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1. Introduction & Background

The essential role of local and national actors in humanitarian response and the need for more equitable partnerships were predominant themes of the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and the 2016 Grand Bargain\(^1\). The latter is an agreement between more than 50 of the largest donors and humanitarian actors\(^2\) which led to a number of significant commitments to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian assistance, including an increase in respect for and investment in national and local responders, through improved partnerships, investment in the long-term capacity of local actors, better integration with local coordination mechanisms aiming to achieve an aggregate global target of 25% of international funding channelled as directly as possible to local actors by 2020\(^3\). The same year of the signature of the Grand Bargain, the often-quoted slogan ‘as local as possible, as international as necessary’ and a multitude of pro-localisation initiatives were spawned.

A commitment to the essence of localisation, however predates the WHS. This is visible in the Code of Conduct for International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief, Sphere Standards, Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS), and even in the humanitarian policies of various donors and High-level Meetings on Aid Effectiveness\(^4\). Similarly, working in partnerships across the humanitarian development nexus has also been in the spotlight for more than a decade as per international agreements such as the 2003 Bali Guidelines on Partnership established by the UN’s Department on Economic and Social Affairs and the 2007 Global Humanitarian Platform’s Principles of Partnership\(^5\)\(^6\). Later, the 2015 Charter for Change resulted in the commitment of international NGOs (currently 35 signatories\(^7\)) to implement eight measures concretely promoting more equitable partnership practice (including endorsing the Principles of Partnership\(^8\)) and has been endorsed since then by more than 200 Local and National NGOs (N/LNGO). For more background information on localisation, ICVA\(^9\) and Trocaire\(^10\) briefing papers published recently explore the evolution of localisation and provide an insightful summary on the landscape, progresses, challenges and stakeholders to inform a balanced understanding of localisation.

---

2 https://wwwagendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/3861
7 https://charter4change.org/
8 Idem as footnote 1
In recent years, the *Missed Opportunities* series has documented partnership experience with local actors in humanitarian response, providing insightful positions in support of the localisation of aid and humanitarian partnership. Hundreds of reports since the WHS have focused on localisation; much fewer focus on partnership. Literature on how to practically facilitate processes fit-for-partnership and adequate governance of collaboration, tailored to the aid sector across different settings, is almost non-existent. No report to date appears to have mapped the processes and business models of NGOs operating in humanitarian settings, to lead to the proposal of a set of flexible and adaptive partnership models that facilitate and accelerate local leadership of humanitarian response. This report aims to fill that gap, identifying key operational elements conducive to L/NNGO and INGO partnerships that further the localisation agenda, making humanitarian response more effective.

This research is part of the *Accelerating Localisation Through Partnerships* programme being guided by national steering committees and existing NGO Forums in the four focus countries: Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan. The programme consortium is made up of ActionAid, CAFOD, CARE, Christian Aid, Oxfam and Tearfund, and is funded by European Union Humanitarian Aid for two years (2017-2019). Consortium agencies have committed to piloting the recommendations of this research in real-time humanitarian response as much as is practicable.

1.1 Defining localisation

Localisation is steadily gaining traction and support from a wide variety of stakeholders. However, some stakeholders are not in favour of this process. One of the most debated issues appears to be

---

**DEFINITIONS**

- **Localisation**: National and local humanitarian actors increasingly empowered to take a greater role in the leadership, coordination and delivery of humanitarian preparedness and response in their countries.

- **Partnership**: the relationship between international humanitarian actors (especially INGOs and L/NNGOs) whereby the international actors work with, support and resource the national and local actors to design and implement humanitarian preparedness and response programming.

- **L/NNGO**: all local, national and regional non-government organisations (including Red Cross-National Societies) that are founded and headquartered in the global south and participate in HA. Excluded are governments, southern chapters/offices/branches of INGOs founded and headquartered in the global north, private sector, diaspora.
  - Each time the term L/NNGO or one or the other is employed in this research, it systematically includes national and local CBOs, Associations and National Red Cross Societies.
  - Each time “INGOs” is employed, it includes Partner National Societies (for Red Cross) or IFRC.

- **Humanitarian action (HA)**: preparedness, response and recovery programming, including certain aspects of resilience programming but not development actions.

---

11 Missed Opportunities: the case for strengthening national and local partnership-based humanitarian responses

the lack of consensus around key definitions. This lack of clear definitions hampers the design and implementation of relevant partnership models and is an impediment to monitoring progress.

This research uses the definitions of localisation stated in the Terms of Reference, as outlined in the textbox. This definition however does not address all concerns about the lack of clarity or consensus on key concepts. Depending on the definition used, issues to be mitigated, expected outcomes and actors targeted differ greatly. Two main interpretations of localisation stand out: the transformative interpretation and the decentralised interpretation (discussed in START Network reports and presented in more detail in the global companion report).

1.2 Background and purpose of the research

A long list of pertinent research efforts was shared in a Workshop to Support Coordinated Localisation Research organised by the Grand Bargain Workstream on Local and National Responders. The concept of partnerships is reportedly being addressed by many of these efforts: building on the Missed Opportunities series, research projects are being conducted by organisations such as Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Ukraine, Gates Foundation, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), World Food Programme (WFP) to name but a few. Beyond partnership, other related themes explored or proposed include capacity strengthening, financing, local leadership and coordination mechanisms, complementarity between international and local actors (particularly in conflict settings) and gender. A localisation progress measurement system was identified as a gap and the NEAR effort has recently developed a draft ‘Localisation Performance Measurement Framework’.

The present research explores how elements of the dominant operating model of NGOs working in humanitarian action are treated in National-International NGO partnerships, to determine which combinations and related practices are most conducive to localisation, more specifically in four countries – Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria and South Sudan. The main research question is: What operational elements of partnerships between NNGOs and INGOs are most likely to foster localisation of humanitarian action?

Sub-questions explore:
1. The ‘hard’ elements of NGO humanitarian operating models (core capabilities and resources): What (partnership/leadership) practices relating to the application of their core capabilities and resources do NNGOs and INGOs consider most and least conducive to localisation?
2. The ‘soft’ elements of NGOs’ humanitarian operating models (Values, Principles and Standards); What (partnership/leadership) practices relating to their values, principles and standards do NNGOs and INGOs regard as most and least conducive to localisation?

13 Notably the following documents:
- Government of Switzerland, Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2017), minutes of the Grand Bargain Workstream on Local and National Responders Workshop to Support Coordinated Localisation Research
- Minutes of the key messages from the internal workshop on the ICRC and localisation of aid Sept 2017

14 Government of Switzerland, Inter-Agency Standing Committee, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2017), minutes of the Grand Bargain Workstream on Local and National Responders Workshop to Support Coordinated Localisation Research
3. And environmental/external factors that most influence localisation: **What environmental/external factors wield the most influence on localisation?**

It is anticipated that the overlay of the above mapping exercises, and the contributions of participants in Validation Workshops will also bring to the surface answers to the following questions:

4. What are the most effective solutions to overcome identified barriers?
5. Which of the above apply in most/specific settings (hazard type and phase of DRM)?
6. How best to facilitate and accelerate localisation across contexts and in all stages of DRM?

For the purpose of this research, Core capabilities and resources are considered the ‘hard’ elements of NGOs’ humanitarian operating models. Approaches and values are the ‘soft’ elements.

The present report covers exclusively the findings for Nigeria. A macro-report will triangulate findings across the four countries.

### 1.3 Nigeria specifics

The following specifics on humanitarian dynamics in Nigeria serve to anchor the research in this country. Greater detail on where the research was conducted inside Nigeria are found under Methods, below. Information on institutional mechanisms for humanitarian action and disaster preparedness are found under Localisation in Nigeria, later in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY PROFILE AT-A-GLANCE- NIGERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCDP/PRIO</strong>[^15] <strong>Armed Conflict</strong> Dataset: Number of deadly conflicts (since 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 conflicts resulted in over 1000 deaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM</strong>[^16] <strong>Risk Index</strong> (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM Hazard &amp; Exposure</strong> (2018) <strong>Max=10.0; higher is worse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN</strong>: 9 (Current conflicts: 9, Conflict Risk: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM Vulnerability</strong> (2018 Value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM Lack of Coping Capacity</strong> (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORM Highest 5 risk indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Conflict probability (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Subnational conflicts (9) Malaria death rate (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-five mortality rate (8.40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most **deadly natural hazards** in the last 5 years (number of events, total deaths, CRED[^17]):

- **Epidemic**: 8 events, 1537 reported deaths
- **Flood**: 6 events, 125 reported deaths
- **Storm**: 1 event, 28 reported deaths

**NB: See Section 2 for most recent in 3 contexts**

**Humanitarian aid contributions**

- **2018 trends in reported funding** 630.1 (in USD-M, FTS[^18], as of 18/09/2018)
- **Total Humanitarian aid contributions reported funding for 2013 – 2018** 2 321.2 USD-M (highest total annual: 965.1 in 2017)

---

[^16]: http://www.inform-index.org/Countries/Country-Profile-Map
[^18]: https://fts.unocha.org/
2. Methodology

The research was underpinned by a mixed methods approach, including classic qualitative (systematic literature review, focus group discussions and key informant interviews) and quantitative (survey) collection techniques. During the analysis phase, all sources of evidence (primary and secondary) were triangulated to iteratively identify and document convergent and divergent trends.

During the literature review, IRMA was asked to develop an analytical framework to represent an idealized operating model of NGOs in humanitarian action. This framework was the foundation that directed qualitative and quantitative questionnaire development. Research teams interrogated NGOs and their partners to determine which structural and other organisational elements facilitate or detract from partnership. The framework (see Figure 1) lays out INGO core capabilities, resources, values, external factors. While it was not expected to fully resonate with all NGOs, nor for their operating models to be exactly the same, it served as a starting point for open, neutral discussions on capabilities, resources, relationships and other aspects of humanitarian action that they were familiar with. While the scope was comprehensive, the research focused above all on the hard elements of partnership (see core capabilities and resources – green shading), followed by Approach and Environmental factors, and how any changes in these elements would affect the Value-add (in yellow, in the centre of the model).

