

# PATHWAYS TO LOCALISATION

A framework towards locally led humanitarian response in partnership-based action.



Funded by  
European Union  
Civil Protection and  
Humanitarian Aid



care

tearfund

act:onaid

CAFOD



OXFAM

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements and Acronyms</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. National Localisation Frameworks</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Purpose of the national localisation frameworks	5
2.2 Foundations of the national localisation frameworks	5
2.3 Contextual differences between the national localisation frameworks	5
2.4 Partnership-based humanitarian response in the national localisation frameworks	6
2.5 Capacity strengthening in the national localisation frameworks	7
<b>3. A Global Localisation Framework</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>I. Partnership-based Humanitarian Response</b>	<b>10</b>
Partnerships	10
Capacity	11
<b>II. An enabling environment for localisation</b>	<b>13</b>
Financial resources	13
Coordination	14
<b>4. Conclusion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>References and further reading</b>	<b>16</b>
Annex 1: List of organisations and agencies contributing to this paper	19
Annex 2: Partnerships practices for localisation; a guidance note	22
Annex 3: How localisation can be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)	24

Published October 2019

Suggested reference:

Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships (2019) *Pathways to Localisation: A framework towards locally-led humanitarian response in partnership-based action*. C. Schmalenbach with Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam.

# Acknowledgements

With thanks and credit to **Christina Schmalenbach** who drafted this paper following a thorough review of four national localisation frameworks, and other recent publications, papers and frameworks on localisation.

Thank you to **all stakeholders who contributed to the development of the national localisation frameworks in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan**; local and national humanitarian actors and organisations, International NGOs, United Nations agencies, donor agencies, Red Cross/Crescent, and Government authorities. Without you, this paper would not have the richness, detail and contextual analysis that it does. Contributing agencies are credited in Annex 1.

Big thanks to **members of the national steering committees in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan** who have guided, advised and coordinated with energy, passion and enthusiasm throughout the programme period.

Appreciation also to all consortium members – **Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam** – including the project staff Lizz Harrison (Christian Aid UK), Myo Oo Thet (Christian Aid Myanmar), Hast Bahadur Sunar (Tearfund Nepal), Victor Arokoyo (Christian Aid Nigeria), and Malish John (CARE South Sudan). Thanks also to the members of the Global Steering Group who have been part of this process, supported the programme, and provided guidance and feedback throughout.

Thank you to the **European Commission's Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)** for not only the funding support to make this programme possible, but also the close coordination and engagement from Brussels, Yangon, Kathmandu, Abuja and Juba.

# List of Acronyms

<b>C4C</b>	Charter for Change
<b>CBPF</b>	Country-Based Pooled Fund
<b>ECHO</b>	European Commission's Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
<b>GB</b>	Grand Bargain
<b>GMI</b>	Global Mentoring Initiative
<b>HCT</b>	Humanitarian Country Team
<b>HPC</b>	Humanitarian Programme Cycle
<b>INGO</b>	International Non-Governmental Organisation (/Not for Profit)
<b>L/NA</b>	Local/national actor
<b>L/NNGO</b>	Local/national NGO
<b>MEAL</b>	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
<b>NEAR</b>	Network for Empowered Aid Response
<b>PoP</b>	Principles of Partnership

This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

## Executive summary

The essential role of local and national actors in humanitarian response was highlighted at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016. The changes or transformations needed to enable local and national actors to take a greater leadership role in humanitarian action were outlined in all three major sets of commitments endorsed at the summit; Agenda for Humanity (2016)<sup>1</sup>, the Grand Bargain (2016)<sup>2</sup>, and the Charter for Change (2015)<sup>3</sup>.

*Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* is a consortium programme of Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam and guided by local and national actors in national steering committees. It is funded by the European Commission's Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) from late 2017 to 2019. This programme has built on existing work from the consortium aiming to strengthen the leadership of local and national actors in humanitarian action since 2012 through the *Missed Opportunities*<sup>5</sup> series of work.

The *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* programme conducted research to identify a partnership model which consists of partnership practices that local/national actors believed to be most conducive to localisation<sup>4</sup>. This research consulted more than 350 organisations in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan – 85% of which were local and national organisations – and recommendations were identified, validated and piloted by consortium members and local partners. Learning from the pilot phase was collated with findings from capacity self-assessments of more than 100 local and national actors. The research, learning and findings from the programme informed the development of national localisation frameworks with contributions from local and national actors and other humanitarian stakeholders including international NGOs, UN agencies, donors, Red Cross/Crescent societies, and relevant government authorities.

The four national localisation frameworks are context-specific to the very different operating environments and humanitarian crises in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan. Notable differences between the four national localisation frameworks are outlined in this paper and reflect the diverse contexts; they diverge particularly in relation to the role of government authorities in localisation.

However, there are a number of priority actions and areas common across the four frameworks; many of which link closely to existing localisation commitments, frameworks, and indicators which are referenced. While the focus of *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* was partnership-based humanitarian action, the national localisation frameworks have gone beyond this. The key areas included in all four national localisation frameworks are outlined in the paper, along with objectives, priority actions, and potential indicators.

<b>Partnerships</b>	Partnerships between international and local/national actors are genuine and equitable.
<b>Capacity</b>	Strong local/national actors able to design, manage and deliver effective people-centred humanitarian response programmes
<b>Financial resources</b>	Local/national humanitarian actors have increased access to international and national funding
<b>Coordination</b>	Local/national actors have greater presence, influence and leadership in humanitarian coordination mechanisms

*Pathways to Localisation*, presents a synthesis of the common areas across the four national localisation frameworks in a Global Localisation Framework in two areas: 1) actions for partnership-based humanitarian action; and 2) actions for an enabling environment for localisation. Actions, and suggested indicators and results, outlined in the Global Localisation Framework are relevant for international NGOs, UN agencies, donor agencies, government authorities, and local and national actors. They reflect what more than 120 local/national actors and another 30 humanitarian stakeholders have highlighted as crucial for a shift towards localisation in their countries.

Humanitarian stakeholders are urged to review the Global Localisation Framework with a view to developing a workplan with an ambitious but realistic timeline to make measurable progress towards the objectives. This Global Localisation Framework presents easy to follow pathways to localisation. Now we must act.

## Introduction

The essential role of local and national actors in humanitarian response was highlighted at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016. The changes or transformations needed to enable local and national actors to take a greater leadership role in humanitarian action were outlined in all three major sets of commitments endorsed at the summit; Agenda for Humanity (2016)<sup>1</sup>, the Grand Bargain (2016)<sup>2</sup>, and the Charter for Change (2015)<sup>3</sup>. The movement towards more locally-led humanitarian responses – ‘localisation’ – has gained momentum since 2016, both globally and in countries with new or on-going humanitarian crises.

From 2012, a consortium of international NGOs (INGO) – Christian Aid, CAFOD, Oxfam, Tearfund, ActionAid, CARE – conducted a number of projects and studies documenting partnership experience with local actors in several humanitarian response programmes with support from UK Aid. The Missed Opportunities series of reports<sup>5</sup> give insights into the changes that are needed to ensure more equitable partnerships between international actors and local/national actors.

Building on this work, the consortium implemented *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* with support from the European Commission’s Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) from late 2017 to 2019. Through research in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan<sup>4</sup>, the programme built an evidence base of partnership practices which local/national actors think are most conducive to localisation. The recommendations of the research were validated and shared widely and piloted by the consortium members and their local partners over the project period. Some recommendations were external to partnerships, and efforts will be needed by other humanitarian stakeholders to make the changes needed to enable locally-led humanitarian response.

