



COUNCIL *for*  
INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
NEW ZEALAND

# CID Localisation Baseline Report

August 2020



Photo credit: ChildFund

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Section 1: Purpose of Report</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 2: Background and Context</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 3: Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Section 4: Key Workshop Findings</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Section 5: Survey Findings</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Section 6: Analysis</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Section 7: Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Localisation Baseline Survey</b>	
<b>Appendix 2: Survey Findings - Charts and Graphs</b>	

## **Section 1: Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to document the outcomes of the Council for International Development (CID) Localisation Baseline Study, designed to capture data on localisation practices by New Zealand international development agencies.

It should be noted that the emergence of COVID in 2020 has accelerated the need for localisation, and there are instances where localisation has been instigated as a response. Having said this, it is thought that this response has arisen more from necessity and assertive advocacy from partners, than from increased INGO commitment, and we are yet to observe if this reaction translates into a change to business as usual.

The methodology used in the development of this report was employed prior to COVID. As such, the localisation practices triggered by COVID are not reflected in the results. CID is working closely with partners, members and donors to monitor progress, and, despite COVID related application of localisation, it is thought that the challenges and barriers to localisation evidenced through this report still remain.

## Section 2: Background and Context

Since 2015, the international development and humanitarian sectors have been highly active with dialogues, workshops, research reports and conferences focused on localisation. The term seems to have been derived from the World Humanitarian Summit, and while it appears it is practised more widely in development than in humanitarian circles, the humanitarian sector is catching up. The World Humanitarian Summit and Grand Bargain gave the topic momentum and many international actors have signed up to the reforms of the Grand Bargain. Discussions have focussed on agreeing definitions and funding commitments rather than on how to implement practical change and role model good practice. Paradoxically much of the theory comes from international actors rather than being developed by local partners.

Five years on, progress is genuinely mixed. Globally, national actors are more aware of the reform commitments they can expect international actors to deliver on, and humanitarian pooled funds have increased allocations and capacity support to local and national recipients. In the Asia-Pacific region, national governments are taking leadership of disaster preparedness and response, and there is a greater onus on international actors to target response, use local processes and groups to implement responses, and to build resilience between emergencies. There is also a move in the regional Pacific humanitarian architecture to put in place better coordinated systems and approaches to address the impact of disasters. The CID Annual Survey of the Sector this year showed some positive signs of localisation: roughly 80% of members have partnered with a Pacific partner (whether government or community organisation), and funding to the Pacific has increased by 6%, with a greater focus on building resilience to climate change events.

However, the survey also indicates that there is a lack of certainty about the definition of localisation amongst CID members, and that partnerships are not necessarily devolving decision-making or resources to locals in a transformative way. 49% of members have implemented only 1-5 activities with local partners. The traditional business model of the international non-governmental organisation (INGO) remains mostly unchanged. CID members are concerned about the burden placed on local partners to fulfil overly

burdensome due diligence processes for government donors but are unclear as to how best to manage accountability back to themselves as partners and to donors. There is also a challenge to find the right local partners. There is little evidence of systematic measurements of progress towards localisation, or evidence that the change is real. There is a familiar sense of being stuck within a system that for the most part, continues with 'business as usual'. Yet the topic consistently resurfaces as a priority area for action with a range of actors across Asia and the Pacific.

In order to take meaningful strides towards addressing this, in May 2019 CID, in partnership with the Pacific Islands Association of Non-governmental Organisations (PIANGO), implemented a one-day Localisation Workshop. The workshop was designed to facilitate a structured, focused dialogue with CID members, to identify steps towards a collective approach for a systemic shift, to strengthened leadership and decision-making of local and national actors in the Pacific region.

