

# Localization:

## Concepts, Considerations, and Contradictions

May 2023

**“The localization ‘agenda’ is a Pandora’s Box of issues linked to the political economy of aid and North/South relations.”<sup>1</sup>**

**“Localization comes with risks but will ultimately lead to capacity and sustainability. Change and growth come with risks and the need for risk acceptance and management.”<sup>2</sup>**

There is a growing recognition of the need to reshape the way in which international development and philanthropy work together – to move away from a largely top-down model that aims to assist “beneficiary” countries in need of a western-derived construct of “development”, towards a more balanced and equitable approach that fosters agency, ownership and growth, led by citizens, local organizations, and governments - a concept referred to in this brief as localization.<sup>3</sup>

Drawing from publicly available literature and media, this brief synthesizes the most salient concepts, considerations – and contradictions – within the localization space of international development. These principles and practices are increasingly becoming the bedrock for strategic implementation and advocacy.

## Key take-aways

1. The concept of localization is not new. The top-down structure of development aid and philanthropy have long been criticized as a foundational barrier to change. The humanitarian sector provided early leadership on localization, which represents a **fundamental shift in power between stakeholders, primarily in terms of strategic decision-making and control of resources**.
2. Current localization approaches are largely a ‘work in progress’. As localization is increasingly taken up by many governments, donors, UN agencies, international NGOs (INGOs), and local/national civil society organizations across the health and development space, it is important that they draw from and leverage the **rich learning available** from civil society and donor experiences on this issue, and equally recognize the limitations and barriers.
3. Localization is not simple. There is **no established “best way”** to localize, and implementing a localized approach is not a silver bullet for challenges related to external aid. Notably, even the current dialogue around localization tends to perpetuate the power imbalance by focusing on the need to build local and national capacities to match international systems and processes over adapting international structures/systems to local context.
4. The rationale for localization is self-evident. An evolving body of evidence highlights the importance and benefits of localization, and a number of common **core principles** that can be leveraged.
5. Localization necessitates a reorientation of the traditional donor – recipient relationship. A wide range of **changes are needed in the model of partnership**, including through the adaptation of policies and procedures by all stakeholders towards one of greater equity, transparency and trust.
6. Localization is an incremental and evolutionary process. Ultimately, **political will, leadership, stamina and sustained commitment** by all stakeholders are necessary requirements for success.
7. Localization is linked to broader development and political agendas. Currently, there are **data gaps** in terms of the impact of localization as various stakeholders have largely focused on shorter term indicators. A holistic understanding and appreciation of its intrinsic benefits will require **new approaches to measuring success**.

## Background and context

The idea of localization has been bandied about for many years. For example, in 2008 as part of the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA),<sup>4</sup> developing countries committed to taking stronger control of their own futures and donors pledged to coordinate better amongst themselves. With its dedication to country ownership and inclusive partnerships, the AAA aimed to fast-track attainment of the 2005 Paris Declaration<sup>5</sup> to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development. Then, eight years later a rather unique agreement between some of the largest donors and aid providers in the humanitarian sector committed to get more support and funding into the hands of people in need and to simultaneously improve effectiveness and efficiency. As part of this Grand Bargain,<sup>6</sup> emphasis was placed on adapting the working practices of donors and aid organizations to ensure greater funding for national and local organizations along with more un-earmarked money and increased multi-year funding. Other recent initiatives include the Charter 4 Change (2015), which sets a specific target of humanitarian funding to be passed to southern-based NGOs by May 2018,<sup>7</sup> and discussions around #ShiftThePower (2016), which raised awareness of the critical need for fundamental changes about the way in which international development is both viewed and approached. Yet despite this growing list of commitments, their realization has been inconsistent and structural change limited. Key learnings and challenges captured in the literature on these global commitments and other localization efforts are highlighted below.

## Key considerations shaping localization discourse

The localization of international development is viewed as both long overdue and inevitable, and all types of involved stakeholders – local/national civil society organizations, governments, donors, INGOs and UN agencies - are finding avenues to ensure that both the process and product of localization is robust. The actualization of localization by funders in particular continues to evolve as they seek to establish better quality, transparency, and equity in their investments and partnerships. They are currently working toward finding that right balance of shifting money and power closer to the communities they serve, while also recognizing potential short-term trade-offs, including reporting modalities and the development of alternative management/business arrangements.<sup>8</sup> Equally, it is important to recognize that the realization of localization as a new paradigm of country centered partnership requires not only strategic adjustments by those currently sitting with the power (e.g. donors, INGOs) but also by stakeholders in the global south as they step into an increased leadership role.