Additionally, more than 100 local/national actors have undertaken their own capacity self-assessment process, supported by the programme, to identify their capacity strengths and gaps. Results of the capacity self-assessment process have been combined with evidence from the research, learning from the pilot phase, and information from other relevant initiatives to inform national localisation frameworks in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan. These national localisation frameworks have been developed by more than 150 humanitarian stakeholders; more than 120 local/national actors (87%), and relevant INGOs, United Nations (UN) agencies, Red Cross/Crescent National Societies, donors, networks, and relevant government authorities in each country, and contextualised to the country. A list of the agencies directly involved in developing the national localisation frameworks is included in Annex 1. Overall, more than 400 local/national actors have been consulted throughout the programme activities.

This paper, *Pathways to Localisation*, presents a synthesis of the four national frameworks into one global localisation framework relevant for humanitarian practitioners, policy-makers and decision-makers.

Throughout this publication, the terms ‘local/national actors’, ‘international actors’, and ‘donors’ have been used to reflect the full diversity of humanitarian agencies, groups and networks implementing and funding humanitarian action.

- **Local/national actors:** community members and groups, local and national NGOs implementing humanitarian action within one country, and including all other forms of civil society organisations and community-based organisations and National Red Cross/Crescent Societies.
- **International actors:** INGOs, UN agencies, and networks implementing humanitarian action in more than one country, including international Red Cross/Crescent Societies, Committee and Federation.
- **Donors:** all funders, donors and agencies which fund humanitarian action, including where funds are from taxpayers via official development assistance, from governments via UN, or from individuals via NGO emergency appeals.



Earthquake recovery in Nepal, one year on. Jiri in Dolakha District.

© Christian Aid / Claudia Janke

## 2. National Localisation Frameworks

### 2.1 Purpose of the national localisation frameworks

The purpose of the national localisation frameworks is to highlight and guide the changes that are needed by all stakeholders in the humanitarian system to enable more locally-led humanitarian response. These frameworks are designed to capture recommendations for humanitarian implementers and donors, towards strengthening leadership of local/national actors in humanitarian action. The recommendations refer to the development and scope of partnerships between INGOs and local/national actors and also the actions needed in capacity strengthening, access to resources, and coordination.

The ultimate goal of the actions identified is to ensure crisis-affected people's needs are met in the most effective way; localisation is one important pathway for this. Every organisation, agency or authority which engages with the humanitarian system has a role to play in accelerating localisation; and those that signed the Grand Bargain have a responsibility to report on their progress. The national localisation frameworks provide a clear and ambitious pathway for humanitarian stakeholders in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan.

### 2.2 Foundations of the national localisation frameworks

The national localisation frameworks were built on the findings and recommendations from the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* research, learning from the consortium members and local partners while piloting the recommendations, findings from the capacity self-assessments of local/national actors, and experiences of local/national actors.

They also build on the following two global frameworks:

- The *seven dimensions of localisation and emerging indicators* developed by Global Mentoring Initiative (GMI) under the Start Network's Disaster and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP)<sup>6</sup>; and
- The *Localisation Performance Measurement Framework* developed by Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR)<sup>7</sup>.

The use of these global models in the process of developing national localisation frameworks highlights their value and validity. In applying these models at a national level, the global ambitions have been translated into a context-relevant national framework with concrete and specific aims.

### 2.3 Contextual differences between the national localisation frameworks

The pathways, speed and milestones of localisation in each country will look quite different depending on the specific country and humanitarian context. While there are a number of key similarities in the national localisation frameworks across the four countries, there are also a number of key differences.

For example, the role of government authorities is attributed quite differently across the four national localisation frameworks. The Nigeria and Nepal Localisation Frameworks attribute the key role in progressing localisation to be the government. The Nigeria Localisation Framework expects the Federal Government to “provide the leadership and effectively coordinate the implementation of this multi-stakeholder Localisation Framework” and mentions the design of the Presidential Humanitarian Response Plan for North East by the Federal Government of Nigeria, and establishment of the Presidential Committee on North East Initiative, as “the first attempt at a response that aligns with the localisation agenda” (Nigeria Localisation Framework; 2019). Similarly, the Nepal Localisation Framework (2019), is seen as complementary to the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of the Government of Nepal, with the Government expected to take the localisation agenda into National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) policy and practice.

By contrast, localisation is seen as the responsibility of civil society in the Myanmar and South Sudan Localisation Frameworks. In South Sudan there are opportunities for the Government to play a greater role, but to date they have not been actively engaged in the localisation agenda. In Myanmar, progress on localisation will depend on the Government of Myanmar creating spaces to local and national NGOs to operate in civil society and humanitarian space. Clearly, any moves to strengthen the leadership of local/national actors in humanitarian action will need to take these differences into account and consider the extent to which civil society organisations are free to engage in humanitarian work, with or without international partners.

Another example is the ranking of actions in the national localisation frameworks. A clear ranking of actions is present in the Nepal Localisation Framework, with funding highlighted as the “highest priority domain”, followed by partnerships, capacity, policy/influence, coordination, participation revolution, and visibility. This ranking is echoed in the Nigeria Localisation Framework as it states that “sourcing and negotiating direct funding from donors including the private sector is one of the greatest challenges for many national and local NGOs involved in humanitarian response”.

Some other notable differences include: an emphasis in the Myanmar Localisation Framework (2019) on the need to include gender, inclusion and Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) as non-negotiable elements of localisation; and highlighting the role of communities affected by disasters, and strengthening community participation and influence in humanitarian programmes, in the Nepal Localisation Framework.

Further differences are not specifically outlined in the global localisation framework presented later in this paper where areas of convergence across the four national localisation frameworks have been highlighted instead. Combining the key similarities of the four national localisation frameworks into one global framework is not an indication that there is only one pathway to localisation; rather that there are some key elements relevant for all humanitarian stakeholders globally.

### **Safety and security risk management**

Given the security context in north-east Nigeria and South Sudan in particular, it is surprising that safety and security risk management was not significantly highlighted in the national localisation frameworks. Security risk management – including access to information, and analysis - is crucial in the move to more locally-led humanitarian response given the additional risks national aidworkers face. Findings are due to be published in 2020 from EISF’s research on *Partnerships and Security Risk Management: From the local organisation perspective*<sup>8</sup>. This should inform discussions on safety and security risk management at national and global levels.

## **2.4 Partnership-based humanitarian response in the national localisation frameworks**

The development of national localisation frameworks was facilitated through the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* programme which has a focus on partnership-based humanitarian action as one pathway to localisation. The research conducted as part of the programme found that two-thirds of respondents believed partnerships were the best pathway to localisation, with the remaining one-third believing there is a better pathway<sup>4</sup>. The research did not ask respondents about satisfaction levels, but it did ask to what extent they believed the partnership(s) their organisation was in was a ‘genuine partnership’; only 24% of local/national actors and 27% of international actors believed they were. These findings emphasise the need for international actors who work with local partners to ensure

that their partnership approach works towards genuine and equitable partnerships and is embedded across organisation culture, policy and practice in all countries.