The outcomes of the Localisation Workshop indicated that at intellectual and ethical levels the New Zealand international development sector understands the concept of localisation and recognises it to be a consequence of the evolution of the international development and humanitarian sectors. This, coupled with the fact that the Council for International Development Annual Survey of the Sector indicates that approximately 80% of CID members have partnered with a Pacific partner, appears promising. However, several blockages to progress were identified, resulting in a lack of momentum and little urgency to substantially change operating models and behaviours. 64% of CID members were found to have not signed any localisation commitment. 49% of members were found to have worked with local partners on only 1-5 activities, and the traditional business model for international non-government organisations at that point was found to be unchanged. Members were also found to be struggling to establish baselines in order to measure progress. As one of several outcomes of the Localisation Workshop, it was recommended that a baseline survey on CID members should be implemented, exploring their work on localisation. This was conducted in February 2020, and analysis was delayed due to the events of COVID-19.

### **Section 3: Methodology**

The methodology for this study comprised both:

- eliciting and documenting key findings of the two one-day Localisation Workshops (held 30 and 31 May 2019), at which members were well represented
- the implementation and analysis of a Localisation Baseline Survey (provided as Appendix 1).

The Localisation Baseline Survey was issued to member organisations in February 2020, and confidentiality was guaranteed.

While members were well represented in the workshops, the baseline survey was only completed by approximately 35% of the membership. The lack of response may be due to a lack of understanding or confusion about localisation and/or lack of firm plans to engage in the localisation agenda.

## Section 4: Key Workshop Findings

Prior to the Localisation Workshops, a pre-workshop survey was implemented, the key findings of which are shown below:

- 11 organisations completed the survey.
- 64% of responders reported that their organisation has not signed any localisation commitment.
- One organisation had signed the Charter for Change.
- One organisation had signed the Grand Bargain.
- The main steps organisations have taken to progress localisation (in order of frequency) are:
  - Promote more local and national actors into decision making position
  - Increase funding to local partners
  - Review programming and localisation practices
  - Develop exit strategies/transition plans
  - Assess organisational business plan.
- 60% of responders believe some progress has been made towards localisation in their NGO, in the INGO sector in NZ, in MFAT and with other donors.
- 80% believe “some progress” has been made by the Development sector globally.
- Significant changes identified to support localisation were:
  - Identifying and recruiting local consultants and programme officers
  - Commitment to increase humanitarian funding to Local NGO
  - Technical advice and surge capacity all moving towards localised staff.
- Significant barriers to localisation within organisations included:
  - Finding suitably qualified local staff and capacity of local partners (especially to physically handle the financial transactions in a consistent manner)
  - Donor requirements
  - Mistrust.

Participants at both workshops found it challenging to collectively define localisation succinctly. PIANGO shared that they used the Australian Red Cross 2017 definition:

*“A process of recognising, respecting and strengthening the independence of leadership and decision making by national actors in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of affected populations.”*

While this definition may indicate what localisation is, it was identified that there remains a need to clearly articulate localisation processes in humanitarian and development activities. Furthermore, there is a need for agreement in how it should be measured in the Pacific, and how will Pacific stakeholders know that development actors are changing practices.

One key workshop outcome was a snapshot identification of what is currently thought to be working well, and what is not. This is shown below:

What is working well	What is not working well
Developing a culture of humility and building relationships Recognition that we all have different perspectives and understandings Real readiness to change Sharing voices Sense of need for equal partnership Recognition of importance of interpersonal relationships	Power and balance (funding, governance) Ability and willingness to invest in governance Mutually accountability Priorities not aligned Funding - carrot and stick

The workshop outcomes also indicated that at intellectual and ethical levels the sector understands the essence of localisation and recognises that the vision and process of localisation is an inevitable consequence of the evolution of the international development and humanitarian sectors. However, there is a lack of momentum and some sector confusion. Sector actors recognise the signals but seem unsure whether to 1. get behind the imperative and lead the way for change, 2. continue as usual and play a watchful wait and see game, or 3. continue as usual and ignore any signs of needing to change until necessary. Intrinsically it is known that there are implications at programmatic, organisational, sector and funding levels. The workshop indicated that there are many questions that remain unresolved and need to be addressed for, and by, the sector, i.e.:

1. What are the influencers of localisation?
2. What are the actor roles of localisation?
3. What global examples can we leverage?
4. What does localisation mean in the different geographic environments in which we work?
5. What protocols best support localisation?
6. When will government funding change to support localisation, and in what way?
7. How does localisation impact and change our 'business as usual' – what does it mean for INGOs, for programmes, and for reporting?
8. How is appropriateness of timing determined?
9. How do we gather evidence and measure localisation and progress towards localisation?
10. What should we ideally be doing differently now; in the short-term future; in the medium-term future; and in the longer term?