![Figure 1: Analytical Framework, Humanitarian INGO Operating Model](image)

Core capabilities are the specific skills sets and abilities that organisations need to do their work. For example, HR management in humanitarian contexts requires the application a unique combination of skills and abilities, as does Planning and design of a humanitarian intervention, and fundraising for humanitarian work, etc. The departments and functions in humanitarian organisations’ ‘architecture’ tend to reflect the core capabilities. Capacity building and organisational development are included as core capabilities because the humanitarian work of many INGOs includes developing the capacities of their partners, local entities and communities.
Resources are the human, financial, material and other assets (some of which are not tangible, such as connections) that organisations draw on to do their work. Their connection with the core capabilities is multi-directional. For example, Fundraising generates funds that are subsequently controlled by financial management and used for Project management in the hands of skilled people. Policies, strategies and other guidance are considered resources, because of the investment made to develop them and the way in which they are drawn upon – as with other assets- for humanitarian purposes.

Approach/Values is the term used for the software anchoring the operations --the principles, related standards and other values that organisations pursue and intend to put into practice in their interactions with their clients/beneficiaries, and with other actors, including partners.

External elements are the mostly exogenous influences from the operating environment (from local to global) in which the organisation moves.

Value add is how NGOs combine their core capabilities, resources and approach to ‘add value’, i.e. to convert the inputs into a service that meets the need of assistance and protection of their beneficiaries; in other words, how they create the intended benefits for their end-users. This is their unique place in the system in which they operate, alongside other stakeholders, and which would be expected to be maintained and enhanced through localisation, albeit with a different distribution of roles.

2.1 Sampling of contexts

The goal of the overall sampling (i.e. across the four countries) was to capture diversity of humanitarian events (conflict versus natural hazard), as well as phase of humanitarian action (response as compared to recovery and preparedness) and urban versus more isolated dynamics. Three (3) sites or “contexts” were chosen in each country (for a total of 12 sites), based primarily on information provided in consultations with NNGOs conducted during the design phase (see Figure 2). The contexts were selected in close coordination with the National Research Associates and Programme Coordinators (and were approved by the Research Advisory Group, RAG). The tables below explain the rationale for the selection of three contexts in Nigeria, chosen to capture diversity and recent operations.

Figure 2: Context diversity among 4 Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital-city and more remote humanitarian contexts</td>
<td>3 outside capital</td>
<td>Kathmandu and 2 others</td>
<td>Abuja and 2 others</td>
<td>Juba and 2 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of events: conflict versus natural hazards</td>
<td>2 conflict and 1 natural</td>
<td>3 natural (1 mixed; 1 earthquake and 1 flash flooding)</td>
<td>3 conflict</td>
<td>3 conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed: rapid versus slow onset events</td>
<td>Slow: flooding</td>
<td>Fast: earthquake and flash flooding</td>
<td>Slow: none</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text Box: Nigeria Contexts

Context 1, Abuja: As capital, Abuja is located in the centre of Nigeria, within the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). Abuja has a land area of 8,000 square Kilometres. It is bounded on the north by Kaduna state, on the west by Niger state, on the east and south-east by Nasarawa state and on the south-west by Kogi state. It falls within latitude 7 45’ and 7 39’. There are six Area Councils in the Federal Capital Territory, each subdivided into wards headed by local councils. The Minister of the Federal Capital Territory is the overall leader and is appointed by the President of Nigeria. Since the emergence of the current democratic governance in 1999, several INGOs have started operations in Nigeria. Due to its central location and as a site of power as well as administrative convenience, many of the INGOs and L/NNGOs have their
### Text Box: Nigeria Contexts

**administrative headquarters in Abuja. Thus, in this study, Abuja was selected as the first context for selection of NNGOs.**

**Context 2, Jos:** The city of Jos is the capital of Plateau State which is one of the 31 states of Nigeria. It is located in the middle belt zone of Nigeria. It is located in the middle belt zone of Nigeria and situated on the Jos Plateau 4062 feet high above the sea level. The city is divided into 3 local government areas of Jos north, Jos south and Jos east. The city proper lies between Jos north and Jos south. Jos north is the state capital and the area where most commercial activities of the state takes place, although due to the recent communal clashes a lot of commercial activities are shifting to Jos south. In June 2018, at least 86 people died, and 50 houses were burnt in the city\(^\text{19}\) displacing tens of thousands of people. Jos’s accessibility by air and serving as a base for several of the INGOs and NNGOs working in the area affected by herder–farmer conflicts were the basis of its selection as the second study site\(^\text{20}\).

**Context 3, Maiduguri:** The city of Maiduguri is the capital and largest city of Borno State located in north-eastern Nigeria. In the state and particularly in Maiduguri, the activities of Boko Haram insurgents over the last nine years have created a massive displacement of the local population. Since late 2016, more than 180 civilians have been killed in suicide bomb attacks, mostly in Maiduguri\(^\text{21}\). WFP reports that close to 2 million people are displaced in Borno state\(^\text{22}\), with almost 800,000 IDPs in Maiduguri alone\(^\text{23}\). As of January 2018, many continue to live in formal and informal camps, and within host communities within the three states most heavily affected by the conflict (Borno, Yobe, Adamawa), with nearly 800,000 IDPs in Maiduguri alone. Evidence also shows that it has one of the highest numbers of INGOs and NNGOs amongst the states affected by the insurgency and hence it was selected as the third study site\(^\text{24}\).

While each country has a different dynamic, it was important to make sure that the ensemble of contexts from the four countries enabled the research to detect trends or patterns from diverse settings. The sampling strategy was designed to be inclusive, to capture the widest diversity of voices among the respective NGO communities.

#### 2.2 Local and National NGO selection

In each context, one main focus group discussion was organised for numerous national NGOs. A sample of NGOs was drawn to capture diversity. The aim was to include at least one L/NNGO with no experience in humanitarian partnership with an INGO, at least one women-led NGO, NNGOs from different networks/consortia and reflecting other factors such as opposition-controlled areas, disabled persons organisation, etc. Between 10 and 20 organisations were invited to each focus group discussion to assure that at least eight attended. The process is charted in Figure 3.

---

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/20180710_acaps_start_nigeria_plateau_displacement_0.pdf
24 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/28082018_ocha_nga_humanitarian_situation_update.pdf
2.3 Key informants

Based on and following the focus group discussion (in each context, a set of actors was invited to participate in a series of Key Informant Interviews (KII). These typically included: a few representatives from different organisational units within two L/NNGOs that reported unique or interesting actions or partnerships (as described in the focus group discussion), as well as one local government and one United Nations official who reportedly also made an interesting contribution linked to one of the partnerships (when pertinent to the context). Additionally, INGO partners of the interviewed local and national NGOs were also contacted for interviews in order to provide a comparative. In the case of Nigeria, multiple INGO/donors were invited for an interview (Oxfam, United Purpose, Tearfund, Institute of Human Virology, Christian Aid and WFP) but most who responded preferred to complete the survey. See Figure 4.

2.4 Survey respondents

During the field phase, all actors (L/NNGO, INGO, UN or government partners and donors) were also invited to complete a survey. The survey was designed on Kobo Platform and the majority of it forms a baseline for the Accelerating Localisation through Partnership Programme. One section of the survey directly relates to this research agenda, asking specifically about current and desired partnership using the organisation framework described above. The survey was made available online and for low-bandwidth environments, print and enter-in-document versions were also disseminated and shared in three languages.

Respondents were asked to identify themselves using 9 profile categories (see Figure 5). The profiles lay out the divisions of gender, inclusion, NGO statute, partnership experience and mindset/attitude. These divisions are important as they are used to compare results and triangulate across different voices. In Nigeria, 36 respondents completed the survey; 30 of them represent Local or National NGOs. Figure 6 portrays the distributions of respondents by profile for Nigeria.
2.5 Research Validation

In Nigeria, a series of validation workshops was organised to share the research results with a large group of stakeholders, to fact check and to confirm that resonated with their realities. The programme was presented by the Programme Coordinators and technical presentations were provided by the IRMA National Research Associate (NRAs). The draft national reports were shared widely to invite feedback. The workshop, meetings and email exchanges in Nigeria was an opportunity to further consult with 46 representatives of 44 NGO and other entities (6 were INGOs, 1 UN entity, 1 entity, 1 INGO forum). This version of the report has addressed much of the feedback obtained.

Combining qualitative and quantitative methods with validation workshops, a total of 70 NGOs were consulted for this research (including 56 L/NNGOs and 12 INGOs).

2.6 Research limitations

This research was designed to capture a wide range of voices, starting with the participation of four national researchers. Giving voice inevitably requires listening and cross-country dynamics require respect for different cultures and rhythms. Time is never sufficient to do this as well as it could...
be done. Voices that were not captured sufficiently, by design, includes those of governments, donors and the United Nations. It is expected that they will be asked to react to the research and may be included in the pilot design efforts.

Other challenges the research encountered include: the need for replacement/additional NRA support due to unexpected health and personal issues, two NRAs unable to attend the face to face training in Yangon (due to visas), poor bandwidth environments, time zone differences, challenges in navigating Kobo Platform, and the underestimated cost and time required for transcription and translation of focus group discussions and interviews. While Kobo is recognised as a powerful remote data collection tool in humanitarian settings, it offered poor remote support options and may have constraints when used for surveys. In regard to the quantitative evidence, while there was no intention of obtaining results that can be called “scientifically valid” (i.e., statistically significant differences when comparing profiles), the sample sizes (although lower than the intended 50 for Nigeria) and strategies chosen resulted in a sample that was wide and inclusive; the nine profiles teased out of the evidence are portrayed to offer inclusive diversity of viewpoints.

Despite these many challenges, the research has successfully compiled an evidence base and a product that may feature the widest diversity of NGO voices ever in the four countries, especially from the local and national NGOs, and upon which all partners can co-create strategies to accelerate localisation of humanitarian action.

Notes to readers:

- Gold coloured literature boxes in the findings chapter are provided to show how the evidence relates to other research on the same topic. Secondary literature is referred to when it presents an interesting comparison to the primary data (i.e. strong similarities and stark differences) or when it describes case studies reflecting good practices. The boxes relate more directly to the element (core capability, resource etc), than to the actual findings. If you are already very familiar with the literature on localisation, please do not get distracted by these sections;
- Quotes from discussions, interviews and survey questions are provided throughout the report in orange text within quotation marks. Unless otherwise noted, each quote is taken verbatim from a local or national NGO. Names of entities are removed to protect those consulted.
3. Findings

3.1 NGO landscape and dynamics in Nigeria

The following description sets the stage for the present research. While it stems from the overall programme baseline survey, the research was not designed to explore these contexts in-depth.

When those consulted in Nigeria were asked how well the international system respects and promotes the role of local or national NGOs in managing and coordinating responses to emergencies, most Nigeria respondents “fair” or “poor” (47% and 25% respectively in Figure 7, top).