All four national localisation frameworks described partnership as one of, if not the “dominant modality of providing relief and recovery” (Nepal Localisation Framework; 2019). Accordingly, all national localisation frameworks attribute a crucial role to INGOs in localisation and outline a set of expectations for INGOs to take into account when considering their future engagement and collaboration in humanitarian work. Multi-stakeholder collaboration is at the heart of all four national localisation frameworks; with partnerships between local/national actors and international actors presented as one of the key pathways towards strengthening the role of local/national actors in humanitarian action.

#### **Examples of good partnership practices: South Sudan Localisation Framework (2019)**

The practices that were most frequently highlighted as conducive to localisation tended to be from multi-year partnerships and long-term relationships. Those mentioned in the South Sudan Localisation Framework include partnerships between: Church and Development and DanChurchAid (15 years); National Christian Development Organization (NCDO) and International Aid Services (IAS) (10 years); and Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD) and Christian Aid (6 years). Each of these partnerships explicitly and strategically aims to strengthen local leadership of humanitarian action through training and mentoring, policy development, contribution to overheads, flexible funding and reporting arrangements, and increasing trust to manage parts of project planning and Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL).

Local/national actors, and other humanitarian stakeholders participating in the development of the national localisation frameworks, were keen to include a much broader range of actions and indicators for localisation beyond partnership-based humanitarian response. Key actions which support an enabling environment for localisation in partnership-based humanitarian response are included in the global localisation framework later in this paper to reflect this.

## **2.5 Capacity strengthening in the national localisation frameworks**

Capacity strengthening is a major element of all three sets of global commitments endorsed at the WHS – Agenda for Humanity, Grand Bargain, Charter for Change – and recognised as a key component of the localisation agenda. All four national localisation frameworks place a strong emphasis on the question of local/national actors’ capacity and the need for capacity strengthening. Differentiation and definition of the following terms are made in some frameworks: capacity vs capability, capacity building vs development vs strengthening vs sharing, and organisational or institutional development or strengthening. This paper uses the term capacity strengthening as a catch-all for these terms.

For those local/national actor research respondents who believed there is a better pathway to localisation than partnerships, the majority recommended capacity strengthening support independent of partnerships, highlighting its importance in humanitarian action whether partnership-based or not.

The results of the capacity self-assessments of more than 100 local/national actors in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan facilitated by the programme informed the national localisation frameworks. Efforts were made to include a diverse range of organisations including: small localised organisations and large national organisations, women-led organisations, and organisations with a focus on vulnerable and/or marginalised groups such as children, women, persons with disability. The capacity self-assessment tool used was based primarily on the NEAR Organisational Capacity Assessment tool with the aim that those organisations who completed it could use the results in future discussions and negotiations with partners, donors and others who might support them in addressing the gaps identified. Additional information was also collected on technical capacities relevant to humanitarian programming, e.g. water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), camp management, protection, food security, accountability etc.

A summary of the key trends in capacity strengths and gaps was developed in each country and consolidated at a global level. The following areas were prioritised for local/national actors’ capacity strengthening support:

1. Resource mapping / fundraising / resource mobilisation – including proposal writing.

2. MEAL – including establishing and developing systems.
3. Standard Operating Procedures.
4. Project cycle management / project performance management.
5. Financial management – including support with financial systems and policies.
6. Policy and advocacy – including influencing skills.
7. Organisational development / institutional sustainability.

While these are broad areas for support, they do provide a good starting point for projects seeking to strengthen the capacity of local and national actors in humanitarian response. However, we must also recognise the huge diversity and capacities of all actors in humanitarian action, and therefore emphasise the importance of developing capacity strengthening and sharing plans which are tailored to each partnership and based on the request for support from local/national actors rather than a generic plan rolled out for all local partners. This is outlined further as a priority action in the Global Localisation Framework in the next section.

There is an expectation, clearly articulated in the national localisation frameworks, for local/national actors to lead humanitarian action, and for INGOs to provide ‘technical support’ and capacity strengthening. However, the national localisation frameworks reflect findings from the research whereby local/national actors want capacity strengthening support which is not restricted to project-relevant, short-term, training. The Nigeria Localisation Framework outlines this well:

*“Most of the capacity building interventions are of short-term nature and only address areas the NGOs are expected to deliver rather than the needs of these local organisations. Although INGOs and UN agencies are investing significant resources and time on capacity building initiatives, the quality and long-term impact remains uncertain.”* Nigeria Localisation Framework (2019)

Discussed in the capacity self-assessment process, and outlined further in the national localisation frameworks, there is a demand for more innovative capacity strengthening methodologies alongside the more traditional training events, with a focus on ‘learning by doing’ e.g. mentoring, accompaniment, secondments.

*“In terms of methodology for support from international partners and donors, local/national NGOs (L/NNGOs) in Myanmar who participated in this process highlighted training and workshops as the most effective methodologies, followed by learning through participation in conferences and exchange visits.”*

Myanmar Localisation Framework (2019)

*“Most L/NNGOs value on-job mentorship and coaching by international partners as the most effective way to build local capacity of staff. This enables direct transfer of knowledge and skills through practice on the job. The L/NNGOs prefer to see increased co-location, secondment and regular technical on-job support to their staff and volunteers.”*

South Sudan Localisation Framework (2019)

However, one area which appears to be missing from the frameworks is that of complementarity. Complementarity is one of the five Principles of Partnership<sup>9</sup> and crucially important in meeting the aim of humanitarian action being ‘as local as possible, as international as necessary’. This is explored further in a new report from Barbelet of Overseas Development Institute’s Humanitarian Policy Group<sup>10</sup>.

An assumption made in the national localisation frameworks is that international actors are the best placed to provide such capacity strengthening support to local/national actors. This may be the case for some organisations and technical areas, but it is unlikely that it is true for all areas outlined above which extends far beyond humanitarian capacities to incorporate organisational development / institutional sustainability. One of the recommendations from the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* research was to: “assess capacity building skills of international actors”, and not assume that people or organisations with expertise or experience in humanitarian operations have the necessary skills to be good trainers or mentors<sup>4</sup>. Such assessments along with plans to address gaps identified are crucial; whether they aim to build internal capacity, or invest in national capacity strengthening providers. Using the term ‘capacity sharing’ seems particularly relevant here.

### 3. A Global Localisation Framework

As outlined throughout this paper, the four national localisation frameworks from Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan have been distilled into one Global Localisation Framework. This Global Localisation Framework is a synthesis of the priority actions highlighted in all four national localisation frameworks, giving confidence that they are relevant for a variety of humanitarian and country contexts.

The key areas in the four national localisation frameworks highlighted as most important for moving towards locally-led humanitarian action are as follows:

- Partnerships
- Capacity
- Financial Resources
- Coordination

These priority areas reflect what more than 150 humanitarian stakeholders have highlighted as the most important for a shift towards localisation in their countries, and reinforce global discussions which have included these four areas since the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016. In fact, the 2017-2019 action plan of the Grand Bargain Workstream 2: More support and funding tools to local and national responders – known as the ‘Localisation Workstream’ – guidance notes for each of these areas are under development. See the final draft of the Partnership Practices for Localisation Guidance Note in Annex 2 which has been informed by *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* research and learning, and validated by a wide variety of stakeholders, including organisations participating in the three regional localisation conferences in 2019.