## Section 5: Survey Findings

This section presents the findings of the Baseline Survey. The paragraphs below correspond to questions throughout the survey. Visual representation of the findings (bar charts and graphs) are also provided as Appendix 2).

### **The meaning of localisation**

When asked, ‘What does localisation mean in your organisation?’ CID member organisations responded with a range of statements. While the responses were not vastly dissimilar, the responses were framed through different perspectives, e.g. an INGO lens; a local representation lens; a local implementation lens; and a locally driven lens. The responses have been grouped accordingly and are presented below.

#### **A. INGO lens**

- “We are only as strong as the local organizations we support. We measure our success by their impact.”
- “It means working with our local field offices and ensuring they have resources and support to deliver effective programmes.”
- “Working through local partners and utilising local expertise. Working in partnership with local groups who are the experts and the activists.”
- “Reaching the point where capacity sharing is taking place and not capacity building.”
- “Understanding that communities in the developing world can respond to their own challenges and we partner to be part of the solution.”

#### **B. Local representation lens**

- “Local staff and expatriates empowering, involving, valuing, engaging, employing and listening to local people so that they are fully represented.”
- “The rangatiratanga of local organisations and government: their plans; their way.”

#### **C. Local implementation lens**

- “We listen to, work with and fund local implementing partners, CBOs & NGOs.”
- “Utilising local resource where previously external resource was used (i.e. supplier, staff).” “Any shift from overseas expertise to local.”

#### ***D. Locally driven lens***

- “Nationals (i.e. people directly affected by development activities) initiate, design, implement, monitor and evaluate programmes.”
- “Localisation means that those affected can drive the development process. For us this starts with listening to and working for children.”
- “Shifting decision-making, resources, staff and ownership to organisations which are based in developing countries and run by local people.”
- “Self-determination (localisation speaks to status quo power imbalances within the aid ecosystem which 'normalise' neoliberal colonial power models).”

#### **Localisation commitments**

Less than 50% of responders were signatories of protocols/agreements such as ‘Charter for Change’ and ‘Grand Bargain’ and less than half of these measure progress on the implementation of the standards.

#### **Steps taken to progress localisation**

64% of responders have reviewed programming practices due to localisation; 43% have increased funding to local partners and 21% have developed a localisation strategy.

#### **Self-assessment of commitment to localisation**

71.43% reported a strong demonstrated commitment to localisation.

#### **Progress towards localisation**

Over 60% reported significant progress as an organisation; approximately 60% believe the sector has made progress; 50% believe MFAT has made progress – and while this isn’t believed to be as much progress as the organisations themselves, the responders do believe MFAT is ahead of other donors in their journey toward localisation progress, but slightly behind international donors on a global scale.

### **Significant changes to support localisation**

A range of most significant changes implemented to support localisation were reported, including:

- Employing nationals as country heads or Executive Director level
- Working with local partners to design a methodology that facilitates their planning
- Prioritising the recruitment of local staff
- Increasing funding to cover overheads and staff development for local partners
- Capacity building with local implementing partners
- Shifting decisions and power from NZ/Australia to the Pacific, with autonomous Pacific entities setting own strategic goals/agendas.

