International Development

ISSN 1470-2320

Prizewinning Dissertation 2017

No.17-AR

Humanitarian Reform and the Localisation Agenda: Insights from Social Movement and Organisational Theory

Alice Robinson

Published: March 2018

Department of International Development

London School of Economics and Political Science

Houghton Street

London

WC2A 2AE UK

Tel: +44 (020) 7955 7425/6252

Fax: +44 (020) 7955-6844

Email: d.daley@lse.ac.uk

Website: http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/home.aspx

Candidate Number: 60134

MSc in International Development and Humanitarian Emergencies 2017

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree

Humanitarian Reform and the Localisation Agenda: Insights from Social Movement and Organisational Theory

Word Count: 10,094

Abstract

This thesis seeks to explain the emergence of the localisation agenda as a focus of humanitarian reform efforts. It draws on social movement and organisational theory, and on interview data, to examine how and why the localisation agenda emerged when it did. Overall, the study suggests that the intersection of SMT and OT represents a productive lens to study change in the humanitarian system, giving substantial purchase on the question of how the localisation agenda emerged, and how it shifted through its interaction with established institutional structures.

Contents

Abstract 2
Contents 2
Abbreviations 3
1. Introduction 4
2. Theoretical Overview 6
2.1. Humanitarian System Change 6
2.2. Localising Humanitarianism 7
2.3. Synthesising Social Movement and Organisational Theories 9
3. Methodology 14
4. Analysis 16
4.1. Destabilising Events and Trends 16
4.2. Mobilising actors 17
4.3. Framing 19
4.4. The role of the WHS 21
4.5. Rhetorical or Substantive Change? 23
5. Discussion and Conclusion 27
Bibliography 28
Appendices 38
Appendix 1. List of interviewees 38
Appendix 2. Codebook 39
Appendix 3. Interview guide 50
Appendix 4. Interview information sheet and consent form 51
Appendix 5. Summary of Published Grand Bargain Self-Reports 52

Abbreviations

AAP	Accountability to Affected Populations
CAFOD	Catholic Agency For Overseas Development
CBPF	Country-Based Pooled Funds
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standard
C4C	Charter for Change
DI	Development Initiatives
DREF	Disaster Relief Emergency Fund
FBOs	Faith-based Organisations
HLP	High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
KII	Key Informant Interview
L/NNGO	Local/ National Non-Governmental Organisation
LNGO	Local NGO
L2GP	Local to Global Protection
NEAR	Network for Empowered Aid Response
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NNGO	National NGO
OT	Organisational Theory
PoP	Principles of Partnership
RC/RC	Red Cross/ Red Crescent
RDT	Resource Dependency Theory
SM	Social Movement
SMT	Social Movement Theory
SNGO	Southern NGO
UNSG	UN Secretary-General
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

1. Introduction

Debates around the relationship between local and international actors in humanitarian response are not new. Local and national actors already comprise the delivery mechanism for much international aid, and researchers and practitioners have persistently highlighted the lack of inclusion of local actors in the humanitarian system. There exists a long-standing body of academic work on the challenges faced by local and national actors, and on the inequalities in power and resources in the humanitarian system. Nonetheless, in the run-up to the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016, a new discourse – ostensibly encapsulating many of these themes – rose to prominence. 'Localisation' entered the humanitarian lexicon with remarkable speed. 50 donors and aid agencies have signed the 'Grand Bargain', which commits to channel 25% of humanitarian funding to local and national responders 'as directly as possible' by 2020 (The Grand Bargain, 2016), a seemingly significant shift, given that just 0.3% of international humanitarian finance was channelled directly to local and national NGOs (L/NNGOs) in 2016 (Development Initiatives, 2017).

This thesis seeks to move beyond normative claims regarding localisation, to examine the undercurrents influencing this shift. At the most basic level, the question is *why now?* Given the long-standing awareness of the inequalities in the system, and of the crucial role played by local actors, why was it at this moment that the topic achieved a far greater level of prominence? To answer these questions, the study turns to social movement theory (SMT) and organisational theory (OT), drawing on concepts such as framing, political opportunity structures, and organisational fields to shed light on the individual, organisational and environmental drivers of the increased focus on localisation. The central research question is thus, "***To what extent can organisational and social movement theories explain the emergence of the localisation agenda in the humanitarian sector?"***

There are a limited number of studies of how change happens in the humanitarian system (Knox-Clarke, 2017). Drawing on interviews with individuals involved in promoting, shaping or challenging the localisation agenda, in various capacities, this thesis aims to produce a rich description of a change process in humanitarianism and the drivers behind it.

Localisation is a nebulous term, used to refer to a range of phenomena from outsourcing aid to local partners, to increasing support for locally-driven initiatives (Wall and Hedlund, 2016). Furthermore, the localisation agenda is not coherent: subsumed within it are numerous overlapping, sometimes competing, perspectives, interpretations and agendas. The meaning of 'localisation' is interrogated throughout the paper. The focus is primarily on the debates that crystallised around the WHS in 2016.

Given that commitments at the WHS were made only one year ago, it is not yet possible to draw firm conclusions about their implications. The focus is therefore on the emergence of the discourse, and on change processes evident since the WHS, rather than on longer-term change. The desk-based nature of the research limits the extent to which light can be shed on 'ground-level' implications of localisation; much of the discussion is therefore focused on policy-level discourse and implications.

The paper is structured as follows: Chapter Two reviews the literature on humanitarian reform and local humanitarian action. It then introduces SMT and OT, elaborating the elements of each that are particularly relevant to the study. The methodology is provided in Chapter Three. Chapter Four presents findings and analysis based on the thematic analysis of interview data, and Chapter Five concludes.

2. Theoretical Overview

2.1. Humanitarian System Change

The humanitarian system is not static: analysts generally agree that it is regularly or continually evolving (Barnett, 2009; Edkins, 2003). Significant pressure for change stems from the external environment, such as increases in the number and scale of emergencies (Clarke and Ramalingam, 2008). Kent et al. (2012) suggest change in the humanitarian sector has been catalysed by key moments, including particular conflicts and large-scale natural disasters, along with slower geopolitical changes. Failures in the response to major crises have previously been identified as drivers of change in the system. Responses to the Balkans Crisis and Rwandan Genocide in the 1990s were significant catalysts for reform (Walker and Maxwell, 2014), while the 2005 Humanitarian Reform initiative can be traced to failures in the response to the 2004 crisis in Darfur (Street, 2009). The Indian Ocean tsunami response and evaluation highlighted the central role of local communities as responders, and the *"tremendous need"* to better support their response (Cosgrave, 2007:iv), fuelling extensive debate about southern capacity and partnerships (Ramalingam et al., 2013).

Furthermore, humanitarian actors have a high capacity for critical self-reflection and many have a strong values-based investment in their work (Knox-Clarke, 2017). A study by Barnett (2009) finds that identity is a greater driver of organisational change than resource competition, and notes the role of significant internal debate mediating between an organisation's identity and their response to environmental changes and challenges. For Barnett, humanitarian agencies are "*constantly taking their "temperature""* with an ability for self-critique that ensures *"adaptations… do not always evolve in the ways that make comfortable the powerful"* (2013:657). The combined role of crises, evaluations and strategic action in creating change can be seen in Buchanan-Smith's (2003) study identifying factors leading to the launch of the Sphere Project. Increasing scrutiny of humanitarianism created a conducive environment for such initiatives, but the response to the humanitarian crisis following the Rwandan genocide, accompanied by media attention and a well-resourced evaluation, created momentum for change. Key actors capitalised upon this window of opportunity, resulting in Sphere.

Nonetheless, analyses suggest that transformative change, particularly involving a redistribution of power, is rare. The system has expanded significantly over time, but its basic power structures, architecture and institutions remain 'remarkably similar' (Kent et al., 2016). Past efforts have tended to tweak the system, without challenging its underlying structures and assumptions (Bennett et al., 2016). Thus, reforms have enhanced effectiveness, but have also reinforced the concentration of power and resources in the hands of a small number of actors, and have failed to improve inclusion of local actors or accountability to affected populations (AAP) (Collinson and Elhawary, 2012; Street,

2009; ALNAP, 2015). For example, evidence suggests that the cluster system enhanced effectiveness, but marginalised L/NNGOs and undermined local ownership (Humphries, 2013; Steets et al., 2010).

There are a number of reasons for this. The approach to change has been top-down, avoiding tackling underlying systemic issues, interests and incentives; and the donor- and supply-driven nature of the system has undermined reforms, particularly around downward accountability and inclusivity (Krueger et al., 2016). Competition for donors distorts accountability mechanisms, and the dominance of 'upward' accountability is a repeated criticism (Barnett, 2013; Lee, 2010). Bennett et al. (2016) highlight perverse incentives in the system including a preoccupation with growth and market share. One analysis of past reform efforts highlighted the role of organised hypocrisy, with vague definitions or divergent interpretations of a reform effort making it easier to reach political consensus, but harder to implement and follow up on proposals (Steets et al., 2016). This also relates to the oft-observed gap between rhetoric and reality on issues such as AAP, with widespread agreement on the desirability of the reform, but little substantive change (Brown and Donini, 2014; Steets et al., 2016).

Thus, despite numerous reforms, the contemporary picture of humanitarianism is remarkably similar to that depicted twenty years ago, when De Waal (1997) critiqued the largely unaccountable power of the 'humanitarian international'; and to the 'mobile sovereignty' described by Pandolfi (2003:377), exercised by a humanitarian apparatus with privileged access to information, a *"machine for producing hierarchies and top-down power flows"*. Echoing the language used by Slim (1995), Collinson and Elhawary (2012) note the exclusive nature of the 'humanitarian establishment'. Barnett and Walker (2015) describe a 'Humanitarian Club': a hierarchical network centred on the UN system that controls much of the resources and agenda. The concentration of power and resources in the largest UN and NGO agencies, with limited scope for new entrants, has been described as an oligopoly (Kent et al., 2016). Gordon and Donini (2015:106) reflect on a new humanitarianism remaining "*inescapably (for now) Northern and Western"*.

2.2. Localising Humanitarianism

The central role played by local actors, including communities, organisations and authorities, in responding to crises, the need to build on local capacities, and the imbalance of power between local and international responders, are long-established themes. A large body of evidence documents the essential role of L/NNGOs in humanitarian response (Campbell and Knox-Clarke, 2016), including in enhancing relevance and effectiveness (Featherstone and Bogati, 2016; Ramalingam et al., 2013). Local organisations often draw on a deep understanding of their context and communities (Saavedra, 2016a, 2016b). Research has also documented the role of affected communities in terms of protection, and the lack of support for self-protection efforts by aid agencies (Corbett, 2011; South et al., 2010;

South and Harragin, 2012). These issues are reflected in numerous humanitarian standards: the RC/RC Code of Conduct, developed in 1994, commits to *"build disaster response on local capacities"* (IFRC, n.d.). This was reiterated in the 2007 Principles of Partnership (PoP) (Global Humanitarian Platform, 2007) and Sphere handbook (Sphere Project, 2011), and again in the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) (CHS Alliance, 2014).

Nonetheless, research suggests that the international aid architecture has struggled to meaningfully connect with and build on local capacities. Sixteen years ago, Smillie and collaborators drew attention to relationships between local and international organisations characterised more by patronage than partnership, and to a gulf between rhetoric and reality around strengthening local capacity (Smillie, 2001). An edited volume published the following year reiterated this message, highlighting the erosion of local capacity and failure to recognise local structures and knowledge, and, again, contrasting this reality to the dominant rhetoric (Juma and Suhrke, 2002). Subsequent studies have further demonstrated the erosion of local capacity by international organisations, for example through surge and hiring practices (Audet, 2011; Christoplos, 2004; Stokke, 2007). In the development sphere, we find substantial literature on the balance of power in partnerships between northern and southern NGOs, and the distortive effects of resource-dependent relationships (see, e.g. Ahmad, 2006; Eade, 2007; Lister, 2000). More recent studies have highlighted the continued relevance of these critiques, with ongoing inequalities in partnerships between L/NNGOs and INGOs (Featherstone, 2014; Tanner and Moro, 2016). A recent survey reported growing frustration amongst L/NNGOs about the lack of funding for local organisations, the lack of transparency surrounding financial arrangements, and the lack of influence over decision-making (Delaney et al., 2016).

In the last few years, and particularly leading up to the WHS, the discourse around local actors increased in prominence (Wall and Hedlund, 2016), and the term 'localisation' entered widespread use. Subsumed within usages of localisation are a broad range of different interpretations, which are often not made explicit. Van Brabant and Patel (2017) identify seven problems which localisation is supposed to address, ranging from excessive centralisation and financial overstretch of the humanitarian system to a perception that it is politically unsustainable in a changing world. They identify two divergent visions of localisation: for some, localisation is a technical-operational process of decentralisation, moving resources and decision-making closer to affected areas. For others, it is a process of transformation of the political economy of humanitarianism. Obrecht (2014) identifies two issues generally associated with heightened attention to local ownership: effectiveness and power.

In the run-up to the WHS, some envisaged localisation as a *"dramatic paradigm shift"* to the aid architecture (Rencoret and Louise, 2016:7). Commentators branded it a 'winner' of the summit (Aly,

2016). Since then, 'localisation' has generated extensive debate, with a plethora of conferences, events and blogs on the topic.

2.3. Synthesising Social Movement and Organisational Theories

SMT and OT are both expansive bodies of literature with numerous theoretical perspectives. This thesis will not attempt to summarise these bodies of work, but rather will focus on the areas of overlap between the two that complement one another and, together, can shed new light on humanitarian system change and the emergence of the localisation agenda.

Neo-institutionalism

Neo-institutional theory emerged in the 1980s as part of a shift in OT away from rational actor models, and towards a greater focus on cognitive and cultural explanations (McAdam and Scott, 2005; Powell and DiMaggio, 2012). At its core is the idea that organisations are under pressure to conform to accepted practices and to signal their legitimacy to various stakeholders. Thus, organisations that share an environment become similar to one another through processes of mimetic, coercive and normative isomorphism; for instance, they may follow organisations considered to be successful, or be coerced by other actors to conform to expectations (Fligstein and McAdam, 2011; Lewis, 2014). Neo-institutionalism understands institutions as socially constructed and routine-reproduced systems, which shape the choices and ideas of individuals through particular scripts or schemas (Hadler, 2015). Thus, by its nature, it has limited scope for an active conception of agency and field transformation (Fligstein and McAdam, 2011). Neo-institutionalism tends to stress the stability of institutions, positing that transformative change is rare, occurring only when *"the social arrangements that have buttressed institutional regimes suddenly appear problematic"* (Powell and DiMaggio, 2012:11). Recent work within neo-institutionalism has sought to overcome an earlier omission of power and interests, acknowledging that actors in key institutions realise considerable gains from their maintenance, and that institutional constraints nonetheless *"leave space for the autonomous play of interests and improvisation"* (Powell and DiMaggio, 2012:29).

The concept of organisational fields was developed by DiMaggio and Powell, who found it helped to account for homogeneity across organisations. An organisational field refers to *"those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life"* (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:148). Fields are bounded by shared cultural-cognitive or normative frameworks, and actors interact more frequently with one another than with those outside the field (Scott, 2013). This concept draws attention to the totality of relevant actors, enabling us to view organizations in the context of a wider arena of actors that take each other into account when carrying out interrelated activities (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; McAdam and Scott, 2005).