At least 53% of the respondents also report that their own organisation’s level of influence on humanitarian decision making fora with donors and UN agencies is limited or very limited (Figure 7, middle). To explore which entity was perceived to have the greatest influence (NB: respondents could choose multiple entities, so the totals do not sum to 100%), Nigeria respondents perceive the most influence to be held by UN (78%), INGOs (72%) and Red Cross (28%); less than 25% suggest that national or local NGOs also had the most influence (Figure 7, bottom). Interestingly, focus group exchanges never suggested the importance of UN when discussing localisation partnerships.

In Nigeria, the concept of localisation appears to be gaining traction. At the time of the survey, a vast majority (78%, the highest of four studied countries) of respondents report they are “absolutely” able to explain what ‘localisation’ means to a colleague; the rest (22%) report they could explain “some” of what it means.

While familiarity of the Grand Bargain was slightly weaker in Nigeria, a majority (56%) of the respondents to the survey reported that they are at least somewhat familiar with the Grand Bargain (GB).
INSIGHTS from the LITERATURE
A comprehensive list of NGOs operating in Nigeria could not be found. Yet, Vconnect.com lists about 4500 registered NGOs and the Nigeria Network of NGOs (NNNGO) has approximately 4900 NGOs. The NNNGO defines its mandate “to promote interconnectivity at the grassroots, provide opportunities for CSOs/NGOs/CBOs and Private Voluntary Organisations to contribute to the advancement of national and global peace through developmental activities focused at the grassroots...with the aim of meeting Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030”. Other in-country alliances exist such as the Civil Society Coalition on HIV and AIDS in Nigeria. Some organisations have reported a shrinking civic space in Nigeria and are notably concerned about an NGO bill under discussion. The Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS) is described as an important national humanitarian actor.

In north-east Nigeria, a total of 39 INGOs are members of the Nigeria INGO Forum (NIF) established in 2014 aiming to provide effective coordination of aid. Fostering partnership with a range of actors, including L/NNGOs, is reported as an integral part of its mandate.

The 2018 [Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)] indicated that the majority of international humanitarian staff appear to remain concentrated in Maiduguri, Yola and Damaturu. The HRP is seen to encourage a more permanent presence of humanitarian partners at Local Government Areas level for better oversight and management of response operations. It also highlighted partnership with L/NNGOs as a priority in 2018. By the end of 2017, five formal humanitarian hubs were established in Maiduguri, Gwoza, Bama, Ngala and Dikwa and more are being established. “As these hubs offer safe and secure accommodation and internet connectivity to aid workers in remote locations, they are also critical in facilitating dispatch of relief items to their destination.”

The Localisation Workstream of the Grand Bargain planned multiple field missions in 2018 to several “demonstrator countries”, including Nigeria. “The objectives of the Localisation Workstream...”

25 http://www.nnngo.org/
35 “Selection Demonstrator countries were selected jointly by Workstream members according to the following criteria: • Regional variety – no more than one from any given region • Contextual variety – disaster, refugee/ displacement response, conflict, complex crises • Interest from local actors and international humanitarian community (and capacity to engage with a multi-stakeholder mission). • Interest among workstream members in country to support coordination / logistics. • Accessible for a multi-stakeholder mission (issues of security, but also cost and distance and authorization/ visas) • Existing good practices to be shared”
“demonstrator country” field missions were to: a) Understand what “localisation” means b) Identify good practices, challenges and barriers around delivering on the four main areas of the GB localisation commitments – partnership, capacity strengthening, coordination and financing – as well as on gender, and c) Promoting progress on the localisation commitments. Findings from the missions will contribute to guidance documents on various aspects of the workstream currently under development and recommendations will be addressed to the relevant signatories”.

3.2 Perceptions of partnership in Nigeria

Questioning turned to experience with partnerships between INGOs and local or national NGOs. Anchored in a recent collaboration (or for respondents who had never had such a partnership, an ideal one), the survey asked how to what extent it had qualities of a genuine partnership). In Nigeria, most survey respondents (27 of the 30 from a L/NNGO who answered the survey question) had experience working on a humanitarian response operation in partnership with an INGO.

Those with partnership experience, were asked to describe to what extent their collaboration could be described as a “partnership”. INGOs were the most generous set of respondents (60%), attributing some qualities to all partnerships (no blue on the innermost circle of Figure 8, left). Local and national NGOs (the middle two rings) were the most critical of their partnerships. An average of 40% INGOs, 0% LNGOs and only 40% NNGOs qualified their partnerships as “genuine” (See yellow bars, left).

Regardless of the “internal” quality of the collaborations, a majority of all profiles (80%, 33% and 100% for INGOs, LNGOs, and NNGOs respectively) reported that those same partnerships were ‘very’ instrumental to meeting needs in the response operation (See Figure 8, right). It appears that partnerships in Nigeria either worked well or slightly at best; there was no moderate opinion (no grey in Figure 8). While it would appear that utility far exceeds quality of the partnerships, at the other end of the spectrum, however, 20% of INGOs found the partnerships to be not at all instrumental (blue).

However, those consulted are inclined to take the meaning several steps further. In focus group discussions, participants emphasised ‘local ownership’ of solutions to local needs, but also questioned the need for localisation to occur through partnerships with INGOs: “I don’t think it is between national NGOs and INGOs… it also has to do with the donors…foreign governments …even the UN agencies. When you talk about localisation it is all about trying to ensure that the interventions are led by the local NGOs, local civil societies the ones that are in that place….because when all the hype is gone, they will be there to carry on for sustainability. It’s not just the relationship between NGO and INGO because putting INGO there defeats the aim
of localisation.” As one participants summarised for several that were stating the same issue: “If the national NGOs can access money directly from the donors then that will be the true meaning of localisation.”

The survey respondents were asked if there is—outside of partnership—a better way to strengthen national or local NGOs to lead humanitarian action and meet humanitarian needs. While a majority overall states that partnership is the best pathway to localisation (86%, green in Figure 9), 14% of the respondents propose an alternative, including one INGO respondent in Nigeria (see blue and orange in figure).

Among those in Nigeria who perceive a better pathway, the largest set (75%) suggested that capacity development should suffice without the need for continued partnership, and the rest preferred different options such as receiving the funding directly to learn by doing.

The findings in the following sections are triangulated across quantitative and qualitative research methods. Secondary literature is referred to when it presents an interesting comparison to the primary data (i.e. strong similarities and stark differences) or when it describes case studies reflecting good practices. They are structured according to the operating model (see also Annex 1).

**INSIGHTS FROM THE LITERATURE**

The 2018 HRP reported a rise in partnerships between international and local/national responders (notably via the Nigeria Humanitarian Fund). The 2018 HRP mentions several commitments which frame the multi-year strategy, including the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (2018-2022) and in numerous instances, efforts planned to strengthen the nexus between humanitarian, development and peace interventions. The INGO Forum released a statement supporting and committing to these efforts. In a paper in which Christian Aid reflected on its partnership practice in 2017, the organisation explains that its direct implementation of relief activities was influenced by challenges to find partners in Northern Nigeria.

---

36 “This United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF), which covers the period 2018-2022, is the fourth in the series of Common Country Programme Document produced by the United Nations System in Nigeria. The document differs significantly from previous ones in several ways. These include its application of the new Standard Operating Procedure for UN coherence, the emphasis on partnerships, the focus on Sustainable Development Goals as the foundation, and its participatory formulation approach with the Nigerian Government and key stakeholders through an elaborate consultative process that upholds the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

The Federal Republic of Nigeria and the United Nations System are, therefore, committed to working together in partnership under a fully-fledged ‘Delivering as One’ modality to implement UNSDPF. This collaborative effort will contribute essentially to the achievement of the development goals and aspirations of Nigeria and strongly support the achievement of its developmental commitments to its people and the international community. We will act together in cognizance of this opportunity and responsibility” - United Nations System in Nigeria (2017). ‘United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework’.

3.3 Core Capabilities and resources

The NGO self-reported lists of **organisational capabilities that are influential for partnerships** (respondents’ top selection, out of 13) are very similar for local, national and international NGOs. See Figure 10, and full data set in Annex. The core capabilities or resources in **bold** represent unique elements (not also appearing in one of the other two top lists of the same row); those in **italics** are shared among at least two categories.

**Figure 10: Quantitative Findings, Snapshot across 3 NGO categories in Nigeria**

**Operational Elements in Nigeria**

**Important for Humanitarian Partnerships**

**Our Core capabilities most IMPORTANT to partnership are...**

**LNGOs**
- MEAL
- Project planning/design
- Capacity building
- Financial mgmt.
- HR mgmt.
- Fundraising
- Logistics mgmt

**NNGOs**
- Project planning/design
- Financial mgmt.
- MEAL
- Advocacy
- HR mgmt.

**INGOs**
- MEAL
- Financial mgmt.
- HR mgmt.
- Fundraising
- Project planning/design
- Technical expertise
- Logistics mgmt.
- Advocacy
- Media/communication

Qualitative consultations served to unpack the highest-ranking elements above, providing details on the practices that are considered by NGOS to be most or least conducive to localisation of humanitarian action. They are addressed in the following sections in order of **frequency of expression across the full set of survey respondent in Nigeria** (all three categories of NGO combined), regardless of the ‘unique’ nature highlighted in figure above.

In Nigeria overall, project planning and management, Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL), and financial management, (each for more than two-thirds of survey respondents) capacities are considered the most influential elements in their own organisations.

**Project planning and management**

Project planning and management was one of the three most highly rated contributions to partnership in Nigeria (an overall average of 67%, scoring highly for all profiles) but INGOs rated this capability slightly lower for themselves (50%). It was more rarely proposed as key contributions for partners (36% overall for the partner organisation); LNGOs attributed the role most frequently to INGOs, but half of the INGOs also attributed project planning and management to L/NGOs.

Notably, a large proportion of women respondents (41%) felt that “Common understanding of the problem or the affected population” with partners was influential to partnership, thereby highlighting the importance of joint assessments and discussion about contextual factors prior to designing a response;

In focus group discussion and interviews, participants considered the following practices most conducive to localisation:
When an institutional assessment is carried out by INGOs and, once they are satisfied, they give the NNGO freedom to plan and deliver the project: “We responded to call for proposal, they came for an assessment and said we are good to go.”

When the NNGO is entirely responsible for implementation, and the INGO tracks progress through periodic monitoring: “As long as they have given the go-ahead the partner is in charge of the implementation and day to day running of the program, and they come once in a while for monitoring.”