## What is localization?

A number of funders, international development agencies and civil society networks have developed and adapted their own unique definitions, perspectives or statements backed by principles related to localization:

- **United States Agency for International Development (USAID):** Incorporates localization within the “Journey to Self-Reliance” (J2SR), defined as “the *local capacity to plan, finance, and implement solutions* to local development challenges” and “is committed to seeing these through effectively, inclusively, and with accountability.”<sup>9</sup>
- **International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA):** a global NGO network for principled and effective humanitarian action: Defines localization as “the process through which a diverse range of humanitarian actors are attempting, each in their own way, to *ensure local and national actors are better engaged in the planning, delivery and accountability of humanitarian action, while still ensuring humanitarian needs can be met* swiftly, effectively and in a principled manner.”<sup>10</sup>
- **Trócaire - an agency of the Irish Catholic Church and the Irish member of the Caritas Internationalis federation:** Places emphasis on working in partnership with local organizations as part of humanitarian action where the ‘*local organization*’ is one that *comes from and works specifically in their own community*.
- **Oxfam:** a confederation of 20 independent charitable organizations focusing on the alleviation of global poverty: Highlights the “transformational process to *recognize, respect, and invest in* local and national humanitarian and leadership capacities, to better meet the needs of crisis-affected communities.”<sup>11</sup>
- **Global Affairs Canada:** the department that leads Canada’s international development and humanitarian assistance: Includes developing *country leadership and greater coordination among donors* as key elements of localization.<sup>12</sup>

Ultimately, although different words are used, localization is broadly recognized as a dynamic, non-linear transformational process that tends to converge around:

- Citizen-led sustainable action, power and lived experience, insights and intelligence
- Ceding decision-making around how global health and development funding is spent closer to the ground
- Relationships between donors and various partners that are built on equity and mutual trust
- Recognizing the differential and unique capacities of a range of different stakeholders and finding the most efficient areas of synergy (and needed divergence) on a collective agenda
- Appreciating that more is needed for a sustainable civil society than project funding alone

## What are some of the main reasons to localize?

Decades of a top-down push in development has largely led to sustained dependency on external aid by donor recipient governments, and removed the agency and power of citizens to own and lead their own development agenda.<sup>13</sup> A systematically localized approach to development, on the other hand, recognizes the local community as the leaders, decision-makers, and implementers of solutions impacting their country and their lives and supports them to lead.<sup>14</sup>

In addition to this overarching value of improving the balance of power and equity in development, strategic benefits to localization are seen to include:

### 1. IMPROVES EFFECTIVENESS:

Local stakeholders are citizens with lived experience and possess authoritative know-how and access to places, knowledge of culture, sensitivities, practices, priorities, and needs on the ground that are essential for impact. Thus, local NGOs (LNGOs) play a key role in identifying citizens' concerns and solutions and facilitating their elevation to donor and country agenda-setting tables and commitments fulfillment.

### 2. BUILDS, STRENGTHENS, AND REINFORCES SUSTAINABILITY OF THE LOCAL ECOSYSTEM:

Strengthening local institutions and capacities - which has in many places increased exponentially - has the potential to both yield more sustained action in the long-term as they are inherently part of the national make-up even during challenging times and also reduce the intense need for the kind of INGO support that has historically been provided.

### 3. FOSTERS JOINT ACCOUNTABILITY:

A localized approach to development changes the direction of accountability as it facilitates a structure with shared power where national organizations inform strategic and financial decision-making. Simultaneously, when organizations are established, led and staffed by people close to, or part of, affected communities, they may simultaneously be more accountable to these communities.

### 4. MAXIMIZES VALUE FOR MONEY:

In the longer term, a localized investment model reduces costs related to implementation, staffing, transaction, and management. Strengthening the capacity of local partners to be strong, informed, efficient and sustainable has a multiplier effect over time, and enhances the value of the initial investment.

# What are the core principles of localization?

The humanitarian sector, a long-standing thought leader in this area, has developed and advanced a localization framework with principles that have richly informed broader thinking on this topic. Key principles of localization include: <sup>15</sup>



1. **Build clear mutually benefitting and equitable partnerships:** Invest in a bi-directional relationship with inclusive, transparent and simplified processes and systems that meet local partners where they are.