Drawing on neo-institutional perspectives, Barnett (2005) argues that humanitarianism became recognisable as a distinctive field during the 1990s. The emergence of humanitarianism as a field involved increased regulation, professionalisation and specialisation, interaction amongst members, and collective awareness of a common enterprise. It was also accompanied by growing interest in organisational self-preservation and survival. Thus, following Barnett, we can consider humanitarianism as an organisational field with organisations shaped by coercive, normative and mimetic pressures (Barnett, 2005).

Political opportunities

Tarrow (2011:163) defines political opportunity as *"dimensions of the political environment… that provide incentives for collective action by affecting expectations for success or failure"*. Political opportunities are 'clues' encouraging people to engage in contentious politics, that may be formal or informal; threats are factors that discourage contention (Tarrow, 2011).

McAdam (1996) honed the study of political opportunities, seeking to introduce greater analytic clarity. McAdam separates political opportunities from the processes by which opportunities are interpreted and framed, suggests specification of the dimensions of political opportunities as including the relative openness of the political system, the stability of elite alignments, the presence of elite allies, and state capacity for repression, and urges clarity about whether investigations are focused on the timing, form or outcomes of movements (McAdam, 1996). Tarrow, similarly, limits the concept to factors that visibly open up the prospect of success, most importantly, the opening of access to participation for new actors; evidence of political realignment; availability of influential allies; and emerging splits within the elite (Tarrow, 2011:164-5).

Another important observation found in Tarrow (2011) is that opportunities can be 'diffused': the efforts of 'early-risers' creates 'master frames', which can *"pry open institutional barriers through which the demands of other groups can pour"* (Tarrow, 2011:167). Initial collective action thus has secondary effects: providing new opportunities for both challengers and elites. Tarrow also introduces the concept of cycles of contention, characterised by heightened conflict, rapid diffusion of collective action, creation and transformation of collective action frames, intensified information flow and interaction (Tarrow, 2011:199).

Framing

There exists a plethora of strands of work on framing, in SMT and OT. Those derived from SMT appear most relevant to our purposes. The study of framing in SMT is concerned with how movements make meanings, in ways that mobilise participants, and can be defined as "*the*

construction of an interpretive scheme that simplifies and condenses the "world out there"" (Tarrow, 2011:142). It is both a strategic process and cognitive mechanism, influencing perceptions of problems and viable courses of action (Campbell, 2005).

Much meaning-making work is evaluative: it involves identifying grievances and translating them into claims against others (Tarrow, 2011). As formulated by Snow and Benford (1988), framing involves diagnosis of a problem (diagnostic framing); proposition of a solution (prognostic framing); and a call to arms or rationale for engaging in ameliorative action (motivational framing). Furthermore, it is widely acknowledged in SMT that framing involves a process of bricolage: frames are not wholly new, but rather are fabricated out of existing repertoires (Campbell, 2005). A core element of framing is *"constructing larger frames of meaning that will resonate with a population's cultural predispositions"* (Tarrow, 2011:144).

The concept of resonance considers why some framings seem to be more effective, based on variations in the credibility and salience of the frame (Benford and Snow, 2000). Credibility is a function of frame consistency, empirical credibility, and credibility of the frame articulators. Salience is comprised of centrality (the salience of the movement to the targets of mobilisation), experiential commensurability (resonance with the targets' everyday experiences), and narrative fidelity (resonance with targets' cultural narrations).

Synthesising SMT and OT

The two bodies of literature offer complementary insights. OT has tended to focus more on structure than process, with power encoded in systems and norms in ways that bolster prevailing structures; less attention has been paid to the ways in which power operates to challenge or change existing structures (McAdam and Scott, 2005). For SMT, transgressive power has been of greater interest. SMT has focused on social process, including mobilising people and resources, building alliances and crafting ideologies and frames (McAdam and Scott, 2005). Where OT, and particularly neo-institutionalism, has stressed stability and isomorphic tendencies, SMT brings a greater focus on contention and change. An SMT-derived model assumes a greater role for agency, interest and strategy, and offers a means to reintroduce strategic action into analysis of institutional change (Walker, 2012). SMT has also attended to complex elements of contention, including identities, emotions and leadership (Goldstone and Useem, 2012). However, SMT has often been movement-centric, lacking a field-level perspective; and furthermore, in focusing on conflict and change, is more limited in its attention to stability (Fligstein and McAdam, 2011).

There is a long history of borrowing between SMT and OT, but interactions have intensified in recent years (Davis and Zald, 2005). Early borrowing was largely unidirectional, with movement scholars

drawing on concepts from OT in their attention to movement organisations and resource mobilisation. More recently, OT scholars turned to SMT to develop a more sophisticated understanding of institutional emergence and change (McAdam and Scott, 2005). The integration of SMT into OT drew attention to the ways actors may challenge authority in institutional fields from without and within, emphasising the purposeful and strategic nature of organisational transformation (Weber and King, 2013). Drawing on core concepts relating to the mobilisation of resources and members, framing, and political opportunity structures, SMT scholars have considered how groups create, transform or resist institutional arrangements (Lounsbury and Schneiberg, 2008:648-9). Such elements of the SMT toolkit can be integrated to understand micro-mechanisms of change within institutions (Weber and King, 2013). Moving away from movements as traditionally understood, SMT can be applied in a metaphorical sense to examine organisational change, including the ways that change-agents *"mobilise resources, frame issues, and capitalise on opportunities"* (Walker, 2012:577). Research into the effects of movements on industries and markets has shown how they can create alterative models, open new paths, and develop cultural and material resources enabling broadening of an industry (King and Pearce, 2010).

Lounsbury and Schneiberg (2008) offer a nuanced integration of neo-institutionalism and SMT. They begin with the neo-institutionalist insight that pressures for continuity exercise considerable force, and note that dominant actors use their advantages to elaborate institutions in ways that preserve their power. The articulation of alternatives, and their translation into change, cannot be assumed, but rather, *"are often fragile achievements which ultimately rest on the emergence and efficacy of social movements"* (ibid:650). They consider movements as institutional forces, with neo-institutional concepts of diffusion, translation and adoption understood as political processes that depend on collective action and the *"mobilization of power by champions of new practices and forms"* (ibid:650). Movements can support diffusion by working as field-wide mechanisms for mobilisation, as political forces to increase receptivity to alternatives *within* organisations, or to increase innovators' influence as exemplars *across* organisations (Lounsbury and Schneiberg, 2008). Furthermore, movements operating within established institutions and power structures can draw on those institutions and on taken-for-granted understandings, to *"theorize, articulate and combine new projects or practices with prevailing models and arrangements"* (Lounsbury and Schneiberg, 2008:654).

Concepts derived from SMT and OT can be integrated to develop a tentative conceptual framework, which could help to shed light on the emergence of the localisation agenda. Firstly, we can understand humanitarianism as an organisational field, subject to isomorphic pressures, and we can take this field as the unit of analysis. Normally, fields tend towards stability, based on institutional settlements negotiated primarily by field dominants to preserve a status quo that serves their interests (McAdam

and Scott, 2005). Periods of significant field contention often begin with destabilising events or processes whose origins are located outside the field. Given the concentration of power and resources in the hands of a number of field 'dominants' (donors, UN agencies and a handful of INGOs) we can consider there to be an existing institutional settlement. Furthermore, the existing literature on humanitarianism identifies interests and incentives, including competition for funding and upward accountability, as key factors that prevent or distort change in the humanitarian system. Mechanisms relating to framing and political opportunity structures can help us understand the role of strategic action, agency and opportunity in the onset and dynamics of episodes of contention, by both field 'dominants' and 'challengers'.

3. Methodology

A core objective of the research was to conduct a detailed examination of the processes shaping the 'localisation agenda', in order to shed light on the question of how change happens in the humanitarian system, and on the applicability of SMT and OT. Methods were therefore selected to enable depth of exploration and interrogation of agency, events and causal mechanisms.

22 key informant interviews (KIIs) were conducted. Qualitative, in-depth interviews were selected with the aim of gaining a deep understanding of the subject, going beyond surface appearances (Wengraf, 2001) and enabling thick description (Warren, 2011) of the various processes, events, and motivations influencing the localisation agenda. KIIs are limited in their generalisability; rather, they function to shed light on an issue and collect in-depth information (Parsons, 2011). Respondents may be selected for their inside knowledge of the social world in question (Warren, 2011) rather than for their representativeness. Nonetheless, care was taken to ensure interviews encompassed a range of different perspectives on and forms of engagement with the localisation agenda. A purposive sample of possible interviewees was identified, including those who have been active in driving, challenging and otherwise influencing the localisation debate, within and across humanitarian organisations, as well as analysts of humanitarian action who could relate their own observations of debates around localisation. A full breakdown of types of organisations represented is included in Appendix 1. Prospective interviewees were contacted via email, and interviewed over Skype. The total number – 22 – was sufficient to enable saturation, with clear, recurring themes emerging.

Interviews were semi-structured: an interview guide was developed, but remained flexible to emerging themes. An interview template and consent form can be found in the appendices. Informed consent was sought and all responses have been anonymised. Some statements supporting the analysis could not be included, because they would reveal the identity of the respondent.

While interviews enabled the identification and verification of some events and processes influencing the localisation agenda, they also reflect the subjective positions and perspectives of both interviewer and respondent. Rather than viewing respondents as repositories of 'facts' to be excavated, these interviews are better conceptualised as a process of co-production (Gabrium and Holstein, 2012) through which narratives are explored, shaped and shared. This approach recognises the assembling of meaning and narratives through interviews, and the active subjectivity of both the interviewer and respondent (ibid.).

All interviews were transcribed by the author, resulting in 85,400 words of transcription. Interview transcripts were analysed thematically, as a means of synthesising, 'getting close to', and interpreting

the data (Lapadat, 2012). The coding process drew on the approaches set out by Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) and Braun and Clarke (2006) with the aim of ensuring a rigorous and systematic analysis. First, all data was coded systematically according to initial codes, both theory-driven and data-driven. These were collated into themes, which were then reviewed, defined, and named. Codes and themes were revised throughout the process, and data read and re-read, to ensure a grounded, iterative approach. The final codebook and extracts of interviews associated with each code are included in Appendix 2.

The generalisability of the findings is limited, given the small selection of interviews, based on purposive rather than random sampling. The final sample was dependent on those who responded to requests for interview. A significant limitation is that only two L/NNGO representatives were interviewed, and no interviews were conducted with donors or single-mandate INGOs. Future research would benefit from engagement with a wider range of actors, particularly L/NNGOs. It would also benefit from an ethnographic approach, involving sustained engagement with humanitarian actors to examine the emergence and implications of the localisation agenda in specific contexts, and within specific organisations.

4. Analysis

This section draws on interview data to propose an explanation of the localisation agenda: how and why it emerged when it did, and how it has been received and negotiated within the humanitarian field. Headings relate to themes, and paragraphs within them to subthemes. To support the analysis, additional quotes associated with each subtheme can be found in Appendix 2.

4.1. Destabilising Events and Trends

Almost all interviewees described events and trends broadly located outside the traditional humanitarian aid architecture as contributing to the emergence of the localisation agenda.

The most prominent amongst these, identified in eleven interviews, was the gap between growing humanitarian needs and funding provision. Funding requirements increased fivefold from $4.4billion in 2007 to $23.5billion in 2017 (OCHA, 2017a). Both L/NNGO and INGO representatives highlighted this as a longer-term driver of localisation, stating, *"it all started with the basic problem of underfunding of humanitarian appeals"* (ID10), and that *"the gap is growing… so, we're all… looking for ways of working more efficiently"* (ID22). This has driven localisation onto the agenda for its perceived gains in both efficiency and sustainability.

A second prominent theme, expressed by almost half of interviewees, was the expansion of southern civil society, and the role of southern NGOs (SNGOs) in advocating for change. Interviewees described drivers including *"stronger, more dynamic…[CSOs] in affected countries"* (ID19), SNGOs "*claiming space"* (ID18), and a *"new generation of more confident southern actors who are willing to tell it like it is without fear that somehow their grant is going to be cut off"* (ID2). Some connected this with broader geopolitical shifts, including the rise of emerging economies with burgeoning civil societies; others emphasised the role of Syrian CSOs. A smaller subtheme was of the challenges to the legitimacy of international system, including the international aid architecture. Some described a *"challenged multilateralism"* (ID18), a *"crumbling global system"* (ID6) and "*falling levels of trust in those sort of international and large institutions"* (ID2). These were seen as being in the background of the localisation debate, placing pressure on the system to change, rather than as explicit arguments put forth for localisation.

Almost one-third of interviewees identified the Syrian crisis as a catalyst of the localisation debate, particularly because of access limitations and the rapid growth of a body of capable Syrian L/NNGOs. Local actors have for decades delivered assistance in areas of the world with limited access for INGOs. However, the scale of the crisis in Syria, the level of reliance on local actors, and the security implications that ensured attention from western governments, all contributed to the prominence of

the crisis and its role in the localisation debate. While remote management has been used temporarily in other crises, Syria is the only case in which it has been the predominant form of operation (Howe et al., 2015). Interviewees also highlighted the role of "*newly formed, very vocal"* (ID22) Syrian NGOs in contributing to debates around localisation, noting, *"you have a strong civil society, [and] you have a strong diaspora, who can speak for it"* (ID14). These themes are also borne out in recent reports. One estimates that Syrian actors delivered 75% of assistance in 2014, but received only 0.3% of direct funding available, concluding that the *"humanitarian enterprise can no longer escape addressing issues of funding… to national and local actors"* (Els et al., 2016:3). Another argued that in Syria*, "one can witness the advantages, both actual and potential, that can be derived from localisation"* (Dixon et al., 2016:119).

Six interviewees identified a general trend towards remote management as contributing to the localisation agenda. Remote management, driven by a combination of reduced access and risk aversion, is seen as increasing reliance on local actors and thus, *"the dependence on the local actors becomes much clearer"* (ID3). This is an increasing trend: remote management is now a common response to insecurity (Egeland et al., 2011; Stoddard et al., 2010) and in insecure settings, UN agencies and INGOs are increasingly absent (Healy and Tiller, 2014).

Thus, the growing funding gap, and the expansion of southern CSOs, created a fertile foundation in which the localisation agenda could take root. Meanwhile, the crisis in Syria can be seen as a significant 'destabilising event' that altered both the prominence and perceptions of issues relating to local humanitarian action. The significance that interviewees placed on the role of external events and trends in driving debates around localisation correlates with the prediction from SMT/OT that episodes of contention tend to begin with events broadly outside the field, and also with literature attributing change in the humanitarian system to specific crises.

4.2. Mobilising actors

A second major theme was the role of specific organisations and individuals in generating momentum around localisation.

The role of partnership-based, predominantly faith-based organisations (FBOs) in generating and shaping debates around localisation was highlighted by almost half of interviewees. These are organisations for whom working with local actors is their modus operandi; it is *"part of their DNA"* (ID22). Though there is variation between them, generally their values and mandates lean towards a more locally-led approach, with a focus on sustainability. These organisations, or individuals within them, have been "*banging the same drum…for a long time"* (ID18) or have *"voiced it time and time*

again" (ID6), and are seen as key actors pushing contemporary debates around localisation. For example, one interviewee noted that, "*they have invested a lot in their presence and in their policy work and have been very successful in that sense"* (ID12). Furthermore, partnership-based organisations have served as institutional springboards for initiatives such as the Charter for Change (C4C) and Local to Global Protection (L2GP), providing supportive environments for their work.

