CAPACITY & COMPLEMENTARITY IN HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
HPG Research Project: capacity and complementarity

- How can capacity be better understood and applied to support more complementary and collaborative humanitarian response?
- What are the opportunities for and obstacles to harnessing the capacity of and forging more effective complementarity among local, national, regional and international actors responding to humanitarian crises?
Case studies

Bangladesh: Response to the Rohingya displacement in Cox’s Bazar

Democratic Republic of Congo: conflicts in South Kivu and Kasai

Models of complementarity: British Virgin Islands Red Cross, INGO brokering role, mixed consortium and more
Complementarity is defined an outcome where all capacities at all levels – local, national, regional, international – are harnessed and combined in such a way to support the best humanitarian outcomes for affected communities.
Defining capacity: key findings

Who defines capacity leads to unequal power dynamics and narrow definitions of capacity.

A lack of consensus on definitions means it is difficult to decide how local responses can be...
Assessing capacity: key findings

Who decides who has capacity? Power dynamics need to be addressed in how capacity is assessed.

Burden of evidence on local organisations to demonstrate they are better, cheaper, and more effective.
Strengthening capacity: key findings

A process generally done for the purpose of delivering projects as implementing partners.

Capacity ‘strengthening’ not systematic, and focuses on technical skills and standards.

Little reflection on the ability of international actors to strengthen capacities.
Capacity strengthening: ways forward

Define capacity with a wider range of stakeholders

Develop a context-wide mapping of capacity

Fill gaps through complementary approaches
Questions for discussion

1. How can capacity be assessed in a manner that better informs local responses?

2. How can actors be included who do not meet funding and partnership requirements?

3. How can we address power dynamics, trust deficits and perceptions of legitimacy?