The practices they considered least conducive to localisation were:
- When key decisions have already been taken by the INGO or donor “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”.
- When the INGO designs the project alone, and the L/NNGO has no input whatsoever in the design: “They just sent a template to fill in”. “Normally what we have is international NGOs coming with their templates” and “they gave us a template, they told us the particular metric tons we will be serving and the number of people to serve”.
- Lack of communication about what the project and/or partnership is aiming to achieve: “INGOs that are funding don’t communicate their aims and objectives properly.”

MEAL

Every respondent group in Nigeria also feels strongly about what their MEAL capability brings to partnerships. INGOs rated MEAL as their single most important contribution (67% overall for our organisation versus 67% overall for theirs). National and local NGOs fully agree with them, assigning MEAL to the INGOs as the main contribution the INGOs can offer. Overall, female respondents give MEAL a more prominent position than male counterparts.

For MEAL, the practices that L/NNGOs considered conducive to localisation were:
- When roles and responsibilities for monitoring are clearly spelt out in the contract
- The L/NNGO is responsible for monitoring implementation and supported by INGO for discussion of problems and solutions: “We the full implementation, day to day monitoring, reporting was weekly, and then midterm we had review meetings, during review meetings issues were look at and thrashed out.”
- A procedure for early warning and early action based on the NNGO communicating with its INGO partner immediately after (or during) a field visit in which data is collected that indicates an imminent threat or worsening situation. This was considered supportive of localisation because it encourages the NNGO to take the lead in ‘calling’ the emergency: “When there is an incident on ground we inform them, the first thing is raising an alert that there is an issue and then we fill the form then they respond to us and ask us to go to the places.”
- Presence of INGO staff alongside NNGO staff in the field, to jointly observe and monitor, and to base decisions on a shared understanding of the situation: “They also came to do monitoring with us, they also call us for review meetings if there are certain changes that needs to be effected, they call us so we can discuss.”
- Support on developing appropriate MEAL, to ensure that goals are realistic, and activities are aligned to achieve the intended results: “When you submit a proposal they organise a way where partners come into play and they streamline your quality outcomes, intermediate outcomes, your output and screen to see if within the one year, you were able to achieve the result. They have the idea that they are not just running activities, but they are running activities to implement a change, with the intention to get the desired result. We get the result because of the conciseness of M&E having to probe your activities and outcomes to see if it’s in line with major outcome that you implemented.”
INGOs provide MEAL training for L/NNGO staff: “All the project staffs were taken up on a training to enable up implement the whole design. They had a separate training for M&E and account person which was for 1 week. There were demonstrations of best practices elsewhere.” And “They train you without any fee, if they identify challenges they get funding to fix it.”

The practices they were considers less conducive to localisation were:
- INGOs providing templates even for monitoring, telling the L/NNGO what to report on, and solely focused on outputs.
- INGOs giving low visibility to their L/NNGO counterparts that do the monitoring: “The INGOs mostly rely on the data collected from the NGOs, and they take credit for that.”
- INGOs that dominate MEAL and do not involve the L/NNGO: “They do the needs assessments themselves you the local NGO you’re just there as a passive partner. Sometimes they finish the proposal before the needs assessments.”

The vast majority of participants in focus group discussions were convinced that L/NNGOs’ local knowledge and presence gives them advantages in MEAL, as illustrated by comments such as: “lack of credible data is the aspect we deal with most in humanitarian work. Sometimes you see that when you go to the field, you see different things, different from information you have prior. I think localisation can help to correct these discrepancies between what is actually the situation and what is been rumoured.” And “Besides identifying needs, understanding local context is very important, if you do not identify players it could be difficult to deliver what is needed as there are spoilers in every community.”

In second place among ranked resources, one prioritised among survey respondents was own organisation’s presence or ongoing operations (53%, compared to 44% respondents prioritising their partner’s presence. Interestingly, while 64% LNGOs held high their skilled human resources, they did not rate highly their own presence (18% compared to 67 and 68% for INGOs and NNGOs); this may be due to fledgling LNGOs having a less established presence despite their proximity to affected populations.

Financial management and reporting

Financial management and reporting as a contribution to partnerships is on equal footing with Project planning/management and MEAL (67% overall for our organisation and 42% for the partner organisation). It was scored highly by every profile excepting the few respondents no partnership experience. Financial management is also a capability that everyone agrees belongs to all NGOs, local, national and international.

INGOs also prioritized their own available funds as a resource important to partnerships. Respondents who believe there are better alternatives to partnership and respondents with no partnership experience, however, assign importance to the available funds of a partner. Nigerian LNGOs are the only group in the survey to give importance to in-kind resources, for both their own and their partner organisation, but these were not proposed during the qualitative consultations. Instead, the focus was strictly on available funds.

Certain INGOs have demonstrated commitment to facilitate localisation by successfully implementing emergency response in Nigeria allowing the L/NNGO to manage large parts (up to 70% in one case) of the overall programme budget. This financial management is seen by L/NNGOs as a valid model to replicate for humanitarian actors.

Other practices in financial management that L/NNGOs appreciated as supportive of their leadership were:
- INGOs giving L/NNGOs freedom to adjust the budget as they see fit (while respecting the total amount of funding available): “We have a free hand to implement what has...”
been approved” and “When there’s funding, the MOU is flexible that the local partner has the liberty to make adjustments in line with the local changes.”

✓ Training on compliance: “They trained us in accounting software and stuff like that, there was certain things we were not aware of as to our responsibility to the government and the community and they made us to understand”.

✓ Budgets created by INGOs that do not include institutional development of the L/NNGO: “There was nothing factored for institutional support. INGOs do not really look at how local NGOs are able to sustain themselves beyond the project. We did not have any input into formulation and funding, on that side I will say it is not good in terms of localisation.”

✓ When the budget includes relevant assets: “The INGO facilitates the L/NNGOs mobility to access remote communities through the provision of vehicles/transport: ‘Because these communities are interior, so they provided motor bikes for us”

✓ When the budget includes an amount for overheads: “They helped us pay 30% of the rent.”

The practices in financial management that L/NNGOs considered were not conducive to localisation were:

- Delays in disbursements/repayments due to disagreements over expenditure: “It brings distrust and it dents the deliveries of the organisation, we have not gotten that money that was spent since august 2017 till now, we are still going back and forth.”

- When budgets do not cover the indirect costs of implementing the project “The cost of administration should not be more than 7%, and they expect the cost of salary not to be more than 15%. Our partner doesn’t fund institutional support and that is a problem, because INGOs are much concerned about delivery forgetting that before the deliveries someone must handle what has to be delivered; they give peanuts on the overhead cost”.

- Lack of opportunity for L/NNGOs to participate in the budget development: “It was a way one way traffic, there was no input from us into the budget and the terms were given to us and we signed and then we implemented, there was no input whatsoever from us.”

Human resource management and skilled people

Most NGOs (47% on average for both own and partner organisation), consider human resource management important to partnerships, and slightly more so to INGOs (50%). A majority of L/NNGOs also agree on the importance of INGOs contributing their HR capabilities. Experienced partners give more importance to HR than those not experienced. While not among the top three, most profiles add human resource management to the list of priority capabilities.

The most highly rated resource among overall survey respondents was skilled people: our own (72%) people, compared to partner’s skilled people (58%).

In focus group discussions and interviews, participants did not mention any partnership practices in human resources that are conducive to localisation. The negative practices they identified included:

- INGO paying stipends to the L/NNGO field staff, sometimes even directly to them rather than through the organisation: “They are sending it (stipend) to the staffs”

- INGOs poaching staff from L/NNGOs: “Sometimes they tell them to come and work with them, they are coming behind pick our staffs”.

- The INGO giving instructions directly to the partner staff rather than through the partner’s own management structure. “They write directly to our staff.”

INSIGHTS FROM THE LITERATURE

According to many Nigeria reports, skilled people at local level are valued highly and merit greater authority and compensation. At international level, would need expertise in capacity building and knowledge transfer, as opposed to directly implementing or supervising. The skilled and educated
workforce is linked to Nigeria’s status as a lower middle-income country. This presents important opportunities to harness the potential of existing capacities (2018 Humanitarian Response Plan 38).

Technical expertise
Survey respondents ranked their own organisation’s Technical expertise among the top-5 capabilities (on average 42% for own organisation; 33% for INGOs). Respondents rank the Technical expertise of partners a little less frequently (39%). Those with no partnership experience value technical expertise more highly. Importantly, respondents who believe there are better alternatives to localisation are more likely than their counterparts to prioritise technical expertise.

In focus group discussions participants did not mention any partnership practices related explicitly to technical capacity. In one interview, however, L/NNGO staff expressed that the most important contribution an INGO can make through partnership to strengthen national NGOs ability to lead humanitarian action is through enhancing technical capacity (and providing funding). They qualified ‘technical capacity’ as “replicating international standards, international principles for the local level...for the proper outcome”.

Advocacy
Advocacy surfaces as an important core capability in Nigeria. Survey respondents more frequently report that their own organisation makes an important advocacy contribution to partnerships than the suggested role for their partners (42% to 36%). NNGOs are most convinced (53%) of the importance of their contribution in advocacy, with over half ranking it among their top-5 influences, but only 17% for of INGO partners assign this role to themselves. More than a third of every respondent profile believes advocacy is important for their partners.

Advocacy was not spontaneously mentioned in focus group discussions or interviews.

Capacity development and organisation development
Over one-third of respondents esteem that Capacity building is an important role for their own organisation (39% overall). Respondents are much less likely to look to their partners to build capacity (17%). In fact, capacity development is visible in the top-5 list for a few profiles (females, L/NGOs and those who believe there are alternatives to partnership) but never for one’s partner. Nearly one half (47%) of women deem it an important contribution of their own organisation.

Focus group participants discussed capacity building and organisational development at length. The practices that LNNGOs identified as conducive to localisation were:

- When an INGO carries out an institutional assessment of the L/NNGOs that respond to its call for proposals, then provides capacity building and institutional support based on the outcome of the institutional assessment.
- Capacity building in fundraising: “The INGO was able to develop our capacity as an NGO, they invested in building knowledge so the NGO is able to stand on its own. They taught us a lot of things apart from just partnering with us, they also taught us to source for donors and be able to continue the work. This is what needs to be done.”
- Capacity building with a timeline, so that the L/NNGOs can see when they should have developed those capacities;

✓ Outsourcing capacity building for L/NNGOs when the INGO does not have capacity itself in that area or lacks capacity-building skills: "They engaged another INGO that had expertise in providing capacity building, so they out sourced that aspect to them";
✓ Inclusion of a budget line for capacity building in Partnership MoUs;
✓ When L/NNGOs are encouraged to make choices for themselves about the capacities that they most need to develop, and what training they want. "We have partners workshop that our partner organizes every year a training for its partners, so during training there’s a section where we the partners will decide, on the kind of training we want";
✓ When INGO partners provide training and funding for NNGOs to replicate the training with local NGOs. “It was a 5-year project for institutional strengthening of local structures, so we go to the local organisation help them to carry out holistic additional capacity assessment to identify their capacity gaps and to be able to give technical assistance and organize capacity building workshops for them. That was funded by our INGO partner”;
✓ Training in financial management (procurement, accounting, tax regulations etc.).