The C4C emerged as an important vehicle for mobilisation around localisation, mentioned by nine interviewees. Signatories agree to implement eight commitments by 2018, including passing 20% of funding to NNGOs. Interviewees described how it was catalysed partly by frustrations around the WHS, as well as the sense that much advocacy was focused on changing the system, or changing other actors. Instead, the motivation for, and framing of, the C4C is about INGOs committing to change their own way of working. Numerous interviewees raised this, and suggested it was a significant reason for the traction of the C4C. It was described as providing a vehicle, or a roadmap, for organisations that wanted to show they were willing to change their behaviour. It also resonated with well-established issues: *"It's very well packaged – if you look at their eight principles, they're touching on things that we've heard about for years – the poaching of staff is something lots of national NGOs complain about, the idea of equality, you see the principles of partnership mentioned"* (ID1). The C4C can be seen as moving from diagnostic to prognostic and motivational framing: it resonates with long-established issues, but provides a clear strategy for change, and a galvanising call for signatories to *"go trailblazing"* (ID22) by addressing their own practices.

The C4C has been signed by 29 INGOs and endorsed by 130 NNGOs (C4C, 2017). For diffusion, the instigators of the C4C drew on personal connections with receptive individuals in other institutions, who, in turn, acted as allies for agreement and adoption within their organisations. Interviewees also recounted how the C4C has acted as a tool for internal advocacy by individuals seeking to change their own institutions. It expanded beyond an initial group of traditionally partnership-based organisations, with more operational agencies adding their voices. As one interviewee noted, when the C4C *"got the likes of CARE and Oxfam on board, [it] suddenly had volume… also in terms of advocacy work and influence, [it had] some real heavyweights around*" (ID22). The reliance on informal contacts in other organisations to facilitate adoption correlates with SMT, in which it is acknowledged that formal and informal networks are crucial mobilising structures and conduits for diffusion, and also with studies showing that movements require *"the face-to-face cultural work of strategically positioned actors within organizations to be effective"* (Kellogg 2011, in Walker, 2012).

Eight interviewees underscored the role of the Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR), usually in connection with Degan Ali, director of Kenya-based NGO Adeso, which is incubating the network. NEAR is a network of southern NGOs (SNGOs) created in 2015 with the explicit aim of

reshaping the aid system to one that is locally-driven, and built around *"equitable, dignified and accountable partnerships"* (NEAR, n.d.). Its approach includes advocacy, organizational capacity strengthening, innovative financing for L/NNGOs and research. Arguments put forward by the NEAR network problematise the top-down nature of the aid system, highlighting this as an issue of inequity and injustice. Their messaging also resonates with other prominent issues, including the funding gap, and AAP.

Also of note was the weight interviewees placed on specific individuals in forging these movements, and for their wider role as vocal and long-standing advocates for a more locally-led response. Most frequently mentioned were Degan Ali, and Anne Street, of CAFOD and instigator of the C4C. Both were noted for their strategic action and ability to form coalitions. Anne was described as an effective advocate, *"very good at thinking of a problem statement, thinking of solutions, framing it in a very catchy way … she forms alliances with people, and gets buy in"* (ID1). Degan was described as someone who can speak with authority (ID7) and fire people up about localisation (ID2); one noted the importance of *"having a dedicated group of people who agitate around a particular issue and create a coalition, which is basically what Degan has done"* (ID4). The pivotal role ascribed to these individuals in interviews in mobilising wider momentum for change resonates with Campbell's assertion that leadership – in terms of organisation and movement-building – may be *"the most important mechanism linking political opportunities, mobilizing structures, framing processes, and outcomes"* (Campbell, 2005:63).

4.3. Framing

Numerous interviewees stressed the breadth and lack of specificity of the debate around localisation. This was explicitly raised by nine interviewees, and is evident in the range of interviewees' own interpretations of localisation. In the words of one respondent, *"localisation is a bit like the Loch Ness monster. Everybody talks about it but everybody has a different idea of what it looks like"* (ID4).

We can broadly identify two overarching themes associated with debates around localisation and local humanitarian action, defined here as *transformation* and *efficiency*. The former is particularly associated with the funding gap, described in section 4.1. It relates to concerns about the length of a funding chain in which *"everybody takes his 10% and at the bottom there's not much left for the beneficiaries"* (ID20), and is bound up with the idea that L/NNGOs can deliver aid more cheaply. Some interviewees expressed this as a key reason to localise, and others highlighted it as an argument that resonated amongst donors.

The latter interpretation, more common amongst interviewees, relates to the idea that localisation is about a more fundamental transformation of power and relationships in the humanitarian system. It relates to the *"traditional disparities of power within the aid sector and to be perfectly frank the neo-colonial aspects"* (ID19). Localisation, in this frame, is responding to the system's unequal architecture and lack of representation for L/NNGOs; it's about *"fundamental transformation"* (ID18), "*trying to break into that system, shake it up a little bit*" (ID13). This frame is reflected in messaging by NEAR and C4C, amongst others. In some interpretations, localisation is about inequalities between local and international organisations; in others, it is more about improving the relevance of aid by working with local actors, or about enhancing accountability to, and recognising agency of, affected populations more broadly, though these themes are often interlaced. Ahead of the WHS, a variety of organisations put forth a diagnostic frame in advocacy that highlighted inequalities in, and overstretch of, the humanitarian system, with a prognosis of fundamental system transformation, including greater power and resources for local actors (e.g. Act Alliance, 2015; Christian Aid et al., 2015; Gingerich and Cohen, 2015; Nightingale, 2014). In the words of one interviewee, the debate that was building ahead of the WHS *"was about power, inequality, inequity and a humanitarian system that has a worse distribution of wealth than the world"* (ID16).

These themes are often interwoven within arguments for localisation. Nonetheless, the differences between them are significant, not least because they propose somewhat divergent prognoses for the nature of change required. The efficiency framing is generally less focused on wider issues such as the quality of partnerships, power or decision-making. Some organisations have sought to reframe the debate away from the term localisation, speaking instead of 'local leadership' or 'locally-led'. One interviewee suggested that, "*if you talk about localisation through the lens of effectiveness and efficiency … the entire discussion becomes one that is missing its essential anger"* (ID16).

Five interviewees highlighted the role of specific financial analyses in drawing attention to issues relating to localisation. The emerging localisation agenda drew attention to, and was itself supported by, these analyses, which starkly illustrated the scale of inequalities in humanitarian financing. This includes the oft-cited figure that 0.2% of humanitarian aid was channelled directly to L/NNGOs in 2014 (Development Initiatives, 2015). Some explicitly utilised this in their advocacy; as one interviewee noted, *""I constantly use […] the very few data points that we have to show the scale of some of what's going on… the fact that so little goes directly to local actors or first responders is staggering, so that's been a key part of our message"* (ID2). The role of these figures as powerful diagnostic frames lending support to localisation is also suggested by their appearance in key documents relating to localisation, including the WHS Synthesis report (WHS Secretariat, 2015), the UN Secretary-General's (UNSG) report to the WHS (UN Secretary-General, 2016), the final report of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing (HLP) (HLP, 2016), and the C4C (C4C, n.d.). Also

relevant was analysis by L2GP, which highlighted the limited amount, and poor tracking, of funding for local actors (Els and Carstensen, 2015). This analysis led to an interactive article on the IRIN website, arguing that the 'humanitarian economy' *"outstrips any country for its inequality"* (IRIN, 2015:n.p.). The article received more views than any other on IRIN that year (personal communication); according to one interviewee, *"after that it was a little bit like the genie was out of the bottle"* (ID22). The widespread employment of these financial analyses, both by advocates and in commitments around localisation, suggests that they supported the empirical credibility of localisation frames.

As shown above, the SMT literature suggests frames are constructed through a process of bricolage. We can see localisation as a frame that has been constructed out of the existing repertoire of the humanitarian field: it speaks to established humanitarian criteria of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and to the issue of AAP; a well-established theme, but one where the humanitarian system is often seen to fall short. Thus, the resonance of localisation may be a function of its breadth – its ability to carry a range of agendas, from efficiency to system change – and its resonance with numerous predispositions and aspirations that are well-established in the humanitarian field. Financial analyses enhanced the empirical credibility of framing around localisation. Some interviewees also noted the increased authority or credibility of these messages when voiced by local actors, suggesting that expansion of advocacy by SNGOs helped to enhance the credibility of frame articulators.

4.4. The role of the WHS

While these trends, mobilisations and frames set the scene, they don't fully explain why localisation emerged when it did. At the core of this question is the WHS, highlighted as a catalyst of the localisation agenda in sixteen interviews.

The WHS was preceded by regional consultations with 23,000 people. The inclusivity of the consultation process, and the role of Jemilah Mahmood as WHS Secretariat Chief in ensuring this inclusivity, were raised in ten interviews as important in getting localisation on the agenda at the summit. Interviews repeatedly pointed to Mahmood's role in ensuring this inclusivity, and as an advocate for localisation, noting that she "*designed very, very inclusive consultations in which that emergent civil society could really speak its mind"* (ID19). The primary message that emerged in consultations was to put affected people at the centre of humanitarianism, requiring a *"fundamental change in the humanitarian enterprise"* (WHS Secretariat, 2015:12), including greater recognition, inclusion and financing of local/national responders. Although such calls are not new, the consultations provided a platform for local and national actors to voice their concerns *"in a way that it hadn't really been aired before in an established, recognised, UN-led platform"* (ID22). By the time

of the summit, Mahmood had resigned, and it became "*much more of the usual top-down [process]*" (ID22), but nonetheless, by *"building [localisation] so centrally into the preparation process, [Jemilah] made it impossible to sideline as an issue in the summit itself"* (ID2).

A second key theme was the role of the HLP, leading to the Grand Bargain, underscored in eight interviews. The HLP was convened by the UNSG ahead of the WHS to find solutions to the funding gap. Panel members were largely from outside the humanitarian sector, and were *"very independent-minded"* (ID2). Members of the panel were supportive of the ideas around localisation, including HLP co-chair Kristalina Georgieva, representing important internal allies. Again, we return to the role of specific individuals; for instance, "*what was important… and this is homage to Kristalina Georgieva, the co-chair, [was] a lot of political push on those, a sort of amplification and constant pushing of the agenda"* (ID2). The panel's report draws on the consultations, above, arguing that *"one message made itself heard more loudly than all the others: a call for the localisation of aid"* (HLP, 2016:19). It also highlights the C4C commitment for INGOs to pass 20% of funding to NNGOs, stating, *"we need more concrete commitments like these if we are to see real change"* (ibid:19).

Two other factors appear to have enhanced the prospect of success for localisation at the summit. The first was the prominence of the funding gap, and the framing of localisation as efficiency, discussed above. Observers noted that "*a lot of donors saw this as a cost-efficiency measure and so were very supportive of the agenda"* (ID19) and that for some, *"it was never about social justice or equity or rebalancing of power in favour of the south, it was about middlemen"* (ID7). This is supported by the wording of the Grand Bargain, negotiated by donors and aid agencies following publication of the HLP's report, at the core of which is a "*deepening deficit"* within a system that is *"woefully under-resourced"* to meet growing needs (The Grand Bargain, 2016:2); its aim is to *"shift resources away from draining backroom activities to frontline delivery"* (ibid:2), thus focusing on the efficiency argument for localisation.

A second factor, less frequently cited, was that political will on other issues was lacking, and WHS organisers were, in a sense, looking for a "win". Interviewees argued that *"the UN leadership were desperate to ensure something came out of that summit in a climate in which nobody was really willing to commit"* (ID22). Political will around other issues – such as respecting international humanitarian law and principles – was lacking, whereas, localisation, as a *"relatively uncontroversial"* (ID12) issue, got most traction.

The concept of political opportunity structures gives purchase on the issue of why momentum formed around localisation now. While often state-centric (see e.g. Goldstone and Tilly, 2001; McAdam et

al., 1996), the concept can be valuably applied to an institutional field. Neo-institutionalists have recognised that institutions can *"enable mobilization, create openings for challengers, and shape their capacities to produce change"* (Lounsbury and Schneiberg, 2008:650). We can consider political opportunity structures, here, as the events, openings and allies in the humanitarian field that shifted the prospects for success around localisation, providing 'cues' for advocates to mobilise. A number of elements associated with the WHS shifted the political opportunity structure, including the funding gap and search for solutions; the availability of influential allies in the WHS Secretariat and on the HLP, including Jemilah Mahmood and Kristalina Georgieva; and the openness to new actors during the consultation process. These factors provided cues for advocacy: as one advocate recounted, in relation to the HLP and presence of receptive allies on the panel, *"we sort of put a foot in the door and pushed it, and got really strong commitments"* (ID8). Indeed, the WHS more broadly was a focal point for advocacy, including by actors described above; the summit *"gave impetus… and legitimacy to a lot of these movements"* (ID13). In the words of one interviewee, localisation came onto the agenda partly because, *"there was just a confluence of those people ahead of the WHS that just refused to let it go"* (ID18).

Furthermore, the breadth of the localisation discourse meant that it was able to bring together the messages and demands of multiple groups, including those searching for efficiency gains and solutions to the funding gap, and those calling for a more fundamental transformation in the humanitarian system. The commitments around localisation at the summit could thus be read as a "compromise frame", into which actors "pool" ideas and values in order to enable a settlement to emerge, based on a minimal level of agreement and joint commitment to the need for action (Cornelissen and Werner, 2014).

4.5. Rhetorical or Substantive Change?

It is too early to fully assess the implications of the localisation agenda. Nonetheless, interviews have suggested a number of insights regarding the nature and pace of change thus far. The WHS has been characterised by a year of ongoing contestation and institutional positioning at multiple levels and in various fora, as well as numerous ongoing processes of change, and further strategic action. Overall, participants perceived a lack of substantive change, and that localisation, at this stage, is more rhetoric than reality.

The most prominent theme, which arose in thirteen interviews, was of the issues around the wording of the Grand Bargain commitments, with organisations seeking to shape definitions in their own interests, and retrofitting existing work to fit the commitments. Interviewees noted, *"it is quite amazing, all the organisations that all of a sudden are local"* (ID3) and that, *"people who have never*

talked about localisation before are suddenly all presenting it as they have done it all the time!" (ID5). The localisation workstream of the Grand Bargain became enmeshed in a debate over the meaning of *'as directly as possible'*, and over who counts as a 'local actor', with a range of institutional positioning as different actors sought to influence the debates. For instance, some INGOs have argued that their national affiliates represent national organisations that should be included within the target. Others, such as WFP, have argued that in-kind transfers should be included, thus taking them over the target. Draft definitions were circulated by localisation workstream co-convenors, proposing to include one intermediary layer as part of "as directly as possible". In an open letter, NEAR argued this would perpetuate the status quo, calling the definitions, a *"disservice to the bold aspiration of the Grand Bargain commitments"* (NEAR, 2017:2). Similarly, one interviewee argued that the *"definition was diluted, to the extent that it makes no difference"* (ID10).

