

Summary Note

Localization Workstream teleconference

26 February 2019

The co-conveners welcomed the participants and presented the proposed agenda to the teleconference of the Grand Bargain localization workstream.

I. Core Commitment indicators and GB Annual Reporting

The small working group formed developed the [Core Commitment Indicators and Target Results \(CCTRI\)](#) on Localization as per the request of the Facilitation Group in December 2018. Given the time and technical limitations of the exercise, the group came out with something that will give a notion of what is happening and what is feasible to report on. The Facilitation Group made some tweaks on the submitted indicators and these are now included as part of the Grand Bargain Annual Report templates. Our request to include a link to the MS Excel form that was used last year as an optional tool for tracking funding flows (Commitment 2.6) was not accepted by the FG. The workstream agreed that this will be shared out again to all workstream members and the co-conveners to reiterate the request to the GB Secretariat to send this out to all GB signatories.

Questions were raised on what level will organizations should be reporting on the CCTRI and how can these be followed up at country level. These questions will be forwarded to ODI which is doing the independent report again this year.

I. Demonstrator country missions update

The co-conveners are looking to organize follow up missions – a light touch, low profile mission conducted by one or two people to follow up specifically on how the recommendations have been or are being taken forward. A TOR is being drafted and will be shared to the workstream in the coming weeks. It was suggested that it would be good if the planning for these follow-up missions be coordinated with the respective HCTs.

The [Iraq Mission Report](#) has been finalized and shared to workstream members and key stakeholders in Iraq on 15 February 2019. An [Arabic version](#) has also been produced and shared with local actors.

During the launch of the Joint Response Plan (JRP) for the Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis in Geneva (15 February 2019), some of the localization workstream mission's recommendations were brought up. In a position paper shared to workstream members prior to the launch, the local actor network in Cox Bazaar, CCNF, made reference to the mission recommendations to strongly criticize the limited attention/mention of localization on the JRP. One workstream member shared that the Government of Bangladesh didn't want to see localization in the JRP or something that refers to longer-term planning and as such this posed a challenge to the international community.

Dates for the third and final demonstrator country mission to Nigeria have now been set for 01 to 05 April 2019. Suggestions were made by workstream members on engaging with the government in the planning process and if security allows, for the mission team to conduct a

field visit to Maidaguri as much can be learned from there. It was also noted that it would be interesting to explore discussions with the local governments as well as to find ways of advancing localization through finding the shared interest of National NGOs and National Government and engaging with the right government agencies.

II. Regional and Global Conferences

Tentative dates and plans were shared by the co-convenors for the conduct of three regional conferences (Africa, Asia, and Middle East). The Africa Conference is being planned to be held in Addis Ababa sometime in April to be co-hosted by the African Union. The next one being planned is for Asia to be held possibly in Kuala Lumpur or Jakarta. If in KL, a suggestion was made to contact the Asian Disaster Response Network based there for possible collaboration. For Middle East, Amman and Beirut are being considered as possible venues. The Global Conference will be held in Brussels tentatively in September as a concluding conference to be co-hosted by ECHO.

Action points - The draft concept notes will be shared to workstream members once available and volunteers will be invited to form the Steering Group/s to assist in the planning and organization of these Conferences.

III. Workplan review

Proposed revisions to the [workstream workplan](#) were revisited. UNICEF is interested on the risk mitigation guidance and will provide feedback to the workstream after consulting internally. On the additional guidance on measuring funding/support to local and national actors, comments were made whether this is really needed and that this has been difficult for donor and that no additional guidance can help other than harmonizing what is already there. The Friends of Gender Group thinks this is interesting for them, however, and will confirm and follow up with the bigger group during their next meeting.

OCHA feels that a guidance note on coordination or any other guidance note for that matter needs to be endorsed by the IASC to be useful. A suggestion was made to take the coordination guidance note out of the workplan.

FoG/UN Women pointed out that there are a couple of additional activities proposed by them that are missing in the document shared.

It was clarified by the co-convenors that the regional conferences/meetings will serve as a space for discussions to review and finalize the guidance notes. On IASC signing off the guidance note/s, a comment was made that it would be odd for a product of the GB workstream to be signed off by the IASC. IASC members are signatories and can participate and they can decide to bring forward the discussion of localizing aid within IASC as they see fit. For the workstream to influence IASC, a suggestion was made that the on-going revision of the IASC structure and workplan might be a good opportunity. It was further suggested to identify which members of the workstream are the right people to push some of the workstream products/activities in the IASC processes.

There is legitimacy for the workstream to come out with guidance notes and these will have to be given attention at field level to be useful. If IASC would like to give a blessing on the products, this is ok although this may create turf battles that are unnecessary. If there is some doubt on coordination, then the IASC can take this up. One of the key things when the workplan is being

reviewed is how to align the several processes going on. There is a need for coordination between the workstreams/GB and IASC.

IV. AOB

The [A4EP position paper](#) on the Grand Bargain and Localization was received by workstream members directly and not sent out by the co-convenors. There were valid points raised particularly on GB structure being too top down and the need for more transparency and increased representation and voice of local actors. There was a comment, however, from workstream members on their criticism on the mission to Bangladesh as a lot of effort was taken to engage with local and national NGOs from the preparation to the actual conduct of the mission.

While the top down criticism for Grand Bargain is valid, there is the rest of the agenda for humanitarian and other pressing humanitarian reforms that the local and national actors could and should engage in. The Grand Bargain cannot last forever, in fact, discussions have started on possible sunseting. Localization is not happening overnight and needs to be discussed and negotiated for a longer time.

It is incumbent for GB signatories to engage local actors at the national level. The planned regional localization meetings will also be a good opportunity to update local actors on GB, generate further interest among the different stakeholders, and to see how the workstream can better engage with them.

The decision and process of selecting the 10 local actors to be invited to the workstream was restated. At least two of the 10 members have been inactive. As it is now possible for local actors to sign in the GB, this could be an entry point to increase the number of local actors in the workstream. The procedures developed, however, for signing on the GB do not provide criteria and leave the FG to decide on the application on case by case basis. The co-convenors are not sure how to make this work and also asked whether the workstream should make changes to its current composition and how.

A suggestion was made to consider inviting 20 more in the assumption that 6 or 7 of them will be interested to join. Signing the GB is not straightforward and a big reporting burden for those who want to become a member. Another suggestion was to reach out to our colleagues at the national/local level, to NGO consortium or networks, and to local governments.

Action point – a small working group will be formed to review and propose a process to invite additional local actor members for the workstream. Those who would like to be part of this group to contact IFRC Secretariat.

Next Call – will send out a suggestion for the next call and a regular schedule

Present: Alycke (ZOA), Bianca (Germany), Stephen (Australia), Janet (OCHA), Brigitte (ECHO), Hibak (NEAR), Elena (FAO), Joe Weber (CRS), Sema (Support to Life), Grace Ileri (ActionAid), Michael (Christian Aid), Tim Stone (DFID), heather van Sice, Palmer, Philimon (UNICEF), Sarah and Regina/SDC, Jahangir, Aima Zarul (WHO), Christine Latif (WVI), David and Coree/IFRC