

Pledge for Change

Signatory Self-Reporting Template 2025

Section 1: Background and summary

Organisation name:	Plan International
Date signed up to the Pledge for Change:	October 2022
Contact person:	Virginia Saiz / Anna Keller
Submission date:	October 2025
Reporting period:	2024 - 2025
Number of active partners ¹ (active during reporting period):	In FY25 we have reached 1,087 partners via the annual partnership survey out of an estimated 1,674 partners contacted to provide feedback. The response rate represents a 1% increase from FY24. As per our Plan in Numbers survey our offices globally have self-reported 26,440 partners (Please note that the definition of partners is still not consistently interpreted across the organisation, and we believe that this figure is significantly higher than we would reasonably expect to fit in with our organisational definition of 'partnerships'. We are seeking to triangulate these figures with finance data on disbursements to partners in FY25 (although noting that some influencing partnerships may not involve financial transactions)
Summary of any major events (Internal/external) within your context that have impacted on your work in the past year	Plan International and our partners, as many as our peers, have been affected by the cut in funding from the US, as well as other governments. Due to funding cuts, we have lost a previously existing role on partnerships at the Global Hub, which limits support and guidance that can be provided on a global level to the organisation. Across our regions, ROA has lost a regional Partnership and civil society strengthening role, due to the closure of the programme which funded it. MEESA also are in a similar position, with the existing funding for their regional partnership role ending in December 2025. Although a systematic analysis hasn't been done on dedicated partnership roles, we know there has been significant turnover of staff with a number dedicated roles being lost or changed significantly with restructures.

¹ Partners are defined as other organisations (or parts of organisations) with whom we have formal or informal partnership relationships, and usually refers to local actors in the place of intervention. One partner may be involved in more than one collaboration/project, but do not count one organisation more than once here. We can include partners who are funded or non-funded, as long as there is an active relationship this year.



Plan International has also had a leadership transition, with a new CEO joining the organisation in April 2025.

Please summarise your key organisational achievements contributing to the Pledge for Change Commitments which you would like to highlight for high-level reporting (NB. you may want to fill this in after completing the detailed report below, pulling out what you would like to highlight). *Max 300 words.*

Programmes and impact:

- Plan International Zambia is taking part in the Reverse Call for Proposals, which is a prototype under the RINGO initiative, which reimagines the purpose and role of INGOs whilst creating a more balanced civil society globally that ensures that national and local organisations can have more power, resources and influence. See the Stories of Change section for more information about this initiative and initial learnings.
- Plan International has completed a full review of its child sponsorship model and launched an initiative to make it more equitable. We're shifting away from donor-centric approaches toward ones that centre child agency, solidarity, and equitable relationships. This transformation is grounded in our Anti-Racism Equity Vision, ensuring a sponsorship model fit for the future.
- Plan International has made Locally Led, Globally Connected an organisation-wide priority, with impact seen across all countries. COs are now embedding localisation targets into annual planning, including commitments to increase budget allocation to partners.

Organisational culture and capabilities:

- Plan International's Leadership team has approved Anti-Racist and Decolonisation standards and are adding standards to their annual objectives.
- Plan International has embarked on a comprehensive journey to actualise its core values, feminist leadership principles, and policies on Harassment, Bullying, Discrimination (HBD), Safeguarding, and Preventing Sexual Harassment, Exploitation, and Abuse (PSHEA).
- We conduct various workshops and sessions to support this mission. Two notable workshops are the Power, Privilege, and Bias (PPB) Workshop and the Masculinities for PSHEA Workshop. Both workshops are central to a discourse on EDI.

Operating models:

- Plan International has a reference group and working group, currently working on an Operating Model review. The Localisation, Decolonisation and Partnerships team has provided thought leadership to ensure localisation and decolonisation are considered.

Governance and leadership:

- We are reviewing the Member Development Policy and redrafting the criteria for membership.
- We have been expanding the attendance at online Members Assembly meetings to include Country Directors.
- We have created a Localisation and Decolonisation Advisory Group, which includes senior leaders, a young person and one external advisor.



Communications, campaigns and influencing:

- Plan International is in the process of socialising its Decolonisation paper from Aid to Solidarity with senior leaders in the organisation
- Plan International has approved a position paper on ODA of the future as part of its influencing ambition
- Plan International’s revised communications narrative has a strong focus on solidarity and local and young people voices.
- Youth engagement was central to influencing efforts, with 71% of our Influencing Survey entries confirming involvement of children and young people. Collaboration was key, with 56% of progress achieved through partnerships with internal and external stakeholders, and 61% of external collaborations involving government institutions.
- Our role in Pledge for Change has driven global visibility, with active reporting and peer learning, and was recognised in the NEAR launch report as an example of organisational transformation in practice. Active role also in the Coms group and the influencing one. Regular engagement with the Decolonisation Forum in Latin America.
- This year’s global campaign on Child Marriage is a good example of locally led, globally connected work.

Section 2: Pledge for Change Accountability

Please indicate which of the following internal accountability processes you have been working on or towards during the reporting period:

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. Adaptation of reporting system to facilitate self-reporting for Pledge for Change | Yes |
| 2. Adaptation of financial system to facilitate self-reporting for Pledge for Change | Planned |
| 3. Development of new policies around equitable partnerships, including funding policies, or authentic storytelling in line with Pledge for Change commitments | Yes |
| 4. Facilitation of a partner survey (either as part of Pledge for Change or independently) | Yes |
| 5. Collaboration with Expert Review Panel on Authentic Storytelling to facilitate analysis of communications materials | Yes |
| 6. Established a common due diligence initiative with other orgs, to reduce compliance burden on partners (if yes, give details of types of collaborating organisations below) | Planned |
| 7. Reporting for the Grand Bargain | No |
| 8. Reporting for Charter for Change | No |
| 9. Reporting for any other accountability initiative (eg. CHS, Accountable Now, please give details below) | Yes |

If you answered “Yes” or “Planned” to any of these questions, please provide any details below (use above numbering to help keep your responses aligned):



Development of new policies around equitable partnerships, including funding policies, or authentic storytelling in line with Pledge for Change commitments

The Global Safeguarding & PSHEA unit in collaboration with the Global External Comms team have developed a new Plan Academy training course: Respectful Storytelling: A Guide to Doing No Harm. This self-paced course is designed to strengthen staff's confidence and competence in ethical communication, especially when working with children, young people, and communities. It complements the written guidance, allowing a different way to learn and in 3 languages.

Global guidance on Building Better Partnerships is due to be reviewed this year.