Ten interviewees emphasised that, at present, there is a gap between rhetoric and reality in relation to localisation. Localisation was described as having become the *"'in' thing to be talking about"* (ID15); *"unstoppable… as a mantra"* (ID12), or as a buzzword (ID5,20). However, few felt there was any indication of tangible change. One suggested localisation *"was a cosmetic attempt on the part of those organisations to say, we're not hierarchical … it is a deflection process, and it is not actually addressing the problem"* (ID6). Another noted that *"localisation as an idea is something everybody is going to subscribe to… the details are going to be where the devil will be hiding"* (ID4). This sentiment is supported by the progress report on WHS Commitment 5a, which notes the gap between rhetorical commitments and international actors' reluctance to relinquish decision-making power or control over financial resources, or reduce their own role (Mosselmans, 2017).

The main reason for this gap, as perceived by interviewees, was the dominance of organisational interests, and the prevailing structures of upward accountability. Respondents highlighted a lack of discussion about what the commitments mean for INGOs and whether they are willing to downsize. They noted, for instance, that *"the money goes somewhere. It goes to fund positions and organisations, if the money goes elsewhere, that means a lot of organisations are going to struggle just to survive"* (ID20). Twelve also emphasised donor capacity and counter-terrorism legislation as barriers to localisation.

Nonetheless, seven interviewees described organisational changes that are underway. This included internal change initiatives, including to meet commitments related to the C4C, and externally-facing advocacy, such as advocating to donors to increase support to L/NNGOs, or seeking to influence the debate around definitions to exclude internationally-affiliated NGOs and in-kind support. Ideas and practices have also been diffused across organisations through new fora, such as C4C working groups. This is supported by recent analyses, and a C4C progress report, suggesting that while Grand Bargain

commitments have been hindered by definitional disputes, a subset of organisations have proceeded with internal changes, programmes and advocacy (C4C, 2017; Van Brabant and Patel, 2017).

Interviewees' perspectives of the limited nature of change are supported by a review of 45 Grand Bargain signatories' self-reports (Appendix 5). Where donors report changes in funding, this generally takes the form of increasing allocations to country-based pooled funds (CBPF) or to the RC/RC movement. CBPFs allocated 17.85% of funding directly to NNGOs in 2016 (OCHA, 2017b). Numerous donors indicate that they will continue working predominantly through international actors, because of their own legal restrictions or lack of capacity, or because of a perceived lack of capacity amongst local responders to meet their requirements. Some donors report amending their selection criteria to consider grantees' partnership approaches. Many INGOs and UN agencies report long-standing commitment to local partnerships and capacity strengthening, in some cases already exceeding the 25% target (sometimes, only if in-kind transfers are included) suggesting commitments reflect, rather than transform, existing practice (e.g. UNFPA, 2017; WFP, 2017), as well as a retrofitting of existing transfers (including in-kind) to demonstrate compliance. Overall, the progress and future plans reported are best described as 'tweaks' to the system; there is little indication of transformative change.

Work on the diffusion of practices across organisations has considered 'organisational bandwagons', emerging when a gap between expectation and performance is made visible, forces for change are mobilised through framing, and 'knowledge entrepreneurs' proffer solutions. Some organisations begin to adopt new practices, and others follow suit, *"not wanting to appear out of step with new trends"* (Campbell, 2005:54). Thus, concepts and practices diffuse across an organisational field. However, this diffusion should be understood, not as imitation, but as *translation:* concepts change as they travel, for example, by organisations seeking to protect their interests. Change in practices, like framing, involves a process of translation or bricolage: a recombination of existing, and sometimes new, elements. Translation of new practices may be shaped by "*already existing normative assumptions about how organizations… ought to be organized"* (Campbell, 2005:57). This helps to explain why organisations often evolve gradually, in path-dependent ways. Furthermore, organisations can respond with symbolic conformity, with little change to organisational procedures (Zald et al., 2005).

This resonates with localisation: problems in the humanitarian system have been identified, momentum for change mobilised through framing, and solutions proposed. However, most of the changes reported build on existing practices – for example, increasing funding to CBPFs, or to INGOs for capacity building. As observed by interviewees, new initiatives or funding relating to localisation generally flow through conventional channels, such as projects designed and managed by INGOs.

Some described the *"complex machinery"* (ID6) of new jobs and initiatives growing around localisation, and that "*some organisations have got millions more to work on localisation. But…it just requires an internal change*" (ID10). A subset of interviewees observed that the discourse around localisation generally focuses only on local organisations that are able "*to engage with the system, on our terms"* (ID11). Thus, the diffusion and translation of practices associated with localisation suggests a reliance on existing ways of working, and on embedded assumptions about the appropriate channels for and recipients of funding. It is also important to emphasise that the process of translation is multi-faceted, complex, and, at times, actively contested, as seen in debates over the definition of 'local'.

The emerging picture is of a field in flux, with ongoing contestation, mobilisation, and counter-mobilisation. Strategic action, political opportunities and external events have facilitated a partial change in logic, with a rhetorical commitment to localisation and pressure for organisations to signal legitimacy through association with this discourse. The discourse around localisation has risen to prominence, but this is neither unitary nor uncontested; rather, there remain multiple competing interpretations and frames. Since the WHS, various individuals and organisations have engaged in strategic action to navigate definitions and commitments to preserve their own interests. There are also examples of change, and of further advocacy and strategic action by individuals seeking to hold organisations to account for their commitments. This correlates with analysis by Lounsbury and Schneiberg (2008) and Schneiberg and Soule (2005) who, drawing on elements of SMT and neo-institutionalism, conceptualise diffusion and institutionalisation as profoundly political, multilevel, contested processes. Pressures for continuity, and the preservation of power, are significant. An emerging institutional settlement may represent less a consensus, than a recombination of existing models, practices and frames, in a way which *"preserves ambiguity and multiplicity and contains a range of possibilities for subsequent assembly, reassembly, and recombination"* (Schneiberg and Soule, 2005:157).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This dissertation sought to explain the emergence of localisation, and the utility of concepts derived from SMT/OT. It highlighted a constellation of interrelated factors influencing the emergence of the localisation agenda. There was a clear role played by strategic advocates and social networks in generating momentum and forging coalitions. However, we can also identify a shifting political opportunity structure that helps to explain why the agenda emerged when it did. Concerns over a growing funding gap destabilised the field and led to a search for solutions; a framing of localisation as efficiency resonated with these concerns, generating support from dominant field actors. Access limitations in Syria, reliance on Syrian organisations, and the growth of vocal and capable southern CSOs more generally, further shifted weight in the debate in favour of advocates for localisation. However, the WHS was the critical event at which these trends converged. The visibility and momentum of localisation at this event was augmented by high-level allies within the WHS Secretariat and HLP, inclusive consultations, the dominant focus on the funding gap, strategic advocacy, and the ability of the localisation discourse to subsume a range of agendas, with the result that major donors and agencies made commitments related to localisation, including the headline 25% target. Subsequently, field actors have engaged in further strategic action, with contestation over the specificities of the commitments and limited substantive change, in a way that resonates with analyses of prior humanitarian reforms as organised hypocrisy.

The intersection of SMT and OT offered a productive lens to capture some of these nuances. Drawing on elements of SMT and neo-institutional analysis has enabled an examination of the humanitarian system that is sensitive to the interaction of individual and institutional actions and constraints, and to the destabilising role of external trends and events. It has also begun to consider how movements and change processes are not only initiated and driven, but re-negotiated and shaped as they come into contact with a range of institutional actors and pressures.

Given the role of external events, and the extent to which humanitarian actors appear to influence one another, attention to environmental pressures and a field-wide perspective is essential. External pressures, including the scale of humanitarian needs, and shifts in the global balance of power, contributed to the destabilisation of the field, catalysed the WHS and led to a search for solutions.

The attention to individual agency and political opportunities from SMT was significant, helping to elucidate key events and strategic action that contributed to the emergence of the localisation agenda. A thread woven throughout this story is the role of individuals pushing for change within their own organisations, forming inter-organisational alliances, or acting as internal allies in high-level fora. Attention to shifting political opportunity structures help to explain why localisation emerged when it

did, with aspects of the WHS providing cues to advocates to mobilise and enhancing the prospects for success.

Elements of the framing of localisation shed light on some of the complexities and challenges relating to its potential to disrupt, reinforce or obfuscate patterns of power within the humanitarian system. Frame resonance was augmented by the ability of localisation to accommodate a range of agendas and issues, from reducing the costs of aid delivery, to rebalancing power and partnerships. However, it was the resonance of the efficiency framing that appear to have facilitated the level of commitment around localisation achieved at the WHS. Core commitments are dominated by diagnoses of efficiency-related issues, rather than the power and inequality frames that posit a more radical transformation of the system. There is thus a question over whether a shift in rhetoric towards localisation, driven partly by the contemporary resonance of the *localisation as efficiency* frame, will have the transformative effects some advocates might hope for.

Elements of SMT risk generating an overly-optimistic account of the level of change taking place. Interviewees frequently questioned the ability of the localisation agenda to resist institutional pressures, or subvert the upward-facing structures of the humanitarian oligopoly. A core tenet of neo-institutionalism is that organisations are evaluated by "social fitness", including legitimacy and accountability, as well as performance, reliability and efficiency (McAdam and Scott, 2005). The level of rhetorical commitment around localisation can be read as organisations seeking and signalling legitimacy in a context in which their hold on power, resources and decision-making is increasingly questioned. Diverse actors have now signalled their commitment to localisation, but commitments have been translated as they have diffused, as actors seek to meet commitments with practices that conform to existing assumptions and ways of working, or preserve their interests. Others have continued to advocate for a more locally-led response, to hold signatories to account for their commitments, and to change their own ways of working. The contemporary picture is complex, contested and multi-faceted, both within and across organisations. The integration of SMT and OT, with its attention to diverse pressures influencing the balance of continuity and change, is a promising avenue for future research.

Bibliography

Act Alliance, 2015. The World Humanitarian Summit: Putting people at the centre (ACT Alliance Humanitarian Policy and Practice Advisory Group (HPPG) Position Paper for the World Humanitarian Summit). Act Alliance. Available at: https://www.icvanetwork.org/resources/world-humanitarian-summit-putting-people-centre (accessed 20.8.2017).

Ahmad, M.M., 2006. The “partnership” between international NGOs (non-governmental organisations) and local NGOs in Bangladesh. J. Int. Dev. 18, 629–638. doi:10.1002/jid.1251

ALNAP, 2015. The state of the humanitarian system, ALNAP Study. ALNAP/ODI.

Aly, H., 2016. The World Humanitarian Summit: winners and losers. IRIN. Available at: http://www.irinnews.org/analysis/2016/05/26/world-humanitarian-summit-winners-and-losers (accessed 11.8.2017).

Audet, F., 2011. What future role for local organizations? A reflection on the need for humanitarian capacity-building. International Review of the Red Cross 93, 1151–1164. doi:10.1017/S1816383112000410

Barnett, M., 2009. Evolution without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt. International Organization 63, 621–663.

Barnett, M., 2005. Humanitarianism Transformed. Perspectives on Politics 3, 723–740.

Barnett, M., Walker, P., 2015. Regime Change for Humanitarian Aid. Foreign Affairs.

Barnett, M.N., 2013. Humanitarian Governance. Annual Review of Political Science 16, 379–398. doi:10.1146/annurev-polisci-012512-083711

Benford, R.D., Snow, D.A., 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. Annual Review of Sociology 26, 611–639. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Bennett, C., Foley, M., Pantuliano, S., 2016. Time to let go: Remaking humanitarian action for the modern era. Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology 3, 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brown, D., Donini, A., 2014. Rhetoric or reality? Putting affected people at the centre of humanitarian action (ALNAP Study). ALNAP/ODI, London.

Buchanan-Smith, M., 2003. How The Sphere Project Came Into Being: A Case Study Of Policy-Making In The Humanitarian Aid Sector And The Relative Influence Of Research. Overseas Development Institute, London.

C4C, 2017. Charter for Change: From commitments to action. Progress Report 2016-2017. Charter for Change. Available at: https://charter4change.org/2017/06/20/from-commitments-to-action-charter4change-1-year-implementation-progress-report-now-available/ (accessed 11.8.2017).

C4C, n.d. Charter for Change. Charter for Change. Available at: https://charter4change.org/ (accessed 13.8.2017).

Campbell, J.L., 2005. Where Do We Stand? Common Mechanisms in Organizations and Social Movements Research, in: Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Social Movements and Organization Theory, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 41–68.

Campbell, L., Knox-Clarke, P., 2016. How can we better involve national actors in humanitarian coordination? (Coordination Workshop Briefing Paper). ALNAP/ ODI, London.

Christian Aid, CAFOD, Tearfund, Oxfam, ActionAid, 2015. Missed Opportunities No More: An Agenda for Change. Available at: https://cafod.org.uk/content/download/25610/183831/file/Missed%20Opportunities%20No%20More%20Briefing%20June%202015.pdf (accessed 3.8.2017).

Christoplos, I., 2004. Institutional capacity building amid humanitarian action. ALNAP Review of Humanitarian Action. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/5215 (accessed 20.8.17).

CHS Alliance, 2014. Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability. Available at: https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/files/files/Core%20Humanitarian%20Standard%20-%20English.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Clarke, P., Ramalingam, B., 2008. Organisational change in the humanitarian sector, ALNAP Seventh Review of Humanitarian Action. ALNAP/ ODI, London. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/ourwork/rha/7 (accessed 20.8.2017)

Collinson, S., Elhawary, S., 2012. Humanitarian space: trends and issues. HPG Policy Brief 46.

Corbett, J., 2011. Learning from the Nuba: Civilian resilience and self-protection during conflict. Local to Global Protection. Available at: http://www.local2global.info/wp-content/uploads/SK_Nuba_L2GP_report_final.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Cornelissen, J.P., Werner, M.D., 2014. Putting Framing in Perspective: A Review of Framing and Frame Analysis across the Management and Organizational Literature. The Academy of Management Annals 8, 181–235. doi:10.1080/19416520.2014.875669

Cosgrave, J., 2007. Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary, Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean tsunami. Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/5536 (accessed 20.8.2017).

Davis, G.F., Zald, M.N., 2005. Social Change, Social Theory, and the Converge of Movements and Organizations, in: Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Social Movements and Organization Theory, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 335–350.

De Waal, A., 1997. Famine Crimes: Politics & the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa, African Issues. James Currey Publishers, Oxford.

Delaney, M., Poole, L., Kumara, S., 2016. Let Your Voice Be Heard: Improving Humanitarian Response. Crescendo International. Available at: http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5625034fe4b092a567cf8a26/t/5707290fd210b84ce6bcc8cf/1460087058841/Let+Your+Voice+be+Heard.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Development Initiatives, 2017. Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2017. Development Initiatives Ltd. Available at: http://devinit.org/post/global-humanitarian-assistance-2017/ (accessed 20.8.2017).

Development Initiatives, 2015. Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2015. Development Initiatives Ltd. Available at: http://devinit.org/post/gha-report-2015/ (accessed 20.8.2017)

DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W., 1983. The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. American Sociological Review 48, 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101

Dixon, S.J., Moreno, E.R., Sadozai, A., Asaad, A.H., 2016. Localisation of Humanitarian Response in the Syrian Crisis. Confluences Méditerranée 99, 109–121.