With an aim to build on, rather than replicate, existing initiatives, relevant commitments, indicators or results are included in the Global Localisation Framework (and shown as superscript, e.g. <sup>GB</sup>). Where existing commitments or frameworks present similar or complementary actions these are shown as superscript in brackets (e.g. <sup>(GB)</sup>) and expanded in the References section at the end. The following coding is used:

- *Localisation Performance Measurement Framework* from NEAR<sup>6</sup> = NEAR
- *Localisation in Practice: Emerging Indicators and Practical Recommendations* from GMI et al<sup>7</sup> = GMI
- Charter for Change<sup>3</sup> = C4C
- Grand Bargain<sup>2</sup> = GB
- Principles of Partnership<sup>9</sup> = PoP

Given the focus of *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships*, the first section of the Global Localisation Framework outlines priority actions and suggested indicators which are related to partnership-based humanitarian response. These are most relevant for international actors working (in partnership) with local/national actors.

The second section of the Global Localisation Framework outlines actions and suggested indicators which are not specifically related to partnerships, but which relate to the enabling environment for locally-led humanitarian response. These are most relevant for those that fund and coordinate humanitarian action. Following is the Global Localisation Framework.

## I. Partnership-based Humanitarian Response

### Partnerships

**Objective:** Partnerships between international and local/national actors are genuine and equitable<sup>(C4C)</sup>

Priority actions	Indicators / Results
<b>Partnership Agreements</b>	
<p>1. International actors to develop <b>new long-term partnership agreements with local/national actors</b>, for both funded and non-funded strategic relationships, in consultation with local partners, which clearly set out terms and conditions of the partnership that are open to negotiation, and allow for the integration of short-term project-related sub-agreements</p>	<p># of new equitable partnership agreements between international and local/national actors which outline the roles and responsibilities of both partners and include key indicators of quality relationships</p> <p>Partnership MoUs [or agreements] include a clause on joint reciprocal evaluations and monitoring of the quality of relationship at regular intervals as a sign of a genuine partnership<sup>GMI</sup></p> <p># of partnerships which include transparency of financial transactions and budgets between international and local/national actors</p> <p># of local partners reporting satisfactory negotiation of partnership terms with international partners</p> <p>Relationships with local and national actors are guided by the Principles of Partnership (equality, transparency, results-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity) and are periodically reviewed<sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p>% of partnerships which have mechanisms by which issues of concern can be raised<sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p># of longer-term strategic partnership that commit to build systems and processes which reflect the ambitions and goals of L/NNGOs<sup>NEAR</sup></p>
<p>2. International and local/national actors <b>integrate points from the <i>Partnership Practices for Localisation Guidance Note</i></b> (Annex 2) into all partnership-based humanitarian action</p>	<p># of humanitarian actors (international / national / local) who have taken action to adopt at least 5 of the points listed in the <i>Partnership Practices for Localisation Guidance Note</i> in their humanitarian programming with partners</p> <p># of humanitarian actors (international/national/ local) who have developed action plans to integrate <i>Partnership Practices for Localisation Guidance Note</i> into their humanitarian programming with partners</p>
<p>3. International actors <b>credit the role of their local partners</b> in communications with supporters, donors and media<sup>(C4C)</sup></p>	<p># of instances of local and national partners being named in communications with donors and supporters, and in fundraising activities</p> <p>Promotion of [local/national actors] L/NA for their role in humanitarian action to the international and national media<sup>NEAR</sup></p>

Programme	
<p>4. International actors and local/national partners <b>collaborate jointly</b> throughout the programme cycle (including design, planning, proposal development, MEAL), and with crisis-affected people, sharing decision-making while taking on <b>complementary</b> roles and responsibilities <sup>(PoP)</sup></p>	<p># of programme proposals identifying the respective contributions/capacities of international and national/local actors in humanitarian action</p> <p># of consortia projects backed up by MoUs/agreements signed by all members, including local/national partners, which outline roles and responsibilities of each agency</p> <p># of proposals and budgets co-designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated with L/NNGOs and affected people <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p># of proposal development processes which actively involve local/national actors, international actors and crisis-affected people</p> <p>% of self-reported satisfaction of L/NNGOs in collaboration</p>
Human Resources (HR)	
<p>5. International actors adopt <b>ethical recruitment</b> practices in consideration of local conditions, and attempt to align pay/incentives to local conditions <sup>(C4C)</sup></p>	<p># of international actors who have taken steps to reduce pay/incentives differentials between them and local/national actors</p> <p># of international actors respecting existing contractual agreements of staff joining from local and national organisations</p> <p>INGOs/UN have ethical recruitment guidelines and abide by them <sup>NEAR</sup></p>

### Capacity

**Objective:** Strong local/national actors able to design, manage and deliver effective people-centred humanitarian response programmes <sup>(NEAR)</sup>

Actions	Indicators / Results
<p>6. International actors and local/national actors <b>assess capacity</b> strengthening needs <b>for each other</b> and accept results of recent similar assessments conducted by other agencies where practicable (on agreement of the respective agencies)</p>	<p># of capacity strengthening plans highlighting respective gaps and contributions of both partners, recognising complementarity</p> <p># of international actors whose partner capacity strengthening plans are informed by the capacity assessment of another agency</p> <p>Capacity-strengthening efforts are purpose and need-driven, not supply driven <sup>GMI</sup></p> <p>The underlying goal in a partnership is capacity-sharing <sup>GMI</sup></p> <p>Support for organisational development by INGOs/UN is coordinated and the results are cumulative <sup>NEAR</sup></p>

	Capacity assessments are routinely used and there is evidence of efforts to harmonise capacity assessment approaches across the sector <sup>NEAR</sup>
<p>7. Humanitarian actors jointly develop and deliver, as part of all partnership and programme budgets, <b>comprehensive capacity and organisational strengthening (and sharing) programmes</b> which are: informed by the priorities of the local/national actors, include long-term organisational development, and a transparent mechanism to measure results <sup>(GB &amp; C4C)</sup></p>	<p># of funded humanitarian project budgets which include a specific budget line for capacity and/or organisational strengthening of local/national actors</p> <p>Partnership contracts include organisational development <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p># of organisational strengthening activities and/or resources provided by international actors in support of local/national actors' surge capacity</p> <p># of international actors that have taken steps to change the mindsets and skill sets of international surge staff to ensure they have the right attitude and relevant skills to work collaboratively with partners in the earliest stages of a response <sup>5b</sup></p> <p># of mechanisms in place to regularly review progress and results of capacity strengthening programmes</p>
<p>8. The most <b>effective capacity strengthening approaches / methodologies</b> are identified as part of the capacity strengthening action plan process with efforts towards a learning-by-doing approach</p>	<p>% of capacity strengthening action plans that include a variety of methodologies (e.g. on-the-job coaching and mentorship, co-located working, job exchanges, secondments, access to e-learning in addition to training and workshops) and focus on learning by doing</p> <p>INGOs/UN adopt innovative approaches such as embedding staff and/or job-shadowing and mentoring L/NNGOs during humanitarian response in preference to substituting capacity <sup>NEAR</sup></p>

**Examples of good partnership practices: Tearfund**

Tearfund have built on the success of the *Shifting the Power* project and adapted the Strategic Humanitarian Assessment & Participatory Empowerment (SHAPE) Framework into a Disaster Management Capacity Assessment (DMCA) tool. The DMCA tool is run over a 2-year period and **supports the capacity strengthening plan of a local partner by providing grants and an accompanier** who supports local partners throughout the programme.