### **Barriers to localisation**

A range of barriers to localisation, experienced within responders' organisation were reported, including:

- "Lack of funding sometimes means very specific goals must be achieved which may preclude the time needed to fully engage the community"
- "Shifting local organisations from chasing funding (project by project), to leading a planning process and being explicit on the support they need"
- "Developed world visitors with 'colonial' attitudes e.g. for one of our organisation's Ugandan partner 'the white man is always right'"
- "Developed world ideas transferred into in country and not put into context of the developing country"
- "Time and resources to sit down with key partners and plot out long term transition goals and plan"
- "Viability of continued funding for training, mentorship and leadership programs"
- "Funding"
- "Clear definition of what this means or looks like in practise"
- "Power still follows the money, meaning donors often call the shots (although changing with MFAT's new approach); who holds the risk"
- "Finding qualified local people willing to work for NGO salaries, sometimes much lower than the corporate sector"

- “Making ourselves redundant and letting go of total control - dis-empowers our position in order to give power to local partner”.

### **Most significant enabler of localisation**

A range of enablers were identified as the responder-organisations’ most significant enabler including:

- “Local appointments at country leader level”
- “A stated commitment that this is how we want to work; recognising capacity building of local partners is development even while it doesn't push donors’ buttons”
- “Our organisation's vision that our International Partners would one day be able to fund their development programmes without international funding”
- “Nationally driven strategies”
- “Our organisation is established in-country and it is local personnel who work with their people to identify the challenges”
- “Strong ethos of local ownership and limited staff resources in NZ meant relatively strong existing focus on partners design and implementing own work”
- “Enculturating development as being fundamentality an exercise in localisation and sustainability”
- “We work exclusively through local partners”
- “Developing stronger project models and systems to support Field Offices to own programme quality locally”
- “Global recognition that we have to do things differently and a commitment from leadership to structurally prioritise self-determination and autonomy”
- “Policy and recognition by leadership of its importance”
- “Change in geopolitical context. Partners in-country are more confident and willing to assert and lead”.

### **Enablers of localisation**

Responders viewed a range of factors as potential enablers of localisation, including:

- “Building significant localisation engagement in project budgets”

- “Supporting local partners to be more strategic, performance-driven and to communicate. Past models have promoted compliance. We need savvy leaders”
- “Providing space for partners to articulate their vision of localisation”
- “Training and development in-country to better empower local leadership”
- “Changed reporting requirements – current ones run counter to localisation”
- “Strengths-based approach to development engagement - from initial concept meetings through activities to empowerment and disengagement”
- “Funding to build capacity. Unrestricted funding”
- “Continuing the discussion, case studies and examples and deepening understanding of what this means in practise”
- “Standing in solidarity with 'local' organisations and starting by analysing power within our partnerships and relationships across the board”
- “Involving nationals at all levels of decision making”.

### **Promotion of local and national leadership**

The majority (85.71%) of responders reported providing human resources to mentor or support local and national leaders. Many (64.29%) also reported promoting national staff into leadership positions and 57% of the responders reported providing financial support to local and national leadership initiatives or forums.

### **Localisation related shifts, in the way local knowledge and experience is used in programmes**

64.29% of responders reported support for leadership and engagement of national and local actors in shared forums; 57.14% reported increased utilisation of national and local expertise (and consultants); and 50% reported increased linkages with traditional leadership and authorities. However, only 21% reported formalising use of local knowledge in humanitarian response.

### **Changes, reflecting localisation, in partnership approach**

Only 42% of responders reported changes in partnership approach when designing programmes, to reflect localisation principles. The following explanations were provided:

- “Our recent development of best practise work in PMERL procedures has meant we are designing projects with full local and community involvement”
- “The structured process of bringing together multiple actors to make long-term plans together and publish those plans”
- “We have been working on challenging our power structures for years, thus recent programme design follows in the wake of these changes”
- “From design to implementation, we ensure the local voices are not only heard but involved in key programme design decisions”.

### **Capacity assessment**

Over 78% of responders reported that they have performed capacity assessments on local partners. However, only 42% of responders reported that their partners had in turn assessed their organisation’s capacity.

### **Strengthening partners’ practices**

86% of responders reported working with partners to strengthen practices, predominantly in the areas of safeguarding (71%), MERL (64%), financial literacy (57%) and health and safety (57%). Half of the responders also reported strengthening practices in human resources and donor reporting. The strengthening of practices was performed through an even split of capacity development initiatives, financial resourcing, peer exchanges and personnel deployment.

