ACCELERATING LOCALISATION THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS: LESSONS LEARNED AND STRATEGIC POINTERS NIGERIA AND SOUTH SUDAN
Lessons Learned and Strategic Pointers for Localisation

South Sudan and Nigeria
Research methodology

• To identify partnership practices which are most and least conducive to localisation according to local and national NGOs.

• Mixed methods research: survey, focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews.

• FGDs in 3 locations in each country.

• Research validation workshops held in Juba, Wau and Abuja to review preliminary research findings and recommendations.
Research locations

**NIGERIA**

- **Abuja**: Humanitarian and NGO hub.

**SOUTH SUDAN**

- **Wau, Wau State**: Protracted armed conflict and violence, resulting in high levels of displacement in camps and food insecurity. Humanitarian hub for the area.

- **Bor, Jonglei State**: Severe levels of armed conflict and violence, restricted humanitarian access, and incidences of flooding, resulting in high levels of displacement in camps and food insecurity.

- **Juba**: Humanitarian and NGO hub. Protracted armed conflict and violence resulting in high levels of displacement in camps in and around the city.

- **Jos, Plateau State**: Communal clashes and herder-farmer conflict resulting in high levels of displacement. Humanitarian hub for the area.
NGO dynamics in South Sudan

“Local/national NGOs are involved in emergency responses as respected and equal partners. International organisations actively reach out to local/national NGOs but local/national NGOs do not have full influence and control over humanitarian response.”

National NGO research participant
NGO dynamics in South Sudan

“When the local organisations are given opportunity to lead in implementation of projects this also means that the communities where we work are also given opportunities to also lead.”

Research participant
NGO dynamics in Nigeria

What influence does your organisation have?

Which entity has the most influence here?

To what extent does the international system respect and promote L/NNGOs to manage / coordinate responses to humanitarian crises?

- UN: 78%
- INGOs: 72%
- RCRC: 28%
- NNGOs: 25%

Rating:
- GOOD: 28%
- FAIR: 47%
- POOR: 25%
Partnership perceptions in Nigeria and South Sudan

Are partnerships were the best pathway to localisation?
86% said yes in Nigeria
49% said yes in South Sudan

Most L/NNGO survey respondents had experience working on a humanitarian response operation in partnership with an INGO. Among these, 38% in Nigeria and 19% in South Sudan qualified their partnerships as “a genuine partnership”, a further 52% said there were “many” qualities of an equitable partnership.

Overall, 70% of these same partnerships were reported as “very” or “moderately” instrumental to meeting humanitarian needs. Survey respondents were less positive in their responses on this in South Sudan than they were in Nigeria: 100% of NNGO respondents in Nigeria compared to 54% in South Sudan.
Top rated operational capacities in partnerships

- Financial management and reporting
- Project planning and management
- Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL)
- Fundraising
- Coordination
- Capacity building
Partnership practices most conducive to localisation

A summary of what was shared during the global learning session:

- Fair budgeting
- Responsiveness to feedback
- Capacity strengthening support
- Equality in partnerships
- Ethical recruitment
Partnership practices not conducive to localisation

1. When key decisions have already been taken by the INGO or donor, e.g. “We did not decide the location, they decided the location they want us to intervene, the people who fund them to fund us, they already had the target in mind.” Research participant

2. When the international actors design the project alone, and the local partner has no input.

3. When there is a lack of communication about what the project and/or partnership is aiming to achieve, e.g. “INGOs that are funding don’t communicate their aims and objectives properly.” Research participant

4. When international actors provide templates for everything, including monitoring, telling the L/NNGO what to report on which only focuses on outputs.
Strategic pointers for localisation in Nigeria and South Sudan

UN agencies

1. Increase representation of local actors in humanitarian coordination mechanisms (e.g. Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG), Technical Working Groups, clusters).

2. Establish a localisation cluster at national level to connect conversations with global workstreams.

3. Increase Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPF) allocations to local actors (increase in both number of local actors and value of funds) and increase multi-year funding.

4. Address neglected humanitarian crises (e.g. OCHA needs to expand humanitarian activities beyond the northeast of Nigeria).
Strategic pointers for localisation in Nigeria and South Sudan

International NGOs / UN agencies

5. Invest in the sustainability of local organisations, including strengthening their technical capacities and organisational governance. Demand led.

6. Manage safety and security risks. INGOs must develop strategies to address the issue of risk transfer as a result of localisation.

Localisation Workstream / Other

7. Establish minimum standards for genuine partnerships.

8. Invest in national annual Grand Bargain commitment and progress reviews for signatories in-country.
Thank you

For more information:

Malish John (CARE) and John Riek Yior (National Steering Committee), South Sudan
Faith Idachaba (Christian Aid) and Mimidoo Achakpa (National Steering Committee), Nigeria

http://caid.org.uk/54