L/NNGOs also identified a handful of practices in capacity building and organisational development that do not strengthen their leadership of humanitarian action, such as limiting training to what is strictly needed to deliver the project, rather than what is needed to become a robust local humanitarian actor, or on what it considers a priority rather than what the L/NNGO feels is a weakness. “There was training on gender based violence, but not on how to distribute food, how to be secure.”

INSIGHTS from the LITERATURE

The 2018 HRP in Nigeria suggested conducive capacity-building approaches such as coaching, mentoring and accompaniment. It encourages international actors “to invest in institutional capacity-building of local partners as an integral part of a broader programme partnership”. Though most donors are perceived as still doing ‘business as usual’, there is a ‘new generation of interventions’ reported in a 2015 article. These include: the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation’s Partnership for Child and Family Health in Nigeria project, advocating for improved outcomes and funding from NNGOs; the 2015/16 British High Commission’s Small Grant Program for Nigerian NGOs; the Ford Foundation’s engagement of four Nigerian NGOs focused on child marriage; the MacArthur Foundation’s emphasis on indigenous education; the European Union-funded Fuel Woods Project implemented by an indigenous conservation NGO; and the Clinton CHARGE initiative incorporating a NGO from Kano State as an equal partner with players such as UNICEF. Good practice also includes mainstreaming capacity-building throughout the project cycle, engaging intermediary providers, and supporting local groups to strengthen compliance systems to align their practices to donor requirements.

In its 2018 Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs reported on a NORCAP project that is strengthening capacity of NGOs in Chad and Niger and may soon be expanded to include Nigeria.

Coordination

Coordination rarely surfaced as a key ingredient of partnership among survey respondents; it never hits the top-5 lists (28% for own organisation and 19% for partners). One-third of both INGOs and those with

42 https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/aboutnорcap/
no partnership experience prioritise this capability for their own organisation. INGOs rated Coordination also moderately for their partner L/NNGOs.

In focus group discussions participants did not mention any actual partnership practices related to coordination, although a minority voiced their frustration about the lack of a coordination forum for L/NNGOs: "We the national NGOs should have a platform to come together like the INGOs."

**Connecting Short, medium- and long-term programming**

Both INGOs (33%) and respondents with no partnership experience (67%) stress the importance of Connecting Short, medium- and long-term programming (overall, 25% score this highly for own organisation and 17% for partners). Close to one-quarter of L/NNGOs assign this task to their partners; NNGOs do so a little less adamantly (32%).

Surprisingly, connecting short-, medium- and long-term programming barely featured in focus group discussion, with only one comment about INGOs not having the same long-term vision as local organisation.

**Fundraising**

Fundraising is most often scored as a contribution made by partners, even by INGOs in Nigeria (the overall average is 19% for own organisation and 57% for partners). Looking more deeply at the categories of NGOs, however, we discover that while 50% INGOs rate fundraising highly as a role for themselves (i.e. ranking among the top-5 core capabilities), they more frequently (67%) score fundraising as a contribution their L/NNGO partners make. L/NNGOs however do not perceive themselves to contribute fundraising but in return they attribute this to INGO partners.

A situation in which both INGOs and L/NNGOs expect fundraising to be a main contribution of their respective partners may not be a favourable situation for those in need. However, focus group discussions and interviews suggested that a main theme was L/NNGOs wanting to access donor funding directly, without the INGO as an intermediary: “… we didn’t have the funding directly from the donor agency, we got it through [INGO name], and the money went to [INGO] and we became the implementing partner for [INGO] that is not the definition of localisation. For me, if we have access to the donor agency and we report to the donor agency that is localisation”

Other practices that participants mentioned as strengthening local leadership of humanitarian action concerned raising funds from sources other than INGOs/institutional donors:

- **L/NNGOs raising funds directly from national donors:** “We decided it was an emergency situation. We have a president who is a key personality in the society and he has a voice, so he can call some philanthropist to help”.
- **L/NNGOs raising funds from their members:** “We are a membership organisation. In the membership we have those who can help, and within one week we were able to get those who can help with funds,” and “From our membership even though the amount is small, but when we gather them together it is something”.
- **L/NNGOs raising funds through income-generating initiatives:** “Normally we locally raise funds, some of the things that generate revenue for us we have a hall we rent, at the headquarters we have a guest house and also a hall.”
- **There are some influential individuals where this crisis occurred. They see that what we are doing is good and they also support us.”**

There was also a general sentiment in focus groups and interviews that national fundraising holds significant potential. Two comments in this vein were:
L/NNGOs potentially holding national fundraising campaigns: “Another way we can strengthen is for us to begin to look inwards; one of the challenges we have in this nation is that people don’t think we can make it on our own, the point am trying to make is that Nigerians can sponsor humanitarian responses, if all Nigerians for example can contribute say 100 naira for humanitarian work, we can strengthen our selves by building some systems where people can voluntary go in and donate 100 naira.”

L/NNGOs potentially fundraising more through churches: “It is not magic; In Europe most of these funds are coming from contributions from churches. Nigeria can also do this.”

One participant commented on how its INGO partner builds the L/NNGO’s capacity in such a way that it can raise and manage larger grants: “Our [INGO] partner comes every year to be sure the organisation is able to apply for bigger grants”.

Given the predominance of L/NNGO respondents, another common resource was partner’s available funding (42% overall). LNGOs expressed the greatest interest in the role of INGO funding (64% as compared to only 26% for NNGOs--who appear to be less dependent); LNGOs also rated highly (36%) the role of INGO in-kind donations (services/goods). One half INGOs rated L/NNGO’s available funds highly (50%).

INSIGHTS from the LITERATURE
The Nigeria Humanitarian Fund has been identified as a critical instrument to enable local NGOs to receive direct funding.

Logistics management
INGOs look more frequently to their partners (50%) than to themselves (17%) for Logistics management. Overall, 14% of INGOs selected logistics for own organisation and 33% for partners. Those who believe in alternatives for localisation, often selected logistics management as their own contribution (20%).

In contrast, however, more than one quarter of NNGOs put substantial weight on INGO’s pre-positioned goods and equipment. INGO goods and L/NNGO logistics could be seen as complementary.

In focus group discussions and interviews, few participants mentioned logistics in relation to localisation. One good practice was mentioned: “When we worked with [INGO partner] there are certain things they did to improve our systems like documentation, procurement document and policy document. We realized through that partner that we needed to work on those policy documents. Sometimes INGOs don’t want to partner with national NGO because the national NGO has not taken time to build their own selves, the benefit we get from partnering with INGO is our system has been upgraded.”

Media and communications
NNGOs were the only category that attributed Media & Communications to their partners i.e., the INGOs (5% assigned it to themselves and 47% to the INGO partners). Overall this capability averaged 8% for one’s own organisation and 36% for partners. Men were at least twice as likely as women to prioritise Media & communication.

---

In one interview with an INGO, the representative referred to their practice of giving visibility to the L/NNGO partner in media work: “We do not take credit for their work…rather, we mention them as implementing agents delivering good work.”

Security management

INGOs (17%) and women (12%) scored Security management highly. Overall security averaged 8% for own organisation and 17% for partners. Up to 26% of NNGOs attribute Security management as a role for their INGO partners. In focus group discussions and interviews, the comparative advantage that L/NNGOs have in accessing high risk areas was mentioned in comments such as: “We went with them because there are places they cannot reach as international NGOs”.

The security-related partnership practices that L/NNGO participants considered conducive to localisation were

✓ Advice on security in the field: “They emphasized that we can’t just walk into the community without security checks.”
✓ Training on security management: “Our [INGO] partner is very passionate about our own security. They have helped us in training us on security and risk management”

Other interviewees considered that partnerships had not developed their capacity to lead on security issues in humanitarian action. The perceived lack of support was expressed as follows: “In the area of security nothing is factored in the design of the contract, knowing fully well we were working in conflict areas. We didn’t have opportunity to negotiate on it we just and to manage to continue the project.” And “During the 2016 crisis with the herds men farmer crisis, our staffs were caught up in the crisis and we lost one of our natural leaders. There was nothing in security management risk, nothing.”

INSIGHTS FROM THE LITERATURE

A blog entry made on the Humanitarian Law & Policy blog hosted by the ICRC flagged issues of “do no harm in contexts such as Afghanistan, Somalia and Nigeria. “ Where there is a history of anti-western violence, ignoring the impact that a partnership between a western international NGO and a local organisation can have on local staff’s acceptance in particular communities can be dangerous”.

Resource: Humanitarian strategy/guideline

Respondents also valued their partner’s humanitarian strategy (53% compared to their own organisation’s humanitarian strategy at 50%). LNGOs score the contribution of their own strategy more than national and international NGOs did their own. Importantly, while 50% INGO respondents score their own strategy as one of their most critical resources, 83% of them put more weight on their L/NNGO partner’s strategy.

Curiously, humanitarian strategy was not spontaneously mentioned in focus group discussions and interviews, possibly because it was not considered contentious.

3.4 Approach: Values, Principles and Standards

Commitment to programme quality, gender and inclusion, and accountability to affected persons were the top three priorities overall in Nigeria (according to survey respondents), followed by the organisation’s own knowledge and application of humanitarian principles and their partner organisation’s commitment to programme quality.

Commitment to quality

Most respondents chose their own organisation’s commitment to programme quality as one of the top-10 elements that influence partnership (78%, compared to those who valued their partner’s programme quality at 53%). “Our programme quality” was only absent among those who had not been involved in a partnership; instead, this profile prioritised own accountability followed by partner’s accountability to affected persons. Three groups of respondents (males, INGOs and those with partnership experience) also recognised their partners’ commitment to programme quality.

As mentioned previously, one L/NNGO participant in this research highlighted that INGO technical expertise enables L/NNGOs to attain international [quality] standards. “The INGOs technical capacity is important replicating international standards, international principles for the local level...for the proper outcome”.