### **Adaptation of HR policies to support localisation**

Only two thirds of the responder-organisations answered positively to this question. Half of these reported increased offshore staffing; 21% reduced NZ based staffing; 21% revised performance management systems; 21% strengthening HR systems.

### **In-country partners conducting performance reviews on international staff working in their organisations**

Only 3 organisations reported that this did take place.

### **In-country partners conducting performance reviews on international partners**

4 organisations reported that this did take place, and a further 2 reported that it sometimes took place.

### **Working with local partners in amending policies, standards and tools to reflect localisation**

Half of the respondents reported that this has taken place.

### **Piloting initiatives for organisations to develop own standards and accountability measures**

42.8% of the respondents reported that this has taken place. For example, INGOs reported that:

- “In Vietnam we have worked with the Womens Union and trained them in our standards and case management approach”
- “Most standards reflect important human rights/ethical practice. As an organisation we have our own accountability commitments to supporters which must be upheld”
- “To a limited extent directly - in relation to Privacy Policies, but generally speaking ALL policies are encouraged to be localised”
- “Depends on how 'local' organisation is defined - a number of things in place to hold us to account, annual partner surveys, as well as partner accountability”
- “Support for local membership body to manage regional programme. Support for local clinicians to review clinical guidelines”.

### **Changing monitoring and evaluation frameworks to reflect localisation**

Half of the respondents reported that this has taken place. This has been performed in a number of ways, e.g.:

- “Introduced global level of PMERL and updated to latest best practises”
- “We measure progress against the local partners’ long-term plans. Country trip reports reflect on localisation improvements”
- “Requesting information re participation of local people (adults, children, community reps) in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes”

- “MERL comes down to measuring what we value, and this value needs to be determined by partners (not us or the donors) - Negotiated Partnership a chance to review?”
- “Measuring increased local ownership and governance”.

### **Changing public engagement in NZ to reflect localisation**

Less than half (42.86%) of the respondents reported doing this, and provided a range of examples as to how this took place:

- “We hold public accountability Skype calls with local staff working in projects where people here in NZ can ask and questions of locals implementing projects”
- “We have moved all support from 15 countries to five countries to ensure we have closer collaboration and partnership, giving local partners clarity re long-term funding”
- “We celebrate our partners' identity in NZ media”
- “Slow progress as still the assumption that the public need to see on-the-ground NZ engagement; we challenge this and hope to tell our stories in new ways”
- “We advocate for more localisation through stories in newsletters to the general public”
- “Sharing the story of graduate impact - less need for our direct involvement”.

### **Co-authoring of evaluation reports**

When asked what proportion of your organisation’s evaluation reports over the past 24 months have been authored or co-authored by in-country staff or in-country consultants:

- 7.14% of respondents claimed 0%
- 14.29% of respondents claimed 1-10%
- 7.14% claimed 11-30%
- 0% claimed 31-60%
- 14.29% claimed 61-80%
- 42.29% claimed 81% or more
- 14.29% did not answer the question.

## **Donor reporting requirements**

In the main, the majority (62.9%) of respondents felt that donor reporting requirements have not changed to reflect commitments towards localisation. Where donor requirements have changed it has been through altered reporting formats and decreased complexity.

## **Identification of learning needs on localisation**

42.86% of respondents said that their organisation had identified areas for learning which included a focus on localisation and 29%, said they had not. The remaining respondents were unsure or did not answer the question. Where respondents stated that their organisations had identified areas for learning which included a focus on localisation, a wide range of examples were provided, including:

- “As part of the PMERL approach we are a learning organisation and strive to get community input to improve our work”
- “Global research on the new shape of aid flows: what's the best role we can play, recognising expectations of both supporters and those we channel their support to”
- “Developing a learning pathway for community development and better use of Faith based facilitation to train personnel in-country to work better with local communities”
- “How our global affiliates approach localisation, and how our organization can speak into that”
- “Everything we do reflects the importance of shifting power and decision making to our partners, with our role to support not manage - lots of ongoing learning!”
- “We have identified the importance of in-country partners to start developing marketing and fund-raising strategies”.