Adaptation of reporting system to facilitate self-reporting for Pledge for Change

Plan International has taken some steps to adapt its reporting system to facilitate self-reporting last year already. For example, additional questions had been added to our existing annual partnerships survey and our annual Global Advocacy Strategy survey. This year, we intensified socialisation of the Pledge for Change reporting on commitment 3. Financial system changes to capture financial information have not been done due to an ongoing systems change journey but are being planned.

Facilitation of a partner survey (either as part of Pledge for Change or independently)

Plan International has conducted its 8th annual Partnership survey in 2025. We are still exploring whether to move to the WACSI journey but need to further investigate this. We still believe that having an annual internal survey provides a good opportunity to get regular feedback from partners.

Collaboration with Expert Review Panel on Authentic Storytelling to facilitate analysis of communications materials

Plan International submitted a range of communications and fundraising materials from across the organisation to the Expert Review Panel. Learnings and actions are underway, such change does take time to roll out and embed.

Reporting for any other accountability initiative (e.g. CHS, Accountable Now, please give details below)

Plan International is reporting on CHS. In the past we also reported to Accountable Now.

Established a common due diligence initiative with other orgs

Plan International are actively collaborating with Save the Children to explore due diligence sharing modalities within our respective organisations. While the planning is still in early stages, the current timeline would see piloting take place between July and August in 2026 and would involve different forms of due diligence 'passporting' e.g. sharing and comparing our internal existing due diligence assessments and conducting joint due diligence assessments together. The aim is to specifically consolidate learning on how to mitigate perceived risks from within our own organisations and document any internal process recommendations to enable our organisations to advance this. We also intend to share this learning outwards. We remain engaged on the topic of due diligence passporting with the Pledge working group, and this initiative has been built off learning in that space to realistically help us move forward.

Section 3: Reporting against metrics

The following 17 metrics allow you to capture where you are at in terms of comparable and evidence-based parameters developed to assess progress according to the Pledge for Change commitments made (see Annex 1 below). Please report on all metrics for which you have data, but AT LEAST report against the metrics in green. Where you are not yet able to report, please note this, and outline in the right hand column any steps you may take to be able to report in future, and by when.

To fill in the table, please complete at least all green fields, and as many white fields as possible. Do not complete the grey fields. If you would like to develop a Pledge Metrics Definition Sheet (PMDS) for each of these indicators, please click [here](#) for a template.

NB. The data in this report, being the first report from each Signatory, will also act as a baseline for comparison for future years.

Metric	Definition used by or culled from the Inter-Agency Standing Committee	In this column provide Definitions used by your organisation when collecting the data and any modification to how specific metrics is reported	Result achieved If you are collecting data on this, insert the relevant figures; if not please use a traffic light rating to indicate if: Red = we are not making progress towards this Amber = we are making some progress towards this Green = we are making good progress towards this (NB. You can leave blank if not reporting on this metric at all)	Learning from data and feedback received, and adaptations made as a result. Where available, include links to relevant evidence or learning documents.	Comments eg. explanation of the data/results presented, or what plans are in place to be able to measure against this metric in future, or whether other data from your organisation shows progress in some way to the Pledge, etc. If not reporting on this metric at all, please explain why not.
Partner perceptions of partnership: 1.1 % of local partners surveyed who consider their partnerships with Pledge for Change signatories to be equitable	<i>Data will be collected by WACSI in a partner survey (if using an alternative process, either external or internal, please explain in Comments box). A partner is any local organization or entity that collaborates with you to deliver assistance, often including local NGOs, and</i>	Plan International does not have a globally agreed definition of the term “equitable” but has been piloting a partnership continuum with Social Development Direct. The continuum has not been integrated into our existing Building Better Partnerships principles guidance at this point.	We asked partners if they considered their partnership with Plan International to be equitable. This year 77% of partners agreed/strongly agreed, with an average score of 7.6/ 10. Last year, 81% of partners agreed/strongly agreed and we received an average score of 7.8/10.	Going forward we need to consider whether integration of the continuum into existing guidance is feasible and continue working to improve our partnership practices.	This information is from the FY25 Annual Partnership Survey

	<i>community-based organizations.</i>																
<p>Level of partnership: 1.2a % of projects where more than half of the total annual budget (including administration costs) was transferred to local partner(s)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>1.2b % of projects where more than half of the activities are managed by one or more local partner(s)</p>	<p>Please choose at least one of the two metric options, and maintain consistency year on year, so that you can see progress.</p> <p>Managed by means having primary responsibility for overseeing, implementing, and ensuring accountability.</p> <p><i>A local partner is any local organization or entity that collaborates with you to deliver assistance, often including local NGOs, and community-based organizations.</i></p>	<p>Our systems do not capture the same degree that these indicators are phrased, so we have maintained the way we have reported on this last year.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total projects started in FY25 in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage</td> <td>348</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan as Lead Implementer</td> <td>278</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan as Sub Grantee</td> <td>8</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partner Implementation Only</td> <td>62</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </table>	Total projects started in FY25 in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage	348	100%	Plan as Lead Implementer	278	80%	Plan as Sub Grantee	8	2%	Partner Implementation Only	62	18%	<p>We noticed that there has been a decrease in Partner Implementation Only. We need to reflect how we can reverse this trend in the coming year.</p>	<p>Information from our Project Monitoring Evaluation system</p>
			Total projects started in FY25 in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage	348	100%												
Plan as Lead Implementer	278	80%															
Plan as Sub Grantee	8	2%															
Partner Implementation Only	62	18%															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total projects started any time in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage</td> <td>2299</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan as Lead Implementer:</td> <td>1612</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plan as Sub Grantee</td> <td>30</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partner Implementation Only</td> <td>657</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Last year 37% projects were noted as Partner Implementation only, 62% marked as Plan as Lead Implementer, and 1% marked as Plan as Sub-Grantee.</p>	Total projects started any time in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage	2299	100%	Plan as Lead Implementer:	1612	70%	Plan as Sub Grantee	30	1%	Partner Implementation Only	657	29%					
Total projects started any time in Implementation, Closing or Closed stage	2299	100%															
Plan as Lead Implementer:	1612	70%															
Plan as Sub Grantee	30	1%															
Partner Implementation Only	657	29%															
<p>Diversity of partnerships: 1.3 % of local partners that are representative of affected</p>	<p>Please specify how you determine "representative", i.e., what percentage of members/leaders would be</p>	<p>At the moment in Plan we are able to disaggregate the information about our partnership portfolio in</p>	<p>Disability led: 5% Women led: 24% Youth led: 19%</p>	<p>The % provided need to be carefully considered, as they are only based on the annual partnership survey</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Annual Partnership Survey</p>												