Accountability to affected people

Accountability to affected people (AAP) is seen as an important value for partnerships (average for own organisation is 72%). While both NNGO and INGOs feel they make an important contribution to AAP, they rate each other’s contribution as lower.

Strangely, very few comments were made in focus groups and interviews about partnership practices relating to accountability, and none were framed in the context of localisation.

Commitment to gender equity and inclusion

Very important to partnership is own organisation’s commitment to gender equity and inclusion: on average 75% of respondents rank their own such commitment compared to 22% for their partner. Breaking the average down by NGO category however, yield the opposite. INGOs felt the L/NNGOs gender approach (67%) offered the partnership more than even their own gender approach (50%).

This commitment was barely mentioned in the focus group discussions and key informant interviews, except in the context of Gender Based Violence, in which some NNGOs had received training. This may suggest that partnership practices relating to gender are not sufficiently well understood in Nigeria.

Knowledge/application of humanitarian principles

While both give weight to their own knowledge/application of humanitarian principles (83% for INGO and 68% for NNGO), NNGOs give a greater weight to INGOs knowledge/application (58%) than INGOs give to NNGOs (36%). Those with no partnership experience give their own and partners AAP the same level of influence.

Again, very few comments were made in focus groups about partnership practices relating to humanitarian principles, and none were framed in the context of localisation. In one interview when asked about principles in common with an INGO partner, the L/NNGO was not sure to which principles the interviewer was making reference.

Trust and respectful working relationship
When L/NGOs discussed trust and respect in partnerships, they were divided into two opposite camps. Those that experience partnerships that are built on respect:

- "The relationship with [our INGO partner] is just perfect...just that sometimes there may be a delay in their reply";
- "They are very transparent with us and accountable, we discuss at the review meeting funding, we discuss activities that have happened, and they also send in some monitors once in a while, they visit us to see if we are having any difficulties, what we are doing, and also they are very professional, and we believe in that";
- "Over the years we have worked with them we send in our annual report and we send in recommendations and they are quite open to learn. Every partnership ought to be like that so over the years we give recommendations and in the next year they come up with they added this or that, you find out that they are incorporating your recommendations."

And those that appear to lack trust and respect:

- "They consider us very high-risk partners because of the distrust, they will check until you have a lot of systems, policy in place so when they give you the money, you won’t just disappear";
- "In addition, I want us to know that corruption is a two-way thing, even though the INGOs don’t trust the national NGOs, they too are not to be trusted based on experience. We were not able to access the funds because we are a faith based organisation and our organisation will not agree to fraudulent acts, then the project was given to another national NGO that is ready to compromise”.

Although trust and respect were not specifically mentioned in relation to promoting or hindering localisation, both are considered fundamental to it. No secondary sources were found to strengthen understanding of these approaches in Nigeria.

**INSIGHTS FROM THE LITERATURE**

Right before the WHS, the development Research and Projects Centre (dRPC) conducted a landscaping of 395 CSOs in Nigeria in 2014 which reveals a ‘global players/donor fatigue’ felt by non-state actor community in Nigeria. The study "paints a picture of a non-state sector with a strong sense of being crowded out by global players. Groups accused global partners of poaching their best staff; driving up third sector salaries; implementing top-down programs; appropriating indigenous best practices without accreditation; and closing out without sustainability planning".

### 3.5 External Elements

#### Conflict and insecurity

While only 14% of respondents rated conflict/insecurity highly overall, 18% women in Nigeria feel insecurity has a large influence on partnerships, as well as 10% of L/NGOs. One-quarter of respondents with partnership experience also share this sentiment.

In focus groups and responses to the survey, the aspects of conflict and insecurity considered to (positively and negatively) affect leadership dynamics were:

---

**Funding:** One L/NNGO reported that INGOs consider them high-risk and, for this reason, cannot provide funding. It appears that they regard lack of funding as hindrance to their leadership in humanitarian action.

**Operating costs/local impact:** One L/NNGO stated that the presence of INGOs had significantly impacted prices and other issues in the area: “There was this issue of post-war economy; the INGOs really messed up the town.”

**Access:** L/NNGOs say they find it easier to reach some areas than INGOs do. “Our organisation’s reach” was recognized as influential to partnerships by local NGOs especially;

**Legal status:** Half of the INGOs felt that L/NNGOs legal status was among the top influential factors on partnerships for humanitarian action; between one-third and one-half of the L/NNGOs agreed that legal status is influential. Legal status is connected to anti-terrorism policies applied by institutional donors and by which INGOs have to abide.

**Government transparency and capacity**

While government transparency, capacity and other external factors were not ranked as highly important elements of effective partnership by any group of respondents, they were nearly twice as likely to be consider transparency as influential (11%) than government capacity (6%). An average of 17, 11 and 9% of INGO, NNGO and LNGO respondents selected government transparency among the top-10 influences.

Government was conspicuous by its almost total absence from focus group discussions and interviews. The only comment referred to the idea that INGOs are only present due to low capacity/inaction by the government: “Government should support this so that there will be sanity in the sector, the government also needs to look inward because we have the capacity to implement some of these humanitarian responses rather than bringing in capacity from outside.”

**Aid trends**

Nigerian L/NNGOs were questioning the trend of ‘nationalisation’ in the in-depth consultations – a phenomenon whereby major INGOs create a national version of themselves, and some are suspicious that it is mainly a move to create aliases that can access ‘national-only’ funding. “They now have a state office and add Nigeria to their name thus becoming a Nigerian NGO”. The following excerpts also support this perception: “We didn’t know what happened between them and national planning commission…the next thing it became [INGO name] Nigeria. From that point, according to them, [INGO name] ceased to be an INGO. It was now a national NGO which mean it will bid for proposals and funding with [INGO name] International. Secondly, [Research INGO] was registered in the UK and Ghana came for intervention in Nigeria and then they reregistered it as a Nigerian NGO”47
4. Discussion

This section explores trends from the overall dataset, including recurring themes, issues that were unvoiced in the consultations, and differences relating to hazard types, phases of disaster risk management and duration of partnerships. Given its pervasive nature throughout the findings, this section also includes a specific section dedicated to Capacity and Organisational development.

4.1 Recurring themes, unanticipated issues, and those unvoiced

Recurring theme: Funding sources and relationships

Clearly, L/NNGOs in Nigeria feel that there are alternatives to the current situation in which INGOs raise funds from institutional donors for Nigeria, rather than L/NNGOs doing so directly. During focus groups and interviews they raised this issue in multiple ways: in relation to the meaning of localisation, as a good practice (by few INGOs) in capacity building and organisational development, in relation to the ‘nationalisation’ trend, and when discussing fundraising per se. Obtaining access to international donors is, in their view, the key to localisation.

At the same time, L/NNGOs in Nigeria appear to have their own sources of funding in-country, from their membership, philanthropists, church or other sources. Comments in focus groups indicate that they are confident that these sources could be developed, and that they could be a driver of real localisation.

Recurring theme: Capacity building and organisational development

Capacity-building in Nigeria appears to have moved beyond (or never included) the ‘staples’ of training in financial management, development of HR policies, etc. The initiatives mentioned as good practices differ from those mentioned in other countries involved in this research: training of trainers in L/NNGOs to reach more local organisations and CSOs; outsourcing capacity building to a specialist entity; allowing L/NNGO partners to determine the content of workshops based on their perceived need. The initiatives mentioned related to organisational development include income-generation and fundraising campaigns, which are more often associated with developed countries.

It is unclear if this more selective approach is due to existing capacities in-country, or the type of and location of the humanitarian crisis that demands a rapid investment in access by CSOs and on particular issues, or simply an overall lack of commitment/perception of need by INGOs and donors to long-term humanitarian engagement. Whatever the explanation, the overall situation tends to ‘accelerate localisation’ but it may be ‘skipping’ some key elements that could negatively affect the quality and accountability of humanitarian aid.

Unvoiced theme: People-centred aid

Despite being elements in the Operating Model that was used to design this research, Gender and Accountability received little attention because participants were not able to identify relevant partnership practices them that were either conducive or not conducive to localisation.

Given the commitment by the aid sector, including donors, to both gender equity and accountability, the absence of these issues from debate in Nigeria is somewhat worrisome. If arguments for localisation focus only on access to funding, not only are they unlikely to succeed because of donor policies, they also threaten to disregard the critical learning on the importance of people-centred humanitarian assistance (and protection) over the past decades.
4.2 Applying localisation across countries and contexts

The research also sought to explore how localisation may have different processes and impacts across the four countries (see Macro report) and across various contexts, such as those described by the type of humanitarian event (conflict or natural hazard), the phase of management in which the humanitarian action occurs or more generally by the duration of the partnership. While these comparisons will be explored most within the 4-country research report, some preliminary suggestions for Nigeria are provided below.

Comparison across different events/hazards

Insecurity is the constant hazard (or, more accurately, set of hazards) in northern Nigeria. All three contexts in which this research was conducted are affected by conflict, making this comparison impossible.

Comparison across different phases of disaster risk management

Disaster management is usually divided into the following phases: preparedness (or DRR), response, recovery, and exit/transition to longer-term development, the last of which links back to preparedness/DRR. No context chosen in the four countries enabled a ‘pure’ exploration of one phase, partly for the reason explained below, but some indications of practices that promote localisation are identifiable from the qualitative consultations.

Firstly, NNGOs may not mark the ‘phases’ in the same way that INGOs and donors do. In focus group discussions and interviews less differentiation than expected was made between response and recovery, as contributions on practices that were conducive and not conducive to localisation spanned both. While this may be partly due to the fact that most of the contexts included in the study experience chronic conflict, in which response and recovery are often parallel/cyclical.

The current humanitarian crisis in Nigeria started to escalate in 2010, and for many of the N/LNGOs involved in this research, it has been their first – albeit extended - experience of humanitarian action and has focused on ‘response’ in which operations have involved addressing medical needs and emergency assistance in food, shelter, WASH and other emerging needs in camps and host communities. Restoration (of assets) activities were also common.

Several participants in focus groups and interviews highlighted the need for capacity building in preparedness and disaster mitigation, largely to reduce the need for an international response and manage the humanitarian action ‘in-house’.

