | 42,714 | 32,852 | 23,455 | 123,903 | 52,466 | 97,243 | 39,369 | 27,342 | 49,998 | |
| Hosted Projects | - | 1,158 | 8,272 | 202 | 12,497 | 10,215 | 1,437 | 373 | 6,810 | 608 | 4,157 | |
| Total multi-year pledges | 22,004 | 39,941 | 50,985 | 33,054 | 36,354 | 173,541 | 53,903 | 98,030 | 46,594 | 27,950 | 58,236 | |
| % multi-year versus total cash pledges | 10% | 15% | 16% | 12% | 15% | 50% | 24% | 12% | 5% | 8% | 15% | |

All the above data exclude cancelled pledges and cancelled pledge reports
The data include Turkey ESSN funding agreement with ECHO (EUR 500m in 2019 and EUR 400m in 2020)

Cash pledge earmarking 2012-2021

| CHF millions | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--|
| Unearmarked | 38.7 | 63.0 | 37.5 | 50.7 | 49.6 | 83.9 | 46.0 | 75.9 | 74.0 | 91.2 | 61.1 | |
| Softly Earmarked | 17.7 | 21.7 | 12.9 | 15.3 | 9.2 | 13.4 | 17.2 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 11.8 | |
| Earmarked | 66.1 | 73.2 | 89.6 | 71.1 | 87.5 | 117.9 | 48.9 | 681.8 | 536.5 | 65.0 | 183.7 | |
| Tightly Earmarked | 132.3 | 155.2 | 206.3 | 166.8 | 132.5 | 195.8 | 151.0 | 166.8 | 400.9 | 207.4 | 191.5 | |
| Total | 254.9 | 313.2 | 346.3 | 303.8 | 278.7 | 410.9 | 263.0 | 926.9 | 1,014.7 | 368.3 | 448.1 | |
| percentage | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
| Unearmarked | 15% | 20% | 11% | 17% | 18% | 20% | 17% | 8% | 7% | 25% | 14% | |
| Softly Earmarked | 7% | 7% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 3% | |
| Earmarked | 26% | 23% | 26% | 23% | 31% | 29% | 19% | 74% | 53% | 18% | 41% | |
| Tightly Earmarked | 52% | 50% | 60% | 55% | 48% | 48% | 57% | 18% | 40% | 56% | 43% | |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

[6] Donors to report on provision of quality funding, indicating if these were provided through direct funding or through pooled funds

Cash pledge earmarking on Emergency appeals 2012-2021

| CHF millions | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Unearmarked | 38.7 | 63.0 | 37.5 | 50.7 | 49.6 | 83.9 | 46.0 | 75.9 | 74.0 | 91.2 | 61.1 | |
| Softly Earmarked | 17.7 | 21.7 | 12.9 | 15.3 | 9.2 | 13.4 | 17.2 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 11.8 | |
| Earmarked | 66.1 | 73.2 | 89.6 | 71.1 | 87.5 | 117.9 | 48.9 | 681.8 | 536.5 | 65.0 | 183.7 | |
| Tightly Earmarked | 132.3 | 155.2 | 206.3 | 166.8 | 132.5 | 195.8 | 151.0 | 166.8 | 400.9 | 207.4 | 191.5 | |
| Total | 106.1 | 125.8 | 182.8 | 160.7 | 132.3 | 194.3 | 96.6 | 140.3 | 392.2 | 174.7 | 170.6 | |

[8] OCHA and UNDP will be requested to provide this data on behalf of the wider group of aid organisations

| Percentage | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Average | |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|--|
| Earmarked | 37% | 43% | 30% | 34% | 46% | 47% | 31% | 34% | 77% | 27% | 37% | |

| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Tightly Earmarked | 63% | 57% | 70% | 66% | 54% | 53% | 69% | 66% | 78% | 78% | 68% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

The above figures exclude contributions to DREF and FBA, as well as allocations from DREF to Emergency Appeals

Definitions:

Unearmarked includes Statutory Contributions from National Societies and Unrestricted Donations, as well as donations to DREF from 2019

Softly earmarked includes FBAF, CBF and NSIA (and DREF until 2018)

Earmarked includes pledges earmarked at appeal, country or thematic area level only, without pledge financial reporting requirement (appeal-coded), as well as Turkey ESSN funding agreement (EUR 500m in 2019 and EUR 400m in 2020)

Tightly earmarked includes pledges earmarked below the appeal, country or thematic area level or with pledge financial reporting requirement (pledge-coded)

All above figures exclude in-kind donations, service fees and other income

The full value of multi-year pledges is shown in the year when the pledge was signed

COVID-19 appeal cash pledges reached 424m, with 70m earmarked (17%) and 354m tightly earmarked (83%)