<p>communities, including particularly WRO and WLO.</p>	<p><i>from the affected communities.</i></p> <p><i>The term "Representative" typically refers to an individual or entity designated to speak or act on behalf of an organization, government, or affected population</i></p>	<p>"types of organisation's" and "types of leadership structures"</p>	<p>Last year we reported: Disability led: 15% Women led: 24% Youth led: 20%</p>	<p>responses received. We need to investigate further why there was such a decrease in the responses received from disability led partners. Our financial systems currently don't allow us to track the type of organization, i.e. WRO or WLO.</p>	
<p>Level of funding for partnerships: 1.4a % of total expenditure of the organisation (incl. management, campaigns/advocacy and fundraising) that is shared with local partners (disaggregated by types of partner)</p> <p>1.4b % of programme expenditure (both national and international, and incl. administrative costs) that is shared with local partners</p>	<p><i>For 1.4a Please report using total organizational expenditure as reported in your annual report for the charity regulator.</i></p> <p><i>For 1.4b, report using total programme funding, both development and humanitarian, and including any ICR or administration costs.</i></p> <p><i>Ensure that it is clear which metric you are reporting against, and maintain consistency over the years so that you can see progress.</i></p>		<p>In FY25 24.7% of our expenditure goes through partners.</p> <p>In FY23 and FY24, 27% of our expenditure went through partners.</p>	<p>Plan's highest % expenditure through partners was in FY23, this has declined over the past two years with an approximate 2% drop in FY25.</p> <p>A recommendation has been made to agree on a global average target to increase funding shared with partners; this has not been agreed yet globally, but in the meantime, many Country Offices have set their own targets.</p>	<p>Plan International's current financial systems do not capture the type of partner in relation to funding shared. Future upgrades of the system (timing of that currently uncertain) may provide this detail.</p>
<p>Fair share of administrative costs: 1.5 % of formal partnership agreements providing a fair share of ICR or administrative costs</p>	<p><i>Fair refers to the equitable, impartial, and just distribution of administrative cost based on needs, vulnerabilities, and rights, without discrimination or bias.</i></p>		<p>Not being reported directly, but we are asking partners if we share enough resources with them to mitigate risks generated through our work together.</p> <p>This year 67% of partners agreed/strongly agreed, with an average score of 6.7/ 10.</p>	<p>Plan International's current cost recovery policy is focusing on Plan International National Organisations sharing ICR fairly with Country Offices. Partners are currently not included in the policy, but we know that some National Organisations, for example</p>	<p>Plan International's current financial systems do not capture the sharing of ICR. Future upgrades of the system (timing of that currently uncertain) may provide this detail.</p>

			<p>Last year, 72% of partners agreed/strongly agreed and we received an average score of 6.9/10.</p>	<p>Plan International Norway, have started doing so. We aim to include partner overhead costs in budgets so that they have resources to support their development.</p>	
<p>Support for organizational development: 1.6 % of partnership or funding agreements that incorporate core and/or flexible funding</p>	<p><i>NB. Typically, “core funding” is unearmarked funding contributed by donors without any restrictions on its use, while “flexible funding” could be restricted thematically or geographically, but used without restriction, also across years.</i> ICR should not be included here.</p>		<p>Not being reported directly, but we are asking our partners if they are a stronger organisation by working together.</p> <p>This year 82% of partners agreed/strongly agreed, with an average score of 7.8/ 10.</p> <p>In FY24, 86% of partners agreed/ strongly agreed and we received an average score of 8/10.</p>	<p>It is clear that our partners require us to support them more to access more flexible funding and that we need to support them better in doing so.</p>	<p>Plan International’s current financial systems do not capture the sharing of flexible funding. Future upgrades of the system (timing of that currently uncertain) may provide this detail. However, Plan International provides flexible funding to youth-led organisations through the Equality Accelerator initiative.</p>
<p>Decision-making: 1.7 % of partners who co-created or led on proposal developed this year</p>	<p><i>Partner led refers to an approach where local or national actors (e.g., NGOs, government agencies, community-based organizations) take the primary leadership role in designing, coordinating, and implementing assistance, with international actors playing a supportive rather than directive role.</i></p> <p><i>While ‘Co-created’ refers to a collaborative process where a signatory and her local partners, with the affected communities jointly design, implement, and evaluate programs</i></p>		<p>In the FY25 Partnership Survey we asked partners if project and initiatives are co-created and decisions are taken jointly. 76% partners agreed/strongly agreed with an average rating of 7.3 out of 10.</p> <p>In 2024 78% partners agreed/ strongly agreed and we had an average rating of 7.4</p>	<p>The decrease in partners reporting positively about co-creation is a trend we will have to try to reverse going forward.</p> <p>We have noted that there are also significant fluctuations across regions – APAC (83%), ECE (86%) and ROA (85%) show good progress, however the findings for MEESA (74%) and WACA (63%) indicate that improvement action needs to be taken. Of note, 9% of partners globally rated co-creation/ decision making very poorly indicating a significant minority of partner work</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Annual Partnership Survey</p>

				which is clearly not aligned with our strategic goals.	
<p>Partner perceptions of communications: 2.1 % of local partners surveyed satisfied with INGO communication materials and feeling they are given rightful credit for their work</p>	<p><i>Data will be collected by WACSI in a partner survey</i></p> <p><i>Communication materials refer to all forms of information products—print, digital, audiovisual, or verbal—used in humanitarian action to engage, inform, and empower affected communities, partners, and stakeholders.</i></p>		<p>In our FY25 Partnership Survey we asked a question about Plan giving rightful credit partners work in communications materials and activities in general. This year 75% of partners agreed/strongly agreed, with an average score of 7.5.</p> <p>Last year, 81% of partners agreed/strongly agreed and we received an average score of 7.7.</p>	<p>We have noted a decrease in partners reporting positively about crediting their work in outward communications. We need to undertake internal reflection to understand what is triggering this drop, and how we can reverse it.</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Annual Partnership Survey</p>
<p>Ethical communication: 2.2 Proportion of INGO written and visual communications which are considered ethical and inclusive based on agreed standards, mention local partner contribution, and avoid reinforcing harmful stereotypes</p>	<p><i>The Expert Review Panel will define agreed standards. You will provide 10 examples of comms to the Expert Review Panel, who will assess them against the standards.</i></p>		<p>Plan International had submitted 10 examples of comms to the Expert Review Panel last year. The results were received in April this year. We’ve delivered an online learning module on Representation, Dignity and Safeguarding in Communications in August 2025. This is a response to the need to continue embedding our principles with our staff. This is provided in 3 languages and will be embedded in inductions for certain staff functions</p> <p>The vast majority of content about programmes on the website names partners.</p>		
<p>Creating space for local voices: 2.3 % of speaking opportunities, and media, social and fundraising communications that facilitate</p>	<p><i>Please specify how you chose your sample of materials, and how you disaggregated “direct engagement of local partners”. We suggest a)</i></p>		<p>All communications plans issued by the Global Hub (GH) in support of influencing events include local staff as the spokesperson.</p> <p>All press releases which offer a spokesperson include a local staff</p>		<p>This is not a metric we capture in data; we can only offer anecdotal evidence of our practice. And we are only able to confidently say what the Global Hub (GH) does</p>