Comparison across duration: long versus short partnerships between INGOs and L/NNGOs

Evidence from key informants indicates that the partnerships that were most likely to accelerate localisation are longer ones, although some short ones with good practices were mentioned too. Naturally, in a protracted crisis like Nigeria, partnerships tend to be longer rather than of the ‘stop-start’ kind in countries with sudden onset disasters, and so offer opportunities for the partners to develop a more considered approach.
5. Conclusions & Recommendations

When asked “what is the **most important contribution** an INGO can make through partnership to strengthen local and national NGO’s ability to lead humanitarian action and meet humanitarian needs?” the most common answer (multiple were permitted) contained some type of **capacity building** (67%). The second most common answer included some element of **funding or financial management** (42% in Nigeria). Other answers gravitated toward engaging in a host of soft aspects such as trust, transparency, equality, sharing and technical expertise (source: survey).

5.1 Operational elements that foster localisation

**What operational elements of partnerships between NNGOs and INGOs are most likely to foster localisation of humanitarian action?**

Aiming to make partnerships more likely to contribute to localisation, this research reveals where the operations of L/NNOs and INGOs can be more synergistic. The shared and specific core capabilities of respective partners are described below, starting with those they could immediately do together (if not already being done) and followed by those which appear to be the added value of a specific partner. The quintessential caveat is that each case needs to be validated and contextualized. The relationships that surface from this research are portrayed in the Venn diagram of Figure 11.

**Operational similarities:**

Looking across local, national and international NGOs, the self-reported contribution of each entity in Nigeria is often the same, with no comparative advantage surfacing for one or the other. Indeed, L/NNGOs and INGOs often propose the same capabilities when they rank the contributions their respective organisations can make to partnerships. Examples that surfaces from this research for Nigeria are many: **Project planning & design, MEAL, Financial management and HR management**, which both L/NNGOs and INGOs felt were important roles for themselves and also for their partners.

Given the strong opinions on these topics expressed by L/NNGOs participating in this research, it seems crucial for both partners to openly discuss how they feel, what their aspirations are, what they feel confidence in the other to do or not do. Partners should bear in mind that the objective of this project and research is ‘Accelerating localisation’, hence whichever assignment of operational roles and responsibilities is agreed, it should seek to increase the L/NNGO’s leadership of humanitarian action in some way. As suggested by an INGO, “Above all, we should contribute the will and enabling environment to mentor and coach L/NNGOs in implementing humanitarian response, but we also need to increase their ability to take risks and learn from them”. It appears that INGOs will have to take risks too, by handing over certain functions or aspects of those functions in order to accelerate localisation.

---

**Figure 11: Where operational elements are most likely to foster humanitarian action**

![Diagram showing operational elements]

- **L/NNGO** lead on/do most:
  - Capacity building
  - Advocacy

- **INGO** lead on/do most:
  - Fundraising

- **BOTH** lead on/do most:
  - Project planning/design
  - MEAL
  - Financial mgmt.
  - HR mgmt.
When self-reported capabilities are unique to one partner, the partner with the unique capability should (once validated in each new context) take on that function in the next partnership in a response operation, or in the next phase of a current operation. When that partner is the INGO, and if the L/NNGO is interested in assuming the same role in future, a mentoring/shadowing arrangement should be set up.

Where can local and national NGOs in Nigeria contribute the most to partnerships with INGOs? Core capabilities that national and local NGOs feel they should contribute and which INGOs acknowledge as an important role for L/NNGOs include:

- **Capacity building** (potentially of CSOs who have greater reach into remote and vulnerable communities); and
- **Advocacy** (including to the Nigerian government, which could play a much greater role in providing and facilitating humanitarian aid in its own country).

INGOs working in Nigeria do not regard these as their own most important contributions. INGOs in Nigeria also suggest that L/NNGOs have strong contributions to make in Logistics management and even Fundraising (even if the L/NNGOs do not score these highly for themselves), hence the recommendations on fundraising below.

Where can humanitarian INGOs in Nigeria provide the greatest added value in advancing the localisation agenda?

- The only main contribution INGOs can make to partnership for which both INGOs and their L/NNGO partners agree is **fundraising**. However, this does not suggest that INGOs should monopolise this task or conduct it in isolation. Instead, it seems to be the right time and place for INGOs to take the decision to build L/NNGOs’ role in fundraising with a view to them seeking funds from international and domestic sources. For this they are likely to need the wide range of fundraising skills that INGOs have developed over decades, for engaging institutional donors, the wider public, companies, philanthropists, and others. Partnerships between INGOs and L/NNGOs in Nigeria would be well served by a focus on this key area.
- Interestingly, L/NNGOs also see **Technical expertise, Logistics management, Advocacy and Media/communication** as key contributions that the INGOs could make to a partnership. While these capabilities were not scored highly by Nigerian INGOs for themselves, it may be useful for INGOs to explore what they can offer to L/NNGOs in this regard. For all of these, sharing learning from humanitarian operations globally would likely make a valuable addition to the skills that already exist in-country.

### 5.2 Conducive practices for localisation

**What practices relating to core capabilities and resources are most and least conducive to localisation?**

IRMA recommends the following complementary paths of action, one for individual L/NNGOs to undertake with their (prospective) partners as a preparedness strategy and the second for the collective of NGOs interested in fostering localisation in Nigeria inside a generic project cycle.

**Path 1. Focus on capacity and organisational development, as a Preparedness strategy**

These steps should ideally be taken by a collective of INGOs and L/NNGOs that are committed fostering localisation but can also be followed by an individual INGO and its partners. As with the above, the steps should be decided together, and a steering/management group comprised of NNGOs and INGOs should be established.

The organisations whose role is to develop capacity must have the necessary skills; they may be INGO staff with proven skills in this area (some INGOs have a roster of trainers/ capacity-
Suggested activities could include:

- Co-development of **draft text for MoUs/partnership contracts** that reflect a ‘new deal’: the roles and responsibilities of both/all parties (not just of the L/NNGO) are specified; financial and other commitments by both/all parties to capacity building and organisational development are documented; communications expectations and monitoring mechanism for reviewing implementation of the commitments in the contract itself are included. Such text could be incorporated into/replace (as appropriate) agency-specific partnership agreement text, and be used by NNGOs as a negotiating tool when engaging with new partners;
- **Set up an interagency, L/NNGO-INGO working group on ‘nationalisation’,** to assess the trend, clarify the intentions and any legal requirements behind it, and agree on a feasible solution that protects the space of national and local NNGOs.
- **Engagement plan with key donors** present in-country (and possibly virtually) so that NNGOs know them and how they work, and they get to know the NNGOs, as a first step towards possible direct funding;
- **Research on international donors that are/might become open to funding NNGOs directly,** and how to access them; **Training on fundraising** from institutional donors (how to write proposals, reports etc.);
- **Research on other sources of funds in Nigeria,** to help L/NNGOs make informed decisions about where to invest their efforts.
- **Training on media, communications and advocacy,** to support and maximise the investment in fundraising. This could be coupled with intensive messaging on humanitarian principles, standards and values, to raise some of the issues that were ‘unvoiced’ in this research and are perhaps less well understood.
- **Training on risk assessment and security management** for L/NNGOs, given by a specialised external service provider with experience of humanitarian action.
- **Learning opportunities on MEAL** (Learning events, training, mutual shadowing) that build technical skills and bonds between L/NNGOs and INGOs.

Path 2. **Integrate partnership practices conducive to localisation directly in response/recovery**

The steps described in the to-be-contextualised checklist on following page – and situated in a classic project cycle – directly reflect the practices that L/NNGOs in Nigeria considered conducive, and positively transform those that were considered not conducive to localisation. They should not be regarded as a blueprint for all partnerships: partners should openly discuss who does what based on their specific experience, knowledge and other capacities --without assumptions or pre-assigned roles. For the sake of highlighting the findings of this research, it is assumed that a **Process “0” for Scoping has taken place,** in which both partners have already established that they offer complementary technical/sectoral skills relevant to the humanitarian crisis.

---

**Partnership practices conducive to localisation in Nigeria a Checklist to be adapted**

**Processes 1/2: Assessment & Planning/Design**

- L/NNGOs and INGO discuss their approach to localisation, to anchor the partnership on a common understanding of the goal and the process. They should also discuss humanitarian principles, including gender equity and accountability, and how they understand them in practice.
- NNGO and INGO both undertake a **rapid institutional capacity self-assessment.** This should include

**Process 3. Start-up/scale up & Implementation**

- L/NNGO and INGO recruit according to needs (profiles) and market conditions. INGO staff will need proven OD skills, as well as technical and MEAL skills and a collaborative management style.
- L/NNGO and INGO set up small project management team with members from both partners.
- Use capacity self-assessment results to create a capacity development work plan for the L/NNGO.
### Partnership practices conducive to localisation in Nigeria a Checklist to be adapted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of the INGO’s capacity-development skills (training, mentoring, etc.) in areas of interest to the L/NNGO, or where gaps/weaknesses are identified. They discuss the results and establish where they can complement each other and what external sources of capacity development are required, such as for security management. This is important prior to creating the budget;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>INGO shares the likely budgetary parameters</strong> with the L/NNGO, with information about the donor(s) and its/their preferences and restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO agree on a budget for assessment</strong> costs. The Assessment methodology and scope is discussed prior by both partners and other stakeholders. The Assessment team is led by L/NNGO, with INGO participants advising/mentoring on technical/sectoral issues and gender and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Both design the project</strong> within established budgetary parameters, based on local knowledge of NNGO and with technical inputs (including on standards) and knowledge of the donor from INGO as appropriate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO writes the project proposal</strong> with support from the INGO on proposal-writing skills in preparation for direct relationships with institutional donors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO prepare the joint project budget together</strong>, to include: a fixed overheads rate; all related HR costs (health, insurance etc.); all implementation costs, such as transport and security measures; contingency lines or in-built flexibility to adapt during implementation; and capacity-building and OD costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO both sign the proposal (and have agreed its contents with local stakeholders) and send to donor for consideration.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using the budget line already approved for CB/OD. While context-specific, this should consider including security management, gender and inclusion, and technical expertise in areas that interest the L/NNGO. Depending on the existing skills of the partner, this may include mentoring/training on fundraising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO agree how each contributes to MEAL</strong> and arrange joint monitoring visits at key intervals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>INGO and L/NNGO establish schedule for project management meetings</strong>, at which monitoring results are shared, potential changes to the project design are agreed, and changes to the budget are made (and donors consulted as necessary). Accountability to the affected people is held key to decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO discuss context and establish security protocols</strong> and a schedule for mutual updates and sharing of lessons learned from other contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>L/NNGO and INGO sign updated partnership contract</strong> to include the above agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Processes 3 and 4: Implementation and Monitoring

| INGO and L/NNGO managers attend coordination meetings together, with a view to leaving the L/NNGO to lead alone when appropriate. |
| Partners periodically monitor commitments laid out in partnership agreement. |
| Partners periodically monitor progress against capacity/organisational development plan and re-prioritise/plan as necessary. |
| L/NNGO manages day to day operations. |
| INGO and L/NNGO draft narrative report for donor together, with the full report visible to both. |
| L/NNGO does financial and narrative reporting using required formats, learning from examples and support given by the INGO. |
| **INGO gives credit to its L/NNGO partner** in all coordination fora, communications and media work. |

#### Process 4 and 5: Evaluation and Transition

| L/NNGOs and INGO partners plan handover to CSOs/the community/other actors. |
| Partners evaluate the partnership (including the affected population’s views). |
| If both partners wish to continue in partnership and funding is available, carry out a deeper capacity assessment and explore activities in Path 1. |

### 5.3 Environments and contexts

**What environmental/external factors wield the most influence on localisation?**

The nationalisation trend appears to be an ‘external’ (although to some extent controlled by the INGOs involved) issue that could influence the atmosphere and relationships for localisation. This should be explored through a working group as soon as possible, ideally with links to similar groups in other countries experiencing the same trend and reactions to it.