Eade, D., 2007. Capacity building: who builds whose capacity? Development in Practice 17, 630–639. doi:10.1080/09614520701469807

Edkins, J., 2003. Humanitarianism, humanity, human. Journal of Human Rights 2, 253–258. doi:10.1080/1475483032000078224

Egeland, J., Harmer, A., Stoddard, A., 2011. To Stay and Deliver: Good Practice for Humanitarians in Complex Security Environments. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), United Nations. Available at: https://www.unocha.org/publication/policy-briefs-studies/stay-and-deliver-good-practice-humanitarians-complex-security (accessed 20.8.2017).

Els, C., Carstensen, N., 2015. Funding of Local and National Humanitarian Actors. Local to Global Protection. Available at: http://www.local2global.info/wp-content/uploads/l2gp_local_funding_final_250515.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Els, C., Mansour, K., Carstensen, N., 2016. Funding to national and local humanitarian actors in Syria: Between sub-contracting and partnerships. Local to Global Protection. Available at: http://www.local2global.info/wp-content/uploads/L2GP_funding_Syria_May_2016.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Featherstone, A., 2017. Time to move on: national perspectives on transforming surge capacity. CAFOD, Christian Aid, Tearfund and Islamic Relief Worldwide. Available at: https://www.christianaid.org.uk/programme-policy-practice/sites/default/files/2017-04/Time-to-move-on-humanitarian-surge-study.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Featherstone, A., 2014. Missed Again: making space for partnership in the Typhoon Haiyan response. ActionAid, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Oxfam GB and Tearfund. Available at: http://www.christianaid.org.uk/Images/Missed-Again-Typhoon-Haiyan-September-2014.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Featherstone, A., Bogati, S., 2016. Opportunity Knocks: Realising the potential of partnerships in the Nepal earthquake response. ActionAid, CAFOD, CARE, Christian Aid, Oxfam, Tearfund. Available at: https://cafod.org.uk/content/download/32774/384682/version/2/file/2016-Opportunity-Knocks-Executive-Summary.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Fereday, J., Muir-Cochrane, E., 2006. Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. International Journal of Qualitative Methods 5, 80–92. doi:10.1177/160940690600500107

Fligstein, N., McAdam, D., 2011. Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields. Sociological Theory 29, 1–26.

Gabrium, J., Holstein, J., 2012. Narrative Practice and the Transformation of Interview Subjectivity, in: Gubrium, J., Holstein, J., Marvasti, A., McKinney, K. (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft. SAGE Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States, pp. 27–44. doi:10.4135/9781452218403

Gingerich, T.R., Cohen, M.J., 2015. Turning the Humanitarian System on its Head. Oxfam. Available at: https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/rr-turning-humanitarian-system-local-capacity-270715-en.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Global Humanitarian Platform, 2007. Principles of Partnership: A Statement of Commitment. Available at: https://www.icvanetwork.org/system/files/versions/Principles%20of%20Parnership%20English.pdf (accessed 8.13.2017).

Goldstone, J.A., Tilly, C., 2001. Threat (and Opportunity): Popular Action and State Response in the Dynamics of Contentious Action, in: Aminzade, R. (Ed.), Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, pp. 179–194.

Goldstone, J.A., Useem, B., 2012. Putting Values and Institutions Back into the Theory of Strategic Action Fields. Sociological Theory 30, 37–47. doi:10.1177/0735275112437161

Gordon, S., Donini, A., 2015. Romancing principles and human rights: Are humanitarian principles salvageable? International Review of the Red Cross 97, 77–109. doi:10.1017/S1816383115000727

Hadler, M., 2015. Institutionalism and Neo-institutionalism: History of the Concepts, in: Wright, J.D. (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition). Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 186–189. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.03187-1

Healy, S., Tiller, S., 2014. Where is Everyone? Responding to emergencies in the most difficult places. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/12983 (accessed 20.8.2017).

HLP, 2016. High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Report to the Secretary-General: Too important to fail—addressing the humanitarian financing gap. Available at: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/%5BHLP%20Report%5D%20Too%20important%20to%20fail%E2%80%94addressing%20the%20humanitarian%20financing%20gap.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Howe, K., Stites, E., Chudacoff, D., 2015. Breaking the Hourglass: Partnerships in Remote Management Settings – The Cases of Syria and Iraqi Kurdistan. Feinstein International Center. Available at: http://fic.tufts.edu/publication-item/breaking-the-hourglass-partnerships-in-remote-management-settings-the-cases-of-syria-and-iraqi-kurdistan/ (accessed 20.8.2017).

Hudock, A.C., 1995. Sustaining Southern NGOs in resource-dependent environments. Journal of International Development 7, 653–667.

Humphries, V., 2013. Improving Humanitarian Coordination: Common Challenges and Lessons Learned from the Cluster Approach. The Journal of Humanitarian Assistance. Available at: http://sites.tufts.edu/jha/archives/1976 (accessed 20.8.2017).

IFRC, n.d. Code of conduct. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Available at: http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/who-we-are/the-movement/code-of-conduct/ (accessed 20.8.2017).

IRIN, 2015. The Humanitarian Economy. IRIN. Available at: http://newirin.irinnews.org/the-humanitarian-economy/ (accessed 12.8.2017).

Juma, M.K., Suhrke, A. (Eds.), 2002. Eroding local capacity: international humanitarian action in Africa. Nordiska AfrikaInstitutet; Transaction Publishers, Uppsala, Sweden : Somerset, NJ.

Kent, R., Bennett, C., Donini, A., Maxwell, D., 2016. Planning from the Future: Is the Humanitarian System Fit for Purpose? King's College London, Feinstein International Center and Overseas Development Institute. Available at: https://www.odi.org/publications/10694-planning-future-humanitarian-system-fit-purpose (accessed 20.8.2017)

King, B.G., Pearce, N.A., 2010. The Contentiousness of Markets: Politics, Social Movements, and Institutional Change in Markets. Annual Review of Sociology 36, 249–267. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102606

Knox-Clarke, P., 2017. Changing humanitarian action? (ALNAP Working Paper). ALNAP/ODI, London.

Krueger, S., Derzsi-Horvath, A., Steets, J., 2016. IASC Transformative Agenda: A Review of Reviews and Their Follow-Up. Global Public Policy Institute. Available at: http://www.gppi.net/publications/humanitarian-action/article/iasc-transformative-agenda-a-review-of-reviews-and-their-follow-up/ (accessed 20.8.2017).

Lapadat, J.C., 2012. Encyclopedia of Case Study Research. SAGE Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States. doi:10.4135/9781412957397

Lee, C., 2010. Humanitarian assistance as containment: New codes for a new order (No. 72), Working Paper Series. Refugee Studies Centre.

Lewis, D., 2014. Non-Governmental Organizations, Management and Development, 3rd Edition. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY.

Lister, S., 2000. Power in partnership? An analysis of an NGO's relationships with its partners. J. Int. Dev. 12, 227–239.

Lounsbury, M., Schneiberg, M., 2008. Social Movements and Institutional Analysis, in: Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin-Andersson, S., Suddaby, R. (Eds.), Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism. Sage, pp. 648–670.

McAdam, D., 1996. Conceptual origins, current problems, future directions, in: McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings. Cambridge University Press, pp. 23–40.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., Zald, M.N., 1996. Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings. Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D., Scott, W.R., 2005. Organizations and Movements, in: Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Social Movements and Organization Theory, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 4–40.

Mosselmans, M., 2017. Invest in Local Capacities: Analytical Paper on WHS Self-Reporting on Agenda for Humanity Transformation 5A. Christian Aid and ACT Alliance. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/25195 (accessed 20.8.2017).

NEAR, 2017. Open Letter on Localization Working Group Definitions Outcome. Available at: http://www.near.ngo/imgtemp/downloadfile/Open%20Letter%20on%20Localization%20Working%20Group%20Definitions_20%20June%202017%20_1498019781.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

NEAR, n.d. NEAR: Who We Are. Available at: http://www.near.ngo/who-we-are (accessed 13.8.2017).

Nightingale, K., 2014. Making the World Humanitarian Summit Worth the Climb. Christian Aid, London. Available at: http://programme.christianaid.org.uk/programme-policy-practice/sites/default/files/2016-03/making-the-world-humanitarian-summit-worth-the-climb-report-dec-2014.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Obrecht, A., 2014. De-internationalising humanitarian action: rethinking the “global- local” relationship. Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategique (IRIS).

OCHA, 2017a. Global Humanitarian Overview 2017: June Status Report. Available at: http://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-humanitarian-overview-2017-june-status-report-enarzh (accessed 20.8.2017).

OCHA, 2017b. Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise: OCHA. Available at: http://www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/GB%20Annual%20self%20reporting%20%20OCHA%20Feb%202%202017%20500%20Words_1.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Pandolfi, M., 2003. Contract of mutual (in)difference: governance and the humanitarian apparatus in contemporary Albania and Kosovo. Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 10, 369–381.

Parsons, J.A., 2011. Key Informant, in: Lavrakas, P.J. (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods. Sage Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States of America, pp. 406–408. doi:10.4135/9781412963947

Powell, W.W., DiMaggio, P.J., 2012. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. University of Chicago Press.

Ramalingam, B., Gray, B., Cerruti, G., 2013. Missed Opportunities: the case for strengthening national and local partnership-based humanitarian responses. ActionAid, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Oxfam GB and Tearfund. Available at: http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/missed-opportunities-the-case-for-strengthening-national-and-local-partnership-302657 (accessed 20.8.2017).

Rauh, K., 2010. NGOs, Foreign Donors, and Organizational Processes: Passive NGO Recipients or Strategic Actors? McGill Sociological Review 1, McGill Sociological Review.

Rencoret, N., Louise, S., 2016. Achieving a more appropriate and fit-for-purpose humanitarian ecosystem in the Pacific: Literature review on the localisation of humanitarian action. Australian Red Cross Humanitarian Advisory Group.

Saavedra, L., 2016a. We know our wounds: National and local organisations involved in humanitarian response in Lebanon., ALNAP Country Study. ODI/ALNAP, London. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/22462.aspx (accessed 20.8.2017).

Saavedra, L., 2016b. Learning from Exposure: How decades of disaster and armed conflict have shaped Colombian NGOS (ALNAP Country Study). ODI/ALNAP, London.

Schneiberg, M., Soule, S.A., 2005. Institutionaliation as a Contested, Multilevel Process: The Case of Rate Regulation in American Fire Insurance, in: Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Social Movements and Organization Theory, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 122–160.

Scott, W.R., 2013. Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities. SAGE Publications.

Slim, H., 1995. The continuing metamorphosis of the humanitarian practitioner: some new colours for an endangered chameleon. Disasters 19, 110–126.

Smillie, I., 2001. Patronage or partnership: local capacity building in humanitarian crises. Kumarian Press, Bloomfield, Conn.

Snow, D.A., Benford, R.D., 1988. Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization. International Social Movement Research 1, 197–217.

South, A., Harragin, S., 2012. Local to Global Protection in Myanmar (Burma), Sudan, South Sudan and Zimbabwe (HPN Network Paper No. 72). ODI/HPN, London.

South, A., Perhult, M., Carstensen, N., 2010. Conflict and Survival: Self-protection in south-east Burma. Asia Programme Paper: ASP 2010. Available at: https://www.chathamhouse.org/publications/papers/view/109464 (accessed 20.8.2017).

Sphere Project, 2011. The Sphere Project: humanitarian charter and minimum standards in humanitarian response. The Sphere Project, Rugby.

Steets, J., Binder, A., Derzsi-Horvath, A., Krueger, S., Ruppert, L., 2016. Drivers and Inhibitors of Change in the Humanitarian System: A Political Economy Analysis of Reform Efforts

Relating to Cash, Accountability to Affected Populations and Protection. Global Public Policy Institute. Available at: http://www.gppi.net/fileadmin/user_upload/media/pub/2016/Steets__Binder__Horvath__Krueger__Ruppert__2016__Drivers_and_Inhibitors_of_Change_in_the_Humanitarian_System.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Steets, J., Grünewald, F., Binder, A., de Geoffroy, V., Kauffmann, D., Krüger, S., Meier, C., Sokpoh, B., 2010. Cluster Approach Evaluation 2 Synthesis Report. Global Public Policy Institute and Groupe URD, Berlin/Plaisians. Available at: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/Cluster%20Approach%20Evaluation%202.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Stoddard, A., Harmer, A., Renouf, J.S., 2010. Once Removed: Lessons and challenges in remote management of humanitarian operations for insecure areas. Humanitarian Outcomes for the Center on International Cooperation. Available at: https://aidworkersecurity.org/sites/default/files/RemoteManagementApr2010.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Stokke, K., 2007. Humanitarian response to natural disasters: a synthesis of evaluation findings. Synthesis Report 1, 2007.

Street, A., 2009. Synthesis Report: Review of the engagement of NGOs with the humanitarian reform process. Actionaid, CAFOD - Catholic Agency for Overseas Development, CARE International, IRC - International Rescue Committee, Oxfam, Save the Children. Available at: http://www.alnap.org/resource/12647 (accessed 20.8.2017).

Tanner, D.L., Moro, D.L., 2016. Missed Out: The role of local actors in the humanitarian response in the South Sudan conflict. CAFOD and Trócaire, Christian Aid, Oxfam GB and Tearfund. Available at: https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/rr-missed-out-humanitarian-response-south-sudan-280416-en.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Tarrow, S.G., 2011. Power in movement: social movements and contentious politics, Rev. & updated 3rd ed. ed, Cambridge studies in comparative politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge ; New York.

The Grand Bargain, 2016. The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need. Istanbul, Turkey. Available at: http://reliefweb.int/report/world/grand-bargain-shared-commitment-better-serve-people-need (accessed 20.8.2017)

UN Secretary-General, 2016. One humanity: shared responsibility: Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit (Seventieth session, Item 73a). UN General Assembly. Available at: http://www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/Secretary-General%27s%20Report%20for%20WHS.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

UNFPA, 2017. Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise: UNFPA. Available at: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/unfpa_-_self-report.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Van Brabant, K., Patel, S., 2017. Understanding the Localisation Debate. Global Mentoring Initiative (GMI). Available at: http://coastbd.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/GMI-Understand.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Walker, E.T., 2012. Social Movements, Organizations, and Fields: a Decade of Theoretical Integration. Contemporary Sociology 41, 576–587. doi:10.1177/0094306112457651b

Walker, P., Maxwell, D.G., 2014. Shaping the Humanitarian World. Routledge.

Wall, I., Hedlund, K., 2016. Localisation and Locally-led Crisis Response: A Literature Review. Local to Global Protection. Available at: http://www.local2global.info/wp-content/uploads/L2GP_SDC_Lit_Review_LocallyLed_June_2016_final.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Warren, C.A.B., 2011. Qualitative Interviewing, in: Gubrium, J., Holstein, J. (Eds.), Handbook of Interview Research. SAGE Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States of America, pp. 83–102. doi:10.4135/9781412973588

Weber, K., King, B., 2013. Social movement theory and organization studies, in: Adler, P.S., Gay, P. du, Morgan, G., Reed, M. (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory and Organization Studies: Contemporary Currents. OUP Oxford.

Wengraf, T., 2001. Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods. SAGE.

WFP, 2017. Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise: WFP. Available at: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/wfp_-_self_report.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

WHS Secretariat, 2015. Restoring Humanity: Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit. United Nations, New York. Available at: http://agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017/Jul/Restoring_Humanity_Synthesis_of_the_Consultation_Process_for_the_World_Humanitarian_Summit.pdf (accessed 20.8.2017).