<p>direct engagement of local partners from global South</p>	<p><i>quotes b) video c) webinar/virtual participation d) physical presence.</i></p>		<p>member, not primarily a Global Hub spokesperson (when issued from GH).</p> <p>All offices will ensure young people, especially girls, are on press conference or event panels, not just local voices but young voices as fits the Plan International strategy and approach. Delegations to influencing events, whether local, regional, or global have a youth engagement and local engagement strategy, ensuring local and young voices drive the calls to action, the storytelling in speeches/on stages, and in the supporting communications work with media or on digital channels. This is the embedded Plan approach.</p>		<p>without a mechanism to capture 80+ office activities.</p>
<p>Engaging talent for content production: 2.4 % of communications content developed, created or produced by local talent during the reporting period</p>	<p><i>Please distinguish between using local talent for a) developing the brief b) producing the content c) the production/edit. Please also clarify how you define "local talent"</i></p>		<p>Any work commissioned by Global Hub uses local creators.</p> <p>Content created with Country Offices with the GH Comms team is highly collaborative, not extractive. Country offices sign off the films along with any girls involved, and their families.</p> <p>The content that we gather together as GH & CO is always shared with the CO, in fact we always leave them with a hard drive with the raw footage and photos, so they are armed with content to create from themselves. The film shoots are a huge collaboration, everything is done to ensure the perceived power GH might have is broken down. It's a team effort with team goals.</p>		<p>Plan International's systems currently can't capture whether contractors are "local" or "international". However, local Plan Country Offices and Regional Offices use local content gatherers, if they are using people extra to their own local staff teams. National Organisation (the fundraising offices) do sometimes use non local content gatherers but this is not the highest proportion of content creation.</p>
<p>Visibility and recognition to local partners: 2.5 Evidence of cases of public communications on programs</p>	<p><i>Please show how partners' work is acknowledged in all communications related to the following "events":</i></p>		<p>Ukraine case study about Patchwork association - https://plan-international.org/ukraine/case-studies/enrolling-school-as-refugee-</p>		<p>There will be many more examples across the organisation of this. Again, from the Communications audit report we</p>

<p>that showcase/acknowledge local partners' work</p>	<p>a) your Annual Report, b) one major fundraising campaign, c) one public information/advocacy campaign</p>		<p>living-with-disability/ - includes a partner CEO quote.</p> <p>Poland research – mentions partners - https://plan-international.org/poland-en/publications/safety-right-now-safer-cities-for-girls/</p> <p>Another Poland example with partners introduced right away - https://plan-international.org/poland-en/publications/sexual-exploitation-and-abuse-reporting/</p>		<p>will be able to keep socialising the importance of naming partners, and actively acknowledging their work more.</p>
<p>Partner perceptions of localisation: 3.1 % of local partners surveyed reporting positive shifts in NGO commitment to shift power to local actors</p>	<p><i>Data will be collected by WACSI in a partner survey</i></p>		<p>In the FY25 Partnership Survey we asked partners if they have seen positive steps in Plan shifting power to local actors. Partners rated us a median average of 7.6 out of 10, and 78% of partners agreed/or strongly agreed.</p> <p>Last year we reported a median average of 7.8 out of 10.</p>		<p>In our FY25 Annual Partnership Survey 78% of partners globally agreed that their partnership with Plan International has contributed to shift the power towards greater local ownership. This is a slight decrease on last year's data.</p> <p>We have seen significant variation across the regions where we work with ROA (84%) and APAC (79%) ranking above the global average, and WACA (78%), MEESA (72%) and ECE (66%) falling below it. When interpreting this indicator, we are also mindful that familiarity with the 'shift the power' movement may vary across different contexts and with different types of partner, influencing the data we receive.</p>

<p>Collective advocacy for equitable, locally led and antiracist approaches to aid and development: 3.2 Evidence of cases of advocacy, individually or collectively, for equitable, locally led and antiracist approaches to aid and development and other interrelated government policies (e.g. trade, foreign policy)</p>	<p><i>Please include all examples of collective advocacy, whether or not the initiative was successful, and naming collaborating actors. NB. Include all collaboration between Signatories, but other collaborations are also worth tracking here.</i></p>	<p>Plan International Ukraine has actively promoted equitable, locally led, and anti-racist approaches throughout FY25. Within the NGO Platform in Ukraine, we contributed to joint positions that challenged unequal partnerships, pressing donors to provide fair cost coverage and respect the leadership of national and women-led organisations. At the European Humanitarian Forum (May 2025), our delegation met with DG ECHO and EU institutions, urging them to maintain flexible humanitarian funding for Ukraine while emphasising that localisation and accountability to affected populations must remain non-negotiable. Beyond closed-door advocacy, we elevated public debate through innovative tactics: an op-ed in EU observer by our Response Director highlighted the urgent need to prioritise mental health and gender-responsive services. These actions ensured that principles of equity and anti-racism were not abstract ideals but embedded into policy dialogue and public narratives.</p> <p>Plan International Zimbabwe is the secretariat for Zimbabwe Alliance for Humanitarian Aid (ZAHA) formed in 2023, comprising nine INGOs. The Alliance aims to engage in collective action and joint advocacy for the purpose of enhancing efficiency and impact of humanitarian response in a resource limited context. In June 2025 ZAHA convened a localisation summit attended by over 50 local NGOs, CBOs, academia, and stakeholders for the purpose of exploring ways of progressing</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Influencing Survey</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>localisation of humanitarian aid in the face of shifting humanitarian landscape. It provided a space for dialogue for different stakeholders, donors, INGOs, and critically local NGOs, CBOs, networks and movements. The summit gave a unique opportunity for local NGOs, CBOs and Networks to articulate how they experience unequal power in the humanitarian coordination architecture and their experiences with varied partnership approaches including the quality of partnerships. Local NGOs, CBOs and networks noted that the quality and quantity of funding was not favorable to them, and they highlighted the need for inclusive and equitable organisational assessments. They highlighted the importance of risk sharing between them and donors. The result of the summit was a call to action by different stakeholders to shift the power closer to local actors. ZAHA will continue to pursue these actions.</p>		
<p>Influencing donors and philanthropic community: 3.3 Evidence of cases where INGOs and partners have successfully influenced donors or philanthropic community policies/mechanisms/budgets/ etc. towards equality in resource allocation to local partner organizations</p>	<p><i>Please only include successful examples of influencing, and be realistic about the contribution made to the result, naming collaborating actors.</i></p>	<p>Plan International Bangladesh advocated for equitable funding flows, resulting in 70% of funding being allocated to local partners, with particular emphasis on women- and youth-led organizations. This ensured that local actors could access resources fairly, reducing dependency on INGO-led implementation.</p> <p>Plan International Cameroon and partners have actively contributed to influencing policies and mechanisms that promote equality in resource allocation to local partner organizations. In Far-North, East, North, Adamawa and center</p>	<p>We have seen a marked increase from last year about Plan International Country Offices influencing in this space.</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Influencing Survey</p>