2. **Co-design, co-implement and co-evaluate:** This might include participatory grant-making,<sup>16</sup> with built in regular check-ins that foster inclusive learning culture and equal partnership founded on flexible and adaptive management, leadership and course correction moments.



3. **Set up sustained and progressive funding mechanisms:** Key to setting local partners up for success is covering 'holistic true costs' that (in addition to project costs) support the institution to provide effective management, institutional systems, and quality human resources.



4. **Model a needs-driven capacity strengthening infrastructure:** Evidence-based capacity strengthening should add value, rather than displace. Leverage local enablers of long-term technical capacity over quick, complex and expensive external support.



5. **Support functional movement building and coordination:** Intentionally support functional, fit for purpose country level networks and partnerships. Leverage the comparative advantage of both LNGO and INGO partners for collective impact.



6. **Be intentional about recognition, attribution and credit:** Acknowledge and publicly declare roles, contributions, and leadership of local partners.



7. **Local voices inform regional, global agendas.** Enhanced local capacity and meaningful representation also has an added-value in the region and promotes sustainability.



8. **Consider language use and communication:** Foster respectful partnership culture through use of words and language that recognize and reinforce a mutually benefiting relationship.

## What is the best way to localize?

Global and national conversations about localization have largely evolved from a question of “why?” to one of “how?”, and the development community is still learning while doing. In recent years, donors in particular have utilized a range of entry points for localization, which include providing more direct funding to existing national and local stakeholders; strengthening and increasing investments in the capacity of national partners; increasing national strategic decision-making power across a range of operational levels; increasing synergy between international priorities and national and local realities; and reducing administrative and policy barriers to accessing international funds.

This range of examples of “how” to localize highlights different aspects of the Pandora’s Box. For some donors, the emphasis is placed on increasing the percentage of direct funding to local national organizations (e.g. The U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), USAID); for others the focus is on supporting predictability through more un-earmarked money for institutional strengthening (e.g. the Robert Carr Fund, the Packard Foundation) and multi-year funding Global Affairs Canada, UBS Optimus Foundation). The efforts of others are framed by the goal of diversifying and expanding a stronger country-centric partnership model (e.g. Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria).

For national stakeholders, questions relate to how to meaningfully address the power asymmetry and how a diverse range of local stakeholders can be involved across all aspects of the localization spectrum – including funding decisions, priority setting and capacity strengthening.

In the absence of a tried and tested model that succinctly covers all aspects of localization from design and implementation through measurement and impact, a range of donors have increasingly, together with their partners, developed bespoke approaches that emphasize various localization parameters. Partner and focus dependent, these approaches have contributed to a deeper appreciation of the intricacies involved while also revealing the slow but progressive realization of the intended outcome. Because localization does not take place in isolation and a plethora of variables come into play, there is currently no one best model for achieving it. From a lack of uniformity about definitional elements (e.g. local partner) to a more cohesive approach towards organizational and individual ‘capacity strengthening’, many of the elements of how to localize are still being fine-tuned. This process has frequently been undertaken with the deliberate commitment to *try it out, pause, reflect, and adapt* moments. Guided by the principles of localization

and with the recognition that it is a process, change and investments will be required in a diversity of measures that are context specific.

**Three examples of emerging good practice strategies and activities that are grounded in the core principles include<sup>17</sup>:**

### 1. PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

Facilitates, from the outset, a co-designed representative process that ensures the meaningful engagement of and feedback from affected communities in understanding and responding to country determined priorities. Encourage sector wide and diverse participation including community-based organizations, local civil society groups, local authorities, etc. (See Annex 1 for an example of a participatory planning.) (e.g. FP/MNCH PAC team at the foundation).

### 2. PARTICIPATORY GRANT MAKING

Shifts the role of funders from arbiters of what gets done, to facilitators of a process in which they work with other organizations and non-grant makers to designate priorities and act.<sup>18</sup> This may include a mixed funding methodology where INGOs and local NGO/CSO’s take partner roles that best fit the local context, but maximizes local organizations taking the lead on implementation over time. ( e.g. Ford Foundation).

### 3. NATIONAL POOLED FUNDS

Facilitates aligned donors to meet their localization commitments that they are unable to execute individually and directly as they pool their contributions into single, unearmarked funds to support local efforts – which is especially prevalent in the humanitarian sector to support crisis-affected countries to deliver timely, coordinated and principled assistance.<sup>19</sup> Using this model, it is key to ensure sufficient funding levels to support not just programmatic deliverables but sustainable and effective organizations. ( e.g. Co-Impact; Amplify Change).