**Examples of good partnership practices: Street Child**

In Nigeria, Street Child have begun to provide national NGO partners with **5% of budgets as unrestricted funding**. This gives partners a level of core funding that they can use however they wish; to fill gaps in other programmes, finance office support personnel, or invest in their own organisational development.

**Examples of good partnership practices: Oxfam's Global Humanitarian Team**

Oxfam is adopting new guidance and indicators to ensure effective and equitable partnering beyond the project and funding cycle, that is supportive of locally-led humanitarian action. As part of its humanitarian quality framework, a principled partnering cycle management is now considered essential across the preparedness, rapid onset, rehabilitation, resilience, sustainability spectrum.

## II. An enabling environment for localisation

### Financial resources

**Objective:** Local/national humanitarian actors have increased access to international and national funding

Actions	Indicators / Results
<p>1. Donors make <b>direct funding</b> (more) available and accessible to local and national actors<sup>(GB &amp; NEAR)</sup>, including through and for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs)</b><sup>(GB)</sup>;</li> <li>- Humanitarian pooled funds;</li> <li>- <b>Multi-year funding</b> which includes a percentage for institutional development <sup>(NEAR)</sup>;</li> <li>- <b>Tangible assets</b> necessary for project implementation and institutional sustainability</li> </ul>	<p>Number and types of humanitarian funding mechanisms available in-country for L/NAs <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p>Presence and use of innovative funding mechanisms that promote localisation <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p>Year-on-year increases in the proportion of total humanitarian funding awarded to L/NA <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p>% of CBPFs which are directly transferred to local/national actors</p> <p>Co-managed pooled funds that are accessible to L/NA are a primary funding modality <sup>GMI</sup></p> <p># of donors who have instituted policy changes to enable/ease funding to local partners</p> <p>% of funded humanitarian project budgets which include unrestricted funds for local/national actors as specific budget lines</p> <p>% of funded humanitarian budgets which include budget lines for overhead and institutional development costs of local/national actors</p> <p># of funded humanitarian project budgets that include provision of tangible assets for local/national actors</p> <p>Un-earmarked overhead costs are allocated for management and future institutional development <sup>GMI</sup></p>
<p>2. Donors coordinate and harmonise <b>compliance and due diligence requirements</b> and provide quick and easy access to available humanitarian funding by simplifying procedures <sup>(GB)</sup></p>	<p># of funder compliance requirements which have been simplified and/or harmonised</p> <p># of international donors whose funding decisions are informed by the due diligence assessment of another funder</p> <p>Pure formalities and unnecessary due diligence assessments are avoided <sup>GMI</sup></p>



In one of Dikwa's Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps, up to 6,500 IDPs are struggling to exist in North Eastern Nigeria after fleeing from their homes due to conflict and violence.

© Christian Aid / Tom Pilston

### Coordination

**Objective:** Local/national actors have greater presence, influence and leadership in humanitarian coordination mechanisms

Actions	Indicators / Results
<p>3. Humanitarian stakeholders <b>recognise and highlight the role local humanitarian responders play</b> in joint humanitarian response and promote the active participation of their local partners and other local actors</p>	<p>L/NA are actively present in local and national task forces and coordination mechanisms <sup>GMI</sup></p> <p>L/NA are members of Humanitarian Country Teams (HCT) or relevant national humanitarian leadership forums <sup>NEAR (GPC)</sup></p>
<p>4. Humanitarian stakeholders ensure humanitarian coordination mechanisms – including clusters, Strategic Advisory Groups (SAG), Humanitarian Country Teams (HCT) – have <b>representation and active participation of local and national actors with plans for transitioning to local leadership</b> <sup>(GB)</sup></p>	<p>Where clusters are active, a transition plan exists to move humanitarian leadership and coordination to national and sub-national authorities <sup>NEAR</sup></p> <p>% of clusters which are led or co-led by local/national actors</p>
<p>5. International actors <b>support leadership of national government</b> in managing and coordinating humanitarian response and processes towards localisation</p>	<p>Government in principle co-leads all coordination mechanisms <sup>GMI</sup></p>

For localisation in humanitarian coordination, it needs to be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC). Some of the actions included in the four national localisation frameworks hint at this, but none made specific reference to the HPC, suggesting that one of the first steps needed is to increase the level of understanding, awareness and participation of local and national actors in the cycle<sup>11</sup>.

#### Examples of integrating localisation into coordination mechanisms: Global Protection Cluster

The Global Protection Cluster (GPC) and its four Areas of Responsibilities (AoRs) are seeking to ensure that protection response strategies and coordination mechanisms are guided by the principle 'as local as possible, as international as necessary'. There is **a variety of guidance and tools for Cluster Coordinators and National Partners on the GPC website**, including the one-page Guidance on how localisation can be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) in Annex 3. There is also a Learning Paper from a recent localisation initiative in Nigeria, Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan, Libya, Myanmar and Pakistan<sup>12</sup>.

## Conclusion

### *What does this mean for those committed to working towards localisation?*

The aim of the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* programme was to accelerate localisation through the strengthening of local and national leadership of humanitarian response with a focus on partnerships. The research explored the extent to which partnerships are genuine, instrumental in meeting humanitarian needs, and conducive to locally-led humanitarian action. Building upon this, the four national localisation frameworks have identified the partnership practices and actions needed to accelerate localisation in partnership-based humanitarian action, and the actions needed by other international actors to provide an enabling environment for localisation to be achieved.

The Global Localisation Framework identifies a clear set of expectations from local and national actors towards international actors and donors engaged in, and funding, humanitarian action. It is a synthesis of priority actions highlighted by a diverse group of more than 150 humanitarian stakeholders in four very different humanitarian, political and geographical contexts. As such, it provides a guide for all humanitarian stakeholders committed to making genuine changes in their ways of working to enable a shift towards a more locally-led humanitarian system; both within and outside partnerships.

International actors have the power to influence how, where and what a humanitarian operation looks like in a foreign country. In fact, respondents of the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* research ranked UN agencies as having the greatest influence in government and donor humanitarian funding decisions, followed by international NGOs. In articulating their expectations for a more equitable and locally-led humanitarian system through four national localisation frameworks, local and national actors have started to shift the power in such discussions, and provided some clear, concrete, measurable actions for accelerating localisation. The Global Localisation Framework provides a challenge and an opportunity for humanitarian stakeholders to analyse their ways of working, invest in longer-term capacity strengthening and organisational sustainability of local partners, and demonstrate their commitments to long-term transformative change.

Local and national actors also have a responsibility and a role to play in ensuring localisation is a viable route for effective, people-centred humanitarian action. There is increasing awareness and commitment to this, but localisation conversations at national level all too often revert to discussions on direct access to humanitarian funds. The South Sudan and Myanmar Localisation Frameworks include the following:

*“Local and national organisations are also encouraged to take deliberate steps to build their own internal systems and capacities.”*

South Sudan Localisation Framework (2019)

*“Local and national actors need to increase capacity and supporting systems to enable them to effectively manage increased funds and deliver effective humanitarian response.”*

Myanmar Localisation Framework (2019)

Actions, and suggested indicators and results, outlined in the Global Localisation Framework are relevant for international NGOs, UN agencies, donor agencies, government authorities, and local and national actors. This Global Localisation Framework is a summary of priority actions. Humanitarian stakeholders are urged to review them with a view to developing a workplan with ambitious but realistic timelines in which to make measurable progress. The commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016 will require proactive steps from all stakeholders, if they are to be realised, and from here on international actors will be judged on their progress. This Global Localisation Framework presents easy to follow pathways to localisation. Now we must act.