		<p>Regions the signing of agreements with 30 municipalities and the allocation of funds, including their own, for managing the sponsorship program and also in North West, we worked closely with municipal authorities and civil society coalitions to advocate for the inclusion of dedicated budget lines targeting grassroots and women-led organisations within local development plans. Through joint workshops and evidence-based advocacy, we highlighted the critical role local organisations play in community development and service delivery. This led to the revision of funding criteria to ensure more transparent and equitable distribution of resources. Additionally, our partners helped establish a participatory budgeting process at the district level, enabling local organisations to directly engage in decision-making and monitor budget implementation.</p>		
<p>Elevating local leadership: 3.4 Evidence of active support to local/national/regional actors to network, coordinate and advocate for locally-led development or humanitarian action</p>	<p><i>Please include all examples of advocacy by local/national/regional actors where you played a facilitating, convening or supporting role.</i></p>	<p>Plan International’s WACA Regional Hub has played a facilitating and convening role in advancing youth-led advocacy across West and Central Africa. Through the Youth Challenge Fund (YCF), the Hub supported over 23 youth-led groups across 9 countries to lead locally-driven initiatives, reaching over 100,000 people. These groups designed and implemented their own advocacy projects, with Plan adapting internal procedures to align with youth realities and priorities.</p> <p>Plan International Mozambique supported 10 feminist and women-led organisations in advocacy actions for women’s participation in decision-</p>	<p>Localisation efforts advanced across 48 offices, with WACA leading. Offices shifted from implementers to enablers, transferring decision-making power and resources to local CSOs.</p> <p>Plan International uses a “One Plan” approach at global policy windows, especially facilitating youth to speak out.</p>	<p>This information is from the FY25 Influencing Survey</p>

			<p>making processes. The advocacy activities with parliamentarians and local and central government are still in progress.</p> <p>Plan International Indonesia facilitated multiple youth-led advocacy platforms where local actors implemented initiatives independently. Through Plan Youth Network (PlaNet) established in 2023, Plan Indonesia created a platform for diverse girls and youth activists throughout Indonesia to lead movements, campaigns, and advocacy on issues they prioritised, with Plan providing support infrastructure. Currently, more than 3000 youth leaders and activists joined the platform. During the evaluation of Indonesia's National Strategy for Prevention of Child Marriage (Stranas PPA), Plan Indonesia facilitated policy dialogue spaces where local youth representatives from the Sahabat Pengadilan initiative led presentations to government stakeholders including BAPPENAS, KPPPA, and the Supreme Court, with youth advocates presenting policy/program recommendations.</p>		
<p>Pledge signatories' accountability: 3.5 % engagement of Pledge for Change signatory INGOs in joint annual reporting, learning and accountability processes, with peers and with partners</p>	<p><i>Data will be collected by Pledge for Change Secretariat and will include number of signatories who:</i> <i>a) reported for Pledge this year, b) attended Pledge Quarterly Meetings, Retreats and WGs, and c) facilitated a partner survey (as per metrics 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1)</i></p>				<p>Plan International is playing an active role in the P4C working groups. In addition to co-chairing the Authentic Storytelling working group, we have started to also co-chairing the Influencing wider change working group in FY25.</p>

Additional space for narrative reporting on qualitative metrics – please do not exceed **300 words** in any section:

Metric	Results achieved – where possible, include links to evidence
<p>2.5 Visibility and recognition to local partners: Evidence of cases of public communications on programs that showcase/acknowledge local partners' work</p>	<p>In addition to examples above, these are three good illustrations of how we encourage offices to ensure partners get the credit and visibility they deserve.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rwanda partnerships for change newsletter. Names all ongoing projects and partners and celebrates local partnerships - https://plan-international.org/rwanda/publications/partnerships-for-change-newsletter-4/ - there are 3 others in this series available here if useful - https://plan-international.org/rwanda/publications/. This is made by CO at local level, then we support them through feedback to ensure all digital best practice is followed and published content is high-quality ahead of publication. • Partners we work with to end child marriage are listed at the bottom of the child marriage page on global site https://plan-international.org/srhr/child-marriage-early-forced/ • Plan Nepal is a good example of a way a CO regularly names and credits their partners at the end of their case studies. Example here - https://plan-international.org/nepal/case-studies/catch-up-classes-help-rima-discover-joy-learning/
<p>3.2 Collective advocacy for equitable, locally led and anti-racist approaches to aid and development: Measurable outcomes from collective advocacy for equitable, locally led and anti-racist approaches to aid and development and other interrelated government policies (eg. trade, foreign policy)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan International Germany in its advocacy and influencing work on the federal budget in Germany called for a dedicated and transparent budget allocation to support locally led organisations, ensuring that resources reach those closest to the communities they serve. • In response to the new Civil Society Partnership Reform Plan proposed by the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), Plan International Korea participated in the public consultation process. Our advocacy focused on ensuring the plan's approach to 'locally-led development' was genuinely equitable. We provided critical feedback that the initial draft, while positive, lacked a deep emphasis on core principles such as solidarity, decolonial approaches, and concrete mechanisms to address power imbalances within partnerships. We advocated for the final plan to more actively embed these values and ensure the voices of diverse civil society actors are central to its finalization. • Plan International UK provided mark-ups to UK Government within UN/global processes that include or advocate for approaches and language that are anti-racist and decolonial. Including for: CSW; CPD; COP29. Several key suggestions were incorporated by the UK Government within their approach. • Through Plan International Colombia's projects we have promoted equitable, locally driven, and anti-racist approaches that strengthen diverse communities. With the Regional Youth Program and Empoderarte por la Paz, we supported 15 civil society organizations in Cauca and the Caribbean in developing gender and safeguarding guidelines. Highlights include the creation of the Decolonial and Anti-Racist Policy by Las Emperadoras de la Champeta, which influenced the Special Safeguard Plan • At the National Disaster Management Agency's recent preparatory engagement, particularly regarding support for flood survivors, Plan International Liberia has taken a leadership role in advocating for policy changes across various levels. We have promoted funding models that prioritize local leadership and accountability rather than conventional top-down approaches from governmental

3.3 Influencing donors and philanthropic community:

Evidence of cases where INGOs and partners have contributed to influencing policies/mechanisms/budgets/ etc. that enable equality in resource allocation to local partner organizations

3.4 Elevating local leadership: Evidence of local/national/regional actors leading advocacy initiatives, with INGO Pledge Signatories playing facilitating, convening or supporting roles

entities. These efforts have led to a heightened recognition of local capacities and a transition towards more equitable partnerships in international development, as well as enhanced local funding opportunities. There is now a greater emphasis on decentralization and inclusion, especially concerning organizations led by women and girls. These initiatives clearly demonstrate our dedication to creating an environment where all voices are acknowledged and systemic inequalities are actively addressed.