Zald, M.N., Morrill, C., Rao, H., 2005. The Impact of Social Movements on Organizations: Environment and Responses, in: Davis, G.F., McAdam, D., Zald, M.N. (Eds.), Social Movements and Organization Theory, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 253–279.

Appendices

Appendix 1. List of interviewees

Organisation type is intended to give an indication of interviewees' backgrounds without compromising anonymity. It is recognised that the boundaries between categories are not always clear-cut (between partnership-based and operational agencies, for instance).

ID	Organisation type	Date
ID1	NGO/CSO Network	July 2017
ID2	NGO/CSO Network	July 2017
ID3	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID4	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID5	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID6	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID7	Other	July 2017
ID8	INGO - partnership-based - multi-mandate	July 2017
ID9	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID10	L/NNGO	July 2017
ID11	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID12	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID13	INGO - partnership-based - multi-mandate	July 2017
ID14	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID15	INGO - operational - multi-mandate	July 2017
ID16	Research Centre or Independent Consultant	July 2017
ID17	INGO - operational - multi-mandate	July 2017
ID18	INGO - operational - multi-mandate	July 2017
ID19	Other	July 2017
ID20	NGO/CSO Network	July 2017
ID21	L/NNGO	July 2017
ID22	INGO - partnership-based - multi-mandate	August 2017

Totals

Type of organisation	Total interviewed
L/NNGO	2
INGO - partnership-based - multi-mandate	3
INGO - operational - multi-mandate	3
INGO - single mandate	0
UN agency	0
NGO/CSO Network	3
Donor	0
Research Centre, Think Tank or Independent Consultant	9
Other	2
Total	22

Appendix 2. Codebook

Overarching Theme One: Drivers of Localisation

Sub-Theme	Code	Example
External events and longer-term trends	Funding gap / system overstretch (Eleven interviews)	*"I think that also the scale and need presented by the protracted conflicts is making the current system unsustainable, and so that pressure is forcing international organisations to rethink how they work."* (ID11) *"The difference in terms of how much it costs is enormous and we live in a world where tensions are becoming really serious over the money that is coming in. … it makes the localisation idea just a really perfectly suited solution."* (ID20) *"The gap is growing still, the needs are outgrowing the increase in funding. So, we're all, particularly the big donors, looking for ways of working more efficient, some would say working cheaper, and obviously I think that motivation is therefore this renewed interest in the local because in many cases their overhead, their salaries, its way lower than what we would find in international agencies."* (ID22).
	Growth of, and advocacy by, southern CSOs (Nine interviews)	*"There are some changes happening across civil society, whether that's the shift of power from north to south, the questioning of the role of the big players in civil society by the smaller, or indeed, social movements and civil society formations that don't even reach or choose not to reach organisational or institutional status … There have been activists, particularly in the global south, who have been complaining about this for decades, ever since the first development worker arrived on a plane I'm sure someone said, "Hold on a minute, what's going on here?", so, it's not that. But I think there is a new generation of more confident southern actors who are willing to tell it like it is without fear that somehow their grant is going to be cut off or they're never going to get funded by anyone. Degan exemplifies that sort of person best but there are others around."* (ID2) "*Articulate and capable national organisations that are seeing themselves marginalised by lack of funding and lack of voice. So, an element of resentment, and very bad deal partnership agreements, INGOs just wanting them to do what they want them to do without supporting them to grow their capacity or their organisations' ability*" (ID8) *"I think it's also responding to a larger pattern of change in the geopolitical environment, moving from a unipolar world to a more multipolar one… The accompanying rise of emerging economies and essentially levels of development which has resulted in stronger, more dynamic, more diversified civil society organisations in affected countries." (ID19)* *"Southern-based NGOs are growing, their capacity is growing, they're becoming increasingly vocal… they are absolutely crucial and key because … they do speak with a kind of credibility…. And if we want to reach people in those localities we'll have to work with them. And when they speak from that position it also becomes embarrassingly clear that*

		having created this greater economic inequality, disparity, in the humanitarian world than you find in most of the hard-core corporate world, it just becomes so blatantly unacceptable, but particularly when it is phrased, put forward, argued, by a Degan Ali rather than [an INGO-representative]." (ID22).
	Remote management and access constraints (Six interviews)	*"In the field, I've seen the localisation logic being used to justify that in fact a lot of international actors… are less and less and less at the frontline and in touch with beneficiaries."* (ID20) *"It used to be just UN agencies that had this risk aversion… but then more of the NGOs, the big INGOs, also moved in that direction now to the point where we have some INGOs which are less present than the UN, which is quite impressive, and I think it's sort of, in this situation, it's clear that without the local actors there's strictly nothing you can do, the dependence on the local actors becomes much more clear."* (ID3)
Role of specific crises	Syrian crisis (including role of L/NNGOs, lack of access) (Seven interviews)	*"I think the role of national actors in Syria - national actors and local actors have long played a role in hard to reach places, but the scale and the seriousness of Syria has highlighted their role in a way that had been potentially overlooked before."* (ID11) *"[In Syria] you have a strong civil society, you have a strong diaspora, who can speak for it. You also have social media as well, which allows these organisations much more visibility and prominence. … And a lot of these things happen organically just because, you know, the terms of trade are changing. If you don't have access in Syria and the only people who have access you can't monitor, they are going to get power, you know. So, however many policy directors you have - if the world is changing, the world is changing."* (ID14) *"Syria was so big that whatever we, whatever you, debated around Syria had ramifications into the wider humanitarian thinking because of the scale, the seriousness, and the security implications. And if you look for game changers or what really drives the humanitarian sector, security considerations by western nations is one never to forget. ... and the fact that with the Syrian crisis we got a bunch of newly formed, very vocal, very proud Syrian NGOs who actually were the only ones who were on the ground … I think you should be careful not to underestimate the importance of having them on board now, as well, and the way they contribute to the debate."* (ID22)
	Indian Ocean Tsunami (Three interviews)	*"I think what really surfaced post tsunami is that like, actually, the international humanitarian system is potentially doing harm by undermining national systems or local systems to cope. And, then, you start seeing things kind of slowly change."* (ID18)
Role of specific actors	Partnership-based & faith-based INGOs (Ten interviews)	*"A major, well, incentive or trigger or push for the localisation agenda, has been the campaigning or advocacy from a number of UK based NGOs and particularly faith-based NGOs….and that's decades old. I think they have been very present, they have been very vocal through advocacy campaigns such as the Charter for Change, …. And have been able to engage with existing mechanisms in the humanitarian sector for, you know, policy discussions and coordination. Like the IASC…I would say they have invested a lot in their presence and in their policy work and have been very successful in that sense."* (ID12)

		"[C4C] started with that recognition that there was inequality in the system, and the organisations that started it were all partnership organisations so they sort of had their ears to the ground and this is what they were seeing and hearing. So, it sort of came through that need, the need to change the status quo, and shake things up a little bit, and building momentum off the back of that…. Of the organisations that set up the charter, they were faith based organisations, these are NGOs with very strong links to local communities, naturally, just by their operating mode" (ID13).
	Charter for Change (Nine interviews)	*"It's very well packaged, if you look at their eight principles, they're touching on things that we've heard about for years - the poaching of staff is something lots of national NGOs complain about, the idea of equality, you see the principles of partnership mentioned … So, its got a target, I just think they packaged it well, they put nice graphics to it, and then they gave a vehicle for people who wanted to show they were willing to change their behaviour. I think there's a lot of pressure in run-up to the World Humanitarian Summit to be seen as doing something to devolve power."* (ID1) *"Early on it was focused on, 'okay what can we change', those signatory organisations, because a lot of advocacy framed around the summit was focused on, 'the system needs change', or we do advocacy to change the UN, or to change others, but this is focused on, okay 'what can we change'? …I think that was probably one of the reasons why it was so well-received." (ID5)* *"The Charter for Change basically broke things down into like real clear, or clearer at least, objectives around what do we want to do about communication, what do we want to do about advocacy, what do we want to do about capacity development, and what is it that we're trying to get to."* (ID18) *"… when you've got the likes of CARE on board, or Oxfam, then you suddenly jump up to a volume, just in terms of volume, of humanitarian turnover, I mean we're looking at collectively probably more than a billion dollars. So that's volume, and that's important."* (ID22)
	Role of the NEAR Network and Degan Ali (Eight interviews)	*"Having a dedicated group of people who agitate around a particular issue and create a coalition, which is basically what Degan has done, can work. She's been able, or NEAR has been able, to put localisation on the agenda."* (ID4) *"[Degan's impact] has been very big. Because she can speak with authority… she strategically has a foot in the door in the big NGO fora … I think, it's force of personality, it's language skills, the fact that she straddles Somalia, Kenya, London, DC, that sort of internationalism comes very naturally to her…As an agent of change I think she's definitely had a lot of influence."* (ID7)

	Role of individuals and interpersonal connections (Nine interviews)	*"A lot of the analysis and initiative you see today, on the grand bargain localisation workstream, 25% target, that was all connected to the idea that was promoted by Anne Street. So, she's very good at thinking of a problem statement, thinking of solutions, framing it in a very catchy way… Anne has constantly been pushing for national NGOs to get more direct access to those funding mechanisms because she's seen how international actors come in and they displace the local response, and she's really been pioneering the Charter for Change" (ID1)* *"Those people, whose names come up again and again in the humanitarian sector on various issues, seem to be a small cohort of fairly radical thinkers not just on localisation but a whole bunch of other things, that seem to have successfully infiltrated if you will the sort of mainstream agenda and started to push things along."* (ID2) *"It's always about interested individuals from a couple of organisations, and their own commitment and drive and pushing that internally. … There is often quite a bit of advocacy work internally. I think, it's just, a bunch of very committed individuals."* (ID5) *"To me, right at the centre of it is basically the IFRC and Jemilah Mahmood, one of the voices and visionaries of the WHS and in particular of this grand bargain, localisation and shift in power, she was right in that too."* (ID16) *"Very much relying on using not just institutional communication channels but using individuals that we know of in those organisations who would have a receptive ear to this agenda …It's funny, I mean a lot of what we've achieved … has been more about networking amongst individuals who apart from their institutional responsibilities and mandates also had a personal persuasion, so I would certainly never underestimate [that]"* (ID22)
Role of WHS	Inclusivity of WHS consultations, role of Jemilah Mahmood (Ten interviews)	*"Jemilah Mahmood… was probably responsible for making localisation such a key part of the summit process, and I hear, had to fight hard to get even the summit build up process to be as open, conversational, and consultative as it was … Jemilah… by building it [localisation] so centrally into the preparation process, made it impossible to sideline as an issue in the summit itself."* (ID2) *"The way that [Jemilah] structured the consultations running up the WHS was very loose and gave a lot of space to local groups and not everybody would have done it that way."* (ID7) *"Jemilah Mahmood… back when she was WHS secretariat, I think she played a big role around making sure that the tipping point around WHS' inclusion existed"* (ID18). *"Jemilah Mahmood who was the Chief UN undersecretary general at that time, designed a very, very inclusive consultations in which that emergent civil society could really speak its mind. And with people like her and people like Degan Ali who really championed this agenda, I think that's, from an advocacy point of view how it kind of was raised."* (ID19)
	Role of the	*"I don't think there's much in the panel report that's particularly new,*

	High-Level Panel and Grand Bargain (Eight interviews)	*but what was important and especially, and this is homage to Kristalina Georgieva, the co-chair, a lot of political push on those, a sort of amplification and constant pushing of the agenda"* (ID2) *"I think it's interesting because localisation is an area which has been on the agenda in a way for a long time, but it hasn't really been part of one of the formal big reform processes before the Grand Bargain, at least not in such an explicit way."* (ID3) *"It got a lot of attention by that high-level panel on humanitarian financing that was working at the same time … a lot of our ideas from charter for change kind of somehow made their way into their thinking."* (ID22)
	Advocacy on localisation around the WHS / WHS as focal point for advocacy (Seven interviews)	*"I didn't really, see this much kind of buzz about localisation, until right before the summit when people were looking for things to push."* (ID1) "*The good thing about the WHS was it really concentrated attention at the policy level, at the level of people who are sort of leaders in policy thinking, it challenged us to look at how change could happen, and what we could do to affect change, or bring about change*." (ID8) *"It became all very vocal in light of the World Humanitarian Summit... the critical moment in that sense was the World Humanitarian Summit and the fact that they managed to get, to have their voice heard within the preparations for the WHS and the summit itself including the preparatory documents and the outcome documents"* (ID12)
	Political consensus lacking on other issues (Four interviews)	*"We were headed into a summit which was incredibly ill prepared, where there was no UN member state real commitment and backing behind it… So, the UN leadership were desperate to ensure something came out of that summit in a climate where nobody was really willing to commit. And on the big issue which was obviously the one around humanitarian access, respect for humanitarian principles, all of that stuff, there was no member state appetite to up the act, at all, so I think this was also a bit of a case of then looking around the room and saying, what can we agree on?"* (ID22) *"You had an international conference but in search of issues. … issues where perhaps some of the voices were the loudest, but also those issues which perhaps were relatively uncontroversial, …, they got most traction. Issues that I would say should have been discussed by the WHS … e.g. upholding IHL, you know, questions around the role of humanitarian actors in terms of protection, which are critical issues, they did raise much more controversy and as a result there was hardly any discussion on them."* (ID12)
	Role of WHS – other / general (Seven interviews)	*"I think the WHS gave impetus and it gave legitimacy to a lot of these movements and these ways of thinking, and it really shifted things significantly. So, I think that's really got to be one of the driving factors."* (ID13) *"People have been very negative about the WHS for really, really good reason. But it did have and will continue to have had quite a significant achievement. And I think the regional consultations, and the energy and*

		coordination that many actors put behind the localisation agenda… it provided the platform where all of these things could, these general trends, unless they were distilled and captured somewhere, I think the WHS kind of did that and that's why it's gone into the grand bargain." (ID14) *"I think the WHS as a massive event has raised the profile of the debate around localisation, and made it much more, the in thing to be talking about."* (ID15)

