

**Summary note**  
**Localization workstream teleconference**  
**29 May 2018**

The co-conveners welcomed the participants to the teleconference of the Grand Bargain localization work stream. An update on the local actor participation in the workgroup – six invitees have confirmed (REACH-Iraq, NHN-Pakistan, NAHAB-Bangladesh, Red Cross-Uganda, STL/NEAR-Turkey, and PDRF-Philippines) while still following up on three (Civil Protection Directorate-Haiti, Community Health Initiative-Liberia, and Local government from Nepal). Suggestion was made that one slot can be made for a representative from Nigeria to have each for the demonstrator countries.

Action point: Anyone interested in having a say on the invitations for new local actors to be part of the group to contact Coree.

### **1. Discussion on the localization and humanitarian-development nexus**

The humanitarian-development nexus co-convenor noted how integration of their workstream should be easy specifically for the localisation WS as many local actors already do both humanitarian and development work and that this is particularly relevant as many countries are faced with protracted crises. A suggestion was made to explore the local/area based development approach and how this incorporates local actors. Other suggestions were around WS2 contributing to looking at the hum-dev nexus in operational context – what works, what are the best practices- and working with the diaspora groups.

The Local to Global Project (L2GP) brings the localization and hum-dev nexus together in one practical approach, the survivor-led approach that enables communities on how to respond to emergencies. The project is being piloted in five countries and researches and learning products have been produced including a [synthesis report](#) by ODI. He offered to exchange information with the workstream and contribute to the planned guidance notes and relevant discussions.

Another approach shared was the work being supported by Denmark on strengthening district level structures in Uganda that includes ensuring that coordination meetings and decision-making spaces are inclusive. Others agreed that interesting progress is indeed being made at the district level hum-dev discussions in Uganda and that Denmark and UNDP are planning to showcase this to highlight on the local perspectives.

Working with the diaspora groups was brought up as another interesting point for the workstream but the group needs to be clear on what it wants to do on this. The Syria and Somalia diaspora groups were mentioned as those that might be interesting to explore.

Specific commitment/section on durable solutions in WS10 is also an area for potential integration. The regional durable solutions secretariat in East Africa is looking at the engagement of local and national government and civil society and proposal was made to link this workstream to their research group to share knowledge.

Action points:

- Share information/resources on L2GP and extend invitation to the project to be part of the localization research information exchange group.
- Schedule a webinar on the diaspora.
- Connect all those interested on durable solutions to take the discussion further.

### **2. Discussion on draft demonstrator country TOR and next steps**

Nigeria, Bangladesh and Iraq have been selected by survey. A letter signed by the co-conveners Sherpas will send to OCHA and respective HC/RC's in countries to seek for support Security issues need to be clarified and considered in the TOR.

Comments and feedback on the draft TOR:

- More clarity needed on what are the expected outcomes and what the mission will focus in each country, question on who the recommendations would be addressed to.

- Conversations with an NGO network in Nigeria have been made through partners from the ECHO Accelerating Programme although the NGO network expressed their worries about their capacity to do the organization for the mission. Local NGOs need to be made primary stakeholders. There has been massive work already that has been done in Bangladesh and the briefing document should note this.
- Appreciate the TOR; good to have specific questions per country but need to maintain common ones across all for comparison.
- Has the lead signatory for each country been selected? Suggestion that the lead for these visits accompany the IFRC pre-mission.
- Make sure that everyone understands the complications of having this mission alongside other missions; need to synchronize so countries are not overwhelmed.
- Have a clear plan to communicate the outcomes to participating organisations in the countries.
- Has validation been made from stakeholders in each country?
- Happy that Iraq is chosen, REACH willing to assist in the preparations and actual mission.
- Stress the gender dimension – from selecting the organisations to be involved in to the objectives and content of the mission.

Action point: Comments on the TOR extended for another week to be sent to IFRC Secretariat; indicate if happy to provide any support.