- As a member of the INGO Forum, **Plan International Malawi** hosted, presented on, and encouraged others to set clear ambitions of resourcing and funding local actors by at least 30%. Plan's ambition in Malawi is 40% minimum. Government gazetted guidelines in December 2024 for INGO operations - compliance will be demanded for at least 30% funds on each project to be shared with and delivered by local NGOs.
- **Plan International Australia** has consistently called for increased funding to local organisations, particularly girls and women led organisations. Specific examples include the policy recommendations arising from the Pacific Girls in A Changing Climate report - which we amplified through communications and direct advocacy to government - and recommendation in the new government briefing we developed and circulated following the Federal election in May 2025.
- Plan actively participated in two key regional forum in the **Americas**: the Latin American Forum on Civic Participation (Lima, Dec 2024) and the Second Permanent Latin American Forum on the Decolonization of Cooperation (Bogotá, June 2025). These engagements reinforced commitments to localization, decolonization, and shifting power to local actors, positioning young women and grassroots organizations as protagonists of change. While these actions did not yet deliver immediate large-scale policy shifts, they created vital alliances, entry points, and narratives that strengthen civic engagement, advance decolonized cooperation, and ensure that young women's rights remain visible and prioritized despite restrictive democratic contexts. Likewise, Plan's presence in the Lima and Bogotá forums demonstrates that, even amid shrinking space, youth and feminist voices can connect with broader regional and global debates on civic participation and decolonization of cooperation.
- **Plan International Ukraine** and partners made deliberate contributions to influence how resources are allocated to local actors. In June 2025, we co-drafted the Humanitarian Reset Joint Statement with Ukrainian CSOs, which put forward concrete financing reforms: multi-year grants, full cost coverage, reduced administrative barriers, and transparent NGO representation in coordination bodies. These demands aimed to close the systemic funding gap faced by local NGOs, especially women- and youth-led organisations. Ahead of the Ukraine Recovery Conference (URC 2025), we also contributed to the Bridging the Gaps: Displacement and Recovery paper, which called for donors to treat investment in community-based and women's groups as core to sustainable recovery, not optional add-ons. At the EHF, our team reinforced these messages in bilateral exchanges with EU policymakers, stressing the inequity of Ukrainian NGOs receiving only a fraction of direct funding compared to international actors. These actions incrementally shifted donor debates toward acknowledging localisation as both fair and effective.
- **Plan International Timor-Leste** often plays a facilitating and supporting role, enabling local, national, and regional actors to lead advocacy initiatives. For example, through our participation in the Child Rights Advocacy Network, we convene meetings, provide technical guidance, and share evidence-based recommendations while ensuring that local CSOs, youth groups, and government representatives take the lead in advocacy efforts. We also support initiatives under the Pledge of Change, including the Conference of the People Asia Forum, where local organizations and youth networks design and lead campaigns, policy dialogues, and community mobilization activities. Plan International's role is to facilitate connections, provide capacity-strengthening support, and amplify the voices of local actors without directing the agenda. By prioritizing locally led approaches, Plan International ensures that advocacy is contextually relevant, inclusive, and owned by Timorese actors. This approach strengthens local leadership, encourages sustainability, and promotes equitable participation of marginalized groups, including women, youth, and persons with disabilities, in policy dialogues and decision-making processes at multiple levels.



- **Plan International Bolivia** assumed a facilitating and convening role in multiple initiatives where local actors were at the forefront of advocacy. A key example was its support to adolescent and youth platforms (PIA) in Altiplano and Tarija, who led advocacy efforts with national authorities during the Encuentro Nacional de Líderes y Jóvenes in La Paz. These youth leaders raised demands on sexual and reproductive health, access to differentiated services, and prevention of early pregnancies. Plan Bolivia also facilitated intersectoral coordination for the development and implementation of 48 Early Childhood Development Centers in 36 municipalities, while municipal governments took the lead in resource allocation, infrastructure, and sustainability. Additionally, Plan accompanied the Civil Society Coalition in preparing and presenting the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) recommendations before the UN system in Geneva, without assuming protagonism, and ensuring that national actors led the drafting and presentation processes. These examples reflect Plan's strategic role in empowering local leadership and ensuring sustainability of advocacy outcomes
- **Plan International Guinea Bissau** played a supporting role to enable 10 youth organizations (CNJ, Alumni GB, RENAJELF GB, CODEDIC, RENAPESC, MIKAT GB, CHILDREN'S PARLIAMENT, NETWORK OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH FROM RURAL AREAS, NHA FALA, GB NATIONAL CONSULTATIVE) to lead the national sexual health and education campaign in Guinea-Bissau, aligned with the 6 WHO Principles: Human rights and gender equality; Scientific information without taboos; Universal access to health services; Respect for diversity; Autonomy and consent; Risk prevention.
- **Plan International Pacific** and Australian Volunteers International proudly hosted the 2025 Disaster Ready Localisation Reflection Workshop in the Solomon Islands. The three-day workshop co-moderated by representative from Plan International Solomon Islands, Plan International Fiji, and Plan International Australia, brought together community leaders from Peava and Kavolavata villages, representatives from the National Disaster Risk Management Office, the National Disability Forum Solomon Islands, and international partners. Together, we shared experiences of localization in practice—exploring what is working well, where challenges remain, and how to create lasting, positive change in communities. As one participant highlighted, projects are most successful when communities lead the way and partner organizations provide support. Through collaboration and reflection, we continue to identify ways to strengthen partnerships, foster inclusion, and build local resilience in the Pacific.

Section 4: Analysis and Reflection

In addition to your progress against the above metrics, how would you describe your overall progress towards meeting the three Pledges (see Annex 1 below)?

You might think about:

- How did your organisational commitment to the three Pledges change? Are there any other initiatives you would like to highlight, eg. working with Accountability Now, Grand Bargain, Charter for Change?
- What did your organisation learn from your Pledge journey this year and what difference did it make?
- What would you like to do more of/do less of next year to facilitate progress towards the Pledge for Change Commitments?

