



## Consultative Workshop on Humanitarian Coordination for Local & National Actors

Hargeisa, Somalia, 27 November 2018

### Introduction

The World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) recognized that increased localisation is fundamental to the delivery of a dignified and effective humanitarian response, concluding that humanitarian action should be “as local as possible, as international as necessary.” The associated Grand Bargain emphasized the need to make more deliberate and explicit efforts to better engage with, empower and promote the work of local actors. The Global Protection Cluster (GPC) is seeking to meet the commitments made in regards to localisation and is keen to ensure and increase local actors’ engagement in both field coordination mechanisms and global strategic decision making. As such, the GPC, in collaboration with the IRC and the Protection Sector in Hargeisa, conducted a consultative workshop on humanitarian coordination with local and national actors. This report provides a summary of the discussions, which took place during the workshop.

### Objective

The consultative workshop aimed at giving national partners an opportunity to share good practices and identify key recommendations to advance the localisation agenda within the Protection Sector in Somaliland.

### Deliverables

- 17 national partners with a total of 21 participants (16 men and 5 women) participated in the workshop, sharing good practices and identifying key gaps on the localisation agenda.
- A set of recommendations for greater inclusion of national actors was put forward and is reflected in this report.

### Workshop

The one-day consultative workshop was organised around three sessions. The agenda is available in Annex A.

#### Session 1: How does the humanitarian system works and what is the role of local actors?

The facilitators and the participants **brainstormed together on the importance of coordination in the humanitarian sector**. Coordination is important to share information, ensure that all persons in need receive aid, as well as ensure our resources as efficiently and effectively used. Coordination also increases the overall response capacity and allows humanitarian to better respond to the needs of affected population. Overall coordination ensure timely, efficient, and effective humanitarian response.

A **brief presentation** was provided on the international humanitarian architecture, the 2005 humanitarian reform, which introduced the cluster approach, and the different steps of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC). The key messages conveyed were that an increased knowledge of the coordination system and the HPC helps national partners to fully participate in the phases of a humanitarian response (i.e. assessment and analysis, planning, resources mobilization and monitoring) and that HPC processes like the HNO and HRP that are inclusive and consultative usually generate better planning decisions, more robust cooperation, greater accountability, and legitimacy.

Participants showed great interest in better understanding the cluster system and how they can influence the different steps of the HPC cycle. It is **recommended that additional support** (i.e. capacity strengthening opportunities) is provided to local actors to ensure their knowledge and skills to understand the international coordination system are strengthened.

Session 2: What is localization and why does it matter?

The workshop started by a **brainstorming session on what localisation means, why it matters, and what is the role of local and international actors in the humanitarian response**. By identifying what local actors and international each bring to the humanitarian response, the facilitators aimed at deconstructing the idea that localisation means ‘going 100% local’. Participants agreed that local actors usually bring local knowledge and understanding of the context and the culture, greater coordination with government, sustainability, trust, access and acceptance by communities and cost efficiency while international actors are often needed for their expertise, resources, capacities, neutrality, tools and standards.

The facilitators therefore insisted on the fact that the localisation approach boils down to ensuring that the response is ‘*as local as possible, as international as necessary*’. While this motto best describes the localisation agenda, it seems however that the humanitarian system remains largely internationally led, with the humanitarian response being as international as possible and local only when necessary. It was recognized that determining the right configuration or balance between international and national contributions is a difficult and subjective task and that the coordination group can support this effort with constantly reviewing the situation and bringing the sector to a consensus on whether the balance is right.

The facilitators then presented the **Localisation Agenda** which started in 2016 during the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul and which recognised that the current humanitarian system requires a radical and systematic change so that the world can deal better with the humanitarian challenges of today, and of the future. It was recognised that national actors can significantly contribute to the relevance of the humanitarian response through their understanding of the context, greater access to affected populations and their sensitivity to political and social dynamics. Through the Grand Bargain aid organisations and donors commit to support institutional capacities of local and national responders and remove barriers that prevent principles partnerships between international and national actors.