## **Section 6: Analysis**

In analysing the key findings from the workshop and the baseline survey, both sets of data were found to align and complement each other.

### **6.1 Definition and Roles**

The findings show there is no common understanding of definition of localisation, nor of what good application of localisation looks like. There is also a lack of clarity as to what the INGO role is in localisation, and whether it is that of an endorser, a facilitator or a supporter. The nature of, and variation in, responses indicate that INGOs have no single understanding of the relationship between INGOs and localisation. It appears that some INGOs might view localisation, perhaps unconsciously, as something that they have a role to permit, allow or enable, thus affirming the role of the INGO to endorse localisation. However, some INGOs view localisation as a concept that is facilitated by the INGO role, and some perhaps believe that their role may be diminished and lessened through localisation.

### **6.2 Commitment to Localisation**

Demonstrating commitment to localisation is not currently a strong focus for many New Zealand based INGOs, and only about 20% of members have focused on actively changing programming practices to support localisation. 15% of members reported an increase in funding to local partners. The results indicate that it is probable that less than 1% of members have developed a localisation strategy. Having said this, when asked, most responders (71.43%) believe their organisation is strongly committed to localisation.

### **6.3 Progress Towards Localisation**

Responders generally believe their organisations and the sector are making good progress towards localisation. MFAT is believed to be making more progress than other donors, but not as much as other international donors on a global scale. The main ways in which NZ INGOs support localisation are through employment of local staff, capacity development and increased funding. One organisation reported the achievement of a power shift from NZ/Australia to the Pacific, resulting in the Pacific entities setting their own strategic goals and agendas.

## **6.4 Barriers and Enablers**

Key barriers to localisation can be grouped into four categories: Vision; Funding; Power; and Perception:

1. Vision: Lack of clarity of what localisation is and how to do it
2. Funding: Lack of funding and time to effectively engage communities, attract the right local talent, permit effective longer-term local planning
3. Power: Donor agendas dictating program focus; INGOs letting go of total control
4. Perception: Local perception of overseas knowledge

Many of the enablers of localisation cited were aspirational at this stage, and responder views on potential enablers of localisation were mixed but seemed to focus on seeking clarity of what localisation means, how to achieve it, and giving consideration to implications for power, funding, capacity strengthening and reporting requirements.

## **6.5 Localisation Programme Practices**

Shifts have been made relating to the way local knowledge and experience is used in developing and managing programmes. However, less than half of responder-organisations have adopted localisation principles to the design of programmes.

## **6.6 Capacity Strengthening**

Responder-organisations reported high activity in promoting and fostering local/national leadership. While it is common to perform capacity assessments on local partners, it is less common for local partners to perform capacity assessments on INGOs. It is usual for INGOs to assist strengthen a range of partners' practices, particularly in the areas of safeguarding and MERL. The strengthening of these practices is commonly performed through capacity development initiatives, financial resourcing, peer exchanges and personnel deployment.

## **6.7 Implications for Human Resource Practices**

Not all INGOs are considering the human resource implications for localisation. For those that are, it is often focused on increased local staffing, but this does not yet translate to decreased NZ based staffing.

It is not found to be usual practice for in-country partners to conduct performance reviews on international staff deployed in in-country organisations. Having said this, it is not clear how common it is for international staff to be deployed into in-country organisations, and as such the low occurrence performance reviews could be due to low numbers of international staff being deployed into the organisations of in-country partners.

It is marginally more common practice for in-country partners to conduct performance reviews on international partners (than on international staff deployed in in-country organisation). However, this is not the norm.

Additionally, with no common understanding of what localisation is and how it should be achieved, understandably a wide range of organisational learning needs have been identified in order to strengthen the ability to facilitate localisation.