You can also provide more detail through the Stories of Change approach, guidance [here](#), and attached in Annex 2.

Pledge	Progress towards the commitments	What will you do more of/less of to facilitate progress?
Equitable Partnerships	Disappointingly all our reported partnership metrics have seen a decline in FY25. It is possible this may partly be attributable to the wider context change, with the global funding crisis and its impact on local civil societies, and the effect on Plan and our organisation’s operational focus and bandwidth but it is also reflective of the fact that strategically, operationally, and culturally we are still learning how to be partner led. While we are undoubtedly seeing increased interest from many different parts of the organisation on localisation and partnerships, this is not yet being translated into tangible results and progress, and there have been many transitions and restructures within teams which have undoubtedly affected partnering relationships across Plan. There is huge variation across regions and countries in terms of progress. Notably, although the volume of work through partners is smallest in ROA we have seen the most positive feedback from partners and our MEESA region has consistently underperformed other regions in terms of partner feedback this year. On a positive note, a number of countries have developed local partnership frameworks and targets to support progress towards quality and equitable partnering, our Zambia office engaged with local partners through the RINGO reverse call for proposals and in May 2025 we held a regional workshop in APAC for regional partnership/ programme colleagues focused on equitable partnering and strengthening civil society.	<p>We are in the process of developing a strategic roadmap for Plan International to be partner-led to help provide clear strategic direction for Plan entities. This will take into account feedback from partners and Plan colleagues from around the world.</p> <p>It is clear from our annual reporting process that we need to do more to create a consistent understanding across the organisation on what partnerships are, and we need to find ways to better integrate partnership metrics and learning into our projects, programmes and management systems. We also need to target more work towards our business development teams to ensure that at the project/ proposal development phase conditions are established that enable us to expand our work through partners, and so that partners to co-create with Plan and are resourced appropriately.</p>



In response to the USG cuts, Plan International set up a Solidarity Fund to help impacted projects and local partners impacted by the sudden cut off in UGS funding.

Authentic Storytelling

We've created, delivered and rolled out an online learning module on our Plan Academy platform on Representation, Dignity and Safeguarding in Communications. This is open to all staff and available to partners/free lancers. This will be a vital way to continue embedding our principles with our staff so the approach gets into our DNA in the same way child safeguarding is. The online course and the written guidelines are provided in 3 languages and will be embedded in inductions for certain staff functions.

We will continue digest and embedding the results of the comms material audit ensuring we are being as diligent about authentic storytelling as possible.

Influencing Wider Change

While our influencing efforts toward localisation have expanded across all offices in FY25, significant structural barriers continue to hinder faster progress. These include limited and inconsistent funding for local actors, particularly youth- and women-led organisations, heightened risks in fragile or conflict-affected contexts, and a shrinking civic space that restricts meaningful engagement.

Further internal influencing will be required to drive the locally-led, globally-connected agenda and the Pledge for Change forward.

Offices are shifting from implementers to enablers, transferring power and resources to local CSOs. However, structural challenges such as limited funding and complex compliance still hinder progress.

This expresses the need for us to invest more efforts in the common understanding and application of our locally-led and globally-connected priorities.

Annex 1: Pledge for Change Commitments

Pledge	Commitments
<p>Equitable Partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equitable partnerships will be our default approach by 2030. National and local organisations will lead humanitarian and development efforts wherever possible. We will help them take control, and we'll engage directly only when there isn't enough national or local capacity to meet people's needs. (Metrics: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.7) • Where there is no partnership, or we're responding to an emergency, we'll find ways of working with national and local organisations at the first opportunity. We'll then support them as they take over the decision-making. Wherever we work, our broad aim is to encourage a more resilient, independent, and diverse civil society that works in real solidarity with international organizations. (Metrics: 1.3, 1.4, 1.7) • INGOs competing for funds, facilities, and talent can unintentionally weaken civil society in the countries where we operate. In the years ahead, we'll allocate more resources to help national and local organizations take the lead. We'll work in partnership with them to make sure they benefit from our presence. (Metrics: 1.2, 1.4) • There will be more collaboration between INGOs to reduce duplication of effort when local organisations are dealing with two or more of us. This should mean a common approach to compliance and due diligence. It could also mean pooling funds and taking other steps to achieve economies of scale. (None – captured through narrative reporting) • We'll take a more collaborative approach to risk management. We'll avoid applying stricter risk requirements to our partners than ourselves and look for ways of minimizing the compliance burden on partners. (Metrics: 1.1) • We will share the burden of costs in ways that will make our partners stronger and more sustainable. (Metrics: 1.5, 1.6)
<p>Authentic Storytelling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our fundraising and communications will reflect our commitments to anti-racism, locally led initiatives, gender equality and equitable partnerships. We will use our platforms to show the actions led by local communities both during a crisis and as they recover, and the impact made by local organisations. (Metrics: 1.2, 2.2) • We will continue to show the harsh realities of poverty, conflict, hunger, and natural disasters because humanitarian crises should not be sanitised. But we'll avoid exploitative imagery that portrays people as helpless victims. We will give credit to partners where it's due. (Metrics: 2.2, 2.5) • We will strengthen efforts to make all our storytelling ethical and safe, based on informed consent and accurate representation. We'll amplify the stories people want to tell rather than merely speaking on their behalf. We'll preserve the authenticity of a story all the way through our editorial process, from the gathering of words and pictures to editing, production and publication. (Metrics: 2.2, 2.4, 2.5)



Influencing
Wider Change

- We will stop using jargon that confuses our audiences, our colleagues, and the communities where we work. We'll use plain words that can be easily translated from English or French into different languages and readily understood by all. (Metrics: 2.1)
- We will regularly review our words and pictures, creating a culture of anti-racism, reflection and learning. As language evolves, we'll invite views from colleagues and local organisations, and remove words that have become outdated or offensive. (Metrics: 2.2)
- We will use language and imagery to inspire wider cultural change. We'll co-produce stories, photographs and video with local organisations and talent. Wherever possible, we'll put local people at the centre of the story. (Metrics: 2.4)
- Our leaders will publicly announce the pledge, spelling out to peers, donors, philanthropists and the private sector why we've decided to change the way we work and how we're going to do it. (Metrics: 3.3, 3.5)
- We will argue for these changes to be made across the aid and development sector and we'll create opportunities for Global South leaders to lead conversations and advocate for change in public platforms. (Metrics: 3.2, 3.4)
- We will speak out against any government policies or international action that perpetuate a colonial approach to aid and development. (Metrics: 3.3)
- We will track our progress in implementing the Pledge for Change 2030 and report it publicly to show staff, supporters, partners, and the global aid system that we're 'walking the talk'. (Metrics: 3.1, 3.5)
- We will share what we learn and demonstrate how we're shifting power and resources to the Global South with the aim of encouraging other INGOs to follow suit. (Metrics: 3.5, plus narrative reporting)

Annex 2: Stories of Change guidance

Accountability and Learning are key to the Pledge for Change. We know that we are trying to bring about change inside complex systems, alongside many other initiatives, both internal and external. And we know that we can learn a huge amount from the stories that people tell in different parts of our organizations and communities around the world. In order to be able to capture some of these experiences, please consider answering these questions:

- In the last year, what was the most significant change that occurred as a result of Pledge for Change?
- Why do you think this is significant? What has been the effect of this change? What part of your organization: people, policies, practices have changed?



