

HOW TO SCALE UP SUCCESSES

Workstream 2 - Localisation

Success	Options for scaling it up	Challenges for scaling it up	Synergies with other WSs and other initiatives	Timeline
Signatories reporting their data on passing funding to local and national partners, with seven signatories reporting that they had met or exceeded the 25% target, compared to five in 2017.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measurement of progress while avoiding duplication (FTS categorisation, IATI prototype window, and mandatory use of Excel reporting template in the next self reports) Promoting/sharing best practice (as well templates available) on adapting and improving data management systems to capture and measure progress (GB and WS2 websites, WS2 workshops and other localization events) Link reporting with WS 7&8 	<p>Work done by FTS on the categorisation using the workstream definitions had been stalled following the IASC reorganization</p> <p>Political will is required to adapt data management systems</p>	<p>On-going discussions with WS1 on the IATI work on a prototype window with a localisation perspective</p> <p>Potential joint action with WS 7& 8 (enhanced quality funding)</p>	
<p>Evidence of aid organisations making a strategic institutional shift towards more support and more funding for local/national responders.</p> <p>That there is a growing normative shift towards more support and more funding for local and national responders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative/Peer research on how localisation happened and the results Signatories to develop/pilot strategies on risk sharing that address fiduciary compliance and concerns around upholding humanitarian principles as well as security and other risks Explore monitoring and reporting on the action plans which are planned to be initiated in the WS2 Regional Conferences 	<p>The case for risk sharing still needs to be made to some signatories</p> <p>Ownership of the action plans</p>	<p>Potential collaboration with WS6 on the research</p> <p>Potential collaboration with WS1, WS3, WS 7&8, and HD nexus</p> <p>Signatories may consider exploring the NEAR Network Localisation Measurement framework</p> <p>Linking with the Ground Truth Solutions perception surveys</p>	
There is also evidence of a growing effort to action the localisation commitments at country level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of country-based model localization strategy development kit that will include the Workstream’s guidance notes and potential strategy outlines based on experiences of the demonstrator countries (and other dialogues). Follow up missions to demonstrator countries 	<p>Major crises/emergencies with pressure to respond fast and at large scale, and other competing tasks at hand</p> <p>Availability of resources</p> <p>Real and perceived concerns about fiduciary and other risks</p> <p>Institutional capacity of local actors to deliver at scale</p>		

HOW TO TACKLE BOTTLENECKS Workstream 2 - Localisation

Bottlenecks	Options for tackling it	Challenges for tackling it	Synergies with other Ws	Timeline
<p>There is still not as yet a critical mass of aid organisations making a strategic shift towards localisation in practice</p> <p>The systemic shift in policy terms will not translate into a systemic shift in operational practice without the major political investment of the wider group of aid organisations and without greater funding and other incentives from donors.</p> <p>Requires fairly radical shift in policy and operations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make greater use of funding tools, including pooled funds and single intermediaries, which increase and improve assistance delivered by national and local responders, while addressing capacity strengthening, partnership and financing issues around these. • More field missions to ground the discussions and promote localization in differing contextual realities • Donors could encourage agencies they provide with multi-year funding to articulate multi-year plans with milestones for how they will deliver on specific steps in their sectors and on the ground to strengthen localisation efforts through to 2021. • More predictable multi-year funding for institutional capacity strengthening programmes, including to support approaches determined by local/national responders. • A more strategic approach that considers how the opportunities for and benefits of localisation can be realised across the Grand Bargain framework. • Inclusion of institutional capacity strengthening for local/national responders in JRPs • Agencies could explore options to catalyse critical mass on localisation on a sector-specific basis through global & country-level clusters 	<p>Disconnect between commitments and targets between HQ and country/field offices</p> <p>Aid agencies may not be ready or willing to reconfigure their humanitarian business models yet</p> <p>Requires time and money that may deem impractical specially at early stages of large-scale emergencies</p> <p>Some local/national responders may feel impatient with incremental slow changes while others may not be ready or keen to step up</p> <p>Real and perceived concerns about fiduciary and other risks</p> <p>Concerns about compatibility of localization and principled humanitarian action in ongoing armed conflicts</p> <p>Institutional capacity of local actors to deliver at scale</p>	<p>Potential synergies with WS1, WS3, WS6, and WS 7&8</p>	
<p>The 25% benchmark for funding to local and national responders has not yet been met by a majority of signatories and some were unable to report against this indicator as this data is still not captured in their data management systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserve allocation or set targets for local/national partners in the OCHA managed CBPF and other funding tools such as CERF, donor RRF mechanisms, etc. • Support and or avoid competition with local/national actors on domestic resource mobilization • Aid agencies can be excluded or can exempt themselves from certain country-based pooled funds that have set ceilings 	<p>Limited resources</p> <p>Perceived and actual risks</p> <p>Risk of downsizing or financial sustainability of their own agency</p> <p>Pressure from media and public</p>	<p>Potential synergies with WS 7 & 8</p> <p>Deepen efforts through START to increase resources for national partners by agreeing and piloting the proposed three-tiered approach to due diligence (linked to wider efforts on risk-sharing) and</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More local/national actor representation in decision-making bodies of country-based pooled funds, and in HCTs, clusters, etc 		<p>by establishing 'NNGO only' funding windows alongside START funds which can be accessed by both INGOs and NNGOs</p>	
<p>A lack of adequate, predictable donor funding for capacity strengthening</p> <p>Need for more sophisticated, more innovative and longer-term strategies to strengthening capacities</p> <p>The greatest challenge to achieving this commitment related to availability of appropriate funds for this kind of long-term support for local/national partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-traditional or humanitarian funding sources such as development or reconstruction funds to support multi-year institutional capacity strengthening • Investigate a greater role for OCHA CBPF on institutional capacity strengthening for local/national partners • Aid agencies sharing local/national partners to consider sharing capacity assessments and joint planning • Support for institutional capacity strengthening to be included in partnership agreements • Explore options to strengthen support for humanitarian localisation through DRR, resilience and climate adaptation efforts. • Further, explore opportunities offered by nexus approaches. • Linking up to the development agendas. 	<p>Siloed thinking and operations between development and humanitarian</p> <p>Different understanding of capacity and capacity strengthening</p> <p>Risk of cloning brand/identity</p>	<p>HD nexus and enhanced quality funding</p>	
<p>Some donors stated that they were unable to make further progress in terms of providing more funding more directly to local and national responders and felt that there needed to be a broader approach to supporting local actors than was currently framed by the specific commitments under workstream 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore concrete ways/offer alternative options helping to overcome internal and external barriers for donors to provide funding more directly to local and national responders. • Consider ways in which local actors and donors can communicate more directly about planning and oversight issues, even if funding arrives to them indirectly • Where possible, hold dialogues with international partners together with local (implementing) actors to explore (agree on issues and solutions 	<p>Donor policies</p>		