### **3. Discussion on the annual GB reporting and ramifications for 2018 the workstream**

IFRC Secretariat shared some initial comments from a very quick and rough review of the independent report and some 20+ self-reports focusing on WS2 as follows:

- Over-all fair assessment although quite critical on the amount of time for the negotiations and discussions on the marker, a low scorecard for donors described as struggling to make significant progress on the localization commitments, and the “challenge” of determining and measuring the collective progress of the workstream. While a great deal of time and energy was indeed spent on the debates on definitions this did not prevent signatories from taking their own actions on other commitments. There has been some good progress across the different commitments (although understandably varied given the different starting points) on financing e.g., increased contribution to and some advocacy on improving access for local actors to CBPFs; some direct funding to local actors and; on the “softer and less quantifiable” commitments around capacity strengthening and partnership. The report seems to have missed to mention a good number of significant reported progress contained in the self-reports.
- Progress on financing varied hugely with many signatories not able to provide yet figures or percentages of funding provided to local actors through a single intermediary. Work with FTS is underway to operationalize the use of the agreed definition.
- It might be good to drive the discussions and debates more around other commitments especially on coordination (where there is limited progress in fact) and highlighting progress and good practices on partnerships and capacity strengthening and their link to financing commitments.

A more thorough analysis will be made in the coming weeks that will include identifying gaps/implications to our workplan. It was shared that the C4C group is also in the process of doing an analysis of all the reports and specifically looking at the good practices – what has worked, can be replicated and built upon. This work is being coordinated with OCHA to contribute to the reporting to PACT. One of the main challenges seem to be the gap in funding for capacity building and the burdensome administrative costs for local actors.

USAID/OFDA supports the idea of finding a way to positively take forward reported progress - identify stories on pathways we are taking and not just the 25% marker, capture all efforts of signatories and what they are leading to, and how we are tackling capacity building.

One frustration from ODI report was that it was overly critical and did not talk about the varied dynamic responses. It did not manage well into looking at what donors worked on specifically in changing approaches and there was too much focus on the percentage of funding. To improve/move forward the workstream can pay more attention on capacity strengthening and develop (partnership) dialogue questions that donors can use with their partners while bringing in the more important aspect of how donors approach local actors. An analysis of the self-reports will be useful to see what works for local

and national actors. While it is good to see that many signatories have increased funding to pooled fund mechanisms, access to these is still very competitive and not addressing their long-term needs. ECHO is struggling with legal constraints and would like to hear from those who have overcome these issues to share good practices. A question was posed on the abandoned idea of a marker, whether the group is advancing the 25% and how much is going to the local level.

PDRF (Philippines) noted that there is a lot of reporting and that there are different points of view about what national actors are seeing in progress. NAHAB (Bangladesh) reiterated the work that they are doing on localization, happy that Bangladesh is one of the demonstrator countries, and offered to assist in the mission.

Action point: Prepare a thorough analysis of the self-reports with inputs from analysis being done by the C4C group before the GB Annual Meeting on 18 June.

4. **Regular review of the workstream workplan** - No proposal
5. **AOB**
  - a. DRC local actors' letters to donors in DRC requesting follow up - can the group discuss this and collectively respond? Action point: Letter to be shared to the group.
  - b. ECOSOC HAS side events on localization – two proposals we are aware of: 1) IFRC, GT & Swiss including panelists from NEAR and Oxfam (who submitted separate proposals and was asked to be integrated to this) and; (2) C4C and Start Network. Action point: Anyone who is doing one to speak to Coree who can consolidate and share information to everyone.
  - c. Friends of Gender Group has made contact and suggestion was to give them some time in the next call.
  - d. ActionAid and CARE holding first localization task team meeting in Brussels (25-26 June) and would like to have as many local actors as possible. Request for the group to share the information and maybe support participation of local actors. Will share to the group outcome of this discussion.

Participants:

Anita Kattakuzhy/Oxfam, Brigitte Mukengeshayi/DG ECHO, Budrun/NAHAB-Bangladesh, Butch Meilly/PDRF-Philippines, Claire Grant/ActionAid, Coree Steadman/IFRC, David Fisher/IFRC, Elena de Giovanni/FAO Rome, Frido/Netherlands MFA, Georgy Pastor/IRC, Hero Brzw/ REACH-Iraq, Ivan/WHO, Jane Backhurst/Christian Aid, Janet Puhlovic/OCHA, Jeremy Wellard/ICVA, Jette Karen/Danish MFA (joined in part), Jonathan Abrahams/WHO, Leonie Oates/Australia, Meixi/ICRC, Michael Mosselmanns/Christian Aid, Mohammed Ahmad/NHN-Pakistan, Nathalie Goetschi/Switzerland, Nils Karsten/NCA, Regina Gujan/Switzerland, Sarah Herrendorff/Switzerland, Tove Myhrman/Sweden, Victoria Stoddard/IFRC, Australian Mission in Geneva, Robert Akankwasa/Red Cross Uganda and Sema Genel/STL/NEAR Turkey