We would like you to think about gathering these stories from different people and perspectives. These could include staff in different roles, partners, community members, etc. You may be able to integrate these questions into program visits or management or team meetings. You may want to host a special session with colleagues and partners or invite them to contribute via existing staff engagement mechanisms (i.e. via the intranet, pulse surveys etc.). We are hoping for a rich and rounded perspective of what has been changing, rather than statistically validated information. The more varied the contributions are, the more we will learn, and the more fruitful our collective analysis and learning about what is valued can be. You could use these questions as prompts to help craft stories of change:

- From your point of view, describe a story that best illustrates the change that you have witnessed or experienced because of the Pledge for Change. This could be a change in organizational culture, internal policy or processes, relationships with partners, partner actions or initiatives, levels of engagement with #shiftpower or other decolonizing space, etc.
- Why is this story significant for you? How do you think it is an example of a shift in power between international NGOs and local actors (partners or communities you work with)?
- Were there any difficulties or challenges you encountered trying to implement this change? What forms of resistance are you experiencing? What do you think is causing the resistance?

What would you like colleagues from peer organizations who are starting to work on similar changes to know as they embark on shifting their programmatic and institutional practices?

² <https://tciurbanhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/MSCTechBrief6-14.pdf>

Plan International Zambia's experience with the Reverse Call for Proposal

The 'Reverse Call for Proposals' (RCfP) is a prototype under the [RINGO initiative](#) and its design and rollout is led by a collective of civil society organisations, including [Pledge for Change](#), Center for Disaster Preparedness, Kujalink and the Pledge for AGNA Zambia Governance Foundation for Civil Society (ZGF). The RCfP is a mechanism to help shift power by asking for solidarity and action from INGOs, and this follows long-standing demands from many in civil society for a more ethical 'localisation' and new forms of bottom-up power.

What was Plan International Zambia's motivation to take part in it?

Plan International Zambia was motivated to participate in the reverse call in order to promote the localisation agenda to implementing activities through local partners and communities. The agenda aims at shifting the decision-making power to the local organisation and communities. Plan International Zambia's response to this call marked a significant power shift, rather than imposing a pre-designed intervention. In addition, Plan International Zambia was keen to be one of the first movers of this agenda after recognising the patterns emerging on localisation and how hyper-local actors were becoming increasingly relevant, as a result of their rootedness in the communities, their legitimacy and the cost effectiveness of channelling development and humanitarian action- through their structures.

How is Plan International Zambia involved?

Plan International Zambia applied to be a partner in the Reverse Call for Proposals, outlining:

- Its experience in supporting local communities using the community-led development approach
- Explaining the extent to which it is willing to shift power and work in genuine solidarity, as evidenced in activities undertaken over the past three years
- Explaining its capacity to support local communities
- The geographical areas that Plan was supporting
- The sector areas that Plan can be supporting on

Nyankanga Community Foundation selected Plan International Zambia under the reverse call issued by the Zambia Governance Foundation which is administering the Pledge for Change in-country. Proposals had been issued in September and selection was done late October 2024.

What are some of the lessons learned so far?

- Reverse call being a new phenomenon needs to be explained well to the communities or the foundation in this case. This is to have a common understanding for both parties involved.
- The communities have the capacity to identify and respond to their own needs. They have a diverse group of people with the different capabilities to implement and respond to their needs.
- Improved coordination: Communities have the interest to work together when they are the ones in-charge of identifying their needs and responding to the needs.
- Amplified community voices and enhanced participation: The communities are free to speak out and participate in their own development agenda



- Flexible processes. The foundation has very flexible processes in implementing activities and this avoids delays in implementation
- Enhanced trust: There is an increased trust among the foundation in managing resources, legitimacy and local knowledge. These are intangible and vital for sustainable development.
- The shift of power to communities as the potential for meaningful development due to the active participation of the communities.

What are some of the challenges experienced so far?

Big brother and risk aversion culture, often very strong in INGOs, is difficult to shift quickly and requires ongoing reflection and behaviour change. Similarly, the community-based organisation needs to be challenged to continue to find its voice and power as the learned powerlessness can sometimes be observed. The tripartite agreement between Plan International, ZGF and Nyankanga Community Foundation has been a good platform to continue to navigate the power issues

What advice would you give to another office that is interested in participating in a reverse call for proposal?

There is need to find alignment and value add. Any Plan International Office that is working on a reverse call for proposals is not just funding a local entity through an alternative mechanism but it is reimagining power relations in our sector. Therefore, it is critical to consider the nature of change that we will bring about by participating in reverse call. What sector-wide contribution are we making to shifting power, and what dimensions of power and levers have we pulled?

Plan International Nepal's learning on working well in Partnerships

In order to succeed in our partnerships work, firstly, there needs to be a real focus on fully implementing our Building Better Partnerships principles. The steps sitting underneath these principles are important to allow us to build high quality, impactful and as equitable as possible partnerships. Secondly, it is not about the number of partners you work with – it is about the quality of those partnerships and how strategic and equitable they can be. Plan International Nepal has explored the technical expertise we have and how we can complement the skills of partners and provide demand driven and tailored capacity strengthening and sharing. Instead of holding all technical expertise, we have created strategic partnerships with local actors who can complement us and vice versa. Also, as part of our partnership portfolio, we have made a concerted effort to work as much as possible with existing youth-led organisations and networks.

Thirdly, we have introduced a partnership dashboard that is bringing greater transparency on partnerships for both us as well as the local actors we are working with.

Fourthly, we have built a strong culture of “bottom up” planning. This means for any projects, there is a strong co-design element of working collaboratively with local actors.

Last but not least – Plan International Nepal has made a conscious decision not to go down the route of pursuing a local registration. This was seen as necessary as to not compete with local actors, but to remain true to the INGO that Plan International Nepal is part of.



Plan International Netherlands (NLNO) restructure

Localisation and 'de-duplicating' has been on the NLNO strategic agenda for a while, but the office has taken bold steps to advance this in the last year. By July of this year, they have let go of 20% of staff and have dismantled their programming and communications department, shifting more power to Country Offices.