# What are some of the key inhibitors to localization?

While various approaches and elements of localization have been envisaged and implemented, their implementation remains sluggish and non-systematic. Overall, donors have fallen short of their localization commitments.<sup>20</sup> For example, a 2020 blog by the Center for Effective Philanthropy<sup>21</sup> highlights that for every \$1 million that philanthropies invest in developing countries, more than \$800,000 is channeled through INGOs based in major cities in the global north. Thus, while there are clear commitments, the process of localization is undoubtedly challenging. A number of linked constraints have impeded the pace and quality of progress in this area, including:

ISSUE	BARRIER	SOLUTION PATHWAY
<b>DONOR-DRIVEN AGENDAS</b>	Funders are reluctant to relinquish control over who and how their funding is managed, and for what purpose. As a result, funding is focused on advancing donor priorities, which may or may not match local realities.	Greater alignment in the development of donor priorities with national needs could be shaped through the more meaningful and inclusive participation of national stakeholders, as well as through mechanisms that position local organizations in stronger and more direct relationships with donors.
<b>PERCEPTIONS OF RISK AND LOCAL CAPACITY STRENGTH</b>	There is a perception that investing in local partners is risky – e.g. risk of fraud, lack of sufficient capacity to deliver. Anything local by locals is subjected to layers of scrutiny. INGOs are frequently viewed as the more attractive partner due to their track record of meeting strict donor requirements.	Improved understanding and nuancing of risk is key to increasing donor trust in local and national partners, with the aim of greater investment, over longer periods of time, with reduced oversight burdens. This can be supported in a number ways, including through needs-based capacity strengthening and partnership alignment/evolution.
<b>INFLEXIBLE DONOR OPERATING SYSTEMS</b>	While a global intermediary model is a useful and convenient mechanism for donors to expand their reach within their operational constraints (i.e. funders' lean staffing, strict funding requirements), this approach has limitations. It generally means smaller amounts of short-term, project-based funding reaches LNGOs, which is less likely to include adequate institutional strengthening support that is needed for efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, and fuels the cycle of real and perceived lack of capacity.	Donor commitment to localization will necessitate reviewing and adapting systems, policies, and requirements to improve equity in local contexts. This could include developing a range of tiered grant-making processes to better support a wider range of local organizations; investing in alternative local/regional organizations to address recurring thematic constraints; flexible grants; and pooled funding for requested capacity strengthening.

ISSUE	BARRIER	SOLUTION PATHWAY
<b>DISJOINTED DONOR PARTNERSHIP MODEL</b>	The donor-grantee relationship is primarily with INGOs, with limited to no direct access, knowledge, and relationships between local partners and donors. This gatekeeping role maintains the imbalance in INGO-local NGO (LNGO) partnerships. As funders move toward localization, INGOs may perceive this as competition and potentially an existential threat, and exacerbate tensions between INGO/LNGO partners.	Forging a revamped partnership model (donor-grantee; INGO-LNGO) that improves the balance of power will strengthen relationships and collective results. This may be facilitated by promoting increased understanding of the value of local partners, and repositioning INGOs to play a revised role (e.g. providing technical assistance on request of and via the LNGO, global level engagement).
<b>HUMAN RESOURCES EQUILIBRIUM</b>	The development of human capital lies at the heart of all localization efforts. Frequently, sector-specific human resource approaches lose sight of this in the interests of safeguarding their issue and/or organization. INGOs who can offer better packages and benefits often recruit local staff for their offices from the very agencies they are working with, which inadvertently results in a heavier burden for LNGOs (e.g. constant investment in a cycle of skills acquisition, capacity building and training), and weakens the ecosystem.	Localization should support civil society as a whole, rather than individual or small numbers of formalized civil society partners. It is important to enable and align human resource practices of all agencies involved in the localization agenda, including by ensuring that LNGOs can offer competitive packages to support staff retention and/ or supporting a pool of local talent management.

