localisation under the looking glass:
what we have learned and where we are headed

Join us in a dialogue on new ways of engaging and empowering local and national responders and evidence-based actions that ensure the safety, dignity and rights of the most vulnerable.

08:30 AM Introduction by Co-Chairs
- Learnings from the Localisation Workstream Country Missions - Naomi Tolay-Solanke, CHI - Liberia
- Localisation and Protection - Kate Sutton, HAG
- Localisation Perspectives from the Field - Elias Sagmeister, GTS
- Survivor-led Approach & Charter4Change - Mai Jarrar, East Jerusalem YMCA and Michael Mosselmans, Christian Aid

09:00 AM Small Group Discussions

09:30 AM Closing Plenary
with Reflections from Monique Parlat, ECHO; Dylan Winder, DFID; and Sema Genel, NEAR Network

Co-Chairs and Moderators - Dr Jemilah Mahmood, IFRC and Mr Philippe Besson, SDC
What we learned from field missions

- Localisation is about - striving for complementarity; acknowledging, respecting and supporting local capacities; trust and relationship building
- Capacity strengthening should be two-way, long-term and strategic; a risk management strategy
- Coordination structures overall are still dominated by international organisations and local organisations struggle to engage
- Localisation needs to encompass increased access to participation, decision-making and funding opportunities for women and women’s groups

Challenge: What are the perceived and real risks in partnering with local and national actors? How have these been managed and what more can be done?
THE KNOWN - Implementing more locally led responses creates challenges and opportunities for protection.

THE NEW - There are important roles for national and international actors but in current responses actors are not recognising and respecting each others roles. International actors often move into national actor space causing friction and undermining established mechanisms

THE CHALLENGE - How do we determine the optimal configuration of international and national actors to take on protection roles in locally-led responses? How would this look different to what currently happens?
Emerging lessons about localization

In conversations with some 5,000 people affected by crisis and 1,500 humanitarian staff in seven countries, we learned that:

1. Progress on localization depends on who you ask.
2. Affected people want local responses, but often prefer international responders.
3. Localization cannot be declared, but needs to be *lived*.
Charter4Change / Local2Global / ALTP

• Strengthen principled partnership through multi-year funding, overhead costs and capacity-strengthening

• Accelerate progress on direct humanitarian funding to local actors

• Catalyse a step-change in meaningful participation by local actors

• Mitigate the impact of proliferating compliance requirements

**CHALLENGE QUESTION** (for group work)
What steps can we take to ensure that progress on localisation and funding to local actors is not hindered by compliance, due diligence and risk management requirements?
1. What are the perceived and real risks in partnering with local and national actors? How have these been managed and what more can be done?

2. How do we determine the optimal configuration of international and national actors to take on protection roles in locally-led responses? How would this look different to what currently happens?

3. How do we reconcile the perspectives of national and international aid providers on localisation? And how can they measure progress towards a shared vision?

4. What steps can we take to ensure that progress on localisation and funding to local actors is not hindered by compliance, due diligence and risk management requirements?