The Grand Bargain also committed to support national coordination mechanisms and to include local actors in international coordination mechanisms. To achieve this commitment, the GPC, with the support of the CP AoR, developed a **Conceptual Framework for Localisation in Coordination** determining the following five dimensions:

Dimension	What this means for coordination
<b>Governance and Decision-Making</b>	Local actors should have equitable opportunities to play leadership and co-leadership roles at national and sub-national levels; and have a seat at the table when strategic decisions are made (Strategic Advisory Groups, Steering Committees, Cluster Lead/Co-Lead, and Humanitarian Country Team).
<b>Participation and Influence</b>	Local actors should have the opportunity to influence the AoR/Sector’s decisions. To do this, they need equitable access to information and analysis on coverage, results; and the opportunity and skills to effectively and credibly convey their thoughts and ideas.
<b>Partnership</b>	Coordinators should be promoting a culture of principled partnership both in the way it interacts with its members; and the way in which members interact with each other. In some cases, this requires transitions from sub-contracting to more equitable and transparent partnerships, including recognising the value of non-monetary contributions by local actors (networks, knowledge).
<b>Funding</b>	Where they have the institutional capacity to manage their own funds, local actors should be able to access funds directly. Local actors should receive a greater share of the humanitarian resources, including pooled funds, where

	applicable.
<b>Institutional Capacity</b>	Whilst technical capacity strengthening is important, coordination groups should also actively encourage more systematic and coordinated opportunities to receive support to strengthen operational functions, as part of the overall sector strategy to scale up services.

The facilitators then presented the findings of the **Localisation Scoping Survey** which took place globally with 112 local organizations from DRC, South Sudan, Pakistan, Myanmar, and Libya. Although the membership of protection coordination groups is composed of a large number of national actors globally (governments counterparts, national and local NGOs), local actors still encounter challenges to fully participate in sector meetings such as their lack of engagement in decisions-making processes or in governance structures, their lack of access to pooled-fund mechanisms and the focus on technical capacity building rather than institutional capacity strengthening. Detailed findings from this survey are available in Annex C.

The facilitators also presented the findings from the **CP AoR Localisation Mission** which took place in March 2018 in South/Central Somalia. The following points were presented and discussed with participants. More detailed information is available in Annex D.

- Current leadership structure of coordination groups is 100% international at national level, while membership is 78% local.
- There is limited participation from non-formal structures (CBO, private sector, and academia) and other coordination mechanisms exist such as NGO consortium, diaspora, and social movements.
- Access to sector meetings is a challenge for many local actors.
- There is a strong preference for more local representation in decision-making processes.
- It is difficult for one local NGO to represent the entire local civil society.
- The capacity for a local NGO to effectively coordinate exists.
- There is evidence of strong partnership between local and international actors for 5-10 years.
- Those partnerships are project based, rather than longer term/strategic engagement. Most local actors are sub-grantees (joint implementation or coaching relationships is rare).
- There is a limited knowledge of the principles of partnerships.
- The SHF has increased allocation to local NGOS (40% overall) but SHF due diligence process remains a concern.
- There is no systematic approach to institutional capacity strengthening and limited evidence of coaching and mentoring approaches.

*Session 3: What are the good practices, key gaps and recommendations with regards to localisation?*

The workshop provided an opportunity to gather partners' perspectives and experience on their involvement with the coordination system in Hargeisa. One of the outcomes of the day was to map out the good practices and key gaps according to the five dimensions of the GPC Conceptual Framework. After having identified good practices and gaps, participants also provided concrete recommendations to ensure the participation of local actors in the coordination system is as effective as possible.

The identification of good practices, key gaps and recommendations was done in a collective manner. Participants were divided into groups which rotated regularly between the five dimensions of the conceptual framework. Whenever one of the dimensions was discussed, participants would note down good practices, barriers or obstacles and recommendation.