Global Theme Two: Interpretations and Frames

Interpretations and framing	Breadth of 'localisation' or 'local', lack of specificity (Nine interviews)	*"Localisation is a bit like the Loch Ness monster. Everybody talks about it but everybody has a different idea of what it looks like"* (ID4) "*It is incredibly context specific. Not even on a country basis, sometimes on a district or regional basis. … just this idea that localisation is good, that we should pursue this agenda and so on, what that has done is it has lacked nuance and it, has become sort of a mantra. … The debate is framed as the transfer of resources and that blocks a lot… if you just frame it in those very simplistic terms … that blocks a lot in terms of discussion of the real content, what are the opportunities, but also what are the challenges"* (ID12) *"It's kind of deceptive, because it's just one word, localisation, and it seems very simple, but the fact is loads of people interpret it in different ways. … it's hard to move towards something when you can't concretely define it, and when everyone has a different understanding."* (ID15) "*I think we're stuck with these global ideological general discussions. What we need to have is context specific, location specific discussions that are focused on implementation. … And I think that there's too much disagreement on what localisation is or what it should be for there to be a productive global consensus over all these things."* (ID19) *"It's a terminology that gathers apples and oranges, many organisations that have nothing to do together, incomparable. So, that's very problematic because that means we don't really know what we're talking about. … It is this idea that it's national versus international, I'm a bit uncomfortable. And again because, it is so country dependent."* (ID20)
	Localisation as transformation - power imbalance as problem (Thirteen interviews)	"*The main problem is unequal architecture. By that I mean, for example, lack of representation, so you have global forums which are making decisions about what's taking place in the developing world, and you have little cluster systems and country level NGO coordination groups and no local actors are involved. And when people are making funding decisions no local actors are invited to the table. … I think the issue in a word is representation, because that leads to other things, it leads to visibility in international forums, it leads to country level planning, even depending on the context. … So, it's about sort of trying to break into that system,*

		shake it up a little bit." (ID13) *"The underlying driver - and these were the early discussions before the WHS - were about power sharing. This was about power and inequality and inequity and a humanitarian system that has a worse distribution of wealth than the world! You have these shocking Oxfam headlines about 8 people having same amount of money as the rest of the world and in humanitarian circles 8 people have 90% of the money not 50%! So, there's quite a, quite some, potential in the discussion to really change things and realign power. Now that's what makes it interesting, and why the debate gets driven down into technicalities like what does direct granting mean, as direct as possible…"* (ID16) *"We constantly use the term fundamental transformation and I think, so there's something about, if I'm talking about key messages or things that have kind of surfaced at the top of the localisation debate there is something about this transformation of the system that's in there, there's something about shifts in power, that's in there"* (ID18) *"Localisation means true partnership, a mutual partnership. ... a true, equal, dignified partnership. ... It is a matter of mindset. Whenever you are an INGO, I am a local NGO, the traditional relation is patrilineal relation. So, all the things in this sector are changing, reforming, this relation should be reformed."* (ID21)
	Localisation as efficiency - Funding gap/ length of chain (Five interviews)	*"At the moment, the normal chain goes from donor to UN agency to international organization to national organisation and sometimes even to some neighbourhood association. It is long and everybody takes his 10% and at the bottom there's not much left for the beneficiaries.* (ID20)
	Localisation as efficiency – resonance (Five interviews)	*"On some of the donors' point of view it was never about social justice or equity or rebalancing of power in favour of the south, it was about middlemen."* (ID7) *"I didn't see it coming but I think there's an efficiency argument there that is appealing to the western donors and why the western donors might have engaged with this, now coming up more clearly, maybe I missed it earlier on."* (ID16) *"I think when it came to the grand bargain there was a need to have this addressed in the context of the WHS, and I think that a lot of donors saw this as a cost efficiency measure and so were very supportive of the agenda and so I think that's kind of how it got off the ground."* (ID19)
	Localisation as relevance or Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)	*"At its root is this idea that it's good practice and people who are closer to problems know more about it and are much more affected by those issues, and so in a sense it only makes sense"* (ID17) *"There are lots of good reasons for being more local, means you're more adapted, you understand the context more, it's cheaper, you are closer to the beneficiaries etc."* (ID20)

	(Four interviews)	*"For me, I think the problem localisation should be trying to address is about the agency of people who are affected by disasters, and the more that you can provide those people with decision-making powers in order to determine how they respond to emergencies in their own lives and communities."* (ID11)
	Financial Analysis (Five Interviews)	*"Development Initiatives and their GHA report were really really critical to start putting out that initial figure"* (ID18) *"I constantly use… the very few data points that we have to show the scale of some of what's going on, so the 1% of all ODA, the .2% of international humanitarian finance, things like that. I think that's because, people are shocked, because very few people understand the scale of what goes on, at least within the self-defined sector… the fact that so little goes directly to local actors or first responders is staggering, so, that's been a key part of our message and we still pursue it."* (ID2)
	Localisation (term and debate) as problematic (Six interviews)	*"Localisation assumes a certain power dynamic whereby western or international organisations … are kind of making their response local, so it implies a power dynamic whereby you've got the power and the agency within the western and the international humanitarian system, and a very disempowered and a very uninformed local system… the problem with this is that the reality on the ground is actually the opposite."* (ID6) *"[Localisation], to a certain extent it doesn't get to the problem necessarily… if you talk about localisation through the lens of efficacy and effectiveness and efficiency you miss out on quite a bit. … this whole discussion is taking place as if it were some kind of historical accident that western aid agencies have essentially been engaged in an abusive set of labour practices with local organisations and with local people. … And so, the entire discussion becomes one that is missing its essential anger.… it's a very sanitised, polite discussion which, sometimes those can work if you've got goodwill on both sides but to a certain extent the aid agencies have not yet come clean"* (ID16) *"Localisation … sort of presumes that it didn't happen before, it did, … it's been happening as long as there's been people helping each other … it's kind of symptomatic for this whole thing, that even the term that's become the catchphrase term is so awkward and actually misleading"* (ID22)

Global Theme Three: Implications and Barriers to Change

Sub-Theme	Code	Example
Implications	Indications of change (Seven interviews)	*"There's greater money going into pooled funding, more focus on the need for capacity investment in the humanitarian sector which is not traditional because a lot of humanitarians don't see that as their role or responsibility at all, and there is greater voice now for local actors in international humanitarian discussions but not a greater voice for them in decision-making."* (ID19)

		"[We're seeing] … a recognition of the importance, still stumbling around in terms of how do we then make it work together. But at least attempts to try to do that whereas before it really truly wasn't even recognised as an issue. … at least it's up there, it's in the air, we can't have a conference on protection without having a panel discussion on the importance of local actors and how to bridge the gaps between the local and the global." (ID22)
	Internal organisational change (Seven interviews)	*"Internally… some organisations that have been more operational have suddenly had to reconsider how their organizational culture, how they work, how do you become more of a partnership focused organisation and move away from that top down way of thinking"* (ID13) *"Our organisation made a decision to make these different kinds of investments for localisation, and what we've kind of, we're doing that in a lot of different ways… Internally we've also got a few programmes that have started that are trying to be more transformative and be more kind of change drivers … And all of those programmes are about strengthening local capacity while addressing our own sort of power and behaviours and trying to challenge the terms of partnership"* (ID18)
Barriers to/ lack of change	Gap between rhetoric and reality (Eleven Interviews)	*"If you followed the debate on the grand bargain, it's going painfully slow. They approved all these lofty goals over a year ago and what they can actually show in terms of simplifying the function of the system is peanuts. So, the oligopoly is talking the talk, but not really walking the walk."* (ID4) *"It was a cosmetic attempt on the part of those organisations to say, we're not hierarchical … it is a deflection process, and it is not actually addressing the problem. It's not. It's just putting a bandage on the problem, making it look as if it's been addressed but it hasn't been addressed."* (ID6) *"Many people have started feeling disillusioned, and fear, it's just going to be another global process where a lot of discussions happen, people travel from different parts of the world, to attend discussions, seminars, lots of online discussions, and again we are back to square one, not meaningfully changing anything. This is what I fear. …When it comes to implementation, … you just do it opposite to that, to continue eroding response capacity of local organisations. … They talk about the solution, they talk about the problem, it's a different thing they don't work on the solutions because if they do, it will be adversely impacting them."* (ID10)
	Definition of local and 'as directly as possible'; retrofitting (Thirteen	*"It is quite amazing, all the organisations that all of a sudden are local."* (ID3) "*It was agreed that at least 25% of funding would reach to local and national actors by 2020. … but, then, this committee was constituted to define who do we define as local and national actors and what do we mean by as directly as possible. Actually,*

	interviews)	*these are very simple things and one can do it in five minutes time, … [they] took ten months to define local and national actors and as directly as possible. And it went to grand bargain signatures and co-conveners, to present it to the donors before ECOSOC meeting in Geneva last month. And then this definition was diluted, to the extent that it makes no difference*." (ID10) "*We see quickly that people can be considering themselves winners or losers depending on which definition it is. So, World Food Programme would like to make sure that its in-kind contribution of food counts, pooled funds would like to be considered as 'as directly as possible', whereas the NEAR network would like as directly as possible to be direct."* (ID1) *"I think one is that everybody makes of it what they want to make of it, the way it fits their strategy or policy, that's very clear. So, everybody's trying to use it to their advantage. I think that's a very clear consequence of it."* (ID12) *"Of course, you pay lip service to localisation, and some organisations for example World Vision are being smart by saying, oh our Kenyan branch is now an independent NGO, and others are doing the same."* (ID4) *"All of a sudden… people who have never talked about localisation before are suddenly all into - presenting it as they have done it all the time! … right now, I think everyone tries to present their work … as totally localised, WFP tries to push for including in-kind transfers in that 25% target which would render that target meaningless because that's what they do to a large extent already."* (ID5) *"What you're seeing now – they hadn't really read the fine print, hadn't really figured out what this could mean in practice. So … That's when you get the gaming. That's when they send in the lawyers and they begin to reinterpret the word as directly as possible to include in-kind food - oh come on, I mean it's a joke - but that's World Food Programme or some of the big donors who see their particular interests threatened. … But at least we're in an interesting position now where they have to game and tweak and cheat and we to a certain extent can go out and name and shame."* (ID22)
	Organisational interests, resilience of upward accountability (Twelve Interviews)	*"A question where I haven't heard any convincing answers yet from the INGOs that are in favour of that, it is basically destroying your own business, saying we want to give up on the revenue, we want local NGOs to get a bigger share of that. … these big international organisations have an interest in maintaining themselves, maintaining their staff, getting bigger."* (ID5) *"The affected populations, it's no longer about them… it really comes down to the buck, the money, where the money comes from, where it goes, and by the time it gets to the population it's a fraction. And that's what's maintained, that's the lifeblood of*

		the system." (ID6) *"Even if at an individual level there's openness to localisation, there's still an organisational protectiveness, and inevitably, organisations are going to think that their ideas about how to do localisation are better than anyone else's and therefore they need to fight for their own space even in just that agenda. So, it's hard to see how the shifts going to happen, in really meaningful ways."* (ID11) *"At the moment, the money goes somewhere. It goes to fund positions and organisations, if the money goes elsewhere, that means a lot of organisations are going to struggle just to survive. People are the same north and south, nobody will be happy to lose his job because aid is being localised." (ID20)*
Donor Limitations	Donor capacity/ preference (Nine interviews)	"*A lot of the institutional donors … ECHO and US AID for sure, they are simply not allowed to fund an organization that is not based in their region. … So, this very simple point, I've never heard it in any conversation about localisation. … if you look at it from the point of view of the donor I'm sure you will see the advantage of dealing with one big UN agency that can receive a massive amount of funds and then will disburse these funds to a multiple number of NGOs"* (ID20) "*I think there are a lot of donor capacity barriers, so if you take Norway you've got like 10 people managing 800 million dollars of humanitarian funding, they can't manage new partners, all they can really do is write big cheques to UN organisations. … donors look at it from the perspective of cost efficiency, they feel under a lot of pressure because of the target so they are trying to get people to understand that they have a lot of challenges."* (ID19) *"The key donors, like the US government, they want to fund American NGOs or the UN, the whole issue of risk has not been addressed, how do we collectively transfer risk, share it, mitigate it… So there's been some resistance from donors, they don't want to participate. Or they want to participate indirectly but pass the risk to someone else."* (ID1) *"Obviously donor policy is a big one, because a lot of them for their own accountability reasons can't or won't find it very difficult to release funds to agencies which either don't have a track record or which are not from their own country"* (ID14)
	Counterterrorism legislation (Four interviews)	*"The reality is CT measures are looming large, they've brought a lot of donors to press pause."* (ID6) *"…Increasing counter terrorism frameworks and policies that are going to restrict local and national organisations from getting direct funding. So, that's a fundamental barrier"* (ID18)
Local actor barriers	- (Four interviews)	*"Let's say everything is great and now 25% of the funding is direct to NGOs, do they have the capacity to absorb that? Many… national NGOs say they need some help managing their NGOs, so, how do they do adequate financial management and*

		oversight, better strategizing, better fundraising … and these are things that were picked up in other bits of the grand bargain but aren't getting as much attention." (ID1)

Appendix 3. Interview guide

Interviews were semi-structured. The following questions formed a guide, but interviews varied based on the role and experience of the interviewee, and to explore topics in-depth.

Introduction to the interview.
Explanation of the research and how information provided will be used.
Explanation of confidentiality and anonymity.
Request for audio recording.

1. Could you begin by telling me about your perspective on and engagement with debates around localisation?
    a. *What does localisation mean to you?*
    b. *What does local mean to you?*
2. From your perspective, what is the problem that localisation is responding to?
3. What has most influenced your own perspective on localisation?
4. Can you tell me a bit about how [your organisation] has engaged with debates and commitments around localisation?
    a. Have you or your organisation sought to influence the debate on localisation? If so, how and why? *Probe: motivations, messages, strategies, responses.*
5. Why do you think the localisation agenda has become so prominent? Probe: *why now? Ask for evidence, examples.*
6. Who or what do you think has been particularly influential in shaping the debate around 'localisation'?
7. How have you seen the debate over local humanitarian action shift or play out over the longer term, e.g. 5 or 10 years? And why?
8. What are the implications of the localisation agenda, thus far?
    a. In your organisation?
    b. In the wider sector?
9. What are the barriers to change?
10. Is there anything we haven't talked about that you think is important?

Appendix 4. Interview information sheet and consent form

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Humanitarian System Change and the Localisation Agenda

Department of International Development
London School of Economics and Political Science

Information for participants

Thank you for considering participating in this study. This information sheet outlines the purpose of the study and provides a description of your involvement and rights as a participant, if you agree to take part.

1. What is the research about?
The aim of this research is to identify the factors driving and shaping localisation as an area of humanitarian reform, in order to better understand how change happens in the humanitarian system. It will examine the rise of the discourse of localisation, the nature of the commitments made by a range of humanitarian actors, and the institutional factors influencing the extent to which change takes place.

The methodology includes a literature review and review of organisational documents, as well as interviews with individuals engaged in humanitarian action in various capacities, and with a range of perspectives on localisation. Interviews will focus on the motivations for the shift towards localisation and drivers for change within humanitarian organisations.

2. Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. You do not have to take part if you do not want to. If you do decide to take part I will ask you to sign a consent form.

3. What will my involvement be?
Your participation will involve an interview of around 30 minutes, to be conducted in person or over Skype. I will ask a series of questions relating to localisation and processes of humanitarian reform.

4. How do I withdraw from the study?
You can withdraw at any point of the study, without having to give a reason. You do not have to give any reason for changing your mind. If any questions during the interview make you feel uncomfortable, you do not have to answer them and you can withdraw from the interview at any time for any reason. Withdrawing from the study will have no effect on you. We would retain the information from your participation unless you tell us that you would prefer it to be destroyed.

5. What will my information be used for?
I will use the collected information to write a Masters dissertation.

6. Will my taking part and my data be kept confidential?
The records from this study will be kept as confidential as possible. Your name will not be used in any reports or publications resulting from the study. All digital files, transcripts and summaries will be given codes and stored separately from any names or other direct identification of participants. Only I will have access to the files and the digital records and audio tapes.

7. What if I have a question or complaint?
If you have any questions regarding this study please contact the researcher. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the conduct of this research, please contact the LSE Research Governance Manager via research.ethics@lse.ac.uk.

If you are happy to take part in this study, please sign the consent sheet attached.

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Humanitarian System Change and the Localisation Agenda

Name of researcher:
CONSENT FORM
I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY IS VOLUNTARY.

I am free to decline to participate in this research study, or I may withdraw my participation at any point without penalty. My decision whether or not to participate in this research study will have no negative impacts on me either personally or professionally.