## References and further reading:

### References:

- 1 Agenda for Humanity (2016). Available online: <https://agendaforhumanity.org/>.
- 2 Grand Bargain (2016). Available online: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain>.
- 3 Charter for Change (2015). Available online: <https://charter4change.org/>.
- 4 Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam (2019) *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships: Recommendations for operational practices that strengthen the leadership of national and local actors in partnership-based humanitarian action globally*. Written by Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) and edited by C. Schmalenbach. Available online: <http://caid.org.uk/3g>.
- 5 *Missed Opportunities* series of reports:
  - 5a ActionAid, CAFOD, CARE, Christian Aid, Oxfam, Tearfund (2016) *Opportunity Knocks: Realising the potential of partnerships in the Nepal earthquake response*. Written by A. Featherstone, with assistance from S. Bogati. Available online: Full: <http://bit.ly/2qeiALv>; summary: <http://bit.ly/2IEv3P2>.
  - 5b Christian Aid, CAFOD, Oxfam, Tearfund, ActionAid (2012) *Missed Opportunities: the case for strengthening national and local partnership-based humanitarian responses*. Written by B. Ramalingam, B. Gray and G. Cerruti. Available online: <http://bit.ly/313j7Nj>.
  - 5c Christian Aid, CAFOD, Oxfam, Tearfund, ActionAid (2014) *Missed again: Making space for humanitarian partnership in the Typhoon Haiyan response*. Written by A. Featherstone, with assistance from C. Antequisa. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2J51wyr>.
  - 5d Christian Aid, CAFOD and Trócaire in Partnership, Oxfam GB and Tearfund (2016) *Missed Out: The role of local actors in the humanitarian response in the South Sudan conflict*. Written by L. Tanner and L. Moro. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2MBzZW0>.
- 6 Action Contre la Faim France, CDAC Network & Start Network (2018) *Localisation in practice - emerging indicators & practical recommendations*. Written by K. Van Brabant & S. Patel, Global Mentoring Initiative (GMI). Disasters & Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP). Available online: <http://bit.ly/2miAl57>.
- 7 Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR) (2019) *Localisation Performance Measurement Framework*. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2YTtHWk>.
- 8 Upcoming publication: EISF (2020) *Partnerships and Security Risk Management: From the local organisation perspective* (title and publication date to be confirmed).
- 9 Principles of Partnership (2007). Available online: <https://www.icvanetwork.org/principles-partnership-statement-commitment>.
- 10 Barbelet, V. (2019) *Rethinking capacity and complementarity for a more local humanitarian action*. Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG).
- 11 For an overview of the HPC see here: [www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space](http://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space).
- 12 Global Protection Cluster (GPC) (2019) *Advancing the Localisation Agenda in Protection Coordination Groups; Learning Paper*. Written by A. Nolan & M.E. Dozin. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2VVA5JC>.

**Complementary objectives, actions and indicators/results in the Global Localisation Framework:**

Page

**Charter for Change (C4C)**

- 9 Charter for Change: Partnership; Reaffirm principles of partnership.
- 10 Charter for Change: Promotion; Promote the role of local actors to media and public.
- 11 Charter for Change: Recruitment; Address and prevent the negative impact of recruiting NNGO staff during emergencies.
- 12 Charter for Change: Support; Provide robust organisational support and capacity building.

**Grand Bargain (GB)**

- 12 Grand Bargain Workstream 2, Commitment 1: Increase and support multi-year investment in the institutional capacities of local and national responders, including preparedness, response and coordination capacities, especially in fragile contexts and where communities are vulnerable to armed conflicts, disasters, recurrent outbreaks and the effects of climate change. We should achieve this through collaboration with development partners and incorporate capacity strengthening in partnership agreements.
- 13 Grand Bargain Workstream 2, Commitment 4: Achieve by 2020 a global, aggregated target of at least 25 per cent of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible to improve outcomes for affected people and reduce transactional costs.
- 13 Grand Bargain Workstream 2, Commitment 6: Make greater use of funding tools which increase and improve assistance delivered by local and national responders, such as UN-led country-based pooled funds (CBPF), IFRC Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) and NGO-led and other pooled funds.
- 14 Grand Bargain Workstream 2, Commitment 2: Understand better and work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders in order to lessen their administrative burden.
- 14 Grand Bargain Workstream 2, Commitment 3: Support and complement national coordination mechanisms where they exist and include local and national responders in international coordination mechanisms as appropriate and in keeping with humanitarian principles.

**NEAR Localisation Performance Measurement Framework (NEAR)**

- 11 Capacity. Impact indicator: L/NA are able to respond effectively and efficiently to humanitarian crises, and have targeted and relevant support from INGOs/UN.
- 13 Funding. Key performance indicator: The amount of humanitarian funding to L/NA increases in line with Grand Bargain and Charter for Change commitments.
- 13 Funding. Key performance indicator: Donors should introduce multi-year financing and incentivise their own grantees to do likewise in order to enable local actors to retain staff, and ensure greater programme, and organisational preparedness, stability and quality.

**Principles of Partnership (PoP)**

- 11 Complementarity; The diversity of the humanitarian community is an asset if we build on our comparative advantages and complement each other's contributions. Local capacity is one of the main assets to enhance and on which to build. Whenever possible, humanitarian organizations should strive to make it an integral part in emergency response. Language and cultural barriers must be overcome.

**Global Protection Cluster (GPC)**

- 14 See also Global Protection Cluster paper: *Guidance on how localisation can be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)*. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2VwBEAe> and in Annex 3.

**Suggested background and/or further reading:**

CARE, Christian Aid, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam (2019) *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships: Recommendations for operational practices that strengthen the leadership of national and local actors in partnership-based humanitarian action in **South Sudan***. Written by Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) and edited by C. Schmalenbach. Available online: <http://caid.org.uk/3k>.

Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam (2019) *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships: Recommendations for operational practices that strengthen the leadership of national and local actors in partnership-based humanitarian action in **Nigeria***. Written by Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) and edited by C. Schmalenbach. Available online: <http://caid.org.uk/3j>.

Christian Aid, Tearfund, CARE, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam (2019) *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships: Recommendations for operational practices that strengthen the leadership of national and local actors in partnership-based humanitarian action in **Myanmar***. Written by Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) and edited by C. Schmalenbach. Available online in English: <http://caid.org.uk/3h> and Myanmar language: <http://caid.org.uk/localisation-research-myanmar>.

Tearfund, Christian Aid, CARE, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam (2019) *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships: Recommendations for operational practices that strengthen the leadership of national and local actors in partnership-based humanitarian action in **Nepal***. Written by Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) and edited by C. Schmalenbach. Available online in English: <http://caid.org.uk/3i> and in Nepali: <http://caid.org.uk/localisation-research-nepali>.

Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Localisation: [www.globalprotectioncluster.org/themes/localisation/](http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/themes/localisation/).

Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC): [www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space](http://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space).

