



FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON THE STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT AT YEAR +4

DECLARATION OF COMMITMENT

Since 2020, 15 humanitarian organisations (NGOs and *think tanks*)¹ have signed the [Statement of Commitment of Humanitarian Organisations on Climate](#), in which they have made **5 commitments to reduce the environmental footprint of their actions and better adapt to climate change**. To be achieved, these commitments require **concrete actions and resources** at NGO level. The signatories must:

1. **Measure** their impact regularly;
2. **Reduce** their carbon footprint: by fixing an objective in line with the IPCC recommendations of -30% by 2025 and -50% by 2030;
3. **Adapt** humanitarian action to new environmental and climatic challenges;
4. **Communicate**: publish this information as soon as possible, on an annual basis;
5. **Involve** other actors to be more ambitious.

This declaration reports on the progress made by 13 of the 15 organisations, the last two having signed in 2024².

FOLLOW-UP TO THE DECLARATION

Four years after its launch, where do the NGOs stand? The [follow-up report](#) - produced by means of an anonymous questionnaire sent to the 13 signatories³ - takes stock of the commitments made, **identifying the challenges and opportunities encountered by NGOs** in achieving their objectives. More broadly, this analysis can benefit the international solidarity sector, since the challenges faced by organisations are often the same.

Compared with the [monitoring report carried out at year +3](#), the problems encountered remain unchanged overall, even if there seems to be a little more **institutional support than before**, a sign of the general dynamic of the sector, and even of society, on the environmental subject. Paradoxically, the follow-up at year +4 highlights that, at the same time, there can be **a loss of momentum** on the part of the people who are driving the transition process in the organisations.

We can also see the issues evolving as the organisations take ownership of the commitments and make progress in the environmental reduction process. The monitoring report highlights the need for **dedicated technical resources**, particularly in the areas of mitigation and adaptation. As far as adaptation is concerned, there is **a growing understanding of what is at stake**. Although it is often still at the thinking stage, organisations are thinking about integrating adaptation concepts into their activities more and more, and stress the need **to think about mitigation and adaptation in a coordinated way in order to avoid the risks of maladaptation**.

MEASURING THE FOOTPRINT AND THE NECESSARY STRATEGIES...

This follow-up also showed that, four years after signing, the organisations had all made progress, or even completed, the measurement of their carbon footprint (9 organisations had done so). However, there are **differences in the carbon accounting methods** used - for example, the way in which cash transfers are taken into account - which make it difficult for other stakeholders to understand the results, hence the importance of explicitly specifying the methodology. All the organisations stated that they had drawn up **reduction strategies** and were currently working on **action plans** to reduce their environmental footprint. One of them also stated that it had adopted a **participative approach in order to ensure collective support** for the process.

¹ Action Contre la Faim, ACTED, ALIMA, CARE France, Electriciens Sans Frontières, Fondation Terre des hommes, GRET, Groupe URD, Handicap International/Humanité et Inclusion, Médecins du Monde, Première Urgence Internationale, Secours Islamique France, Solidarités International. The French Red Cross and Triangle Génération Humanitaire signed up in 2024.

² The French Red Cross and Triangle Génération Humanitaire.

³ The two new organisations that signed up in November 2024 are not included in the report.

...TOWARDS EVOLVING ACTIONS

All the organisations have started to implement the **most obvious and affordable actions**. At the same time, organisations are working on actions that are more complex - technically, financially or because of socio-cultural resistance - by setting up **working groups, advocacy or raising awareness**. So, 4 years after the launch of the Declaration, although organisations continue to put forward quick-fix solutions that are often technical and focused on the short term, there is a growing awareness of the nature of the reduction commitment beyond the technical aspects. In particular, we can see that technical considerations (calculations, monitoring indicators, action plans, trajectory modelling, etc.) are **gradually giving way to questions on the social and even ethical issues at stake**, from the need for change management support to thoughts about **what actions might be considered 'acceptable'**. As a result, it is becoming clear that the changes required are not limited to technical adjustments, but are also based on changes in behaviour and practices, and that they need to be approached holistically.

KEY OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Several key questions remain. Firstly, the choice of reduction in absolute or relative terms in relation to their volume remains an open question for some organisations. As a strategic decision, it **raises questions about their growth potential**. Some organisations are also questioning the commitments made with regard to the **right to develop of countries in the Global South and in the name of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities**, which has led one organisation to exclude projects from its carbon accounting perimeter. Another area of concern is whether the methods used to implement the ecological transition risk being perceived as injunctions from Northern players to Southern countries. Behind these questions lie **unavoidable political and ethical choices concerning the ecological transition of international aid**.

WHAT COMES NEXT?

With the 2025 and 2030 targets fast approaching, the question of **how far they will be achieved is becoming a sensitive issue**. Some organisations stress that these commitments are above all political drivers for the internal implementation of the ecological transition dynamic. These targets therefore seem to be perceived more as **a framework of ambition** than as an obligation to achieve results. In order to make progress on this sensitive issue, we need to **think about a common narrative that will enable us to maintain a strong environmental ambition, while analysing the results obtained in a critical - and obviously transparent - way**.

FOR THE SECTOR

We invite the international aid sector to collectively reflect on the above issues and to consider their environmental commitments from **a more holistic perspective, for the benefit of the most vulnerable populations**. In addition, we continue to encourage organisations in the sector to sign the [Declaration](#), which is a genuine tool for collective mobilisation to **link social and ecological solidarity**.

The full report can be read [here](#).

Resources to consult :

- ➔ Reduction strategies: [ACF](#), [ALIMA](#), [CARE International](#), [GRET](#), [Groupe URD](#), [HI](#), [MDM](#), [SIF](#), [Solidarités Internationales](#), [Tdh](#).
- ➔ Carbon footprint calculations: [ACF](#), [ACTED](#), [ALIMA](#), [Groupe URD \(2012, 2015, 2019, 2022\)](#), [Tdh](#).



For more information, visit <https://www.environnementhumanitaire.org/en/>