I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet provided for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.	YES / NO
I agree to take part in the project, and for the information I provide to be used to write a Masters dissertation.	YES / NO
I agree to the interview being audio recorded.	YES / NO

Participant name:

Signature: _____ Date _____

Interviewer name:

Signature: Date:

Appendix 5. Summary of Published Grand Bargain Self-Reports

The table below summarises Grand Bargain signatories' self-reports on localisation (work stream 2). All of the following reports were published on the IASC website in July 2017, and are available at: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/resources?og_group_ref_target_id=19568&sort_by=field_published_date_value&sort_order=DESC&og_subspaces_view_all=1&og_subspaces_view_parent=0

Actor	Summary
USA	The US reports continuing capacity building efforts, piloting pooled fund contributions in Ethiopia and Iraq, and working with WFP to ensure 25% of funds go directly to local NGOs (whether or not this includes in-kind contributions is not specified). USAID staff aim to begin more systematically tracking the proportion of funding that goes to local

	agencies, both directly and through sub-awards.
Ireland	Continuation of support to the DREF, CHS Alliance and START fund. In 2017, Ireland began providing its funding to NGO partners working in protracted crises on a multi-year basis, with criteria for this funding stream including analysis of the NGO's own partnership approach, capacity building approach, and analysis of the NGO's flow of funds to local responders. Planned next steps include continued support to pooled funds (and advocacy for allocations from funds to be made to local responders), and funding research relating to localisation and partnership.
Italy	Italian law did not allow direct funding of local responders. It has approved new procedures allowing local civil society organisations to submit humanitarian project proposals, ***if*** they had previous partnerships with CSOs registered in Italy (termed "graduation"). Italy also funds IFRC programmes. Considers localisation a key driver of "*efficiency and sustainability*" but also notes challenges, e.g. "*Monitoring system also need to be adapted in order to allow a sound assessment of the local CSOs capacity*." Also planning to strengthen consortia between INGOs and LNNGOs, including capacity strengthening.
Japan	Japan continues to fund L/NNGOs, INGOs and local authorities through its already-existing 'Grant Assistance for Grass-Roots Human Security Projects (GGP)' scheme. It is unclear how much of this fund supports local responders, or whether that information is tracked. No planned next steps listed.
Luxembourg	Luxembourg "*considers this work stream to be of one of the most important in the Grand Bargain*". It has committed to greater use of pooled funding (CBPFs, CERF and DREF). It has increased its contributions to DREF and CBPFs. The terms and conditions for receiving Ministry funding for humanitarian projects have been revised to highlight the question of involvement of local actors and capacity building.
Mercy Corps	"NTR" (nothing to report).
Norway	Norway increased its contribution to CBPFs in 2016. It reports discussions on local actors' engagement in the delivery of humanitarian assistance, noting, "*this is an issue that we raise with our humanitarian partners, for example in annual meetings with Norwegian NGOs and in country-based pooled fund meetings*." It is revising its principles for support to civil society. It also states: *"More attention should also be paid to the **quality of partnerships**, not just the global, quantitative target."*
Norwegian Refugee Council	"*NRC is participating to the discussion but we are not, for the time being, planning undertaking any specific initiative*". No other information provided.
OCHA	In 2016, CBPFs allocated $127.57 million (17.85%) of funding directly to **national NGOs,** almost double the net amount from previous years. OCHA is also developing a mapping tool to assess capacity of local and national actors, and aiming to reduce humanitarian terminology and language barriers in coordination settings. It plans to strengthen capacities of national and local responders in various areas, with advice and training. It plans to improve CBPF tracking to reflect sub-granting.
Spain	Spain continues to fund the Algerian Red Crescent, the DREF and CBPFs. It notes, "*Complications in terms of reporting on the part of the local actors - who have difficulties in understanding the Spanish legislation and praxis - limit the possibilities of increasing localization on a large scale*" and states, "*the target of 20% funding to local actors in 2020 is very ambitious, but it's open to increase its percentage, if the context and legislation allow it.*" It is assessing the possibility of using a localisation marker to encourage Spanish NGOs to work more closely with local partners.
Steering Committee for	No information on localisation provided.

Humanitarian Response	
Sweden	An estimated 12% of Sweden's humanitarian aid was allocated to local actors in 2015 (including indirect funds where traceable). Doesn't support local authorities and organisations directly. “Localization” is a priority in the new strategy for humanitarian assistance through Sida; the strategy has four focus areas, one of which is “*Enhance the influence of crisis affected people and improve the interaction with local organisations*”. Also plans to continue supporting CBPFs, capacity strengthening of L/NNGOs, and to identify a possible mechanism for directly financing local actors.
Switzerland	One third of its aid is provided to NGOs, including local NGOs, or given through ‘direct actions’ (actions conducted the Swiss Humanitarian Aid staff without intermediaries). Also co-convening the localisation workstream, increasing funding to CBPFs, and planning setting up a National Societies Investment Mechanism to be co-hosted by IFRC and ICRC.
The Netherlands	Increase from 1.7 million euros (2016) to 2.15 million euros (2017) for capacity building. Decreased funding for CBPFs, no additional funds have been allocated to local and national responders.
UNHCR	In 2016, transferred 16% of total expenditures to local partners (LNGOs and local/national governments), an increase from 15% in 2015. UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP are continuing joint work to harmonise partnership arrangements. Planning to adopt a common approach to auditing of partners with other UN agencies, to harmonise partnership agreement templates and simplify reporting.
UNDP	UNDP already 'committed to localised approaches'. Within Global Cluster for Early Recovery, discussions have been held on how to engage local actors in coordination and transition from externally- to locally-led response. UNDP trainings for country offices on crisis response include sessions on how to fulfil WHS and GB commitments including around localisation. Participation in localisation workstream.
UNICEF	23% of its CERF funds already allocated to national partners. In 2016, enacted system changes to measure progress against commitments to allocate funding to local actors. Working to simplify and harmonise terminology and assessments. The UN multi-agency portal is also aimed to increase local/national CSO participation as it will potential partners to express their interest in partnering with UN agencies (UN Partner Portal).
UNFPA	Based on CERF data on UN agency sub-grants in 2014, UNFPA has exceeded the 25% target to local and national responders, taking into consideration in-kind transfers**.** UNFPA is focused on enlarging partnership with local and national responders, and ensuring local organisations are active in coordination structures. UNFPA has made progress in increasing numbers of local organisations or government in GBV coordination. Plans to improve tracking of funding to local and national responders.
UNRWA	No information on localisation provided.
UN Women	UN Women has set up a Global Acceleration Instrument as a *“flexible and rapid financing mechanism that supports quality interventions by local organisations engaging in humanitarian and peacebuilding interventio*ns.” Officially launched in 2016 with programmes have been identified for support in 20 countries. Plans to grow the volume of this instrument.
WFP	Around 80% of WFP partners are local actors. During the Grand Bargain negotiations, WFP *"successfully argued that the target for transfers to national and local responders should be raised from the 20 per cent suggested in the HLP report to 25 per cent."* WFP's 2017-2021 strategic plan commits to demand-side investments in capacity strengthening of local actors. National and local responders 'systematically' included in Country Strategic Plan processes. Some country-specific targets for increasing the number of national partners. Investing in RC/RC national societies. Simplifying and harmonising

	partnership processes.
WHO	As Health Cluster Lead Agency, working to engage national NGOs in response, and providing coordination and linkages with other partners. Tracking of funding for local/national responders underway. Range of work relating to building local and national health responder capacity.
World Vision International (WVI)	Engagement in the IASC HFTT working group to develop localisation marker. WVI "*engaged on the issue of localisation raising the need to consider the role of national affiliates regularly in various financing for and working groups. We have had bilateral discussions with several government donors on the role of affiliates in localisation and contributed to various NGO platforms thinking on the issue."* Lack systems to adequately track funding to L/NNGOs, but a current estimate (based on a survey of 11 of their humanitarian operations) is that 7% of WVI's humanitarian funding is currently going to local organisations. Have developed an internal humanitarian position on localisation.
Australia	Already provide direct support to NDMOs and local institutions. Considering greater use of local suppliers. Funding to Australian Red Cross, supporting Humanitarian Leadership Program, and various other internationally-led efforts relating to preparedness and response. They note, "*We have a long way to go if we are to meet the current target of 20% of humanitarian funding directly to national actors by 2020. Safeguards such as our due diligence requirements can be onerous for local organisations. Varying levels of national capacities will also make it difficult for a global localisation narrative to fit in the Pacific context*".
Belgium	Direct funding of local organisations is not possible under current legal framework. A modification to the 'Royal Decree for Humanitarian Aid' is proposed to allow for contributions to flexible funds managed by INGOs; when this is modified Belgium will consider a contribution to the START Network. Increasing funding for CBPFs. 8% of humanitarian funding goes to local organisations (indirectly, e.g. through Belgian NGOs).
Canada	Ongoing support of RC/RC societies. Continued support to CBPFs in Yemen, South Sudan, Iraq and CAR; extending support to CBPFs in Myanmar and Somalia in 2017. Exploring increasing support for CBPFs and other pooled funding mechanisms. Consulting with CSOs and partners to identify opportunities to deepen collaboration with local actors and remove barriers to partnership.
Care International	CARE signed up to the Charter4Change, and has become a full member of the Missed Opportunities Consortium. CARE has begun to establish a baseline to measure the commitments, and has begun documenting current practices and identifying challenges to more transformative partnerships. They also note it is more challenging to collect qualitative data vs quantitative, e.g. on quality of partnerships. Creation of a CARE-wide High Level Reference Group on Humanitarian Partnership tasked with clarifying CARE's intent for partnering, identifying priority areas for change, and securing high-level commitment to enact this change.
CAFOD	Approximately 55% of CAFOD's programme spend is allocated to partner organisations, but not yet able to disaggregate national or international NGOs. An initial analysis suggests around 20% of funding goes to national organisations. Continuously working to improve their approach to partnerships with regular monitoring by Keystone. Working with Missed Opportunities consortium to develop a fund with START, accessible only to national NGOs. CAFOD is supporting the NEAR network to establish its own national NGO emergency response fund and has obtained funding for a two year project to work on capacity strengthening with NEAR.
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Long-standing focus on investment in capacity strengthening and partnerships with local organisations. Increase from 12.2 million in capacity strengthening in 2015 to 26 million in 2016. Over 2 million USD for multi-year humanitarian capacity strengthening in the Middle East and Eastern/Southern Africa.

Christian Aid	No direct implementation. Based on a manual classification of its 175 partner organisations into the five GHA report categories, Christian Aid's 2015/16 spend was channelled through NNGOs (62%), LNGOs (22%), INGOs (8%), Southern INGOs (5%) and affiliated NNGOs (4%). Christian Aid was the first to propose a target for increasing funding to local and national actors in its WHS submission. Consortium member of four Disaster Emergency Preparedness Programme (DEPP) initiatives. Have undertaken to review Partnership Agreement and Partner Principles to ensure alignment with Charter for Change commitments, and to develop internal guidelines for media, comms and PR staff to ensure to give visibility to local actors in all communications.
Czech Republic	NGO humanitarian projects always based on local capacities (ca. 60% of annual budget); limited direct coordination with local authorities. Planning a bigger proportion of funding for direct cooperation with local stakeholders.
Denmark	In a redesigned partnership policy, CSO applicants are assessed on their contribution to the development of a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal and mutually committing partnerships between CSOs in Denmark and in the global South. Also calling on CSOs to strengthen their analysis of the proportion of funding transferred to local partners, and will hold CSOs accountable for increasing involvement of beneficiaries in design, response, and monitoring and evaluation. Increased contribution to CBPFs.
DfID	Maintaining commitments to the START fund, the DEPP and the Humanitarian Leadership Academy. Largest funder of CBPFs. Preparing a business case for core funding over four years to the Red Cross Movement. Does not have systems available to comprehensively track funding to build local capacity.
Estonia	Supporting local responders via national NGO partnerships in Ukraine and Jordan, representing 6.9% of overall humanitarian funding in 2015. In 2016, salaries and direct costs to local partners in Ukraine, Jordan and Lebanon represented 7.7% of humanitarian funding.
European Civil Protection & Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)	Existing activities include capacity building through the DG ECHO Disaster Preparedness programmes and EU Aid Volunteers programme. Funding for NEAR and (pending) funding for ICVA to connect southern NGO's to Geneva-based coordination and policy-making. Direct funding would require amending Humanitarian Aid Regulation. Also funding the Diaspora Emergency Action & Coordination project, enhancing collaboration with diasporas involved in humanitarian response and conventional humanitarian institutions.
Finland	Investment in strengthening CSOs through MFA Civil Society Unit. Humanitarian funding channelled only to Finnish NGOs with ECHO partnership status; no direct support to local authorities and organisations. Supporter of RC/RC movement.
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	Engagement through FAO-WFP led global Food Security Cluster (FSC). Development of a video project in 2016 showing the importance of partnering and how local partners can become involved in FSCs at the country level. Localisation included in the gFSC Strategic Plan 2017-19.
Germany	Significant increase in funding to CBPFs. Working with ICVA on harmonising reporting requirements. Supporting a project aimed at strengthening WASH capacities of local and national actors. Also support RC/RC projects. The German Coordination Committee on Humanitarian Assistance has established a working group on localisation. Continuing to fund local and national responders as directly as possible; "*for the immediate future this includes one transaction layer, as discussed in the IASC Financing Task Team*".
InterAction	Input on localisation discussions. InterAction members have reported efforts on localisation in the past year including developing internal positions and guidance on localisation and assessing best methods to track funding to local partners.
International Committee of	The ICRC is itself a local (frontline) responder. A new National RC/RC Society Investment Mechanism (NSIM) is being developed by the IFRC and the ICRC to

the Red Cross (ICRC)	strengthen National Societies. This will be used as a pooled fund and will focus on multi-year support for strengthening institutional capacities of National Societies.
International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)	Long-standing work on inclusion of L/NNGOs, including NGOs in Humanitarian Reform project and Principles of Partnership campaigns. Investment in NGO fora at the country level. Supported the translation into Arabic of the survey on the localisation marker. Partnership with UNHCR to invest in its national NGO partners' capacity. Supports the Syrian NNGO representative in the pooled fund working group.
IFRC	Development of new National Society investment mechanism with IFRC and ICRC.
International Labour Organization (ILO)	ILO's intervention model is based on support to its national constituents (Ministries of Labour, Trade Unions, Employers' Organisations). GB commitments informed the ILO's programming in response to the Syrian refugee crisis, in privileging the contracting of national partners where possible. In Turkey, ILO's programme on skills training and certification is fully implemented by local partners.
International Organization for Migration (IOM)	Relies on direct implementation as preferred delivery modality. IOM will expand its capacity building activities over 2017. The organisation also commits to review its mechanism for tracking funds to local and national responders, which in 2016 amounted to approximate 5% of total funding received. The Global CCCM Cluster Strategy 2017-2021 refers to the need for inclusive programming that adheres to local contexts.
International Rescue Committee (IRC)	Already committed to local partner responsiveness under 2020 strategic plan. Working with local and national partners for many years (no percentage given). Has established a set of tools for capacity strengthening. IRC's Emergency Unit has committed to moving emergency programming towards investment in partner's emergency response strategies. Investing in a partnership with Oxfam and World Vision to strengthen capacity of local partners on protection mainstreaming.