**Annex 1: List of organisations and agencies contributing to this paper**

<b>Myanmar</b>			
1	ActionAid	14	Local Resources Center (LRC)
2	Aryone Oo	15	Mon Taxi Youth Group
3	Better Life	16	Myanmar Baptist Churches Union (MBCU)
4	CAFOD	17	Myanmar Baptist Convention (MBC)
5	Christian Aid	18	Myitta Resources Foundation (MRF)
6	Church of Province Myanmar (CPM)	19	Oxfam
7	Community Empowerment & Resilience Association (CERA)	20	Pathein-Myaung Mya Association (PMA)
8	Community Health and Development (CHAD)	21	Primary Colour Association
9	Green Life Alliance for Development (GLAD)	22	Rakhine Women Network
10	Karen Baptist Church (KBC)	23	Strength of Survival (SOS)
11	Karuna Mission Social Solidarity (KMSS)	24	Tawin Thazin Women Group
12	Karuna Mission Social Solidarity (KMSS) Pathein	25	Tearfund
13	Local Development Network		
<b>Nepal</b>			
1	ActionAid Nepal	19	Janahit Gramin Sewa Samittee (JGSS)
2	Association for Rural Social Welfare (ARSOW – Nepal)	20	National Disaster Management Network of Nepal (DiMaNN)
3	Bageshwori Asal Shasan (BAS) Club	21	National Network of Community Disaster Management Committees (NCDMC), Nepal
4	Bagmati Welfare Society	22	National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET) - Nepal
5	CARE Nepal	23	NELUMBO Nepal
6	Caritas Nepal	24	NGO Federation of Nepal (NFN)
7	Center for Community Development, Nepal (CCDN)	25	Oxfam Nepal
8	Center for Disaster Management Studies (CDMS), Women Humanitarian Platform	26	Protection Nepal (PN)
9	Centre for Development and Disaster Management (CDM-Nepal)	27	Rural Development Centre (RDC) Nepal
10	Community Development & Advocacy Forum Nepal (CDAFN)	28	Shree Swanra Integrated Community Development Center (SSICDC)
11	Community Development Center (CDC-Nepal)	29	Social Development & Research Centre (SDRC)
12	Development Project Service Center (DEPROSC) Nepal	30	Sustainable Enterprise & Environment Development Society (SEEDS)
13	Disaster Preparedness Network- Nepal (DPNet-Nepal)	31	Tearfund Nepal
14	Education Training & Service for Community-Nepal (ETSC-Nepal)	32	The Group of Helping Hands (SAHAS) – Nepal

15	Forum for Community Upliftment System Nepal (FOCUS-Nepal)	33	United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
16	Federation of Nepalese Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FNCCI)	34	UN Resident Coordinator Office (UNRCO)
17	Feminist Dalit Organization (FEDO)	35	Volunteer Corps Nepal
18	Homenet Nepal (HNN)		
<b>Nigeria</b>			
1	BudgIT	21	Keen and Care Initiative (KCI)
2	CARE International	22	Life at Best Development Initiative (Labi)
3	Catholic Caritas Foundation of Nigeria	23	Mercy Vincent Foundation
4	CEDASY	24	Ministry of Budget and National Planning
5	Centre for Citizens with Disability (CCD)	25	National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)
6	Centre for Social Cohesion, Peace and Empowerment (CENSCOPE)	26	National Youth Action For Development and Empowerment (NAYADE)
7	Christian Aid	27	Nigeria NGO Network (NINGONET)
8	Christian Rural and Urban Development Association of Nigeria (CRUDAN)	28	Participation Initiative for Behavioural Change in Development (PIBCID)
9	Connected Development	29	RIDE
10	Cool FM	30	Street Child
11	CRUE	31	Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC)
12	Development Action Group	32	Swiss Embassy
13	Faith live Foundation	33	The Guardian
14	Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs	34	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)
15	Federal Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development	35	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)
16	Global Education Emergencies Support Initiatives (GEESI)	36	Women and Children in Support Community Development Initiative (WOCCI)
17	ICARE Global Development Initiative	37	Women for Peace in Nigeria (WOPIN) Katsina
18	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)	38	Women in the New Nigeria and Youth Empowerment Initiative (WINN)
19	Justice and Development Peace Commission	39	Womens Right to Educational Programme (WREP)
20	Kebetkache Women Resource Centre		
<b>South Sudan</b>			
1	Across	29	LAM
2	Action for Children Development Foundation - South Sudan (ACDF-SS)	30	Language and Social Development Organisation (LSDO)
3	Africa Development Aid (ADA)	31	Lulu Care
4	African Leadership and Reconciliation Ministries (ALARM)	32	MLI
5	Aliab Rural Development Agency (ARUDA)	33	Narrative Hub

6	ALSI	34	NDA
7	ARD-A	35	Organization for Peace, Relief and Development (OPRD)
8	AWICO	36	Oxfam
9	AWIDA	37	PDW
10	AYWEO	38	Peace and Development Collaborative Organisation (PDCO)
11	CARE International	39	Peace Corps Organisation (PCO)
12	Centre for Emergency and Development Support (CEDS)	40	RAO
13	Change in Society Health Aid (CSHA)	41	Save the Children
14	Charity and Empowerment Foundation (CEF)	42	Smile Again Africa Development Organization (SAADO)
15	Christian Aid	43	South Sudan Development Agency (SSUDA)
16	Community Initiative for Development Organisation (CIDO)	44	South Sudan Grassroot Initiative for Development (SSGID)
17	CORED	45	Sudan Evangelical Mission (SEM)
18	CSHO	46	Sudanese Fellowship Mission (SUFEM)
19	DAS	47	SWIGO
20	Diar for Rehabilitation & Development Association (DRDA)	48	Tearfund
21	Disabled Association for Rehabilitation and Development (DARD)	49	TGCDA
22	Evangelical Alliance of South Sudan (EASS)	50	The Organisation for Children Harmony (TOCH)
23	GACDO	51	Titi Foundation (TF)
24	Health Action Aid (HAA)	52	UNCDR
25	Hope Agency for Relief and Development (HARD)	53	UNH
26	Hope South Sudan Initiative (HSSI)	54	Voice of the Peace (VOP)
27	Humanitarian Aid for Change and Transformation (HACT)	55	WFC
28	Lacha Community and Economic Development (LCED)	56	Women Empowerment Centre South Sudan (WECSS)
<b>Global</b>			
1	ActionAid	4	Christian Aid
2	CAFOD	5	Oxfam
3	CARE	6	Tearfund

## Annex 2: Partnerships practices for localisation; a guidance note

### Partnership Practices for Localisation: A Guidance Note

More than 400 humanitarian agencies contributed to identifying the priority partnership practices for localisation; approximately 85% of them were local/national actors. The basis of the guidance note is the findings of the research conducted in Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan in 2018 as part of the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* programme<sup>1</sup>. Research respondents, representing more than 350 agencies, highlighted partnership practices they believe are most conducive to localisation. This guidance note was further validated by participants of the three Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream regional conferences in 2019. All humanitarian stakeholders are urged to note the partnership practices below and make concerted efforts to action them, while keeping crisis-affected people at the centre of all responses.