### **6.8 Policies, Standards and Accountability Measures in Localisation**

It is not uncommon for INGOs to consult local partners in amending policies, standards and tools to reflect localisation; 50% of respondents reported doing this. It is also not uncommon for INGOs to pilot initiatives to assist local and national organisations to develop standards and accountability measures.

However, there appears to be a range of motivations for doing this. It is sometimes:

- reflective of the international organisations' own standards, and therefore performed to ensure ease and consistency of practices
- performed as a capacity development exercise, to ensure the local organisations have strong standards and accountability i.e. strengthening the outcome orientated
- performed as a capacity development exercise to strengthen the process of developing standards and accountabilities, i.e. strengthening the process orientated.

### **6.9 MERL and Localisation**

It is not uncommon for INGOs to change monitoring and evaluation frameworks to reflect localisation; 50% of respondents reported doing this, demonstrating an awareness of the importance and necessity for localisation practices, and an attempt at monitoring

localisation practices. While not standard practice, it is not uncommon to engage local partners to author or co-author evaluation reports.

#### **6.10 Public Engagement and Localisation**

A few INGOs attempt to ensure their public engagement practices platform localisation through methods such as publicizing local stories and communities and connecting NZ public to the local partners directly. One reported focusing their geographic range of work to provide certainty of funding. However, the INGOs come up against the challenge of the NZ public wanting to see NZ engagement on the ground and are striving to change this expectation.

#### **6.11 Donor Practices and Localisation**

It appears that donor processes are not necessarily aligned with or incentivising the adoption of localisation practices. However, some donors have changed reporting formats and have decreased the complexity of processes.

## Section 7: Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion, the picture is mixed. Most organisations believe they are strongly committed to localisation, but the organisational actions, behaviours and practices do not yet consistently demonstrate this commitment. There is a lack of momentum and some sector members appear a little dazed by the implications. There is no urgency to change operating models and behaviour and, while there is an acceptance and understanding that things should change, several blockages are present:

- the linkage between localisation and how it transforms business as usual is not well understood
- there is no collective understanding of localisation and the protocols supporting localisation, whether it changes in different environments, and how it is defined in the environments in which we work
- the system (i.e. the funding and policy established for the sector) does not currently acknowledge, enable, incentivise or demand localisation sufficiently
- while the sector knows of, and has an appreciation of, the importance of localisation, the required pace of change, and the factors determining that pace, are not well-understood. Is this something that needs to happen quickly or incrementally? How is this decided? What is appropriate, and how would we recognise localisation being implemented at an appropriate pace?

As outlined in Section 4, questions which need to be addressed for, and by, the sector are:

1. What are the influencers of localisation?
2. What are the actor roles of localisation?
3. What global examples can we leverage?
4. What does localisation mean in the different geographic environments in which we work?
5. What protocols best support localisation?
6. When will government funding change to support localisation, and in what way?
7. How does localisation impact and change our 'business as usual' – what does it mean for INGOs, for programmes, and for reporting?
8. How is appropriateness of timing determined?
9. How do we gather evidence and measure localisation and progress towards localisation?
10. What should we ideally be doing differently now; in the short-term future; in the medium-term future; and in the longer term?

The recommendation is for the sector to prioritise the development of the localisation agenda and seek to provide practical responses to these questions.

This may be achieved by developing a high performing hub or incubator, which is strategically inclined and sets out through research, evidence-based practice, and adaptive management practices to drive six key practices:

- ***Partner the Pacific***: work with the Pacific to create, document and share best practices in the field to facilitate the smooth transitioning to localisation
- ***Develop the alternative funding models***: work with stakeholders to identify how the funding model of aid needs to be changed to best administer and support localisation
- ***Determine the transformational path***: develop the transformational change programme, i.e. a programme of transformation to enable the changes identified for the funding model
- ***Identify implications of localisation for INGOs***: identify what localisation means for different types of INGOs in New Zealand, and what it means function by function for the INGOs
- ***Facilitate transformational change***: assist, support and facilitate the learnings and changes to take place within the INGOs
- ***Facilitate adaptive management***: Capture, document and enable learnings from each other.