## How is progress towards localization being captured?

Evidence around localization is largely qualitative and anecdotal (e.g. case studies). While tracking of singular elements is possible (e.g. funding for local partners), there are vast differences on what exactly is being measured – such as, who is a “local” partner? Unpacking this particular concept has been a central debate within localization efforts. For example, the Grand Bargain committed to “a global, aggregated target of at least 25% of humanitarian funding to local and national responders as directly as possible.” While a consultative process defined local as “local NGOs/CSOs operating in a specific, geographically defined, subnational area of an aid recipient country, without affiliation to an international NGO/CSO” (with a similar definition for “national”), the definition finally applied to the 25% funding commitment included a clause which allowed country offices of INGOs to qualify as local, and the concept of getting funding to national and local actors ‘as directly as possible’ was expanded to include international aid organizations as intermediaries). This was of great disappointment to many across the humanitarian space.<sup>22</sup>

Further, because localization approaches are variable and context specific, providing a holistic picture of progress and impact is complicated. The Pando Localization Learning System, a USAID-supported platform for tracking local ownership within projects in real time, is one example of how this is being done. Pando<sup>23</sup> uses network maps and feedback surveys to capture four measures:

1. *Leadership* looks at whether project design and implementation are bottom-up.
2. *Mutuality* measures whether strong reciprocal, or two-way, relationships exist.
3. *Connectivity* asks whether the local system is improving, and if we are playing the right roles.
4. *Financing* measures whether dependency on external financial resources is decreasing, and local financial opportunities are becoming stronger.

Key changes are undoubtedly needed to the way we are determining success, including measures that value community engagement, calculating savings due to increased local capacity, impacts of stronger local leadership, and developing a better understanding of the other less-tangible contributions that local stakeholders bring.

## Current dialogue and action

In the wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, and bolstered by a broad wave of calls to decolonize health and development aid, there is unprecedented attention to structural racism within the development sector, and revitalized interest among donors, researchers, advocates, and implementers alike to make strategic changes in the way they work, in order to advance the power shifts needed for sustained localization. Further, the COVID-19 pandemic – during which local and national organizations led the crisis response in locally relevant ways – laid bare the urgency to invest in local partners. Yet while the rhetoric around localization has increased exponentially over the past few years, beyond a few exemplary practices, progress and impact remain limited. Overall, INGOs have retained financial and program design and delivery control, providing activity-based funding to LNGOs.

While the process of localization is still a work in progress, the logic of it is unquestionable: strategic decisions about development aid must be meaningfully centered within the communities they serve. Shaped by the initiatives of the past, strengthened by current political commitment, and harnessing the potential of tomorrow, the time to realize localization commitments may have arrived. With the recognition that there is risk to waiting for the “right” answers, all stakeholders on the pathway of localization should actively contribute to enhancing the evidence base by engaging in the process, while also acknowledging the fault lines – that there are areas that still need to be better understood, and that to do this work well will require a shift in the status quo of ingrained practices. As the current architecture of global health and development is confronted and potentially transformative adjustments are made, we are all contributing to the science of localization, and nurturing the seeds of a more equitable, just and fair society.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

### Three key documents to read:

1. [More Than the Money](#), by Véronique de Geoffroy and François Grunewaldde, published by Trócaire and Groupe URD, July 2017
2. [Localization in Practice](#), by K. Van Brabant & S. Patel, published by the Global Mentoring Initiative, June 2018
3. [Going Local: The Promise & Challenge of Aid Localization](#), Global Finance Strategies, 2015

### Three news articles to review:

1. [Foreign aid is having a reckoning](#), Editorial Board of the New York Times, February 2021
2. [Samantha Power lays out her vision for USAID](#), Adva Saldinger, Devex, November 2021
3. [Are INGOs ready to give up power?](#) by Maria Faciolince, From Poverty to Power blog, December 2019

### Three videos to watch:

1. [Localization in International Development](#), hosted by Women of Color Advancing Peace and Security, August 2021
2. [#ShiftThePower – Shifting the Power Balance to the Global South](#), hosted by Centre for Strategic Philanthropy at CJBS, July 2021
3. [The Localization Agenda: Questioning the Intermediary Donor System](#), hosted by WACSI, May 2021

### Three podcasts to listen to:

1. [Pathways to Power](#) Podcast Series, hosted by Terry Gibson of Investing Future, Oct 2019
2. [Accelerating Localisation Through Partnerships](#), Humanitarian Practice Network, May 2021
3. [15 Minutes on Localizing and Decolonizing Aid](#), CARE Canada, March 2021