#### *Project and financial management*

1. **Local organisations design projects and budgets** or co-design with international humanitarian actors who provide technical expertise on proposal writing and technical issues where needed.
2. **Local actors are treated as equal partners**, not as sub-contractors presented with already agreed projects and budgets. Partnership agreements include roles and responsibilities of *both* parties.
3. **Partners conduct joint monitoring visits** to beneficiaries, providing opportunities for joint reflection on progress, obstacles and required modifications. Local partners maintain relationships with local communities, and international partners and donor agencies visit communities in agreement with, or when accompanied by, local actors.
4. **International actors and donors are open to discussions on findings** from local partner monitoring, and allow flexibility to adapt programmes and budgets in response to evidence of changing needs and community feedback as much as is practicable.
5. **Project budgets include funds for local partners, relevant to the context and needs**, for: 1) reasonable overheads; 2) indirect costs (as % of project budget); 3) assets vital for project implementation, safety and/or organisational financial sustainability; and 4) organisational strengthening. Budgets should clearly show core funding allocations.
6. **All humanitarian actors follow ethical recruitment practices**. International actors attempt to keep salaries/benefits within as close a range as practicable to local actors. Local actors strive to support staff to do their job effectively and treat them fairly and equitably.
7. **All actors support the active participation of crisis-affected people** in project design, monitoring, implementation and evaluation. With particular focus on involving marginalised, minority and vulnerable groups such as women, children, and persons with disability.
8. **All humanitarian actors identify their added value in any partnership and work on the basis of complementarity**. International actors provide support to local partners based on demand (rather than supply); longer-term institutional strengthening support is generally preferred over short-term project-related support. Strategic partnerships tailored to partner needs, with complementarity identified before crises, are important.

#### *Capacity strengthening and sharing*

9. **Joint capacity assessments are conducted for both local and international partners**. Strengths are recognised, and gaps used to develop tailored, long-term, capacity strengthening/sharing plans which are shared with other partners to coordinate effective support and investment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Funded by ECHO. For more about *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* visit: <http://caid.org.uk/54>.

10. **Capacity strengthening/sharing plans are long-term, not solely based on project needs, and include comprehensive training and mentoring plans.** The most effective approaches are identified, such as secondments, mentoring, and on the job training, with follow up monitoring.
11. **International actors and donors include/allow capacity strengthening and organisational development budget line(s) in all projects and partnership agreements.** Ideally an explicit % of budgets and/or specific funds are earmarked for this. Local actors commit time and other resources to invest in their own capacity and organisational development.
12. **International actors assess their capacity strengthening skills,** and address gaps by either strengthening staff skills or investing in local training providers.
13. **International agencies show a clear intention to adopt an advisory, backstopping or secondary role once adequate local capacity exists.** Review and partner 'graduation' strategies are key.

### *Financing*

14. **International actors and donors support local actors to build their sustainability** (including retention of key staff) by providing multi-year funds, allowing core funds in project budgets, and supporting local actors in income-generating activities or generating local funds.
15. **Local organisations actively participate in meetings, communication and coordination with donor agencies** to support relationship building, facilitated by international actors if needed.
16. **International actors credit the role of their local partners** in communications with supporters and donors, recognising the positive impact narratives have on reframing perceptions of local leadership of humanitarian response.
17. **Donor agencies coordinate to identify minimum standards for accountability and compliance,** reforming processes where necessary. International actors and donors support local partners to meet these minimum standards. Local organisations invest in meeting these standards.

### *Coordination*

18. **International actors, particularly UN agencies and cluster coordinators, promote and facilitate active participation of local partners and other local actors in relevant coordination fora,** and ensure a diversity of organisations represented, including women-led/focused organisations.
19. **International actors highlight the role their local partners play** in partnership-based / joint humanitarian response at cluster and other humanitarian coordination fora meetings.

### *Safety and Security*

20. **Training, advice and timely information on security and risk management, and safeguarding is provided to local actors** for operations in high-risk areas. Donors and international actors allocate funds/budget to establish and maintain sustainable national provision of such services.
21. **Local actors are involved in decision-making about security risk management with their international partners,** with adaptations made for local context as advised by local actors.

### *Advocacy*

22. **International agencies support national actors to engage with the government,** when requested, to influence humanitarian response decisions to ensure effectiveness.
23. **Local actors are facilitated to connect crisis-affected people with relevant international actors and government authorities for advocacy** related to the humanitarian response.

For the *Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships* research reports, and global paper *Pathways to Localisation*, visit the webpage: [caid.org.uk/54](http://caid.org.uk/54). Refer also to: [Principles of Partnership](#) (Equality, Transparency, Results-Oriented Approach, Responsibility, and Complementarity); [Charter 4 Change; NEAR Localisation Performance Measurement Framework](#) (Section 1: Partnerships); and [Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability \(CHS\)](#).

### Annex 3: How localisation can be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)

Global Protection Cluster (2019) *Guidance on how localisation can be integrated into the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)*. Available online: <http://bit.ly/2VwBEAe>.

- Supporting local agencies for Lead/Co-Lead positions or putting leadership transition strategies in place
- Including local actors in Strategic Advisory Groups (SAG) and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT)
- Modelling and monitoring a culture of principled partnerships in Clusters
- Constantly reviewing service delivery and funding arrangements (such as localisation dashboards) with the SAG and Area of Responsibility (AoR) members and using recommendations to inform strategy and response.



- Ensuring the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) incorporates the views and data from local actors. This could also include academia, diaspora, private sector, in addition to civil society
- Ensuring HNO includes both needs of affected populations **and** the institutional capacity needs of local actors
- Ensure local partners are involved in the analysis, not just the data collection.

- Prioritising service delivery by local actors Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and cluster strategies, *where possible*
- Developing a sectoral institutional capacity building strategy as part of the HRP
- Disaggregate cluster indicators by local/international
- Promoting partnerships that draw on coaching and mentoring approaches, rather than sub-granting
- Including explicit references to institutional capacity building outputs (e.g. reduced risk ratings) in project sheets

- Ensure that Cluster membership accurately reflects the diversity of the humanitarian community – including diaspora, private sector, academia etc
- Translating key communications into local languages
- Facilitate onsite coaching and mentoring support from international partners
- Share good practices and promote these in future response plans
- Adapt the 5Ws to allow for disaggregation by implementing and funding agency
- Produce and share dashboards that provide analyses disaggregated by local/international implementing agencies
- Continuously identify and advocate for local actors to be supported for service provision and capacity building opportunities

- Supporting local actors to contribute to Financial Tracking Service (FTS) tracking
- Prioritising approved local actors' project sheets in funding rounds (e.g. pooled funds)
- Advocate for and include investments for institutional capacity building for local partners in pooled funds

Pathways to Localisation has been developed with support and input from local and national organisations, international NGOs, United Nations agencies, and relevant government authorities in four countries; Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan.

The process was facilitated by the Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships consortium and national steering committees, with funding from the European Commission's Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO).



Funded by  
European Union  
Civil Protection and  
Humanitarian Aid



### **Christian Aid**

[caid.org.uk](http://caid.org.uk)

### **CARE**

[care-international.org](http://care-international.org)

### **Tearfund**

[tearfund.org](http://tearfund.org)

### **ActionAid**

[actionaid.org.uk](http://actionaid.org.uk)

### **CAFOD**

[cafod.org.uk](http://cafod.org.uk)

### **Oxfam GB**

[oxfam.org.uk](http://oxfam.org.uk)

### **Front cover photo:**

Marissa and her family fled from famine and conflict in Mayendit, South Sudan, where all of their food had been burnt and their home razed to the ground. They brought what little they had left to Nyal, pulling their possessions along the swamps in large tarpaulins.

Oxfam/Dorothy Sang



**CARE**

**tearfund**

**actionaid**

**CAFOD**  
Just one world



**OXFAM**