The following table summarizes the discussion and views of local actors:

Dimensions	Good Practices	Key Gaps	Recommendations
<b>Governance and Decision-Making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government-led coordination structures (sectors)</li> <li>LNGOs participation in the development of policies (IDP and sectoral policy)</li> <li>Well-structured inter-agency group locally led (NADFOR)</li> <li>NGO Act developed by the Government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No local representation at the HCT level</li> <li>Lack of inter-ministerial collaboration</li> <li>No clear mandates and roles defined between government and ministries</li> <li>Few line ministries represented at the inter-sector meeting</li> <li>Lack of information/feedback from Government who lead the sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase representation of LNGOs in HCT leadership</li> <li>Provide capacity-building on effective humanitarian coordination to government/line ministries</li> </ul>
<b>Participation and Influence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective role of LNGO in protection meeting and information sharing</li> <li>LNGOs participation in multi-sector assessments and programme implementation</li> <li>LNGOs participation in advocacy efforts influencing laws and policies (Sexual Offensive Bill)</li> <li>Government involvement in HNO/HRP consultation process</li> <li>Sector meetings translated in Somali language</li> <li>Specialised LNGOs advocating for inclusion of marginalized groups in the HNO/HRP (disability inclusion)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low level of influence of LNGOs in HNO/HRP processes, participation is not systematic enough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include national partners at the initial stages of strategic planning processes such as HNO/HRP to ensure ownership</li> <li>Give an effective role for local actors in decisions-making processes</li> </ul>
<b>Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong collaboration and good complementarity between Government, NGOs and UN</li> <li>Space given to LNGOs, good level of delegation of responsibilities</li> <li>Strong collaboration of LNGOs with local communities</li> <li>Ability of LNGOs to deliver programmes in remote &amp; hard to reach locations</li> <li>Transfer of capacities, technical knowledge and resources from international to national actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnership model between international and national actors are predominantly sub-granting or sub-contracting in nature</li> <li>Principles of partnership are unknown and application is inconsistent</li> <li>Unequal power relationships between international and national actors</li> <li>Perceived preference from UN to partner with INGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model and monitor a culture of principled partnerships</li> <li>Promote partnerships that draw on coaching and mentoring approaches rather than sub-granting/sub-contracting.</li> <li>Develop equal and transparent partnership with LNGOs</li> </ul>

<b>Funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding is channelled to CBOs (women groups)</li> <li>• Diaspora and private sector channel funds to the humanitarian response (local fundraising approach)</li> <li>• 40% of SHF goes to local actors</li> <li>• LNGOs are partners of HRP</li> <li>• Willingness of some donors to channel funding to LNGOs (DERF, Australia)</li> <li>• Government contributes to humanitarian funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No influence of LNGOs in funding allocation processes</li> <li>• Current number of LNGOs from Somaliland eligible for SHF is limited compared to LNGOs from SC Somalia</li> <li>• Resources competition between international and national actors</li> <li>• Lack of trust from donors to LNGOs (limited to a few LNGOs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include LNGOs on funding board/committees</li> <li>• Ensure LNGOs are more transparent to gain trust from donors</li> <li>• Invest in institutional capacity building activities to increase LNGOs competitiveness</li> </ul>
<b>Capacities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong local capacity exists in country</li> <li>• Technical capacity strengthening (e.g. protection mainstreaming, child protection and GBV, WASH, food security, DRR) and hardware/equipment support is often provided to local actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of institutional capacity building and absence of planned budget to support such efforts</li> <li>• Lack of other models of capacity-building (experience sharing), strong focus on one-off training/workshop</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocate for investments in institutional capacity building for national partners</li> <li>• Promote longer-term capacity-building models such as secondment of staff, on-the-job training, mentorship, exchange visit programs, multi-year support</li> </ul>

## Annexes

Annex A – Workshop Agenda

Annex B – PowerPoint Presentation and Workshop Material

Annex C – Localisation Scoping Survey

Annex D – CP AoR Localisation Mission to Somalia

## Funding

The Localisation Workshop in Hargeisa (Somalia) was funded through a Global Protection Cluster (GPC) project, implemented by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR), and generously funded by the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO). Complementary funding was provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).



Funded by  
European Union  
Civil Protection and  
Humanitarian Aid

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