<sup>1</sup> de Geoffroy, Véronique and Grunewaldde, François. More Than the Money. Trócaire and Groupe URD, July 2017

<sup>2</sup> Going Local: The Promise & Challenge of Aid Localization. Global Finance Strategies, 2015

<sup>3</sup> Including: ICVA. Localization Examined: An ICVA Briefing Paper. ICVA, September 2018; Fabre, Cyprien. Localising the Response. OECD, 2017; The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), Accra Agenda for Action (2008) and The Grand Bargain (2016); OECD/UNDP. Making Development Cooperation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report. OECD, 2016; USAID. Financing Self Reliance Fact Sheet. October, 2016

<sup>4</sup> Accra Agenda for Action (2008)

<sup>5</sup> The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)

<sup>6</sup> Grand Bargain (2016)

<sup>7</sup> Charter 4 Change

<sup>8</sup> Highlighted in the following publications: USAID. Financing Self Reliance Fact Sheet. October, 2016; World Humanitarian Summit Commitments to Action, May 2016; Fabre, Cyprien. Localising the Response. OECD, 2017; Kumar, Raj. What's new with localization. Devex, May 2015

<sup>9</sup> USAID Journey to Self-Reliance (2018)

<sup>10</sup> ICVA. Localization Examined: An ICVA Briefing Paper. ICVA, September 2018

<sup>11</sup> Oxfam. The power of local leadership in emergencies. Oxfam website.

<sup>12</sup> Kattakuzhy, Anita and Parrish, Chloe. Money Talks. Development Initiative and Oxfam, 2018; Novovoic, Gloria. Localize or Perish. Cooperation Canada, blog October 2020.

<sup>13</sup> As highlighted in: Wangchuk, Dawa and Turner, Mark. Aligning top-down and bottom-up in development planning: The case of Bhutan. Public Administration and Development, March 2019; Stanford, Victoria. Aid Dependency: The Damage of Donation. This Week in Global Health, July 2015; Knack, Stephen. Aid Dependence and the Quality of Governance: A Cross-Country Empirical Analysis. World Bank, 2000.

<sup>14</sup> Cornish, Lisa. Putting Localization at the Center of Humanitarian Future. Devex, May 2019

<sup>15</sup> Drawn primarily from: Charter 4 Change; Emmens, Ben and Clayton, Maxine. Localisation of Aid: Are INGOs Walking the Talk? Shifting the Power Project, date unknown

<sup>16</sup> Participatory grant making (PGM) is the practice of ceding grant-making power to affected community members and constituencies. In practice, it means placing affected communities at the center of grant-making by giving them the power to decide **who and what to fund**. This form of grant-making requires both a recognition of the unequal power relationships inherent in philanthropy as well as a conscious effort to rebalance that power. Source: Fund for Global Human Rights

<sup>17</sup> Drawn from: Transparency and Accountability Initiative. Smarter Grantmaking for Grantee Organizations: Conversations to Have with Funders. Transparency and Accountability Initiative, 2019; Gibson, Cynthia. Participatory Grantmaking: Has its Time Come? Ford Foundation, date unknown; Carr, Alastair based on research by Stephen, Monica and Martini, Ariana. Turning the Tables: Research Briefing. Saferworld and Save the Children, date unknown.

<sup>18</sup> Gibson, Cynthia. Participatory Grantmaking: Has its Time Come? Ford Foundation, date unknown

<sup>19</sup> Featherstone, Andy and Mowjee, Tasneem. Desk Review on Enhancing the Potential of Pooled Funds for Localisation. The Grand Bargain Workstream 2: Localisation, September 2020.

<sup>20</sup> As highlighted in: Ramalingam, Ben, Gray, Bill and Cerruti, Giorgia. Missed Opportunities: The Case for Strengthening National and Local Partnership-Based Humanitarian Responses. ActionAid, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Oxfam GB, and tearfund, date unknown; Fabre, Cyprien. Localising the Response. OECD, 2017.

<sup>21</sup> Levine, Ruth. How Funders Can Help Reimagine the Relationship Between International NGOs and Local Partners. CEP, February 2020.

<sup>22</sup> Paige, Shannon. Time to Decolonize Aid: Insights and Lessons from a Global Consultation. Save the Children, 2021

<sup>23</sup> Root Change's Pando system

Brief compiled for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's FP/ MNCH/PHC Program Advocacy and Communications Team by GHV in January 2022. The information contained in this brief reflects the current state at the time of research.