Also, given the Nigerian L/NNGOs’ interest in assuming a greater fundraising role, the policies and willingness of institutional donors to accept direct approaches from Nigerian L/NNGOs will significantly enable or block progress on this aspect of localisation.
5.4 Gaps to address in future research

In Nigeria, there appears to be a dynamic with **Local NGOs** engaging in humanitarian action that widely differs from National NGOs. For example, 40% of NNGOs but none of the LNGOs qualified their partnerships with INGOs as “genuine”. LNGOs also had the lowest regard for the utility of their partnerships in meeting humanitarian need and the largest proportion of respondents convinced that there are alternatives to partnership. Nigerian LNGOs are also the only profile (in survey) to give importance to **in-kind funds**, for both “our” and the other organisation, but these were not proposed during the consultations. While differences between INGOs and L/NNGOs are starting to be understood, the divergence between Local and NNGOs merits greater exploration.

NGO voices highlighted the importance of comparing the present research on INGO/NNGO partnerships with UN/Donor models of partnership. While this was beyond the scope of the present research, no good practice was reported in the focus group discussions.

In regard to **humanitarian principles**, while humanitarian principles per se were rarely mentioned explicitly by L/NNGOs, in face to face consultations, prioritisation of those vulnerable, neutrality and independence were frequently discussed. Dialogue needs to be revitalised on this, so even if adapted to contexts, humanitarian principles are brought alive as the goal of partnership for localisation. [Humanitarian] **policies and guidelines** are preferred as tools for organisational development and sustainability, not as prerequisites from donors/to be followed at all costs. Policy divergence (e.g., human resource policies, procurement policies, financial management policies and policies on audit, reporting etc.) between INGOs and NNGOs is a key issue.

This research was based on the assumption, supported by previous research, that more locally-led humanitarian responses achieve better, or at least ‘as good’ outcomes as those led by INGOs. Nevertheless, evaluations need to be systematically conducted to understand the impact of localisation on those whose needs come first.
Annex 1: Quantitative data for Nigeria

Most influential operational elements in humanitarian partnerships

### What's Most Important TO Partnerships?

**Our organisation's Core Capabilities (out of 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner organisation’s Core Capabilities (out of 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gender</strong></th>
<th><strong>Stakeholder</strong></th>
<th><strong>Partner organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Financial Mgmt</td>
<td>Project Planning MEAL HRMgmt Advocacy MEAL ORMgmt Fundraising Financial Mgmt Tech. expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Financial Mgmt</td>
<td>Project Planning MEAL HRMgmt Advocacy MEAL ORMgmt Fundraising Financial Mgmt Tech. expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Austria

**Our organisation's Resources (out of 7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner organisation's Resources (out of 5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach: Values/principles/standards and external elements (out of 37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Values/principles/standards and external elements

- **Gender:**
  - Skilled people: 19
  - Inclusive: 19
  - Presence/Ongoing: 21
  - Skilled people: 22
  - Female: 36
  - Male: 23

- **Statute:**
  - Skilled people: 11
  - Presence/Ongoing: 11

- **NGO:**
  - Skilled people: 19
  - Skilled people: 19
  - Skilled people: 19

- **EXPERIENCE:**
  - Skilled people: 11
  - Skilled people: 11
  - Skilled people: 11

- **MINDSET:**
  - Skilled people: 11
  - Skilled people: 11
  - Skilled people: 11

---

**Annexes**

**Annex 1: Quantitative data for Nigeria**

Most influential operational elements in humanitarian partnerships

What's Most Important TO Partnerships?
### Annex 2: Local, National and International NGOs consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Cat.</th>
<th>NGO name: 70 total (duplicates removed) 56 L/NNGO and 12 INGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Context 1. Abuja** | 1. 21stcentury community empowerment for youths and women initiatives*  
2. Budgit information Technology Nigeria*  
3. Catholic Caritas Foundation of Nigeria*  
4. Centre for Development and Social Justice  
5. Community Emergency Response Initiative (CERI)*  
6. Gender and Environmental Risk Reduction Initiative (GERI)*  
7. Global Agenda for Total Emancipation (GATE)*  
8. Ideal Development and Resource Centre (IDRC)*  
9. SHEDAfrica*  
10. West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP-Nigeria) |
| Blue: also completed survey | * Attended validation workshop |
| **Context 2. Jos** | 11. Faith Alive Foundation (FAF)*  
12. International Centre for Peace, Charities and Human Development (INTERCEP)*  
13. Islamic Counselling Initiative*  
14. Justice Peace and Reconciliation Movement*  
15. New Era Educational and Charitable Support Initiative  
16. Scripture Union West Africa HIV/AIDS (SUWA)*  
17. Women and Children in Support of Community Development Initiative (WOCCI)*  
18. Women Initiative for Sustainable Development (WISCOD)* |
| Blue: also completed survey | * Attended validation workshop |
20. CODERHI*  
22. EYN (Ekklesiayar Yan’uwa a Nigeria)*  
23. JDPC Maiduguri (Justice, Development, Peace/Caritas)*  
24. Life at Best Development Initiative (LABI)*  
25. Mercy Vincent Foundation (MVF)  
26. NEEM Foundation*  
27. Samaritan Care and Support Initiative (SCSI)*  
28. Women in the New Nigeria and Youth Empowerment Initiative (WINN)* |
| Blue: also completed survey | * Attended validation workshop |
| **Survey Respondents** | 29. Advocate for Community Vision and Development (ACOVID)  
30. African Health Project  
31. Anonymous  
32. Community Partners for Development  
33. Fahimta Women and youth development Initiative  
34. ForCEF (Fortune Citizens’ Empowerment Foundation)  
35. Good women association sheepdog railway line  
36. Grow Strong Foundation  
37. Hope sisters against HIV stigma and discrimination initiative.  
38. Jireh Doo Foundation  
39. Kebetkache Women Development and Resource Centre*  
40. Manna Resource Development Centre  
41. Pat Mhbo Initiative for Vulnerable Children and Women  
42. Pearls Care Initiative (PCI)  
43. Pride of Womanhood Empowerment Initiative  
44. Rachel Mbazamber Gbeda Ramberg Child Survival Initiative  
45. Taimako Community Development Initiative (Taimako-CDI)  
46. Women for Peace in Nigeria*  
47. Women’s Right to Education Programme |
| **See also Blue font above** | 48. Budgit Foundation  
49. CARE*  
50. Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD)  
51. Plan International  
52. Street Child*  
53. Tearfund*  
54. United Purpose |
| **Key informant interviews (mainly INGOs)** | 55. Center for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) *  
56. Centre for Peace and Social Justice *  
57. Connected Development Initiative (CODE) * |
<p>| <strong>Engaged in validation</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Cat.</th>
<th>NGO name: 70 total <em>(duplicates removed)</em> 56 L/NNGO and 12 INGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exchanges or workshop <em>(see also * above)</em></td>
<td>58. Development Action Group DAG *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs and others</td>
<td>59. Network of CSOs *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60. New Era Educational and Charitable Support Initiative *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61. NiNGOnet *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62. Participation initiative for behavioural change in development (PIBCID) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63. West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP-Nigeria) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64. Action Aid*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65. CAFOD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66. Christian Aid *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67. ECHO Nigeria Country Office *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68. INGO Forum*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69. Save the Children*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70. UN-OCHA*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Literature consulted
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Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA), LLC

Who we are: Integrated Risk Management Associates (IRMA) is a women-owned limited liability company, founded in 2015, headquartered in Tucson, Arizona, USA.

What we do: We are an international consulting company serving clients whose mandate is to promote equitable human development and undertake effective humanitarian action. The services we provide to governments, inter-governmental organizations, donors, non-governmental organizations and private companies operating in this field include:

- Research, learning and knowledge management;
- Technical support for accountability and quality assurance, including MEAL;
- Policy, strategy and program design and development;
- Capacity-building, facilitation and training.

Our expertise and experience: Specialising in inter-disciplinary research, IRMA has deep experience in all sectors of development and humanitarian action, including food, nutrition and livelihoods; health and wellbeing, child protection and education; WASH, shelter, environment and natural resource management, gender equity and social inclusion. As indicated by our name, we also have specific thematic expertise in ‘integrated risk management’, which enables us to advise our clients on strategies to strengthen societal resilience, promote disaster risk reduction and foster climate change adaptation, all of which are increasingly important in our era of complexity and escalating risk.

Our team: The Directors/Co-founders of IRMA are Leslie Morinière (Ph.D. Climate Science, U of Arizona and MPH Nutritional Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Tulane) and Ms. Marilise Turnbull (M.Sc. Development Management, Open U.K.). IRMA has over twenty Associates whose competences are matched to its range of clients and assignments. Together, IRMA’s Associates have worked in over 60 countries across all world regions, in urban and rural contexts, and in situations of conflict, fragility, post-disaster and inequitable development. We pride ourselves in offering a diverse, gender-balanced, multi-lingual and culturally sensitive team for every assignment.

Our approach: IRMA’s approach is to provide clients with the expertise they require for a fair price, enabling them to focus their resources on the societies and communities they are mandated to assist. As such, we offer highly competitive rates for our expert consultants, and keep our ‘operational costs’ to those really required. In short, IRMA is a consulting company driven by quality, innovation and impact rather than profit.

Sample reports of direct relevance: